

# Discontents at Rome: 63 B.C.

*Class Struggle and Social Praxis  
in Republican Rome*

with a new translation, text, and commentary  
of Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae*

By E. H. Campbell

Third Edition

© E. H. Campbell 2008

All Rights Reserved

**Inopibus Press: Seattle**  
inopibus@gmail.com  
<http://inopibuspressseattle.blogspot.com>

*To Dr. Paul R. Dixon*

Away from these he adds also the abodes of Hell,  
The high gates of Dis, the penalties of sin,  
And thee, Catiline, hanging on a frowning cliff,  
And trembling at the faces of the Furies;  
Far apart, the good, and Cato giving them laws.

*Aeneid* 8.666-670.

If it were possible to present the same subject matter in one form and in no other, one might have reason to think it gratuitous to weary one's hearers by speaking again in the same manner as his predecessors; but since oratory is of such a nature that it is possible to discourse on the same subject matter in many different ways—to represent the great as lowly or invest the little with grandeur, to recount the things of old in a new manner or set forth events of recent date in an old fashion—it follows that one must not shun subjects upon which others have spoken before, but must try to speak better than they. For the deeds of the past are, indeed, an inheritance common to us all; but the ability to make proper use of them at the appropriate time, to conceive the right sentiments about them in each instance, and set them forth in finished phrase, is the peculiar gift of the wise.

*Panegyricus 7-10*

## Chronology

Foundation of Rome (753 B.C.)  
 Lucius Junius Brutus (509 B.C.)  
 Thucydides (460-455 B.C. to 400 B.C.)  
 Plato (427 BC-347 BC)

First Servile War (135-132 B.C.)  
 Second Servile War (104 -103 B.C.)  
 The Social War (91-88 B.C.)  
 Proscriptions of Sulla (81 B.C.)  
 Third Servile War (73 -71 B.C.)  
 Cicero elected Consul (64 B.C.)  
 Bellum Catilinae (63- Jan. 62 B.C.)

Catiline (87-62 B.C.)  
 Cicero (106-43 B.C.)  
 Sallust (86-35 B.C.)  
 Varro (136-27 B. C.)  
 Diodorus Siculus (80-20 B.C.)  
 Pollio (76/75 B.C.-A.D. 5)  
 Livy (59 B.C.-A.D. 17)  
 Elder Seneca (54 B.C.-A.D. 39)  
 Quintilian (35-95)  
 Martial (38–41 to 103-102)  
 Tacitus (56–117)  
 Plutarch (46- 127)  
 Suetonius (75-60)  
 Appian (95-165)  
 Cassius Dio (155-229)  
 St. Jerome (340-420)  
 St. Augustine (354-430)  
 Leonardo Bruni, *History of the Florentine People* (1416)  
 Machiavelli, *Discourses on Livy* (1531)  
 Ben Jonson, *Catiline: His Conspiracy* (1611)  
 Voltaire, *Rome Sauvée* (1754)  
 G.W.F Hegel, *Phenomenology of Spirit* (1807)  
 Henrik Ibsen, *Catiline* (1850, revised 1875)  
 Theodor Mommsen, *A History of Rome* (1854-56)  
 Karl Marx, *Capital* (1867)  
 Aleksandr Blok, *Catiline: A Page from the History of World Revolution* (1918)  
 Sigmund Freud, *Civilization and its Discontents* (1929)  
 Martin Heidegger, *The Origin of the Work of Art* (1935)  
 R.G. Collingwood, *The Idea of History* (1946)  
 Judith E. Kalb, *A Roman Bolshevik* (2000)  
 E. H. Campbell, *Discontents at Rome: 63 B.C.* (2006)

# Contents

<b>I. PREFACE</b> .....	<b>9</b>
<b>II. PROLOGUE (ΠΡΟΛΟΓΟΣ)</b> .....	<b>13</b>
THE QUESTION OF HISTORY: ΓΝΩΘΙ ΣΑΥΤΟΝ .....	14
HISTORY AS ΛΟΓΟΣ AND ΜΕΝ ΛΟΓΟΣ .....	15
HISTORY AS A <i>WORK</i> AND AS A WORK OF ART .....	17
HISTORY AS RHETORIC AND ORATORY .....	17
HISTORY AS RHETORIC, ETHICS, AND HUMANISTIC LOGIC .....	19
PHILOSOPHICAL HISTORY AS A REASONING ABOUT AN EPISODE IN HISTORY .....	20
<b>III. OVERVIEW (ΛΟΓΟΣ)</b> .....	<b>32</b>
THE PROBLEM STATED .....	33
THE GOLDEN AGE AND THE DECLINE.....	39
CLASS STRUGGLE AND SOCIAL PRAXIS .....	61
SALLUST.....	73
CICERO .....	93
SULLA .....	95
CATILINE .....	101
JONSON AND IBSEN.....	103
<b>IV. NARRATIVE (‘ΕΞΗΓΗΤΙΚΟΣ)</b> .....	<b>107</b>
<b>SALLUST’S PROLOGUE</b> .....	<b>108</b>
SECOND CONSPIRACY, JUNE 1 64 B.C. ....	127
FIRST CONSPIRACY, JAN. 1ST – FEB. 5TH, 66.....	129
FIRST SPEECH OF CATILINE AT THE HOME OF PROCIUS LAECA, JUNE 1, 4 B.C. ....	131
ELECTION OF CONSULS SILANUS AND MURENA. SECOND CONSPIRACY, JULY 63 .....	136
MANLIUS, SEPTIMIUS OF CAMERINUM, AND GAIUS JULIUS, ET AL TAKE TO THE FIELD AT FAESULAE, PICENE, AND APULIA RESPECTIVELY, OCT. 27.....	141
SECOND MEETING AT LAECA’S HOUSE, NOV. 6 & <i>ARGUMENTUM AD BACULUM</i> AGAINST CICERO, NOV. 7 .....	142
CICERO ASCENDS AS DICTATOR .....	143
SENATE INFORMED ABOUT THE ACTIVITIES OF MANLIUS, NOV. 1 & QUINTUS POMPEIUS RUFUS DISPATCHED TO CAPUA AND QUINTUS METELLUS CELER TO PICENE.....	144
CATILINE DEPARTS FOR THE CAMP OF MANLIUS.....	146
<b>CICERO’S <i>ORATIO IN CATILINAM I</i>, ARGUMENTUM AD HOMINEM, NOV. 8</b> .....	<b>147</b>
CATILINE MAKES INSULTING REMARKS TO THE CONSUL .....	164
CATILINE DEPARTS FOR THE CAMP OF MANLIUS.....	165
<b>CICERO’S <i>ORATIO IN CATILINAM II</i>, ARGUMENTUM AD POPULUM, NOV. 9</b> .....	<b>166</b>
MANLIUS SENDS INSTRUCTIONS TO MARCIUS REX .....	179
REPLY OF QUINTUS MARCIUS .....	181
QUINTUS CATULUS READS A LETTER FROM CATILINE TO THE SENATE .....	182
CATILINE AND MANLIUS DECLARED <i>HOSTES REI PUBLICAE</i> , NOV. 17 .....	183
PUBLIUS UMBRENUS SEEKS THE AMBASSADORS OF THE ALLOBROGES .....	188
THE ALLOBROGES INFORM QUINTUS FABIUS SANGA ABOUT THE PLOT .....	189
PLOT TO ASSAULT CICERO AT HIS DOOR .....	191
ALLOBROGES SECURE LETTERS FROM CONSPIRATORS, LETTER OF VOLTURCIUS TO CATILINE.....	192
ARREST OF THE CONSPIRATORS AT THE MULVIAN BRIDGE, DEC. 2 .....	193
CICERO CONVENES THE SENATE AND READS OUT THE LETTERS OF THE CONSPIRATORS .....	194

VOLTURCIUS GRANTED IMMUNITY .....	196
<b>CICERO'S ORATIO IN CATILINAM III, ARGUMENTUM AD POPULUM, DEC. 3 .....</b>	<b>197</b>
EVIDENCE GIVEN BY LUCIUS TARQUINIUS AGAINST MARCUS CRASSUS.....	211
CICERO ASKED TO INTRODUCE FALSE CHARGES AGAINST JULIUS CAESAR .....	213
REWARDS VOTED FOR THE ALLOBROGES AND TITUS VOLTURIUS .....	215
<b>CICERO'S ORATIO IN CATILINAM IV, ARGUMENTUM AD SENATUM .....</b>	<b>216</b>
OPINION OF DECIMUS SILANUS .....	227
SPEECH OF JULIUS CAESAR, ARGUMENTUM AD SENATUM .....	228
SPEECH OF CATO MINOR, ARGUMENTUM AD SENATUM.....	236
SENATE ADOPTS THE RESOLUTION OF CATO .....	243
SALLUST'S CHARACTER ANALYSIS OF CAESAR AND CATO MINOR.....	245
EXECUTION OF THE CONSPIRATORS, DEC. 5.....	246
CATILINE ARMS HIS MEN, FORMS TWO LEGIONS, REFUSES THE HELP OF THE SLAVES .....	248
NEWS OF THE EXECUTION OF THE CONSPIRATORS REACHES CATILINE'S CAMP.....	249
FINAL SPEECH OF CATILINE .....	250
ARGUMENTUM AD BACULUM IN CATILINAM, AT PISTORIA, JAN. 62.....	253
<b>SALLUST'S DENOUEMENT .....</b>	<b>257</b>
<b>V. ARGUMENT (ΣΥΛΛΟΓΙΣΜΟΣ).....</b>	<b>259</b>
THE IRONY OF ALEXANDER BLOK .....	260
JUDITH KALB THE HELMET OF HADES AND THE RING OF GYGES .....	265
ANN THOMAS WILKINS, POSITIVISM AND DECONSTRUCTION .....	271
LYNN HAROLD HARRIS' <i>OXYMORON</i> .....	293
<b>VI. CONCLUSION (ΚΡΙΤΙΚΟΣ).....</b>	<b>358</b>
THE SPARTACUS REBELLION .....	368
THE FIRST TRIUMVIRATE AND THE PROSECUTION OF CICERO .....	372
DIGRESSION ON DEIOCES.....	375
DIGRESSION ON RELIGION .....	376
GRADATIO (ΚΑΙΜΕ) .....	392
THE ORIGIN OF THE LAWGIVER .....	398
DIREMPTION OF THE SELF AND THE MATERIAL WORLD .....	402
ETHICS LIKE HISTORY DEVELOPS IN SPIRALS.....	407
POST-CIVILIZATIONISM.....	413
DIGRESSION ON <i>GENESIS</i> .....	416
<b>VII. METALOGUE (ΜΕΤΑ ΛΟΓΟΥ) .....</b>	<b>460</b>
<b>VIII. ADDENDA .....</b>	<b>491</b>
THE SPARTACUS REBELLION FROM APPIAN'S <i>CIVIL WARS</i> .....	492
TACTIUS ON THE ORIGINS OF THE JEWS FROM <i>HISTORIAE</i> .....	496
<b>IX. WORKS CITED.....</b>	<b>499</b>
<b>X. INDEX .....</b>	<b>513</b>



## **I. Preface**

1. It has been my intention neither to lead the reader to believe that the translations of the great Hellenists and Latinists of Oxford and Harvard are wholly inadequate nor that they beyond reproach; nor have I intended to lead the reader to believe that one rendering of these works in to English is altogether much better than all others and, on account of that, be relied upon alone. Ezra Pound said somewhere that every generation requires a new translation. But here is more to it than this: it is necessary for the student to become acquainted with both the best of the old and the best of the new, and, consequently, I believe that one should familiarize oneself with as many of these translators, textual critics, and commentators as they have time for, not just with my work alone. Many of the standard translation are quite good. The work done by the English grammarians, authenticating texts, translating the Greek and Latin library, codifying Greek and Latin grammar, and certifying the Latin and Greek dictionaries and lexicon, in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries c.1885-1925, is indubitably of singular importance to the history of Western thought. And we must but ask: how is it that what once was of such great importance that countless scholars, the best and the brightest, were employed for well neigh forty years standardizing this library has all but vanished from American higher education? The enormous amount of dedication, energy, and resources demands its recompense.

2. On the other hand, I must confess that J. C. Rolf's translation of the *Bellum Catilinae* has not suited my purposes. Indeed, in his translation of the *Bellum Catilinae*, he took, in my opinion, far too many liberties with respect to the exactness of grammar and syntax; though the gist of what it says in Latin truly is there, and indubitably I could not have achieved what I have achieved with out his work ahead of me, indeed I often

relied on it for the gist of Sallust; but it did not have the precision that I have required.<sup>1</sup> And on account of the fact that I seldom agreed with his translation, and therefore would not render Sallust's epigrams among my own words in the manner that he chose; I concluded that a complete translation of the *Bellum Catilinae* by my own hand was necessary. But if the whole of the *Bellum Catilinae*, then why not the whole of Cicero's *Orationes in Catilinam I-IV*, since both texts are first and primary things, the very things to be taken in hand. I therefore have felt the need to include a complete Latin text, translation, and commentary of that document as well.

3. The parts of Sallust's narrative about the founding of the city and the decline of its morals, have been substantively and creatively employed before the center piece, the Narrative, 'ο εξηγητικός, which itself begins with the First Conspiracy and relates the entire *Bellum Catilinae* thence from to the defeat of Catilinae at Pistora, the *argumentum ad baculum*, in January of B.C. 62. Therefore I resolved to include Sallust's preface to *Bellum Catilinae* earlier on in the Overview, 'ο λόγος and, moreover, to repeat a number of things from both the Overview, the Narrative later on in the Argument, 'ο συλλογισμὸς and the Conclusion, ἡ κριτικός. Aware of the repetitive nature of this practice, after delivering the Narrative I supply in brief citations from both the *Bellum Catilinae* and *In Catilinam* in English, which I have done, where I believe necessary, only to punctuate important philosophical points pertaining to the truth or fallacy of certain arguments lain down by the opposition. Thus a few of the things you have read before the Argument and the Conclusion one read before. One shall have, nevertheless,

---

<sup>1</sup> "In not a few instances, perhaps oftener than a more gifted translator would have found necessary, Sallust's sententious brevity has been sacrificed to clearness." Cf. Rolf's translation of *Bellum Catilinae*: viii.

read the whole *Bellum Catilinae* and the four orations of Cicero against Catiline, in both English and Latin, by the time one has completed the whole work.

4. I intend to render a translation of the four speeches Cicero and to place these speeches in between Sallust's narrative, at the proper time when they should have occurred, thus creating a sort of *narrative intextus*, or *πεπλεγμενοι*: an interweaving of texts including remarks by a number of Latin and Greek authors, like Plutarch and Cassius Dio, to name a few.

5. There remains, however, a great many Greek and Latin translations ahead of me, and I sincerely hope to have the time to get around to rendering those texts as well; but there are, one must recall, many renderings of the Greek and Latin library which are fine unto themselves; and those ought to be known to every student of the Classics.

Edward H. Campbell  
April 24, 2008.

## **II. Prologue (Πρόλογος)**

## The question of history: γνώθι σαυτόν

1. *History*, like philosophy, begins with a question. Many believe that the principal question of History is about the past and, moreover, a question about the *actuality* of the events of the past in order to reach conclusions which answer the question with *certainty*, *certus*.<sup>2</sup> Hence the question: ‘What actually happened?’ comes to mind almost immediately. But the real question of History is not what *was*, but what *is*; for the past is gone forever and can but live in the minds of those in the present. But we must first ask what *was* in order to arrive at the principal question: What *is*? This essay, being about Catiline, must first ask: Who *was* L. Sergius Catiline? But only so as to arrive at the point where we are able to answer the question: Who *is* L. Sergius Catiline? But we shall find that not even the answer to this is really the thing sought after, since the mission of all philosophy is to ‘know thyself,’ γνώθι σαυτόν, hence: ‘Who am I?’

“Knowing yourself means knowing, first, what it is to be a man; secondly, knowing what it is to be the kind of man you are; thirdly, knowing what it is to be the man you are and nobody else is.” (*The Idea of History*10)

And, seeing that ‘No man is an island,’<sup>3</sup> we must ask moreover, who are *we*? History is collective property, but not merely property that is owned by us all but is also *in* us all. We are possessed by it and shall become it as we pass over from *being* to pure Being. Thus we must also ask not only what we shall make of it, but what shall *it* make of us?

---

<sup>2</sup> *certus*, -a, -um, determined, resolved, fixed, settled; *determinate* and *fixated*. (*Lewis and Short*)

<sup>3</sup> John Donne (1572-1631), *Meditation XVII*, “No man is an island, entire of itself; every man is a piece of the continent, a part of the main. If a clod be washed away by the sea, Europe is the less, as well as if a promontory were, as well as if a manor of thy friend’s or of thine own were: any man’s death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind, and therefore never send to know for whom the bells tolls; it tolls for thee.”

And, moreover, in adjudging the character of Catiline we must also pass judgment on his contemporaries, for Catiline was not alone in his crimes nor Cicero alone in opposing them.

## History as λόγος and μὲν λόγος

2. Now if there is a word, λόγος, there is a definition, ὄρος, for that word.

Ἔστι μὲν οὖν τὰ ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ παθημάτων σύμβολα καὶ τὰ γραφόμενα τῶν ἐν τῇ φωνῇ

Things in sounds are symbols of impressions in the soul is and written things of those things in the sounds. (*On Interpretation* 16a4)

At first we have a word, Catiline, next we seek the definition for that word which is arrived at through a *rational account*, μετα λογου, of that word.

Ἔστι δ' ὄρος μὲν λόγος ὅ τὸ τί ἦν εἶναι σημαίνων.

And a definition is a *reason* for the thing which was to be signified. (*Topica* 101b39)

And despite all the controversy about the meaning of the word 'definition:'<sup>4</sup>

“The search for definition basically belongs to the activity of the human mind in all its scientific or dialectical efforts to clarify discourse, to achieve precision of thought, to focus issues and resolve them.” (*Definition* 294)

---

<sup>4</sup> That is, is definition a question of usage, a system of genus and differentia, the cause or genesis of a thing, a thing which suits us when we use a word, mere opinion, its essence, or its actuality, and so on?

The true definition of a word is its *lexical definition*,<sup>5</sup> for this is where we shall find out what truly is the cultural agreement as to the definition of the word; hence what most people believe a word means which enables us to communicate effectively within the culture that we live, for *lex* also means *law*. Thus the lexical entry is its *lawful definition*. If there is some contention about the definition of a word, then it is proper that we begin with the *lexical definition* and contend against this through reasoning which, if successful, shall change the definition of a word which ought to lead to a corrected lexical entry. Hence definitions are the proper objects of rhetoric and it is precisely the definition of the phrase L. Sergius Catiline which either has already or now is, undergoing a change. And it is against this new, or becoming, definition of Catiline, i.e., that Catiline was either a hero, or no worse than other people, or a little something great, or enigmatic, *et cetera*, that I shall launch my attack in order to arrive at a corrected definition for the phrase, that is to state the word's essence through its predicate. For instance, Catiline could not have been enigmatic for that y says x is enigmatic is not to say that x is truly a mystery but that x is a mystery to y. And just as Catiline may be a mystery to some contemporary author he was, nevertheless, no mystery to Sallust, or Cicero, or Plutarch, or Cassius Dio, or Appian, or Florus, or Boccaccio, or Ben Jonson, *et al.* To say that Catiline is 'an enigma' is not to say that Catiline is truly a mystery but that the questioner has been confused. Catiline may not be, and indeed wasn't, confusing to everyone.

---

<sup>5</sup> Lexis, -eos, *a word*; Gr. λέξις, *a word peculiar in form or signification*, λέξεις, fem. nom. pl., *glossary*. (Liddell and Scott) And definitus, a, um, *definite, limited, distinct*. (Lewis and Short)



## History as a *work* and as a Work of Art

3. And though this document is History, the first thing that the reader might notice is that it is nothing like any history book they have seen before for it is also philosophy, but it is more than *mere* philosophy. It is, as Martin Heidegger (1889-1976) might have put it, the *strife* of the *craft of thinking* against an historical object creating an *opening* between *world* and *earth* which allows *being*, ἀλήθεια, *to presence* in the form of a book; *truth being brought to stand in a work of art*. And since it is a craft that creates a work of art, and the craft practiced here is thinking about historical thought, it is truly *philosophy* in general and philosophy *about* history in particular. But it is beyond the *metaphysics* of philosophy for it presences its truth in a work of art—a word which itself means truth, or indeed *true being*, or moreover the truth of pure Being coming *to be*, *crescere*.

“The establishing of truth in the work is the bringing forth of a being such as never was before and will never come to be again.” (*The Origin of the Work of Art* 181)

## History as Rhetoric and Oratory

4. It is also not ordinary history too in so far as it does not simply treat written works which pertain directly to the matter at hand, but develops a line of reasoning about those sources, builds an argument, and delivers a conclusion through rhetoric and therefore draws upon a wide range of thought both ancient, medieval, Renaissance, Enlightenment

and post-Enlightenment, or modern. And whereas it is rhetoric is genetically related to oratory:

*[30.5] Neque oratoris vis et facultas, sicut ceterarum rerum, angustis et brevibus terminis cluditur, sed is est orator, qui de omni quaestione pulchre et ornate et ad persuadendum apte dicere pro dignitate rerum, ad utilitatem temporum, cum voluptate audientium possit. [31.1] Hoc sibi illi veteres persuaserant, ad hoc efficiendum intellegebant opus esse, non ut in rhetorum scholis declamarent, nec ut fictis nec ullo modo ad veritatem accedentibus controversiis linguam modo et vocem exercerent, sed ut iis artibus pectus implerent, in quibus de bonis et malis, de honesto et turpi, de iusto et iniusto disputatur; [2] haec enim est oratori subiecta ad dicendum material nam in iudiciis fere de aequitate, in deliberationibus de honestate disserimus, ita ut plerumque haec ipsa in vicem misceantur: de quibus copiose et varie et ornate nemo dicere potest, nisi qui cognovit naturam humanam et vim virtutum pravitatemque vitiorum et intellectum eorum, quae nec in virtutibus nec in vitiis numerantur...[7] Neque enim sapientem informamus neque Stoicorum comitem, sed eum qui quasdam artis haurire, omnes libare debet. Ideoque et iuris civilis scientiam veteres oratores comprehendebant, et grammatica [8] musica geometria imbuebantur.*

[30.5] The virtue and power of oratory, unlike other matters, is that it is not enclosed by a narrow and short boundary, but he is an orator who would be able to speak on every question beautifully, ornately and to persuasion suitable to the dignity of the affairs, utility of the times, and the delight of the audience. [31.1] By this the ancients had convinced themselves, to bring about this thing they understood to be a work, not in the way they would declaim in the schools of

rhetoric, nor in the manner exercising the tongue and voice in debates approaching reality, but in such a way that should fill the breast with these arts which examine the good and the bad, the honorable and the dishonorable, justice from injustice; [2] these in fact are subject matters for an orator to speak about, for we speak about complete equality in court and honesty in deliberation; these should mix themselves in such a way so as to be interchangeable about which no one is able to speak abundantly with both variety and adornment except he who knows human nature, both the power of virtue and the crookedness of vice, and understanding those things which are counted as neither virtues nor vices... We are fashioning neither a Wiseman nor a companion<sup>6</sup> of the Stoics—he who draws from certain kinds of arts, but he who samples them all. For that reason both the knowledge of law<sup>7</sup> and being saturated with grammar, music, and geometry was common to ancient orators. (*Dialogus de Oratoribus* 30.5-31-7)

Thus I develop a *pathway* to an opening by setting worldly philosophers, thinkers, and historians to strife for the middle ground; for this is the pathway to the presence-ing of the Being of beings; and against Sallust himself, *inter alios*, they shall contend.

### History as Rhetoric, Ethics, and Humanistic Logic

5. My history is a history of the process of the historical revision of the *Bellum Catilinae*, a defense of Sallust's history, a vindication of classical scholarship, and, moreover, a defense of rhetoric as the art of expounding ethics through *humanistic logic*. It is a history of thought about the conspiracy of Catiline, but it is not, strictly speaking, a

---

<sup>6</sup> masc. acc. sing. of *comes*, companion, hence *neque sapientem...neque Stoicorum comitem* = neither a Wiseman nor a companion of the Stoics.

<sup>7</sup> *jus civilis*, 'civil justice' = law.

forensic examination of those sources; for the question to be answered is not who Catiline really was, but who he is and those who take sides with him are.

“In our language the term *history* unites the objective with the subjective side, and denotes quite as much the *historia rerum gestarum* as the *res gestae* themselves; on the other hand it comprehends no less what has *happened*, than a *narration* of what has happened. This union of the two meanings we must regard as of a higher order than mere outward accident; we must suppose historical narrations to have appeared contemporaneously with historical deeds and events. It is an internal vital principle common to both that produces them synchronously.”

(*Philosophy of History* 181)

### Philosophical History as a Reasoning about an Episode in History

6. By Hegel’s methodological schemata my history is neither an *original history*, because I do not discuss deeds which were held before my own eyes in a time when I shared the same spirit of the principle actors, nor is it *reflective history* because my history only treats a single *episode* of a great history and does not apply a forensic methodology to the *criticism* of the sources for this episode in history, it is the *thoughtful consideration of this episode* in history because it considers the *meaning* of the events, and the meaning of the implicit change in the interpretation of those events, with the aim that people learn from this history and act according to it, seeing that ‘he who has a memory is teachable,’<sup>8</sup> and, moreover:

‘Ὅλως τε σημεῖον τοῦ ἑιδότος καὶ μὴ ἑιδότος τὸ δύνασθαι διδάσκει ἔστιν, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τὴν τέχνην τῆς ἑμπειρίας ἡγούμεθα μᾶλλον ἑπιστήμην εἶναι.

---

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Aristotle’s *Metaphysics* (980b22-25).

And as a whole it is a sign of knowledge or ignorance to be able to teach, and, on account of this, we hold Art over Experience to be scientific knowledge.

(*Metaphysics* 981b7-8)

Sallust's history is an *original history* Livy's *reflective history*, mine *philosophical*.

Thus it is in general a *philosophical history*, μετα λογου,<sup>9</sup> of the *Bellum Catilinae*.

7. Thus it is a *reasoning* about this episode in history, for all real history is a reasoning, and, moreover, a rational account of the acts of men past for the use of men in the present, the dead instructing the living.

Ἔστι δὴ συλλογισμὸς λόγος ἐν ᾧ θεέντων τινῶν ἕτερόν τι τῶν κειμένων ἐξ ἀνάγκης συμβαίνει διὰ τῶν κειμένων. Ἀπόδειξις μὲν οὖν ἐστίν, ὅταν ἐξ ἀληθῶν καὶ πρώτων ὁ συλλογισμὸς ἢ ἀληθῆς ἢ ἐκ τοιούτων ἀδιὰ τινῶν πρώτων καὶ ἀληθῶν τῆς περὶ αὐτὰ γνώσεως τὴν ἀρχὴν εἴληφεν· διαλεκτικὸς δὲ συλλογισμὸς ὁ ἐξ ἐνδόξων συλλογιζόμενος. Ἔστι δὲ ἀληθῆ μὲν καὶ πρώτα τὰ μὴ δι' ἐτέρων ἀλλὰ δι' αὐτῶν ἔχοντα τὴν πίστιν... ἐνδοξα δὲ τὰ δοκοῦντα πᾶσιν ἢ τοῖς πλείστοις ἢ τοῖς σοφοῖς... ἐριστικὸς δ' ἐστὶ συλλογισμὸς ὁ ἐκ φαινομένων ἐδόξων, μὴ ὄντων δέ... οὐ γὰρ πᾶν τὸ φαινόμενον ἐνδοξον καὶ ἐστὶν ἐνδοξον.

Now reasoning<sup>10</sup> is an account in which what is being laid down through its laying down comes to be laid down a different thing.<sup>11</sup> A *demonstration*,<sup>12</sup> then, is either reasoning out of true things and first things; or out of such things which

<sup>9</sup> 'a rational account.'

<sup>10</sup> ὁ συλλογισμὸς, or the syllogism.

<sup>11</sup> τι τῶν κειμένων... διὰ τῶν κειμένων: the thing laid down...through the laying down... συμβαίνει: comes to be... ἐξ ἀνάγκης: by necessity... ἕτερόν: a different thing.

<sup>12</sup> That is, a *demonstrative argument*; ἀπόδειξις, apodixis, showing forth, making known, exhibiting, demonstration. (Liddell and Scott)

has left the origin of our knowledge about them from first things and true things; *dialectical* reasoning, on the other hand, is reasoning out of accepted opinions. And things are true and primary which not through other things but through themselves commands belief...accepted opinions, however, are things which are thought by the whole, the majority, or the wise...but contentious reasoning appears<sup>13</sup> to be from accepted opinions, but is not so...for not every thing which appears to be accepted opinion is accepted opinion. (*Topica* 100a18.25-100b18.26)

And the history of the *Bellum Catilinae*, having thus been lain down, is once again taken in hand, as accepted opinions held by the whole, the just, the majority, or the wise, lain down again and, thereby, comes to be a different thing.

8. But it is in its particular aspect too it is *ethical philosophy* derived from historical examples, for we cannot have mere history, the mere narration, and thus transmission, of the events, because the telling of the story is not without reason. Thus it is imperative not that we only understand the story, but also the reason for the story. And seeing that the story must reason have, and that the telling of the story constitutes history, we must also ascertain the reason for History.

[1.14.5] ‘Όταν δὲ τὸ τῆς ἱστορίας ἦθος ἀναλαμβάνη τις, ἐπιλαθέσθαι χρὴ πάντων τῶν τοιούτων καὶ πολλάκις μὲν εὐλογεῖν καὶ κοσμεῖν τοῖς μεγίστοις ἐπαίνοις τοὺς ἐχθροὺς, ὅταν αἱ πράξεις ἀπαιτῶσι τοῦτο, πολλάκις δ’ ἐλέγχειν καὶ ψέγειν ἐπονειδίστως τοὺς ἀναγκαιοτάτους, ὅταν αἱ τῶν ἐπιτηδευμάτων ἀμαρτίαι τοῦθ’ ὑποδεικνύωσιν. [6] ‘Όσπερ γὰρ ζώου τῶν ὄψεων ἀφαιρεθειῶν ἀχρειοῦται τὸ

---

<sup>13</sup> φαινομένων: i.e., phenomena

ὄλον, οὕτως ἐξ ἱστορίας ἀναιρεθείσης τῆς ἀληθείας τὸ καταλειπόμενον αὐτῆς ἀνωφελές γίνεται διήγημα. [7] Διόπερ οὔτε τῶν φίλων κατηγορεῖν οὔτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ἐπαινεῖν ὀκνητέον, οὔτε δὲ τοὺς αὐτοὺς ψέγειν, ποτὲ δ' ἐγκωμιάζειν εὐλαβητέον, ἐπειδὴ τοὺς ἐν πράγμασιν ἀναστρεφομένους οὐτ' εὐστοχεῖν αἰεὶ δυνατὸν οὐθ' ἀμαρτάνειν συνεχῶς εἰκόσ. [8] Αποστάντας οὖν τῶν πραττόντων αὐτοῖς τοῖς πραττομένοις ἐφαρμοστέον τὰς πρεπούσας ἀποφάσεις καὶ διαλήψεις ἐν τοῖς ὑπομνήμασιν. [9] ὡς δ' ἔστιν ἀληθὴ τὰ νῦν ὑφ'

[1.14.5] Whenever anyone assumes<sup>14</sup> the moral character of History,<sup>15</sup> it is necessary, on the one hand, to have forgotten everything such as this,<sup>16</sup> and often, on the other hand, necessary to speak well of, and honor with the greatest commendations, the enemy; while at the same time you shall pass over they who demand this very thing, many times, moreover, to shame with reproach and censure with force, whenever a failure of their practices should make itself known. [6] For just as an animal which has had its eyesight taken away is rendered completely useless, in the same way, History itself, having been razed of truth, is left behind a useless thing and becomes a tale. [7] Therefore hesitate neither to speak against friends nor commend enemies, nor to blame them both,<sup>17</sup> but to praise at any time one must beware of turning things upside down, for it is neither possible to always hit the mark nor to miss the mark holding together a likeness of truth. [8] Standing aloof, at any rate, from the doers, one must adapt

<sup>14</sup> ἀναλαμβάνη pres. subj. act. of ἀναλαμβάνω, to take up, take into one's hands, to take upon one's self, assume, undertake, engage in. (*Liddell and Scott*)

<sup>15</sup> ἱστορία, inquiry, to learn by inquiry, and knowledge so obtained. (*Liddell and Scott*) Thus, as it were, 'whoever assumes the morals necessary to learn by inquiry.'

<sup>16</sup> I.e. To love his friends and his country and share their enemies. *Op. cit.* (1.14.4).

<sup>17</sup> τοὺς αὐτοὺς = 'the same men,' i.e. them both.

to be clearly seen speaking plainly and making determinations in the remembrances for the actions themselves, [9] so as they be true now by itself.

(*Polybius* 1.14.5-9)

This document understood in so far as it tells of history it relates the *perfective*, yet in terms of the ethics derived there from it transmits the *progressive*.

9. In other words, its *being*, *ov*, *ens*, has *dual aspect*.<sup>18</sup> It is both critical, κριτικός and exegetical, ἑξηγητικός,<sup>19</sup> and presents a *dialectical problem*, προβλήμα διαλεκτικόν Was Catiline a criminal, or not?

Πρόβλημα δ' ἔστι διαλεκτικὸν θεώρημα τὸ συντεῖνον ἢ πρὸς αἵρεσιν καὶ φυγὴν ἢ πρὸς ἀλήθειαν καὶ γνῶσιν.

A dialectical problem is an investigation contending either to acceptance or avoidance or to truth and knowledge. (*Topica* 104b1)

With respect to passing judgment, *absolvere*, on the Catilinarian affair there are two questions that must be answered, a *problem* and a *proposition*, and two ways of reasoning about them. First the problem then the proposition: (I) 'Was Catiline a villain, or a hero?' (II) 'If Catiline did these things would he be a criminal?' Now a *proposition* has two parts: (α) a *protasis*, πρότασις,<sup>20</sup> 'If,' *si*, or *ei* and (β) an *apodosis*, απόδοσις, 'Then,'

<sup>18</sup> "Dual" refers specifically to "things that come in pairs." For instance, eyes, legs, feet hands, etc. "Aspect" refers to verbal action being either past completed that is, Aorist in Greek, or Perfective in Latin, or to one of the progressive tenses, that is, Present, Imperfect, or Future. Although a written document is generally designated as a Noun, the study of the document give the document a progressive being, i.e. it is an action in the mind of the reader, but also carries through the values of the past into the presents and breathes new life, as it were, into old ideas. This is another way of saying that the ethics of Western Civilization has been, and is, a progressive development, not a static sort of thing as is a *moral substantive*.

<sup>19</sup> ἑξηγητικός *of* or *for narrative* by way of ἑξήγησις, εως, ἢ, statement, narrative; explanation, interpretation from ἑξήγεόμαι, to be the leader of. (*Liddell and Scott*)

<sup>20</sup> "The protasis has its name from πρότασις, lit. stretching *forward*, that which is put forward (in logic a *permiss*); the apodosis, from απόδοσις lit. *giving back*; *return*; i.e. the *resuming* or *answering* clause." (*Smyth's Greek Grammar* 2280a)



*ita, tum, sic*, or ‘αν, δέ, ‘αλλά, μή, ‘ου. There are two kinds of reasonings about the problem and the proposition are *demonstrative* and *dialectical*.

10. First the demonstrative argument followed by the dialectical. In answering the moral problem ‘Was Catiline a villain, or a hero?’ By way of *demonstrative* argument, I must first presume that the history of the affair that we have received is both true and primary, ‘αληθῶν καὶ πρώτων. Thus without considering whether or not Catiline actually did the things he was accused of, we lay down the proposition: ‘If Catiline did these things would he be a criminal?’ Taking the history that we have received<sup>21</sup> as true and primary the apodosis would be ‘yes.’ Thus the moral problem would be answered: ‘Catiline was a villain.’

11. But this moral judgment with respect to the moral problem: ‘Catiline was a villain?’ is to proceed down the path by way of *demonstrative* reasoning and would, therefore, require me to adopt a *moral substantive* principle such as ‘Thou shalt not kill’ and show that Catiline killed and, therefore, Catiline was a criminal; presuming the history as it was handed down to us is true and it is. But it can be shown that the words of the demonstrative moralist always belie his deeds. For instance, a moral substantive such as ‘Thou shalt not kill,’ was propounded by Moses, himself a murderer:

[2.11] *In diebus illis postquam creverat Moses egressus ad fratres suos vidit afflictionem eorum et virum aegyptium percutientem quendam de Hebraeis*

---

<sup>21</sup> The complete list of crimes that Catiline has been accused of are as follows. *Sacrilege*: for the desecration of the fountain of Apollo by washing his bloody hands in it after murdering of Marcus Marius. The *Rape* of the Vestal Virgin Fabia which is also a sacrilege in addition to a rape. *Incest*: married his daughter Aurelia Orestilla. Six or seven counts of *Murder*: murdered his wife, murdered his son, sacrificed a boy (probably his own son), murdered his brother-in-law Quintus Caecilius, murdered Marcus Marius Gratidianus, and murdered Marcus Volumnius and Lucius Tanusius. *Cannibalism*: drank the blood of a human sacrifice and ate vital parts. *Conspiracy*: conspired along with several other men to seize the Roman government. *Attempted Murder*: attempted to murder Cicero, and *Bribery*. We hold that he would only need to be guilty of one of these crimes in order to be named justly ‘criminal.’

*fratribus suis [12] cumque circumspexisset huc atque illuc et nullum adesse vidisset percussum Aegyptium abscondit sabulo.*

[2.11] In those days, after Moses had separated,<sup>22</sup> having gone out to his own brothers, he saw their suffering and an Egyptian striking a man, as one might say one of their Hebrew brothers, [12] and when he looked about, this way and that, and saw no one to be about, struck the Egyptian and hid him in the sand. (*Exodus* 2.11-12)

Moreover, he later on commanded others commit murder immediately after he himself forbade it to the same.

*[32.27] Quibus ait haec dicit Dominus Deus Israhel ponat vir gladium super femur suum ite et redite de porta usque ad portam per medium castrorum et occidat unusquisque fratrem et amicum et proximum suum [28] fecerunt filii Levi iuxta sermonem Mosi cecideruntque in die illo quasi tria milia hominum [29] et ait Moses consecratis manus vestras hodie Domino unusquisque in filio et fratre suo ut detur vobis benediction.*

[32.27] To whom he said these things:<sup>23</sup> “The Lord God of the land of the gods of El<sup>24</sup> says let a man put a sword on your leg and go from gate to gate and return too the middle of the camp and let him kill each one of these: a brother, a friend, and a next of kin of yours. [28] The sons of Levi did near to the speech of Moses and they killed almost three thousand men on that day. [29] And Moses said,

---

<sup>22</sup> I.e. from home.

<sup>23</sup> *Quibus* is a dat. pl. Thus: to whom, *ait*, he said, *haec*, a neut. acc. pl., these things.

<sup>24</sup> *Dominus Deus Israhel*, as a masc. nom. sing., is the Subject of the sentence. *Israhel* could be an indeclin. masc. nom. sing. and does not necessarily have to be translated “of Israel,” as is frequently done, but could be translated “the Lord God Israel.” But, moreover, *isra* = ‘a land’ + *ha* = the + *el* or ‘the god El.’ meaning ‘the land of the gods El’ where El = ‘Elohim’ or ‘Elshaddai,’ etc. and Elohim is a masc. nom. pl.

today you have consecrated your hands to the Lord, a blessing to y'all each, each one gave by means of a son or a brother. (*Exodus 32.27-29*)

Thus what was taken to be a first and primary principle, which required no proof for itself, was indeed merely an accepted opinion; that one *should* not kill according to the whole, the majority, or the wise. Whoever said that the moral principle 'Thou shalt not kill' must not have believed his own words.

12. Those who follow this doctrine somehow fail to give the weight to this contradiction that it truly deserves, for no one but a *dissembler*, 'είρων,<sup>25</sup> would say that it is always wrong to kill or the *argumentum ad baculum* is always a fallacy. They themselves maintain that the murder of the Cohenites and the Israelites by the Levites was a justifiable exception to the absolute moral substantive, and thereby demonstrate that what to them is absolute is not truly so. It can be shown that, to they who hold them, there are exceptions to every substantive moral principle, demonstrating that the morality of any given act must judged according to each and every *special case* because morality is not in *stasis*, στάσις,<sup>26</sup> but in *flux, fluxus*.<sup>27</sup>

13. There are those who suppose to sidestep the problem of law revealed through divine agency by propounding theories of what they call *natural law*, but even this fails. There is no natural law, true and primary principles, or axioms with respect to human social praxis. Fundamental generalized principals can only be discovered in the natural world. The human world, on the other hand, is a world of absolute moral freedom and it is for mankind itself to determine what is just and moral, which is indeed changing.

---

<sup>25</sup> 'είρων, ωνος, 'ο, 'η, dissembler, one who says less than he thinks; also 'ειρωνεία, 'η, dissimulation, i.e. ignorance purposely affected from 'ειρω, say, speak, tell. (*Liddell and Scott*)

<sup>26</sup> στάσις, εως, 'η, a placing or setting from 'ίστημι, to make stand. (*Liddell and Scott*)

<sup>27</sup> *fluxus* archaic form of *flūo*, *xi, xum*, to flow, spring, arise, come forth; to go, proceed. (*Lewis and Short*)

Hence the interpretation of the Catilinarian affair must be judged not only according to his times, but also according to these times, justice is *ad hoc*.

14. Thus I proceed by way of the path of *dialectical reasoning*. I take the history laid down by classical authors, by advancing the *principle of generosity*, as generally accepted and received opinions, not as axioms or fundamental principles. This is to say; I can presume neither that he did them, nor that they were wrong if he did do them. Therefore, in order to convict him, and I shall, I must show both that he did them and that they were wrong, without presuming that anything is true and primary in order to show that the contending argument is not merely contentious, ‘εριστικός, but is *contentious reasoning*, ‘εριστικός συλλόγισμος, which is not reasoning at all.

15. Showing who Catiline *was*, and indeed to the contemporary mind who he *is*, requires me to proceed against *contentious reasoners* who, after examining details of the affair as it has been received by us, concluded: ‘that Catiline did not do them,’ and worse, ‘that he *maybe* did them, or *maybe* committed some of the crimes he was accused of and *maybe* didn’t commit some of the other crimes and although he no doubt committed some of those crimes, still he was great, or there was something about him which was ‘a little something great,’ or at least *no worse* than some other people who lived at the same time.’ Thus the argument advanced by some *serious* reasoners, as incredible as it may seem. Indeed, I show that whereas they ostensibly prove that Catiline did not do the crimes he was accused of, what they do prove is that to them they are not really crimes; and not that he did not do them. For the answer to the question as to whether or not he did them is an attempt to be a *trier of fact* in a *moot case* and, on account of the fact that

no one would waste their time attacking a *straw man*, their *ostensible aim* must be other than their *real aim*.

“And if anyone dies of hunger, and if anyone insults and outrages the little girl is that good?”

“Yes! And if anyone blows his brains out for the baby that’s good too. And if anyone doesn’t, that’s good too. It’s all good, all.” (*The Possessed* 114)

Their purpose must be to prove that his crimes should not be considered crimes for there are no triers of fact in *moot court*, only actors and spectators. But I must adopt a dialectical method towards both problems: Did he do it? And were they crimes if he did? For I cannot argue either point through demonstrative methods.

16. But there is more to reasoning than mere reason if reasoning is itself presumed to be a craft for a craft is work and work requires an object and work on an object produces *a work*. The craft here is reasoning, but it requires both an object and a special kind of *craftsmanship*. The craftsmanship practiced here is writing, but the purpose for the writing is to persuade someone and the craftsmanship of causing persuasion is *rhetoric*. Thus I proceed to practice the *art of rhetoric*. My rhetoric is both *forensic* rhetoric, for it defends and accuses individuals for past acts; and it is *deliberative* rhetoric, for it is concerned with what is honorable and thus both exhorts and dissuades future actions; and it is *epideictic* because concerns itself with vice and virtue and I lay praise and blame on my contemporaries.

Ἡ ῥητορικὴ ἐστὶν ἀντίστροφος τῆ διαλεκτικῆ: ἀμφότεραι γὰρ περὶ τοιούτων τινῶν εἰσὶν ἃ κοινὰ τρόπον τινὰ ἀπάντων ἐστὶ γνωρίζειν καὶ οὐδεμιᾶς ἐπιστήμης ἀφωρισμένης.

Rhetoric is the *antistrophe* to Dialectic, for each of the two concerns such things common men may become acquainted with and not one branch of knowledge marking itself off. (*Rhetoric* 1.1.1)

17. It is rhetoric, but it is not imitative of any particular classical form of rhetoric. And though it is conditioned by classical thought, it is rhetoric which shares in the spirit of these times. And though it is presented in a written form, it is, because of this, also *oratory*.

*Non de otiosa et quieta re loquimur et quae probitate et modestia gaudeat, sed est magna illa et notabilis eloquentia alumna licentiae, quam stulti libertatem vocitant, comes seditionum, effrenati populi incitamentum, sine obsequio, sine severitate, contumax, temeraria, adrogans, quae in bene constitutis civitatibus non oritur.*

We are not talking about an idle and quiet thing which delights in modesty and moderation, but that which is great and memorable eloquence is the disciple of license, which the stupid usually call ‘lack of restraint;’ a partner of sedition, an incitement unleashing the populace, without obedience, without discipline, insolent, inconsiderate, arrogant, that which does not appear in a well governed community. (*Dialogus de Oratoribus* 40.2)

18. Taking in hand as well, the maxim that it is not the purpose of philosophy to merely understand the world, but also to change it; it seems necessary to justify a digression into matters of the distant past, but in so doing we uncover the common objections the veracity of the testimony of the authors on account of the fact that the authors believed in things that contemporary men take for superstition, for instance polytheism, portents, oracles, dreams, soothsayers, etc. This is called the *argumentum ad*

*superstitiosum*, or argument to superstition. In other words, the informant is not to be believed on account of the fact that he is demonstrated to be superstitious. But this is really a fallacy of relevance, for people one may believe to be superstitious give evidence in court all the time. The question is then not whether or not a prospective juror is superstitious, but whether or not his or her superstitions are relevant to truth and falsehood.

[1.pr.5] *Ego contra hoc quoque laboris praemium petam, ut me a conspectu malorum quae nostra tot per annos uidit aetas, tantisper certe dum prisca [tota] illa mente repeto, auertam, omnis expers curae quae scribentis animum, etsi non flectere a uero, sollicitum tamen efficere posset. [6] quae ante conditam condendamue urbem poeticis magis decora fabulis quam incorruptis rerum gestarum monumentis traduntur, ea nec adfirmare nec refellere in animo est.*

[1.pr.5] I myself, on the other hand, shall seek also for my labor the privilege, that, while revisiting the old days, I may avert my gaze from the bad things which our age has seen over so many years, and, so long as my whole mind is fixed in such a way,<sup>28</sup> having no part in the troubles which, though it would not be able to turn aside the mind of the writer, might nevertheless be able to cause anxiety. [6] Such tradition, being handed down with grand poetics and beautiful narration before the founding, or during the founding of the city, rather than uncorrupted history, is, in my mind, to be neither affirmed nor denied. (*Ab Urbe Condita* 1.pr.5-6)

---

<sup>28</sup> *illa mente* is a *prepositional phrase* in the fem. abl. sing where *illa* means ‘in that way,’ + the adv. *certe* = ‘fixed in that way,’ i.e. his whole mind fixated on thinking about the ‘olden days.’

### **III. Overview (Λόγος)**



## The Problem Stated

1. *M. Tullio Cicerone oratore et C. Antonio consulibus, anno ab urbe condita sexcentesimo octogesimo nono, L. Sergius Catiline, nobilissimi generis vir, sed ingenii pravissimi, ad delendam patriam coniuravit cum quibusdam claris quidem, sed audacibus viris. A Cicerone urbe expulsus est. Socii eius deprehensi in carcere strangulati sunt. Ab Antonio, altero consule, Catiline ipse victus proelio est interfectus.*

In the consulship of Marcus Tullius Cicero, the orator, and Gaius Antonius, in the six hundred and eighty ninth year from the founding of the city, Lucius Sergius Catiline, a man of the noblest lineage, but of the most crooked character conspired to destroy the fatherland with certain illustrious, but audacious, men. His accomplices were arrested and strangled in prison. Catiline himself was defeated in battle by Antonius, the other Consul, and killed. (*Breviarium* 6.15)

The reputation of the once archetypal villain, Catiline, has undergone a complete transformation over the past 150 years. Once considered the epitome of political villainy, Lucius Sergius Catiline has been rehabilitated within the western canon; transformed, as it were, from a villain to a hero. While on the one hand, the verdict rendered by ancient authors against Catiline is universal, those held by the many contemporary scholars, such as: Henrik Ibsen, Aleksandr Blok, Ann Thomas Wilkins, Lester Hutchinson, E. G. Hardy, C. MacDonald and Judith Kalb, tend to admire him. There are those opinions about Sallust which are almost equally as bad; especially for those who follow the opinions of pseudo-Cicero, or according to certain readings of Cassius Dio.

2. Textual critic J. C. Rolf disputed the authenticity of Cicero's invective against Sallust, *In Sallustium Crispum*. The *Invective's* vituperation of Sallust's character is unparalleled and for that reason it has become suspect, since, according to him, Cicero's ability to traduce with greater eloquence is well known. The authenticity of Sallust's invective against Cicero, *In Ciceronem*, has also been disputed, but the opinion of Rolf tends to indicate that it is a genuine work of Sallust published by him as a political pamphlet and circulated anonymously. The *In Sallustium Crispum* however is believed to be the product of a rhetorical school, composed by a writer of small ability.<sup>29</sup> But this opinion does not appear to be correct, for instance Sallust praises Cicero as 'the best of Consuls.'<sup>30</sup> Sallust also suggests that Cicero had a democratic character referring to his tendency to submit issues to a vote in the Senate, even when dictator, as being *consulente Cicerone frequens*, 'as usual, Cicero deliberated.'

3. Cassius Dio was even less than kind to Cicero than he was to Sallust. The trend in contemporary scholarship, however, is to discredit Sallust's scholarship as opposed to the mere traducing of his character as Linaeus did.

Διαβολή γὰρ ἐστὶ δεινότατον: ἐν τῇ δύο μὲν εἰσὶ οἱ ἀδικέοντες, εἷς δὲ ὁ ἀδικεόμενος. ὁ μὲν γὰρ διαβάλλον ἀδικεῖ οὐ παρεόντι κατηγορέων, ὁ δὲ ἀδικεῖ ἀναπειθόμενος πρὶν ἢ ἀτρεκέως ἐκμάθη: ὁ δὲ δὴ ἀπεὼν τοῦ λόγου τάδε ἐν αὐτοῖσι ἀδικέεται, διαβληθεὶς τε ὑπὸ τοῦ ἑτέρου καὶ νομισθεὶς πρὸς τοῦ ἑτέρου κακὸς εἶναι.

<sup>29</sup> Sallust, *Bellum Catilinae*, with an English translation by J. C. Rolfe, New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons: 2005: xix-xx

<sup>30</sup> Sallust calls Cicero the 'best of Consuls, 'optumo consuli.' (*Bellum Catilinae* 43.1) Later on he praises Cicero's first speech against Catiline: "Marcus Tullius...delivered a brilliant speech, also of utility to the Republic, which he later published." (*Bellum Catilinae* 31.6)

Calumny is most terrible, for by her two men do wrong, and one man suffers wrong. For, on the one hand, the slanderer does wrong attacking a man not present, and, on the other hand, wrongs the one being convinced before really examining closely. Now then, the one being away suffers wrong from the these same two; from the one for slandering and the other one for holding him to be bad. (*The History* 7.10G.2)

Many important scholars, particularly his contemporaries, and the Renaissance humanists inspired by them, have praised Sallust as a historian *par excellence*.

4. The history of the *Bellum Catilinae* was allegedly handed down by two of Catiline's bitterest enemies, Cicero and Sallust, who had a mutual dislike for each other; and although they hated one another, they were united in hating Catiline.<sup>31</sup> But he history of the *Bellum Catilinae* was handed down by Sallust, not by Cicero. Cicero is only a source for history. Indeed Cornelius Nepos said Cicero: *debuerit historiam digna voce pronuntiare*, 'he gave history a dignified voice to narrate.'

5. The history of Catiline's conspiracy, and his *putsch* against the Roman Republic, was transmitted to us, more or less, authentically from the classical authors to the Renaissance humanists. The authentic transmission ended, however, with Voltaire's dramatic piece *Rome Sauvée* (1754). Ibsen's dramatization of the event, *Catiline* (1850), marked a new beginning. Once the historical persona Catiline was removed from what was considered the pinnacle of classical historical scholarship, and transmitted into the dramatic arts, the history of the event itself began to change until the historical persona, Catiline, had undergone a complete historical revision, from villain to hero.

---

<sup>31</sup> The source of the controversy between Sallust and Cicero was that Cicero was united with the Pompeians, Sallust was a Caesarian. But the contention between them has been far overrated in contemporary scholarship.

6. For instance, Aleksandr Blok's opinion of Catiline is the first ostensibly dialectical and historical materialist interpretation of the Catilinarian conspiracy. Blok's commentary is an important one and cannot be ignored. Aside from being a gifted poet, he was also a classicist who could read Latin, and was generally aware of contemporary philological trends in the classics, especially in relation to the Catiline affair. It is clear that he has pondered this matter very deeply. As he put it,

“Scholars of the new era think that the life of Catiline has yet to receive a just evaluation. We shall examine whether or not they are correct.” (*World Revolution* 293)

I will examine whether or not Blok's treatment is itself adequate.

*Non mediocres enim tenebrae in silva ubi haec captanda neque eo quo pervenire volumus semitae tritae, neque non in tramitibus quaedam obiecta quae euntem retinere possent.*

For there is no ordinary darkness in the forest where these things are to be caught and no worn paths to there where we wish to arrive, nor are there not certain obstacles in the paths which keeps back the traveler. (*De Lingua Latina* 5.5)

7. Eighty-two years after Blok's *Catiline*, Judith E. Kalb, in her commentary on Blok's commentary, *A Roman Bolshevik* (2000), seems to complete a historical revision of the Catilinarian conspiracy which began with Ibsen; a marked departure from Ben Jonson's interpretation dramatic piece *Catiline: His Conspiracy* (1611). Ibsen's work departed not only from all his predecessors, and historical authorities before him, but even from his own principal mentor from afar, Voltaire. Voltaire's *Rome Sauvée* followed the historical tradition and presented Catiline as a villain. Voltaire himself

opposed tyranny, but Ibsen, in his apologetic for Catiline, actually supported a would-be tyrant, Catiline. Ironically as well, Voltaire, as opposed to Ibsen, not only loved Cicero, but had reportedly produced the play *Rome Sauvée*: “To make Cicero known to the young people who attend the spectacles.” He would even play the role of Cicero when the drama was presented in Paris in 1750 where he reportedly exclaimed during a moment of inspired acting:

*Romains, j'aime la gloire et ne veux point m'en taire!*

Romans, I love the glory and don't conceal any of it from me! (*Rome Sauvée* 154)

8. To Ibsen however, who hated Cicero, to him Catiline would appeal, not because of his propensity for revolutionary violence, but because Ibsen and his family underwent a percipitous social decline slightly resembling that of Catiline's, from riches to rags, but his is the only real similarity between their lives. Ben Jonson's play preserved the traditional legend of Catiline and transmitted it to us in the post-reformation Elizabethan English vernacular, during the wars of religion. Jonson's study of Catiline comes at a critical time between the Renaissance and the Enlightenment. His work has been praised both its adherence to the texts of Sallust and Cicero and for his many allusions to other classical Roman authors, particularly Seneca Minor, but also for his knowledge and skill as a Latin grammarian and translator of Roman classics. Jonson too contemplated the whole affair. But it was with Ibsen's work that the historical persona of Catiline was transformed from an archetypal villain into a hero for the modern bourgeoisie. Blok seized upon this shift and tried to transform Catiline into a symbol of revolutionary violence, and failed. Indeed it appears that Blok's *Catiline* was intended to be smear on

Lenin's reputation and after Blok's interpretation it appears that a *bone fide* movement of historical revision was undertaken which has attempted to rehabilitate the historical persona Catiline within the western cannon, with tragic results.

*Quis male deorum Tantalo visas domos ostendit iterum?*

Which bad device of the gods once again presents Tantalus haunting homes?

*(Thyestes 1.3-4)*

Henrik Ibsen's interpretation of Catiline was the decisive turning point in the history of the event for it is here that a diametrical change in the interpretation is to be found.

9. It is with Judith Kalb's interpretation, however, that what was quintessentially bad and what was quintessentially good, and the difference between the two, according to classical authorities, becomes transposed, *good* becomes *bad* and *bad* becomes *good*, ἀναστοπή, or rather ταδέ ἀναστοφομένοι εισί.

Ξυνον δε μοι εστιν ὄπποθεν ἀρξῶμαι· τοθι γαρ παλιν ἴξομαι ἄυθις.

But to me it's all the same place from whence I began; for there once again I shall return. *(Parmenides 5)*

For the transposition of the meanings of these words as well their significance when properly ascribed is a central to my argument. Thus the transmission of the history of the *Bellum Catilinae* may be divided into two periods: (a) Voltaire and before, and (b) Ibsen and after.

## The Golden Age and the Decline

10. The ancients had a theory of a golden age which was a period of time wherein it was believed that all was right with the world which was followed by a period of social decline. Many of the Latin historians begin their *operae* with a description of this golden age and the social decline ending their preface with a few remarks on just how bad things had really become by the time anyone got around to writing about it. Tacitus narrated what happened along these lines:

*Vetustissimi mortalium, nulla adhuc mala libidine, sine probro, scelere eoque sine poena aut coercionibus agebant. neque praemiis opus erat cum honesta suoapte ingenio peterentur; et ubi nihil contra morem cuperent, nihil per metum vetabantur. At postquam exui aequalitas et pro modestia ac pudore ambitio et uis incedebat, prouenere dominationes multosque apud populos aeternum mansere.*

In the earliest days of the mortals, no one heretofore lived by evil desire, without shameful act or sin, conducted himself without punishment or compulsions. And work was done with honor not for rewards it would be sought after for its own sake, and when nothing was desired against custom, nothing through fear was prohibited. But, as soon as equality proceeded to be put off and, in the face of moderation and decency, ambition and strength was advanced, tyrannies arose and remained among many peoples. (*Annals* 3.26.1)

11. And when they had, the description of the contemporary horrors flows forth with such eloquence, wisdom and foresight that we today dismiss *their* golden age as *arcadianism*, irrelevant childish reverie. We ourselves ascribe instead the period of the writing of Latin history as *the* golden age which, according to our own schemata didn't

even begin until the writing of Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae* (43 B.C.)—for the most ancient of the Roman historians Quintus Fabius Pictor (c. 254 B.C.) wrote in Greek, not Latin, and Livy's monumental work *Ab Urbe Condita* was not begun until after 27 B.C.<sup>32</sup> The oldest extant Latin text is Cato Major's *De Agricultura* (c. 150 B.C.) and was considered archaic by the time Sallust composed his *Bellum Catilinae* and is, nevertheless, not history *per se*. Thus there is 710 A.U.C. intervening years between the founding of Rome and the appearance of Rome's first Latin historian.<sup>33</sup> Although the publication of Caesar's *Commentarii de Bello Gallico* (50 B.C.) preceded that of the *Bellum Catilinae*, Caesar was a noted dissembler and a sophist, as Appian pointed out:

Δεινὸς δ' ὢν ὁ καισαρ ὑποκρίνεσθαι λόγους ἐν τῇ βουλῇ.

Being very clever, Caesar, made dissembling speeches in the Senate. (*Civil Wars* 2.2.10)

That Caesar cared from no one but himself is really beyond question as it was preserved in his immortal if not prophetic remarks made at the Rubicon:

“Ἡ μὲν ἐπίσχεσις, ᾧ φίλοι, τῆσδε τῆς διαβάσεως ἐμοὶ κακῶν ἄρξει, ἡ δὲ διάβασις πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις.” Καὶ εἰπὼν οἷά τις ἔνθους ἐπέρα σὺν ὀρμῇ, τὸ κοινὸν τόδε ἐπειπὼν: “Ὁ κύβος ἀνερρίφθω.”

“On the one hand, my friends, hesitating to cross will be bad for me, but crossing all mankind.” And having said this, as a man inspired, rushed headlong across

<sup>32</sup> Luce, T. J., “The Dating of Livy's First Decade,” *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 96. (1965): 209.

<sup>33</sup> There are a number of non-extant writers who preceeded Sallust, but their work, it is generally agreed, was annalistic and not historical *per se*. Dionysius of Halicarnassus: “The first historian, so far as I am aware, to touch upon the early period of the Romans was Hieronymus of Cardia, in his work on the Epigoni. After him Timaeus of Sicily related the beginnings of their history in his general history.” (1.6.1) He also credited Procius Cato with being the most learned of the Latin historians. “But the most learned of the Roman historians, among who is Porcius Cato, who compiled with the greatest care the “Origins” of the Italian cities.” (*Roman Antiquities* 1.11.1)



following it up with this common phrase: “The die has been cast!” (*Civil Wars* 2.5.35)

Because of that fact and since his works are merely autobiographical, Caesar’s works are merely a source for history but not the work of a historian *per se*. Sallust then was not only the *first* Roman historian in the sense that he was the *best* Roman historian, but *is* also, incidentally, *chronologically* first in Roman history.

12. On account of his epic poem the *Annals*, which purportedly related the events intervening between the Fall of Troy to the death of Romulus, some may hold Quintus Ennius (239-169 B.C.) as having been first Latin historian. Indeed though nominally historical his style was epic and, surviving in fragments and related to us through the works of other authors, he himself would be best described as a poet and a playwright. Though interest has declined in recent years, today many pedagogues of Latin and of Roman history have made the study of the *Bellum Catilinae* primary, but not on account of it being first in any way. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries it seems that Sallust was taught either first, or very nearly so, for his *moral import*, Sallust was considered first in history for his moral import.

13. The so-called golden age the Latin authors wrote about would have been in Rome’s earliest period, certainly before Romulus, or even Aeneas. If it ever existed, it would have been the time of the *Aborigines*, *ab* ‘from’ + *origio* ‘origin, source, beginning’ hence ‘from the origins or beginnings,’ thus γηγενής—*born of the earth* and hence not truly Roman, but Native. At any rate, according to Sallust, *inter alios*, there was a golden age of the ancient past before the time of Jupiter when Saturn ruled the world. Men at that time were viewed as having been truly virtuous which was followed

by a period social decline. It was a time to which all contemporaneous men and social institutions ought to be compared; it was a *moral datum*.

14. In his *Georgics*, Virgil described it thus:

(125) *Ante Iovem nulli subigebant arva coloni;  
ne signare quidem aut partiri limite campum  
fas erat: in medium quaerebant ipsaque tellus  
omnia liberius nullo poscente ferebat.*

Before Juppiter no farmers subdued the land.

It was the law not even to designate a field or to divide it with a path.

They sought out for the things in middle,

And the Earth yielded all things freely when no one demanded.

*Ille malum virus serpentibus addidit atris*

(130) *praedarique lupos iussit pontumque moveri,  
mellaque decussit foliis ignemque removit  
et passim rivis currentia vina repressit,  
ut varias usus meditando extunderet artis  
paulatim et sulcis frumenti quaereret herbam.*

He gave the black snakes evil venom,

The wolves prowl and the ocean stir;

From leaves honey flow and removed the fire,

Repressed far and wide streams running with wine

So as to forge various uses for thinking arts

And little by little herbage he sought with furrows of grain.

(135) [*Ut silicis venis abstrusum excuderet ignem.*]<sup>34</sup>

*Tunc alnos primum fluvii sensere cavatas;  
navita tum stellis numeros et nomina fecit,  
Pleiadas, Hyadas, claramque Lycaonis Arcton;  
tum laqueis captare feras et fallere visco*

Then rivers of first rank sense hollow alders,  
A sailor at the time named and number the stars:  
Pleiads, Hyads, and shining Arctos of Lycaon.  
Then wild beasts snares to capture and trip meeting birdlime  
*atque alius latum funda iam verberat amnem*

(140) *inventum et magnos canibus circumdare saltus;*

*alta petens, pelagoque alius trahit humida lina;  
tum ferri rigor atque argutae lamina serrae,--*

And surround by hounds great forests,  
And soon a hand net strikes the wide stream,  
Seeking the depths, and drags another wet line to the sea  
Then the stiffness of iron and a thin saw makes itself known;  
*nam primi cuneis scindebant fissile lignum*

(145) *tum variae venere artes. Labor omnia vicit*

*inprobis et duris urgens in rebus egestas.*

For first the wedge used to Split firewood,  
Then came various skills. Labor conquered everything;

---

<sup>34</sup> This line has been omitted from the translation, because it appears to repeat the idea of ‘put away the fire’ (l. 131) with *excuderet ignem*, ‘struck out fire.’ Repeating this idea would interrupt the flow of the verse.

Necessity and hardship press urgently in man's affairs. (1.125-145)

15. Indeed as Varro has it:

*Pincipes dei Caelum et Terra. Hi dei idem qui Aegypti Serapis et Isis...Idem principes in Latio Saturnus et Ops. Terra Ops, quod hic omne opus et hac opus ad vivendum, et ideo dicitur Ops mater, quod terra mater.*

The first gods were Sky and Earth. These gods are the same as those who in Egypt are called Serapis and Isis...The same first gods were in Latium called Saturn and Ops. The Earth is Ops, because in this there is all work and from this work comes life; and for that reason it is said Ops is mother, because the earth is mother. (*De Lingua Latina* 5.57)

But this of course is another way of saying that earth is property, since property is *ops*. Varro connects the Sky to Saturn from the word *satus* 'sowing,' *Ab satu est dictus Saturnus*, but Kent doubts this etymology.<sup>35</sup>

16. The Roman city was also marked by class distinctions. The was, *inter alios*, the nobility, frequently referred to in the *Bellum Catilinae* as *bonum*, or 'the Good.' There were, however, a number of social classes below them. The principal class besides the nobility, were the Plebs, frequently translated as 'the commons.' Although the etymology—*ετυμος*, 'true' or 'real' + *λογος* 'word,' 'account,' or 'reason;' thus the true account of the word, or reason for the word—plebeian, *plebius*, is unknown, the plebeians were an intermediary class also of noble origin which would later become a division of the ruling class as distinct from both the patricians, *patricus* from *pater*

---

<sup>35</sup> "Saturn; according to the myth, the most ancient king of Latium, who came to Italy in the reign of *Janus*; afterwards honored as the god of agriculture and of civilization in general; hence early identified with the *Kronos* of the Greeks." (*Lewis and Short*)

‘father,’ and *servi*, ‘slaves.’ The nobles of Rome were *sprung from the soil*, i.e., of noble birth, αὐτόχθων. This nobility *per se* is to be distinguished from men of noble *deeds*, or men noble character, since men carry out deeds in accordance with their character. The noble *classes*, and therefore the so-called *nobility*, derived its *status*, class standing, from noble birth notwithstanding their actions.

ἔστι δὲ εὐγενὲς μὲν κατὰ τὴν τοῦ γένους ἀρετήν, γενναῖον δὲ κατὰ τὸ μὴ ἐξίστασθαι τῆς φύσεως: ὅπερ ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ οὐ συμβαίνει τοῖς εὐγενέσιν, ἀλλ’ εἰσὶν οἱ πολλοὶ εὐτελεῖς: φορὰ γὰρ τίς ἐστὶν ἐν τοῖς.

On the one hand, noble race<sup>36</sup> is concerned with a descent of excellent offspring, noble character, on the other hand, is concerned with a descent excellent character, that not being displaced from natural abilities. (*Rhetoric* 2.15.3)

17. This is of course to distinguish the Roman nobility from the *Aborigines* who were a native tribe inhabiting the region when the Trojan king Aeneas, fleeing the destruction of Troy, arrived.

*Arma virumque cano, Troiae qui primus ab oris Italiam fato profugus Lavinaque venit litora—multum ille et terris iactatus at alto vi superum, saevae memorem Iuonis ob iram, multa quoque et bello pasus, dum conderet urbem inferretque deos Latio—genus unde Latium Albanique patres atque altae moenia Romae. Musa, mihi causas memora.*

<sup>36</sup> “The difference between εὐγενής and γενναῖος lies in this; that in the former the race or descent, γένος, is directly expressed as the prominent and leading idea; it indicates that the εὐγενής comes of a good breed, but says nothing of the individual character: in the latter it is the character, conformable to the excellence of the breed or race, that is put prominently forward.” (E. M. Cope, *Commentary on the Rhetoric of Aristotle*)

I sing of arms and a man, who first, exiled by Fate, came from the coast of Troy to Italy and the beaches of Lavinium—tossed about he was, many times on land and sea by the will of the gods on account of Juno’s unrelenting anger, suffering many things and a war until he founded a city and brought the gods to Latium—whence the Latin race, the Alban fathers, and the high walls of Rome. O Muse to me these things relate. (*Aeneid* 1.1)

18. The patricians were the descendants of the Italic kings of Latium, the Sabines, and the Trojan refugees who sailed to Italy after the sack of Troy and inter-married with them. Sallust confirms that the Roman city was founded by both the Trojans and the Aborigines.

19. Though other authors have had something to say about the founding of the city, not Livy alone, for the sake of brevity, clarity and continuity; I shall continue by first recounting the origins of Rome by way of Livy’s narration.

[1.1.1] *Iam primum omnium satis constat Troia capta in ceteros saevitum esse Troianos, duobus, Aeneae Antenorque, et uetusti iure hospitii et quia pacis reddendaeque Helenae semper auctores fuerant, omne ius belli Achiuos abstinuisse; [2] casibus deinde uariis Antenorem cum multitudine Enetum, qui seditione ex Paphlagonia pulsi et sedes et ducem rege Pylaemene ad Troiam amisso quaerebant, uenisse in intimum maris Hadriatici sinum, [3] Euganeisque qui inter mare Alpesque incolebant pulsos Enetos Troianosque eas tenuisse terras. et in quem primo egressi sunt locum Troia uocatur pagoque inde Troiano nomen est: gens uniuersa Ueneti appellati. [4] Aeneam ab simili clade domo profugum sed ad maiora rerum initia ducentibus fatiis, primo in Macedoniam uenisse, inde*

*in Siciliam quaerentem sedes delatum, ab Sicilia classe ad Laurentem agrum tenuisse. [5] Troia et huic loco nomen est. ibi egressi Troiani, ut quibus ab immenso prope errore nihil praeter arma et naues superesset, cum praedam ex agris agerent, Latinus rex Aboriginesque qui tum ea tenebant loca ad arcendam uim aduenarum armati ex urbe atque agris concurrunt.*

[1.1.1] Now first of all, is sufficiently agreed upon that Troy having been captured there had been violence against the other Trojans, but two, Aeneas and Antenor,<sup>37</sup> because both a long standing hospitality with justice and they had always promoted peace and the return of Helen, the Achaeans<sup>38</sup> withheld all the penalties of war. [2] Thereafter, having undergone a variety of unexpected changes Antenor with throng of Eneti, who had been driven from Paphlagonia on account of a sedition, and were seeking a place to settle and leadership, for they parted with their king Pylaemenes at Troy and came to an innermost bay of the Adriatic [3] which was inhabited by the Euganei, who were between the Alps and the sea, driving them out took possession of the land, and the first place they landed is called Troy, and the name for the region is Trojan, the whole race was called the Veneti. [4] Aeneas fled home on account of a similar misfortune, but being led by fate was initiated into better things, first came to Macedonia, thence seeking a

---

<sup>37</sup> *Antenor* was a Trojan son of *Aesyetes* and *Cleomestra*, and husband of *Theano*, by whom he had many children. (*Illiad* 6.398) According to the Homeric account, he was one of the wisest among the elders at Troy, and received *Menelaus* and *Odysseus* into his house when they came to Troy as ambassadors. (*Illiad* 3.146 & 203) He also advised his fellow-citizens to restore *Helen* to *Menelaus*. (*Illiad* 7.348) When *Menelaus* and *Odysseus* came to Troy they would have been killed by the sons of *Priam* had it not been for the protection of *Antenor*. When Troy was plundered, the skin of a panther was hung up at the door of *Antenor's* house, as a sign for the Greeks not to commit any outrage upon it. *Antenor* with his family and his house, on which the panther's skin was seen, was painted in the *Lesche* at Delphi. (Cf. William Smith's, *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities*: 1870)

<sup>38</sup> Lat. *Achivi* = Achaeans.

place to settle was carried to Sicily and from Sicily took the fleet to the land of Laurentum. [5] The name for this place is also Troy. There the Trojans disembarked in such a way for whom, on account of their endless wandering, nothing but arms and ships remained. When they began pillaging from the fields king Latinus and the Aborigines, who at the time held these places, flocked from the city and the country keeping off the strangers by force of arms.

*[6] Duplex inde fama est. alii proelio uictum Latinum pacem cum Aenea, deinde adfinitatem iunxisse tradunt: [7] alii, cum instructae acies constitissent, priusquam signa canerent processisse Latinum inter primores ducemque aduenarum euocasse ad conloquium; percontatum deinde qui mortales essent, unde aut quo casu profecti domo quidue quaerentes in agrum Laurentinum exissent, [8] postquam audierit multitudinem Troianos esse, ducem Aeneam filium Anchisae et Ueneris, cremata patria domo profugos, sedem condendaeque urbi locum quaerere, et nobilitatem admiratum gentis uirique et animum uel bello uel paci paratum, dextra data fidem futurae amicitiae sanxisse. [9] Inde foedus ictum inter duces, inter exercitus salutationem factam. Aeneam apud Latinum fuisse in hospitio; ibi Latinum apud penates deos domesticum publico adiunxisse foedus filia Aeneae in matrimonium data. [10] Ea res utique Troianis spem adfirmat tandem stabili certaue sede finiendi erroris. oppidum condunt; [11] Aeneas ab nomine uxoris Lauinium appellat.*

[6] Thence tradition is twofold: some say Latinus having been conquered by Aeneas made peace and afterwards to have united by contacting a marriage, [7] others have agreed that when drawing up the battle lines, Latinus, among his



chiefs, prior the signal to advance, summoned the leader of the strangers to a *colloquium*<sup>39</sup> afterwards inquiring what men they were, whence they had come, what caused them to depart home, and what they sought in the land of Laurentinum. [8] After that he heard that the throng were Trojans lead by Aeneas son of Venus and Anchises that their home had been burnt, they were refugees from their fatherland, and that they were seeking a place to settle and found a city and being filled with wonder at the renown of the race and the spirit of the man preparing for both war and peace gave him his right hand making a sacred pledge of lasting<sup>40</sup> friendship. [9] Thence an alliance was struck between the leaders and the armies made a salutation between them, Aeneas was received hospitably in the home of Latinus, there Latinus among the *Penates deos*<sup>41</sup> added a domestic union to a public treaty by giving his daughter in marriage to Aeneas. [10] This affair, at any rate, affirmed the Trojan's hope that at last their wanderings had ended with a stable and certain place to settle. [11] They founded a city which Aeneas named after his wife Lavinium. (*Ab Urbe Condita* 1.1.1-11)

20. Continuing by way of Livy's narrative: A son was born to Aeneas and Lavinia named Ascanius and Turnus, king of the Rutulians, became enraged and attacked the Aborigines and the Trojans because he claimed that Lavinia had already been betrothed to him, the Rutulians were defeated but Latinus was killed during the war. After this, the

---

<sup>39</sup> *colloquium*, a conversation, conference, discourse. (*Lewis and Short*)

<sup>40</sup> *futurae* is the fem. dat sing. fut. act. part. of *sum* = the being of *will be*. The friendship would be enduring or forever since the future is always ahead of us, thus a pledge of faith *for the being of a friendship that will be*.

<sup>41</sup> the *Penates deos* = household gods.

Rutulian's made an alliance with king Mezentius of the Etruscans who was jealous of the growing power of the Trojans.

*Aeneas aduersus tanti belli terrorem ut animos Aboriginum sibi conciliaret nec sub eodem iure solum sed etiam nomine omnes essent, Latinos utramque gentem appellauit.*

Aeneas, so as to turn aside the fear of such a great war, united the spirit of the Aborigines so that everyone would be not only under the same laws alone but also would be under the same name and called both nations 'the Latins.'<sup>42</sup> (*Ibid.* 1.2.4)

Aeneas was killed in the war and Lavinia ruled as regent for Ascanius. After about thirty years, when the population of the Latins had outgrown Lavinium, Ascanius founded a new city called Alba Longa, which was so-called because it stretched out along a ridge. During this time peace out of fear was established with the Etruscans and the River Albula, latter known as the Tiber, became the boundary between the two nations.

21. After Ascanius, Silvius reigned over the Latins and after him Aeneas Silvius and next Latinus Silvius. Latinus begat Alba, Alba Atys, Atys Capys, Capys Capetus,<sup>43</sup> and Capetus begat Tibernius who drown in the river Albula whence its name 'River Tiber.' Then Agrippa son of Tibernus, next Romulus Silvius was king and he, having been killed by lightening, passed the imperium to Aventinus. Next, Proca who begat Numitor and Amulius. Now Proca favored the first born Numitor and bequeathed him Silvian realm wherefrom violence erupted and Amulius drove out his brother and ruled in his stead

---

<sup>42</sup> Cf. *Aeneid* 12.819-828.

<sup>43</sup> This is an example of *Brachylogy*.

murdering Numitor's male issue along the way and consigning his daughter, Rhea Silvia to be Vestal Virgin.

*Fratris filiae Reae Silviae per speciem honoris cum Vestalem eam legisset perpetua virginitate spem partus adimit.*

Rhea Silvan his brother's daughter, through the pretext of an honor, when chosen Vestal with perpetual virginity took from her hope of offspring. (*Ibid.* 1.3.11)

22. But the Vestal was raped and gave birth to twin son's, Romulus and Remus.

*[1.4.2] Vi compressa Vestalis cum geminum partum edidisset, seu ita rata seu quia deus auctor culpae honestior erat, Martem incertae stirpis patrem nuncupat.*

*[3] Sed nec dii nec homines aut ipsam aut stirpem a crudelitate regia vindicant: sacerdos vincita in custodiam datur, pueros in profluentem aquam mitti iubet.*

[1.4.2] The virtue of the Vestal was forced when she begat twins, whether believing this or if the god were the father of her guilt there was more honor, named Mars of her indeterminate<sup>44</sup> offspring. [3] But neither gods nor men protected either herself or her offspring from the king's cruelty; he ordered the priestess bound and given into prison, the boys cast into the flowing water. (*Ibid.* 1.4.2)

23. And so the story goes, the men who were charged with the duty with drowning the children could not get close enough to the main channel of the River Tiber, on account of the fact that it had over flown its banks, and, having made rather short shift of their duties, consigned the boys to some stagnant pool of the river's backwaters near the

---

<sup>44</sup> *incertus* = *in* + *certus*, uncertain or indeterminate.

fig-tree Ruminalis, formerly called Romularis, where they hoped that the boys, being infants, would nevertheless be drown by the sluggish the stream in that wild and isolated place.

[1.4.6] *Tenet fama cum fluitantem alueum, quo expositi erant pueri, tenuis in sicco aqua destituisset, lupam sitientem ex montibus qui circa sunt ad puerilem vagitum cursum flexisse; eam submissas infantibus adeo mitem praebuisse mammas ut lingua lambentem pueros magister regii pecoris inuenerit. sunt qui*

[1.4.6] The story holds that when the floating basket, in which the boys were exposed, was left high and dry by the receding water, a thirsty prostitute,<sup>45</sup> who came down from the mountains which are around there, hastened around to the squalling boys and thus gently offered her ripe *mammas* to the infants and in this way the keeper of the kings cows found her bathing the boys with her tongue.

(*Ibid.* 1.4.6)

24. According to tradition, the swineherd Faustulus, who suspected that the boys were royalty, since it was known to him that the boys had been ordered exposed by order of the king, took the boys to home and gave him to his wife Larentia to rear.

[1.2.7] *Sunt qui Larentiam volgato corpore lupam inter pastores vocatam putent; inde locum fabulae ac miraculo datum.*

There are those who think Larentia was called *lupa* among the shepherds because she was free with her body. (*Ibid.* 1.2.7)

---

<sup>45</sup> The Latin word used here is *lupa* which means wolf, but is also a *metonym* for prostitute whence the *fable* that Romulus and Remus were raised by a she-wolf whereas in truth is was Larentia wife of the swineherd Faustulus who reared them.

25. According to Livy's narration the boys Romulus and Remus became highway men who, along with a band of shepherds,<sup>46</sup> plundered robbers along the road some of whom captured Remus and handed him over to King Amulius who claimed they had pillaged the lands of Numitor, their grandfather. Faustulus told Romulus who went on to slay King Amulius, announce the death of the tyrant, and acclaim Numitor king; whence Romulus and Remus desired a new city since the population of was too large to accommodate the shepherds who were now thus added to the tribe of the Latins. The boys, on account of their rivalry for royal power resorted to augury to determine where a city should be built, who should choose its name, and who ought rule it. Romulus encamped on the Palatine and Remus on the Aventine who received an augury in the form of a vision of six vultures followed by Romulus who claimed to see twelve.

*[1.7.1] Utrumque regem sua multitudo consalutauerat: tempore illi praecepto, at hi numero auium regnum trahebant. [2] Inde cum altercatione congressi certamine irarum ad caedem vertuntur; ibi in turba ictus Remus cecidit. Volgatio fama est ludibrio fratris Remum novos transiluisse muros; inde ab irato Romulo, cum verbis quoque increpitans adiecisset: "Sic deinde, quicumque alius transiliet moenia mea," interfectum. [3] Ita solus potitus imperio Romulus; condita urbs conditoris nomine appellata.*

[1.7.1] And each of the two was saluted 'King' by his followers: the one carried away the kingship on account of being earlier in time, the other on account of the number of birds. [2] Then when an angry war of words led to bloodshed, Remus

---

<sup>46</sup> The word *pastor*, 'shepherd,' is used by Livy to denote all kinds of animal herders, not just for those who herd sheep.

was cut down in the disturbance. The common story is that Remus crossed over the the new walls of his brother in mockery; wherefore Romulus, having destroyed him, out of anger also added these insulting words: “Thus to the next whosoever shall cross over walls of mine!” [3] In this way, Romulus acquired sole power and the founded city is called by the name of its founder. (*Ibid.* 1.7.1-3)

26. Now Romulus, being keen for great power and dominion, sought a *proletary* to populate his now big empty city; to contribute wealth to it by multiplying labor power through numbers of inhabitants.

[1.8.5] *Deinde ne vana urbis magnitudo esset, adiciendae multitudinis causa vetere consilio condentium urbes, qui obscuram atque humilem conciendo ad se multitudinem natam e terra sibi prolem ementiebantur, locum qui nunc saeptus escendentibus inter duos lucos est asyllum aperit. [6] Eo ex finitimis populis turba omnis sine discrimine, liber an servus esset, avida novarum rerum perfugit, idque primum ad coeptam magnitudinem roboris fuit. [7] Cum iam virium haud paeniteret consilium deinde viribus parat. Centum creat senatores, sive quia is numerus satis erat, sive quia soli centum erant qui creari patres possent. Patres certe ab honore patriciique progenies eorum appellati.*

Next in order that the big city not be empty, increasing the numbers with an old plan used by the founders of cities by rousing the obscure and lowly multitude, pretending they were their progeny was *born of the Earth*, γενναίος, to a place where now between two sacred groves he opened a sanctuary. [6] There were from neighboring peoples, all in disorder, without discrimination, freeman or

slave, fled eager for new affairs; and this was the first thing towards a beginning a great power; [7] already with no reason to repent of power next added council to his power by creating one hundred Senators. Whether this was sufficient numbers, or whether of whom only one hundred were able to be designated Fathers; at any rate, they were honored as Fathers and their progeny were called the 'Patricians,' εὐγενής.<sup>47</sup> (*Ibid.* 1.8.5-7)

27. Thus the *patricians* could be understood as the *sons of the founding fathers* while the plebians made up the greater part of the commons. The plebeians were a burgeoning class which was distinct from the patricians, the *proletarii*, 'proletariat' and the slave class. Between the patricians and the plebeians there was a class of equestrians, to which both Cicero and Sallust belonged. This class was a noble class between the plebians and the patricians carved out from those who had met a property qualification. The members of the proletariat were citizens of the lowest freeborn class and who served the State not with their property but with their children; the *proletary*.<sup>48</sup> Among the lowest levels of Roman society there were the *libertinii* 'libertines' who were men who had won their freedom from servitude, by one means or another, but while making up a part of the proletariat, they were, nevertheless, distinct from the freeborn of the laboring class.

28. Tacitus explained in brief the early political developments of Rome from its foundation to the ascension of Augustus:

[1.1] *Vrbem Romam a principio reges habuere; libertatem et consulatum L. Brutus instituit. Dictaturae ad tempus sumebantur; neque decemviralis potestas*

<sup>47</sup> Thus the Fathers were γενναίος while their progeny, the Patricians, would have been εὐγενής.

<sup>48</sup> From the word *proles* meaning *that which grows forth*; especially of human beings, *offspring, progeny, child, descendant*; and collectively, *descendants, race, progeny, posterity*. (*Lewis and Short*)

*ultra biennium, neque tribunorum militum consulare ius diu valuit. non Cinnae, non Sullae longa dominatio; et Pompei Crassique potentia cito in Caesarem, Lepidi atque Antonii arma in Augustum cessere, qui cuncta discordiis civilibus fessa nomine principis sub imperium accepit.*

From the beginning the Roman city was held by kings. Freedom and consulship was instituted by Lucius Brutus. Dictatorships were assumed at times, neither was the power of the Decemvirs<sup>49</sup> beyond two years, nor the consular authority of the military tribunes enduring. Neither Cinna's nor Sulla's dominion was long; both the power of Pompey and Crassus quickly yielded to Caesar; and the arms of Lepidus and Antonius to Augustus, who when the whole citizenry was exhausted by discord accepted it as an Empire under the name "Principate." (*Annals* 1.1)

Lucius Brutus was the patrician revolutionary who is credited with running out the Etruscan kings in 509 B.C. and, thereby, establishing the Roman Republic.

29. Rome, until this time, had been ruled by the Etruscans, a foreign power. Unable to agree on who should rule, instead of appointing another king, or a tyrant, the ruling class decided to institute a political system similar to the Spartan regime by appointing two consuls, who ruled simultaneously, and thereby settled, at least for a time, how many should rule insofar as they agreed that it should not be one man alone, but should in fact be two men who simultaneously shared power and answered to a great body of noble men called the Senate.

30. Because of this, so says Tacitus, the peoples of the world required codes of law.

*Quidam statim aut postquam regum pertaesum leges maluerunt. Hae primo rudibus hominum animis simplices erant.*

---

<sup>49</sup> *decemviralis* is a masc. gen. sing.



Some at once, or after tiring of kings, preferred laws. These at first were for rough men of simple minds. (*Annals* 3.26.2)

What we find is that within each fledgling city-state arose a lawgiver. Tacitus himself notes Minos of the Cretans, Lycurgus of the Spartans, Solon of the Athenians, but we might as easily add Moses, or Draco. Zoroaster is the reputed lawgiver of Persia in its earliest time. Mohammed was the lawgiver to the Muslims. There have been many lawgivers in the history of the world. Servius Tullius was the lawgiver of Rome:

*Nobis Romulus ut libitum imperitaverat: dein Numa religionibus et divino iure populum devinxit, repertaque quaedam a Tullo et Anco. Sed praecipuus Servius Tullius sanctorum legum fuit quis etiam reges obtemperarent.*

Romulus ruled us as he pleased: then Numa united the people by means of religion and divine justice, somewhat refined by Tullius and Ancus. But Servius Tullius was primary lawgiver to whom even kings were obedient. (*Annals* 3.26.3)

By the time of the *Bellum Catilinae*: “Things were truly inverted: before labor, idleness, before continence and equity, desire and arrogance, fortune changed with morals.” (*Bellum Catilinae* 2.6)

Livy noted,

*[1.pr.12] Adeo quanto rerum minus, tanto minus cupiditatis erat: nuper divitiae avaritiam et abundantes voluptates desiderium per luxum atque libidinem pereundi perdendique omnia inuexere.*

Accordingly the fewer one's things, the less was his desire: lately riches have introduced avarice; and abundant pleasures, through indulgence, longing and

eagerness for everything to come to naught and be destroyed.<sup>50</sup> (*Ab Urbe Condita* 1.pr.12)

31. According to Sallust, kings at first ruled the lands, but some pursued wisdom, others power and money.

On account of these developments, Catiline, a product of sloth, greed, and ambition, gathered about him a number of young men to whom he taught the habits and techniques of the criminal mind. In addition to these men, Catiline enlisted the aid of a number of Sulla's veterans, like himself. Plutarch confirms this.

“It was the old soldiers of Sulla, however, who were most of all urging Catiline on to action.” (*Cicero* 14.2)

According to Leonardo Bruni,

*In his igitur aedificationibus ac cetero vitae splendor, quem Tullius memorat, occupatos, dum nec futurum prospiciunt nec parto parcunt, brevi, ut fit, tempore, pecuniae defecerunt, et simul unica largitionum spes, L. Sylla, non dictatura modo, verum etiam vita abierat. Itaque partim indigentia, partim consuetudine praeminorum adducti, novum aliquem motum exoriri optabant. Viri militares et civili bello assueti, quietes esse nullo pacto sciebant; rursus novas dictaturas et nova belli praemia mente volutabant. Et accedebat aes alienum, acer quidem stimulus et qui timidis etiam animos facere soleat ad otium perturbandum.*

---

<sup>50</sup> That is to say: Lately, *nuper*, riches, *divitiae*, have brought, *inuexere*, avarice, *avaritiam*, and overflowing pleasures, *et abundantes voluptates*, through excess, *per luxum*, have brought, *inuexere*, desire, *desiderium*, and, *atque*, eagerness, *libidinem*, for everything, *omnia*, to pass away, *pereundi*, and be destroyed, *perdendique*.

Accordingly, in buildings such as these and moreover they were occupied spending the rest of their lives among such splendor, which Tullius Cicero mentioned, exercising foresight neither for the future nor using their store sparingly, in this way, after a short period of time, it came to pass, they ran out of money, and, at the same time, their only hope of largesses not only deserted the dictatorship, but passed out of this world. And so, partly because of their poverty, partly because they were accustomed to receiving rewards, they wished for some new rebellion to arise. Men were accustomed to using the military, and civil war. They had no idea how to live in peace. On the contrary, new dictatorships, and the exploits of a new war, revolved in the mind, and debt was indeed a sharp goad to acquiescence, by which even timid souls were dislodged from their leisure.

*(History of the Florentine People 1.6)*

In his second invective against Catiline, Cicero lays out the six types of men who supported Catiline. The first group were those

“who have heavy debts and possess estates more than large enough to pay them...These men have the most respectable outward appearance—for they are wealthy—but their intentions and attitudes are quite unscrupulous...The second group consists of those overwhelmed by debt but still enjoy absolute power. They want to gain control of the government and think that revolution, *perturbata* or disturbance, can bring them offices of which they have no hope in times of peace...The third group...are men from those colonies which Sulla founded...who have used their sudden and unexpected wealth to give a display of luxury to which they were quite unaccustomed and which was beyond their

means...they have run so deeply into debt that they would have to raise Sulla from the dead if they wanted to be in the clear...The fourth group is a motley assortment of trouble makers...These men, I would say, are not so much eager soldiers as reluctant defaulters...The fifth group is composed of parricides, assassins and every sort of criminal...The last group is...Catiline's very own; his special choice...his most intimate friends. These men are the men you see with their carefully combed hair, dripping with oil, some smooth as girls, others with shaggy beards...wearing frocks not togas...their waking hours are devoted to banquets that last till dawn...all the gamblers, all the adulterers, all the filthy minded lechers...boys so dainty and effeminate, have learnt not only to love and be loved, not only to dance and sing, but also to brandish daggers and sow poison." (2 *In Catilinam* 18-23)

## Class Struggle and Social Praxis

The dual consulship that was instituted at the outset of the Republic to ameliorate a factional fight actually precipitated one that had many aspects. First it was a factional fight between the patricians themselves, and then it split up into a factional fight between the patricians as the aristocracy and the plebeians as the burgeoning class, the bourgeoisie. The equestrians class was an intermediary class between the burgeoning class and the nobility, hence the middle term in the factional fight between those immediately above and below them. The dialectical interplay of social classes again splits up into a number of social wars, servile wars, proscriptions, an attempted putsch, two oligarchies, and finally the ascension of the first Roman king, Octavian. All of this is played out against the backdrop of a grand dialectic of national wars and imperialism.

“The principal conquests of the Romans were achieved under the republic; and the emperors for the most part, were satisfied with preserving those dominions which had been acquired by the policy of the senate, the active emulation of the consuls, and the martial enthusiasm of the people.” (*Decline and Fall* 1)

The reader may wish to recall that Sparta had once been ruled by two kings. The Roman Republic was likewise ruled by two men called Consuls. Contra Homer’s advice:

Οὐκ ἀγαθὸν πολυκοιρανίη: εἰς κοίρανος ἔστω.

Not good a rule of the many: let one man be commander! (*Iliad* 2.204)

The Roman system of consulship was different from the Spartan system of dual kings, however, in that each consul had the right of *veto*, ‘I forbid, protest or reject,’ over the decisions of his co-consul and, in time of war, one consul would nominate the other to be *dictator* ‘the one who gives orders,’ also known as the *magister populi et peditum*

‘master of the people and infantry,’ and the other consul became the *magister equitum* ‘master of the horse and cavalry’ and rendered aid to the *dictator*. From the speech of Catulus (67 B.C.) :

Λέγω δε τον δικτάτορα. Και τουτον μεντοι τοιτουτον ‘όντα ‘ούτε ‘επι πασί ποτε τοις πράγμασιν ‘οι πατέρες ‘ημων ‘ούτε ‘επι πλείω χρόνον ‘εξαμήνου κατεστήσαντο.

I speak of the Dictatorship. And because of the power of this man, however, our Fathers appointed one, neither on all occasions nor for a longer time than six months. (*Historiae Romanae* 36.34.1)

The decree passed by the Senate authorizing the dictatorship was called the *senatus consultum ultimum*, ‘final decree of the Senate,’ and conferred *imperium*, ‘the power to command,’ upon the dictator and was only used in times of crisis.

Both consuls were preceded wherever they went by 12 *lictors*, who functioned as bodyguards and carried the *fascēs* and other emblems of Roman political authority like the silver eagle. The Latin word *fascēs* is the plural of *facio*. A *facio* was a bundle of rods surrounding an ax carried by the *lictors* who preceded the *dictator* the *facio* was both a symbol of state power and a symbol of the authority to administer the scourge.

*Constat autem Romanos preatextam et trabeas phalerasque et annulos, togas quoque pictas et palmatas tunicas, currus insuper aureas triumpho decoros, fascēs denique et lictores et tubas et sellam curulem ac cetera omnia regum magistratuumque insignia ab Etruscis sumpsisse. Nam quod duodecim lictores apparebant regibus consulibusque romanis, id quoque inde sumptum traditur, quod cum ex duodecim populis Etrusci constarent, singulos singuli lictores regi dabant. Inde ab Romanis res accepta, nec numerus quidem imminutus est.*

It is evident the Romans have taken from the Etruscans the *praetexta*, the *trabea*, the *phalerae*, and the *anuli*, but also the painted togas and the embroidered tunics, and besides that the golden chariots for the elegant triumph, the fasces, the lictors, the trumpets, the *curule chairs*, and all the rest of the insignia of kings and magistrates. For on account of the fact that twelve lictors attend the Roman kings and consuls, this too has been carried over from there, because the Etruscans were composed of twelve peoples, each gave one to the lictors of the king. Thence this thing was accepted by the Romans, the number indeed has not been diminished. (*History of the Florentine People* 1.20)

The contemporary word *fascist* was derived from this Latin word. The fact that Piso and Catiline sought to seize them tends to imply that they also intended to seize control of the government by an illegal means. In the early period of Rome, after a great victory soldiers would salute their general “*Imperator*” which was intended to signify that they considered him to be worthy to be their commander.

Ἔστι δὲ τιμὴ τοῖς στρατηγοῖς τόδε τὸ προσαγόρευμα παρὰ τῶν στρατῶν, καθάπερ αὐτοῖς ἐπιμαρτυρούντων ἀξίως σφῶν αὐτοκράτορας εἶναι.

This appellation is an honor to generals from the army as witnessing them worthy to be their master. (*Civil Wars* 2.7.44)

Octavian, after ascending as Caesar Augustus (27 B.C.), changed the meaning of the word *Imperator* to mean ‘Emperor.’

At the time of Sallust, the Roman state was developing a distinct slave class, a proletariat, a bourgeoisie, and an aristocracy. The office of the dictatorship had fallen into disuse after the *Third Punic War* (146 B.C.). The patricians corresponded to the

aristocracy and played a revolutionary role under the leadership of Lucius Junius Brutus—the historical founder of the Roman Republic (509), sharing this distinction with Publicola. The plebians would assume *their* revolutionary role under the leadership of Tiberius Gracchus Sempronius in what would become known as the *Gracchi Rebellion* (133 B.C.) It was to this legacy and the achievements of the Plebians after the Gracchi, that Cicero owed his *status*. His political *essence* was an allegiance to the achievements of the Gracchi though of his contemporaries it was to Pompey the Great. Appian relates the whole development of the Republic from its foundation to its destruction.

[1.0.1] Ρωμαίοις ὁ δῆμος καὶ ἡ βουλὴ πολλάκις ἐς ἀλλήλους περὶ τε νόμων θέσεως καὶ χρεῶν ἀποκοπῆς ἢ γῆς διαδατουμένης ἢ ἐν ἀρχαιρεσίαις ἐστασίασαν: οὐ μὴν τι χειρῶν ἔργον ἔμφυλον ἦν, ἀλλὰ διαφοραὶ μόναι καὶ ἐρίδες ἐννομοί, καὶ τάδε μετὰ πολλῆς αἰδοῦς εἰκόντες ἀλλήλοις διετίθεντο. ὁ δὲ δῆμός ποτε καὶ στρατευόμενος ἐς τοιάνδε ἔριν ἐμπεσῶν οὐκ ἐχρήσατο τοῖς ὄπλοις παροῦσιν, ἀλλ' ἐς τὸ ὄρος ἐκδραμῶν, τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦδε κληζόμενον ἱερόν, οὐδὲν οὐδὲ τότε χειρῶν ἔργον, ἀλλ' ἀρχὴν ἑαυτοῦ προστάτιν ἀπέφηνε καὶ ἐκάλεσε δημαρχίαν ἐς κώλυσιν μάλιστα τῶν ὑπάτων ἀπὸ τῆς βουλῆς αἰρουμένων μὴ ἐντελὲς αὐτοῖς ἐπὶ τῇ πολιτείᾳ τὸ κράτος εἶναι. ὅθεν δὴ καὶ μάλιστα δυσμενέστερον ἔτι καὶ φιλονεικότερον ἐς ἀλλήλας αἱ ἀρχαὶ διετίθεντο ἀπὸ τοῦδε, καὶ ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμος ἐς αὐτὰς ἐμερίζετο ὡς ἐν ταῖς τῶνδε πλεονεξίαις ἐκάτεροι τῶν ἐτέρων ἐπικρατοῦντες. Μάρκιός τε ὁ Κοριολανὸς ἐν ταῖσδε ταῖς ἔρισιν ἐξελαθεὶς παρὰ δίκην ἐς Οὐολούσκους ἔφυγέ τε καὶ πόλεμον ἐπήγαγε τῇ πατρίδι.

[1.0.1] The commons, 'Plebians,' and the Senate, 'η βουλή, for Rome often times rebelled against one another regarding concerning the enactment of laws,



cancellation of debts, the dividing of lands amongst themselves, or the election of magistrates. But nothing, however, was worked out by force, but merely disagreements and quarrels within the law, and both of these were mutually settled among them, yielding much respect to one another. But once upon a time, the Demos, ὁ δῆμος, Plebs, when doing military service, falling into such a quarrel did not cut their way through declaring themselves by means of weapons, but ran off to a hill, on account of this it is called Sacred, ἱερός, but even at that time nothing was done by fighting, but for the very first time created a man who stood for them and called him 'Tribune,' sent as protection, especially from the highest men the Senate choses from itself, the political power not to be completely upon themselves, who were of course rather hostile and moreover to the other who began to array themselves against them, and the Senate divided themselves from the Plebs, thus each of the two, by the greediness of this, sought to ruler the other. Marcius Coriolanus amid this strife was driven out contrary to justice fled to the Volsci, Ὀυόλουσκος, and waged war on the fatherland. (*Civil Wars* 1.0.1)

[42.1] *Nam postquam Ti. Et C. Gracchus, quorum maiores Punico atque aliis bellis multum rei publicae addiderant, vindicare plebem in libertatem et paucorum scelera patefacere coepere, nobilitas noxia atque eo perculsa modo per socios ac nomen Latinum, interdum per equites Romanos, quos spes societatis a plebe dimouerat, Gracchorum actionibus obviam ierat; et primo Tiberium, dein paucos post annos eadem ingredientem Gaium, tribunum alterum, alterum triumvirum coloniis deducendis, cum M. Fulvio Flacco ferro necauerat. [2] Et*

*sane Gracchis cupidine victoriae haud satis moderatus animus fuit. [3] Sed bono vinci satius est quam malo more iniuriam vincere. [4] Igitur ea victoria nobilitas ex libidine sua usa multos mortalis ferro aut fuga extinxit plusque in relicuum sibi timoris quam potentiae addidit. Quae res plerumque magnas civitatis pessum dedit, dum alteri alteros vincere quovis modo et victos acerbius ulcisci volunt. [5] Sed de studiis partium et omnis civitatis moribus si singillatim aut pro magnitudine parem disserere, tempus quam res maturius me deseret. Quam ob rem ad inceptum redeo.*

[42.1] For example, when Tiberius and Gaius Gracchus, whose forefathers, in the Punic and other wars, had added much to the Republic, began to vindicate the Plebs with respect to freedom and brought the crimes of the few to light; the nobles, who were guilty and were sent scurrying by this, in the manner of their associates and in the Latin name, and occasionally through Roman knights, who they had hopes to be allies, and had separated from the Plebs, began to meet the actions of the Gracchi, and first Tiberius, and a few years thereafter Gaius, following in his footsteps, one a Tribune, the other a Triumvir for the founding of colonies, with Marcus Fulvius Flaccus, were killed by the sword. [2] And certainly on account of desire for victory by the Gracchi, the soul was not sufficiently moderated, [3] for to the good it is better to be conquered rather than to conquer the unjust by being foolishly bad. [4] Accordingly the nobility, out of their caprice, used this victory to destroy many men by the sword or banishment; and increased themselves more in the future through terrors rather than powers. It is this affair which generally destroys great states; when one desires to conquer the other by any and every means and to take vengeance on the vanquished with

cruelty. [5] But if I were to speak about the spirit of the parties and about the general character of the state, one by one, or in relation to its magnitude, time rather than material would forsake me. Wherefore, I return to the matter at hand.

*(Bellum Iurgurthinum 42)*

Appian by way of Horace White continued:

(2) “This is the only case of armed strife that can be found in the ancient seditions, and this was caused by an exile. The sword was never carried into the assembly, and there was no civil butchery until Tiberius Gracchus, while serving as tribune and bringing forward new laws, was the first to fall a victim to internal commotion; and many others besides, who were assembled with him at the Capitol, were slain around the temple. Sedition did not end with this abominable deed. Repeatedly the parties came into open conflict, often carrying daggers; and occasionally in the temples, or the assemblies, or the forum, some one serving as tribune, or praetor, or consul, or a candidate for those offices, or some person otherwise distinguished, would be slain. Unseemly violence prevailed almost constantly, together with shameful contempt for law and justice. As the evil gained in magnitude open insurrections against the government and large warlike expeditions against the country were undertaken by exiles, or criminals, or persons contending against each other for some office or military command. There were chiefs of factions in different places aspiring to supreme power, some of them refusing to disband the troops intrusted to them by the people, others levying forces against each other on their own account, without public authority. Whichever of them first got possession of the city, the others made war nominally

against their adversaries, but actually against their country. They assailed it like a foreign enemy. Ruthless and indiscriminate massacres of citizens were perpetrated. Men were proscribed, others banished, property was confiscated, and some were even subjected to excruciating tortures.

(4) “After his death the troubles broke out afresh and continued until Gaius Cæsar, who had held the command in Gaul by election for some years, was ordered by the Senate to lay down his command. He charged that it was not the wish of the Senate, but of Pompey, his enemy, who had command of an army in Italy, and was scheming to depose him. So he sent a proposal that both should retain their armies, so that neither need fear the other’s enmity, or that Pompey should dismiss his forces also and live as a private citizen under the laws in like manner with him-self. Both requests being refused, he marched from Gaul against Pompey in the Roman territory, entered it, put him to flight, pursued him into Thessaly, won a brilliant victory over him in a great battle, and followed him to Egypt. After Pompey had been slain by the Egyptians Cæsar set to work on the affairs of Egypt and remained there until he had settled the dynasty of that country. Then he returned to Rome. Having overpowered by war his principal rival, who had been surnamed the Great on account of his brilliant military exploits, he now ruled without disguise, nobody daring any longer to dispute him about anything, and was chosen, next after Sulla, dictator for life. Again all civil dissensions ceased until Brutus and Cassius, envious of his great power and desiring to restore the government of their fathers, slew in the Senate this most popular man, who was also the one most experienced in the art of government.

The people mourned for him greatly. They scoured the city in pursuit of his murderers. They buried him in the middle of the forum and built a temple on the place of his funeral pile, and offered sacrifice to him as a god.

(5) “And now civil discord broke out again worse than ever and increased enormously. Massacres, banishments, and proscriptions of both senators and the so-called knights took place straightway, including great numbers of both classes, the chief of factions surrendering their enemies to each other, and for this purpose not sparing even their friends and brothers; so much does animosity toward rivals overpower the love of kindred. So in the course of events the Roman Empire was partitioned, as though it had been their private property, by these three men: Antony, Lepidus, and the one who was first called Octavius, but afterward Cæsar from his relationship to the other Cæsar and adoption in his will. Shortly after this division they fell to quarrelling among themselves, as was natural, and Octavius, who was the superior in understanding and skill, first deprived Lepidus of Africa, which had fallen to his lot, and afterward, as the result of the battle of Actium, took from Antony all the provinces lying between Syria and the Adriatic gulf. Thereupon, while all the world was filled with astonishment at these wonderful displays of power, he sailed to Egypt and took that country, which was the oldest and at that time the strongest possession of the successors of Alexander, and the only one wanting to complete the Roman empire as it now stands. In consequence of these exploits he was at once elevated to the rank of a deity while still living, and was the first to be thus distinguished by the Romans, and was called by them Augustus. He assumed to himself an authority like Cæsar’s over the country and

the subject nations, and even greater than Cæsar's, not needing any form of election, or authorization, or even the pretence of it. His government being strengthened by time and mastery, and himself successful in all things and revered by all, he left a lineage and succession that held the supreme power in like manner after him." (*Civil Wars* 1.0.1-5)

According to Mommsen,

"The gangrene of a slave-proletariat gnawed at the vitals of the states of antiquity."

This was especially coming to a head in 66 B. C. when, in addition to the robbing and squandering, the rural population was falling into debt, losing their property and crowding into the cities. Machiavelli said that Rome was a free state, because it had free origins. For, although Rome had been founded by foreigners, it was not founded as a colony of another Republic or by a prince who sought to glorify his own name and hence had free origins.

"The builders of cities are free when any people, either under a prince or on its own, are forced by disease, famine, or war to abandon its native land and seek a new home." He credits Aeneas with having achieved this. (*Discourses* 19-20)

Hegel disagreed. With respect to the founding of Rome and the events that occurred at the end of the Republic and the ascension of Julius Caesar to the *imperium*:

"A state which had first to form itself, and which is based on force, must be held together with force. It is not a moral, liberal connection, but a compulsory condition of subordination, that results from such an origin." (*Philosophy of History* 287)

The *argumentum ad baculum* became his final argument against the Republic. G. W. F. Hegel said,

“The relation of the patricians and the plebeians is that those who were poor, and consequently helpless, were compelled to attach themselves to the richer and more respectable, and to seek for their *patrocinium*—a protection, advocacy, defense, patronage—in this relation of protection on the part of the more wealthy, the protected are called *clients*—a freeman protected by a patron.” (*Philosophy of History* 288)

Marx obtained his *patrocinium* from the wealthy Engles. Virgil and Horace received theirs from Gaius Maecenas. Without the *patrocinium* of Engles *Capital* would never have been written, without that of Maecenas “the greatest poem by the greatest poet”<sup>51</sup> would likewise be non-extant.

Although it was true that the plebeians were poor and made up the great mass of the commons at the time of the expulsion of the Etruscan king Lucius Tarquinius Superbus, and for sometime after, the plebeians scaled the political hierarchy, as Hegel put it, “by degrees,” and, over time, a *proletarii* and a *servi* grew by degrees as well. By the time of the *Bellum Catilinae*, in 63 B.C., the patrician and the plebeians formed a dualistic “aristocracy of a rigid order.” (*Ibid* 285) Thus the plebeians were a burgeoning class, a class that had grown outside itself, i.e., had outgrown its social position. Once upon a time having been completely subordinate to the patricians, they began to accumulate a great deal of wealth and through what are known as the *succession movements* and the civil wars, succeeded in obtaining a share of the government as Appian described.

---

<sup>51</sup> John Dryden said of Virgil’s *Georgics*.

"The Romans, as they subdued the Italian nations successively in war, seized a part of their lands and built towns there, or established their own colonies in those already existing, and used them in place of garrisons. Of the land acquired by war they assigned the cultivated part forthwith to settlers, or leased or sold it. Since they had no leisure as yet to allot the part which then lay desolated by war (this was generally the greater part), they made proclamation that in the meantime those who were willing to work it might do so for a share of the yearly crops a tenth of the grain and a fifth of the fruit. From those who kept flocks was required a share of the animals, both oxen and small cattle. They did these things in order to multiply the Italian race, which they considered the most laborious of peoples, so that they might have plenty of allies at home. But the very opposite thing happened; for the rich, getting possession of the greater part of the undistributed lands, and being emboldened by the lapse of time to believe that they would never be dispossessed, and adding to their holdings the small farms of their poor neighbors, partly by purchase and partly by force, came to cultivate vast tracts instead of single estates, using for this purpose slaves as laborers and herdsmen, lest free laborers should be drawn from agriculture into the army. The ownership of slaves itself brought them great gain from the multitude of their progeny, who increased because they were exempt from military service. Thus the powerful ones became enormously rich and the race of slaves multiplied throughout the country, while the Italian people dwindled in numbers and strength, being oppressed by penury, taxes, and military service. If they had any respite from



these evils they passed their time in idleness, because the land was held by the rich, who employed slaves instead of freemen as cultivators.” (*Civil Wars* 1.1.7)

These practices led to the civil wars by which a land reform law, the *lex Licinia* (367 B.C.), which governed the size of land holdings was won.

## Sallust

The *Chronicles of Jerome* records the life of C. Sallustius Crispus between 87 B.C. and 36 B.C. The textual critic J. T. Ramsey ascribes to these dates. The textual critic P. McGushin said, on the other hand,

“There is no absolute certainty about the standard dates, since Jerome can be convicted of carelessness and inaccuracy in other particulars of literary history.”  
(McGushin 1)

Thus by McGushin’s dates, Gaius Sallustius Crispus was born in 85 B.C. at Amiternum and died in 35 B.C. McGushin contradicts Ramsey. While Ramsey relied on R. Helm’s codex of Jerome’s *Chronicle*, McGushin relied on MS (O).

(1) ann. Abr. 1931 [=Ol. 173.2/3 = 86 B.C.] (87 B.C., cod. B) p. 151 *Sallustius Crispus scriptor historicus in Sabinis Amiterni nascitur.*

(2) ann. Abr. 1981 [=Ol. 185.4/186.1 = 36 B.C.] p. 159 *Sallustius diem obit quadriennio ante Actiacum bellum.* (Ramsey 1)

*Vis-à-vis:*

(i) *Sallustius Crispus scriptor historicus in Sabinis Amiterni nascitur:* ann. Abr. 1931 = Ol. 173.3/4 = A.U.C. 669 = 85 B.C.

(ii) *Sallustius diem obit quadriennio ante Actiacum bellum:* ann. Abr. 1981 = Ol. 186.1/2 = A.U.C. 719 = 35 B.C. (McGushin 1)

His family was of plebian origin and of the equestrian order. The *ordo equester* were those who had met a property qualification and served on horseback in the Roman army. They were not *senators* and were not members of the *ordo plebeius* either. Although they were not members of the patrician ruling class *per se*, their class contained the *publicani*—tax collectors and financiers. After 70 B.C. they would share the function of the juries along with the *senators*.

“A *publicanus* was a farmer-general of the revenues, usually from the equestrian order.” (Ramsey 108)

Having followed the example of Thucydides, and allegedly imitating him, Sallust has been recognized as one of the greatest historians of all time. Like Thucydides, Sallust invented the speeches of his historical *personae*, a customary practice of the early historians, proving himself at once to be both a historian and an orator, while, at the same time, relying both on extant sources, such as eye witnesses and written documents, and remaining true to the character of the individual to which the oration was so ascribed. Hence it would best be described as *indirect discourse*, because it gives the main drift of a speech but not the exact words of it. Thucydides himself rationalized this practice in his *History of the Peloponnesian War* (c. 404 B.C.) as follows:

(1.22.1) Καὶ ὅσα μὲν λόγῳ εἶπον ἕκαστοι ἢ μέλλοντες πολεμήσειν ἢ ἐν αὐτῷ ἤδη ὄντες, χαλεπὸν τὴν ἀκρίβειαν αὐτὴν τῶν λεχθέντων διαμνημονεύσαι ἦν ἐμοί τε ὦν αὐτὸς ἤκουσα καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοθεν ποθεν ἐμοὶ ἀπαγγέλλουσιν: ὡς δ' ἂν εἰδοῦν ἐμοὶ ἕκαστοι περὶ τῶν αἰεὶ παρόντων τὰ δέοντα μάλιστ' εἰπεῖν, ἐχόμενω, ὅτι ἐγγύτατα τῆς ξυμπάσης γνώμης τῶν ἀληθῶς λεχθέντων, οὕτως εἴρηται. (2) τὰ δ' ἔργα τῶν πραχθέντων ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ παρατυχόντος πυνθανόμενος

ἠξίωσα γράφειν, οὐδ' ὡς ἐμοὶ ἐδόκει, ἀλλ' οἷς τε αὐτὸς παρήν καὶ παρὰ τῶν ἄλλων ὅσον δυνατὸν ἀκριβείᾳ περὶ ἐκάστου ἐπεξελεθῶν. (3) ἐπιπόνως δὲ ἠύρισκετο, διότι οἱ παρόντες τοῖς ἔργοις ἐκάστοις οὐ ταυτὰ περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν ἔλεγον, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐκατέρων τις εὐνοίας ἢ μνήμης ἔχοι. (4) καὶ ἐς μὲν ἀκρόασιν ἴσως τὸ μὴ μυθῶδες αὐτῶν ἀτερπέστερον φανεῖται: ὅσοι δὲ βουλήσονται τῶν τε γενομένων τὸ σαφὲς σκοπεῖν καὶ τῶν μελλόντων ποτὲ αὐθις κατὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον τοιούτων καὶ παραπλησίων ἔσεσθαι, ὠφέλιμα κρίνειν αὐτὰ ἀρκούντως ἔξει. κτημᾶ τε ἐς αἰεὶ μάλλον ἢ ἀγώνισμα ἐς τὸ παραχρημᾶ ἀκούειν ζύγκεται. (1.22.1-4)

On account of the fact that Sallust is silent on this question with respect to the production of his own history, it is presumed that Sallust followed a similar rationale as did Thucydides and of course as did Herodotus who had set the precedent even before him. St. Jerome placed Sallust and Thucydides next to God in historical authority. In his jeremiad for Christian history:

*Neque enim historiam proposui scribere, sed nostras breviter flere miserias.*

*Alioquin ad haec merito explicanda et Thucydides et Sallustius muti sunt.*

But I have not proposed to write a history, but to briefly bewail our misfortunes.

At any rate, to give these things a worthy explanation both Thucydides and Sallust would have been speechless (*Letters* 60.16).

In his *City of God*, St. Augustine said that Sallust was:

*Nobilitate veritatis historicus.*

A historian having been famous for truthfulness. (*Civitas Dei* 1.5)

Martial called him the foremost of the Roman historians.

*Hic erit, ut perhibent doctorum corda virorum,  
primus Romana Crispus in historia.*

This will be Crispus, the hearts of learned men declare:

“First in Roman history.” (*Epigrams* 14.191)

Tacitus said that Sallust was:

*Rerum Romanarum florentissimus auctor.*

An author of Roman blossoms. (*Annals* 3.30)

And Horace wrote of his adopted son, often confused with our Sallust, C. Sallustius Crispus, who is alleged to have acquired the good qualities, and wealth of his adopted father:<sup>52</sup>

*Nullus argento color est avaris  
abdito terries, inimice lamnae  
Crispe Sallusti, nisi temperato  
splendeat usu.*

There is no color to silver

Hidden by the greedy Earth;

Sallust, hostile to the thin flakes,

Unless in use they shine modestly. (*Odes* 2.2.1-4)

Plutarch, on the other hand, faulted Sallust for saying that Romans had never seen a camel until Lucullius defeated king Mithridates at a battle near the river Rhyndacus, Bithynia, in Asia Minor.

---

<sup>52</sup> C. Sallustius Crispus was the grandnephew and adopted son of the historian Sallust. (*Cf.* C. L. Smith’s *Odes and Epodes of Horace*, 108)

“Sallust says, to my amazement, that camels were seen by the Romans for the first time. He must have thought that the soldiers of Scipio who conquered Antiochus before this, and those who had lately fought Archelaus at Orchomenus and Chaeroneia, were unacquainted with the camel.” (*Lucullus* 11.4)

In the end, Sallust had both his flatterers and his critics. In general, however, he was highly praised and held in equal esteem as the Greek historian Thucydides. According to the Seneca Major,

*Cum sit praecipua in Thucydide virtus brevitatis, hac eum Sallustius vicit et in suis illum castris cecidit; nam in sententia Graeca tam brevi habes quae salvo sensu detrahas: deme vel συγκρύψαι vel συσκιάσαι, deme ‘εκάστων: constabit sensus, etiamsi non aequae comptus, aequae tamen integer. At ex Sallusti sententia nihil demi sine detrimento sensus potest.*

While the principal virtue of Thucydides is brevity, Sallust has beaten him at this and the former yields to him in his own camp; for the Greek sentence is certainly short, you have that which may be removed while the sense is unharmed: take out, for instance, συγκρύψαι,<sup>53</sup> or συσκιάσαι,<sup>54</sup> take out, ‘εκάστων:<sup>55</sup> the sense will remain, not as elegant, but still equally complete. But from a sentence of Sallust nothing can be removed without harm to the sense. (*Controversarium* 9.1.13)

---

<sup>53</sup> Συγκρύψαι, aorist infinitive active of συγκρύπτω, *to cover up or completely conceal*.

<sup>54</sup> Συσκιάσαι, aorist infinitive active of συσκιάζω, *to shade quite over, throw a shade over, shade closely or thickly*.

<sup>55</sup> ‘Εκάστων, masc., fem., and neuter of ἕκαστος, *each one, every one*.

Quintilian preferred Livy to Sallust when teaching boys, because he believed that Livy was easier to understand.

*Ego optimos quidem et statim et semper, sed tamen eorum candidissimum quemque et maxime expositum velim, ut Livium a peris magis quam Sallustium (hic historiae maior est auctor, ad quem tamen intellegendum iam profectu opus sit).*

I think that what is indeed best should come both first and regularly, but of them the best candidate is nevertheless anyone who besides that is most accessible; for example Livy for boys rather than Sallust, for although he is a better author of history in order to appreciate him one's work should already be advanced.

*(Institutio 2.5.19-20)*

Ausonius asserted that Sallust as a historian neither enlarged the events nor understated them, and was, therefore, the middle path between the jealous critic and obsequious opportunistic flatterer.

*Si parce decore morum eius adtingam, liventi similis existimabor: si iuste persequar ero proximus blandienti, imitabor igitur Sallustiani testimonii castigationem.*

If I were to touch sparingly on the gracefulness of his character, I shall be thought similar to being jealous: if justly, I shall be following as a flatterer. I shall, therefore, be a copier of Sallust's correct testimony. (*Epistularum 3*)

Seutonius reported that the grammarian Asinius Pollio had criticized Sallust for his archaic language.<sup>56</sup>

---

<sup>56</sup> C. Asinius Pollio was a friend of Cicero, Horace, Virgil's, he established the first public library in Rome, and introduced the *recitatio*—the practice of reading new compositions in the company of friends—a man

*De eodem Asinius Pollio in libro, quo Sallustii scripta reprehendit ut nimia priscorum verborum affectatione oblita, ita tradit: 'In eam rem adiutorium ei fecit maxime quidam Ateius praetextatis nobis grammaticus Latinus declamantium deinde auditor atque praeceptor, ad summam Philologus ab semet nominatus.'*

Asinius Pollio, too, in a book where he rebukes the writings of Sallust as being defiled with excessive affectation with old words, teaches thus: 'In relation to this thing he gained the help for it primarily from a certain Ateius, Latin grammarian to our *praetextus* and afterwards *auditor* and *praeceptor* and finally a self-made scholar.'<sup>57</sup> (*De Grammaticis* 10)

Aelius Spartianus said that Hadrian thought that Sallust was not archaic enough.

*[16.5] Amavit praeterea genus vetustum dicendi, controversias declamavit. (6) Ciceroni Catonem, Vergilio Ennium, Sallustio Caelium praetulit eademque iactatione de Homero ac Platone iudicavit.*

Moreover he loved the ancient style of speaking, declaiming in controversies. He preferred Cato to Cicero, Ennius to Virgil, Caelius to Sallust and in the same way he expressed the opinion about Homer and Plato. (*Hadrian* 16.5-6)

---

to whom Horace dedicated his second book of *Carminia*. "Eleven years older than Horace, Pollio had been a friend and correspondent of Cicero, had fought under Caesar at Pharsalus, and had subsequently held important commands, first under the Dictator and then under Antony. He was the governor of Transpadane Gaul in B.C. 43-41, and consul, B.C. 40. The next year he won a triumph over the Parthini, a Dalmatian tribe. With these laurels he withdrew from politics and his public life thenceforth was confined to the senate and the courts, in which he was accounted one of the foremost orators of the day. He declined to accompany Octavian to Actium, pleading his friendship with Antony. By his great ability and energy and a courage of opinion that was tempered with excellent discretion, he maintained a position of independence which Augustus found it prudent to respect...Virgil was indebted to him for substantial aid at a very critical time. From the spoils of his Dalmatian campaign he established a library of Greek and Latin works...the first public library in Rome." (Smith's *Odes and Epodes of Horace*, 103)

<sup>57</sup> That is, an autodidact.

Seneca Rhetor, the elder Seneca, said that Livy was deeply jealous of Sallust. According to him, Livy intended to detract for Sallust by praising Sallust's chief competitor Thucydides.

*T. autem Livius tam iniquus Sallustio fuit ut hanc ipsam sententiam et tamquam translata et tamquam corruptam dum transfertur obiceret Sallustio. Nec hoc amore Thucydides facit, ut illum praeferat, sed laudat quem non timet et facilius putat posse a se Sallustium vinci si ante a Thucydide vincatur.*

Titus Livius, on the other hand, was unjust enough to Sallust to as to object to Sallust for both translating this sentence and for corrupting it while translating it.

*(Controversarium 9.1.14.)*

Cassius Dio thought that Sallust was a dangerous hypocrite. He said,

“Caesar, immediately after Juba's flight, captured the palisade and caused great slaughter among all who came in the way of his troops, sparing not even those who came over to his side. Next he brought the rest of the cities to terms, meeting with no opposition; and taking over the Numidians, ‘Nomads,’ he reduced them to the status of subjects, and delivered them to Sallust, nominally to rule, but really to harry and plunder. At all events this officer took many bribes and confiscated much property, so that he was not only accursed but incurred the deepest disgrace, inasmuch as after writing such treatises as he had, and making many bitter remarks about those who fleeced others, he did not practice what he preached. Therefore, even if he was completely exonerated by Caesar, yet in his own history, as upon a tablet, the man himself had chiseled his own condemnation as well.” (*Historiae Romanae* 43.9.1-3)



Aleksandr Blok said of Sallust,

“Man is weak, and he can be forgiven everything except loutishness. Thus Sallust can, if you please, be forgiven his decadence, his corruption...One thing alone cannot be forgiven: the moral and patriotic tone he adopted...Sallust’s voice cracks; and it is this cracking of his voice that is difficult to forgive the stylist and bribe-taker.” (*World Revolution* 296-7)

Sallust, however, while admitting to some wrong doing, claimed in his prologue to the *Bellum Catilinae* to have repented from his earlier bad deeds. Instead of continuing along the wrong path he resolved to record wickedness of the age, the *res gestae* of this foul pasture. Sallust began narrative:

[1.1] All men, who are themselves eager to surpass other animals, are fit to strive with all their might, not pass life in silence just as cattle that have been made by nature groveling and obeying the belly. (*Bellum Catilinae* 1.1)

But man is also a slave to the belly. Poverty hurts. Starvation compels man to satisfy the demands of the belly. It is, in fact, only when man’s material needs have been satisfied that man become free to excel the other animals. Sallust was not starving when he wrote these lines. The opening remarks to the *Bellum Catiline* are also a self-disclosure indicating not to which social class he belongs, but to which social classes he does not belong. He does not belong to the social class of the slaves nor to the class of free labor, the proletariat. Though Sallust attributes subservience to the belly as being caused by Nature, he neglects to mention the real cause for his own leisure. In truth, it is through the high civilization that he lives in that, by means of the class system, has satisfied his material needs. The state that Sallust lived in was class stratified with

slavery at its base. Sallust himself was neither in the lowest class nor in the highest class, but was somewhere in between them. Both the laboring class and the slave class toiled to satisfy the immediate hunger pangs of the belly. They were subservient to it while Sallust was not. Though it is true there were some exceptions to this, the *proletarii*, the *servi*, and the *libertinii* were most likely illiterate.

The historian Polybius was one exception to this rule. He was seized by the Romans during the *Third Macedonian War* (166 B.C.) and was transported to Rome where he, in a condition of servitude, was forced to remain in Rome and tutor the younger Scipio. After having been held 17 years he was allowed to return to Greece in 150 B.C. The vast majorities of the members of the lower classes oppressed by the nobility were illiterate and as such had no voice with which to narrate history. There are no extant slave narratives in either of the Greek or Latin tongues emanating from the Roman Empire. Even the Roman slave Polybius who wrote in Greek *The Histories*, covering the period from the *Second Punic War* to the conclusion of the *Third Punic War* (220-146 B.C.), made no mention of his own condition in servitude. We learn from Herodotus that the famous writer of fables, Aesop, was a slave to Iadmon at Samos. It is unknown who murdered him, but

Καὶ γὰρ οὗτος Ἰάδμονος ἐγένετο, ὡς διέδεξε τῆδε οὐκ ἤκιστα: [4] ἐπεῖτε γὰρ πολλάκις κηρυσσόντων Δελφῶν ἐκ θεοπροπίου ὃς βούλοιο ποινὴν τῆς Αἰσώπου ψυχῆς ἀνελέσθαι, ἄλλος μὲν οὐδεὶς ἐφάνη, Ἰάδμονος δὲ παιδὸς παῖς ἄλλος Ἰάδμων ἀνείλετο. οὕτω καὶ Αἰσώπος Ἰάδμονος ἐγένετο. (*The History* 2.134.3-4)

Of course we all know that Plato was once sold as a slave, but was afterward redeemed by his wealthy friends who provided him with a *patrocinium* to found the Academy at

Athens. On his first voyage to Sicily, he was raped by the tyrant Dionysius II (c. 397-343 BC)

‘Οτε και Διονυσιος ‘ο ‘Ερμοκρατους τυραννος ων ηναγκασεν ‘ωστε συμμιξαι αυτω’

And on this occasion, when Dionysius son of Hermocrates, then tyrant, forced him to have intercourse with him. (*Plato* 3.18)

“But when Plato held forth on tyranny and maintained that the interest of the ruler alone was not the best end, unless he were also preeminent in virtue, he offended Dionysius, who in his anger exclaimed ‘You talk like an old dotard.’ ‘And you like a tyrant,’ rejoined Plato. At this the tyrant was furious and at first was bent on putting him to death; then, when he had been dissuaded from this by Dion and Aristomenes, he did not indeed go so far but handed him over to Pollis the Lacedaemonian...with orders to sell him into slavery. And Pollis took him to Aegina and there offered him for sale...Anniceris the Cyrenaic happened to be present and ransomed him for twenty minae—according to others thirty minae—and dispatched him to Athens to his friends, who immediately remitted the money.” (*Ibid* 3.19-20)

Indeed Sallust uses many pretty words. He leads us to believe, to trust, that such words or moral rectitude could have only come from the most upright of men. He passed moral judgment on mankind and, at the same time, excused himself from scrutiny. Sallust as an author, and as a moral being, was beyond reproach. Like a god he lectures the reader on virtue. This cannot but help build trust between the author and the reader. With these remarks Sallust exalted himself and his work. The reader becomes a co-

traveler with Sallust's soaring virtue by affirming that Sallust himself is no animal. Though it may have been unintended, correspondences could be drawn between the actual social classes and Sallust's metaphors: 'gods' and 'brutes.' Sallust's metaphor indicates that the ruling class corresponds to the linguistic signs, the analogy: god = mind = rulers and the proletariat corresponds to the analogy: body = brutes = workers. "But as a whole all power is situated in the body and soul, moreover the soul is used to rule, the body to serve. The one thing by us is held in common with gods, the other with beasts." (*Bellum Catilinae* 1.2)

He questions his own remarks: "Each of these, mind and body, is incomplete in itself." (*Ibid.* 1.7) Sallust develops this dichotomy as a kind of historical dualism. "In the beginning kings took different courses, some training their minds and others their bodies." (*Ibid.* 2.1) In so doing, he admitted that the rulers, who by nature correspond to the mind, virtue and god, could, as individuals, correspond to either mind, body, or vice. This is a somewhat contradictory metaphorical mixture by his previous tenets and, nevertheless, shows Aristotle's influence on his thinking.

"The soul rules the body with the sort of authority of a master: mind rules the appetite with the sort of authority of a statesman or a monarch." (*The Politics* 1254b)

Freud, on the other hand, said that there are three basic types of human personality: the 'erotic personality', the 'narcissistic personality' and the 'man of action personality'.

"The man who is primarily erotic will choose emotional relationships with others above all else; the narcissistic type, who is more self-sufficient, will seek his essential satisfactions in the inner working of his own soul; the man of action will

never abandon the external world in which he can assay his power.” (*Civilization and Its Discontents* 40)

Thus, according to Freud’s psychoanalysis, the mindful are narcissistic and the brutes are men of action. Naturally the erotic are somewhere in between them, but each personality type is, by itself, a mixture of all these traits with but one trait overwhelming all the others. Sallust himself was, clearly, a narcissist, though he denies it, but Catiline, on the other hand, was a man of action—a brute.

*Ceterum ex aliis negotiis, quae ingenio exercentur, in primis magno usui est memoria rerum gestarum. Cuius de virtute quia multi dixere, praetereundum puto, simul ne per insolentiam quis existimet memet studium meum laudando extollere.*

This one out of the other occupations, which are pursued by the intellect, in the first place the producing of things of history is of great use. Of whose virtues I presume to pass over since many have spoken of them, at the same time, that someone not suppose that I through insolence extol my study.

(*Bellum Jugurtha* 4.1-2)

But Cassius Dio, and moreover Blok, are the unforgiving judges. “But the confession of the one who is wicked, ‘I am so,’ is not followed by the reciprocal similar confession...The one who made the confession sees himself repulsed, and sees the *other* to be in the wrong when he refuses to let his own *inner* being come forth into the *outer* existence of speech...It thereby reveals itself as a consciousness which is forsaken by and which itself denies Spirit; for it does not know that Spirit, in the absolute certainty of itself, is lord and master over every deed and actuality, and can cast them off, and make

them as if they had never happened. At the same time, it does not recognize the contradiction it falls into in not letting the rejection which has taken place in *words*, be validated as a genuine rejection...by this hardness of heart produces the disparity which still exists.” (*Phenomenology of Spirit* 667) There can be little question that Sallust repented, for his confession and repentance in words was later substantiated by his deeds, he indeed had fled public life, did not return to it, and blessed the world with his moral teachings through his written works. Cassius Dio, in refusing to validate Sallust’s confession and repentance, receives back the blame that he once had the audacity to impose.

Not only that, but, Catiline’s belief that riches ought obtained by means of force, *ad baculum*, is diametrically opposed to the behavior Sallust, or any wise man, would recommend to his students. Sallust said:

[1] *Falso queritur de natura sua genus humanum, quod inbecilla atque aevi brevis forte potius quam virtute regatur. Nam contra reputando neque maius aliud neque praestabilius invenias magisque naturae industriam hominum quam vim aut tempus deesse. Sed dux atque imperator vitae mortalium animus est. Qui ubi ad gloriam virtutis via grassatur, abunde pollens potensque et clarus est neque fortuna eget, quippe quae probitatem, industriam aliasque artis bonas neque dare neque eripere cuiquam potest. Sin captus pravis cupidinibus ad inertiam et voluptates corporis pessum datus est, perniciose libidine paulisper usus, ubi per socordiam vires tempus ingenium diffluxere, naturae infirmitas accusatur: suam quisque culpam auctores ad negotia transferunt. Quod si hominibus bonarum rerum tanta cura esset, quanto studio aliena ac nihil profutura multaque etiam periculosa ac perniciose petunt, neque reagentur*

*magis quam regerent casus et eo magnitudinis procederent, ubi pro mortalibus gloria aeterni fierent.*

On account of capability being governed by chance, rather than intellectual power, men bemoan the nature of their race in vain. For, on the contrary, you would find, by means of reflection, nothing greater, and nothing more excellent; and that the industry of human nature, rather than virtue, or time, to be lacking. But, the leader and master of life of the mortals is the soul. Which, when goes to glory by means of the path of excellence, is sufficiently powerful and capable and it is clearly not needing luck, which obviously is able to give neither probity, industry, or any other goods of the arts, nor to take them away. If on the contrary, it has been seized by by crooked desires for laziness and pleasures of the body it has been given to the bottom, serving itself a little while by pernicious desire, whence through indolence, time, strength, and constitution have passed away, weakness in nature is accused: the actors who are themselves to blame transfer it to circumstances. If, however, care for good things were as important to men, as fondness for the useless, as well as striving for things useless, and many dangerous and even destructive things, he would not be governed by circumstances more than he would govern them and from there would advance to greatness, where, instead of being mortal they would be made immortal by glory.

[2] *Nam uti genus hominum compositum ex corpore et anima est, ita res cuncta studiaque omnia nostra corporis alia, alia animi naturam secuntur. Igitur praeclara facies, magnae divitiae, ad hoc vis corporis et alia omnia huiusce modi brevi dilabuntur; at ingeni egregia facinora sicuti anima immortalia sunt. Postremo corporis et fortunae bonorum ut initium sic finis est, omniaque orta*

*occidunt et aucta senescunt: animus incorruptus, aeternus, rector humani generis agit atque habet cuncta neque ipse habetur. Quo magis pravitas eorum admiranda est, qui, dediti corporis gaudiis, per luxum et ignaviam aetatem agunt, ceterum ingenium, quo neque melius neque amplius aliud in natura mortalium est, incultu atque socordia torpescere sinunt, cum praesertim tam multae variaeque sint artes animi, quibus summa claritudo paratur.*

For just as the race of man is composed of body and mind, in this way all our concerns and endeavors, some by nature would follow the body others the soul. Accordingly, beautiful appearance, great wealth, and to this bodily strength and everything of this kind after a short time pass away. Finally, of things of the body and of good fortune, whereas there is a beginning thus there is an end, all things rise and fall and things flourishing, decay: the uncorrupted soul, eternal, is the captain steering the human race; it holds all things together, but is itself held not held. Wherefore the great depravity of men is to be wondered at, who, having devoted themselves to the delights of the body, lead a life by means of luxury and indolence, with respect to the rest of their character [i.e. the mind], whither nothing better and nothing is greater in anything of mortal birth, they allow to grow stiff through neglect and negligence, especially when there are so many varieties of mental skills by means of which the highest reputation is obtained.

[3] *Verum ex iis magistratus et imperia, postremo omnis cura rerum publicarum minime mihi hac tempestate cupienda videntur, quoniam neque virtuti honor datur neque illi, quibus per fraudem iis fuit uti, tuti aut eo magis honesti sunt. Nam vi quidem regere patriam aut parentis, quamquam et possis et delicta corrigas, tamen importunum est, cum praesertim omnes rerum mutationes*



*caedem, fugam aliaque hostilia portendant. Frustra autem niti neque aliud se fatigando nisi odium quaerere extremae dementiae est; nisi forte quem inhonesta et perniciose libido tenet potentiae paucorum decus atque libertatem suam gratificari.*

Truly out of these things are magistrates and dominions, and finally care of public affairs appear to me, at the present time, least of all desirable, since neither honor is given on account of virtue nor are those, who were benefit from them through fraud, safe or he more greatly respected. For indeed to rule our fatherland or our parents by force, although you may have the ability and in correcting wrongdoing, is, nevertheless, unsuitable, particularly changing the affairs [of State] through bloodshed [i.e. the cutting down of men], exile, and other things of the enemy, would be a monstrosity. But to press on in vain fatiguing oneself, and not the other, seeking nothing but hatred is extreme of madness unless a strong man gets pleasure, power out of poverty, honor, and also freedom, gratifying himself against one who is dishonest and dangerous. (*Bellum Iurgurthinum* 1-3)

With these remarks Sallust shows himself to be decidedly stoical. He is taking up a negative attitude towards the lord and bondsman relationship, but only in a way that avoided a trial by strength and the possibility of death; as had happened to both Cicero, Cato and many others before them, and after.

“Stoicism is the freedom which always comes directly out of bondage and returns into the pure universality of thought. As a universal form of the World-Spirit,

Stoicism could only appear on the scene in a time of universal fear and bondage.”

*(Phenomenology of Spirit 199)*

His ability, however, to withdraw from civic affairs was conditioned by his class standing. He could have only withdrawn from the class struggle, the struggle in the Forum and at the Rostra, because he had some place to withdrawl to, which, incidentally wasn't merely into his own mind, but to an estate. His personal estate was made famous as the *Horti Sallustiani*, ‘gardens of Sallust.’ In contradistinction to this, we should note that was very much not the state of affairs for Sparticus, or the *servi* and the *proletarii* that he represented.

“This trial by death, however, does away with the truth which was supposed to issue from it.” *(Ibid. 188)*

At any rate, we have no doubt been repeatedly admonished by the wise sages of antiquity through their numerous *gnomae*, γνομαι to pursue wisdom not wealth, for this it is said to be not only the path of the righteous, but also that of true happiness.

“Self-consciousness learns that life is essential to it.” *(Ibid. 189)*

According to Seneca Minor hunger should be no obstacle and the question of death at the hands of the lord is to be resolved through retreat.

*Non est quod nos paupertas a philosophia revocet, ne egestas quidem. Toleranda est enim ad hoc properantibus vel fames...Dubitabit aliquis ferre paupertatem, ut animum furoribus liberet?*

There is no reason poverty should call us away from philosophy, not even indigence. In fact, when hastening to this we endure even hunger...Will anyone hesitate to bear modest means that he may liberate his mind from madness?

(Epistolae 17.6)

After all, it would take nothing less than a fool to fall in love with riches at the expense of wisdom.

Και ως κεφαλαιω, ανοητου ευδαιμονος ηθος πλουτου εστιν.

And thus the Character<sup>58</sup> of the rich is the thought of success in the head of the senseless. (*Rhetoric* 2.16.3)

Though it does appear that Seneca did not practice what he preached since he was wealthy, at least he died well: bravely and tragically, manifesting the strength of his character; his dedication to justice and truth.

*Vitae est avidus quisquis non vult*

*Mundo secum pereunte mori.*

Greedy for life is he who when

the world dies is not willing to die with it. (*Thyestes* 883-4)

It is interesting to note however his use of the word *paupertas* which indicates a man of *small means* as opposed to the word he might have used, *inops*, which would have indicated a man without resources or is *needy*, literally *in*, without + *ops*, help: thus a man without help, but in need of it.

“*Pauperis* from *paulus lar* ‘scantily equipped home’...*Dives* ‘rich’ is from *divus* ‘godlike person,’ who, as being a *dues* ‘god,’ seems to lack nothing. *Opulentus* ‘wealthy’ is from *ops* ‘property,’ said of one who has it in abundance; from the same, *inops*, ‘destitute’ is said of him who lacks *ops*, and from the same source *copis* ‘well supplied’ and *copiosus* ‘abundantly furnished.’” (*De Lingua Latina* 5.92)

---

<sup>58</sup> Ηθoς signifies *character*, while εθoς indicates *habits*.

And we learn elsewhere from Varro that the alteration of words can

“Come about by the loss or the addition of single letters and on account of the transposition or the change of them.” (*Ibid.* 5.6)

Thus we could deduce that *ops* might have been related to *pos* ‘having power’ by way of transposition of the vowel, thus *inpos* ‘lacking power.’ (*Ibid.* 5.4)

“The mere making of sounds serves to indicate pleasure and pain, and is thus a faculty that belongs to animals in general: their nature enables them to attain the point at which they have perceptions of pleasure and pain, and can signify those perceptions to one another. But language serves to declare what is advantageous and what is the reverse, and it therefore serves to declare what is just and what is unjust.” (*The Politics* 1253a)

We have learned from history that a man of small means possessed of literacy carries a voice with which to narrate it while those in need but without help have been scarcely possessed literacy and historically therefore have had no voice, were silenced.

φαίνεται δ' ὁμῶς καὶ τῶν ἐκτὸς ἀγαθῶν προσδεομένη, καθάπερ εἶπομεν: ἀδύνατον γὰρ ἢ οὐ ράδιον τὰ καλὰ πράττειν ἀχορήγητον ὄντα. πολλὰ μὲν γὰρ πράττεται, καθάπερ δι' ὀργάνων, διὰ φίλων καὶ πλούτου καὶ πολιτικῆς δυνάμεως: ἐνίων δὲ τητῶμενοι ρυπαίνουσι τὸ μακάριον, οἷον εὐγενείας εὐτεκνίας κάλλους: οὐ πάνυ γὰρ εὐδαιμονικὸς ὁ τὴν ἰδέαν παναίσχης ἢ δυσγενῆς ἢ μονώτης καὶ ἀτεκνος, ἐτι δ' ἴσως ἦττον, εἰ τῶ πάγκακοι παῖδες εἶεν ἢ φίλοι, ἢ ἀγαθοὶ ὄντες τεθνάσιν. καθάπερ οὖν εἶπομεν, εἴκει προσδεῖσθαι καὶ τῆς τοιαύτης εὐημερίας: ὅθεν εἰς ταυτό τὰπτουσιν ἐνιοὶ τὴν εὐτυχίαν τῇ εὐδαιμονία, ἕτεροι δὲ τὴν ἀρετήν.  
(*Nicomachean Ethics* 1099a1-b1)

With the coming of modernity, as opposed to antiquity, and with modernity the bourgeois revolution, and with the bourgeois revolution the *welfare state*, the historically *inopes* have for the most part been enabled at least to obtain a marginal level of literacy and thus enabled have become not wholly silent if they could find the means, ποιησις.

“If he is too poor to provide himself with tools and other things he needs for his craft, his work will be worse.” (*Republic* 4.421d)

Catiline, a man of means, chose not the course of wisdom and philosophy for he left no written works.

## Cicero

Although Cicero was born in Arpinum he was a naturalized citizen of Rome and possessed full citizenship. Catiline supposed to traduce him thus:

Κατιλίνας δ' αὐτὸν ἐς ὕβριν τῶν ἐλομένων ἐπέσκωπτεν, ἐς μὲν ἀγνώσιαν γένους καινὸν ὀνομάζων καλουῖσι δ' οὕτω τοὺς ἀφ' εἰαυτῶν, ἀλλ' οὐ τῶν προγόνων γνωρίμουσ', ἐς δ' ξενίαν τῆς πόλεως ἰγκουιλίνον, ὧ' ῥήματι καλουῖσι τοὺς ἐνοικουήντας ἐν ἀλλοτρίας οἰκίαις. (*Civil Wars* 2.1.2)

Cicero evidently never ceased in praising himself both before, and after, the defeat of Catiline.

“Toward Caesar, accordingly, the masses were well disposed, for the reasons given, but they were angry at Cicero for the death of the citizens, and displayed their enmity in many ways. Finally, when on the last day of his office he desired to present his account and defense of all that he had done in his consulship—for he certainly did take great pleasure not only in being praised by others but also in extolling himself—they made him keep silent and did not let him utter a word

outside of his oath...Nevertheless, Cicero, doing his best to resist them, added to his oath the statement that he had saved the city; and for this he incurred much greater hatred.” (*Historiae Romanae* 37.38.1-2)

The infuriating remarks referred to by Cassius Dio could have been nothing less than those Cicero himself published.

*Pro meis in vos singularibus studiis proque hac quam perspictis ad conservandam rem publicam diligentia nihil a vobis nisi huius temporis totiusque mei consulatus memoriam postulo: quae dum erit in vestris fixa mentibus, tutissimo me muro saeptum esse arbitrabor.*

For my part, diligence in singular devotion to you and for seeing through that which to saved the Republic, I demand nothing from you except this time and the whole of my consulship be remembered: which when fixed in your minds; I am protected by a most safe wall, to be powerfully enclosed. (4 *In Catilinam* 23)

And even before that Cicero said,

*Et si non minus nobis iucundi atque inlustres sunt ei dies quibus conservamur quam illi quibus nascimur, quod salutis certa laetitia est, nascendi incerta condicio et quod sine sensu nascimur cum voluptate servamur, profecto, quoniam illum qui hanc urbem condidit ad deos immortalis benivolentia famaue sustulimus, esse apud vos posteroque vestros in honore debebit is qui eandem hanc urbem conditam amplificatamque servavit. Nam toti urbi, templis, delubris tectis ac moenibus subiectos prope iam ignis circumdatosque restinximus, idemque gladios in rem publicam destrictos rettudimus mucronesque eorum a iugulis vestris deiecimus. Quae quoniam in senatu inlustrata, patefacta, comperta sunt per me, vobis iam exponam breviter ut et quanta et quam manifesta et qua*

*ratione investigata et comprehensa sint vos qui et ignoratis et exspectatis scire possitis.*

And to us this day on which we are saved should not be less bright and joyous than that on which we are born, because joyfulness on account of safety is certain, being born circumstances uncertain, and because we are born without awareness with pleasure we are saved, actually, seeing that we raise benevolence and glory to he who founded this city and to the immortal gods, it ought to be likewise among you and your posterity he who saved this founded and flourishing city. For now we have quenched the fires nearly already having encircled the whole city, from its temples to its shrines, to its houses and walls (3 *In Catilinam* 2-3)

And we ought to concur. It was Cicero, as we shall find who saved them, but not they him.

## Sulla

(3) “No unseemly deed was wanting until, about fifty years after the death of Gracchus, Cornelius Sulla, one of these chiefs of factions, doctoring one evil with another, made himself the absolute master of the state for an indefinite period. Such officials were formerly called dictators—an office created in the most perilous emergencies for six months only, and long since fallen into disuse. Sulla, although nominally elected, became dictator for life by force and compulsion. Nevertheless he became satiated with power and was the first man, so far as I know, holding supreme power, who had the courage to lay it down voluntarily and to declare that he would render an account of his stewardship to any who were dissatisfied with it. And so, for a considerable period, he walked to the

forum as a private citizen in the sight of all and returned home unmolested, so great was the awe of his government still remaining in the minds of the onlookers, or their amazement at his laying it down. Perhaps they were ashamed to call for an accounting, or entertained other good feeling toward him, or a belief that his despotism had been beneficial to the state. Thus there was a cessation of factions for a short time while Sulla lived, and a compensation for the evils which Sulla had wrought.

Lucius Cornelius Sulla Felix, having returned to Italy, landed at Brundisium in 83 B.C. after campaigning in Greece, Macedonia and Asia Minor against the king Mithridates. By 82 B.C. the Roman Senate conferred *imperium* on Sulla and he adopted the title of *dictator*, which for all intensive purposes had been abolished after the Hannibalic War.

“No unseemly deed was wanting until, about fifty years after the death of Gracchus, Cornelius Sulla, one of these chiefs of factions, doctoring one evil with another, made himself the absolute master of the state for an indefinite period. Such officials were formerly called dictators -- an office created in the most perilous emergencies for six months only, and long since fallen into disuse. Sulla, although nominally elected, became dictator for life by force and compulsion. Nevertheless he became satiated with power and was the first man, so far as I know, holding supreme power, who had the courage to lay it down voluntarily and to declare that he would render an account of his stewardship to any who were dissatisfied with it. And so, for a considerable period, he walked to the forum as a private citizen in the sight of all and returned home unmolested, so



great was the awe of his government still remaining in the minds of the onlookers, or their amazement at his laying it down. Perhaps they were ashamed to call for an accounting, or entertained other good feeling toward him, or a belief that his despotism had been beneficial to the state. Thus there was a cessation of factions for a short time while Sulla lived, and a compensation for the evils which Sulla had wrought.” (*Civil Wars* 1.1.3)

By choosing the title dictator as opposed to the title tyrant or king, Sulla tried to dissemble the significance of his true nature of his rule, that of a tyrant, because the leading men of the city would have taken offence to it. While Sulla wished to appear to be diminishing his power by adopting the title of dictator in reality he was enlarging it. Although Sulla had indeed held the *imperium* before Cicero he only managed to acquire it through the force of arms. Thus we could say that Cicero was the first to *lawfully* hold the office of dictator after the *Third Hannibalic War*, since the senators who had elevated Sulla had been thoroughly intimidated. According to Mommsen, Sulla adopted the title of *dictator* in order to create the nuance of the old dictatorship, something more favorable to the ruling class at the time.

In reality, Sulla’s dictatorship restored the old monarchy of the Tarquin’s in all but name. In fact, because the office had no heredity precepts, it would best be called Rome’s first tyranny. The word tyrant is not applied to hereditary sovereignties like kings, for the term regards the irregular way in which the power was *gained*, than the way in which it was *exercised*, Τύραννος, an absolute sovereign, unlimited by law or constitution. (*Liddell and Scott*) Sulla’s contemporary apologists vindicated him under the slogan:

*Satius est uti regibus quam uti malis legibus.*

It is more satisfying to profit one-self by means of kings than by bad laws.

*(Rhetorica ad Herennium 2.40)*

The articulation of this slogan indicated both that one should not lament the loss of the constitution since kings are just as beneficial as bad laws and that Sulla was all but a king. At any rate, Sulla having reconstituted Rome and effectuated the *Leges Corneliae*, ascended as an absolute monarch and his first act was to annihilate his opposition by means of a list of the “proscribed,” called a *proscriptio* from *proscribo*, to make public by writing, publish, proclaim, announce. The *proscriptio* was a list of names posted by Sulla in the Forum. Anyone whose name appeared on this list could be killed by anyone else and, he who carried out the evil deed would receive a reward for having done so. In fact, one could even obtain a reward by indicating the hiding place of one so proscribed. The victim’s property was expropriated to the State to be disposed *subhastio*; colloquially *sub hasta*, i.e., at auction, with political disabilities vested on his children and grandchildren. By the end of Sulla’s reign, according to Valerius Maximus, an estimated 4700 people had been so proscribed. (Cf. *The History of Rome* 102) After Sulla, neither Catiline nor Crassus were required to return their ill gotten gains.

“The man who had slain Lucretius at the instance of Sulla, and another who had slain many of the persons proscribed by him, were tried for the murders and punished, Julius Caesar being most instrumental in bringing this about. Thus changing circumstances often render very weak even those once exceedingly powerful. This matter, then, turned out contrary to most people’s expectation, as did also the case of Catiline, who, although charged with the same crimes as the

others (for he, too, had killed many of the proscribed), was acquitted. And from this very circumstance he became far worse and even lost his life as a result.”

*(Historiae Romanae 37.10.2-3)*

Sallust says,

*(11.4) Sed postquam L. Sulla armis recepta re publica bonis initiis malos eventus habuit, rapere omnes, omnes trahere, domum alius, alius agros cupere, neque modum neque modestiam victores habere, foeda crudeliaque in civis facinora facere. (5) Huc accedebat, quod L. Sulla exercitum, quem in Asia ductaverat, quo sibi fidum faceret, contra morem maiorum luxuriose nimisque liberaliter habuerat. Loca amoena, voluptaria facile in otio ferocis militum animos molliverant. (6) Ibi primum insuevit exercitus populi Romani amare, potare, signa, tabulas pictas, vasa caelata mirari, ea privatim et publice rapere, delubra spoliare, sacra profanaque omnia polluere. (7) Igitur ii milites, postquam victoriam adepti sunt, nihil reliqui victis fecere. Quippe secundae res sapientium animos fatigant: ne illi corruptis moribus victoriae temperarent.*

(11.4) But after Sulla seized the Republic by means of arms, having made a bad end from good beginning, all men robbed, all men pillaged, some desired houses, others lands; the victors had neither limits nor moderation, committed filthy and cruel deeds on the citizens. (5) Hither to, because L. Sulla was approaching his army which he had led into Asia, which he hoped to make loyal to himself which, contrary to the mores of the Greats, he had held through luxury and freedom beyond measure, who in leisure, those lovely voluptuous places easily softened the spirit of the fierce soldiers. (6) There an army of the Roman people first became accustomed to love and to drink; to admire statues, paintings, and

engraved vases; to steal them from public and private places, to pillage shrines and to desecrate everything sacred and profane. (7) Therefore these soldiers, after they have achieved a victory, left nothing to the vanquished. As one might expect, inferior things vex the even souls of the wise; could victories restrain these men of bad morals? (*Bellum Catilinae* 11.4-7)

Leonardo Bruni retells this story, in part, in his *History of the Florentine People* (1416).

According to him, Florence was first colonized by Sulla's veterans.

*Haud multos ante Syllae dictaturan annos cuncti ferme Italiae populi unum sub tempus a Romanis defecere.*

Not many years before Sulla's dictatorship nearly all the people of Italy sank to the Romans for a time. (1.2)

What resulted was the *Social War*. Sulla quashed the rebellion and areas adjacent to the ruins of Tuscany, Asculum, Faesulae were colonized by his agents. He credits both Cicero and Sallust for recording these events and the existence of the colonies.

*Modum in sumptibus servare nescisse; dum aedificant tanquam beati, dum magni familiis magnisque conviviis et sumptuosis apparatibus violentius utuntur, in tantum aes alienum incidisse, ut si liberare se velint, rursus foret eis Sylla ab inferis excitandus...Forte per id tempus Romae L. Catiline res novare aggressus, magnam adversus rem publicam coniurationem inierat, in qua multi equestris, multi senatorii ordinis, quidam item patritii generis fuerunt.*

Not having known how to save while building as if rich, while establishing great households and holding great banquets, and their lavish apparatus being used impetuously, to have fallen into such great debt, if they themselves wished to be set free Sylla awakened from the dead would have to be brought back for

them...As it happened at this time Lucius Catiline in Rome, planning new affairs, had initiated a great conspiracy against the Republic in which many Knights, many Senators, were numbered, moreover what one might *call sons of the Fathers*. (1.4-1.7)

## Catiline

The conspiracy of Catiline, a patrician, was an outgrowth of the dictatorship and the proscriptions of Sulla. Catiline was himself among Sulla's adherents and had profited by his service to him and had reportedly used the proscriptions of Sulla as a cover for the murder of his own brother-in-law and for killing a former praetor, Marius Gratidianus. He also greatly enriched himself under Sulla's reign.

“This man [Catiline], namely had killed his brother before the civil struggle was decided, and now asked Sulla to proscribe the man, as one still living; and he was proscribed. Then Catiline, returning the favor of Sulla's, killed a certain Marcus Marius, one of the opposite faction, and brought his head to Sulla as he was sitting in the forum, and then going to the lustral water of Apollo which was near, washed the blood off his hands.” (*Sulla* 32.2)

Lester Hutchinson recounts this event in fine finished phrases that bear repeating.

“Before decapitation, Gratidianus had his legs broken, his hands cut off and his eyes plucked out. It is said that Catiline then carried the bleeding head from the Janiculum through the streets to the temple of Apollo in the Palatine where Sulla was waiting. Having deposited his burden at the feet of the gratified dictator, Catiline, so Plutarch says, added sacrilege to murder by washing the blood off his

hands in the water of a nearby fountain which was sacred to Apollo.” (*The Conspiracy* 39-40)

The Seneca the play write reported that

*M. Mario, cui vicatim populus staruas posuerat, cui ture ac vino supplicabat, L. Sulla praeFRINGI crura, erui oculos, amputari linguam, manus iussit et, quasi totiens occideret quotiens vulnerabat, paulatim et per singulos artus laceravit. Quis erat huius imperii minister? Quis nisi Catilina iam in omne facinus manus iussit et, quasi totiens occideret quotiens vulnerabat, paulatim et per singulos artus laceravit. Quis erat huius imperii minister? Quis nisi Catiline iam in omne facinus manus excercens? Is illum ante bustum Quintii Catuli carpebant gravissimus mitissimi viri cineribus, supra quos vir male exempli, popularis tamen et non tam immerito quam nimis amatus per stillicidia sanguinem dabat. Dignus erat Marius qui illa pateretur, Sulla qui iuberet, Catiline qui faceret, sed indigna res publica quae in corpus sum partier et hostium et vindicum gladios reciperet.*

Marcus Marius, to whom the people erected statues from street to street, to whom they supplicated with frankincense and wine, Sulla commanded to have his legs broken, his eyes dug out, his tongue and hands cut off; little by little, and through tearing apart each joint, as if he killed him as many times as he injured him. Who was the servant of this command? Who but Catiline already busying his hands in every sort of crime. He hacked him apart before the tomb of Quintus Catulus desecrating the ashes of this most gentle man. Over which a man of bad example, yet popular, and not so innocent, rather loved overmuch, shed his blood, drop by drop. It was fitting that Marius should suffer these things, that Sulla should order

them, that Catiline should do them, but it was wrong that the Republic should receive in her breast the swords of both her enemy and her defender equally. (*On Anger* 3.18.1)

“The change of government made by Sulla, which at first seemed a senseless one, by time and usage had now come to be considered by the people no unsatisfactory settlement. But there were some that endeavoured to alter and subvert the whole present state of affairs, not from any good motives, but for their own private gain...These people had for their head man of bold, daring, and restless character, Lucius Catiline, who was accused, besides other great offences, of deflowering his virgin daughter, and killing his own brother.” (*Cicero*, Dryden, Trans. 708)

## Jonson and Ibsen

Ben Jonson’s drama *Catiline: His Conspiracy* (1611) begins with Sulla’s ghost arisen which, after haunting Rome like a specter, enters “the darkest bosoms” of Rome, which happens to be Catiline’s at the time.

Dost thou not feel me, *Rome*? not yet?...

Can SYLLA’S Ghost arise within thy walls,

Less threatening, then an earth-quake, the quick falls...

Thy darker bosome enter SYLLA’S spirit:

All that was mine, and bad, thy breast inherit...and I feele

A spirit, within me, chides my sluggish hands

And sayes, they haue beene innocent too long. (*His Conspiracy* 80-81)

Though many of Seneca's tragedies are known to begin with specters and ghosts, Jonson's apparition was undoubtedly taken from Cicero's remarks to the effect that if Sulla's veterans, who had squandered their wealth on luxuries, and now sought, through the Catilinarian conspiracy, to make a putsch on the consulship, wanted to be out of debt:

*Si salvi esse velint, Sulla sit eis ab in feris excitandus.*

If they wish to be saved, Sulla would have to be arising from the dead for them. (2  
*In Catilinam* 20)

Jonson borrowed the phrase from Bruni who borrowed it from Cicero. Ibsen lost the thread. The story of the Catilinarian conspiracy preserved in the writings of the historians of the late Roman Republic, the scribes of the Roman church, the writings of the Church fathers and eventually transmitted to us the writings of the Renaissance humanists. After the Renaissance humanists, however, the interpretation of the texts began to change until Catiline was transformed from a villain of classical antiquity through Ibsen's work into the hero of the modern bourgeoisie. Though it has been said that Ibsen knew no dramatic works before he wrote *Catiline* (1850), he began with a similitude of Jonson's ghost. Instead of Sulla's ghost arisen entering "the darkest bosoms," a voice speaks from the beginning to Catiline from within. This similitude is strange since although Ibsen repeats Jonson's metaphor of a wicked soul entering Catiline, he fails to employ Sulla's ghost as it was set forth in Cicero's oration.

I must, I must a voice commands me thus

from my soul's depths, and will follow it...

a secret nation smolders in my breast. (*Ibsen's Catiline* 127-28)



Catiline is, in this instance, Ibsen himself, of course, speaking through the persona of Catiline. Ibsen, and the dramatic trend that followed him, took the historical persona of Catiline not as a *bone fide* character of history, but as merely an abstract character of literature which could be molded to suit their own rhetorical needs and used as a mouthpiece for their own political programs. Ibsen's *Catiline* was written in 1850, just after the upheavals in of 1848, when he was only 21 years of age.

*Quisquis es qui iacentem calamum et sopitum, ut ita dixerim leonem importunes latratibus excitasti.*

Whoever you are your importune barking has roused we might say that idle pen and a sleeping lion. (*In. Medicum* 1.1)

Born in Skien, Norway, Ibsen's father Knud was a member of the upper echelons of the merchant bourgeoisie who own a general store and an import business. According to a census taken at the time, Ibsen's family was the 17th wealthiest in the town of 2000 people. Between 1834 and 1836 much of the Ibsen family's business was shut down by authorities and Knud, having fallen deeply into debt, was forced to sell much of the family's possessions and his business came to an end. This gave Henrik "the sense of having been cruelly deprived of his rightful place in life by an unjust fate." Clearly, Henrik Ibsen had bound-up his ego with his nearly aristocratic early up-bringing for after his social decline "he refused to accept as equals or develop any kind of friendship with the poorer children."

Ibsen left school in 1843 when he was fifteen and became an apprentice to a pharmacist in the town of Grimstad where, five years later, he wrote *Catiline*. At sometime within this period he became acquainted with the writings of Voltaire and had

gathered around him a small group of friends, Due and Schulerud, who wrote poetry, political pamphlets and read aloud together. Ibsen became an atheist and a Republican under the influence of the writings of Voltaire and began to express his “bitter ill will” towards those with “empty brains with full purses.” In 1848 he became enthusiastic about the February Revolution in France and began to speak against all emperors, tyrants and kings and in favor of Republicanism while the historical persona which would become the protagonist in his first play, and to whom Ibsen would soon identify himself, was the *criminis auctor* that destroyed the Roman Republic and paved the way for the empire.

—Yes, freedom, it is freedom I’ll create,  
as pure as one time in the bygone days. (*Ibid.* 181)

Ibsen’s understanding of the conspiracy of Catiline was not particularly deep. While still in Grimstad, Ibsen studied both Cicero’s invectives against Catiline and Sallust’s *Bellum Catilinae*. “He read these from the perspective formed by the political events of 1848 and his own financial and social circumstances, and developed a completely different view of Catiline from the one Sallust and Cicero sought to convey.” (*Ibid.* 4-8) Save Mommsen, the true Catiline became lost after this work of Ibsen.

#### IV. Narrative (‘Εξηγητικός)

## Sallust's prologue

[1.1] *Omnis homines, qui sese student praestare ceteris animalibus, summa ope niti decet, ne vitam silentio transeant veluti pecora, quaenatura prona atque ventri oboedientia finxit. [2] Sed nostra omnis vis in animo et corpore sita est: animi imperio, corporis servitio magis utimur; alterum nobis cum dis, alterum cum beluis commune est. [3] Quo mihi rectius videtur ingeni quam virium opibus gloriam quaerere et, quoniam vita ipsa, qua fruimur, brevis est, memoriam nostri quam maxume longam efficere. [4] Nam divitiarum et formae gloria fluxa atque fragilis est, virtus clara aeternaque habetur. [5] Sed diu magnum inter mortalis certamen fuit, vine corporis an virtute animi res militaris magis procederet. [6] Nam et, prius quam incipias, consulto et, ubi consulueris, mature facto opus est. [7] Ita utrumque per se indigens alterum alterius auxilio eget.*

[1.1] It suits all men who are themselves eager to be distinguished from other animals to strive with all their might not passing through life in silence just as cattle who were made by nature stooping forward and obeying the belly. [2] But as a whole all power is situated in the body and soul, moreover the soul is used to rule, the body to serve. The one thing by us is held in common with gods, the other with beasts. [3] Wherefore it seems to me to be correct character to strive for glory by means of moral resources because life itself, which we may enjoy, is short, to make our memory enduring. [4] For riches and beautiful reputation is fleeting and frail, virtue is held bright and eternal. [5] But long ago there was great contention among the mortals; whether strength of body or virtue of soul would succeed better in military affairs. [6] For both before you begin you

must deliberate and, when one has deliberated act when needed. [7] In such a way each through itself is needy, the one needs the help of the other.

*[2.1] Igitur initio reges [nam in terris nomen imperi id primum fuit] divorsi pars ingenium, alii corpus exercebant: etiam tum vita hominum sine cupiditate agitabatur; sua cuique satis placebant. [2] Postea vero, quam in Asia Cyrus, in Graecia Lacedaemonii et Athenienses coepere urbis atque nationes subigere, lubidinem dominandi causam belli habere, maxumam gloriam in maxumo imperio putare, tum demum periculo atque negotiis compertum est in bello plurimum ingenium posse. [3] Quod si regum atque imperatorum animi virtus in pace ita ut in bello valeret, aequabilius atque constantius sese res humanae haberent neque aliud alio ferri neque mutari ac misceri omnia cerneret. [4] Nam imperium facile iis artibus retinetur, quibus initio partum est. [5] Verum ubi pro labore desidia, pro continentia et aequitate lubido atque superbia invasere, fortuna simul cum moribus inmutatur. [6] Ita imperium semper ad optimum quemque a minus bono transferetur. [7] Quae homines arant, navigant, aedificant, virtuti omnia parent. [8] Sed multi mortales, dediti ventri atque somno, indocti incultique vitam sicuti peregrinantes transiere; quibus profecto contra naturam corpus voluptati, anima oneri fuit. Eorum ego vitam mortemque iuxta aestumo, quoniam de utraque siletur. [9] Verum enim vero is demum mihi vivere atque frui anima videtur, qui aliquo negotio intentus praeclari facinoris aut artis bonae famam quaerit. Sed in magna copia rerum aliud alii natura iter ostendit.*

[2.1] And so, in the beginning, kings, for that was the name of the supreme authority in the lands, turned in different directions, part pursued the mind, others the body. Now at the time the life of man was not driven by evil desire, and each one was satisfied with his own possessions. [2] Indeed later on, when Cyrus began to subjugate nations in Asia and

the Athenians and Lacedaemonians cities in Greece, to hold in their lust for power a cause for war, to see the greatest glory in the greatest dominion, at last through these dangerous enterprises it was discovered in war that it was possible to multiply talent. [3] But if the mental ability of kings and rulers were as vigorous in peace as it is in war human affairs would in themselves be held equal and constant, everything would be borne neither from one thing to another nor be changed and all mixed up. [4] For dominion is easy to retain by those practices by which was brought forth. [5] Truly when before labor idleness, before continence and equanimity lust and pride have invaded; good fortune changes with the practices, [6] and in this way dominion will always pass to whoever is best from the less good. [7] All things which men do plowing, sailing, building, come to be through virtue. [8] But man men give themselves up to the belly and slumber, uncultivated and untaught, pass through life as travelers; for whom indeed, contrary to nature, the body was a pleasure, the soul was a burden, and I in my opinion the life and death of those men to be about the same, since both are silent. [9] But in very truth, only he appears to me to live, and to enjoy life, who, intent on some employment, seeks fame through some illustrious deed or good art. But among the great abundance of things, nature shows one way to one man and another to the other.

*[3.1] Pulchrum est bene facere rei publicae, etiam bene dicere haud absurdum est; vel pace vel bello clarum fieri licet; et qui fecere et qui facta aliorum scripsere, multi laudantur. [2] Ac mihi quidem, tametsi haudquaquam par gloria sequitur scriptorem et auctorem rerum, tamen in primis arduum videtur res gestas scribere: primum, quod facta dictis exaequanda sunt; dehinc, quia plerique, quae delicta reprehenderis, malevolentia et invidia dicta putant, ubi de magna virtute atque gloria bonorum memores, quae sibi*

*quisque facilia factu putat, aequo animo accipit, supra ea veluti ficta pro falsis ducit. [3] Sed ego adolescentulus initio, sicuti plerique, studio ad rem publicam latus sum ibique mihi multa advorsa fuere. Nam pro pudore, pro abstinentia, pro virtute audacia, largitio, avaritia vigeabant. [4] Quae tametsi animus aspernabatur insolens malarum artium, tamen inter tanta vitia imbecilla aetas ambitione corrupta tenebatur; [5] ac me, cum ab reliquorum malis moribus dissentirem, nihilo minus honoris cupido eadem, qua ceteros, fama atque invidia vexabat.*

[3.1] To act well for the Republic is a beautiful thing, moreover to speak well is by no means absurd; to do a brilliant thing, the one in peace the other in war, is to be valued, and to have done; those who act and those who write about the acts of others are to be praised. [2] And to me certainly, although by no means altogether does equal glory follow the writer of things and the doer of things, still it seems difficult to write down the *res gestae* in the first place: firstly because the things said must equal the things done, secondly, because men for the most part consider whatever crimes you pass judgment against are words of envy and malevolence; when you remember the great virtue and the glory of good men, that which he himself thinks easy to do, the soul equally receives without effort, everything beyond these things as fiction before leading to deception. [3] But when I was a young man, beginning, just as most, being borne into public life and there were many obstacles for me. For before shame, before abstinence, before virtue, audacity, bribery, and greed flourished. [4] Although my soul, unaccustomed to evil ways, was repulsed, I nevertheless, among so many vices, was, on account of my tender age, captivated by ambition and corruption. [5] And though I myself would differ with

the evil practices of the others, I nevertheless, on account of desire for honors, was vexed by the same reputation and envy as the others.

*[4.1] Igitur ubi animus ex multis miseriis atque periculis requievit et mihi reliquam aetatem a re publica procul habendam decrevi, non fuit consilium socordia atque desidia bonum otium conterere neque vero agrum colundo aut venando, servilibus officiis, intentum aetatem agere; [2] sed, a quo incepto studioque me ambitio mala detinuerat, eodem regressus statui res gestas populi Romani carptim, ut quaeque memoria digna videbantur, perscribere, eo magis, quod mihi a spe, metu, partibus rei publicae animus liber erat. [3] Igitur de Catilinae coniuratione, quam verissime potero, paucis absolvam; [4] nam id facinus in primis ego memorabile existumo sceleris atque periculi novitate. [5] De cuius hominis moribus pauca prius explananda sunt, quam initium narrandi faciam.*

[4.1] As I was saying, when my soul rested from the many troubles and perils, I resolved to spend the rest of my life at a distance from public affairs. It was not my intention to occupy my precious leisure in laziness and idleness, certainly not cultivating land or hunting, leading a life having been directed to slavish occupations, [2] instead I undertake the study from which evil ambition detained me, returning to the same purpose, considering the things done at different times by the Roman people, and to record them in a manner by which they would appear to be worthy of memory, all the more to me on account of the fact that my soul was free from hope, fear, and factions of the Republic. [3] Therefore, I shall pass judgment [absolvo] on the conspiracy of Catiline which I shall be able to do truthfully and by means of few words, [4] for I regard that deed as particularly memorable on account of its wickedness and the uniqueness of



it's danger. [5] Before beginning to narrate, I should first compose a few words which explain the morals of that man.

[5.1] *L. Catilina, nobili genere natus, fuit magna vi et animi et corporis, sed ingenio malo pravoque. [2] Huic ab adulescentia bella intestina, caedes, rapinae, discordia civilis grata fuere ibique iuventutem suam exercuit. [3] Corpus patiens inediae, alboris, vigiliae supra quam quouquam credibile est. [4] Animus audax, subdolos, varius, quouius rei lubet simulator ac dissimulator, alieni appetens, sui profusus, ardens in cupiditatibus; satis eloquentiae, sapientiae parum. [5] Vastus animus immoderata, incredibilia, nimis alta semper cupiebat. [6] Hunc post dominationem L. Sullae libido maxuma invaserat rei publicae capiundae; neque id quibus modis adsequeretur, dum sibi regnum pararet, quicquam pensi habebat. [7] Agitabatur magis magisque in dies animus ferox inopia rei familiaris et conscientia scelerum, quae utraque iis artibus auxerat, quas supra memoravi. [8] Incitabant praeterea corrupti civitatis mores, quos pessuma ac divorsa inter se mala, luxuria atque avaritia, vexabant. [9] Res ipsa hortari videtur, quoniam de moribus civitatis tempus admonuit, supra repetere ac paucis instituta maiorum domi militiaeque, quo modo rem publicam habuerint quantamque reliquerint, ut paulatim immutata ex pulcherruma <atque optuma> pessuma ac flagitiosissima facta sit, disserere.*

[5.1] Lucius Catiline was begotten by the nobility; great in energy both in body and soul, but with an evil and depraved nature. [2] Civil war, murder, rapine, and civil discord were gratifying to this young man from a very young age and there occupied his youth. [3] His body could endure hunger, cold, and sleeplessness to an incredible degree. [4] His mind, reckless, cunning, and treacherous, was agreeable to any form of pretense or

concealment.<sup>59</sup> Coveting the things of another he out did himself burning with cupidity, great in eloquence, but little in wisdom, [5] his wasted mind, immoderate beyond belief, always longed for the great beyond measure. [6] After Sulla's domination, a great desire for seizing the Republic entered this man, if only to make himself supreme, he weighed out anything, and not by what standard [mode] he should pursue it. [7] His fierce soul was being driven onward more and more by the day by poverty at home and the guilt of his crimes; both of these he had augmented by the practices that I recounted above. [8] Besides that the corrupt morals of the State, which were shaken to the ground by evils opposite between themselves,<sup>60</sup> luxury and greed, were inspiring. [9] The appearance of the affair itself urges discussion about the morals of the State, since to recall earlier times, and in particular a few institutions of our forefathers at home and at war, in what manner they maintained the Republic and how great they would have bequeathed it; how little by little it was changed, how the most beautiful and best was made worst and ugliest.

*[6.1] Urbem Romam, sicuti ego accepi, condidere atque habuere initio Troiani, qui Aenea duce profugi sedibus incertis vagabantur, cumque iis Aborigines, genus hominum agreste, sine legibus, sine imperio, liberum atque solutum. [2] Hi postquam in una moenia convenere, dispari genere, dissimili lingua, alii alio more viventes, incredibile memoratu est, quam facile coaluerint: ita brevi multitudo dispersa atque vaga concordia civitas facta erat. [3] Sed postquam res eorum civibus, moribus, agris aucta, satis prospera satisque pollens videbatur, sicuti pleraque mortalium habentur, invidia ex opulentia orta est. [4] Igitur reges populique finitimi bello temptare, pauci ex amicis auxilio esse; nam ceteri metu percussi a periculis aberant. [5] At Romani domi*

<sup>59</sup> *simulator*, 'similitude,' *ac dissimulator*, 'or dissimilitude.'

<sup>60</sup> "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."—Rolf

*militiaeque intenti festinare, parare, alius alium hortari, hostibus obviam ire, libertatem, patriam, parentisque armis tegere. Post, ubi pericula virtute propulerant, sociis atque amicis auxilia portabant magisque dandis quam accipiundis beneficiis amicitias parabant. [6] Imperium legitimum, nomen imperi regium habebant. Delecti, quibus corpus annis infirmum, ingenium sapientia validum erat, rei publicae consultabant; hi vel aetate vel curae similitudine patres appellabantur. [7] Post, ubi regium imperium, quod initio conservandae libertatis atque augendae rei publicae fuerat, in superbiam dominationemque se convortit, inmutato more annua imperia binosque imperatores sibi fecere: eo modo mimume posse putabant per licentiam insolescere animum humanum.*

[6.1] The city of Rome, as I have learned, was founded and initially held by Trojans, who, as exiles, were wandering about homeless and unsettled under the leadership of Aeneas, and along with them the Aborigines, a savage race of men, without laws, without government, free and unrestrained. [2] How easily they united, with a disparate origin, a dissimilar language and one having a different way of life from the other, after they came together within the same walls, is unheard of in all memory: thus, after a short while, the great differences were smoothed out and harmony and citizenship was built. [3] But after that, their civic affairs, the mores, with expanding domains, enough prosperity and sufficient power appeared, just as most mortal things have, jealousy out of opulence arose. [4] Consequently, neighboring kings and peoples assailed them with war, few friends were to be of help; for the remainder, struck by fear, were absent from dangers. [5] But the Romans were eager, at home and in the field, to hasten, to prepare, urging each other on to go to meet the enemy, they protected liberty, country, and parents by

means of arms. [6] They had lawful sovereignty, in name it was commanded by kings.<sup>61</sup> Chosen men whose body was weakened by years, whose character was strengthened by wisdom, held council for the Republic; these, whether by age or by similar diligence, were called Fathers. [7] Afterwards, when the monarchy, which had been initiated to preserve liberty and develop the Republic, haughtiness and supremacy converted it, they changed its manner and created two dictators who ruled for a year: by this small measure to be able to prune the growth of the human soul to insolence due to license.

*[7.1] Sed ea tempestate coepere se quisque magis extollere magisque ingenium in promptu habere. [2] Nam regibus boni quam mali suspectiores sunt [3] semperque iis aliena virtus formidulosa est. Sed civitas incredibile memoratu est, adepta libertate, quantum brevi creverit: tanta cupido gloriae incesserat. [4] Iam primum iuventus, simul ac belli patiens erat, in castris per laborem usum militiae discebat magisque in decoris armis et militaribus equis quam in scortis atque conviviiis lubidinem habebant. [5] Igitur talibus viris non labor insolitus, non locus ullus asper aut arduus erat, non armatus hostis formidulosus: [6] virtus omnia domuerat. Sed gloriae maxumum certamen inter ipsos erat: se quisque hostem ferire, murum ascendere, conspici, dum tale facinus faceret, properabat. Eas divitias, eam bonam famam magnamque nobilitatem putabant. Laudis avidi, pecuniae liberales erant, [7] gloriam ingentem, divitias honestas volebant. Memorare possum, quibus in locis maxumas hostium copias populus Romanus parva manu fuderit, quas urbis natura munitas pugnando ceperit, ni ea res longius nos ab incepto traheret.*

[7.1] But at that time everyone began to extol himself higher and higher, to have his talents on display. [2] For by kings the good as well as the bad are suspects [3] and to

---

<sup>61</sup> *I.e.* 'a monarchy.'

them the virtue of another is always dreadful. But the free State, by means of gaining freedom, came into being is worthy of mention; desire for glory grew forth. [4] A youth, at first, as soon as he was tough enough for war learned, through labor in the camp, military skills. And they had more pleasure in beauty of arms and horses for war than in prostitutes and parties. [5] Accordingly, to such distinguished men, no task was unfamiliar, not any place too rough or steep no armed stranger too formidable; manliness conquered all. [6] But in fact rivalry for the greatest glory was between themselves; each one made haste to himself strike the enemy, to climb the wall while conspicuously doing such a deed. These they considered riches, this good reputation and great renown. They were greedy for praise, generous with money; they wished for great fame, honorable wealth. [7] I could mention the places in which the Roman people routed a great number of enemies with a small handful, those cities seized by natural fighting ability, if this matter did not draw me away from our undertaking.

*[8.1] Sed profecto fortuna in omni re dominatur; ea res cunctas ex lubricine magis quam ex vero celebrat obscuratque. [2] Atheniensium res gestae, sicuti ego aestumo, satis amplae magnificaeque fuere, verum aliquanto minores tamen, quam fama feruntur. [3] Sed quia provenere ibi scriptorum magna ingenia, per terrarum orbem Atheniensium facta pro maxumis celebrantur. [4] Ita eorum, qui fecere, virtus tanta habetur, quantum eam verbis potuere extollere praeclara ingenia. [5] At populo Romano numquam ea copia fuit, quia prudentissimus quisque maxime negotiosus erat: ingenium nemo sine corpore exercebat, optimum quisque facere quam dicere, sua ab aliis bene facta laudari quam ipse aliorum narrare malebat.*

[8.1] But in reality Fortune is master in all things, She, according to Her pleasure, everything with greatness celebrated or obscure apart from truth. [2] The things done by the Athenians, as I see it, were sufficiently distinguished and magnificent, nevertheless in truth somewhat less than fame represents them. [3] But because they produced writers of great genius there, deeds of the Athenians were very greatly celebrated throughout the whole world. [4] Thus the virtue of those who did the things is held to be as great as those things excellent minds have been able to extol by means words. [5] But the Roman people were never abundantly furnished with this thing because everyone of good sense was very busy, nobody engaged the mind without the body; everyone good acted rather than spoke; they preferred their benefaction to be praised by others rather than to tell of them himself.

*[9.1] Igitur domi militiaeque boni mores colebantur; concordia maxuma, minuma avaritia erat; ius bonumque apud eos non legibus magis quam natura valebat. [2] Iurgia, discordias, simultates cum hostibus exercebant, cives cum civibus de virtute certabant. In suppliciis deorum magnifici, domi parci, in amicos fideles erant. [3] Duabus his artibus, audacia in bello, ubi pax evenerat, aequitate, seque remque publicam curabant. [4] Quarum rerum ego maxuma documenta haec habeo, quod in bello saepius vindicatum est in eos, qui contra imperium in hostem pugnaverant quique tardius revocati proelio excesserant, quam qui signa relinquere aut pulsi loco cedere ausi erant; [5] in pace vero, quod beneficiis magis quam metu imperium agitabant et accepta iniuria ignoscere quam persequi malebant.*

[9.1] Accordingly good morals were cultivated at home and in war; there was great harmony, little greed; justice and good will prevailed among them not on account of laws more than nature. [2] Strife, discord and rivalry were carried out with the enemies,

citizens vied with citizens out of virtue; they were magnificent in supplications for the gods, frugal at home, and loyal in friendship. [3] Having practiced these two arts, bold in war, fair in peace, they care for themselves and the Republic. [4] Of which things I have this great evidence, because punishing in war was frequently upon those who against orders attacked the enemy and whoever tardily withdrew when they had retired from battle rather than those who relinquished the standard or those who gave ground when they were being overcome; [5] truly in peacetime, they ruled through great kindness rather than by means of fear, and preferred to ignore it when receiving injury rather than to follow it up.

[10.1] *Sed ubi labore atque iustitia res publica crevit, reges magni bello domiti, nationes ferae et populi ingentes vi subacti, Carthago, aemula imperi Romani, ab stirpe interiit, cuncta maria terraeque patebant, saevire fortuna ac miscere omnia coepit. [2] Qui labores, pericula, dubias atque asperas res facile toleraverant, iis otium divitiaeque optanda alias, oneri miseriaeque fuere. [3] Igitur primo pecuniae, deinde imperi<sup>62</sup> cupido crevit: ea quasi materies omnium malorum fuere. [4] Namque avaritia fidem, probitatem ceterasque artis bonas subvertit; pro his superbiam, crudelitatem, deos neglegere, omnia venalia habere edocuit. [5] Ambitio multos mortalis falsos fieri subegit, aliud clausum in pectore, aliud in lingua promptum habere, amicitias inimicitiasque non ex re, sed ex commodo aestumare magisque voltum quam ingenium bonum habere. [6] Haec primo paulatim crescere, interdum vindicari; post, ubi*

---

<sup>62</sup> Rolfe's MSS reads *Igitur primo imperi, deinde pecuniae* and is translated thus here. McGushin relied on the Teubner edition of A. Kurfess, 1957 which reads *Igitur primo pecuniae, deinde imperi*. As does W. W. Capes who relied on Sorb. 500 also known as MSS P. Rolfe's progression here, however, seems more logical for first one ought to desire power and then realize wealth was a means to getting it.

*contagio quasi pestilentia invasit, civitas immutata, imperium ex iustissimo atque optumo crudele intolerandumque factum.*<sup>63</sup>

[10.1] But when the Republic became distinguished through labor and justice, when great kings had been subdued through war, when savage nations and great peoples had been subjugated by force, when Carthage, rival of Rome's dominion, perished root and branch, and all lands and seas lay open, Fortune began to grow fierce and to mix everything up. [2] To those who had easily endured toils, dangers, uncertainties, and perils, things were leisure and wealth; desiring otherwise, burdensome and woe some.<sup>64</sup> [3] Consequently, first lust for power, and thereafter money, was decided; these things were just about the source of all evils. [4] For greed subverts trust, honesty, and all other good arts; arrogance, cruelty, to neglect the gods, and to set a price on everything was taught before these.<sup>65</sup> [5] Ambition<sup>66</sup> trained<sup>67</sup> many men to become deceptive; to have one thing enclosed in the breast another in public on the tongue, to value friendships and enmities not from circumstances but out of convenience and to have a grand visage rather than good character. [6] At first these things came into being little by little, punished now and then; finally, when this disease invaded like the plague, citizenship was being changed, government of the best and most just was becoming cruel and intolerable.

---

<sup>63</sup> neut. nom. sing. perf. pass. part. of *facio* and in *apposition* with *imperium*.

<sup>64</sup> *Qui...iis: iis* is a dat. pl., thus "to those who had easily tolerated toils, dangers, uncertainties, and perils, *res* (things or affairs) *fuere* (3rd pl. perf. act. ind.) were leisure and wealth." *Optanda alias: alias* is a f. acc. pl in *apposition* with *res*, thus "desiring other things" (or wishing for affairs besides toils, dangers, uncertainties, and perils) *res fuere*, i.e., "things were burdensome and woe some" where *oneri* (n. dat. sing.) and *miseriae* (f. dat. sing.) are *predicative datives*. "The dative marking the end, whether intended or simply resulting, is most commonly used in combination with a dative of the person interested, and predicated with the verb 'to be.'" Woodcock §68.

<sup>65</sup> "In place of these."

<sup>66</sup> *ambitio*: the going about of candidates for office, striving for favor; desire for honor, popularity or flattery ( *Lewis and Short*).

<sup>67</sup> *subegit*: McGushin counts this verb to be the equivalent of *cogere*: to drive together, collect, crowd, bring together, summon, congregate, convene ( *Lewis and Short*).



[11.1] *Sed primo magis ambitio quam avaritia animos hominum exercebat, quod tamen vitium propius virtutem erat. [2] Nam gloriam, honorem, imperium bonus et ignavus aequae sibi exoptant; sed ille vera via nititur, huic quia bonae artes desunt, dolis atque fallaciis contendit. [3] Avaritia pecuniae studium habet, quam nemo sapiens concupivit: ea quasi venenis malis imbuta corpus animumque virilem effeminat, semper infinita, insatiabilis est, neque copia neque inopia minuitur. [4] Sed postquam L. Sulla armis recepta re publica bonis initiis malos eventus habuit, rapere omnes, omnes trahere, domum alius, alius agros cupere, neque modum neque modestiam victores habere, foeda crudeliaque in civis facinora facere. [5] Huc accedebat, quod L. Sulla exercitum, quem in Asia ductaverat, quo sibi fidum faceret, contra morem maiorum luxuriose nimisque liberaliter habuerat. Loca amoena, voluptaria facile in otio ferocis militum animos molliverant. [6] Ibi primum insuevit exercitus populi Romani amare, potare, signa, tabulas pictas, vasa caelata mirari, ea privatim et publice rapere, delubra spoliare, sacra profanaque omnia polluere. [7] Igitur ii milites, postquam victoriam adepti sunt, nihil reliqui victis fecere. Quippe secundae res sapientium animos fatigant: ne illi corruptis moribus victoriae temperarent.*

[11.1] But, at first, great ambition, rather than greed, occupied the minds of men, which was, nevertheless, a vice nearer to a virtue. [2] For glory, honor, power the good and the cowardly equally desire; but the one strives by way of the truth, the other destitute of the good arts, by fraud and deceit contends. [3] Greed has money as its object, which no wise man has desired: it, as if imbued by a deadly poison, feminizes the manliness of the body and soul, it is always infinite and insatiable, diminished neither abundance nor indigence. [4] But after Sulla seized the Republic by means of arms, having made a bad end from good beginning, all men robbed, all men pillaged, some desired houses, others

lands; the victors had neither limits nor moderation, committed filthy and cruel deeds on the citizens. [5] Hither to, because L. Sulla was approaching his army which he had led into Asia, which he hoped to make loyal to himself which, contrary to the mores of the Greats, he had held through luxury and freedom beyond measure, who in leisure, those lovely voluptuous places easily softened the spirit of the fierce soldiers. [6] There an army of the Roman people first became accustomed to love and to drink; to admire statues, paintings, and engraved vases; to steal them from public and private places, to pillage shrines and to desecrate everything sacred and profane. [7] Therefore these soldiers, after they have achieved a victory, left nothing to the vanquished. As one might expect, inferior things vex the even souls of the wise; could victories restrain these men of bad morals?

[12.1] *Postquam divitiae honori<sup>68</sup> esse coepere<sup>69</sup> et eas<sup>70</sup> gloria, imperium, potentia sequebatur, hebescere<sup>71</sup> virtus, paupertas probro haberi, <sup>72</sup> innocentia pro malevolentia duci coepit. [2] Igitur ex divitiis iuventutem luxuria atque avaritia cum superbia invasere: rapere, consumere, sua<sup>73</sup> parvi pendere, aliena cupere, pudorem, pudicitiam, divina atque humana promiscua, nihil pensi neque moderati habere. [3] Operae pretium est, cum domos atque villas cognoveris<sup>74</sup> in urbium modum exaedificatas, visere templa deorum, quae nostri maiores, religiosissimi mortales, fecere. [4] Verum illi delubra deorum pietate, domos suas gloria decorabant neque victis quicquam praeter iniuriae*

<sup>68</sup> *honori*; masc. nom. pl. here is a *Predicate Nominative*.

<sup>69</sup> *coepere* is an *Historical Infinitive*: "The Infinitive is often used for the Imperfect Indicative in narration, and takes a subject in the Nominative." (Allen and Greenough 463)

<sup>70</sup> fem. nom. pl. pronoun in agreeing with *divitiae* in gender, number and case. Translated in the singular as wealth in English is also expressed in the singular.

<sup>71</sup> also an *Historical Infinitive*.

<sup>72</sup> pres. inf. pass. *Historical Infinitive*.

<sup>73</sup> neut. acc. pl.: "their own things."

<sup>74</sup> 2nd sing. Fut. perf. act. ind.

*licentiam eripiebant. [5] At hi contra, ignavissumi homines, per summum scelus omnia ea sociis adimere, quae fortissimi viri victores reliquerant: proinde quasi iniuriam facere id demum esset imperio uti.*

[12.1] After that, wealth began to be honorable and glory, dominion, personal power<sup>75</sup> followed this, virtue became blunt, poverty was being held to be a shameful act, innocence began to be taken for malevolence. [2] Consequently, on account of riches, luxury, and greed, along with arrogance, seized upon the youth. Considering their own things to be of little value, desired the things of another; shame, chastity they held to be nothing, mixing the human and the divine, being inconsiderate and immoderate. [3] It is worth the effort when you become acquainted with homes and villas being built in the size of cities to visit the temples of the gods which were built by our Forefathers, most religious men. [4] Indeed these men adorned the shrines of the gods with piety, their own homes with glory, and didn't take anything from the vanquished beyond the freedom to injure. [5] But these men, on the contrary, the most lazy men, through everything wicked took away from these allies which the most powerful men had left the vanquished, accordingly as if the only way to employ imperium is to commit injury.

*[13.1] Nam quid ea memorem, quae nisi iis, qui videre, nemini credibilia sunt: a privatis compluribus subvorsos montis, maria constrata esse? Quibus mihi videntur ludibrio fuisse divitiae: quippe, quas honeste habere licebat, abuti per turpitudinem properabant. Sed libido stupri, ganeae ceterique cultus non minor incesserat: viri muliebria pati, mulieres pudicitiam in propatulo habere; vescendi causa terra marique omnia exquirere; dormire prius, quam somni cupido esset; non famen aut sitim, neque frigus neque*

---

<sup>75</sup> *potential*: to be distinguished from *potestas*. "The former denotes power attained by personal means, wealth, influence etc., and used largely for personal ends. The latter is used of power that is associated with public office, properly constituted authority." (McGushin 98-99)

*lassitudinem opperiri, sed omnia luxu antecapere. Haec iuventutem, ubi familiares opes defecerant, ad facinora incendebant: animus imbutus malis artibus haud facile lubricibus carebat; eo profusius omnibus modis quaestui atque sumptui deditus erat.*

[13.1] But why is this remembered, which is credible to except to those who saw it; mountains completely destroyed and the sea made firm by many private men? [2] It seems to me, to those men, riches were but a plaything; naturally it is lawful to have them respectably, they made haste to use them up disgracefully. [3] But desire for disgrace, brothels, and for other things was spread about no less; men submitted to feminine things, women put their chastity up for sale, feeding this they searched for everything on land and sea,<sup>76</sup> to sleep first before there was much need for sleep, to not await hunger or thirst, neither cold nor weariness but to anticipate everything with extravagance. [4] This aroused the youth, when they had used up their family wealth, to crime. [5] Their minds, having been steeped in the bad arts, was not easily freed from inordinate desires.

*[14.1] In tanta tamque corrupta civitate Catilina, id quod factu facillimum erat, omnium flagitiorum atque facinorum circum se tamquam stipatorum catervas habebat. [2-3] Nam quicumque inpudicus, adulter, ganeo manu, ventre, pene bona patria laceraverat quique alienum aes grande conflaverat, quo flagitium aut facinus redimeret, praeterea omnes undique parricidae, sacrilegi, convicti iudiciis aut pro factis iudicium timentes, ad hoc, quos manus atque lingua periurio aut sanguine civili alebat, postremo omnes, quos flagitium, egestas, conscius animus exagitabat, ii Catilinae proximi familiaresque erant. [4] Quod si quis etiam a culpa vacuus in amicitiam eius inciderat, cotidiano usu atque illecebris facile par similisque ceteris efficiebatur. [5] Sed maxime adulescentium*

---

<sup>76</sup> *Vescendi* is a masc. nom. pres. pass. gerundive governing the ablatives *terra*, and *marique*. *Omnia* as a neut. acc. pl. is the direct object. *Exquirere* is an infinitive. *Causa* expresses purpose *Allen and Greenough* 504 b). The antecedent for this is in 13.1 *subvorsos montis, maria constrata esse*.

*familiaritates adpetebat: eorum animi molles etiam et fluxi dolis haud difficulter capiebantur. [6] Nam ut cuiusque studium ex aetate flagrabat, aliis scorta praeberere, aliis canes atque equos mercari; postremo neque sumptui neque modestiae suae parcere, dum illos obnoxios fidosque sibi faceret. [7] Scio fuisse nonnullos, qui ita existumarent: iuventutem, quae domum Catilinae frequentabat, parum honeste pudicitiam habuisse; sed ex aliis rebus magis, quam quod cuiquam id compertum foret, haec fama valebat.*

[14.1] In a community so great and so corrupt, Catiline, on account of the fact that doing so was easy, gathered around himself a band of men as a bodyguard. [2-3] Every lewd man, adulterer, and gambler who had wasted his patrimony through gluttony, anyone inflamed by great debt who sought to be rescued from crime or disgrace, and besides them from every direction all fearing conviction by the courts, or who was already convicted, for sacrilege or murder, and add to this those whose hand and tongue was fed through perjury or civil war, and finally all those whose mind was disturbed by wants or disgrace. [4] But if anyone free from guilt fell into friendship with him, daily intercourse and allurements would make him equal or similar to the others. [5] But mostly he sought intimacy with young men, whose minds were still impressionable and pliable, their souls were seized by trickery without difficulty. [6] For by learning that each burned with a passion, some he gave whores, for others he purchased dogs and horses while he made them obedient and loyal to himself. [7] I am aware that there have been some who thus thought that the youth who frequented Catiline's home had little respect for their chastity, but for more important reasons this rumor arose rather than because anyone had learned that.

*[15.1] Iam primum adulescens Catilina multa nefanda stupra fecerat, cum virgine nobili, cum sacerdote Vestae, alia huiusce modi contra ius fasque. [2] Postremo captus amore*

*Aureliae Orestillae, cuius praeter formam nihil umquam bonus laudavit, quod ea nubere illi dubitabat timens privignum adulta aetate, pro certo creditur necato filio vacuum domum scelestis nuptiis fecisse. [3] Quae quidem res mihi in primis videtur causa fuisse facinus maturandi. [4] Namque animus impurus, dis hominibusque infestus neque vigiliis neque quietibus sedari poterat: ita conscientia mentem excitam vastabat. [5] Igitur color ei exsanguis, foedi oculi, citus modo, modo tardus incessus: prorsus in facie vultuque vecordia inerat.*

[15.1] Already as a young man, Catiline had done many unspeakable things with a noble virgin, with a priestess of Vesta, and other things of this sort against law and sanctity.

[2] Finally seized by love for Aurelia Orestilla, about whom a good man has praised nothing save her beauty; when she hesitated to marry him, fearing his stepson, a grown man, it is resolved for certain that murdering his son made a vacant home for the criminal marriage. Which affair indeed, it seems to me to have been the primary cause maturing the plot, [4] for surely his vile soul, at odds with gods and men, was able to be calm neither waking nor sleeping; in such a way his conscience destroyed his disturbed mind.

[5] Hence his pallid complexion, his bloodshot eyes; his gait now fast, now slow; in his face and his every glance showed him a madman.

*[16.1] Sed iuventutem, quam, ut supra diximus, illexerat, multis modis mala facinora edocebat. [2] Ex illis testis signatoresque falsos commodare; fidem, fortunas, pericula vilia habere, post, ubi eorum famam atque pudorem attriverat, maiora alia imperabat.*

*[3] Si causa peccandi in praesens minus suppetebat, nihilo minus insontis sicuti sontis circumvenire, iugulare: scilicet, ne per otium torpescerent manus aut animus, gratuito potius malus atque crudelis erat. [4] His amicis sociisque confisus Catilina, simul quod aes alienum per omnis terras ingens erat et quod plerique Sullani milites largius suo usu*

*rapinarum et victoriae veteris memores civile bellum exoptabant, opprimundae rei publicae consilium cepit. In Italia nullus exercitus, Cn. Pompeius in extremis terris bellum gerebat; ipsi consulatum petenti magna spes, senatus nihil sane intentus: tutae tranquillaeque res omnes, sed ea prorsus opportuna Catilinae.*

[16.1] But the youth he seduced, about whom we spoke above, he taught terrible crimes of many kinds. [2] From these men he supplied perjurers and forgers; to hold honor, fortunes, and dangers worthless. Afterwards, when he had exhausted their reputation and sense of shame, he ordered even greater crimes. [3] If grounds for sinning in the present was not at hand, he nevertheless encircled the guilty and the innocent alike and cut their throats. Evidently he was gratuitously evil and cruel rather than allow through leisure, their hands and minds to grow numb. [4] With friends and associates such as these, Catiline, both because of his debt throughout the whole world was immense and because most of Sulla's soldiers used up their wealth and were mindful of rapine and victory, now wished for civil war, for overthrowing the Republic and seizing the consulship. In Italy there was no army for Gnaeus Pompeius was fighting a war in far away lands, himself desiring the consulship with great hope. The Senate was not very attentive, everything was entirely tranquil, and this was, in a word, an opportunity for Catiline.

### Second Conspiracy, June 1 64 B.C.

*[17] Igitur circiter Kalendas Iunias L. Caesare et C. Figulo consulibus primo singulos appellare, hortari alios, alios temptare; opes suas, inparatam rem publicam, magna praemia coniurationis docere. [2] Ubi satis explorata sunt, quae voluit, in unum omnis convocat, quibus maxuma necessitudo et plurimum audaciae inerat. [3] Eo convenere senatorii ordinis P. Lentulus Sura, P. Autronius, L. Cassius Longinus, C. Cethegus, P. et*

*Ser. Sullae Ser. filii, L. Vargunteius, Q. Annius, M. Porcius Laeca, L. Bestia, Q. Curius; praeterea ex equestri ordine M. Fulvius Nobilior, L. Statilius, P. Gabinius Capito, C. Cornelius; ad hoc multi ex coloniis et municipiis domi nobiles. [5] Erant praeterea complures paulo occultius consili huiusce participes nobiles, quos magis dominationis spes hortabatur quam inopia aut alia necessitudo. [6] Ceterum iuventus pleraque, sed maxime nobilium, Catilinae inceptis favebat; quibus in otio vel magnifice vel molliter vivere copia erat, incerta pro certis, bellum quam pacem malebant. [7] Fuere item ea tempestate, qui crederent M. Licinium Crassum non ignarum eius consili fuisse; quia Cn. Pompeius, invisus ipsi, magnum exercitum ductabat, cuiusvis opes voluisse contra illius potentiam crescere, simul confisum, si coniuratio valisset, facile apud illos principem se fore.*

[17.1] Accordingly, about the first of June in the consulate of Lucius Caesar and Gaius Figulus [64 B.C.], he first appealed to them individually, encouraging some, testing others; showing them their power, the unpreparedness of the Republic, and the great prizes of the conspiracy. [2] When thing had been sufficiently explored, who had the greatest need, and who the greatest audacity to enter upon the which he desired, he called them together as one. [3] There convened from the senatorial order were 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, Quntus Curius; and besides them of the equestrian order were Marcus Fulvius Nobilior, Lucius Statilius, Publius Gabinius Capito, Gaius Cornelius; add to this many men from the colonies and municipalities of noble rank at home. [5] There were [erat] moreover [preatrea] several nobles [complures nobiles] you might include [participes is a 2nd sing. pres. subj. act.] by a little more [paulo] secretly [occultius] in



this council [huiusce consili], men who were encouraged by hope for great power rather than by poverty or any other necessity. On the other hand, most of the youth, also of great renown, favored Catiline's undertaking; for although in peace were able to live magnificently and patiently, preferred uncertainty to certainty, war to peace. Moreover, there were those at the time who thought Marcus Licinius Crassus was not ignorant of this plot, because his great enemy Gaius Pompeius was himself leading a great army, he wished the influence of anyone to grow against his power; at the same time confident, if the conspiracy were to prevail he himself would easily become the leader among them.

#### First Conspiracy, Jan. 1st – Feb. 5th, 66

[18.1] *Sed antea item coniuravere pauci contra rem publicam, in quibus Catilina fuit. De qua, quam verissime potero, dicam. [2] L. Tullo et M'. Lepido consulibus P. Autronius et P. Sulla designati consules legibus ambitus interrogati poenas dederant. [3] Post paulo Catilina pecuniarum repetundarum reus prohibitus erat consulatum petere, quod intra legitimos dies profiteri nequiverat. [4] Erat eodem tempore Cn. Piso, adulescens nobilis, summae audaciae, egens, factiosus, quem ad perturbandam rem publicam inopia atque mali mores stimulabant. [5] Cum hoc Catilina et Autronius circiter Nonas Decembris consilio communicato parabant in Capitolio Kalendis Ianuariis L. Cottam et L. Torquatum consules interficere, ipsi fascibus correptis Pisonem cum exercitu ad obtinendas duas Hispanias mittere. [6] Ea re cognita rursus in Nonas Februarias consilium caedis transtulerant. [7] Iam tum non consulibus modo, sed plerisque senatoribus perniciem machinabantur. [8] Quod ni Catilina maturasset pro curia signum sociis dare, eo die post conditam urbem Romam pessimum facinus patratum foret. Quia nondum frequentes armati convenerant, ea res consilium diremit.*

[18.1] But earlier, moreover, there was a small conspiracy against the Republic in which Catiline was, about which I shall speak as truly as I am able. [2] In the consulship of Lucius Tullus and Manius Lepidus the consuls elect were indicted for bribery and payed the penalty. [3] A little while later, Catiline, convicted of extortion, had been forbidden to run for the consulship, because he would be unable to announce it during the lawful days. [4] At the same time there was a young noble Gnaeus Piso, of great audacity, poor, seditious, was excited to upset the Republic by his poverty and bad morals. [5] With him Catiline and Autronius, about the fifth of December, communicated a plan there were preparing to murder the Consuls Lucius Cotta and Lucius Torquatus in the Capitol on the first of January; they themselves were to creep against and seize-up the fasces and to send

Piso, with an army, to the desired two Spanish provinces. [6] Upon the discovery of it, they postponed the attack to the fifth of February. [7] Then at that time, not the Consuls alone, but many Senators were to be killed by their pernicious mechanizations. [8] If not for the fact Catiline gave a signal to his accomplices in front of the Senate-house before it was time,<sup>77</sup> it would have been the worst crime ever executed since the day after the founding of the Roman city. [9] But because the crowd of soldiers had not yet gathered together as a crowd, this affair failed.

*[19.1] Postea Piso in citeriorem Hispaniam quaestor pro praetore missus est adnitente Crasso, quod eum infestum inimicum Cn. Pompeio cognoverat. [2] Neque tamen senatus provinciam invitus dederat; quippe foedum hominem a republica procul esse volebat, simul quia boni conplures praesidium in eo putabant et iam tum potentia Pompei*

---

<sup>77</sup> If not for the fact, *Quodni*, Catiline, *Catilina*, gave, *dare*, a signal, *signum*, to his accomplices, *sociis*, in front of the Senate-house, *pro curia*, before it was time, *maturasset*, etc.

*formidulosa erat. [3] Sed is Piso in provincia ab equitibus Hispanis, quos in exercitu ductabat, iter faciens occisus est. [4] Sunt, qui ita dicant: imperia eius iniusta, superba, crudelia barbaros nequivisse pati; [5] alii autem: equites illos, Cn. Pompei veteres fidosque clientis, voluntate eius Pisonem aggressos; numquam Hispanos praeterea tale facinus fecisse, sed imperia saeva multa antea perpessos. Nos eam rem in medio relinquemus. De superiore coniuratione satis dictum.*

[19.1] Afterwards, on account of pressure from Crassus, Piso, Quaestor with praetorian powers, was sent to Hither Spain because he was known to be a dangerous enemy of Pompey. [2] The Senate was, nevertheless, willing to give him a province, obviously withing this vile man to be far removed from the Republic and because at the the same time several good men were thinking they found a defense through him now that the power of Pompey was formidable. [3] But this Piso was killed by the Spanish cavalry which he was leading as an army. [4] There are some who tell the story in this manner, the barbarians were unable to tolerate his unjust, haughty, and cruel command; [5] others, on the other hand, say that the knights, that were veterans and loyal vassals to Pompey, attacked Piso and the instigation of him. Never had the Spanish done such a deed, but had previously suffered savage command many times. We shall leave this affair undecided. Enough has been said about the first conspiracy.

First Speech of Catiline at the home of Procius Laeca, June 1, 4 B.C.

*[20.1] Catilina ubi eos, quos paulo ante memoravi, convenisse videt, tametsi cum singulis multa saepe egerat, tamen in rem fore credens univorsos appellare et cohortari in abditam partem aedium secedit atque ibi omnibus arbitris procul amotis orationem huiusce modi habuit: [2] “Ni virtus fidesque vostra spectata mihi forent, nequiquam*

*opportuna res cecidisset; [3] spes magna, dominatio in manibus frustra fuissent, neque ego per ignaviam aut vana ingenia incerta pro certis captarem. Sed quia multis et magnis tempestatibus vos cognovi fortis fidosque mihi, eo animus ausus est maximum atque pulcherrimum facinus incipere, simul quia vobis eadem, quae mihi, bona malaque esse intellexi; [4] nam idem velle atque idem nolle, ea demum firma amicitia est. [5] Sed ego quae mente agitavi, omnes iam antea divorsi audistis. [6] Ceterum mihi in dies magis animus accenditur, cum considero, quae condicio vitae futura sit, nisi nosmet ipsi vindicamus in libertatem. [7] Nam postquam res publica in paucorum potentium ius atque dicionem concessit, semper illis reges, tetrarchae vectigales esse, populi, nationes stipendia pendere; ceteri omnes, strenui, boni, nobiles atque ignobiles, vulgus fuimus, sine gratia, sine auctoritate, iis obnoxii, quibus, si res publica valeret, formidini essemus. [8] Itaque omnis gratia, potentia, honos, divitiae apud illos sunt aut ubi illi volunt; nobis reliquere pericula, repulsas, iudicia, egestatem. [9] Quae quousque tandem patiemini, o fortissimi viri? Nonne emori per virtutem praestat quam vitam miseram atque inhonestam, ubi alienae superbiae ludibrio fueris, per dedecus amittere? [10] Verum enim vero, pro deum atque hominum fidem, victoria in manu nobis est: viget aetas, animus valet; contra illis annis atque divitiis omnia consenuerunt. Tantummodo incepto opus est, cetera res expedit. [11] Etenim quis mortalium, cui virile ingenium est, tolerare potest illis divitias superare, quas profundant in exstruendo mari et montibus coequandis, nobis rem familiarem etiam ad necessaria deesse? Illos binas aut amplius domos continuare, nobis larem familiarem nusquam ullam esse? [12] Cum tabulas, signa, toreumata emunt, nova diruunt, alia aedificant, postremo omnibus modis pecuniam trahunt, vexant, tamen summa lubidine divitias suas vincere nequeunt. [13] At nobis est domi inopia, foris aes alienum, mala res, spes multo asperior: denique quid*

*reliqui habemus praeter miseram animam? Quin igitur expergiscimini? [14] En illa, illa, quam saepe optastis, libertas, praeterea divitiae, decus, gloria in oculis sita sunt; [15] fortuna omnia ea victoribus praemia posuit. Res, tempus, pericula, egestas, belli spolia magnifica magis quam oratio mea vos hortantur. [16] Vel imperatore vel milite me utimini! Neque animus neque corpus a vobis aberit. [17] Haec ipsa, ut spero vobiscum una consul agam, nisi forte me animus fallit et vos servire magis quam imperare parati estis.”*

[20.1] Although he had often carried this out with them individually many times, he nevertheless believed it would be necessary to address and encourage everyone who was about to in the affair. He withdrew to a secret part of the building and there, far removed from all witnesses, he gave an oration of this sort: [2] “If your bravery and loyalty was not apparent to me, this opportune affair would be presented to no purpose; [3] high hopes, dominion, might be at hand in vain nor through cowards or hollow characters it seized with certainty, but, on account of many great tests, I know you are strong and faithful to me, and because of that my soul dares to undertake a great and glorious crime and, at the same time, because I think what is good and bad are to you and me the same; [4] for to like the same and dislike the same, that is true friendship. [5] But in fact those things which I have in mind separately you have all already heard before. Moreover, my soul is by the day set ablaze when I consider what our condition of life will be unless we set ourselves free. [7] For when the Republic yielded law and authority up to a few powerful men, it is always to them that kings and princes are to be paying tribute, peoples and nations pay taxes. All the rest of us, vigorous and good, noble and ignoble, are a crowd without esteem, without authority, subservient to those who, if the Republic was free, we would be terrifying. [8] Thus, all respect, power, power, honors, and riches are

with them or where they wish them to be; to us they left danger, defeat, indictments, and want. [9] At last, how long may you endure, O bravehearts. Is not better to die in a show of strength than to lose one's pitiful and disgraceful life through shame after arrogant men have made you a fool? [10] Yes, yes indeed! By the gods and men I swear, to us victory is at hand; life flourishes, spirit is strong. To them, on the contrary, years and riches have made everything fade. I only need to begin, the rest shall take care of itself. [11] As a matter of fact, what man of virile nature can tolerate those who abound in riches; those who waste, building upon sea and leveling mountains, yet, with respect to necessities, we fell short at home? They however join homes in pairs, or more, while we never have anyplace for Lares; [12] while they buy paintings, statues, engraved vases, destroy new things, build others, and finally squander money in every possible way and attack their wealth, yet even with the utmost extravagance they are unable to vanquish their wealth? [13] To us, on the other hand, there is poverty within, debt without, wicked affairs, hope for greater austerity; in short, what do we have left but worthless air? [14] Look, look at this! How for liberty you have often wished for freedom; besides that wealth, honor, and glory have been there before your eyes. [15] Fortune to the victors has placed all these things as prizes. The object, the opportunity, the danger, the need; the magnificent spoils of war say more to you than any speech of mine. [16] Use me either as your commander or your soldier, neither my body nor my soul shall abandon you. [17] With your help, I hope, as a Consul, I may carry out; unless by chance my mind has failed me and you prefer to be slaves more than rulers."

*[21.1] Postquam accepere ea homines, quibus mala abunde omnia erant, sed neque res neque spes bona ulla, tametsi illis quietam movere magna merces videbatur, tamen*

*postulavere plerique, ut proponeret, quae condicio belli foret, quae praemia armis peterent, quid ubique opis aut spei haberent. [2] Tum Catilina polliceri tabulas novas, proscriptionem locupletium, magistratus, sacerdotia, rapinas, alia omnia, quae bellum atque libido victorum fert. [3] Praeterea esse in Hispania citeriore Pisonem, in Mauretania cum exercitu P. Sittium Nucerinum, consili sui participes; petere consulatum C. Antonium, quem sibi collegam fore speraret, hominem et familiarem et omnibus necessitudinibus circumventum; cum eo se consulem initium agendi facturum. [4] Ad hoc maledictis increpabat omnis bonos, suorum unumquemque nominans laudare; admonebat alium egestatis, alium cupiditatis suae, compluris periculi aut ignominiae, multos victoriae Sullanae, quibus ea praedae fuerat. [5] Postquam omnium animos alacris videt, cohortatus, ut petitionem suam curae haberent, conventum dimisit.*

[21.1] After this was received by those men who had every kind of misfortune in abundance, but neither the means nor hope for anything good, and although disturbing the peace to them appeared wages enough, still many demanded that he explain under what conditions the war was to be waged; what prizes by means of arms were sought, by what hope and what means and where they were to be had. [2] Catiline, thereupon, promised a clean slate, the proscription of the rich, magistrates, priesthoods, plunder, everything else that war brings, and the caprice obtained by the victorious. [3] Besides that, Pison was in Hither Spain, Publius Sittius of Nuceria was in Maurentania with an army; themselves partners in the plot. Gaius Antonius, whom he hoped would be his colleague, was striving for the consulship; a man both a friend and encircled by necessities of every kind, with he himself Consul, he would begin leading the undertaking. [4] Thereupon, he heaped abuse on all good men, and lauded each of his followers by name; reminded one of his needs, the other of his desires, several of their danger or disgrace,

many of the victories of Sulla, to whom he had been prey. [5] When all their spirits he saw aflame, he dismissed the meeting; urging them to have at heart, his candidacy.

[22.1] *Fuere ea tempestate, qui dicerent Catilinam oratione habita, cum ad iusiurandum popularis sceleris sui adigeret, humani corporis sanguinem vino permixtum in pateris circumtulisse: inde cum post exsecrationem omnes degustavissent, sicuti in sollemnibus sacris fieri consuevit, aperuisse consilium suum; [2] idque eo dicitur fecisse, quo inter se fidi magis forent alius alii tanti facinoris conscii. [3] Nonnulli ficta et haec et multa praeterea existumabant ab iis, qui Ciceronis invidiam, quae postea orta est, leniri credebant atrocitate sceleris eorum, qui poenas dederant. Nobis ea res pro magnitudine parum comperta est.*

[22.1] At the time there were those who said Catiline, after having given the speech, bound his fellow criminal with an oath, handed around, in Patera, human blood mixed with wine. Next, after pronouncing a curse, all drank just as in sacred rites a thing comes to be consider an act of worship, and then he disclosed his plan. [2] It is said that to do that thing, they would be made more trustworthy among themselves through sharing, one with the other, the knowledge of such a crime. [3] Moreover, there are some who reckoned both this and many other things to be fictions from men who sought, to weaken the enemies of Cicero who later arose through the hideousness of the crimes of those who payed the penalties.<sup>78</sup> Too little has been learned about that affair in the face of its magnitude for us.

### Election of Consuls Silanus and Murena. Second Conspiracy, July 63

---

<sup>78</sup> Moreover, *praeterea*, there are some, *nonnulli*, who reckoned, *existumabant*, both this and many other things, *et haec et multa*, to be fictions, *ficta*, from men who, *ab eis qui*, who sought (i.e. were thinking, or believing), *credebant*, to weaken, *leniri*, the enemies, *invidiam*, of Cicero, *Ciceronis*, who later arose, *quae postea orta est*, through the hideousness of the crimes, *atrocitate sceleris eorum*, of those who payed the penalties, *qui poenas dederant*.



[23.1] *Sed in ea coniuratione fuit Q. Curius, natus haud obscuro loco, flagitiis atque facinoribus coopertus, quem censores senatu probri gratia moverant. [2] Huic homini non minor vanitas inerat quam audacia: neque reticere, quae audierat, neque suamet ipse scelera occultare, prorsus neque dicere neque facere quicquam pensi habebat. [3] Erat ei cum Fulvia, muliere nobili, stupri vetus consuetudo. Cui cum minus gratus esset, quia inopia minus largiri poterat, repente glorians maria montisque polliceri coepit et minari interdum ferro, ni sibi obnoxia foret, postremo ferocius agitare, quam solitus erat. [4] At Fulvia insolentiae Curi causa cognita tale periculum re publicae haud occultum habuit, sed sublato auctore de Catilinae coniuratione, quae quoque modo audierat, compluribus narravit. [5] Ea res in primis studia hominum accendit ad consulatum mandandum M. Tullio Ciceroni. [6] Namque antea pleraque nobilitas invidia aestuabat et quasi pollui consulatum credebant, si eum quamvis egregius homo novus adeptus foret. Sed ubi periculum advenit, invidia atque superbia post fuere.*

[23.1] But in this conspiracy there was Quintus Curius, not born in obscure position, overflowing with scandals and crimes, who Censors expelled from the Senate for reason of a shameful act. [2] This man undertook not only minor lying but recklessness as well, reticent neither about anything he heard nor inducing himself to conceal his own crimes; in a word valued little neither what he said nor what he did. [3] This man had a long standing relationship with Fulvia, a noble woman, to whom, when he was less gratuitous on account of poverty, was less able to give, suddenly began boasting and promised seas and mountains, and on occasion, when at last his ferocity was agitated more than usual, threatened her with a sword if she would not submit. [4] But when Fulvia became aware of the cause of Curius' insolence, she did not keep such a great danger to the Republic secret; but concealing the source about the conspiracy of Catiline also told a number of

people that which she had recently heard. [5] It was primarily this affair that made men eager to entrust the consulship to Marcus Tullius Cicero. [6] For before that envy stewed most nobles and they thought the consulship to be defiled, so to speak, if a “new man” obtained it however exceptional he might be. But when the danger arrived, envy and arrogance were left behind.

*[24.1] Igitur comitiis habitis consules declarantur M. Tullius et C. Antonius. Quod factum primo popularis coniurationis concusserat. [2] Neque tamen Catilinae furor minuebatur, sed in dies plura agitare: arma per Italiam locis opportunis parare, pecuniam sua aut amicorum fide sumptum mutuum Faesulas ad Manlium quendam portare, qui postea princeps fuit belli faciundi. [3] Ea tempestate plurimos cuiusque generis homines adscivisse sibi dicitur, mulieres etiam aliquot, quae primo ingentis sumptus stupro corporis toleraverant, post, ubi aetas tantummodo quaestui neque luxuriae modum fecerat, aes alienum grande conflaverant. [4] Per eas se Catilina credebat posse servitia urbana sollicitare, urbem incendere, viros earum vel adiungere sibi vel interficere.*

[24.1] Accordingly when the elections were held, Marcus Tullius and Caius Antonius were declared Consuls, and as I was saying, this fact as, at first, alarming to the members of the conspiracy. [2] Yet Catiline's frenzy was not diminished, but increased by the day gathering arms in convenient locations all over Italy, paying the cost with borrowed money on his own credit or that of his friends; sending it to a certain Manlius in Faesulae,

who later was to be the first to make war.<sup>79</sup> [3] It is said that at the time he received to himself very many men from each rank, indeed even some women who primarily supported their huge expenses by the defilement of their bodies, later, when age put a limit to their only source of profit, but not to their extravagance, they had acquired huge debt. [4] Through them, Catiline believed he was able to incite the city slaves to set the city ablaze, the husbands of those women to join him or to be killed.

*[25.1] Sed in iis erat Sempronia, quae multa saepe virilis audaciae facinora commiserat. [2] Haec mulier genere atque forma, praeterea viro atque liberis satis fortunata fuit; litteris Graecis et Latinis docta, psallere et saltare elegantius, quam necesse est probae, multa alia, quae instrumenta luxuriae sunt. [3] Sed ei cariora semper omnia quam decus atque pudicitia fuit; pecuniae an famae minus parceret, haud facile discerneres; libido sic accensa, ut saepius peteret viros quam peteretur. [4] Sed ea saepe antehac fidem prodiderat, creditum abiuraverat, caedis conscia fuerat; luxuria atque inopia praeceps abierat. [5] Verum ingenium eius haud absurdum: posse versus facere, iocum movere, sermone uti vel modesto vel molli vel procaci; prorsus multae facetiae multusque lepos inerat.*

[25.1] But Sempronia, who was often mixed up in crimes of masculine daring was also involved in this. [2] This woman, fortunate enough in birth and beauty, and in husband and children besides, learned in Latin and Greek literature, in playing the lute and lyre, and in elegant dancing more than was necessary and proper, and in many other things which are instrumental to extravagance. [3] But to her nothing was more rotten than

---

<sup>79</sup> Paying the cost, *sumptam*, with borrowed money, *pecuniam mutuam*, on his own credit, *fide*, or that of his friends, *aut amicorum*; sending it, *potare*, to a certain Manlius in Faesulae, *Faesulas ad Manulium quondam*.

honor and chastity; which she used less sparingly, money or reputation? It would be difficult to tell. Her libido was so overflowing that she often sought men more often than she was sought. [4] But often before this affair she betrayed trust, repudiated her debts, and privy to murder. Extravagance and poverty drove her head long. [5] Yet her character was not silly; able to compose verse, to tell a joke, speak with modesty, or tenderness, or brashness. In short, she was very clever and quite charming.

*[26.1] His rebus comparatis Catilina nihilo minus in proximum annum consulatum petebat sperans, si designatus foret, facile se ex voluntate Antonio usurum. [2] Neque interea quietus erat, sed omnibus modis insidias parabat Ciceroni. Neque illi tamen ad cavendum dolus aut astutiae deerant. [3] Namque a principio consulatus sui multa pollicendo per Fulviam effecerat, ut Q. Curius, de quo paulo ante memoravi, consilia Catilinae sibi proderet; [4] ad hoc collegam suum Antonium pactione provinciae perpulerat, ne contra rem publicam sentiret; circum se praesidia amicorum atque clientium occulte habebat. [5] Postquam dies comitiorum venit et Catilinae neque petitio neque insidiae, quas consulibus in campo fecerat, prospere cessere, constituit bellum facere et extrema omnia experiri, quoniam, quae occulte temptaverat, aspera foedaque evenerant.*

[26.1] Having arranged these things, Catiline, nevertheless, sought the consulship the next year hoping, if he was elected, he would easily be able to use Antonius according to his own desire. [2] Neither was he idle, in the meantime, but was preparing many traps for Cicero; nor was he, however, failing to guard against deceit and cunning. [3] For as a matter of fact, after the beginning of his consulship, by promising many things through Fulvia, was able to cause Quintus Curius, about whom I spoke a little while ago, to reveal

Catiline's plans to him. [4] And to this purpose he had very strongly persuaded his colleague Antonius, by means of agreement for a province, not to entertain designs against the Republic. [5] When the day of the elections came, and neither Catiline's suit nor plots which he had attempted against the Consuls had come to be, he attempted everything most extreme and made war because that which he had secretly attempted had come to be adverse and disgracefull.<sup>80</sup>

[27.1] *Igitur C. Manlium Faesulas atque in eam partem Etruriae, Septimium quendam Camertem in agrum Picenum, C. Iulium in Apuliam dimisit, praeterea alium alio, quem ubique opportunum sibi fore credebat. [2] Interea Romae multa simul moliri: consulibus insidias tendere, parare incendia, opportuna loca armatis hominibus obsidere; ipse cum telo esse, item alios iubere, hortari, uti semper intenti paratique essent; dies noctisque festinare, vigilare, neque insomniis neque labore fatigari. [3] Postremo, ubi multa agitantibus nihil procedit, rursus intempesta nocte coniurationis principes convocat ad M. Porcium Laecam ibique multa de ignavia eorum questus [4] docet se Manlium praemisisse ad eam multitudinem, quam ad capiunda arma paraverat, item alios in alia loca opportuna, qui initium belli facerent, seque ad exercitum proficisci cupere, si prius Ciceronem oppressisset; eum suis consiliis multum officere.*

Manlius, Septimius of Camerinum, and Gaius Julius, et al take to the field at Faesulae, Picene, and Apulia respectively, Oct. 27.

[27.1] Therefore he sent Manlius to Faesulae and to that part of Etruria a certain Septimius of Camerinum to the field at Picene, Gaius Julius to Apulia, and other to other

---

<sup>80</sup> When the day of the elections came, *postquam dies comitorum venit*, and neither Catiline's suit, *et Catilinae neque petitio*, nor plots, *neque insidiae*, which, *quae*, he had attempted, *temptaverat*, against the Consuls, *consulibus*, had come to be, *evenerant*, he attempted, *experiri*, everything most extreme, *extrema omnia*, and made war, *bellum facere*, because, *quoniam*, that which he had secretly attempted, *quae occulte temptaverat*, had come to be, *evenerat*, adverse, *aspera*, and disgracefull, *foedaque*.

palces as well; who and to where he believed they would be about to be<sup>81</sup> an opportunity for him. [2] Meanwhile at Rome, he, at the same time exerted himself in many ways; laying traps for the Consuls, planning arson, occupying commanding places with armed men, was himself armed with a sword, ordered others to do the same, and urged all to be alert and prepared. Staying on the move night and day, was himself awake; succumbing neither to sleeplessness nor labor.” [3] At last, when of the many things he had set in motion, and nothing came forth, through Marcus Porcius Laeca, he summoned back the ringleaders of the conspiracy in the dead of night, and thereupon complained in several ways about their laziness and instructed them that Manlius had been sent on ahead and that a multitude had prepared to lay hold by means of arms, that others likewise were in locations of opportunity who were ready to initiate the war, and that he himself wanted to begin if only Cicero, who had greatly hindered his plans, could first be overpowered.

Second meeting at Laeca’s house, Nov. 6 & *Argumentum ad baculum* against Cicero, Nov. 7

*[28.1] Igitur perterritis ac dubitantibus ceteris C. Cornelius eques Romanus operam suam pollicitus et cum eo L. Vargunteius senator constituere ea nocte paulo post cum armatis hominibus sicuti salutatum introire ad Ciceronem ac de improviso domi suae inparatum confodere. [2] Curius ubi intellegit, quantum periculum consuli inpendeat, propere per Fulviam Ciceroni dolum, qui parabatur, enuntiat. [3] Ita illi ianua prohibiti tantum facinus frustra susceperant. [4] Interea Manlius in Etruria plebem sollicitare egestate simul ac dolore iniuriae novarum rerum cupidam, quod Sullae dominatione agros bonaque omnis amiserat, praeterea latrones cuiusque generis, quorum in ea*

---

<sup>81</sup> *Fore*, for *futurus esse*, is a fut. inf., hence ‘to be about to be.’

*regione magna copia erat, nonnullos ex Sullanis coloniis, quibus libido atque luxuria ex magnis rapinis nihil reliqui fecerat.*

[28.1] As I was saying, the others were stricken by fright and doubt, But Gaius Cornelius, a Roman knight, affirmed his promise, and with him Lucius Vargunteius, a Senator; that night, after a little while, a band of armed men, entering, as if giving a salutation, to Cicero at home, and stab him unexpectedly when he was unprepared. [2] When Curius became aware of the great danger to the Consul, he revealed the plot that had been prepared. [3] In this way, they, who were prevented at the door, undertook such a great crime for nothing. [4] In the meantime, Manlius, in Etruria, was inciting the Plebs into revolt, who, on account of poverty and pain from an injury, were desiring new affairs, because during the tyranny of Sulla they lost lands and everything good, and besides them [the Etrurians], criminals of every kind, a great abundance of whom were in this region from Sulla's colonies; to whom, on account of luxury and desire, nothing of their great plunder remained.

### Cicero ascends as Dictator

*[29] Ea cum Ciceroni nuntiarentur, ancipiti malo permotus, quod neque urbem ab insidiis privato consilio longius tueri poterat neque, exercitus Manli quantus aut quo consilio foret, satis compertum habebat, rem ad senatum refert iam antea vulgi rumoribus exagitatam. [2] Itaque, quod plerumque in atroci negotio solet, senatus decrevit, darent operam consules, ne quid res publica detrimenti caperet. [3] Ea potestas per senatum more Romano magistratui maxuma permittitur: exercitum parare, bellum gerere, coercere omnibus modis socios atque civis, domi militiaeque imperium*

*atque iudicium summum habere; aliter sine populi iussu nullius earum rerum consuli ius est.*

[29.1] When this was reported to Cicero, he was disturbed by the twofold peril because he was able neither to defend the city from plots by his private measures long, nor was the size of Manlius' army, or what his plans would be, sufficiently authenticated; he referred the matter to the Senate, already excited by the rumors of the populace. [2] Then, because it is usual in frightful situations, the Senate decreed the Consuls give attention not to let anything cause harm to the Republic. [3] This power, according to Roman custom, the greatest granted to a magistrate, permits him to raise an army, to wage war, to coerce allies and citizens in every possible way, and to have supreme command and unlimited jurisdiction at home and in the field; otherwise, without the order of the people, none of these things are lawful to a Consul.

Senate informed about the activities of Manlius, Nov. 1 & Quintus Pompeius Rufus dispatched to Capua and Quintus Metellus Celer to Picene

*[30.1] Post paucos dies L. Saenius senator in senatu litteras recitavit, quas Faesulis adlatas sibi dicebat, in quibus scriptum erat C. Manlium arma cepisse cum magna multitudine ante diem VI. Kalendas Novembris. [2] Simul, id quod in tali re solet, alii portenta atque prodigia nuntiabant, alii conventus fieri, arma portari, Capuae atque in Apulia servile bellum moveri. [3] Igitur senati decreto Q. Marcius Rex Faesulas, Q. Metellus Creticus in Apuliam circumque ea loca missi—[4] ii utrique ad urbem imperatores erant, impediti, ne triumpharent, calumnia paucorum, quibus omnia honesta atque inhonesta vendere mos erat,— [5] sed praetores Q. Pompeius Rufus Capuam, Q.*



*Metellus Celer in agrum Picenum iisque permissum, uti pro tempore atque periculo exercitum compararent. [6] Ad hoc, si quis indicavisset de coniuratione, quae contra rem publicam facta erat, praemium servo libertatem et sestertia centum, [7] libero inpunitatem eius rei et sestertia ducenta itemque decrevere, uti gladiatoriae familiae Capuam et in cetera municipia distribuerentur pro cuiusque opibus, Romae per totam urbem vigiliae haberentur iisque minores magistratus praeessent.*

[30.1] A few days later, the Senator Lucius Saenius read a letter in the Senate, which he said was brought to him from Faesulae, in which was written that Manlius along with a multitude had taken up arms before the 27th of October. [2] At the same time, because it is usual in affairs of this kind, some reported portents and prodigies, others that there was a meeting, arms being carried, and that the slaves of Capua and in Apulia were in revolt. [3] Thereupon, by decree of the Senate, Quintus Marcius Rex was sent to Faesulae, Quintus Metellus Creticus to Apulia and the area around this place—[4] both of these men were generals for the city, being obstructed by the misrepresentations of a few men who were in the habit of selling everything honorable and dishonorable, were not able to make a triumphal procession,—[5] but the Praetors Quintus Pompeius Rufus was sent to Capua and Quintus Metellus Celer to Picene, and these men were permitted to gather an army suitable to the times and the danger. [6] And to this, if anyone informed about the conspiracy which had been made against the Republic, to a slave the reward was liberty and one hundred thousand sesterces, [7] to a free man, immunity to this affair and two hundred thousand sesterces, and furthermore that Capua be diminished in such a way so as to be the home of the gladiators and that they be distributed in other municipalities according to each ones wealth. Rome, thought the whole city was to be held under watch, and that minor magistrates would be responsible for this.

## Catiline departs for the camp of Manlius

*[31.1] Quibus rebus permota civitas atque inmutata urbis facies erat. Ex summa laetitia atque lascivia, quae diuturna quies pepererat, repente omnis tristitia invasit: [2] festinare, trepidare, neque loco neque homini cuiquam satis credere, neque bellum gerere neque pacem habere, suo quisque metu pericula metiri. [3] Ad hoc mulieres, quibus rei publicae magnitudine belli timor insolitus incesserat, adflictare sese, manus supplices ad caelum tendere, miserari parvos liberos, rogitare omnia, omni rumore pavere, superbia atque deliciis omissis sibi patriaeque diffidere. [4] At Catilinae crudelis animus eadem illa movebat, tametsi praesidia parabantur et ipse lege Plautia interrogatus erat ab L. Paulo. [5] Postremo dissimulandi causa aut sui expurgandi, sicut iurgio lacessitus foret, in senatum venit. [6] Tum M. Tullius consul, sive praesentiam eius timens sive ira conmotus, orationem habuit luculentam atque utilem rei publicae, quam postea scriptam edidit.*

[31.1] These things were panicking the citizens and altering the face of the city. Great levity and playfulness ended with a long silence; then suddenly everything was seized by sadness, [2] hurring about nervously; trusting neither any place nor any man enough, there were neither making war nor having peace, every man judged thing out of his fear. [3] Add to this the women too, to whom, by the greatness of the Republic, had been yeilded unaccustomed to the terror of war, were themselves afflicted, raised their hands in supplication, pittied their small children, asked questions, trembled at everything; abandoning arrogance and allurments, despaired themselves and the fatherland. [4] But this very thing moved Catiline's soul even if defenses were being prepared and he himself had been charged by Lucius Paulus under the Plautian law. [5] At last, either to

conceal his plans or to clear himself; as though he was being provoked by a quarrel, he came to the Senate. [6] Then Marcus Tullius, Consul, whether fearing his presence or moved by anger, delivered a brilliant speech, also of utility to the Republic, which he later published.

Cicero's *Oratio In Catilinam I*, argumentum ad hominem, Nov. 8

[1] *Quo usque tandem abutere, Catilina, patientia nostra? Quam diu etiam furor iste tuus nos eludet? Quem ad finem sese effrenata iactabit audacia? Nihilne te nocturnum praesidium Palati, nihil urbis vigiliae, nihil timor populi, nihil concursus bonorum omnium, nihil hic munitissimus habendi senatus locus, nihil horum ora voltusque moverunt? Patere tua consilia non sentis? Constrictam iam horum omnium scientia teneri coniurationem tuam no vides? Quid proxima, quid superiore nocte egeris, ubi fueris, quos convocaveris, quid consilii ceperis, quem nostrum ignorare arbitraris?*

In heaven's name, Catiline, how long will you abuse our patience? How much longer will mock us with your madness? How long will unrestrained audacity toss itself about? Is it nothing to you that the Palatine is garrisoned at night, nothing that there are sentinels in the city, nothing that people are terrified, nothing that all good men have gathered, nothing that the Senate is being held in this fortified place, hasn't the faces and countenance of these men here moved you? Don't you realize that your plans have been exposed? Don't you see that your conspiracy is fettered with the knowledge held by all these men? Which of us do you think does not know what you did last night, the night before last, where you went, who you summoned, where you held council?

[2] *O tempora, o mores! Senatus haec intellegit, consul videt: hic tamen vivi. Vivit? Immo vero etiam in senatum venit, fit publici consilii particeps, notat et designat oculis ad caedem unum quemque nostrum. Nos autem, fortes viri, satis facere rei publicae videmur, si istius furorem ac tela vitemus. Ad mortem, Catiline, duci iussu consulis iam pridem oportebat, in te conferri pestem quam tu in nos machinaris.*

O the times, o the morals! The Senate knows these things, the consul sees it: this man lives. He lives? On the contrary indeed, he still comes to the Senate, takes part in a public meeting, notes us with his gaze, and marks each one of us down for death. It appears to us, on the other hand, o brave men, enough for the Republic if we should ignore his madness and his weapons? It was necessary, Catiline, that you to be led on a consul's orders to your death long ago, to bring a scourge upon you from all sides that you contrived against us.

[3] *An vero vir amplissimus, P. Scipio, pontifex maximus, Ti. Gracchum, mediocriter labefactantem statum rei publicae, privatus interfecit: Catilinam, orbem terrae caede atque incendiis vastare cupientem, nos consules perferemus? Nam illa nimis antique praetereo, quod C. Servilius Ahala Sp. Maelium, novis rebus studentem, manu sua occidit. Fuit, fuit ista quondam in hac re publica virtus, ut viri fortes acrioribus suppliciis civem perniciosum quam acerbissimum hostem coërcerent. Habemus senatus consultum in te, Catilina, vehemens et grave; non deest rei publicae consilium neque auctoritas huius ordinis: nos, nos, dico aperte, consules desumus.*

Or truly we ought to consider whether indeed a distinguished man, Publius Scipio, Pontifex Maximus, though a private citizen, murdered Tiberius Gracchus

for moderately weakening the status of the Republic: should we Consuls endure Catiline wanting to devastate the whole land with murder and arson? For I pass over that very old thing that Gaius Servilius Ahala killed with his own hand Spurius Maelius who was eager for new affairs. Gone, gone is that virtue that strong men would use to coerce a dangerous citizen with more severe punishments than the worst enemy. We have a decree of the Senate against you, Catiline, strong and grave; it not lacking in council and resolutions, but we of this order, I say openly, we consuls are lacking.

[4] *Decrevit quondam senatus, ut L. Opimus consul videret ne quid res publica detrimenti caperet: nox nulla intercessit; interfectus est propter quasdam seditionum suspensions C. Gracchus, clarissimo patre, avo, maioribus; occisus est cum liberis M. Fulvius consularis. Simili senatus consulto C. Mario et L. Valerio consulibus est permissa res publica; num unum diem postea L. Saturninum tribunum pl. et C. Servilium praetorem mors ac rei publicae poena remorata est? At vero nos vicesimum iam diem patimur hebescere aciem horum auctoritatis. Habemus enim huiusce modi senatus consultum, verum inclusum in tabulis, tamquam in vagina reconditum, quo ex senatus consulto confestim te interfectum esse, Catilina, convenit. Vivis, et vivis non ad deponendam, sed ad confirmandam audaciam. Cupio, patres conscripti, me esse clementem, cupio in tantis rei publicae periculis me non dissolutum videri, sed iam me ipse inertiae nequitiaeque condemno.*

The Senate once decreed that Lucius Opimius should see that the Republic should suffer no harm: not one night intervened when Gaius Gracchus, descended from a famous father, grandfather, and ancestors, was murdered on account of suspicions

of a certain sedition and Marcus Fulvius, an ex-Consul, was slain along with his children. The Republic entrusted a similar decree of the Senate to the Consuls Gaius Marius and Lucius Valerius: surely Lucius Saturninus, Tribune of the Plebs, and Gaius Servilius, a Praetor, were not kept waiting more than a single day for death and the penalty of the State. But indeed we have already permitted the edge of the Senates authority to become dull for twenty days. For we have a decree of this kind, but it has been locked up in the public records as if buried in a sheath, in accordance with this decree you, Catiline, should have been put to death immediately. You live, and you live not towards ceasing but towards strengthening your insolence. I wish, conscript fathers, to be merciful myself, I wish myself to not appear irresolute in such great dangers to the Republic, but now I condemn myself for inactivity and negligence

[5] *Castra sunt in Italiae contra populum Romanum in Etruriae faucibus collocatae, crescit in dies singulos hostium numerus, eorum autem castrorum imperatorem ducemque hostium intra moenia atque adeo in senatu videtis intestinam aliquam cotidie perniciem rei publicae molientem. Si te iam, Catilina, comprehendi, si interfici iussero, credo, erit verendum mihi, ne non potius hoc omnes boni serius a me quam quisquam crudelius factum esse dicat. Verum ego hoc, quod iam pridem factum esse oportuit, certa de causa nondum adducor ut faciam. Tum denique interficiere, cum iam nemo tam improbus, tam perditus, tam tui similis inveniri poterit, qui id non iure factum esse fateatur.*

There is a camp in Italy against the Roman people stationed in the narrow passes of Etruria, the number of those enemies grows every day, moreover, the leader of those men and the enemy the walls and you actually see him in the Senate plotting

civil war every day. Now if I arrested you, Catiline, if I order you put to death what shall I have to fear not that all good men may say the act by me is too late, but rather that some may say it is too cruel. In truth, though I may do this, on account of that reason I am not yet inclined to do that which ought to have been done long ago. When there is nobody to be found who is so wicked, so worthless, so like you, as to say that the deed is unjust, then you may finally be put to death. So long as there shall be anyone at all who might be bold enough to defend you, you will live, but you will live such as you do live; besieged by my many and strong defenses, thou shalt not be able to move against the Republic.

[6] *Quam diu quisquam erit qui te defendere audeat, vives, et vives ita ut nunc vivis, multis meis et firmis praesidiis obsessus ne commovere te contra rem publicam possis. multorum te etiam oculi et aures non sentientem, sicut adhuc fecerunt, speculabuntur atque custodient. Etenim quid est, Catilina, quod iam amplius exspectes, si neque nox tenebris obscurare coetus nefarios nec privata domus parietibus continere voces coniurationis tuae potest, si inlustrantur, si erumpunt omnia? Muta iam istam mentem, mihi crede, obliviscere caedis atque incendiorum. teneris undique; luce sunt clariora nobis tua consilia omnia, quae iam mecum licet recognoscas.*

So long as there shall be anyone at all who might be bold enough to defend you, you will live, but you will live such as you do live; besieged by my many and strong defenses, thou shalt not be able to move against the Republic. Though you shall feel nothing, many eyes and ears will be spying on you, watching over you just as they have done. Indeed, Catiline, what now thee detains, if night for its gloom cannot conceal the wickedness of a meeting, nor the walls of a home

within its walls contain the voices of conspiracy, if all is illuminated, if all permeates? Now, take my advice. Change your mind. Forget your murder and arson. You are beset on all sides. All your plans, which you may recount with me now, are clear as day.

[7] *Meministine me ante diem xii Kalendas Novembris dicere in senatu fore in armis certo die, qui dies futurus esset ante diem vi Kal. Novembris, C. Manlium, audaciae satellitem atque administrum tuae? num me fefellit, Catilina, non modo res tanta tam atrox tamque incredibilis, verum, id quod multo magis est admirandum, dies? dixi ego idem in senatu caedem te optimatum contulisse in ante diem v Kalendas Novembris, tum cum multi principes civitatis Roma non tam sui conservandi quam tuorum consiliorum reprimendorum causa profugerunt.*

Don't you recall my saying in the Senate on October 21 that Gaius, your servant and assistant in your adventure, would be in arms by a certain day and that day would be before October 27? Surely I was not mistaken, Catiline, about the seriousness of this thing, so savage, so incredible, but, this was much more remarkable because of the date? I said the same thing in the Senate, that you set the date for the murder of the nobles before October 28, when by then many of the leading men of the State left Rome; not so much for the sake of saving them, as for thwarting your plans.

[8] *Quid? cum te Praeneste Kalendis ipsis Novembribus occupaturum nocturno impetu esse confideres, sensistin illam coloniam meo iussu meis praesidiis, custodiis, vigiliis esse munitam? Nihil agis, nihil moliris, nihil cogitas, quod non ego non modo audiam, sed etiam videam planeque sentiam. IV. Recognosce tandem mecum noctem illam superiorem; iam intelleges multo me vigilare acrius*



*ad salutem quam te ad perniciem rei publicae. Dico te priore nocte venisse inter falcarios--non agam obscure--in M. Laecae domum; convenisse eodem complures eiusdem amentiae scelerisque socios. Num negare audes? quid taces? Convincam, si negas. Video enim esse hic in senatu quosdam, qui tecum una fuerunt.*

*[9] O di immortales! ubinam gentium sumus? in qua urbe vivimus? quam rem publicam habemus? Hic, hic sunt in nostro numero, patres conscripti, in hoc orbis terrae sanctissimo gravissimoque consilio, qui de nostro omnium interitu, qui de huius urbis atque adeo de orbis terrarum exitio cogitent! Hos ego video consul et de re publica sententiam rogo et, quos ferro trucidari oportebat, eos nondum voce volnero!*

*Fuisti igitur apud Laecam illa nocte, Catilina, distribuisti partes Italiae, statuisti, quo quemque proficisci placeret, delegisti, quos Romae relinqueres, quos tecum educeres, descripsisti urbis partes ad incendia, confirmasti te ipsum iam esse exiturum, dixisti paulum tibi esse etiam nunc morae, quod ego viverem. Reperti sunt duo equites Romani, qui te ista cura liberarent et sese illa ipsa nocte paulo ante lucem me in meo lectulo interfekturos [esse] pollicerentur. [10] Haec ego omnia vixdum etiam coetu vestro dimisso comperi; domum meam maioribus praesidiis munivi atque firmavi, exclusi eos, quos tu ad me salutatum mane miseras, cum illi ipsi venissent, quos ego iam multis ac summis viris ad me id temporis venturos esse praedixeram.*

*V. Quae cum ita sint, Catilina, perge, quo coepisti, egredere aliquando ex urbe; patent portae; proficiscere. Nimum diu te imperatorem tua illa Manliana castra desiderant. Educ tecum etiam omnes tuos, si minus, quam plurimos; purga urbem. Magno me metu liberabis, dum modo inter me atque te murus intersit. Nobiscum versari iam diutius non potes; non feram, non patiar, non sinam. [11] Magna dis immortalibus habenda est atque huic ipsi Iovi Statori, antiquissimo custodi huius urbis, gratia, quod hanc tam taetram, tam horribilem tamque infestam rei publicae pestem totiens iam effugimus.*

*Non est saepius in uno homine summa salus periclitanda rei publicae. Quamdiu mihi consuli designato, Catilina, insidiatus es, non publico me praesidio, sed privata diligentia defendi. Cum proximis comitiis consularibus me consulem in campo et competitores tuos interficere voluisti, compressi conatus tuos nefarios amicorum praesidio et copiis nullo tumultu publice concitato; denique, quotienscumque me petisti, per me tibi obstiti, quamquam videbam perniciem meam cum magna calamitate rei publicae esse coniunctam.*

*[12] Nunc iam aperte rem publicam universam petis, templa deorum immortalium, tecta urbis, vitam omnium civium, Italiam [denique] totam ad exitium et vastitatem vocas. Quare, quoniam id, quod est primum, et quod huius imperii disciplinaeque maiorum proprium est, facere nondum audeo, faciam id, quod est ad severitatem lenius et ad communem salutem utilius. Nam si te interfici iussero, residebit in re publica reliqua coniuratorum manus; sin tu, quod te iam*

*dudum hortor, exieris, exhaurietur ex urbe tuorum comitum magna et perniciosa sentina rei publicae.*

[13] *Quid est, Catiline? Num dubitas id me imperante facere quod iam tua sponte faciebas? Exire ex urbe iubet consul hostem. Interrogas me, num in exsilium? Non iubeo, sed, si me consulis, suadeo. Quid est enim, Catilina, quod te iam in hac urbe delectare possit? In qua nemo est extra istam coniurationem perditorum hominum qui te non metuat, nemo qui non oderit. Quae nota domesticae turpitudinis non iusta vitae tuae est? Quod privatarum rerum dedecus non haeret in fama? Quae libido ab oculis, quod facinus a manibus umquam tuis, quod flagitium a toto corpore afuit? Cui tu adolescentualo quem corruptelarum inlecebris inretisses non aut ad audaciam ferrum aut ad libidinem facem praetulisti?*

What now, Catiline? Now do you hesitate to do by my command that which you were already willing to do? The consul orders the enemy to leave the city. You ask me, whether into exile? I do not order it, but, if you consult me, I recommend. For what is there in this city, Catiline, that will be able to delight you now? With respect to this, there is no one outside that conspiracy of hopeless men of yours who does not fear you, who does not hate. What mark of family disgrace is not branded upon your life? What shame of your private affairs does not remain fixed on your reputation? What lust from your eyes, what crime ever from your hands, what shame from your whole body never was? Before what young man, whom you have ensnared with the allurements of seduction, have you not either boldly carried a sword or a passionate flame?

[14] *Quid vero? nuper cum morte superioris uxoris novis nuptiis domum vacuefecisses, nonne etiam alio incredibili scelere hoc scelus cumulasti? quod ego praetermitto et facile patior sileri, ne in hac civitate tanti facinoris inmanitas aut extitisse aut non vindicata esse videatur. Praetermitto ruinas fortunarum tuarum, quas omnis inpendere tibi proxumis Idibus senties; ad illa venio, quae non ad privatam ignominiam vitiorum tuorum, non ad domesticam tuam difficultatem ac turpitudinem sed ad summam rem publicam atque ad omnium nostrum vitam salutemque pertinent.* [15] *Potestne tibi haec lux, Catilina, aut huius caeli spiritus esse iucundus, cum scias esse horum neminem, qui nesciat te pridie Kalendas Ianuarias Lepido et Tullo consulibus stetisse in comitio cum telo, manum consulum et principum civitatis interficiendorum causa paravisse, sceleri ac furori tuo non mentem aliquam aut timorem tuum sed fortunam populi Romani obstitisse?*

*Ac iam illa omitto--neque enim sunt aut obscura aut non multa commissa postea-- quotiens tu me designatum, quotiens consulem interficere conatus es! quot ego tuas petitiones ita coniectas, ut vitari posse non viderentur, parva quadam declinatione et, ut aiunt, corpore effugi! nihil [agis, nihil] adsequeris [, nihil moliris] neque tamen conari ac velle desistis.* [16] *Quotiens tibi iam extorta est ista sica de manibus, quotiens [vero] excidit casu aliquo et elapsa est! [tamen ea carere diutius non potes] quae quidem quibus abs te initiata sacris ac devota sit, nescio, quod eam necesse putas esse in consulis corpore defigere.*

*VII. Nunc vero quae tua est ista vita? Sic enim iam tecum loquar, non ut odio permotus esse videar, quo debeo, sed ut misericordia, quae tibi nulla debetur. Venisti paulo ante in senatum. Quis te ex hac tanta frequentia totque tuis amicis ac necessariis salutavit? Si hoc post hominum memoriam contigit nemini, vocis expectas contumeliam, cum sis gravissimo iudicio taciturnitatis oppressus? Quid, quod adventu tuo ista subsellia vacuefacta sunt, quod omnes consulares, qui tibi persaepe ad caedem constituti fuerunt, simul atque adsedisti, partem istam subselliorum nudam atque inanem reliquerunt, quo tandem animo [hoc] tibi ferundum putas?*

*[17] Servi mehercule mei si me isto pacto metuerent, ut te metuunt omnes cives tui, domum meam relinquendam putarem; tu tibi urbem non arbitraris? et, si me meis civibus iniuria suspectum tam graviter atque offensum viderem, carere me aspectu civium quam infestis omnium oculis conspici mallet; tu cum conscientia scelerum tuorum agnoscas odium omnium iustum et iam diu tibi debitum, dubitas, quorum mentes sensusque volneras, eorum aspectum praesentiamque vitare? Si te parentes timerent atque odissent tui neque eos ulla ratione placare posses, ut opinor, ab eorum oculis aliquo concederes. Nunc te patria, quae communis est parens omnium nostrum, odit ac metuit et iam diu nihil te iudicat nisi de parricidio suo cogitare; huius tu neque auctoritatem verebere nec iudicium sequere nec vim pertimesces?*

*[18] Quae tecum, Catilina, sic agit et quodam modo tacita loquitur: "Nullum iam aliquot annis facinus exstitit nisi per te, nullum flagitium sine te; tibi uni*

*multorum civium neces, tibi vexatio direptioque sociorum impunita fuit ac libera; tu non solum ad neglegendas leges et quaestiones, verum etiam ad evertendas perfringendasque valuisti. Superiora illa, quamquam ferenda non fuerunt, tamen, ut potui, tuli; nunc vero me totam esse in metu propter unum te, quicquid increpauerit, Catilinam timeri, nullum videri contra me consilium iniri posse, quod a tuo scelere abhorreat, non est ferendum. Quam ob rem discede atque hunc mihi timorem eripe; si est verus, ne opprimar, sin falsus, ut tandem aliquando timere desinam.”*

*[19] VIII. Haec si tecum, ita ut dixi, patria loquatur, nonne impetrare debeat, etiamsi vim adhibere non possit? Quid, quod tu te ipse in custodiam dedisti, quod vitandae suspicionis causa ad M'. Lepidum te habitare velle dixisti? A quo non receptus etiam ad me venire ausus es atque, ut domi meae te adservarem, rogasti. Cum a me quoque id responsum tulisses, me nullo modo posse isdem parietibus tuto esse tecum, qui magno in periculo essem, quod isdem moenibus contineremur, ad Q. Metellum praetorem venisti. A quo repudiatum ad sodalem tuum, virum optimum, M. Metellum, demigrasti; quem tu videlicet et ad custodiendum diligentissimum et ad suspicandum sagacissimum et ad vindicandum fortissimum fore putasti. Sed quam longe videtur a carcere atque a vinculis abesse debere, qui se ipse iam dignum custodia iudicavit!*

*[20] Quae cum ita sint, Catilina, dubitas, si emori aequo animo non potes, abire in aliquas terras et vitam istam multis suppliciis iustis debitisque ereptam fugae solitudinique mandare? “Refer” inquis “ad senatum”; id enim postulas et, si hic*

*ordo [sibi] placere decreverit te ire in exilium, optemperaturum te esse dicis. Non referam, id quod abhorret a meis moribus, et tamen faciam, ut intellegas, quid hi de te sentiant. Egredere ex urbe, Catilina, libera rem publicam metu, in exilium, si hanc vocem exspectas, proficiscere. Quid est, Catilina? ecquid attendis, ecquid animadvertis horum silentium? Patiuntur, tacent. Quid exspectas auctoritatem loquentium, quorum voluntatem tacitorum perspicis?*

*[21] At si hoc idem huic adulescenti optimo, P. Sestio, si fortissimo viro, M. Marcello, dixissem, iam mihi consuli hoc ipso in templo iure optimo senatus vim et manus intulisset. De te autem, Catilina, cum quiescunt, probant, cum patiuntur, decernunt, cum tacent, clamant, neque hi solum, quorum tibi auctoritas est videlicet cara, vita vilissima, sed etiam illi equites Romani, honestissimi atque optimi viri, ceterique fortissimi cives, qui circumstant senatum, quorum tu et frequentiam videre et studia perspicere et voces paulo ante exaudire potuisti. Quorum ego vix abs te iam diu manus ac tela contineo, eosdem facile adducam, ut te haec, quae vastare iam pridem studes, relinquentem usque ad portas prosequantur.*

*[22] IX. Quamquam quid loquor? te ut ulla res frangat, tu ut umquam te corrigas, tu ut ullam fugam meditare, tu ut ullum exilium cogites? Utinam tibi istam mentem di immortales duint! tametsi video, si mea voce perterritus ire in exilium animum induxeris quanta tempestas invidiae nobis, si minus in praesens tempus recenti memoria scelerum tuorum, at in posteritatem impendeat. Sed est tanti, dum modo ista sit privata calamitas et a rei publicae periculis seiungatur. Sed tu*

*ut vitiis tuis commoveare, ut legum poenas pertimescas, ut temporibus rei publicae cedas, non est postulandum. Neque enim is es, Catilina, ut te aut pudor umquam a turpitudine aut metus a periculo aut ratio a furore revocarit.*

[23] *Quam ob rem, ut saepe iam dixi, proficiscere ac, si mihi inimico, ut praedicas, tuo conflare vis invidiam, recta perge in exilium; vix feram sermones hominum, si id feceris, vix molem istius invidiae, si in exilium iussu consulis ieris, sustinebo. Sin autem servire meae laudi et gloriae mavis, egredere cum inportuna sceleratorum manu, confer te ad Manlium, concita perditos cives, secerne te a bonis, infer patriae bellum, exsulta impio latrocinio, ut a me non eiectus ad alienos, sed invitatus ad tuos isse videaris.*

[24] *Quamquam quid ego te invitem, a quo iam sciam esse praemissos, qui tibi ad Forum Aurelium praestolarentur armati, cui iam sciam pactam et constitutam cum Manlio diem, a quo etiam aquilam illam argenteam, quam tibi ac tuis omnibus confido perniciosam ac funestam futuram, cui domi tuae sacrarium [scelerum tuorum] constitutum fuit, sciam esse praemissam? Tu ut illa carere diutius possis, quam venerari ad caedem proficiscens solebas, a cuius altaribus saepe istam impiam dexteram ad necem civium transtulisti?*

[25] *X. Ibis tandem aliquando, quo te iam pridem ista tua cupiditas effrenata ac furiosa rapiebat; neque enim tibi haec res adfert dolorem, sed quandam incredibilem voluptatem. Ad hanc te amentiam natura peperit, voluntas exercuit, fortuna servavit. Numquam tu non modo otium, sed ne bellum quidem nisi*



*nefarium concupisti. Nactus es ex perditis atque ab omni non modo fortuna, verum etiam spe derelictis conflata inproborum manum. [26] Hic tu qua laetitia perfruere, quibus gaudiis exultabis, quanta in voluptate bacchabere, cum in tanto numero tuorum neque audies virum bonum quemquam neque videbis! Ad huius vitae studium meditati illi sunt, qui feruntur, labores tui, iacere humi non solum ad obsidendum stuprum, verum etiam ad facinus obeundum, vigilare non solum insidiantem somno maritorum, verum etiam bonis otiosorum. Habes, ubi ostentes tuam illam praeclaram patientiam famis, frigoris, inopiae rerum omnium, quibus te brevi tempore confectum esse senties. [27] Tantum profectum, cum te a consulatu reppuli, ut exsul potius temptare quam consul vexare rem publicam posses, atque ut id, quod esset a te scelerate susceptum, latrocinium potius quam bellum nominaretur.*

*XI. Nunc, ut a me, patres conscripti, quandam prope iustam patriae querimoniam detester ac deprecet, percipite, quaeso, diligenter, quae dicam, et ea penitus animis vestris mentibusque mandate. Etenim, si mecum patria, quae mihi vita mea multo est carior, si cuncta Italia, si omnis res publica loquatur:*

*“M.Tulli, quid agis? Tunc eum, quem esse hostem comperisti, quem ducem belli futurum vides, quem expectari imperatorem in castris hostium sentis, auctorem sceleris, principem coniurationis, evocatorem servorum et civium perditorum, exire patiere, ut abs te non emissus ex urbe, sed immissus in urbem esse videatur? Nonne hunc in vincla duci, non ad mortem rapi, non summo supplicio mactari imperabis? [28] Quid tandem te impedit? mosne maiorum? At persaepe etiam*

*privati in hac re publica perniciosos cives morte multarunt. An leges, quae de civium Romanorum supplicio rogatae sunt? At numquam in hac urbe, qui a re publica defecerunt, civium iura tenuerunt. An invidiam posteritatis times? Praeclaram vero populo Romano refers gratiam, qui te, hominem per te cognitum nulla commendatione maiorum tam mature ad summum imperium per omnis honorum gradus extulit, si propter invidiam aut alicuius periculi metum salutem civium tuorum neglegis. [29] Sed, si quis est invidiae metus, non est vehementius severitatis ac fortitudinis invidia quam inertiae ac nequitiae pertimescenda. An, cum bello vastabitur Italia, vastabuntur urbes, tecta ardebunt tum te non existumas invidiae incendio conflagraturum?"*

*XII. His ego sanctissimis rei publicae vocibus et eorum hominum, qui hoc idem sentiunt, mentibus pauca respondebo. Ego si hoc optimum factu iudicarem, patres conscripti, Catilinam morte multari, unius usuram horae gladiatori isti ad vivendum non dedissem. Etenim si summi viri et clarissimi cives saturnini et Gracchorum et Flacci et superiorum complurium sanguine non modo se non contaminarunt, sed etiam honestarunt, certe verendum mihi non erat, ne quid hoc parricida civium interfecto invidiae [mihi] in posteritatem redundaret. Quodsi ea mihi maxime impenderet tamen hoc animo fui semper, ut invidiam virtute partam gloriam, non invidiam putarem.*

*[30] Quamquam non nulli sunt in hoc ordine, qui aut ea, quae imminent non videant aut ea, quae vident, dissimulent; qui spem Catilinae mollibus sentiis aluerunt coniurationemque nascentem non credendo corroboraverunt; quorum*

*auctoritate multi non solum improbi, verum etiam inperiti, si in hunc animadvertissem, crudeliter et regie factum esse dicerent. Nunc intellego, si iste, quo intendit, in Manliana castra pervenerit, neminem tam stultum fore, qui non videat coniurationem esse factam neminem tam improbum, qui non fateatur. Hoc autem uno interfecto intellego hanc rei publicae pestem paulisper reprimi, non in perpetuum comprimi posse. Quodsi se eiecerit secumque suos eduxerit et eodem ceteros undique collectos naufragos adgregarit, extinguetur atque delebitur non modo haec tam adulta rei publicae pestis, verum etiam stirps ac semen malorum omnium.*

*[31] Etenim iam diu, patres conscripti, in his periculis coniurationis insidiisque versamur, sed nescio quo pacto omnium scelerum ac veteris furoris et audaciae maturitas in nostri consulatus tempus erupit. Quodsi ex tanto latrocinio iste unus tolletur, videbimur fortasse ad breve quoddam tempus cura et metu esse relevati, periculum autem residebit et erit inclusum penitus in venis atque in visceribus rei publicae. Ut saepe homines aegri morbo gravi cum aestu febrique iactantur, si aquam gelidam biberunt, primo relevari videntur, deinde multo gravius vehementiusque adflictantur, sic hic morbus, qui est in re publica, relevatus istius poena vehementius reliquis vivis ingravescet.*

*[32] Quare secedant improbi, secernant se a bonis, unum in locum congregentur, muro denique, [id] quod saepe iam dixi, secernantur a nobis; desinant insidiari domi suae consuli, circumstare tribunal praetoris urbani, obsidere cum gladiis curiam, malleolos et faces ad inflammandam urbem comparare; sit denique*

*inscriptum in fronte unius cuiusque, quid de re publica sentiat. Polliceor hoc vobis, patres conscripti, tantam in nobis consulibus fore diligentiam, tantam in vobis auctoritatem, tantam in equitibus Romanis virtutem, tantam in omnibus bonis consensionem, ut Catilinae profectioe omnia patefacta, inlustrata, oppressa, vindicata esse videatis.*

*[33] Hisce ominibus, Catilina, cum summa rei publicae salute, cum tua peste ac pernicie cumque eorum exitio, qui se tecum omni scelere parricidioque iunxerunt, proficiscere ad impium bellum ac nefarium. Tu, Iuppiter, qui isdem quibus haec urbs auspiciis a Romulo es constitutus, quem Statorem huius urbis atque imperii vere nominamus, hunc et huius socios a tuis [aris] ceterisque templis, a tectis urbis ac moenibus, a vita fortunisque civium [omnium] arcebis et homines bonorum inimicos, hostis patriae, latrones Italiae scelerum foedere inter se ac nefaria societate coniunctos aeternis suppliciis vivos mortuosque mactabis. ( 1 In Catilinam)*

### Catiline makes insulting remarks to the Consul

*[31.7] Sed ubi ille adsedit, Catilina, ut erat paratus ad dissimulanda omnia, demisso voltu, voce supplici postulare a patribus coepit, ne quid de se temere crederent: ea familia ortum, ita se ab adolescentia vitam instituisse, ut omnia bona in spe haberet; ne existumarent sibi, patricio homini, cuius ipsius atque maiorum plurima beneficia in plebem Romanam essent, perdita re publica opus esse, cum eam servaret M. Tullius, inquilinus civis urbis Romae. [8] Ad hoc maledicta alia cum adderet, obstrepere omnes, hostem atque parricidam vocare. [9] Tum ille furibundus: “Quoniam quidem circumventus”, inquit, “ab inimicis praeceps agor, incendium meum ruina restinguam.”*

[31.7] But when he<sup>82</sup> took his seat, Catiline, just as he was, prepared to conceal everything, with a dejected look, in a tone of supplication, he began to demand the fathers not believe anything about him without sufficient cause; originating from a family in such a way, from youth he governed his life so that he should have hope for everything good. They must not think that he a Patrician, who himself as well as his forefathers were of great benefit to the Roman people, would need to ruin the Republic, while Marcus Tullius, a tenant, would save it? And to this abuse he would have added others, but everyone shouted him down, calling him a traitor and an assassin. [9] Then he said in a fury: “Seeing that indeed I am surrounded and being driven headfirst off a cliff, I shall extinguish my fire with ruin.”

#### Catiline departs for the camp of Manlius

*[32.1] Deinde se ex curia domum proripuit. Ibi multa ipse secum volvens, quod neque insidiae consuli procedebant et ab incendio intellegebat urbem vigiliis munitam, optimum factu credens exercitum augere ac, priusquam legiones scriberentur, multa antecapere, quae bello usui forent, nocte intempesta cum paucis in Manliana castra profectus est. [2] Sed Cethego atque Lentulo ceterisque, quorum cognoverat promptam audaciam, mandat, quibus rebus possent, opes factionis confirmet, insidias consuli maturent, caedem, incendia aliaque belli facinora parent: sese propediem cum magno exercitu ad urbem accessurum.*

[32.1] Then he dashed out of the Curia to home, and there, by himself, alone, he thought over many things because the traps for the Consul were not making progress at he was aware the city was defended from arson by watchmen, he believed the best thing to do as

---

<sup>82</sup> Cicero

to increase the army, particularly before the legions were enlisted. Taking before hand many things which were useful in war, and in the dead of night, with a few others, set out for the camp of Manlius. [2] But to Cethagus, Lentulus and others, whom he knew were bold and ready, he trusted to the affairs to be able to carry out the work of the faction; they were to ripen the plots for the Consul, prepare murder, arson, and other war crimes; he himself would soon be at the gates of the city with a large army.

Cicero's *Oratio In Catilinam II*, argumentum ad populum, Nov. 9

*[1] Tandem aliquando, Quirites, L. Catilinam furentem audacia, scelus anhelantem, pestem patriae nefarie molientem, vobis atque huic urbi ferro flammaque minitantem ex urbe vel eiecimus vel emisimus vel ipsum egredientem verbis prosecuti sumus. Abiit, excessit, evasit, erupit. Nulla iam perniciēs a monstro illo atque prodigio moenibus ipsis intra moenia comparabitur. Atque hunc quidem unum huius belli domestici ducem sine controversia vicimus. Non enim iam inter latera nostra sica illa versabitur, non in campo, non in foro, non in curia, non denique intra domesticos parietes pertimescemus. Loco ille motus est, cum est ex urbe depulsus. Palam iam cum hoste nullo inpediente bellum iustum geremus. Sine dubio perdidimus hominem magnificeque vicimus, cum illum ex occultis insidiis in apertum latrocinium coniecimus.*

*[2] Quod vero non cruentum mucronem, ut voluit, extulit, quod vivis nobis egressus est, quod ei ferrum e manibus extorsimus, quod incolumes cives, quod stantem urbem reliquit, quanto tandem illum maerore esse adflictum et profligatum putatis? Iacet ille nunc prostratus, Quirites, et se perculsum atque*

*abiectionem esse sentit et retorquet oculos profecto saepe ad hanc urbem, quam e suis faucibus ereptam esse luget; quae quidem mihi laetari videtur, quod tantam pestem evomuerit forasque proiecerit.*

*[3] Ac si quis est talis, quales esse omnes oportebat, qui in hoc ipso, in quo exultat et triumphat oratio mea, me vehementer accuset, quod tam capitalem hostem non comprehenderim potius quam emiserim, non est ista mea culpa, Quirites, sed temporum. Interfectum esse L. Catilinam et gravissimo supplicio adfectum iam pridem oportebat, idque a me et mos maiorum et huius imperii severitas et res publica postulabat. Sed quam multos fuisse putatis, qui, quae ego deferrem, non crederent, [quam multos, qui propter stultitiam non putarent,] quam multos, qui etiam defenderent [quam multos, qui propter improbitatem faverent]! Ac, si illo sublato depelli a vobis omne periculum iudicarem, iam pridem ego L. Catilinam non modo invidiae meae, verum etiam vitae periculo sustulissem.*

*[4] Sed cum viderem, ne vobis quidem omnibus re etiam tum probata si illum, ut erat meritis, morte multassem, fore ut eius socios invidia oppressus persequi non possem, rem huc deduxi, ut tum palam pugnare possetis, cum hostem aperte videretis. Quem quidem ego hostem, Quirites, quam vehementer foris esse timendum putem, licet hinc intellegatis, quod etiam illud moleste fero, quod ex urbe parum comitatus exierit. Utinam ille omnis secum suas copias eduxisset! Tongilium mihi eduxit, quem amare in praetexta coeperat, Publicium et Minucium, quorum aes alienum contractum in popina nullum rei publicae motum*

*adferre poterat; reliquit quos viros, quanto aere alieno, quam valentis, quam nobilis!*

*[5] Itaque ego illum exercitum prae Gallicanis legionibus et hoc dilectu, quem in agro Piceno et Gallico Q. Metellus habuit, et his copiis, quae a nobis cotidie comparantur, magno opere contemno collectum ex senibus desperatis, ex agresti luxuria, ex rusticis decoctoribus, ex iis, qui vadimonia deserere quam illum exercitum maluerunt; quibus ego non modo si aciem exercitus nostri, verum etiam si edictum praetoris ostendero, concident. Hos, quos video volitare in foro, quos stare ad curiam, quos etiam in senatum venire, qui nitent unguentis, qui fulgent purpura, malletm secum suos milites eduxisset; qui si hic permanent, mementote non tam exercitum illum esse nobis quam hos, qui exercitum deseruerunt, pertimescendos. Atque hoc etiam sunt timendi magis, quod, quid cogitent, me scire sentiunt neque tamen permoventur.*

*[6] Video, cui sit Apulia adtributa, quis habeat Etruriam, quis agrum Picenum, quis Gallicum, quis sibi has urbanas insidias caedis atque incendiorum deposcerit. Omnia superioris noctis consilia ad me perlata esse sentiunt; patefeci in senatu hesterno die; Catilina ipse pertimuit, profugit; hi quid expectant? Ne illi vehementer errant, si illam meam pristinam lenitatem perpetuam sperant futuram. Quod expectavi, iam sum adsecutus, ut vos omnes factam esse aperte coniurationem contra rem publicam videretis; nisi vero si quis est, qui Catilinae similis cum Catilina sentire non putet. Non est iam lenitati locus; severitatem res ipsa flagitat. Unum etiam nunc concedam: exeant,*



*proficiscantur, ne patiantur desiderio sui Catilinam miserum tabescere. Demonstrabo iter: Aurelia via profectus est; si accelerare volent, ad vesperam consequentur.*

*[7] O fortunatam rem publicam, si quidem hanc sentinam urbis eiecerit! Uno mehercule Catilina exhausto levata mihi et recreata res publica videtur. Quid enim mali aut sceleris fingi aut cogitari potest, quod non ille conceperit? quis tota Italia veneficus, quis gladiator, quis latro, quis sicarius, quis parricida, quis testamentorum subiector, quis circumscriptor, quis ganeo, quis nepos, quis adulter, quae mulier infamis, quis corruptor iuventutis, quis corruptus, quis perditus inveniri potest, qui se cum Catilina non familiarissime vixisse fateatur? quae caedes per hosce annos sine illo facta est, quod nefarium stuprum non per illum?*

*[8] Iam vero quae tanta umquam in ullo homine] iuventutis inlecebra fuit, quanta in illo? qui alios ipse amabat turpissime, aliorum amori flagitiosissime serviebat, aliis fructum lubricum, aliis mortem parentum non modo inpellendo, verum etiam adiuvando pollicebatur. Nunc vero quam subito non solum ex urbe, verum etiam ex agris ingentem numerum perditorum hominum collegerat! Nemo non modo Romae, sed [ne] ullo in angulo totius Italiae oppressus aere alieno fuit, quem non ad hoc incredibile sceleris foedus asciverit.*

*[9] Atque ut eius diversa studia in dissimili ratione perspicere possitis, nemo est in ludo gladiatorio paulo ad facinus audacior, qui se non intimum Catilinae esse*

*fateatur, nemo in scaena leuior et neuior; qui se non eiusdem prope sodalem fuisse commemoret. Atque idem tamen stuprorum et scelerum exercitatione adsuefactus frigore et fame et siti et vigiliis perferendis fortis ab istis praedicabatur, cum industriae subsidia atque instrumenta virtutis in lubricine audaciaque consumeret.*

*[10] Hunc vero si secuti erunt sui comites, si ex urbe exierint desperatorum hominum flagitiosi greges, o nos beatos, o rem publicam fortunatam, o praeclaram laudem consulatus mei! Non enim iam sunt mediocres hominum lubricines, non humanae ac tolerandae audaciae; nihil cogitant nisi caedem, nisi incendia, nisi rapinas. Patrimonia sua profuderunt, fortunas suas obligaverunt; res eos iam pridem deseruit, fides nuper deficere coepit; eadem tamen illa, quae erat in abundantia, lubrico permanet. Quodsi in vino et alea comissiones solum et scorta quaerent, essent illi quidem desperandi, sed tamen essent ferendi; hoc vero quis ferre possit, inertes homines fortissimis viris insidiari, stultissimos prudentissimis, ebriosos sobriis, dormientis vigilantibus? qui mihi accubantes in conviviis complexi mulieres impudicas vino languidi, conferti cibo, sertis redimiti, unguentis obliti, debilitati stupris eructant sermonibus suis caedem bonorum atque urbis incendia.*

*[11] Quibus ego confido impendere fatum aliquod, et poenam iam diu improbitati, nequitiae, sceleri, libidini debitam aut instare iam plane aut certe adpropinquare. Quos si meus consulatus, quoniam sanare non potest, sustulerit, non breve nescio quod tempus, sed multa saecula propagarit rei publicae. Nulla*

*est enim natio, quam pertimescamus, nullus rex, qui bellum populo Romano facere possit. Omnia sunt externa unius virtute terra marique pacata; domesticum bellum manet, intus insidiae sunt, intus inclusum periculum est, intus est hostis. Cum luxuria nobis, cum amentia, cum scelere certandum est. Huic ego me bello ducem profiteor, Quirites; suscipio inimicitias hominum perditorum; quae sanari poterunt, quacumque ratione sanabo, quae resecanda erunt, non patiar ad perniciem civitatis manere. Proinde aut exeant aut quiescant aut, si et in urbe et in eadem mente permanent, ea, quae merentur, expectent.*

[12] *At etiam sunt, qui dicant, Quirites, a me eiectum in exilium esse Catilinam. Quod ego si verbo adsequi possem, istos ipsos eicerem, qui haec locuntur. Homo enim videlicet timidus aut etiam permodestus vocem consulis ferre non potuit; simul atque ire in exilium iussus est, paruit, ivit. Hesterno die, Quirites, cum domi meae paene interfectus essem, senatum in aedem Iovis Statoris convocavi, rem omnem ad patres conscriptos detuli. Quo cum Catilina venisset, quis eum senator appellavit, quis salutavit, quis denique ita aspexit ut perditum civem ac non potius ut inportunissimum hostem? Quin etiam principes eius ordinis partem illam subselliorum, ad quam ille accesserat, nudam atque inanem reliquerunt.*

[13] *Hic ego vehemens ille consul, qui verbo civis in exilium eicio, quaesivi a Catilina, in nocturno conventu apud M. Laecam fuisset necne. Cum ille homo audacissimus conscientia convictus primo reticuisset, patefeci cetera; quid ea nocte egisset, [ubi fuisset,] quid in proximam constituisset, quem ad modum esset ei ratio totius belli descripta, edocui. Cum haesitaret, cum teneretur, quaesivi,*

*quid dubitaret proficisci eo, quo iam pridem pararet, cum arma, cum secures, cum fasces, cum tubas, cum signa militaria, cum aquilam illam argenteam, cui ille etiam sacrarium [scelerum] domi suae fecerat, scirem esse praemissam.*

*[14] In exilium eiciebam, quem iam ingressum esse in bellum videbam? Etenim, credo, Manlius iste centurio, qui in agro Faesulano castra posuit bellum populo Romano suo nomine indixit, et illa castra nunc non Catilinam ducem expectant, et ille eiectus in exilium se Massiliam, ut aiunt, non in haec castra conferet. O condicionem miseram non modo administrandae, verum etiam conservandae rei publicae! Nunc si L. Catilina consiliis, laboribus, periculis meis circumclusus ac debilitatus subito pertimuerit, sententiam mutaverit, deseruerit suos, consilium belli faciendi abiecerit et ex hoc cursu sceleris ac belli iter ad fugam atque in exilium converterit, non ille a me spoliatus armis audaciae, non obstupefactus ac perterritus mea diligentia, non de spe conatuque depulsus sed indemnatus innocens in exilium eiectus a consule vi et minis esse dicetur; et erunt, qui illum, si hoc fecerit, non improbum, sed miserum, me non diligentissimum consulem, sed crudelissimum tyrannum existimari velint!*

*[15] Est mihi tanti, Quirites, huius invidiae falsae atque iniquae tempestatem subire, dum modo a vobis huius horribilis belli ac nefarii periculum depellatur. Dicatur sane eiectus esse a me, dum modo eat in exilium. Sed, mihi credite, non est iturus. Numquam ego ab dis immortalibus optabo, Quirites, invidiae meae levandae causa, ut L. Catilinam ducere exercitum hostium atque in armis volitare audiatis, sed triduo tamen audietis; multoque magis illud timeo, ne mihi sit*

*invidiosum aliquando, quod illum emiserim potius quam quod eiecerim. Sed cum sint homines, qui illum, cum profectus sit, eiectum esse dicant, idem, si interfectus esset, quid dicerent?*

*[16] Quamquam isti, qui Catilinam Massiliam ire dictitant, non tam hoc queruntur quam verentur. Nemo est istorum tam misericors, qui illum non ad Manlium quam ad Massilienses ire malit. Ille autem, si mehercule hoc, quod agit, numquam antea cogitasset, tamen latrocinantem se interfici mallet quam exulem vivere. Nunc vero, cum ei nihil adhuc praeter ipsius voluntatem cogitationemque acciderit, nisi quod vivis nobis Roma profectus est, optemus potius, ut eat in exilium, quam queramur.*

*[17] Sed cur tam diu de uno hoste loquimur, et de eo hoste, qui iam fatetur se esse hostem, et quem, quia, quod semper volui, murus interest, non timeo; de his, qui dissimulant, qui Romae remanent, qui nobiscum sunt, nihil dicimus? Quos quidem ego, si ullo modo fieri possit, non tam ulcisci studeo quam sanare sibi ipsos, placare rei publicae, neque, id quare fieri non possit, si me audire volent, intellego. Exponam enim vobis, Quirites, ex quibus generibus hominum istae copiae comparentur; deinde singulis medicinam consilii atque orationis meae, si quam potero, adferam.*

*[18] Unum genus est eorum, qui magno in aere alieno maiores etiam possessiones habent, quarum amore adducti dissolvi nullo modo possunt. Horum hominum species est honestissima (sunt enim locupletes), voluntas vero et causa*

*inpudentissima. Tu agris, tu aedificiis, tu argento, tu familia, tu rebus omnibus ornatus et copiosus sis et dubites de possessione detrahere, acquirere ad fidem? Quid enim expectas? bellum? Quid ergo? in vastatione omnium tuas possessiones sacrosanctas futuras putas? An tabulas novas? Errant, qui istas a Catilina expectant; meo beneficio tabulae novae proferentur, verum auctionariae; neque enim isti, qui possessiones habent, alia ratione ulla Salvi esse possunt. Quod si maturius facere voluissent neque, id quod stultissimum est, certare cum usuris fructibus praediorum, et locupletioribus his et melioribus civibus uteremur. Sed hosce homines minime puto pertimescendos, quod aut deduci de sententia possunt aut, si permanebunt, magis mihi videntur vota facturi contra rem publicam quam arma laturi.*

[19] *Alterum genus est eorum, qui quamquam premuntur aere alieno, dominationem tamen expectant, rerum potiri volunt, honores, quos quieta re publica desperant, perturbata se consequi posse arbitrantur. Quibus hoc praecipendum videtur, unum Scilicet et idem quod reliquis omnibus, ut desperent se id, quod conantur, consequi posse; primum omnium me ipsum vigilare, adesse, providere rei publicae; deinde magnos animos esse in bonis viris, magnam concordiam [maximam multitudinem], magnas praeterea militum copias; deos denique immortalis huic invicto populo, clarissimo imperio, pulcherrimae urbi contra tantam vim sceleris praesentis auxilium esse laturos. Quodsi iam sint id, quod summo furore cupiunt, adepti, num illi in cinere urbis et in sanguine civium, quae mente conscelerata ac nefaria concupiverunt, consules se aut dictatores aut*

*etiam reges sperant futuros? Non vident id se cupere, quod si adepti sint, fugitivo alicui aut gladiatori concedi sit necesse?*

*[20] Tertium genus est aetate iam adfectum, sed tamen exercitatione robustum; quo ex genere iste est Manlius, cui nunc Catilina succedit. Hi sunt homines ex iis coloniis, quas Sulla constituit; quas ego universas civium esse optimorum et fortissimorum virorum sentio, sed tamen ii sunt coloni, qui se in insperatis ac repentinis pecuniis sumptuosius insolentiusque iactarunt. Hi dum aedificant tamquam beati, dum praediis lectis, familiis magnis, conviviis apparatis delectantur, in tantum aes alienum inciderunt, ut, si salvi esse velint, Sulla sit iis ab inferis excitandus; qui etiam non nullos agrestis homines tenues atque egentes in eandem illam spem rapinarum veterum impulerunt. Quos ego utrosque in eodem genere praedatorum direptorumque pono, sed eos hoc moneo, desinant furere ac proscriptiones et dictaturas cogitare. Tantus enim illorum temporum dolor inustus est civitati, ut iam ista non modo homines, sed ne pecudes quidem mihi passurae esse videantur.*

*[21] Quartum genus est sane varium et mixtum et turbulentum; qui iam pridem premuntur, qui numquam emergunt, qui partim inertia, partim male gerendo negotio, partim etiam sumptibus in vetere aere alieno vacillant, qui vadimoniis, iudiciis, proscriptione bonorum defetigati permulti et ex urbe et ex agris se in illa castra conferre dicuntur. Hosce ego non tam milites acris quam infitiores lentos esse arbitror. Qui homines quam primum, si stare non possunt, corruant sed ita, ut non modo civitas, sed ne vicini quidem proximi sentiant. Nam illud non*

*intellego, quam ob rem, si vivere honeste non possunt, perire turpiter velint, aut cur minore dolore perituros se cum multis quam si soli pereant, arbitrentur.*

*[22] Quintum genus est parricidarum, sicariorum, denique omnium facinerosorum. Quos ego a Catilina non revoco; nam neque ab eo divelli possunt et pereant sane in latrocinio quoniam sunt ita multi, ut eos carcer capere non possit. Postremum autem genus est non solum numero verum etiam genere ipso atque vita, quod proprium Catilinae est, de eius dilectu, immo vero de complexu eius ac sinu; quos pexo capillo nitidos aut inberbis aut bene barbatos videtis, manicatis et talaribus tunicis velis amictos, non togis; quorum omnis industria vitae et vigilandi labor in antelucanis cenis expromitur.*

*[23] In his gregibus omnes aleatores, omnes adulteri, omnes impuri impudicique versantur. Hi pueri tam lepidi ac delicati non solum amare et amari neque saltare et cantare, sed etiam sicas vibrare et spargere venena didicerunt. Qui nisi exeunt, nisi pereunt, etiamsi Catilina perierit, scitote hoc in re publica seminarium Catilinarum futurum. Verum tamen quid sibi isti miseri volunt? num suas secum mulierculas sunt in castra ducturi? Quem ad modum autem illis carere poterunt, his praesertim iam noctibus? Quo autem pacto illi Appenninum atque illas pruinas ac nives perferent? nisi idcirco se facilius hiemem toleraturos putant, quod nudi in conviviis saltare didicerunt.*

*[24] O bellum magno opere pertimescendum, cum hanc sit habiturus Catilina scortorum cohortem praetoriam! Instruite nunc, Quirites, contra has tam*



*praeclaras Catilinae copias vestra praesidia vestrosque exercitus. Et primum gladiatori illi confecto et saucio consules imperatoresque vestros opponite; deinde contra illam naufragorum eiectam ac debilitatam manum florem totius Italiae ac robur educite. Iam vero urbes coloniarum ac municipiorum respondebunt Catilinae tumulis silvestribus. Neque ego ceteras copias, ornamenta, praesidia vestra cum illius latronis inopia atque egestate conferre debeo.*

*[25] Sed si omissis his rebus, quibus nos suppeditamur, eget ille, senatu, equitibus Romanis, urbe, aerario, vectigalibus, cuncta Italia, provinciis omnibus, exteris nationibus, si his rebus omissis causas ipsas, quae inter se confligunt, contendere velimus, ex eo ipso, quam valde illi iaceant, intellegere possumus. Ex hac enim parte pudor pugnat, illinc petulantia; hinc pudicitia, illinc stuprum; hinc fides, illinc fraudatio; hinc pietas, illinc scelus; hinc constantia, illinc furor; hinc honestas, illinc turpitude; hinc continentia, illinc libido; denique aequitas, temperantia, fortitudo, prudentia, virtutes omnes certant cum iniquitate, luxuria, ignavia, temeritate, cum vitiis omnibus; postremo copia cum egestate, bona ratio cum perdita, mens sana cum amentia, bona denique spes cum omnium rerum desperatione confligit. In eius modi certamine ac proelio nonne, si hominum studia deficiant, di ipsi immortales cogant ab his praeclarissimis virtutibus tot et tanta vitia superari?*

*[26] Quae cum ita sint, Quirites, vos, quem ad modum iam antea dixi, vestra tecta vigiliis custodiisque defendite; mihi, ut urbi sine vestro motu ac sine ullo tumultu*

*satis esset praesidii, consultum atque provisum est. Coloni omnes municipalesque vestri certiores a me facti de hac nocturna excursione Catilinae facile urbes suas finesque defendent; gladiatores, quam sibi ille manum certissimam fore putavit, quamquam animo meliore sunt quam pars patriciorum, potestate tamen nostra continebuntur. Q. Metellus, quem ego hoc prospiciens in agrum Gallicum Picenumque praemisi, aut opprimet hominem aut eius omnis motus conatusque prohibebit. Reliquis autem de rebus constituendis maturandis, agendis iam ad senatum referemus, quem vocari videtis.*

*[27] Nunc illos, qui in urbe remanserunt, atque adeo qui contra urbis salutem omniumque vestrum in urbe a Catilina relictis sunt, quamquam sunt hostes, tamen, quia [nati] sunt cives, monitos etiam atque etiam volo. Mea lenitas adhuc si cui solutior visa est, hoc expectavit, ut id, quod latebat, erumperet. Quod reliquum est, iam non possum oblivisci meam hanc esse patriam, me horum esse consulem, mihi aut cum his vivendum aut pro his esse moriendum. Nullus est portis custos, nullus insidiator viae; si qui exire volunt, conivere possum; qui vero se in urbe commoverit, cuius ego non modo factum, sed inceptum ullum conatumve contra patriam deprehendero, sentiet in hac urbe esse consules vigilantis, esse egregios magistratus, esse fortem senatum, esse arma, esse carcerem, quem vindicem nefariorum ac manifestorum scelerum maiores nostri esse voluerunt.*

*[28] Atque haec omnia sic agentur, Quirites, ut maxumae res minimo motu, pericula summa nullo tumultu, bellum intestinum ac domesticum post hominum memoriam crudelissimum et maximum me uno togato duce et imperatore sedetur.*

*Quod ego sic administrabo, Quirites, ut, si ullo modo fieri poterit, ne improbus quidem quisquam in hac urbe poenam sui sceleris sufferat. Sed si vis manifestae audaciae, si inpendens patriae periculum me necessario de hac animi lenitate deduxerit, illud profecto perficiam, quod in tanto et tam insidioso bello vix optandum videtur, ut neque bonus quisquam intereat paucorumque poena vos omnes salvi esse possitis.*

*[29] Quae quidem ego neque mea prudentia neque humanis consiliis fretus polliceor vobis, Quirites, sed multis et non dubiis deorum immortalium significationibus, quibus ego ducibus in hanc spem sententiamque sum ingressus; qui iam non procul, ut quondam Solebant, ab externo hoste atque longinquo, sed hic praesentes suo numine atque auxilio sua templa atque urbis tecta defendunt. Quos vos, Quirites, precari, venerari, implorare debetis, ut, quam urbem pulcherrimam florentissimamque esse voluerunt, hanc omnibus hostium copiis terra marique superatis a perditissimorum civium nefario scelere defendant.*

*Nulla iam perniciēs a monstro illo atque prodigio moenibus ipsis intra moena comparabitur...Palam iam cum hoste nullo impediēte bellum iustum geremus.*

No longer will the destruction of our very walls be prepared within the walls itself by that monstrous and reckless man thither...Now we will openly wage a just war without impediment against the enemy. (2 *In Catilinam* 1)

### Manlius sends instructions to Marcius Rex

*[32.3] Dum haec Romae geruntur, C. Manlius ex suo numero legatos ad Marcium Regem mittit cum mandatis huiusce modi:*

[32.3] While this was going on at Rome, Gaius Manlius set emissaries from his numbers to Marcius Rex with instructions of this sort:

[33.1] *“Deos hominesque testamur, imperator, nos arma neque contra patriam cepisse neque quo periculum aliis faceremus, sed uti corpora nostra ab iniuria tuta forent, qui miseri, egentes violentia atque crudelitate faeneratorum plerique patria, sed omnes fama atque fortunis expertes sumus. Neque cuiquam nostrum licuit more maiorum lege uti neque amisso patrimonio liberum corpus habere: tanta saevitia faeneratorum atque praetoris fuit. [2] Saepe maiores vestrum, miseriti plebis Romanae, decretis suis inopiae eius opitulati sunt ac novissime memoria nostra propter magnitudinem aeris alieni volentibus omnibus bonis argentum aere solutum est. [3] Saepe ipsa plebs aut dominandi studio permota aut superbia magistratuum armata a patribus secessit. [4] At nos non imperium neque divitias petimus, quarum rerum causa bella atque certamina omnia inter mortalis sunt, sed libertatem, quam nemo bonus nisi cum anima simul amittit. [5] Te atque senatum obtestamur: consulatis miseris civibus, legis praesidium, quod iniquitas praetoris eripuit, restituatis neve nobis eam necessitudinem inponatis, ut quaeramus, quonam modo maxime ulti sanguinem nostrum pereamus!”*

[33.1] “We call to witness gods and men, General, we have taken up arms neither against the fatherland nor do we make danger for others, but so as our bodies may be protected from injury; we are those who are the most pitiable and needy of the fatherland on account of the cruelty of the moneylenders, but we are devoid of good reputations and fortunes. Neither anything of our bodies and liberty, having lost our patrimony, been permitted according to the laws and customs of our fore fathers; such the brutality of the moneylenders and the Praetor was. [2] Often your forefathers pitied the Plebs of Rome and decreed their assistance to them because of their poverty; and in our recent memory,

because of their debt, with the general consent of the Good, because of the size of their debt, freely paid silver with copper. [3] Often the Plebs themselves enthusiastically moved, either for domination or were roused to arms by the arrogance of the magistrates, seceded from the Patricians. [4] But we desire neither power nor riches, which are the causes of wars and all rivalries among men, but freedom, which no man gives up except with his soul at the same time. [5] We implore you and the Senate: consider the misery of the people, rebuild the primacy of the laws, which the unfairness of the Praetor has snatched away, not imposing on us this necessity, that, we desire, pray, in such an extreme way having taken our revenge by destroying our own blood.”

### Reply of Quintus Marcius

*[34] Ad haec Q. Marcius respondit: Si quid ab senatu petere vellent, ab armis discedant, Romam supplices proficiscantur; ea mansuetudine atque misericordia senatum populi Romani semper fuisse, ut nemo umquam ab eo frustra auxilium petiverit. [2] At Catilina ex itinere plerisque consularibus, praeterea optumo cuique litteras mittit: Se falsis criminibus circumventum, quoniam factioni inimicorum resistere nequiverit, fortunae cedere, Massiliam in exilium proficisci, non quo sibi tanti sceleris conscius esset, sed uti res publica quieta foret neve ex sua contentione seditio oreretur. [3] Ab his longe divorsas litteras Q. Catulus in senatu recitavit, quas sibi nomine Catilinae redditas dicebat. Earum exemplum infra scriptum est:*

[34.1] To this Quintus Marcius responded, that if they wanted to demand anything from the Senate, they should abandon arms and set out for Rome as suppliants; that he Senate of the Roman people has always been gentle and compassionate, and that no one who would ever seek help from it in vain. [2] But Catiline, en route, sent letters to the

consular authorities, and many others, who were in the nobility, besides: That he was surrounded by the false accusations of a faction of his enemies and he would be unable to remain, and conceded to Fortune and that he was departing into exile at Massilia; not that he was admitting that he was a party to the great crime he was being accused of, but so that the Republic would be calm, that a sedition not arise out of this contention.

### Quintus Catulus reads a letter from Catiline to the Senate

[3] Not long after that, Quintus Catulus read out a letter in the Senate, which he said had been returned in the name of Catiline.

[35.1] *“L. Catilina Q. Catulo. Egregia tua fides re cognita, grata mihi magnis in meis periculis, fiduciam commendationi meae tribuit. [2] Quam ob rem defensionem in novo consilio non statui parare; satisfactionem ex nulla conscientia de culpa proponere decrevi, quam, me dius fidius, veram licet cognoscas. Iniuriis contumeliisque concitatus, quod fructu laboris industriaeque meae privatus statum dignitatis non obtinebam, publicam miserorum causam pro mea consuetudine suscepi, non quin aes alienum meis nominibus ex possessionibus solvere non possem et alienis nominibus liberalitas Orestillae suis filiaeque copiis persolveret, sed quod non dignos homines honore honestatos videbam meque falsa suspicione alienatum esse sentiebam. [4] Hoc nomine satis honestas pro meo casu spes reliquae dignitatis conservandae sum secutus. [5] Plura cum scribere vellem, nuntiatum est vim mihi parari. [6] Nunc Orestillam commendo tuaeque fidei trado; eam ab iniuria defendas per liberos tuos rogatus! Haveto!”*

[35.1] I recognize your exceptional loyalty, it greatly pleases me in my time of peril, and it has bestowed upon me confidence in my own worth. [2] Wherefore, I have determined

not to prepare a defense for my current decision; that I have resolved to give an account is not because of a feeling of guilt, [3] God willing, you know the truth, it is permitted. Having become agitated by insults and injuries, because I was not able to keep the fruits of my labor and industry, or a private position of honor; following my usual custom, I have I have taken up the public cause of the wretched; not that I am unable to pay the debts in my name with my own properties, and of course the liberality of Orestilla has paid of abundantly on those in the names of others; but because I saw undignified men honored and became aware that I was alienated because of false suspicions about me. [4] For this reason, hoing to preserve what dignity remains, I am following this path; it is honorable enough considering my cause. [5] While I would desire to write many things, it was announced that force is being prepared against me. [6] And now I hand over Orestilla, commending her to your protection, that you defend her from injury as one of your own children, is all I ask. Farewell!”

Catiline and Manlius declared *hostes rei publicae*, Nov. 17

[36.1] *Sed ipse paucos dies conmoratus apud C. Flaminium in agro Arretino, dum vicinitatem antea sollicitatam armis exornat, cum fascibus atque aliis imperi insignibus in castra ad Manlium contendit. [2] Haec ubi Romae comperta sunt, senatus Catilinam et Manlium hostis iudicat, ceterae multitudini diem statuit, ante quam sine fraude liceret ab armis discedere praeter rerum capitalium condemnatis. [3] Praeterea decernit, uti consules dilectum habeant, Antonius cum exercitu Catilinam persequi maturet, Cicero urbi praesidio sit. [4] Ea tempestate mihi imperium populi Romani multo maxime miserabile visum est. Cui cum ad occasum ab ortu solis omnia domita armis parerent, domi otium atque divitiae, quae prima mortales putant, adfluerent, fuere tamen cives, qui*

*seque remque publicam obstinatis animis perditum irent. [5] Namque duobus senati decretis ex tanta multitudine neque praemio inductus coniurationem patefecerat neque ex castris Catilinae quisquam omnium discesserat: tanta vis morbi ac veluti tabes plerosque civium animos invaserat.*

[36.1] But he himself, lingering a few days with Gaius Flaminius in the territory of Aretium, while supplying arms to a neighborhood already incited, with the Fases and other symbols of authority, he rushed to the camp of Manlius. [2] When these things were discovered at Rome, the Senate declared Catiline and Manlius foreigners<sup>83</sup> and fixed a day before which the others were permitted to lay down arms without harm, except those condemned to capital crimes. [3] Besides that, decided that the Consuls would hold a draft, Antonius would immediately pursue Catiline with an army, Cicero would defend the city. [4] At that time, the authority of the Roman people appeared to me, in many ways, most pitiable. Everything, subdued by arms, from sunrise to sunset, was obedient to her. At home there was wealth and leisure, which mortal men value first and foremost; there were, nevertheless, citizens who were so overflowing with obstinance that they would go on ruining both themselves and the Republic by means of arms. [5] For, despite two decrees from the Senate, neither was anyone out of such a multitude persuaded to expose the conspiracy, nor did anyone desert from Catiline's camp; such was the power of the sickness which, like a plague, invaded the souls of very many citizens.

*[37.1] Neque solum illis aliena mens erat, qui conscii coniurationis fuerant, sed omnino cuncta plebes novarum rerum studio Catilinae incepta probabat. [2] Id adeo more suo videbatur facere. Nam semper in civitate, quibus opes nullae sunt, bonis invident, malos*

---

<sup>83</sup> *Hostis* here can mean both enemy and stranger. Cf. Varro 5.3



*extollunt, vetera odere, nova exoptant, odio suarum rerum mutari omnia student, turba atque seditionibus sine cura aluntur, quoniam egestas facile habetur sine damno. Sed urbana plebes, ea vero praeceps erat de multis causis. Primum omnium, qui ubique probro atque petulantia maxime praestabant, item alii per dedecora patrimoniis amissis, postremo omnes, quos flagitium aut facinus domo expulerat, in Romam sicut in sentinam confluxerant. Deinde multi memores Sullanae victoriae, quod ex gregariis militibus alios senatores videbant, alios ita divites, ut regio victu atque cultu aetatem agerent, sibi quisque, si in armis foret, ex victoria talia sperabat. Praeterea iuventus, quae in agris manuum mercede inopiam toleraverat, privatis atque publicis largitionibus excita urbanum otium ingrato labori praetulerat. Eos atque alios omnis malum publicum alebat. Quo minus mirandum est homines egentis, malis moribus, maxuma spe, rei publicae iuxta ac sibi consuluisse. Praeterea, quorum victoria Sullae parentes proscripti, bona erepta, ius libertatis imminutum erat, haud sane alio animo belli eventum exspectabant. Ad hoc, quicumque aliarum atque senatus partium erant, conturbari rem publicam quam minus valere ipsi malebant. Id adeo malum multos post annos in civitatem revorterat.*

[37.1] Not only those who were involved in the conspiracy, but together with all the Plebs eager for new affairs, there were other minds as well who approved of the enterprise. [2] In this very thing they appeared to act foolishly, [3] for in every State there are those who, being without power, envy the good, extol the bad, hate the old, long for the new, and are eager, out of their hatred for everything, to change things, for in the turmoil and the insurrections they are easily maintained without difficulty, seeing that having poverty is easy to have without harm.

*[38.1] Nam postquam Cn. Pompeio et M. Crasso consulibus tribunicia potestas restituta est, homines adulescentes summam potestatem nacti, quibus aetas animusque ferox erat, coepere senatum criminando plebem exagitare, dein largiundo atque pollicitando magis incendere, ita ipsi clari potentesque fieri. [2] Contra eos summa ope nitebatur pleraque nobilitas senatus specie pro sua magnitudine. [3] Namque, uti paucis verum absolvam, post illa tempora quicumque rem publicam agitavere honestis nominibus, alii sicuti populi iura defenderent, pars quo senatus auctoritas maxuma foret, bonum publicum simulantes pro sua quisque potentia certebant. [4] Neque illis modestia neque modus contentionis erat: utrique victoriam crudeliter exercebant.*

[38.1] Now when the tribunican power was restored by the Consuls Gnaeus Pompeius and Marcus Crassus, those whom, on account of age and spirit, were warlike, began to stir up the Plebs with slander against the Senate, the inflamed them more greatly with promises and gifts, and in this way made themselves famous and powerful. [2] Against these men, very many nobles struggled with all their might, ostensibly for the Senate, but really for their own aggrandizement. [3] For in fact, in order to truly do justice to this in a few words, whoever, after that time, agitated against the Republic, some as if defending the rights of the people, another part were most of all defending the authority of the Senate, simulating the public good, each one was fighting for his own power. [4] For these men there was neither discretion nor moderation; both exercised victory with cruelty.

*[39.1] Sed postquam Cn. Pompeius ad bellum maritimum atque Mithridaticum missus est, plebis opes inminutae, paucorum potentia crevit. [2] Ei magistratus provincias aliaque omnia tenere; ipsi innoxii, florentes, sine metu aetatem agere ceterosque iudiciiis terrere, quo plebem in magistratu placidius tractarent. [3] Sed ubi primum dubiis rebus*

*novandi spes oblata est, vetus certamen animos eorum adrexit. [4] Quod si primo proelio Catilina superior aut aequa manu discessisset, profecto magna clades atque calamitas rem publicam oppressisset; neque illis, qui victoriam adepti forent, diutius ea uti licuisset, quin defessis et exsanguibus, qui plus posset, imperium atque libertatem extorqueret. [5] Fuere tamen extra coniurationem complures, qui ad Catilinam initio profecti sunt. In iis erat Fulvius, senatoris filius, quem retractum ex itinere parens necari iussit. [6] Isdem temporibus Romae Lentulus, sicuti Catilina praeceperat, quoscumque moribus aut fortuna novis rebus idoneos credebat, aut per se aut per alios sollicitabat, neque solum civis, sed cuiusque modi genus hominum, quod modo bello usui foret.*

[39.1] But after Gnaeus Pompeius was sent to the maritime war and the Mithridatic war; the power of the Plebs was diminished, and the power of the few increased. [2] These men held magistratedpovinces and everything else; themselves safe, prosperous, lead a life without fear and terrified others with the courts, in order that, when in office, quietly managed the Plebs. [3] But as soon as affairs showed themselves to be doubtful, hopes renewed, old rivaliries roused their souls. [4] But if, in the first battle, Catiline would have proved himself superior or at least equal in violence, really, great ruin and calamity would have overwhelmed the Republic, nor would they who were victorious be permitted their gains long; exhausted and feeble, a greater one would be able to wretch away power and liberty. [5] Yet there were several men, outside the conspiracy, who went to Catiline at the beginning. Among them was Fulvius a Senator's son, who was brought back from the adventure and killed by order of his father. [6] About this same time, Lentulus at Rome, just as Catiline had instructed, either through himself or through others, was soliciting whomsoever he believed suitable, by disposition or fortune, for new affairs,

and not only citizens, but whatever manner of people, insofar as he would be able to use them in war.

### Publius Umbrenus seeks the ambassadors of the Allobroges

[40.1] *Igitur P. Umbreno cuidam negotium dat, uti legatos Allobrogum requirat eosque, si possit, inpellat ad societatem belli, existumans publice privatimque aere alieno oppressos, praeterea quod natura gens Gallica bellicosa esset, facile eos ad tale consilium adduci posse. [2] Umbrenus, quod in Gallia negotiatus erat, plerisque principibus civitatum notus erat atque eos noverat. Itaque sine mora, ubi primum legatos in foro conspexit, percontatus pauca de statu civitatis et quasi dolens eius casum requirere coepit, quem exitum tantis malis sperarent. [3] Postquam illos videt queri de avaritia magistratuum, accusare senatum, quod in eo auxilii nihil esset, miseris suis remedium mortem exspectare: "At ego", inquit, "vobis, si modo viri esse voltis, rationem ostendam, qua tanta ista mala effugiatis." [4] Haec ubi dixit, Allobroges in maxumam spem adducti Umbrenum orare, ut sui misereretur: nihil tam asperum neque tam difficile esse, quod non cupidissime facturi essent, dum ea res civitatem aere alieno liberaret. [5] Ille eos in domum D. Bruti perducit, quod foro propinqua erat neque aliena consili propter Semproniam; nam tum Brutus ab Roma aberat. [6] Praeterea Gabinium arcessit, quo maior auctoritas sermoni inesset. Eo praesente coniurationem aperit, nominat socios, praeterea multos cuiusque generis innoxios, quo legatis animus amplior esset. Deinde eos pollicitos operam suam domum dimittit.*

[40.1] Then he gave a certain Publius Umbrenus the business of searching out the ambassadors of the Allobroges, in order, if he was able, to persuade them to be an ally in

the war; thinking that since they were oppressed by debt public and private, and beside that the Gallic people were bellicose by nature, it would be easy to draw them into a plan of such a kind. [2] Umbrenus, because he had business in Gaul, knew and was known to many leading men of the State. And so, without delay, when he first saw the ambassadors in the Forum, questioning a little about the condition of the State and feigning sympathy for their cause. [3] After he saw them complain about the greed of the magistrates, accusing the Senate because they were no help to them, and that they looked forward to death as a remedy for their suffering, he said, “But I if you are willing to be like a hero, may reveal a plan by which you may escape such great evils.” [4] When he said this, the Allobroges, in great hope, begged Umbrenus to take pity on them. Nothing would be so adverse nor so difficult that they would not be overjoyed to do it provided that it freed their people from debt. [5] He escorted them to the home of Decimus Brutus, because it was near the Forum and, on account of Sempronia, not unsuitable to the plot for Brutus was away from Rome at the time. [6] Besides that, he sent for Gabinius which would give greater authority to the discussion, with him present, he unveiled the conspiracy, named the participants, and, to increase the morale of the ambassadors even more, he added many innocent men of any rank. Next, promising them his assistance, he sent them home.

### The Allobroges inform Quintus Fabius Sanga about the plot

*[41.1] Sed Allobroges diu in incerto habuere, quidnam consili caperent. [2] In altera parte erat aes alienum, studium belli, magna merces in spe victoriae, at in altera maiores opes, tuta consilia, pro incerta spe certa praemia. [3] Haec illis volventibus tandem vicit fortuna rei publicae. [4] Itaque Q. Fabio Sangae, cuius patrociniō civitas plurimum*

*utebatur, rem omnem, uti cognoverant, aperiunt. [5] Cicero per Sangam consilio cognito legatis praecipit, ut stadium coniurationis vehementer simulent, ceteros adeant, bene polliceantur dentque operam, uti eos quam maxime manifestos habeant.*

[41.1] But the Allobroges were for a long time held in uncertainty about which plan they were to pursue. [2] On the one hand, there was the debt, enthusiasm for war, the great rewards in hope of victory, but on the other hand, greater resources, prudent council, and before uncertain hope were certain rewards. [3] These things were for consideration by them, at last, the fortune of the Republic was victorious. [4] And so to Quintus Fabius Sanga, the most important of their lawyers used by the citizens, they disclosed the whole affair just as they had learned it. [5] Cicero, becoming aware of the plan through Sanga, instructed the ambassadors that they should pretend ardent interest in the conspiracy, approach the others, they should promise all is well, and should give an effort in such a way so as they, very clearly, would be held.

*[42] Isdem fere temporibus in Gallia citeriore atque ulteriore, item in agro Piceno, Bruttio, Apulia motus erat. [2] Namque illi, quos ante Catilina dimiserat, inconsulte ac veluti per dementiam cuncta simul agebant. Nocturnis consiliis armorum atque telorum portationibus, festinando, agitando omnia plus timoris quam periculi effecerant. [3] Ex eo numero compluris Q. Metellus Celer praetor ex senatus consulto causa cognita in vincula coniecerat, item in citeriore Gallia C. Murena, qui ei provinciae legatus praeerat.*

[42.1] There were about the same time disturbances in Hither and Further Gaul and likewise in the districts of Picene, Bruttian and Apulia. [2] For those whom Catiline had sent were shamelessly doing everything simultaneously, and, as it were, insanely. By their nocturnal meetings, by their transportation of arms and weapon, hastening about

their agitation created greater fear than actual danger. [3] Quintus Metellus Celer, Praetor, on account of decree of the Senate, threw several out of their number into prison, and in Hither Gaul, Gaius Murena, who the ambassador governing that province, did the same.

### Plot to Assault Cicero at his door

[43.1] *At Romae*<sup>84</sup> *Lentulus cum ceteris, qui principes coniurationis erant, paratis, ut videbatur, magis copiis constituerant, uti, cum Catilina in agrum Faesulanum cum exercitu venisset, L. Bestia tribunus plebis contione habita quereretur de actionibus Ciceronis bellique gravissimi invidiam optumo consuli inponeret; eo signo proxima nocte cetera multitudo coniurationis suum quisque negotium exsequeretur. [2] Sed ea divisa hoc modo dicebantur: Statilius et Gabinius uti cum magna manu duodecim simul opportuna loca urbis incenderent, quo tumultus facilius adit ad consulem ceterosque, quibus insidiae parabantur, fieret; Cethegus Ciceronis ianuam obsideret eumque vi aggrederetur, alius autem alium, sed filii familiarum, quorum ex nobilitate maxuma pars erat, parentis interficerent; simul caede et incendio percussis omnibus ad Catilinam erumperent. [3] Inter haec parata atque decreta Cethegus semper querebatur de ignavia sociorum: illos dubitando et dies prolatando magnas opportunitates corrumpere; facto, non consulto in tali periculo opus esse seque, si pauci adiuvent, languentibus aliis impetum in curiam facturum. [4] Natura ferox, vehemens, manu promptus erat, maxumum bonum in celeritate putabat.*

[43.1] On the other hand, Lentulus, with the other leaders of the conspiracy were in Rome preparing things, which appeared to be an abundant supply, in such a way that when Catiline had arrived in Faesulae with an army, Lucius Bestia, Tribune of the Plebs,

<sup>84</sup> *Romae* here is a predicative use of the Dative.

holding a meeting, should complain about the actions of Cicero in order to impose the greatest hatred of a war on the best of Consuls; that was the signal to the many other conspirators that, whatever their enterprises, were to be performed the next night. [2] And in fact it is said that things were divided up in this way: Statilius and Gabinius, with a great number of hands, were to simultaneously set fire to twelve places of opportunity in order that, in the commotion, the insidious things, which were being planned against the Consul and others, may come about more easily; Cethagus was to beset Cicero at his door and attack him, and other men other things, in fact the sons of families, the greatest part of whom were from the nobility, would kill their parents, and, at the same time, with everyone scared to death by the bloodshed and fire, they were to rush forth and join Catiline. [3] During the preparations and decisions, Cethagus was always complaining about the inaction of his accomplices, by hesitation and delay they were wasting great opportunities; [4] aggressive and violent by nature, he was ready to act, thought speed of action was best.

Allobroges secure letters from conspirators, Letter of Volturcius to Catiline

*[44.1] Sed Allobroges ex praecepto Ciceronis per Gabinium ceteros conveniunt. Ab Lentulo, Cethego, Statilio, item Cassio postulant ius iurandum, quod signatum ad civis perferant; aliter haud facile eos ad tantum negotium inpelli posse. [2] Ceteri nihil suspicantes dant, Cassius semet eo brevi venturum pollicetur ac paulo ante legatos ex urbe proficiscitur. [3] Lentulus cum iis T. Volturcium quendam Crotoniensem mittit, ut Allobroges, priusquam domum pergerent, cum Catilina data atque accepta fide societatem confirmarent. [4] Ipse Volturcio litteras ad Catilinam dat, quarum exemplum infra scriptum est: "Qui sim, ex eo, quem ad te misi, cognosces. Fac cogites, in quanta*



*calamitate sis, et memineris te virum esse! Consideres, quid tuae rationes postulent! Auxilium petas ab omnibus, etiam ab infumis!” [6] Ad hoc mandata verbis dat: “Cum ab senatu hostis iudicatus sit, quo consilio servitia repudet? In urbe parata esse, quae iusserit; ne cunctetur ipse propius accedere.”*

[44.1] But the Allobroges, following Cicero’s instructions, met the others through Gabinius and demanded from Lentulus, Cethegus, Statilio, and from Cassius the same, and oath which was to be sealed and carried back to their fellow citizens; otherwise they could not easily be induced into such an enterprise. [2] The other gave without suspicion, Cassius himself promised he would be coming shortly, but departed the city a little before the ambassadors. [3] With them, Lentulus sent a certain Titus Volturcius, so that, before they proceeded home, they might confirm the alliance by giving and accepting a pledge of faith with Catiline. [4] This same man gave a letter to Volturcius for Catiline, a copy of which has been written below. [5] “Who I might be you shall learn from he whom to you I have sent. You should consider the fact you may be ruined and remember that you are a man. You should consider what your orders may require. You should seek help from everyone, even the lowest.” [6] And to this he added the verbal entreaty: “What plan would reject the help slaves when by the Senate they may have been adjudged to be enemies? In the city what he had ordered was being prepared, he himself should not hesitate to proceed nearer.”

### Arrest of the conspirators at the Mulvian Bridge, Dec. 2

*[45.1] His rebus ita actis constituta nocte, qua proficiscerentur, Cicero per legatos cuncta edoctus L. Valerio Flacco et C. Pomptino praetoribus imperat, ut in ponte Mulvio per insidias Allobrogum comitatus deprehendant. Rem omnem aperit, cuius gratia*

*mittebantur; cetera, uti facto opus sit, ita agant, permittit. [2] Illi, homines militares, sine tumultu praesidiis conlocatis, sicuti praeceptum erat, occulte pontem obsidunt. [3] Postquam ad id loci legati cum Volturcio venerunt et simul utrimque clamor exortus est, Galli cito cognito consilio sine mora praetoribus se tradunt; Volturcius primo cohortatus ceteros gladio se a multitudine defendit, deinde, ubi a legatis desertus est, multa prius de salute sua Pomptinum obtestatus, quod ei notus erat, postremo timidus ac vitae diffidens velut hostibus sese praetoribus dedit.*

[45.1] With these things were, in a manner of speaking, deeds, settling what night they would be departing, having learned everything through the ambassadors, Cicero ordered the praetors Lucius Valerius Flaccus and Gaius Pomptinus in such a way that a party, through an ambush, might intercept the Allobroges on the Mulvian bridge; he explained everything with respect to what sake they were being sent, everything else, how they were to proceed to do the work, he left to them. [2] They, being military men, without creating a commotion, just as they had been ordered, secretly occupied the bridge with a garrison. [3] When the ambassadors with Volturcius came to that location, and at the same time a shout came from both sides, the Gauls became aware of the plan, handed themselves over to the praetors without delay. [4] At first Volturcius exhorted the others and defended himself against the multitude with a sword, but when he was deserted by the ambassadors, he at first called to Pomptinus, because he was known to him, a greeting many times; he finally was terrified and, fearing for his life surrendered himself to the praetors as enemies.

Cicero convenes the Senate and reads out the letters of the conspirators

[46.1] *Quibus rebus confectis omnia propere per nuntios consuli declarantur. [2] At illum ingens cura atque laetitia simul occupavere. Nam laetabatur intelligens coniuratione patefacta civitatem periculis ereptam esse: porro autem anxius erat dubitans, in maximo scelere tantis civibus deprehensis quid facto opus esset: poenam illorum sibi oneri inpunitatem perdundae rei publicae fore credebat. [3] Igitur confirmato animo vocari ad sese iubet Lentulum, Cethegum, Statilium, Gabinium itemque Caeparium Terracinensem, qui in Apuliam ad concitanda servitia proficisci parabat. [4] Ceteri sine mora veniunt; Caeparius, paulo ante domo egressus, cognito indicio ex urbe profugerat. [5] Consul Lentulum, quod praetor erat, ipse manu tenens in senatum perducit, reliquos cum custodibus in aedem Concordiae venire iubet. [6] Eo senatum advocat magnaue frequentia eius ordinis Volturcium cum legatis introducit; Flaccum praetorem scrinium cum litteris, quas a legatis acceperat, eodem adferre iubet.*

[46.1] Everything through which these things had been done through the messengers to the Consul was communicated. [2] But at the same time both great worry and joy seized him, for he rejoiced at knowing that on account of the fact that disclosure of the conspiracy rescued the State from perils, moreover he was worried, uncertain about what ought to be done when such citizens were detected in such a great crime; aware he was that punishing for these things would be onerous upon himself, not punishing the ruin of the Republic. [3] Accordingly he strengthened his resolve, ordered Lentulus, Cethegus, Statius, Gabinius before him, and Caeparius of Terracita, who was preparing to depart for Apulia in order to stir up the slaves, likewise. [4] The others came without delay, Caeparius, aware of the indictment, quit home a little while before and fled the city. [5] Lentulus, who was a Praetor, the Consul himself, by the hand, to the Senate led; ordered the others in custody to come to the temple of Concord, [6] and thither convened the

Senate and, to the great croad of this order, introduced Volturcius along with the ambassadors, ordered Flaccus to the same place the portfolio bring along with the letters he had received from the ambassadors.

### Volturcius granted immunity

[47.1] *Volturcius interrogatus de itinere, de litteris, postremo quid aut qua de causa consili*<sup>85</sup> *habuisset, primo fingere alia, dissimulare de coniuratione; post, ubi fide publica dicere iussus est, omnia, uti gesta erant, aperit docetque se paucis ante diebus a Gabinio et Caepario socium adscitum nihil amplius scire quam legatos; tantummodo audire solitum ex Gabinio P. Autronium, Ser. Sullam, L. Vargunteium, multos praeterea in ea coniuratione esse. [2] Eadem Galli fatentur ac Lentulum dissimulantem coarguunt praeter litteras sermonibus, quos ille habere solitus erat: Ex libris Sibyllinis regnum Romae tribus Corneliis portendi; Cinnam atque Sullam antea, se tertium esse, cui fatum foret urbis potiri; praeterea ab incenso Capitolio illum esse vigesimum annum, quem saepe ex prodigiis haruspices respondissent bello civili cruentum fore. Igitur perlectis litteris, cum prius omnes signa sua cognovissent, senatus decernit, uti abdicato magistratu Lentulus itemque ceteri in liberis custodiis habeantur. [3] Itaque Lentulus P. Lentulo Spintheri, qui tum aedilis erat, Cethegus Q. Cornificio, Statilius C. Caesari, Gabinius M. Crasso, Caeparius (nam is paulo ante ex fuga retractus) erat Cn. Terentio senatori traduntur.*

[47.1] Volturcius, in the course of being questioned about the letters, and at last what he had planned and why he planned it, at first he, inventing something else, concealed knowledge about the conspiracy, later, when, upon a pledge of immunity, he was ordered

---

<sup>85</sup> *quid aut qua de causa consili* is an example of *synchysis*. Thus : *quid de causa, qua consili* = ‘why the cause and what the reason.’ Cf. Allen & Greenough 598h.

to speak, disclosed everything just as they were done and instructed that he only a few days before was admitted to the confederacy by Gabinius and Caeparius, knew nothing more than the ambassadors, only so much as hearing the usual from Gabinius that Publius Autronius, Servius Sulla, Lucius Vargunteius, and many others besides, were in this conspiracy. [2] The testimony of the Gauls was the same, and, moreover, they proved Lentulus was dissimulating; for, apart from the letter, by means of statements which he was in the habit of making: that the kingdom of Rome was to be possessed by three Corneli; previously by Cinna and Sulla, he himself, to become master of the city, was fated to be the third; and besides that, this was the twentieth year since the burning of the Capitol, which, often the soothsayers had foretold from prodigies, there would be a bloody civil war. Accordingly, after everyone had first acknowledged his seal, and the letters were read out, the Senate decided that Lentulus would have to abdicate his magistrate and the same, along with the others, would have to be placed under house arrest.<sup>86</sup> [3] Thus, Lentulus was handed over to Publius Lentulus Spinther, who was and Aedile at the time, Cethagus to Quintus Cornificius, Statilius to Gaius Caesar, Gabinius to Marcus Crassus, and Ceaparius, for he a little while before had been caught in flight and brought back, to Gnaeus Terentius, a Senator.

### Cicero's *Oratio In Catilinam III*, argumentum ad populum, Dec. 3

*[1] Rem publicam, Quirites, vitamque omnium vestrum bona, fortunas, coniuges  
liberosque vestros atque hoc domicilium clarissimi imperii, fortunatissimam  
pulcherrimamque urbem, hodierno die deorum immortalium summo erga vos*

---

<sup>86</sup> *liberis custodiis* = 'free custody,' which is like the contemporary idea of 'released on bail.' The individual released *liberis custodiis* was remanded to the custody of a trust worthy individual while awaiting trial and was not otherwise obligated to post a bond.

*amore, laboribus, consiliis, periculis meis e flamma atque ferro ac paene ex faucibus fati ereptam et vobis conservatam ac restitutam videtis.*

*[2] Et si non minus nobis iucundi atque inlustres sunt ii dies, quibus conservamur, quam illi, quibus nascimur, quod salutis certa laetitia est, nascendi incerta condicio, et quod sine sensu nascimur, cum voluptate servamur, profecto, quoniam illum, qui hanc urbem condidit, ad deos immortalis benivolentia famaue sustulimus, esse apud vos posterosque vestros in honore debebit is, qui eandem hanc urbem conditam amplificatamque servavit. Nam toti urbi, templis, delubris, tectis ac moenibus subiectos prope iam ignis circumdatosque restinximus, idemque gladios in rem publicam dstrictos rettudimus mucronesque eorum a iugulis vestris deiecimus.*

*[3] Quae quoniam in senatu inlustrata, patefacta, comperta sunt per me, vobis iam exponam breviter, Quirites, ut, et quanta et quam manifesta et qua ratione investigata et comprehensa sint, vos, qui et ignoratis et expectatis, scire possitis. Principio ut Catilina paucis ante diebus erupit ex urbe, cum sceleris sui socios huiusce nefarii belli acerrimos duces Romae reliquisset, semper vigilavi et providi, Quirites, quem ad modum in tantis et tam absconditis insidiis salvi esse possemus. Nam tum, cum ex urbe Catilinam eiciebam (non enim iam vereor huius verbi invidiam, cum illa magis sit tiunenda, quod vivus exierit), sed tum, cum illum exterminari volebam, aut reliquam coniuratorum manum simul exituram aut eos, qui restitissent, infirmos sine illo ac debiles fore putabam.*

[4] *Atque ego ut vidi, quos maximo furore et scelere esse infiammatos sciebam, eos nobiscum esse et Romae remansisse, in eo omnes dies noctesque consumpsi, ut, quid agerent, quid molirentur, sentirem ac viderem, ut, quoniam auribus vestris propter incredibilem magnitudinem sceleris minorem fidem faceret oratio mea, rem ita comprehenderem, ut tum demum animis saluti vestrae provideretis, cum oculis maleficium ipsum videretis. Itaque, ut comperi legatos Allobrogum belli Transalpini et tumultus Gallici excitandi causa a P. Lentulo esse sollicitatos, eosque in Galliam ad suos civis eodemque itinere cum litteris mandatisque ad Catilinam esse missos, comitemque iis adiunctum esse T. Volturcium, atque huic esse ad Catilinam datas litteras, facultatem mihi oblatam putavi, ut, quod erat difficillimum, quodque ego semper optabam ab dis immortalibus, ut tota res non solum a me, sed etiam a senatu et a vobis manifesto deprehenderetur.*

[5] *Itaque hesterno die L. Flaccum et C. Pomptinum praetores, fortissimos atque amantissimos rei publicae viros, ad me vocavi, rem eui, quid fieri placeret, ostendi. Illi autem, qui omnia de re publica praeclara atque egregia sentirent, sine recusatione ac sine ulla mora negotium susceperunt et, cum advesperasceret, occulte ad pontem Mulvium pervenerunt atque ibi in proximis villis ita bipertito fuerunt, ut Tiberis inter eos et pons interesset. Eodem autem et ipsi sine cuiusquam suspicione multos fortis viros eduxerant, et ego ex praefectura Reatina complures delectos adulescentes, quorum opera utor adsidue in rei publicae praesidio, cum gladiis miseram. Interim tertia fere vigilia exacta cum iam pontem Mulvium magno comitatu legati Allobrogum ingredi inciperent unaque Volturcius, fit in eos impetus; educuntur et ab illis gladii et a nostris. Res*

*praetoribus erat nota solis, ignorabatur a ceteris. Tum interventu Pomptini atque Flacci pugna, quae erat commissa, sedatur. Litterae, quaecumque erant in eo comitatu, integris signis praetoribus traduntur ipsi comprehensi ad me, cum iam dilucesceret, deducuntur. Atque horum omnium scelerum inprobissimum machinatorem, Cimbrum Gabinium, statim ad me nihil dum suspicantem vocavi; deinde item accersitus est L. Statilius et post eum C. Cethegus; tardissime autem Lentulus venit, credo quod in litteris dandis praeter consuetudinem proxima nocte vigilarat.*

*[6] Cum summis et clarissimis huius civitatis viris, qui audita re frequentes ad me mane convenerant, litteras a me prius aperiri quam ad senatum deferri placeret, ne, si nihil esset in re, temere a me tantus tumultus iniectus civitati videretur, negavi me esse facturum, ut de periculo publico non ad consilium publicum rem integram deferrem. Etenim, Quirites, si ea, quae erant ad me delata, reperta non essent, tamen ego non arbitraber in tantis rei publicae periculis esse mihi nimiam diligentiam pertimescendam. Senatum frequentem celeriter, ut vidistis, coegi.*

*[7] Atque interea statim admonitu Allobrogum C. Sulpicium praetorem, fortem virum, misi, qui ex aedibus Cethegi, si quid o telorum esset, efferret; ex quibus ille maximum sicarum numerum et gladiatorum extulit. Introduxi Volturcium sine Gallis; fidem publicam iussu senatus dedi; hortatus sum, ut ea, quae sciret sine timore indicaret. Tum ille dixit, cum vix se ex magno timore recreasset, a P. Lentulo se habere ad Catilinam mandata et litteras, ut servorum praesidio uteretur, ut ad urbem quam primum cum exercitu accederet; id autem eo consilio,*



*ut, cum urbem ex omnibus partibus, quem ad modum discriptum distributumque erat, incendissent caedemque infinitam civium fecissent, praesto esset ille, qui et fugientis exciperet et se cum his urbanis ducibus coniungeret.*

*[8] Introducti autem Galli ius iurandum sibi et litteras ab Lentulo, Cethego, Statilio ad suam gentem data esse dixerunt, atque ita sibi ab his et a L. Cassio esse praescriptum, ut equitatum in Italiam quam primum mitterent; pedestres sibi copias non defuturas. Lentulum autem sibi confirmasse ex fati Sibyllinis haruspicumque responsis se esse tertium illum Cornelium, ad quem regnum huius urbis atque imperium pervenire esset necesse; Cinnam ante se et Sullam fuisse. Eundemque dixisse fatalem hunc annum esse ad interitum huius urbis atque imperii, qui esset annus decimus post virginum absolutionem, post Capitolii autem incensionem vice simus.*

*[9] Hanc autem Cethego cum ceteris controversiam fuisse dixerunt, quod Lentulo et aliis Saturnalibus caedem fieri atque urbem incendi placeret, Cethego nimium id longum videretur. Ac ne longum sit, Quirites, tabellas proferri iussimus, quae a quoque dicebantur datae. Primo ostendimus Cethego; signum cognovit. Nos linum incidimus, legimus. Erat scriptum ipsius manu Allobrogum senatui et populo sese, quae eorum legatis confirmasset, facturum esse; orare ut item illi facerent, quae sibi eorum legati recepissent. Tum Cethegus, qui paulo ante aliquid tamen de gladiis ac sicis, quae apud ipsum erant deprehensa, respondisset dixissetque se semper bonorum ferramentorum studiosum fuisse, recitatis litteris debilitatus atque abiectus conscientia repente conticuit.*

*Introductus est Statilius; cognovit et signum et manum suam. Recitatae sunt tabellae in eandem fere sententiam; confessus est. Tum ostendi tabellas Lentulo et quaesivi, cognosceretne signum. Adnuit. 'Est vero', inquam, 'notum quidem signum, imago avi tui, clarissimi viri, qui amavit unice patriam et cives suos; quae quidem te a tanto scelere etiam muta revocare debuit.'*

*[10] Leguntur eadem ratione ad senatum Allobrogum populumque litterae. Si quid de his rebus dicere vellet, feci potestatem. Atque ille primo quidem negavit; post autem aliquanto, toto iam indicio eito atque edito, surrexit; quaesivit a Gallis, quid sibi esset cum iis, quam ob rem domum suam venissent, itemque a Volturcio. Qui cum illi breviter constanterque respondissent, per quem ad eum quotiensque venissent, quaesissentque ab eo, nihilne secum esset de fatis Sibyllinis locutus, tum ille subito scelere demens, quanta conscientiae vis esset, ostendit. Nam, cum id posset infitari, repente praeter opinionem omnium confessus est. Ita eum non modo ingenium illud et dicendi exercitatio, qua semper valuit, sed etiam propter vim sceleris manifesti atque deprehensi inprudencia, qua superabat omnis, improbitasque defecit.*

*[11] Volturcius vero subito litteras proferri atque aperiri iubet, quas sibi a Lentulo ad Catilinam datas esse dicebat. Atque ibi vehementissime perturbatus Lentulus tamen et signum et manum suam cognovit. Erant autem sine nomine, sed ita: 'Quis sim, scies ex eo, quem ad te misi. Cura, ut vir sis, et cogita, quem in locum sis progressus. Vide, ecquid tibi iam sit necesse, et cura, ut omnium tibi auxilia adiungas, etiam infimorum.'* Gabinius deinde introductus cum primo

*impudenter respondere coepisset, ad extremum nihil ex iis, quae Galli insimulabant, negavit.*

*[12] Ac mihi quidem, Quirites, cum illa certissima visa sunt argumenta atque indicia sceleris, tabellae, signa, manus, denique unius cuiusque confessio, tum multo certiora illa, color, oculi, voltus, taciturnitas. Sic enim ob stupuerant, sic terram intuebantur, sic furtim non numquam inter sese aspiciebant, ut non iam ab aliis indicari, sed indicare se ipsi viderentur.*

*[13] Indiciis eitis atque editis, Quirites, senatum consului, de summa re publica quid fieri placeret. Dictae sunt a principibus acerrimae ac fortissimae sententiae, quas senatus sine ulla varietate est secutus. Et quoniam nondum est perscriptum senatus consultum, ex memoria vobis, Quirites, quid senatus censuerit, exponam.*

*[14] Primum mihi gratiae verbis amplissimis aguntur, quod virtute, consilio, providentia mea res publica maximis periculis sit liberata. Deinde L. Flaccus et C. Pomptinus praetores, quod eorum opera forti fidelique usus essem, merito ac iure laudantur.*

*[15] Atque etiam viro forti, collegae meo, laus inperitur, quod eos, qui huius coniurationis participes fuissent, a suis et a rei publicae consiliis removisset. Atque ita censuerunt, ut P. Lentulus, cum se praetura abdicasset, in custodiam traderetur; itemque uti C. Cethegus, L. Statilius, P. Gabinius, qui omnes praesentes erant, in custodiam traderentur; atque idem hoc decretum est in L.*

*Cassium, qui sibi procurationem incendendae urbis depoposcerat, in M. Ceparium, cui ad sollicitandos pastores Apuliam attributam esse erat indicatum, in P. Furium, qui est ex iis colonis, quos Faesulas L. Sulla deduxit, in Q. Annium Chilonem, qui una cum hoc Furio semper erat in hac Allobrogum sollicitatione versatus, in P. Umbrenum, libertinum hominem, a quo primum Gallos ad Gabinium perductos esse constabat. Atque ea lenitate senatus est usus, Quirites, ut ex tanta coniuratione tantaque hac multitudine domesticorum hostium novem hominum perditissimorum poena re publica conservata reliquorum mentes sanari posse Io arbitraretur. Atque etiam supplicatio dis immortalibus pro singulari eorum merito meo nomine decreta est quod mihi primum post hanc urbem conditam togato contigit, et his decreta verbis est, 'quod urbem incendiis, caede civis, Italiam bello liberassem.' Quae supplicatio si cum ceteris supplicationibus conferatur, hoc interest, quod ceterae bene gesta, haec una conservata re publica constituta est. Atque illud, quod faciendum primum fuit, factum atque transactum est. Nam P. Lentulus, quamquam patefactis indiciis, confessionibus suis, iudicio senatus non modo praetoris ius, verum etiam civis amiserat, tamen magistratu se abdicavit, ut, quae religio C. Mario, clarissimo viro, non fuerat, quo minus C. Glauciam, de quo nihil nominatim erat decretum, praetorem occideret, ea nos religione in privato P. Lentulo puniendo liberaremur.*

*[16] Nunc quoniam, Quirites, consceleratissimi periculosissimique belli nefarios duces captos iam et comprehensos tenetis, existumare debetis omnis Catilinae copias, omnis spes atque opes his depulsis urbis periculis concidisse. Quem quidem ego cum ex urbe pellebam, hoc providebam animo, Quirites, remoto*

*Catilina non mihi esse P. Lentuli somnum nec L. Cassi adipem nec C. Cethegi furiosam temeritatem pertimescendam. Ille erat unus timendus ex istis omnibus, sed tam diu, dum urbis moenibus continebatur. Omnia norat, omnium aditus tenebat; appellare, temptare, sollicitare poterat, audebat. Erat ei consilium ad facinus aptum, consilio autem neque manus neque lingua deerat. Iam ad certas res conficiendas certos homines delectos ac descriptos habebat. Neque vero, cum aliquid mandarat, confectum putabat; nihil erat, quod non ipse obiret, occurreret, vigilaret, laboraret; frigus, sitim, famem ferre poterat.*

[17] *Hunc ego hominem tam acrem, tam audacem, tam paratum, tam callidum, tam in scelere vigilantem, tam in perditis rebus diligentem nisi ex domesticis insidiis in castrense latrocinium compulsem (dicam id, quod sentio, Quirites), non facile hanc tantam molem mali a cervicibus vestris depulsem. Non ille nobis Saturnalia constituisset neque tanto ante exitii ac fati diem rei publicae denuntiavisset neque commisisset, ut signum, ut litterae suae testes manifesti sceleris deprehenderentur. Quae nunc illo absente sic gesta sunt, ut nullum in privata domo furtum umquam sit tam palam inventum, quam haec tanta in re publica coniuratio manifesto inventa atque deprehensa est. Quodsi Catilina in urbe ad hanc diem remansisset, quamquam, quoad fuit, omnibus eius consiliis occurri atque obstiti, tamen, ut levissime dicam, dimicandum nobis cum illo fuisset, neque nos umquam, cum ille in urbe hostis esset, tantis periculis rem publicam tanta pace, tanto otio, tanto silentio liberassemus.*

[18] *Quamquam haec omnia, Quirites, ita sunt a me administrata, ut deorum immortalium nutu atque consilio et gesta et provisa esse videantur. Idque cum coniectura consequi possumus, quod vix videtur humani consilii tantarum rerum gubernatio esse potuisse, tum vero ita praesentes his temporibus opem et auxilium nobis tulerunt, ut eos paene oculis videre possemus. Nam ut illa omittam, visas nocturno tempore ab occidente faces ardoremque caeli, ut fulminum iactus, ut terrae motus relinquam, ut omittam cetera, quae tam multa nobis consulibus facta sunt, ut haec, quae nunc fiunt, canere di immortales viderentur, hoc certe, quod sum dicturus, neque praetermittendum neque relinquendum est.*

[19] *Nam profecto memoria tenetis Cotta et Torquato consulibus complures in Capitolio res de caelo esse percussas, cum et simulacra deorum depulsa sunt et statuae veterum hominum deiectae et legum aera liquefacta et tactus etiam ille, qui hanc urbem condidit, Romulus, quem inauratum in Capitolio parvum atque lactantem uberibus lupinis inhiantem fuisse meministis. Quo quidem tempore cum haruspices ex tota Etruria convenissent, caedes atque incendia et legum interitum et bellum civile ac domesticum et totius urbis atque imperii oecusum adpropinquare dixerunt, nisi di immortales omni ratione placati suo numine prope fata ipsa flexissent.*

[20] *Itaque illorum responsis tum et ludi per decem dies facti sunt, neque res ulla, quae ad placandos deos pertineret, praetermissa est. Idemque iusserunt simulacrum Iovis facere maius et in excelso conlocare et contra, atque antea*

*fuerat, ad orientem convertere; ac se sperare dixerunt, si illud signum, quod videtis, solis ortum et forum curiamque conspiceret, fore ut ea consilia, quae clam essent inita contra salutem urbis atque imperii, inlustrarentur, ut a senatu populoque Romano perspici possent. Atque illud signum collocandum consules illi locaverunt; sed tanta fuit operis tarditas, ut neque superioribus consulibus neque nobis ante hodiernum diem collocaretur.*

*[21] Hic quis potest esse, Quirites, tam aversus a vero, tam praeceps, tam mente captus, qui neget haec omnia, quae videmus, praecipueque hanc urbem deorum immortalium nutu ac potestate administrari? Etenim, cum esset ita responsum, caedes, ineendia, interitum rei publicae eomparari, et ea per cives, quae tum propter magnitudinem scelerum non nullis incredibilia videbantur, ea non modo cogitata a nefariis civibus, verum etiam suscepta esse sensistis. Illud vero nonne ita praesens est, ut nutu Iovis optimi maximi factum esse videatur, ut, cum hodierno die mane per forum meo iussu et coniurati et eorum indices in aedem Concordiae ducerentur, eo ipso tempore signum statueretur? Quo collocato atque ad vos sena tumque converso omnia [et senatus et vos], quae erant contra salutem omnium cogitata, inlustrata et patefacta vidistis.*

*[22] Quo etiam maiore sunt isti odio supplicioque digni, qui non solum vestris domiciliis atque tectis sed etiam deorum templis atque delubris sunt funestos ac nefarios ignes inferre conati. Quibus ego si me restitisse dicam, nimium mihi sumam et non sim ferendus; ille, ille Iuppiter restitit; ille Capitolium, ille haec templa, ille cunctam urbem, ille vos omnis salvos esse voluit. Dis ego*

*inmortalibus ducibus hanc mentem, Quirites, voluntatemque suscepi atque ad haec tanta indicia perveni. Iam vero [illa Allobrogum sollicitatio, iam] ab Lentulo ceterisque domesticis hostibus tam dementer tantae res creditae et ignotis et barbaris commissaeque litterae numquam essent profecto, nisi ab dis immortalibus huic tantae audaciae consilium esset ereptum. Quid vero? ut homines Galli ex civitate male pacata, quae gens una restat quae bellum populo Romano facere et posse et non nolle videatur, spem imperii ac rerum maxumarum ultro sibi a patriciis hominibus oblatam neglegerent vestramque salutem suis opibus anteponerent, id non divinitus esse factum putatis, praesertim qui nos non pugnando, sed tacendo superare potuerint?*

*[23] Quam ob rem, Quirites, quoniam ad omnia pulvinaria supplicatio decreta est, celebratote illos dies cum coniugibus ac liberis vestris. Nam multi saepe honores dis immortalibus iusti habiti sunt ac debiti, sed profecto iustiores numquam. Erepti enim estis ex crudelissimo ac miserrimo interitu [erepti]; sine caede, sine sanguine, sine exercitu, sine dimicatione togati me uno togato duce et imperatore vicistis.*

*[24] Etenim recordamini, Quirites, omnis civiles dissensiones, non solum eas, quas audistis, sed eas, quas vosmet ipsi meministis atque vidistis. L. Sulla P. Sulpicium oppressit [eiecit ex urbe]; C. Marium, custodem huius urbis, multosque fortis viros partim eiecit ex civitate, partim interemit. Cn. Octavius consul armis expulit ex urbe collegam; omnis hic locus acervis corporum et civium sanguine redundavit. Superavit postea Cinna cum Mario; tum vero clarissimis viris*



*interfectis lumina civitatis extincta sunt. Ultus est huius victoriae crudelitatem postea Sulla; ne dici quidem opus est, quanta deminutione civium et quanta calamitate rei publicae. Dissensit M. Lepidus a clarissimo et fortissimo viro, Q. Catulo; attulit non tam ipsius interitus rei publicae luctum quam ceterorum.*

*[25] Atque illae tamen omnes dissensiones erant eius modi [Quirites], quae non ad delendam, sed ad commutandam rem publicam pertinerent. Non illi nullam esse rem publicam, sed in ea, quae esset, se esse principes, neque hanc urbem conflagrare, sed se in hac urbe florere voluerunt. Atque illae tamen omnes dissensiones, quarum nulla exitium rei publicae quaesivit, eius modi fuerunt, ut non reconciliatione concordiae, sed interneccione civium diiudicatae sint. In hoc autem uno post hominum memoriam maximo crudelissimoque bello, quale bellum nulla umquam barbaria cum sua gente gessit, quo in bello lex haec fuit a Lentulo, Catilina, Cethego, Cassio constituta, ut omnes, qui salva urbe salvi esse possent, in hostium numero ducerentur, ita me gessi, Quirites, ut salvi omnes conservaremini, et, cuun hostes vestri tantum civium superfuturum putassent, quantum infinitae caedi restitisset, tantum autem urbis, quantum flamma obire non potuisset, et urbem et civis integros incolumesque servavi.*

*[26] Quibus pro tantis rebus, Quirites, nullum ego a vobis praemium virtutis, nullum insigne honoris, nullum monumentum laudis postulo praeterquam huius diei memoriam sempiternam. In animis ego vestris omnes triumphos meos, omnia ornamenta honoris, monumenta gloriae, laudis insignia condi et collocari volo. Nihil me mutum potest delectare, nihil tacitum, nihil denique eius modi, quod*

*etiam minus digni ad sequi possint. Memoria vestra, Quirites, nostrae res alentur, sermonibus crescent, litterarum monumentis inveterascent et corroborabuntur; eandemque diem intellego, quam spero aeternam fore, propagatam esse et ad salutem urbis et ad memoriam consulatus mei, unoque tempore in hac re publica duos civis extitisse quorum alter finis vestri imperii non terrae, sed caeli regionibus terminaret, alter eiusdem imperii domicilium sedesque servaret.*

*[27] Sed quoniam earum rerum, quas ego gessi, non eadem est fortuna atque condicio quae illorum, qui externa bella gesserunt, quod mihi cum iis vivendum est, quos vici ac subegi, illi hostes aut interfectos aut oppressos reliquerunt, vestrum est, Quirites, si ceteris facta sua recte prosunt, mihi mea ne quando obsint, providere. Mentis enim hominum audacissimorum sceleratae ac nefariae ne vobis nocere possent, ego providi, ne mihi noceant, vestrum est providere. Quamquam, Quirites, mihi quidem ipsi nihil ab istis iam noceri potest. Magnum enim est in bonis praesidium, quod mihi in perpetuum comparatum est, magna in re publica dignitas, quae me semper tacita defendet, magna vis conscientiae, quam qui neglegunt, cum me violare volent, se ipsi indicabunt.*

*[28] Est enim in nobis is animus, Quirites, ut non modo nullius audaciae cedamus, sed etiam omnis in probos ultro semper lacessamus. Quodsi omnis impetus domesticorum hostium depulsus a vobis se in me unum convorterit, vobis erit videndum, Quirites, qua condicione posthac eos esse velitis, qui se pro salute vestra obtulerint invidiae periculisque omnibus; mihi quidem ipsi quid est quod*

*iam ad vitae fructum possit adquiri, cum praesertim neque in honore vestro neque in gloria virtutis quicquam videam altius, quo mihi lubeat ascendere?*

*[29] Illud perficiam profecto, Quirites, ut ea, quae gessi in consulatu, privatus tuear atque ornem, ut, si qua est invidia in conservanda re publica suscepta, laedat invidios, mihi valeat ad gloriam. Denique ita me in re publica tractabo, ut meminerim semper, quae gesserim, curemque, ut ea virtute, non casu gesta esse videantur. Vos, Quirites, quoniam iam est nox, venerati Iovem illum, custodem huius urbis ac vestrum, in vestra tecta discedite et ea, quamquam iam est periculum depulsum, tamen aequae ac priore nocte custodiis vigiliisque defendite. Id ne vobis diutius faciendum sit, atque ut in perpetua pace esse possitis, providebo.*

### Evidence given by Lucius Tarquinius against Marcus Crassus

*[48.1] Interea plebs coniuratione patefacta, quae primo cupida rerum novarum nimis bello favebat, mutata mente Catilinae consilia exsecrari, Ciceronem ad caelum tollere, veluti ex servitute erepta gaudium atque laetitiam agitabat. [2] Namque alia belli facinora praeda magis quam detrimento fore, incendium vero crudele, immoderatum ac sibi maxime calamitosum putabat, quippe cui omnes copiae in usu cotidiano et cultu corporis erant. [3] Post eum diem quidam L. Tarquinius ad senatum adductus erat, quem ad Catilinam proficiscentem ex itinere retractum aiebant. [4] Is cum se diceret indicaturum de coniuratione, si fides publica data esset, iussus a consule, quae sciret, edicere, eadem fere, quae Volturcius, de paratis incendiis, de caede bonorum, de itinere hostium senatum docet; praeterea se missum a M. Crasso, qui Catilinae nuntiaret, ne*

*eum Lentulus et Cethegus aliique ex coniuratione deprehensi terrerent eoque magis properaret ad urbem accedere, quo et ceterorum animos reficeret et illi facilius e periculo eriperentur. [5] Sed ubi Tarquinius Crassum nominavit, hominem nobilem, maxumis divitiis, summa potentia, alii rem incredibilem rati, pars, tametsi verum existumabant, tamen, quia in tali tempore tanta vis hominis magis leniunda quam exagitanda videbatur, plerique Crasso ex negotiis privatis obnoxii, conclamant indicem falsum esse deque ea re postulant uti referatur. [6] Itaque consulente Cicerone frequens senatus decernit Tarquini indicium falsum videri eumque in vinculis retinendum neque amplius potestatem faciundam, nisi de eo indicaret, cuius consilio tantam rem esset mentitus. [7] Erant eo tempore, qui existumarent indicium illud a P. Autronio machinatum, quo facilius appellato Crasso per societatem periculi reliquos illius potentia tegeret. [8] Alii Tarquinium a Cicerone inmissum aiebant, ne Crassus more suo suspecto malorum patrociniis rem publicam conturbaret. [9] Ipsum Crassum ego postea praedicantem audivi tantam illam contumeliam sibi ab Cicerone inpositam.*

[48.1] Meanwhile, the conspiracy having been brought to light, the Plebs, who, desiring new affairs, were, at first, very eager for war, changed their minds, cursing Catiline's plans, praising Cicero to the skies, celebrated with joy and happiness just as if they had been rescued from slavery. [2] For in fact the one, the spoils of war would be greater than its crimes a detriment, for the other, the fire, to be sure cruel, excessive, and a great disaster to themselves, since their sole livelihood was the daily use of their food and clothing.<sup>87</sup> [3] When on the following day a certain Lucius Tarquinius, who they said, making his way to Catiline, was arrested en route and returned to the Senate. [4] When

---

<sup>87</sup> The antecedent to *alia* is *mutata mente*. To wit: since their minds were changing first the 'one mind' was *belli facinora detrimento magis fore*, the 'other mind' was *belli praeda magnis fore*.

he indicated he would give evidence about the conspiracy if given immunity, he was ordered by the Consul to tell what he knew; what he instructed the Senate was nearly the same, about the preparing of arson, about the murder of good men, about the march of the enemy, and moreover, that he was sent by Crassus to relate to Catiline that the arrests of Lentulus, Cethegus, and the others of the conspiracy, should not frighten him and to that end, he should make haste to approach the city, to boost the morale of the others, that they would be more easily rescued from danger. [5] But when Tarquinius named Crassus, a Noble man of great wealth, extremely powerful, some deemed the affair incredible, though part thought it true. Nevertheless, because it appeared in such a time, that so powerful a man, be mollified rather than aroused. Many, who were under obligation to Crassus, on account of private business, shouted down the evidence declaring it to be false, demanded that the thing be reconsidered. [6] Accordingly, the Senate, as Cicero usually advised, decided: the evidence of Tarquinius appeared false, and he in prison be restrained, not furthermore having the ability to do anything, unless he revealed upon the advice of whom, about him, he had been caused to lie. [7] At the time there were those who were thinking that the evidence was a contrivance of Publius Autronius; so that, by naming Crassus as and accomplice, with his own power he would be able to protect the others. [8] Others said that Tarquinius was being egged on by Cicero; that Crassus by his usual custom of taking up the patronage of the bad, the Republic be not disturbed. [9] I heard Crasuss himself afterwards proclaiming that, about him, by Cicero such a great slander was imposed.

Cicero asked to introduce false charges against Julius Caesar

[49.1] *Sed isdem temporibus Q. Catulus et C. Piso neque gratia neque pretio Ciceronem inpellere potuere, uti per Allobroges aut alium indicem C. Caesar falso nominaretur. [2] Nam uterque cum illo gravis inimicitias exercebat: Piso oppugnatus in iudicio pecuniarum repetundarum propter cuiusdam Transpadani supplicium iniustum, Catulus ex petitione pontificatus odio incensus, quod extrema aetate, maxumis honoribus usus, ab adolescentulo Caesare victus discesserat. [3] Res autem opportuna videbatur, quod is privatim egregia liberalitate, publice maxumis muneribus grandem pecuniam debebat. [4] Sed ubi consulem ad tantum facinus inpellere nequeunt, ipsi singillatim circumeundo atque ementiundo, quae se ex Volturcio aut Allobrogibus audisse dicerent, magnam illi invidiam conflaverant usque eo, ut nonnulli equites Romani, qui praesidi causa cum telis erant circum aedem Concordiae, seu periculi magnitudine seu animi mobilitate impulsus, quo studium suum in rem publicam clarius esset, egredienti ex senatu Caesari gladio minitarentur.*

[49.1] But at the sametime, Quintus Catulus and Gnaeus Piso by neither prayer, nor kindness, nor reward, were able to persuade Cicero, through the Allobroges, or another person, Gaius Caesar be arraigned on a false charge. [2] For both, in connection with him, were cultivating serious enmity; for unjustly accusing Piso, on trial for extortion of money, with the execution of a certain Transpadane, Catulus, accustomed to great honors, was excited to hatred because, when, at a very old age, campaigning for Pontificate, he went away defeated by Caesar, a youth. [3] On the other hand, the affair appeared to be an opportunity because he was distinguished privately for generosity, in public for huge extravaganzas. [4] But when they were unable to impel the Consul into such a great crime, the same men were going around one by one and lying; which they said that they themselves heard it from Volturcio or the Allobroges. A great deal of

animosity was incited against him, even some Roman knights, who were garrisoned around the temple of Concord, and for that reason armed, whether on account of the great danger or on account of knee-jerk reaction, threatened Caesar with the sword when leaving the Senate so that their loyalty to the Republic would be manifest.

### Rewards voted for the Allobroges and Titus Volturius

*[50.1] Dum haec in senatu aguntur et dum legatis Allobrogum et T. Volturcio conprobato eorum indicio praemia decernuntur, liberti et pauci ex clientibus Lentuli divorsis itineribus opifices atque servitia in vicis ad eum eripiundum sollicitabant, partim exquirebant duces multitudinum, qui pretio rem publicam vexare soliti erant. [2] Cethegus autem per nuntios familiam atque libertos suos, lectos et exercitatos, orabat, ut grege facto cum telis ad sese inrumperent. [3] Consul ubi ea parari cognovit, dispositis praesidiis, ut res atque tempus monebat, convocato senatu refert, quid de iis fieri placeat, qui in custodiam traditi erant. Sed eos paulo ante frequens senatus iudicaverat contra rem publicam fecisse.*

[50.1] While these things were being done in the Senate, and while rewards, upon verifying their evidence, were being decided for the ambassadors of the Allobroges and Titus Volturcius, libertines and a few clients of Lentulus, to rescue him, were going about in turns inciting revolt in different ways by the craftsmen and the slaves. Some were looking for the leaders of the multitude, who usually prized harassing the Republic. [2] But Cethegus, on the other hand, through messengers, was beseeching his freedmen and slaves, elite and disciplined men, in a bold maneuver, as a crowd, to act with arms to break through to him. [3] The Consul, when he learned these things, prepared; arranging a garrison as the affair and time instructed, called together the Senate, and again asked

about what would be acceptable to do with those who had been taken into custody, since a little while ago before the Senate as a crowd declared them to be acting against the Republic.

Cicero's *Oratio In Catilinam IV*, argumentum ad senatum

*I. video, patres conscripti, in me omnium vestrum ora atque oculos esse conversos, video vos non solum de vestro ac rei publicae verum etiam, si id depulsum sit, de meo periculo esse sollicitos. est mihi iucunda in malis et grata in dolore vestra erga me voluntas, sed eam per deos immortalis! deponite atque obliti salutis meae de vobis ac de vestris liberis cogitate. mihi si haec condicio consulatus data est ut omnis acerbitates, omnis dolores cruciatusque perferrem, feram+ non solum fortiter verum etiam libenter, dum modo meis laboribus vobis populoque Romano dignitas salusque pariat. [2] ego sum ille consul, patres conscripti, cui non forum in quo omnis aequitas continetur, non campus consularibus auspiciis consecratus, non curia, summum auxilium omnium gentium, non domus, commune perfugium, non lectus ad quietem datus, non denique haec sedes honoris<sup>1</sup> umquam vacua mortis periculo atque insidiis fuit. ego multa tacui, multa pertuli, multa concessi, multa meo quodam dolore in vestro timore sanavi. nunc si hunc exitum consulatus mei di immortales esse voluerunt ut vos populumque Romanum ex caede miserrima<sup>2</sup>, coniuges liberosque vestros virginesque Vestalis ex acerbissima vexatione, templa atque delubra, hanc pulcherrimam patriam omnium nostrum ex foedissima flamma, totam Italiam ex bello et vastitate eriperem, quaecumque mihi uni proponetur<sup>3</sup> fortuna subeat. etenim si P. Lentulus suum nomen inductus a vatibus fatale ad*



*perniciem rei publicae fore putavit, cur ego non laeter meum consulatum ad salutem populi Romani prope fatalem exstitisse?*

*II.[3] qua re, patres conscripti, consulite vobis, prospicite patriae+, conservate vos+, coniuges, liberos fortunasque vestras, populi Romani nomen salutemque defendite; mihi parcere ac de me cogitare desinite. nam primum debeo sperare omnis deos qui huic urbi praesident pro eo mihi ac mereor relatores esse gratiam; deinde, si quid obtigerit, aequo animo paratoque moriar. nam neque turpis<sup>1</sup> mors forti viro potest accidere neque immatura consulari nec misera sapienti<sup>2</sup>. nec tamen ego sum ille ferreus qui fratris carissimi atque amantissimi praesentis maerore non movear horumque omnium lacrimis a quibus me circumsessum videtis. neque meam mentem non domum saepe revocat exanimata uxor et abiecta metu filia et parvulus filius, quem mihi videtur amplecti res publica tamquam obsidem consulatus mei, neque ille qui exspectans huius exitum diei stat in conspectu meo gener. moveor his rebus omnibus, sed in eam partem uti<sup>3</sup> salvi sint vobiscum omnes, etiam si me vis aliqua oppresserit, potius quam et<sup>4</sup> illi et nos una rei publicae peste pereamus. qua re, [4] patres conscripti, incumbite ad salutem rei publicae, circumspicite omnis procellas quae impendent nisi providetis. non Ti. Gracchus quod iterum tribunus plebis fieri voluit, non C. Gracchus quod agrarios concitare conatus est<sup>5</sup>, non L. Saturninus quod C. Memmium occidit, in discrimen aliquod atque in vestrae severitatis iudicium adducitur: tenentur ei qui ad urbis incendium, ad vestram omnium caedem, ad Catilinam accipiendum Romae restiterunt, tenentur litterae, signa, manus, denique unius cuiusque confessio: sollicitantur Allobroges, servitia excitantur, Catilina arcessitur, id est<sup>6</sup> initum consilium ut interfectis omnibus nemo ne ad*

*deplorandum quidem populi Romani nomen atque ad lamentandam tanti imperi calamitatem relinquatur.*

*III.[5] haec omnia indices detulerunt, rei confessi sunt, vos multis iam iudiciis iudicavistis, primum quod mihi gratias egistis singularibus verbis et mea virtute atque diligentia perditorum hominum coniurationem patefactam esse decrevistis, deinde quod P. Lentulum se abdicare<sup>1</sup> praetura coegistis; tum quod eum et ceteros de quibus iudicastis in custodiam dandos censuistis, maximeque quod meo nomine supplicationem decrevistis, qui honos togato habitus ante me est nemini; postremo hesterno die praemia legatis Allobrogum Titoque Volturcio dedistis amplissima. quae sunt omnia eius modi ut ei<sup>2</sup> qui in custodiam nominatim dati sunt sine ulla dubitatione a vobis damnati esse videantur.*

*[6] sed ego institui referre ad vos, patres conscripti, tamquam integrum<sup>3</sup>, et de facto quid iudicetis et de poena quid censeatis. illa praedicam quae sunt consulis. ego magnum in re publica versari furorem et nova quaedam misceri et concitari mala iam pridem videbam, sed hanc tantam, tam exitiosam haberi coniurationem a civibus numquam putavi. nunc quicquid est, quocumque vestrae mentes inclinant atque sententiae, statuendum vobis ante noctem est. quantum facinus ad vos delatum sit videtis. huic si paucos putatis adfinis esse, vehementer erratis. Latius opinione disseminatum est hoc malum; manavit non solum per Italiam verum etiam transcendit Alpibus et obscure serpens multas iam provincias occupavit. id opprimi sustentando et<sup>4</sup> prolatando nullo pacto potest; quacumque ratione placet celeriter vobis vindicandum est.*

IV.[7] video duas adhuc esse sententias, unam D. Silani qui censet eos qui haec delere conati sunt morte esse multandos, alteram C. Caesaris qui mortis poenam removet, ceterorum suppliciorum omnis acerbitates amplectitur. Vterque et pro sua dignitate et pro rerum magnitudine in summa severitate versatur. alter eos qui nos omnis, qui populum Romanum vita privare conati sunt, qui delere imperium, qui populi Romani nomen extinguere, punctum temporis frui vita et hoc communi spiritu non putat oportere atque hoc genus poenae saepe in improbos civis in hac re publica esse usurpatum recordatur. alter intellegit mortem a<sup>3</sup> dis immortalibus non esse supplici causa constitutam, sed aut necessitatem naturae aut laborum ac miseriarum quietem<sup>4</sup>. itaque eam sapientes numquam inviti, fortes saepe etiam libenter oppetiverunt<sup>5</sup>. vincula<sup>+</sup> vero et ea sempiterna<sup>+</sup> certe ad singularem poenam nefarii sceleris inventa sunt. municipiis dispertiri iubet. habere videtur ista res iniquitatem, si imperare velis, difficultatem, si rogare. [8] decernatur tamen, si placet. ego enim suscipiam et, ut spero, reperiam qui id quod salutis omnium causa statueritis non putent<sup>6</sup> esse suae dignitatis recusare. adiungit gravem poenam municipiis<sup>7</sup>, si quis eorum vincula ruperit; horribilis custodias circumdat et dignas<sup>8</sup> scelere hominum perditorum; sancit ne quis eorum poenam quos condemnat aut per senatum aut per populum levare possit<sup>9</sup>; eripit etiam spem quae sola hominem in miseriis consolari solet. bona praeterea publicari iubet; vitam solam relinquit nefariis hominibus: quam si eripuisset, multas uno dolore animi atque corporis<sup>10</sup> et omnis scelerum poenas ademisset. itaque ut aliqua in vita formido improbis esset proposita<sup>11</sup>, apud inferos eius modi quaedam illi antiqui supplicia impiis

*constituta esse voluerunt, quod videlicet intellegebant his remotis non esse mortem ipsam pertimescendam.*

*V.[9] nunc, patres conscripti, ego mea video quid intersit. si eritis secuti sententiam C. Caesaris, quoniam hanc is in re publica<sup>1</sup> viam quae popularis habetur secutus est, fortasse minus erunt hoc auctore et cognitore huiusce sententiae mihi populares impetus pertimescendi; sin illam alteram, nescio an amplius mihi negoti contrahatur. sed tamen meorum periculorum rationes utilitas rei publicae vincat<sup>2</sup>. habemus enim a Caesare, sicut ipsius dignitas et maiorum eius amplitudo postulabat, sententiam tamquam obsidem perpetuae in rem publicam voluntatis. intellectum est quid interesset inter levitatem contionatorum et animum vere popularem saluti populi consulentem. [10] video de istis qui se popularis haberi volunt abesse non neminem, ne de capite videlicet civium Romanorum sententiam ferat. is et<sup>3</sup> nudius tertius in custodiam civis Romanos dedit et supplicationem mihi decrevit et indices hesterni die maximis praemiis adfecit. iam hoc nemini dubium est qui reo custodiam, quaesitori<sup>4</sup> gratulationem, indici praemium decrevit<sup>5</sup>, quid de tota re et causa iudicavit. at vero C. Caesar intellegit legem Semproniam esse de civibus Romanis constitutam; qui autem rei publicae sit hostis eum civem esse nullo modo posse: denique ipsum latorem Semproniae legis iussu<sup>6</sup> populi poenas rei publicae dependisse. idem ipsum Lentulum<sup>7</sup>, largitorem et prodigum, non putat, cum de pernicie populi Romani, exitio huius urbis tam acerbe, tam crudeliter cogitarit, etiam appellari posse popularem. itaque homo mitissimus atque lenissimus non dubitat P. Lentulum aeternis tenebris vinculisque mandare et sancit in posterum ne quis huius supplicio levando se<sup>8</sup> iactare et in pernicie populi Romani posthac popularis esse*

*possit. adiungit etiam publicationem bonorum, ut omnis animi cruciatus et corporis etiam egestas ac mendicitas consequatur.*

*VI.[11] quam ob rem, sive hoc statueritis, dederitis mihi comitem ad contionem populo carum atque iucundum, sive Silani sententiam sequi malueritis, facile me atque vos<sup>1</sup> crudelitatis vituperatione populus Romanus<sup>2 3</sup>, atque obtinebo eam multo leniorem fuisse. quamquam, patres conscripti, quae potest esse in tanti sceleris immanitate puniendae crudelitas? ego enim de meo sensu iudico. nam ita mihi salva re publica vobiscum perfrui liceat<sup>+</sup> ut ego, quod in hac causa vehementior sum, non atrocitate animi moveor<sup>4</sup> -- quis enim est me mitior? -- sed singulari quadam humanitate et misericordia. videor enim mihi videre hanc urbem, lucem orbis terrarum atque arcem omnium gentium, subito uno incendio concidentem. cerno animo sepulta in patria<sup>5</sup> miseros atque insepultos acervos civium, versatur mihi ante oculos aspectus Cethegi et furor in vestra caede bacchantis. [12] Cum vero<sup>+</sup> mihi proposui regnantem Lentulum, sicut ipse se<sup>6</sup> ex fati sperasse confessus est, purpuratum esse huic<sup>7</sup> Gabinium, cum exercitu venisse Catilinam, tum lamentationem matrum familias, tum fugam virginum atque puerorum ac vexationem<sup>8</sup> virginum Vestalium perhorresco, et, quia mihi vehementer haec videntur misera atque miseranda, idcirco in eos qui ea perficere voluerunt me severum vehementemque praebebo<sup>9</sup>. etenim quaero, si quis pater familias, liberis suis a servo interfectis, uxore occisa, incensa domo, supplicium de servis<sup>10</sup> quam<sup>11</sup> acerbissimum sumpserit, utrum is clemens ac misericors an inhumanissimus et crudelissimus esse videatur? mihi vero importunus ac ferreus qui non dolore<sup>12</sup> et cruciatu nocentis suum dolorem cruciatumque<sup>13</sup> lenierit. sic nos in his hominibus qui nos, qui coniuges, qui liberos nostros trucidare*

*voluerunt, qui singulas unius cuiusque nostrum domos et hoc universum rei publicae domicilium delere conati sunt, qui id egerunt ut gentem Allobrogum in vestigiis huius urbis atque in cinere deflagrati imperi conlocarent, si vehementissimi fuerimus, misericordes habebimur; sin remissiores esse voluerimus, summae<sup>14</sup> nobis crudelitatis in patriae civiumque pernicie fama subeunda est. [13] Nisi<sup>+</sup> vero cuipiam L. Caesar<sup>+</sup>, vir fortissimus et amantissimus rei publicae, crudelior<sup>+</sup> nudius tertius visus<sup>+</sup> est, cum sororis suae, feminae lectissimae<sup>15</sup>, virum praesentem et audientem vita privandum esse dixit, cum avum suum<sup>16</sup> iussu consulis interfectum filiumque eius impuberem legatum a patre missum in carcere necatum<sup>17</sup> esse dixit. quorum quod simile factum<sup>+</sup>, quod initum delendae rei publicae consilium? largitionis voluntas tum in re publica versata est et partium quaedam contentio. atque illo<sup>18</sup> tempore huius avus Lentuli, vir clarissimus<sup>19</sup>, armatus Gracchum est persecutus. ille etiam grave tum volnus accepit, ne quid de summa rei publicae<sup>20</sup> minueretur<sup>21</sup>; hic ad evertenda fundamenta rei publicae<sup>22</sup> Gallos arcessit, servitia concitat, Catilinam vocat, attribuit nos trucidandos Cethego et ceteros civis interficiendos Gabinio, urbem inflammandam Cassio<sup>23</sup>, totam Italiam vastandam diripiendamque Catilinae. vereamini minus<sup>24</sup> censeo ne in hoc scelere tam immani ac nefando aliquid severius<sup>25</sup> statuisse videamini: multo magis est verendum ne remissione poenae crudeles in patriam quam ne severitate animadversionis nimis vehementes in acerbissimos hostis fuisse videamur.*

*VII.[14] sed ea quae exaudio, patres conscripti, dissimulare non possum. iaciuntur enim voces quae perveniunt ad auris meas eorum qui vereri videntur utl habeam satis praesidi ad ea quae vos statueritis hodierno die transigenda.*

omnia et provisae et parata et constituta sunt<sup>2</sup>, patres conscripti, cum mea summa cura atque diligentia tum multo etiam maiore populi Romani ad summum imperium retinendum et ad communis fortunas conservandas voluntate. omnes adsunt omnium ordinum homines, <sup>3</sup>, > omnium denique<sup>4</sup> aetatum; plenum est forum, plena templa circum forum, pleni omnes aditus huius templi ac loci<sup>5</sup>. causa est enim post urbem conditam haec inventa sola in qua omnes sentirent<sup>6</sup> unum atque idem praeter eos qui, cum sibi viderent esse pereundum, cum omnibus potius quam soli perire voluerunt. [15] hosce ego homines excipio et secerno libenter, neque in improborum civium sed in acerbissimorum hostium numero habendos puto. ceteri vero, di immortales! qua frequentia, quo studio+, qua virtute ad communem salutem dignitatemque consentiunt+! quid ego hic equites Romanos commemorem? qui vobis ita summam ordinis consilique concedunt ut vobiscum de amore rei publicae certent; quos ex multorum annorum dissensione huius ordinis ad societatem concordiamque revocatos hodiernus dies vobiscum atque haec causa coniungit. quam si coniunctionem in consulatu confirmatam meo perpetuam in re publica tenuerimus, confirmo vobis nullum posthac malum civile ac domesticum ad ullam rei publicae partem esse venturum. Pari studio defendendae rei publicae convenisse video tribunos aerarios, fortissimos viros; scribas item universos quos, cum casu hic dies ad aerarium frequentasset, video ab expectatione sortis ad salutem communem esse conversos. [16] omnis ingenuorum adest multitudo, etiam tenuissimorum. quis est enim cui non haec templa, aspectus urbis, possessio libertatis, lux denique haec ipsa et<sup>7</sup> commune patriae solum cum<sup>8</sup> sit carum tum vero dulce atque iucundum?

*VIII. operae pretium est, patres conscripti, libertinorum hominum studia cognoscere qui, sua virtute fortunam huius civitatis consecuti, vere<sup>1</sup> hanc suam patriam esse<sup>2</sup> iudicant quam quidam<sup>3</sup> hic nati, et summo nati loco<sup>4</sup>, non patriam suam sed urbem hostium esse iudicaverunt. sed quid ego hosce ordines atque homines<sup>5</sup> commemoro quos privatae fortunae, quos communis res publica, quos denique libertas ea quae dulcissima est ad salutem patriae defendendam excitavit? servus est nemo, qui modo<sup>6</sup> tolerabili condicione sit servitutis, qui non audaciam civium perhorrescat, qui non haec stare cupiat, qui non quantum<sup>7</sup> audet<sup>8</sup> et quantum<sup>9</sup> potest conferat ad salutem<sup>10</sup> voluntatis. [17] qua re si quem vestrum forte commovet hoc quod auditum est, lenonem quendam Lentuli concursare circum tabernas, pretio sperare sollicitari posse animos egentium atque imperitorum, est id quidem coeptum atque temptatum, sed nulli sunt inventi tam aut fortuna miseri aut voluntate perditum qui non illum ipsum sellae atque operis et quaestus cotidiani locum, qui non cubile ac lectulum suum<sup>11</sup>, qui denique non cursum hunc otiosum vitae suae salvum esse velint. multo vero maxima pars eorum qui in tabernis sunt, immo<sup>12</sup> vero -- id enim potius est dicendum -- genus hoc universum amantissimum est otii. etenim omne instrumentum, omnis opera atque quaestus frequentia civium sustentatur, aliter otio; quorum si quaestus oclusis tabernis minui solet, quid tandem incensis futurum fuit? [18] quae cum ita sint, patres conscripti, vobis populi Romani praesidia non desunt: vos ne populo Romano deesse videamini providete.*

*IX. habetis consulem ex plurimis periculis et insidiis atque ex media morte non ad vitam suam sed ad salutem vestram reservatum. omnes ordines ad conservandam rem publicam mente, voluntate<sup>1</sup>, voce consentiunt. obsessa facibus et telis impiae*



*coniurationis vobis supplex manus tendit patria communis, vobis se, vobis vitam omnium civium, vobis arcem et Capitolium, vobis aras Penatium, vobis illum ignem Vestae sempiternum, vobis omnium deorum templa atque delubra, vobis muros atque urbis tecta commendat. praeterea de vestra vita, de coniugum vestrarum atque liberorum anima, de fortunis omnium<sup>2</sup>, de sedibus, de focus vestris hodierno die vobis iudicandum est. [19] habetis ducem memorem vestri, oblitum sui<sup>++</sup>, quae non semper facultas datur; habetis omnes ordines, omnes homines, universum populum Romanum, id quod in civili causa hodierno die primum videmus, unum atque idem sentientem. cogitate quantis laboribus fundatum imperium, quanta virtute stabilitam libertatem, quanta deorum benignitate auctas exaggeratasque fortunas una nox paene<sup>3</sup> deleverit. id ne umquam posthac non modo non<sup>4</sup> confici sed ne cogitari quidem possit a civibus hodierno die providendum est<sup>5</sup>. atque haec, non ut vos qui mihi studio paene praecurreris excitarem, locutus sum, sed ut mea vox quae debet esse in re publica princeps officio functa consulari videretur.*

*X.[20] nunc ante quam ad sententiam redeo, de me pauca dicam. ego, quanta manus est coniuratorum, quam videtis esse permagnam, tantam me inimicorum multitudinem suscepisse video; sed eam turpem iudico<sup>1</sup> et infirmam<sup>2</sup> et abiectam. quod si aliquando alicuius furore et scelere concitata manus ista plus valuerit quam vestra ac rei publicae dignitas, me tamen meorum factorum atque consiliorum numquam, patres conscripti, paenitebit. etenim mors, quam illi<sup>3</sup> fortasse minitantur, omnibus est parata: vitae tantam laudem quanta vos me vestris decretis honestastis nemo est adsecutus; ceteris enim semper bene gesta<sup>4</sup>, mihi uni conservata re publica<sup>5</sup> gratulationem decrevistis. [21] sit Scipio*

*clarus+ ille cuius consilio atque virtute Hannibal in Africam redire atque Italia<sup>6</sup> decedere coactus est, ornetur alter eximia laude Africanus qui duas urbis huic imperio infestissimas Karthaginem Numantiamque delevit, habeatur vir egregius Paulus+ ille cuius currum rex potentissimus quondam et nobilissimus Perses honestavit, sit aeterna gloria Marius qui bis Italiam obsidione et metu servitutis liberavit, anteponatur omnibus Pompeius cuius res gestae atque virtutes isdem quibus solis cursus regionibus ac terminis continentur: erit profecto inter horum laudes aliquid loci nostrae gloriae, nisi forte maius est patefacere nobis provincias quo exire possimus quam curare ut etiam illi qui absunt habeant quo victores revertantur. [22] quamquam est uno loco condicio melior externae victoriae quam domesticae, quod hostes alienigenae aut oppressi serviunt aut recepti<sup>7</sup> beneficio se obligatos putant, qui autem ex numero civium dementia aliqua depravati hostes patriae semel esse coeperunt, eos, cum a pernicie rei publicae reppuleris, nec vi coercere nec beneficio placare possis. qua re mihi cum perditis civibus aeternum bellum susceptum esse video. id ego vestro bonorumque omnium auxilio memoriaque tantorum periculorum, quae non modo in hoc populo qui servatus est sed in<sup>8</sup> omnium gentium sermonibus ac mentibus semper haerebit, a me atque a meis facile propulsari posse confido. neque ulla profecto tanta vis reperietur quae coniunctionem<sup>9</sup> vestram equitumque Romanorum et tantam conspirationem bonorum omnium confringere et labefactare possit.*

*XI.[23] quae cum ita sint, pro imperio, pro exercitu, pro provincia quam neglexi, pro triumpho ceterisque laudis insignibus quae sunt a me propter urbis vestraeque salutis custodiam repudiata, pro clientelis hospitiisque<sup>1</sup>*

*provincialibus quae tamen urbanis opibus non minore labore tueor quam comparo, pro his igitur omnibus rebus, pro meis in vos singularibus studiis proque hac quam perspicitis<sup>2</sup> ad conservandam rem publicam diligentia nihil a vobis nisi huius temporis totiusque mei consulatus memoriam postulo: quae dum erit in vestris fixa mentibus, tutissimo me muro saeptum esse arbitrabor. quod si meam spem vis improborum fefellerit atque superaverit, commendo vobis parvum meum filium, cui profecto satis erit praesidi non solum ad salutem verum etiam ad dignitatem, si eius qui haec omnia suo solius<sup>3</sup> periculo conservavit illum filium esse<sup>4</sup> memineritis. quapropter de summa salute vestra populique Romani, [24] de vestris coniugibus ac liberis, de aris ac focis, de fanis atque templis, de totius urbis tectis ac sedibus, de imperio ac libertate, de salute Italiae, de universa re publica decernite diligenter, ut instituistis, ac fortiter. habetis eum consulem<sup>+</sup> qui et parere vestris decretis non dubitet<sup>+</sup> et ea quae statueritis, quoad vivet, defendere et per se ipsum praestare possit.*

### Opinion of Decimus Silanus

*[50.4] Tum D. Iunius Silanus primus sententiam rogatus, quod eo tempore consul designatus erat, de iis, qui in custodiis tenebantur, et praeterea de L. Cassio, P. Furio, P. Umbreno, Q. Annio, si deprehensi forent, supplicium sumundum decreverat; isque postea permotus oratione C. Caesaris pedibus in sententiam Ti. Neronis iturum se dixit, qui de ea re praesidiis abductis referendum censuerat. [5] Sed Caesar, ubi ad eum ventum est, rogatus sententiam a consule huiusce modi verba locutus est:*

[50.4] Then Decimus Junius Silanus, asked first for an opinion, for he was Consul elect at the time, about those who were in custody held ;<sup>88</sup> about Lucius Cassius, and besides him, Publius Furius, Publius Umbrenus, and Titus Annius if they should be caught. He was resolute for seizing them for death, later on, deeply moved by the oration of Gaius Caesar, he said, when it came to voting with the feet<sup>89</sup> he would be going to the opinion of Tiberius Nero, because he reckoned about the affair for increasing the guards and reopening the case. [5] But Caesar, when it came to him, asked his opinion by the Consul, spoke words of such a kind.

### Speech of Julius Caesar, Argumentum ad Senatum

[51.1] *“Omnis homines, patres conscripti, qui de rebus dubiis consultant, ab odio, amicitia, ira atque misericordia vacuos esse decet. [2] Haud facile animus verum providet, ubi illa officiunt, neque quisquam omnium lubidini simul et usui paruit. [3] Ubi intenderis ingenium, valet; si libido possidet, ea dominatur, animus nihil valet. [4] Magna mihi copia est memorandi, patres conscripti, quae reges atque populi ira aut misericordia impulsus male consuluerint. Sed ea malo dicere, quae maiores nostri contra lubidinem animi sui recte atque ordine fecere. [5] Bello Macedonico, quod cum rege Perse gessimus, Rhodiorum civitas magna atque magnifica, quae populi Romani opibus creverat, infida et advorsa nobis fuit. Sed postquam bello confecto de Rhodiis consultum est, maiores nostri, ne quis divitiarum magis quam iniuriae causa bellum inceptum diceret, impunitos eos dimiserunt. [6] Item bellis Punicis omnibus, cum saepe Carthaginenses et in pace et per inducias multa nefaria facinora fecissent, numquam ipsi*

<sup>88</sup> This is an example of *Anastrophe*.

<sup>89</sup> After debates such as these, members of the Roman Senate moved to one side of the chamber or to the other to be counted. This was called *pedibus ire in sententiam illius*, ‘to go by foot to the opinion of him.’ Cf. Rolf 88 n.1.

*per occasionem talia fecere: magis, quid se dignum foret, quam quid in illos iure fieri posset, quaerebant. [7] Hoc item vobis providendum est, patres conscripti, ne plus apud vos valeat P. Lentuli et ceterorum scelus quam vostra dignitas neu magis irae vestrae quam famae consulatis. [8] Nam si digna poena pro factis eorum reperitur, novum consilium adprobo; sin magnitudo sceleris omnium ingenia exsuperat, his utendum censeo, quae legibus comparata sunt. [9] Plerique eorum, qui ante me sententias dixerunt, conposite atque magnifice casum rei publicae miserati sunt. Quae belli saevitia esset, quae victis acciderent, enumerare: rapti virgines, pueros, divelli liberos a parentum complexu, matres familiarum pati, quae victoribus conlubuissent, fana atque domos spoliari, caedem, incendia fieri, postremo armis, cadaveribus, cruore atque luctu omnia conpleri. [10] Sed per deos immortalis, quo illa oratio pertinuit? An uti vos infestos coniurationi faceret? Scilicet, quem res tanta et tam atrox non permovit, eum oratio accendet. [11] Non ita est neque cuiquam mortalium iniuriae suae parvae videntur; multi eas gravius aequo habuere. [12] Sed alia aliis licentia est, patres conscripti. Qui demissi in obscuro vitam habent, si quid iracundia deliquere, pauci sciunt: fama atque fortuna eorum pares sunt; qui magno imperio, praediti in excelso aetatem agunt, eorum facta cuncti mortales novere. [13] Ita in maxuma fortuna minuma licentia est; [14] neque studere neque odisse, sed minime irasci decet; quae apud alios iracundia dicitur, ea in imperio superbia atque crudelitas appellatur. [15] Equidem ego sic existumo, patres conscripti, omnis cruciatus minores quam facinora illorum esse. Sed plerique mortales postremo meminere et in hominibus impiis sceleris eorum obliti de poena disserunt, si ea paulo severior fuit. [16] D. Silanum, virum fortem atque strenuum, certo scio, quae dixerit, studio rei publicae dixisse neque illum in tanta re gratiam aut inimicitias exercere: eos mores eamque modestiam viri cognovi. [17] Verum*

*sententia eius mihi non crudelis quid enim in talis homines crudele fieri potest?— sed aliena a re publica nostra videtur. [18] Nam profecto aut metus aut iniuria te subegit, Silane, consulem designatum genus poenae novum decernere. [19] De timore supervacaneum est disserere, cum praesertim diligentia clarissimi viri consulis tanta praesidia sint in armis. [20] De poena possum equidem dicere, id quod res habet, in luctu atque miseriis mortem aerumnarum requiem, non cruciatum esse; eam cuncta mortalium mala dissolvere; ultra neque curae neque gaudio locum esse. [21] Sed, per deos immortalis, quam ob rem in sententiam non addidisti, uti prius verberibus in eos animadvorteretur? [22] An quia lex Porcia vetat? At aliae leges item condemnatis civibus non animam eripi, sed exsilium permitti iubent. [23] An quia gravius est verberari quam necari? Quid autem acerbum aut nimis grave est in homines tanti facinoris convictos? [24] Sin, quia levius est, qui convenit in minore negotio legem timere, cum eam in maiore neglexeris? [25] At enim quis reprehendet, quod in parricidas rei publicae decretum erit? Tempus, dies, fortuna, cuius lubido gentibus moderatur. [26] Illis merito accidet, quicquid evenerit; ceterum vos patres conscripti, quid in alios statuatis, considerate! [27] Omnia mala exempla ex rebus bonis orta sunt. Sed ubi imperium ad ignaros eius aut minus bonos pervenit, novum illud exemplum ab dignis et idoneis ad indignos et non idoneos transfertur. [28] Lacedaemonii devictis Atheniensibus triginta viros inposuere, qui rem publicam eorum tractarent. [29] Ii primo coepere pessimum quemque et omnibus invisum indemnatum necare: ea populus laetari et merito dicere fieri. [30] Post, ubi paulatim licentia crevit, iuxta bonos et malos lubricinose interficere, ceteros metu terrere: [31] ita civitas servitute oppressa stultae laetitiae gravis poenas dedit. [32] Nostra memoria victor Sulla cum Damasippum et alios eius modi, qui malo rei publicae creverant, iugulari iussit, quis non factum eius*

laudabat? Homines scelestos et factiosos, qui seditionibus rem publicam exagitaverant, merito necatos aiebant. [33] Sed ea res magnae initium cladis fuit. Nam uti quisque domum aut villam, postremo vas aut vestimentum alicuius concupiverat, dabat operam, ut is in proscriptorum numero esset. [34] Ita illi, quibus Damasippi mors laetitiae fuerat, paulo post ipsi trahebantur neque prius finis iugulandi fuit, quam Sulla omnis suos divitiis explevit. [35] Atque ego haec non in M. Tullio neque his temporibus vereor; sed in magna civitate multa et varia ingenia sunt. [36] Potest alio tempore, alio consule, cui item exercitus in manu sit, falsum aliquid pro vero credi. Ubi hoc exemplo per senatus decretum consul gladium eduxerit, quis illi finem statuet aut quis moderabitur? [37] Maiores nostri, patres conscripti, neque consili neque audaciae umquam eguere; neque illis superbia obstat, quo minus aliena instituta, si modo proba erant, imitarentur. [38] Arma atque tela militaria ab Samnitibus, insignia magistratuum ab Tuscis pleraque sumpserunt. Postremo, quod ubique apud socios aut hostis idoneum videbatur, cum summo studio domi exsequebantur: imitari quam invidere bonis malebant. [39] Sed eodem illo tempore Graeciae morem imitati verberibus animadvortebant in civis, de condemnatis summum supplicium sumebant. [40] Postquam res publica adolevit et multitudine civium factiones valere, circumveniri innocentes, alia huiusce modi fieri coepere, tum lex Porcia aliaeque leges paratae sunt, quibus legibus exsilium damnatis permissum est. [41] Hanc ego causam, patres conscripti, quo minus novum consilium capiamus, in primis magnam puto. [42] Profecto virtus atque sapientia maior illis fuit, qui ex parvis opibus tantum imperium fecere, quam in nobis, qui ea bene parta vix retinemus. [43] Placet igitur eos dimitti et augeri exercitum Catilinae? Minime. Sed ita censeo: publicandas eorum pecunias, ipsos in vinculis habendos per municipia, quae maxime opibus valent; neu quis de iis postea ad senatum referat neve cum populo agat;

*qui aliter fecerit, senatum existumare eum contra rem publicam et salutem omnium facturum.”*

[51.1] “It is proper for all men, fathers of the Senate, who reflect on doubtful issues to be free from hatred and friendship, anger and pity. [2] when obstructed by these things, the mind can by no means easily see the truth coming, nor has anyone gathered everything at the same time, pleasure and usefulness. [3] When you have aimed with character, it prevails; if held by lust, that is lord, the mind is useless. [4] To me there is plenty of things worthy of mention, fathers of the Senate, whereby kings and peoples impelled by wrath or pity may have followed bad advice, but I prefer to speak about those things which our forefathers, contrary to passion of the mind, acted just and orderly. [5] In the Macedonian war, which we fought with king Perse, and the great and glorious citizens of the Rhodians, who were created by the wealth of the Roman people, was unfaithful and hostile. But after the war was finished, the question of the Rhodians was deliberated, our forefathers dismissed them unpunished, so that no one would have said on account of greatness of wealth, rather than injury was the reason for beginning the war. [6] Likewise in all the Punic wars, when the Carthaginians, both in peace and in truces, did many nefarious deeds, never, at the time of opportunity, themselves did such things; because they desired great things, which would dignify themselves, rather than because against them by justice they would be able. [7] This to you, Fathers of the Senate is to be discerned, the wickedness of Publius Lentulus and the others should not be strong enough, have more influence over you than dignity; that you consider not your anger more than your reputation. [8] For if worthy punishment is found according to their deeds, I approve a new decision, if, on the otherhand the greatness of the crimes



exceeds anything imaginable, I propose using that which was established by the laws. [9] Most of those who before me expressed well arranged and splendid opinions pitying the downfall of the Republic, were pleased to enumerate those things which would be the barbarity of war; enumerating the maidens and boys raped, children torn from their parents embrace, matrons suffering whatever by the victors, temples and houses plundered, murder and arson arising, and finally, arms and corpses, gore and grief filling everything. [10] But to what in fact did these speeches apply to, for the sake of the immortal gods? Or is it that it would make you disturbed by the conspiracy, but of course who is not moved deeply by such an affair, such savageness, that he would not be inflamed by a speech? [11] Is it not thus, not to any mortal man do his wrongs appear small, many have held them weighty. [12] But freedom is to one person one thing, to others it is another, for he who is poor occupies life in obscurity if any quick tempered person committed a crime, few know; their reputation and fortune are equal; those who, in high station, endowed with great power, their deeds are known to all men. [13] Thus in the greatest fortune is the least freedom. [14] Neither partial nor hated, but by no means is it fitting to get angry, what among others is called anger, would be called haughtiness and cruelty in those who rule. [15] Thus, I truly think, fathers of the Senate, the crimes of those men to be not unworthy of tortures of every kind, but mortal men, for the most part, remember the last thing; and among disloyal men forgetting their crimes when discussing punishment, if it was a little severe. [16] I know for certain, Decimus Silanus, a brave and vigorous man, out of devotion for the Republic, said what he did say, that he exercised neither favor nor enmity in such a matter; I know the morals and propriety of that man. [17] Indeed the opinion of those men seems to me not cruel, for

what could possibly be cruel to such man? But appears foreign to our Republic. [18] For, really, either fear or insult forced you, Silanus, Consul elect, to put forward a novel punishment. [19] The argument from fear is superfluous, especially on account of the diligence of our most brilliant of men, from this Consul there ought to be sufficient guards under arms. [20] Indeed, with respect to the penalty, I can say, because that matter is being considered, in sorrow and misery, death is a relief from hardships, not a torture, for it frees him from mortal ills all together; more than that, there is room neither for worry nor joy. [21] But by the immortal gods, wherefore to your opinion did you not add that they shall first be flogged? [22] Or is it because *lex Porcia* forbids, but in fact there are other laws besides; they who are judged to be condemned should not lose their lives, but are permitted exile. [23] Or is it because it is more painful to be flogged than to be killed? What, however, is harsh enough or severe enough for men convicted of such crimes? [24] But if it is lighter, what agreement is there to fear the law in a minor affair, when you ignore it in a major one? [25] But, will anyone find fault if indeed there shall be a decree against the traitors to the Republic? Time, seasons, Fortune, whose fancy controls nations. [26] Whatever happens to them is rightly deserved, still you Fathers of the Senate should consider what for others you may cause to stand for others. [27] All bad precedents have originated out of good cases, but when power passed to the ignorant, or to the less good man, that new precedent is passed from the worthy and fit to the unworthy and unfit. [28] The Spartans, in conquering the Athenians, imposed thirty men to control their republic. [29] These men, at first, began to kill unconvicted men and whoever was hated by everyone, at this the people rejoiced and it was rightly done. [30] Later on, when their license grew, little by little, they arbitrarily killed good men and bad

men alike, terrifying the others with apprehension. [31] In this way, the state reduced to slavery, payed for follish rejoicing payed great penalties. [32] In our own memory, Sulla the conqueror, when Damassippus, and other such men, who prospered in public affairs, ordered their throats cut; who was not praisin gthis deed? Satirized as wicked criminals those men were, who, on account on a sedition against the Republic, were said to merit death. [33] But that affair was the beginning of a great disaster, for when anyone coveted a house or a villa, or at the very least even someone's dish or garment, he went to work in such a way so as that man would be numbered among the proscribed. [34] Thus those to whom the death of Damasippus was joyous, a little while later were themselves handed over; no sooner was he done with the killing than Sulla satisfied his followers with riches of all kinds. [35] And though I do not dear this under Marcus Tullius, nor in these times, but in a great state there are many and diverse characters. [36] It is possible at another time, under another Consul, to whom, likewise, may have an army at hand, something false may be taken for the truth. When a Consul with this as an example, according to the Senates decree, drew the sword, by whom for him shall a boundry be set, by whom shall he be restrained? [37] Our forefathers, patres conscripti, were, neither in wisdom nor in courage, ever wanting; nor by any means was pride standing in the way of their imitating foreign customs if that way was acceptable. [38] They assumed the defensive and offensive weapons from the Samnites, from the Etruscans, for the most part, the insignia of the magistrates. Finally, whatever, in so far as it appeared to be proper, among allies and enemies, at home they would pursue with great eagerness, they preferred to imitate rather than to envy the good. [39] But at that same time, imitatin gthe customs of the Greeks, they used to punish the citizens with the scourge, and inflicted the

supreme punishment on the condemned. [40] Later on, the Republic grew up and, on account of the great number of people, factions prevailed over the citizens; innocent people were oppressed, and other such things began to be done, then they enacted *lex Porcia*, and other laws, by which those those condemned by the laws were permitted exile. [41] This I think, Fathers of the Senate, is in the first place a good reason we should not adopt a new policy. [42] For actually there was in those men greater virtue and wisdom, who made such a great empire from few resources, than there is in us who can hardly retain that which was well prepared. [43] Is it, however, satisfactory to send them away and augment Catiline's army? Certainly not. But thus I propose: confiscating their money, holding the very same, at the hands of the municipalities which, on account of resources, are the strongest, in prison; furthermore, with respect to this, neither may it be brought before the Senate, nor to the people, he who otherwise does shall be thought by the Senate to be working against the Republic and the welfare of everything."

### Speech of Cato Minor, Argumentum ad Senatum

[52.1] *Postquam Caesar dicundi finem fecit, ceteri verbo alius alii varie adsentiebantur. At M. Porcius Cato rogatus sententiam huiusce modi orationem habuit: [2] "Longe alia mihi mens est, patres conscripti, cum res atque pericula nostra considero et cum sententias nonnullorum<sup>90</sup> ipse mecum reputo. [3] Illi mihi disseruisse videntur de poena eorum, qui patriae, parentibus, aris atque focis suis bellum paravere; res autem monet cavere ab illis magis quam, quid in illos statuamus, consultare. [4] Nam cetera maleficia tum persequare, ubi facta sunt; hoc, nisi provideris, ne accidat, ubi evenit,*

---

<sup>90</sup> 'non nullorum' is an example of *Litotes*.

*frustra iudicia inploras: capta urbe nihil fit reliqui victis. [5] Sed, per deos immortalis, vos ego appello, qui semper domos, villas, signa, tabulas vestras pluris<sup>91</sup> quam rem publicam fecistis: si ista, cuiuscumque modi sunt, quae amplexamini, retinere, si voluptatibus vestris otium praebere vultis, expergiscimini aliquando et capessite rem publicam! [6] Non agitur de vectigalibus neque de sociorum iniuriis: libertas et anima nostra in dubio est. [7] Saepenumero, patres conscripti, multa verba in hoc ordine feci, saepe de luxuria atque avaritia nostrorum civium questus sum multosque mortalis ea causa advorsos habeo. [8] Qui mihi atque animo meo nullius umquam delicti gratiam fecissem, haud facile alterius lubidini male facta condonabam. [9] Sed ea tametsi vos parvi pendebatis, tamen res publica firma erat: opulentia negligentiam tolerabat. [10] Nunc vero non id agitur, bonisne an malis moribus vivamus, neque quantum aut quam magnificum imperium populi Romani sit, sed haec, cuiuscumque modi videntur, nostra an nobiscum una hostiam futura sint. [11] Hic mihi quisquam mansuetudinem et misericordiam nominat! Iam pridem equidem nos vera vocabula rerum amisimus: quia bona aliena largiri liberalitas, malarum rerum audacia fortitudo vocatur, eo res publica in extremo sita est. [12] Sint sane, quoniam ita se mores habent, liberales ex sociorum fortunis, sint misericordes in furibus aerari; ne illi sanguinem nostrum largiantur et, dum paucis sceleratis parcunt, bonos omnis perditum eant! [13] Bene et composite C. Caesar paulo ante in hoc ordine de vita et morte disseruit, credo falsa existumans ea, quae de inferis memorantur: divorso itinere malos a bonis loca taetra, inculta, foeda atque formidulosa habere. [14] Itaque censuit pecunias eorum publicandas, ipsos per municipia in custodiis habendos, videlicet timens, ne, si Romae sint, aut a popularibus coniurationis aut a multitudine conducta per vim eripiantur. [15] Quasi vero mali atque*

---

<sup>91</sup> This is *Asyndeton*.

*scelesti tantummodo in urbe et non per totam Italiam sint aut non sibi plus possit audacia, ubi ad defendendum opes minores sunt! [16] Quare vanum equidem hoc consilium est, si periculum ex illis metuit; si in tanto omnium metu solus non timet, eo magis refert me mihi atque vobis timere. [17] Quare, cum de P. Lentulo ceterisque statuetis, pro certo habetote vos simul de exercitu Catilinae et de omnibus coniuratis discernere! [18] Quanto vos attentius ea agetis, tanto illis animus infirmior erit; si paulum modo vos languere viderint, iam omnes feroces aderunt. [19] Nolite existumare maiores nostros armis rem publicam ex parva magnam fecisse! [20] Si ita esset, multo pulcherrumam eam nos haberemus; quippe sociorum atque civium, praeterea armorum atque equorum maior copia nobis quam illis est. [21] Sed alia fuere, quae illos magnos fecere, quae nobis nulla sunt: domi industria, foris iustum imperium, animus in consulendo liber, neque delicto neque lubrico obnoxius. [22] Pro his nos habemus luxuriam atque avaritiam, publice egestatem, privatim opulentiam. Laudamus divitias, sequimur inertiam. Inter bonos et malos discrimen nullum, omnia virtutis praemia ambitio possidet. [23] Neque mirum: ubi vos separatim sibi quisque consilium capit, ubi domi voluptatibus, hic pecuniae aut gratiae servitis, eo fit, ut impetus fiat in vacuam rem publicam. [24] Sed ego haec omitto. Coniuravere nobilissimi cives patriam incendere, Gallorum gentem infestissimam nomini Romano ad bellum arcessunt, dux hostium cum exercitu supra caput est. [25] Vos cunctamini etiam nunc et dubitatis, quid intra moenia deprentis hostibus faciatis? [26] Misereamini censeo deliquere homines adolescentuli per ambitionem atque etiam armatos dimittatis. [27] Ne ista vobis mansuetudo et misericordia, si illi arma ceperint, in miseriam convortat! [28] Scilicet res ipsa aspera est, sed vos non timetis eam. Immo vero maxime. Sed inertia et mollitia animi alius alium exspectantes cunctamini, videlicet dis immortalibus confisi, qui hanc*

*rem publicam saepe in maxumis periculis servavere. [29] Non votis neque suppliciis muliebribus auxilia deorum parantur: vigilando, agundo, bene consulundo prospere omnia cedunt. Ubi socordiae te atque ignaviae tradideris, nequiquam deos implores: irati infestique sunt. [30] Apud maiores nostros A. Manlius Torquatus bello Gallico filium suum, quod is contra imperium in hostem pugnaverit, necari iussit [31] atque ille egregius adulescens immoderatae fortitudinis morte poenas dedit: [32] vos de crudelissimis parricidis quid statuatis, cunctamini? Videlicet cetera vita eorum huic sceleri obstat. [33] Verum parcite dignitati Lentuli, si ipse pudicitiae, si famae suae, si dis aut hominibus umquam ullis pepercit! Ignoscite Cethegi adolescentiae, nisi iterum patriae bellum fecit! [34] Nam quid ego de Gabinio, Statilio, Caepario loquar? Quibus si quicquam umquam pensi fuisset, non ea consilia de re publica habuissent. [35] Postremo, patres conscripti, si mehercule peccato locus esset, facile paterer vos ipsa re corrigi, quoniam verba contemnitis. Sed undique circumventi sumus. Catilina cum exercitu faucibus urget, alii intra moenia atque in sinu urbis sunt hostes; neque parari neque consuli quicquam potest occulte : quo magis properandum est. [36] Quare ego ita censeo: Cum nefario consilio sceleratorum civium res publica in maxuma pericula venerit iique indicio T. Volturci et legatorum Allobrogum convicti confessique sint caedem, incendia aliaque se foeda atque crudelia facinora in civis patriamque paravisse, de confessis, sicuti de manifestis rerum capitalium, more maiorum supplicium sumendum.”*

[52.1] After Caesar was finished speaking, the others orally assented to the various different proposals, but Marcus Porcius Cato being asked for an opinion gave an oration of such a kind: [2] “My opinion is a long way off from the others, Fathers of the Senate, when I think about the matter and our peril, and when I reflect upon the opinions of some

who are even with me, [3] it seems to me they have argued about the punishment of those men who have prepared war against their fatherland, their parents, altars and hearths, but the matter advises us to guard against them more than deliberating what we are to inflict upon them. [4] For with other crimes, when they are done you may prosecute; this, unless you make ready for it not to happen, when it arrives in vain to justice you shall appeal; the city once seized, to the living remains nothing. [5] But, buy the gods immortal,<sup>92</sup> I call upon you who have always valued houses, villas, paintings, statues, and your many things, more than the Republic, if you wish to keep that to which you cling, whatever they are, if you wish to give yourselves over to the enjoyment of leisure, you should wake up at once and lay hold of the Republic. [6] It is not about taxes, nor about the insults of our allies, our life and liberty is doubtful. [7] Often I have spoken at great length, Fathers of the Senate, in this order, often I have complained about the extravagance, and greed of our citizens, and for that reason I have many adversaries. [8] I, who never granted to my self or soul any transgression, by no means can easily forgive other for crimes of passion. [9] But even if you considered this to be of little value, the Republic was, all the same, steadfast, enduring neglect by the rich. [10] Now, however, this is not to be discussed; whether or not we should live by good or bad customs, nor how great or to what extent the magnificence of the empire of the Roman people might be, but this, whether our things, together with our own selves, shall be our or a sacrifice.<sup>93</sup> [11] At this point, does anyone mention to me gentleness and pity? Indeed we let slip the true names for things long ago, it is because squandering the goods of others is called generosity, recklessness in wrong doing is called courage, that the Republic

---

<sup>92</sup> This is *Anastrophe*.

<sup>93</sup> *Hostiam* is a fem. acc. sing. signifying 'a victim, or a sacrifice.'



is in an extreme position. [12] Seeing that they the morals after this manner, they should certainly be liberal with the fortunes of our allies, they should be merciful to the thieves of the treasury, but they should not be lavish with our blood, and, while sparing a few criminals, they should not go about ruining all good men. [13] Gaius Caesar a little while ago before this order discussed thoroughly and well life and death, thinking false, I suppose that which is said about the Underworld, where, in that loathsome place, a wilderness horrible and terrifying, the good go by a different path than the bad. [14] He therefore proposed confiscating their money, the same held in custody by the municipalities, fearing, evidently, if they should be in Rome, either by members of the conspiracy, or by leading a throng, they might be rescued by force. [15] As if indeed base and criminal men were just in the city and not throughout the whole of Italy, or therein boldness not more capable when the resources to defend are less. [16] Wherefore, if he fears danger from them, this advice, as far as I'm concerned, is pointless; if, on the other hand, amid such general fear, only he is not afraid, on account of that, all the more it brings me to be afraid more for me and you. [17] Wherefore, when you determine the status concerning Publius Lentulus and the others, keep in mind at the same time you shall have decided concerning Catiline's army and all the conspirators. [18] The more attention you give to this, the weaker shall be their resolve, but, if they should perceive only a little weakness, then, surely, with all ferocity they shall attack. [19] Don't think our forefathers built the Republic from insignificance to greatness by means of arms. [20] If this was so, we should have one much more beautiful, naturally because of allies and citizens, and besides that our arms and horses are in greater abundance than theirs. [21] But there were other things which made them great, which to us are nothing:

industry at home, just rule abroad, mindfulness in deliberation, subservient neither to transgression nor to passion. [22] Instead of these, we have extravagance and greed, public want, private opulence; we praise riches, pursue laziness; there is no distinction between good men and bad, *ambitus*<sup>94</sup> possesses everything of value. [23] And no wonder when each of you schemes for himself; when at home you are slaves to pleasure, here to money or prestige, that is how an attack on the defenseless Republic may be made. [24] But I pass over this, the most Noble citizens have taken an oath to set fire to the fatherland, sent for the Gauls, a nation most hostile to the Roman name, to engage in war, the leader of the enemy, with an army, is hanging over head. [25] And still you hesitate and doubt what you ought to do by way of *deprenta*<sup>95</sup> with enemies within the walls? [26] I think maybe it is you who should be pitied—men of youth through ambition fell short—and you should, by all means, dismiss armed men. [27] Certainly, if they should take up arms, that gentleness and compassion of yours may change into unhappiness. [28] Evidently the matter is itself a tough one, but you do not fear it. No indeed, very much to the contrary. But laziness and effeminacy of spirit hesitating, waiting for one another, evidently trusting to the gods immortal, who have often saved this Republic when in great peril. [29] Not vows, nor by womanish entreaties, is the help of the gods at hand; but by being vigilant, active, deliberating well,<sup>96</sup> do all things prosper. When you surrender to stupidity and laziness, pointlessly do you the gods implore, they are angry and hostile. [30] Among our forefathers, Aulus<sup>97</sup> Manlius

---

<sup>94</sup> *ambitio*, fem. nom. sing, the going about as a candidate for office, an excessive desire to please, flattery, popularity, ambition.

<sup>95</sup> a species of military punishment, more severe than *castigatio*, but milder than *ignominia*, Paul. ex Fest. p. 71, 15 Müll. (*Lewis and Short*).

<sup>96</sup> This is *Asyndeton*: *vigilando, agundo, bene consulundo*.

<sup>97</sup> An error for Titus, Cf. Rolf: 106.

Torquatus, in the war with Gaul, ordered his son killed, because, contrary to orders, fought against the enemy, [31] and this exceptional young man, for excessive bravery, paid the penalty with death. [32] You are in doubt what you should inflict upon the most cruel of murderers? Evidently, the crimes of the rest of their lives stands in the way of this. [33] By all means spare the dignity of Lentulus, if he spared his chastity, if he spared his reputation, if he ever spared the gods or any men. Forgive the young men of Cethagus, unless he makes war upon the fatherland a second time.<sup>98</sup> Now what should I say about Gabinius, Statilius, Caeparius? By whom, if anything was ever considered, they would have not had designs against the Republic.<sup>99</sup> [35] Finally, Fathers of the Senate, if, by Hercules, there was room for error, I would willingly put up with you being corrected by the affair itself, seeing that you think little of speeches. But we are on all sides surrounded, Catiline with an arm is grasping at our throats; other enemies are within the walls and in the heart of the city, neither any preparations nor any plans can be kept secret, what is better is to be hastening. [36] Wherefore, I thus recommend, with the Republic having come to the greatest danger, on account of a nefarious conspiracy of wicked citizens, and, by the testimony of Titus Volturcius and the ambassadors of the Allobroges, were convicted and confessed that they have prepared, murder, arson, and other disgusting and cruel crimes against the citizens and the fatherland; with respect to the confessed, just as those caught in a capital offense, by the custom of our forefathers, inflicting execution.

### Senate adopts the resolution of Cato

---

<sup>98</sup> That is, to say, the *Bellum Catilinae* would be the first, yet the Senate should, nevertheless wait until the second before responding. This is *Irony*.

<sup>99</sup> This is *Irony*.

[53.1] *Postquam Cato adsedit, consulares omnes itemque senatus magna pars sententiam eius laudant, virtutem animi ad caelum ferunt, alii alios increpantes timidos vocant. Cato clarus atque magnus habetur; senati decretum fit, sicuti ille censuerat. [2] Sed mihi multa legenti, multa audienti, quae populus Romanus domi militiaeque, mari atque terra praeclara facinora fecit, forte lubuit attendere, quae res maxime tanta negotia sustinisset. [3] Sciebam saepenumero parva manu cum magnis legionibus hostium contendisse; cognoveram parvis copiis bella gesta cum opulentis regibus, ad hoc saepe fortunae violentiam toleravisse, facundia Graecos, gloria belli Gallos ante Romanos fuisse. [4] Ac mihi multa agitanti constabat paucorum civium egregiam virtutem cuncta patravisse eoque factum, uti divitas paupertas, multitudinem paucitas superaret. [5] Sed postquam luxu atque desidia civitas corrupta est, rursus res publica magnitudine sua imperatorum atque magistratuum vitia sustentabat ac, sicuti effeta<sup>100</sup> parentum vi, multis tempestatibus haud sane quisquam Romae virtute magnus fuit. [6] Sed memoria mea ingenti virtute, divorsis moribus fuere viri duo, M. Cato et C. Caesar. Quos quoniam res obtulerat, silentio praeterire non fuit consilium, quin utriusque naturam et mores, quantum ingenio possum, aperirem.*

[53.1] After Cato was seated, all the ex-Consuls and a great part of the Senators as well, bearing his courage up to heaven, praised his opinion, scolding one another, calling them cowards; Cato was held to be great and famous, a decree of the Senate was passed just as he suggested. [2] But of the many things by me gathered together, many things reported to me,<sup>101</sup> the illustrious things which the Roman people did at home and in war, on land and on sea, as it happens, it was nice to take note what particular things would have

<sup>100</sup> *effetus*, exhausted, worn out by bearing

<sup>101</sup> *multa legenti, multa audienti*; this is *Pleonasm*.

sustained this business. [3] As I would understand it, frequently a small number of men fought with great armies of foreigners; I learned that with little resources they carried out wars against wealthy kings, and to this, often endured the violence of Fortune, the Greeks were before the Romans in eloquence, the Gauls in thirst for war. [4] But after much hunting, it agreed with me, that the whole thing was brought about by a few outstanding citizens; and that by them how it was done that poverty would prevail over riches, the few over the many. [5] But after the State was corrupted by extravagance and laziness, the Republic in turn was sustained by the magnitude of its power and the defects of the magistrates, just as a mother is exhausted by the force of child bearing, in Rome certainly there was no one of virtue at all, for a very long time. [6] By in my time, there were two men, though diverse in character, of great value, Marcus Cato and Gaius Caesar, seeing that the affair advances it, it was not my intention to pass it over in silence, but in fact I shall reveal the character and habits of each, with as much talent as I am able.

#### Sallust's character analysis of Caesar and Cato Minor

*[54.1] Igitur iis genus, aetas, eloquentia prope aequalia fuere, magnitudo animi par, item gloria, sed alia alii. [2] Caesar beneficiis ac munificentia magnus habebatur, integritate vitae Cato. Ille mansuetudine et misericordia clarus factus, huic severitas dignitatem addiderat. [3] Caesar dando, sublevando, ignoscendo, Cato nihil largiundo gloriam adeptus est. In altero miseris perfugium erat, in altero malis pernicies. Illius facilitas, huius constantia laudabatur. [4] Postremo Caesar in animum induxerat laborare, vigilare; negotiis amicorum intentus sua neglegere, nihil denegare, quod dono dignum esset; sibi magnum imperium, exercitum, bellum novum exoptabat, ubi virtus*

*enitescere posset. [5] At Catoni studium modestiae, decoris, sed maxume severitatis erat; [6] non divitiis cum divite neque factione cum factioso, sed cum strenuo virtute, cum modesto pudore, cum innocente abstinentia certabat; esse quam videri bonus malebat: ita, quo minus petebat gloriam, eo magis illum sequebatur.*

[54.1] Accordingly, in their birth age, eloquence,<sup>102</sup> they were nearly equal; greatness of mind equal,<sup>103</sup> in glory the same, but different.<sup>104</sup> [2] Caesar was thought great on account of kindness and generosity, Cato purity of life; the former was made famous by gentleness and compassion, the latter by austerity was raised to distinction. [3] Caesar won fame by supporting and forgiving, Cato by bribing no one; the one was a refuge for the unfortunate, the other a curse on the bad, the good nature of the former was praised, the steadfastness of the latter. [4] Finally Caesar trained himself to work hard and sleep little;<sup>105</sup> being attentive to the affairs of friends, neglected his own, refused nothing in so far as it was a gift worth having, desired for himself great power, an army, a new war, whereby he would be able to illuminate his valor. [5] But Cato had eagerness for modesty, grace, but mostly for austerity; did not contents against the rich with riches, nor by faction with the factious, but with modest with decency, with the innocent by self-control, he preferred to rather be than to be thought good; in this way, the less he strived for fame, the more he was followed by it.

#### Execution of the conspirators, Dec. 5

*[55.1] Postquam, ut dixi, senatus in Catonis sententiam discessit, consul optimum factu ratus noctem, quae instabat, antecapere, ne quid eo spatio novaretur, tres viros, quae*

<sup>102</sup> *iis genus, aetas, eloquentia is Asyndeton.*

<sup>103</sup> *magnitudo animi par is Ellipsis.*

<sup>104</sup> *item gloria, sed alia alii is Oxymoron.*

<sup>105</sup> *induxerat laborare, vigilare = had induced himself to work, to stay awake. Thanks Rolf for the rendering supra.*

*supplicium postulabat, parare iubet. [2] Ipse praesidiis dispositis Lentulum in carcerem deducit; idem fit ceteris per praetores. [3] Est in carcere locus, quod Tullianum appellatur, ubi paululum ascenderit ad laevam, circiter duodecim pedes humi depressus. [4] Eum muniunt undique parietes atque insuper camera lapideis fornicibus iuncta; sed incultu, tenebris, odore foeda atque terribilis eius facies est. [5] In eum locum postquam demissus est Lentulus, vindices rerum capitalium, quibus praeceptum erat, laqueo gulam fregere. [6] Ita ille patricius ex gente clarissima Corneliorum, qui consulare imperium Romae habuerat, dignum moribus factisque suis exitium vitae invenit. De Cethego, Statilio, Gabinio, Caepario eodem modo supplicium sumptum est.*

[55.1] As I have said, after the Senate voted for Cato's proposal, the Consul, reckoning it was best to do at night in order to anticipate that which was impending, there would be nothing new in the interval of time, ordered the Triumvirs to ready those being demanded for execution. [2] Himself, posting guards, led Lentulus into the prison, the same, by the Praetors, was done to the others. [3] There is a place in the prison which is called *Tullianum*, when you ascend a little to the left, about twelve feet below the ground. [4] It is enclosed on all sides by walls and overhead is built a roof with arched stone, but because of neglect, darkness and stench made it frightful. [5] Afterwards, in that place, Lentulus was shamed; the punishers of capital matters,<sup>106</sup> as to them it was instructed, with a noose, crushed his throat. [6] That that Patrician of the illustrious stock of the Corneli, <sup>107</sup> who had once held the consular authority in Rome, came to an end of life worthy of his character and his deeds; Cethegus, Statilius, Gabinius, and Caeparius assumed the same punishment.

---

<sup>106</sup> That is, executioners.

<sup>107</sup> *ita ille patricius ex gente clarissima Corneliorum* is Irony.

Catiline arms his men, forms two legions, refuses the help of the slaves

*[56.1] Dum ea Romae geruntur, Catilina ex omni copia, quam et ipse adduxerat et Manlius habuerat, duas legiones instituit, [2] cohortis pro numero militum complet. Deinde, ut quisque voluntarius aut ex sociis in castra venerat, aequaliter distribuerat ac brevi spatio legiones numero hominum expleverat, cum initio non amplius duobus milibus habuisset. [3] Sed ex omni copia circiter pars quarta erat militaribus armis instructa; ceteri, ut quemque casus armaverat, sparos aut lanceas, alii praeacutas sudis portabant. [4] Sed postquam Antonius cum exercitu adventabat, Catilina per montis iter facere, modo ad urbem, modo in Galliam versus castra movere, hostibus occasionem pugnandi non dare. Sperabat propediem magnas copias sese habiturum, si Romae socii incepta patravissent. [5] Interea servitia repudiabat, cuius generis initio ad eum magnae copiae concurrebant, opibus coniurationis fretus, simul alienum suis rationibus existumans videri causam civium cum servis fugitivis communicavisse.*

[56.1] while this was being carried out in Rome, Catiline had drawn together as much as he could forming two legions out of all the troops as both he himself and Manlius had, completeing the army of [2] Cohorts according to their number ; next, equally distributing to each one volunteers or accomplices that came to the camp, and, in a short time completeed the legions with the number of men, at the beginning he would have had no more than two thousand soldiers. [3] But out of all the troops about one quarter part were equipped with military arms ; the others, opportunity armed with whatever, some carried spears or lances, others sharpened stakes. [4] But when Antonius approached with an army, Catiline made his way through the mountains ; he kept moving his camp, first towards the city, then towards Gaul, did not give opportunity for battle to the enemy,



hoping, if the accomplices in Rome had accomplished their undertaking, he himself would have a great force. [5] Meanwhile he scorned the slaves, who at the beginning, flocked to him in great abundance ; confident in the strength of the conspiracy, at the same time, according to his reasoning it seemed to considered strange to have shared the cause of a citizen with runaway slaves.

#### News of the execution of the conspirators reaches Catiline's camp

*[57.1] Sed postquam in castra nuntius pervenit Romae coniurationem patefactam, de Lentulo et Cethego ceterisque, quos supra memoravi, supplicium sumptum, plerique, quos ad bellum spes rapinarum aut novarum rerum studium illexerat, dilabuntur; reliquos Catilina per montis asperos magnis itineribus in agrum Pistoriensem abducti eo consilio, uti per tramites occulte perfugeret in Galliam Transalpinam. [2] At Q. Metellus Celer cum tribus legionibus in agro Piceno praesidebat ex difficultate rerum eadem illa existumans, quae supra diximus, Catilinam agitare. [3] Igitur ubi iter eius ex perfugis cognovit, castra propere movit ac sub ipsis radicibus montium consedit, qua illi descensus erat in Galliam properanti. [4] Neque tamen Antonius procul aberat, utpote qui magno exercitu locis aequioribus expeditus in fuga sequeretur. Sed Catilina, postquam videt montibus atque copiis hostium sese clausum, in urbe res advorsas, neque fugae neque praesidi ullam spem, optimum factu ratus in tali re fortunam belli temptare, statuit cum Antonio quam primum conflare. Itaque contione advocata huiusce modi orationem habuit:*

[57.1] But when news that the conspiracy in Rome had been discovered reached the camp, about Lentulus and Cethegus and the others,<sup>108</sup> who I mentioned above, had been

---

<sup>108</sup> *de Lentulo et Cethego ceterisque* is Polysyndeton.

executed, a great many who were eagerly attracted to the war by hope for plunder and new affairs, began to desert; Catiline led the remainder by forced marches through rugged mountains in the region of Pistoria, according to his plan, in such a way by trails to secretly flee to Transalpine Gaul. [2] But Quintus Metellus Celer with three legions was guarding the district of Picene, on account of the difficulty of the affair, as I said before, estimated that Catiline would pursue this way. [3] Accordingly, when he learned his route from deserters, he quickly moved his camp and took up position at the base of the same mountain which he had to descend in hastening to Gaul. [4] And Antonius was not retired far off, he was following in haste with a large unencumbered army. [5] But when Catiline saw himself enclosed by mountains and the soldiers of the enemy, that matters in the city had gone awry; neither flight nor hope for any reinforcements, he reckoned the best thing was the doing in such an affair, resolved to test Fortune, to do battle with Antonius as soon as possible.

### Final speech of Catiline

[58.1] *“Compertum ego habeo, milites, verba virtutem non addere neque ex ignavo strenuum neque fortem ex timido exercitum oratione imperatoris fieri. [2] Quanta cuiusque animo audacia natura aut moribus inest, tanta in bello patere solet. Quem neque gloria neque pericula excitant, nequiquam hortere: timor animi auribus officit. [3] Sed ego vos, quo pauca monerem, advocavi, simul uti causam mei consili aperirem. [4] Scitis equidem, milites, socordia atque ignavia Lentuli quantam ipsi nobisque cladem attulerit quoque modo, dum ex urbe praesidia opperior, in Galliam proficisci nequiverim. [5] Nunc vero quo loco res nostrae sint, iuxta mecum omnes intellegitis. [6] Exercitus hostium duo, unus ab urbe, alter a Gallia obstant; diutius in his locis esse, si maxime*

*animus ferat, frumenti atque aliarum rerum egestas prohibet; [7] quocumque ire placet, ferro iter aperiendum est. [8] Quapropter vos moneo, uti forti atque parato animo sitis et, cum proelium inibitis, memineritis vos divitias, decus, gloriam, praeterea libertatem atque patriam in dextris vestris portare. [9] Si vincimus, omnia nobis tuta erunt: commeatus abunde, municipia atque coloniae patebunt; [10] si metu cesserimus, eadem illa advorsa fient, neque locus neque amicus quisquam teget, quem arma non texerint. [11] Praeterea, milites, non eadem nobis et illis necessitudo inpendet: nos pro patria, pro libertate, pro vita certamus, illis supervacaneum est pugnare pro potentia paucorum. [12] Quo audacius aggredimini memores pristinae virtutis! [13] Licuit vobis cum summa turpitudine in exsilio aetatem agere, potuistis nonnulli Romae amissis bonis alienas opes exspectare: [14] quia illa foeda atque intoleranda viris videbantur, haec sequi decrevistis. [15] Si haec relinquere voltis, audacia opus est; nemo nisi victor pace bellum mutavit. [16] Nam in fuga salutem sperare, cum arma, quibus corpus tegitur, ab hostibus avorteris, ea vero dementia est. [17] Semper in proelio iis maximum est periculum, qui maxime timent; audacia pro muro habetur. [18] Cum vos considero, milites, et cum facta vostra aestumo, magna me spes victoriae tenet. [19] Animus, aetas, virtus vestra me hortantur, praeterea necessitudo, quae etiam timidos fortis facit. [20] Nam multitudo hostium ne circumvenire queat, prohibent angustiae loci. [21] Quod si virtuti vestrae fortuna inviderit, cavete inulti animam amittatis neu capiti potius sicuti pecora trucidemini quam virorum more pugnantes cruentam atque luctuosam victoriam hostibus relinquatis!”*

[58.1] “I am well aware, men,<sup>109</sup> that words to valor do not add, neither do commanders by a speech make the vigorous out of the lazy, nor the brave out of the timid. [2] How

---

<sup>109</sup> *milites*, lit. ‘soldiers.’

much courage, either by nature or by habits, is in anyone's soul is such that it won't be revealed in war, whom are, neither by glory nor by danger are enlivened, for nothing are they encouraged, fear in the soul closes their ears. [3] But I have called you together in order that I may advise you a little and, at the same time, so as to reveal the motive for my decision. [4] Indeed, men, you know how the stupidity and cowardice of Lentulus brought disaster upon us and himself, also how, while I waited for reinforcements from the city, I have been unable to depart for Gaul.<sup>110</sup> [5] Now indeed you understand just the same as me, what our situation probably is. [6] Two armies of the enemy stand in the way, one from the city, the other from Gaul, even if it were most desired, staying in this place any longer is prohibited by want of grain and other things, [7] to whatever place it is acceptable to go, the path by the sword shall be opened. [8] Therefore, what I advise you is to thirst for bravery, and with a ready heart, when you enter battle you shall have remembered that in your right hand you carried riches, honor, glory, liberty and the fatherland besides. [9] If we are victorious, everything of yours shall be safe, supplies abound, towns and colonies shall be opened, [10] if we shall have yielded to fear, the same things shall be those reversed, neither place nor friend shall shelter anyone whom arms should not have protected. [11] Besides that, men, the distress looming over us and over them is not the same thing. Our struggle is for the fatherland, for freedom, and for life; for them to fight is a superfluous thing for the power of a few men. [12] Whither you should attack, be mindful of pristine manhood. [13] It would be alright for you to pass through life in the greatest disgrace in exile, of Rome you have demanded not

---

<sup>110</sup> This is *Scapegoating*, Catiline is himself the source of the predicament with which he and his men are now faced. Indeed Catiline was not the great general he was made out to be for this men are ill equipped and on the brink of starvation in addition to being surrounded.

nothing,<sup>111</sup> longing for lost goods, another's power, [14] because that appeared repulsive and intollerable to men, you decided to follow this course. [15] If you wish to abandon these things, you need courage, no one except the victor exchanges war for peace. [16] For to hope for safety in flight with arms by which to defend your bod, which you would have turned away from the enemy, this indeed is madness. [17] In battle the greatwest danger is always to they who are most afraid, having courage is the same as having a wall.<sup>112</sup> [18] Soldiers, when I consider, and when I evaluate your deeds, great hope for victory takes hold of me. [19] Your spirit, age, and bravery, encourages me, besides that necessity, which likewise, makes the timid brave. [20] For a great number of the enemy cannot surround us, the narrowness of the place prevents it. [21] But if Fortune looks askance upon your valor, beware of letting your soul slip away unavenged, do not be captured and slaughtered lie cattle, but rather fighting like men, leaving the enemy a bloody and tearful victory.”

#### Argumentum ad Baculum in Catilinam, at Pistoria, Jan. 62

*[59.1] Haec ubi dixit, paululum conmoratus signa canere iubet atque instructos ordines in locum aequum deducit. Dein remotis omnium equis, quo militibus exaequato periculo animus amplior esset, ipse pedes exercitum pro loco atque copiis instruit. [2] Nam uti planities erat inter sinistros montis et ab dextra rupe aspere, octo cohortis in fronte constituit, reliquarum signa in subsidio artius conlocat. [3] Ab iis centuriones, omnis lectos et evocatos, praeterea ex gregariis militibus optimum quemque armatum in primam aciem subducit. C. Manlium in dextra, Faesulanum quendam in sinistra parte curare iubet. Ipse cum libertis et colonis propter aquilam adsistit, quam bello Cimbrico*

<sup>111</sup> *non nulli is Litotes.*

<sup>112</sup> ‘having courage,’ *audacia habetur*, ‘is the same as,’ *pro*, ‘having a wall,’ *muro habetur*. This is *Zeugma*.

*C. Marius in exercitu habuisse dicebatur. [4] At ex altera parte C. Antonius, pedibus aeger quod proelio adesse nequibat, M. Petreio legato exercitum permittit. [5] Ille cohortis veteranas, quas tumultus causa conscripserat, in fronte, post eas ceterum exercitum in subsidiis locat. Ipse equo circumiens unumquemque nominans appellat, hortatur, rogat, ut meminerint se contra latrones inermis pro patria, pro liberis, pro aris atque focis suis certare. [6] Homo militaris, quod amplius annos triginta tribunus aut praefectus aut legatus aut praetor cum magna gloria in exercitu fuerat, plerosque ipsos factaque eorum fortia noverat; ea commemorando militum animos accendebat.*

[59.1] When he said these things, lingering a little while, he ordered the signal for battle sounded, and led the arranged orders on to the level plain, thereafter, by removing all horses, which, by making the danger equal, the spirit of the men would be enhanced, himself on foot, deployed the army according to the place and the means. [2] Now, whereas the plain was between mountains on the left and a jagged cliff on the right, he arranged eight Cohorts in front, and the Cohorts of the remainder he loosely arranged in close reserve. [3] From these centurions, all elite veterans, thereafter from the common soldiers, whoever was best armed, he drew up into the front line; He order the command on the right to Gaius Manlius, on the left<sup>113</sup> a certain man fro Faesulae, himself, with the Libertines and the servants, stood next to the Eagle, which was said to have been in the army of Gaius Marius in the war with the Cimbri. [4] But Gaius Antonious, from the other side, was unwell with respect to the feet,<sup>114</sup> and, on account of that, was unable to

---

<sup>113</sup> *sinistra* from *sinister*, *-ra*, *-rum*; left, on the left; (because in Roman augury the augur faced south, having the East on the left) favorable, auspicious, lucky; (because in Greek augury the augur faced north, having the East on his right) unfavorable, inauspicious, unlucky; wrong, perverse improper. *The New College Latin and English Dictionary*.

<sup>114</sup> Although Rolf understands *pedibus* to mean 'gout,' *Lewis and Short* define *pes* to mean foot; *pedibus* therefore is a masc. dat. pl., Dative of Respect. Thus, *pedibus aeger* means 'sick with respect to the feet.'

participate in the battle, permitted Marcus Petreius with the leadership of the army. [5] He placed the veterans of the Cohorts, who had enlisted for the reason of the rebellion, in front, after them the others with the army in reserve, he himself was going around by horse; he calls out, naming each one, encouraging him, asking that he should remember he would be fighting against unarmed mercenaries, for the fatherland, for his children, for the altars, and for his hearth. [6] A military man, with a great reputation in the army, knew a great many of the men and their brave exploits themselves, because for more than thirty years was either a Tribune, a Perfect, a Lieutenant, or a Praetor; recalling these things excited the soldier's spirits.

*[60.1] Sed ubi omnibus rebus exploratis Petreius tuba signum dat, cohortis paulatim incedere iubet; idem facit hostium exercitus. [2] Postquam eo ventum est, unde a ferentariis proelium committi posset, maximo clamore cum infestis signis concurrunt: pila omittunt, gladiis res geritur. [3] Veterani pristinae virtutis memores comminus acriter instare, illi haud timidi resistunt: maxuma vi certatur. [4] Interea Catilina cum expeditis in prima acie vorsari, laborantibus succurrere, integros pro sauciis arcessere, omnia providere, multum ipse pugnare, saepe hostem ferire: strenui militis et boni imperatoris officia simul exsequebatur. [5] Petreius ubi videt Catilinam, contra ac ratus erat, magna vi tendere, cohortem praetoriam in medios hostis inducit eosque perturbatos atque alios alibi resistentis interficit. Deinde utrimque ex lateribus ceteros aggreditur. [6] Manlius et Faesulanus in primis pugnantes cadunt. [7] Catilina postquam fusas copias seque cum paucis relictum videt, memor generis atque pristinae suae dignitatis in confertissimos hostis incurrit ibique pugnans confoditur.*

---

Whereas gout out commonly occurs in the big toe, it may be presumed that the use *pedibus* here signifies gout, but .

[60.1] But after becoming certain of everything, Petreius gives<sup>115</sup> the signal by means of a trumpet,<sup>116</sup> he orders the Cohorts to advance little by little. [2] When that place was reached whence joining the battle by *ferentarii*<sup>117</sup> was possible, with the greatest uproar, with hostile banners, they clash; abandoning pikes, the matter is carried out by swords.<sup>118</sup> [3] The veterans, mindful of their former valor, approach sharply to close quarters, the others, no being cowards, resist; it is a struggle with the greatest violence. [4] Meanwhile, Catiline, with the light troops was engaged in the front line, running to help those in danger, summoning fresh troops for the wounded, looked after everything, fought much himself, often struck down the enemy, was at the same time performing the duties of an active soldier and a good leader. [5] Petreius, when he saw Catiline exerted greater force than he had reckoned, he led the praetorian cohort into the center of the enemy and threw them into confusion, and also killed others resisting elsewhere, then attacked the rest from both sides. [6] Manlius and the man from Faesulae are killed in the first fighting. [7] Catiline, when he saw his troops were being routed and was left with a few men, mindful of his lineage and his former rank, into the thickest of the enemy he ran, and there fighting was stabbed.

### Sallust's Denouement

---

<sup>115</sup> *dat* = he gives. Latin authors occasionally use the Present Tense for past actions in order to create vividness in the narrative. English translators however nearly always translate verbs of the present tense as past, but this practice is by no means mandatory. Thus I have translated present tense verbs in the present in order to recreate this effect.

<sup>116</sup> Cf. *tuba signum dat* vis-à-vis *signa canere* [59.1]. Catiline did not give the signal for his troops to advance by means of a trumpet as Petreius had but by *signa canere*, or signal by means of a singsong voice.

<sup>117</sup> The *ferentarii* were light armed infantry stationed on the wings, who hurled their javelins and then retired behind the battle line.

<sup>118</sup> [cum] *maximo clamore*, 'with a great shout,' *cum infestis signis*, 'with hostile banners,' *concurrunt*, 'they run together.'



[61.1] *Sed confecto proelio tum vero cerneret<sup>+</sup>, quanta audacia quantaque animi vis fuisset in exercitu Catilinae. [2] Nam fere quem quisque vivus pugnando locum ceperat, eum amissa anima corpore tegebat. [3] Pauci autem, quos medios cohors praetoria disiecerat, paulo divorsius, sed omnes tamen advorsis volneribus conciderant. [4] Catilina vero longe a suis inter hostium cadavera repertus est paululum etiam spirans ferociamque animi, quam habuerat vivus, in voltu retinens. [5] Postremo ex omni copia neque in proelio neque in fuga quisquam civis ingenuus captus est: [6] ita cuncti suae hostiumque vitae iuxta pepercerant. [7] Neque tamen exercitus populi Romani laetam aut incruentam victoriam adeptus erat; nam strenuissimus quisque aut occiderat in proelio aut graviter volneratus discesserat. [8] Multi autem, qui e castris visundi aut spoliandi gratia processerant, volventes hostilia cadavera amicum alii, pars hospitem aut cognatum reperiebant; fuere item, qui inimicos suos cognoscerent. [9] Ita varie per omnem exercitum laetitia, maeror, luctus atque gaudia agitabantur.*

[61.1] But when the battle was over you were indeed able to see<sup>119</sup> how great must have been the boldness and how great in Catiline's army the strength of spirit must have been. [2] For nearly each one that let his soul slip away was covering with his body that place which, when fighting, he occupied alive. [3] A few in the center, on the other hand, whom the praetorian cohort had scattered, were a little apart, but all the same were killed by wounds in the front. [4] Indeed Catiline was found far out from them among the bodies of the enemy, still breathing a little, and in his face holding the ferocity of mind which he had in life. [5] Finally out of the whole army, neither in battle nor in flight was anyone of the free-born citizens captured, [6] in such a way, on the whole they had

---

<sup>119</sup> This whole paragraph suggest that Sallust may have visited the battle field as he his quite certain what one was able to see.

spared their own lives and those of the enemy just the same. [7] Still neither had the army of the Roman people obtained a happy or bloodless victory, for each one of the most vigorous had fallen in battle or had come away severely wounded. [8] Many, however, who had come out from the camp for reason to see or to pillage, turning over the bodies of the enemies found a friend, part of the others, a guest or a relative; some would also have recognized those who were their personal enemies. [9] In this manner, everyone throughout the whole army was variously affected with rejoicing and mourning, with sorrow and happiness.

## V. Argument (Συλλογισμός)

## The Irony of Alexander Blok

In a manifestly uncritical way, Aleksandr Blok took Catiline not as a revolutionary archetype, but as a symbol of violence against the state abstracted from its motive force. (*A Roman Bolshevik* 414) For him, it was analogous that if Catiline attacked the powers that be, and Lenin attacked the powers that be, then Catiline must have been a revolutionary, since Lenin was one. Remarkably, Kalb said Catiline was running for consul on a “populist platform.” (*Ibid.* 416) When it was Tiberius Gracchus in an earlier period who ought to be credited with that. “By asserting this familiarity Blok aims in ‘Catiline’ to situate the Bolshevik revolution in a momentous lineage.” (*Ibid.* 416) In truth, however, it was Cato who would rightly be described as the leader of the commons.

“Cato belonged to the family of the Porcii and emulated the great Cato, except that he had enjoyed a better Greek education than the former. He diligently promoted the interest of the *plebs*, and admired no man, but was thoroughly devoted to the commonweal. Suspicious of unlimited power, he hated anyone who had grown above his fellows, but loved anyone of the common people through pity for his weakness. He was becoming the friend of the people such as no one else, and indulged in outspokenness in behalf of the right, even when it involved danger.” (*Historiae Romanae* 37.22.1-4)

Everyone has praised Cato’s virtues. After him, it was Caesar who captivated the masses. Sallust compared Cato and Caesar’s virtues,

(53.6) *Sed memoria mea ingenti virtute, divorsis moribus fuere viri duo, M. Cato et C. Caesar. Quos quoniam res obtulerat, silentio praeterire non fuit consilium, quin utriusque naturam et mores, quantum ingenio possum, aperirem.*

[54] *Igitur iis genus, aetas, eloquentia prope aequalia fuere, magnitudo animi par, item gloria, sed alia alii. Caesar beneficiis ac munificentia magnus habebatur, integritate vitae Cato. Ille mansuetudine et misericordia clarus factus, huic severitas dignitatem addiderat. Caesar dando, sublevando, ignoscendo, Cato nihil largiundo gloriam adeptus est. In altero miseris perfugium erat, in altero malis perniciēs. Illius facilitas, huius constantia laudabatur. Postremo Caesar in animum induxerat laborare, vigilare; negotiis amicorum intentus sua negligere, nihil denegare, quod dono dignum esset; sibi magnum imperium, exercitum, bellum novum exoptabat, ubi virtus enitescere posset. At Catoni studium modestiae, decoris, sed maxime severitatis erat; non divitiis cum divite neque factione cum factioso, sed cum strenuo virtute, cum modesto pudore, cum innocente abstinentia certabat; esse quam videri bonus malebat: ita, quo minus petebat gloriam, eo magis illum sequebatur.*

“In birth then, in years and in eloquence, they were about equal...Caesar was held great because of his benefactions and lavish generosity, Cato for the uprightness of his life...Caesar gained glory by giving, helping, and forgiving; Cato by never stooping to bribery. One a refuge for the unfortunate, the other a scourge for the wicked...[Caesar] longed for great power, an army, a new war to give scope to his brilliant merit. Cato, on the contrary, cultivated self-control, propriety, but above all austerity. He did not vie with the rich in riches nor in intrigue with the

intriguer...He preferred to be, rather than to seem virtuous.” (*Bellum Catilinae* 54.1-6)

In short, Caesar bribed people with gifts, Cato stood as a role model.

Blok impetuously compared Catiline to Tacitus.

“A few decades after Christ it fell to the lot of Tacitus...A few decades before Christ, it had fallen to the lot of poor Catiline.” (*World Revolution* 294)

Blok said,

“Sulla was a free and easy-going man.” (*Ibid.* 296)

And

“That Catiline was a lover of the people or dreamed of universal equality, there can, of course, be no question.” (*Ibid.* 300)

Blok complained that Cicero drowned Catiline in a flood of lawyer’s oratory, but what Catiline heard was nothing compared to Cicero’s panegyrics delivered to the people and to the Senate which he did not hear. Oratory such as this:

*Ex hac enim parte pudor pugnat, illinc petulantia;*

*Hinc pudicitia, illinc stuprum;*

*Hinc constantia, illinc furor;*

*Hinc honestas, illinc turpitude;*

*Hinc continentia, illinc libido;*

*Hinc denique aequitas, temperantia, fortitudo, prudential*

*virtues omnes cerant cum iniquitate, luxuria, ignavia, temeritate, cum vitiis omnibus; postremo copia cum egestate, bona denique spes cum omnium rerum desperatione confligit.*

For from this part fights decency, over there wantonness;

Hence modesty, thence defilement;

Hence constancy, thence madness;

Hence honor, thence turpitude;

Hence continence, thence lust;

and finally, from hence fairness, temperance, fortitude, prudence, all virtues, contend with inequality, luxury, laziness, thoughtlessness, against all vices; in the end abundance fights indigence, and finally, good wishes against all things hopeless. (2 *In Catilinam* 25).

For him, Sallust was actually the real criminal,

“He left a very bad memory. He managed to squeeze all the juice out of a rich country through bribes and extortion.” (*World Revolution* 295)

There’s no arguing with someone who maintains the most absurd positions in the face of all evidence to the contrary. For Blok, Catiline is Christ arisen, followed by the real Christ arisen, followed by the V. I. Lenin, and again, Christ arisen! The fact that Blok was no follower of Lenin’s seriously undermines his argument. Not being Bolsheviks, both Blok and Kalb are hard pressed to vindicate Catiline by drawing correspondences between Catiline and Lenin. In his poem *The Twelve* (1918), which Bloc claimed had been written in support of the revolution, he wrote:

Our sons have gone

to serve the Reds

to serve the Reds

to risk their heads! ...

So they march with sovereign tread ...

Behind them limps the hungry dog,  
 and wrapped in wild snow at their head  
 carrying a blood-red flag...  
 ahead of them goes Jesus Christ.

And though Blok says,

“Catiline was a revolutionary with all his spirit and all his being.” (*World Revolution* 300)

But even Leon Trotsky disputed that Blok could understand this. In his critique of Blok’s poem *The Twelve*, Trotsky said,

“Blok was not a poet of the revolution...Throughout all his changes, Blok remained a true decadent, if one were to take his word in a large historic sense, in the sense of the contrast between decadent individualism and the individualism of the rising bourgeoisie...’The Twelve’ does not sing the Revolution, but Russia, in spite of the Revolution...To be sure, Blok is not one of ours, but he reached toward us. And in doing so, he broke down.” (*Literature and Revolution* 118)

After *The Twelve*, Aleksandr Blok never published again. Sallust’s voice didn’t crack, Blok’s voice did. In his *Catiline*, Blok claims that Catiline underwent a ‘metamorphosis.’

“Such a person is a madman, a maniac, possessed.” (*World Revolution* 300)

Just as Sallust himself recorded,

“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 complexions, his bloodshot eyes, his gait now fast now slow; in short, his face and his every glance showed the madman.” (*Bellum Catilinae* 15.4-5)

Sallust, Blok and Freud can, at least for the moment, agree:

“Unbridled gratification of all desires forces itself into the foreground as the most alluring guiding principle of life.” (*Civilization and Its Discontents* 29)

Once accustomed to the high life, Catiline now deprived of it

“Was found [to have] become neurotic because [he could not] tolerate the degree of privation that society imposes on [him].” (*Ibid.* 46)

Catiline became neurotic because he had lost a luxurious lifestyle he had been accustomed too. Not only that, he had also accustomed himself to self-gratification through violence.

### Judith Kalb the Helmet of Hades and the Ring of Gyges

As a commentary upon a commentary, Kalb’s analysis of Blok’s essay, and consequently of the Catiline affair and the Bolshevik revolution, is in a precarious position. Since Kalb is neither a Latinist, nor a Marxist, her ability to contribute a meaningful commentary on the *Bellum Catilinae* and to draw correspondences between it and the Bolshevik revolution, is dubious. Indeed she sought to explain Blok, not Catiline. Although she compared Catiline both to Christ and to Bolshevism; she never mentioned Lenin or Marx by name and made no annotations to any classical text, save Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*. Although Kalb does cite Ovid, he said nothing on the Catiline affair. Kalb’s argument that Catiline was a calumniated man and, “a precursor to Jesus Christ,” is absurd. Catiline could not have been a Bolshevik because any class analysis would place him in the category of the nobles of Rome. According to Karl Marx,

“The wage-laborer lives only by the sale of his labor-power.” (*Capital vol. II* 33)

He was a discontent, but he was not motivated by any *class consciousness*.

“What makes men morally discontented...is that they do not find the present adapted to the realization of aims which they hold to be right and just.”

(*Philosophy of History* 169)

For Catiline it was not merely the nobility whom he believed ought to rule, but of those of the stronger. He was not the leader of a proletarian vanguard political party. These were men who had lost all they had through riotous living and attempted to steal back what they had just finished throwing away. After the exhaustion of all legal means, they withdrew from Rome and hurled themselves against it and, being annihilated, as it were, to the very last man. It would not be difficult to elaborate a completely dialectical and historical materialist interpretation of Catiline himself. He is of the noble class it is true, but he is not the vanguard of any class and has no political principles to speak of and does not articulate any particular political program besides placing himself at the helm of state and benefiting his friends and harming his enemies. Catiline is not a reformer; he does not motivate the oppressed to rise in arms as a social movement of their entire class in the way Spartacus did, but instead conspired among his personal associates, formed a cabal, and attempted a *putsch*. Furthermore the biography of Lenin does not correspond to that of Catiline. After serving 15 months in prison, Lenin and his family were exiled to Siberia in 1897 for his brother, Alex's, involvement in the plot to murder the Tsar Alexander III. Lenin became a revolutionary while in exile. There is no evidence that Lenin had ever undergone a neurotic metamorphosis, nor is there any that he had committed any of the crimes Catiline had. This whole question as applied to Christ is

absurd. Hegel thought Christ was revolutionary on account of a single paragraph in the *Gospel of Matthew*.

*Nolite arbitrari quia venerim mittere pacem in terram non veni pacem mittere sed gladium.*

Wish not to believe that I have come to bring peace on the Earth. I have not come to bring peace, but the sword. (10.34)

To this Hegel said:

“Nowhere are to be found such revolutionary utterances as in the *Gospels*.”  
(*Philosophy of History* 308)

This may of course be true and Kalb seems to take her departure from here, but she should not have forgotten Jesus’ earlier statement:

*Ecce ego mitto vos sicut oves in medio luporum estote ergo prudentes sicut serpentes et simplices sicut columbae.*

Lo, I am sending you out like sheep among wolves, therefore be as wary as serpents and as simple as doves. (*Matthew* 10.16)

Though it would be difficult to characterize Cicero as either a serpent or a dove, the populace could indeed have been called sheep and if it were not for sword of Cicero, the wolf Catiline should devour us. *Cave Canem!* Indeed Jesus represented a movement of the oppressed. Since in his case criticism came from below we may conclude that his movement was indeed revolutionary, an ascendancy from the lower to the higher. Of course this metaphor was itself prefigured by Herodotus:

“But as Theras’ son would not sail with him, his father said that he would leave him behind as a sheep among wolves; after which saying the boy got the nickname of Oeolycus.” (4.149)

To return to my point of departure, it was incumbent upon Cicero to deploy the *argumentum ad baculum* against a criminal like Catiline for, as Tacitus noted:

*Inter inpotentes et validos faslo quiescas: ubi manu agitur, modestia ac probitas nomina superioris sunt.*

Among the powerless and the powerful you would find peacefulness vain: where a strong hand commands, moderation and honesty are the appellations of the stronger. (*Germania* 36.1)

One could take the view that Catiline, having already lost his great fortune, had descended in class to the *proletarii*. Hutchinson takes the position that Catiline was a revolutionary who intended to

“Strike at the heart of Roman capitalism.” (*The Conspiracy* 15)

He continued:

“It is clear that Catiline was proposing not merely a change in government and policy but a social and economic revolution.” (Ibid. 56-57)

But this was clearly not the case, for, although he was financially ruined, he suffered no political disability on account of this and ran for consul twice, in 64 and again in 63. Catiline promised to cancel the debts of certain members of the ruling class and to confiscate the property of others, but he makes no mention of abolishing *capitalism*—if he even perceived of it. Sulla’s expropriations of land and property followed by disposal

of that property *sub hasta* were fraudulent. The auctions were rigged and the profits were channeled back to Sulla and his agents. The populace benefited little from these enterprises. Hutchinson represents a nostalgic leftist malaise, which, having already been smeared with the reputation of Catiline, seek to embrace it, co-opt it, and revise it in order to give it a more palatable interpretation. Vindicating Catiline is, nevertheless, utterly pathological. Though some may feel somehow vindicated by Hutchinson's interpretation of the *Bellum Catilinae*; Catiline was no doubt a scandalous creature and anyone compared to him should consider his reputation smeared. There is a moral relation between author and his object, that is: Should someone consider their reputation smeared if they were called "a Catiline of our time?" According to what has been asserted by Hutchinson he, and everyone who defends him, should be perfectly happy to be referred to as a "New Catiline?"

- I. Catiline was a notorious criminal
- II. for if he was not a notorious criminal,
- III. then we should all be proud to bear his name;
- IV. but no one honestly feels that way,
- V. Therefore Catiline was infamous. QED.

But there are, of course, exceptions to every rule. Avidius Cassius delighted in the appellation. On account of his attempted conspiracies against emperors Antoninus Pius and Lucius Verus:

*Nec defuerunt qui illum Catilinam vocarent, cum et ipse se ita gauderet appellari.*

Nor were there lacking those who would call him ‘Catiline,’ and he would when hearing he himself thus called.<sup>120</sup> (*Avidus Cassius* 3.5)

He was a supporter of Sulla and his proscriptions and benefited from them. He was also a cannibal.

“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.” (*Bellum Catilinae* 5.6)

His actions would be best described as an attempted *putsch*, not a revolution. A revolution is progressive by its very nature. It seeks to overturn an old oppressive order and replace it with a new freer order. Catiline sought to re-establish an old and hated political regime. Catiline’s program didn’t intend to benefit even his own class in its entirety, but only himself and his conspirators. He, furthermore, made no allusion to any *bone fide* theory of justice, sacred moral, or commonly held value. Indeed he systematically desecrated every value of the civilization in which he lived. The rape of the Vestal was the most corrupt thing Catiline could have ever done, for it was from the rape of the first Vestal Rhea Silvia the hated Romulus was born; and not only that the household gods, the *Penates deos*, brought by Aeneas from Troy where established in the Temple Vesta where the Vestal Virgin Fabia tended the eternal flame.<sup>121</sup>

---

<sup>120</sup> *defuerunt*, as a perf. act. ind., is a *secondary tense* and is, therefore, followed by a impf. subj. act., *vocarent*. (*Allen and Greenough* 482-484) Thus: Those who would call him a ‘Catiline’ were not lacking [and they still aren’t]. *appellari* is a pres. inf. pass. and an Historical Infinitive.

<sup>121</sup> Vesta, one of the great Roman divinities, identical with the Greek Hestia both in name and import. She was the goddess of the hearth, and therefore inseparably connected with the Penates, for Aeneas was believed to have brought the eternal fire of Vesta from Troy, along with the images of the Penates ; and the praetors, consuls, and dictators, before entering upon their official functions, sacrificed not only to the Penates, but also to Vesta at Lavinium. (Virg. Aen. ii. 296, &c., x. 259, v. 744 ; Macrob. Sat. iii. 4.) The goddess was not represented in her temple by a statue, but the eternal fire burning on the hearth or altar was her living symbol, and was kept up and attended to by the Vestals, her virgin priestesses. (Smith’s *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology*)

Blok's analogy between the conspirators of the *Bellum Catilinae* to the revolutionaries of the Bolshevik revolution proves that Blok was beyond the pale of the Russian working class. He was a dilettante to the very end. He sang bleary eyed of the old Russia, and it ruined him. The *Bellum Catilinae* was an outgrowth of Catiline's conspiracy. The Bolshevik revolution was not a conspiracy, but a mass movement of the truly oppressed transformed into a civil war whereby the oppressed class as a whole supplanted the ruling class as a whole. Catiline was no V. I. Lenin, but he was no Spartacus either. In truth, Judith Kalb, as Blok did before her, thinks she may more easily overcome Lenin if Catiline overcomes him first. It is a well known sophistical technique to smear the reputation of a good man by continually comparing that man to a bad one.

“Irony is to say something and pretend you are not saying it, or else to call things by the names of their contraries.” (*Rhetoric to Alexander* 21.1)

There are no *bone fide* comparisons between the life of Lenin and that of Catiline. Lenin did not undergo a neurotic metamorphosis as Catiline had. He had committed neither rape, nor incest, nor cannibalism, nor murder and no one says he did.

### Ann Thomas Wilkins, Positivism and Deconstruction

Wilkins' monograph is an attempted deconstruction, so popular within academia these days. For instance, she seeks to prove that if Sallust's *antistrophe*, the word *hostis* 'enemy,' was to describe Catiline and Catiline used the same word to refer to the Roman government, then Sallust was guilty of blurring the distinction between right and wrong.

The word *hostis* in its original meaning, however, signified a *stranger* in a time when any stranger might be an *enemy*.<sup>122</sup>

“Many words indicate one thing now, but formerly meant something else, as is the case with *hostis* ‘enemy:’ for in olden times by this word they meant a foreigner from another country independent of Roman laws, but now they give the name to him whom they then called *perduellis* ‘enemy.’” (*De Lingua Latina* 5.3)

Through the use of ambiguous speech, Sallust, then, indicated that Catiline had become like a foreigner since his actions indicated that he no longer considered himself a subject to Roman law. And Sallust, noted for his archaisms, signified through this antistrophe that these men, though citizens of the same *πολις*, had become *strangers* to each other.

*Cum unius cuiusque verbui naturae sint duae,  
a qua re et in qua re vocabulum sit impositum.*

Each and every word has a dual nature, that thing from which and that thing to which a name is imposed. (*De Lingua Latina* 5.2)

Thus Sallust’s acceptance of the word *hostis* as taken *from* the actions of Catiline, or by way of etymology, was as a *stranger* while that same acceptance as applied *to* him by way of semantics was enemy.

The central argument of Wilikins’ work is an apparent error in Sallust’s chronology, though she denies it after suggesting it. The central precept of her methodology, however, is to functionally deny that Sallust was a historian and affirm that history can be discovered somewhere outside him as an extant source. She goes on and

---

<sup>122</sup> Cf. Wheelock, Frederic M., *Latin: An Introductory Course Based on Ancient Authors*, 3rd Edition, New York : Barnes and Noble : 1963: 121.



on using phrases to the effect that Sallust intended to “depict” or “portray” Catiline this way or that way. In so doing, however, Wilkins actually depicts and portrays Sallust as an author who disregarded historical veracity as means of justifying her praise for Catiline. Her revisionist operation revolves primarily around her excessive preoccupation with forensic philological concerns while at the same time denying Sallust’s objectivity which she initially impugned by his chronological mistake. Not that there is anything wrong with forensic philology *per se*, but Wilkins uses it to assert that Sallust invented both the first conspiracy and the infamous oath. Wilkins, furthermore, does not vet the many extant codices of the *Bellum Catilinae*, discuss any of Sallust’s other works, or examine any other extant sources, but asserts that Sallust needed to invent the first conspiracy in order to justify a later passage where Catiline departed Rome

“With the fasces and other emblems of authority.” (*Bellum Catilinae* 36.1)

By denying objectivity to Sallust and simultaneously discovering *real* history through pinpoint philological parsing; Wilkins supposes to induce the reader into believing that objectivity actually does exist, and, not only that, it resides with her; and that it can be found in her work and by her methodology, but she remains hard pressed to find history from within written sources which she denied veracity to at the outset. If Sallust’s monograph is a fictive work, on the grounds that he intentionally included events that never took place, then all extrapolated evidence must likewise be held in doubt because the all the facts have been drawn from the same *poison well*.

“We question why, since Catiline had the chance of being elected to the consulship, he was reduced to revolutionary action.” (*Villain or Hero* 7)

I question whether or not Catiline's actions could properly be called "revolutionary." Wilikins' primary fault as a historian is not her use of forensic philology, but her *positivistic* methodology. She treats Sallust's text as an object of a *natural science*, not as an object of history. She failed to understand that in interpreting the *Bellum Catilinae* the historian does not start with a hypothesis and then attempt to falsify that hypothesis by gathering pieces of evidence which become data plugged into one or the other of two columns of data which either *supports* or *refutes* the hypothesis *Catiline was a villain*. Since the events of the *Bellum Catilinae* are of the past, they are not falsifiable because they cannot be re-enacted. But this fact is neither here nor there. Whether or not Catiline was an actual villain or merely a calumniated man is not essential to the historian, because whether or not he was an actual villain *he was believed to be one*. It is inconsequential if Catiline was an actual villain because the object of study for the historian is not who or what Catiline actually was, but is how *man* in general has become who he *is*. The *Bellum Catilinae* has influenced who we are today. The proper object of study for the historian is to compare who we are as a civilization to Catiline's *reputation* for whom he was, not an inquiry as to whether or not the actual Catiline corresponds 1:1 with his reputation, unless inquiry happens to be a study of whether or not a historian has lied. But Wilikins' monograph is not an inquiry into whether or not Sallust as a historian is a liar, but whether or not Catiline was a villain or a hero. Determining whether or not Catiline was a villain is based on whether or not the crimes alleged against him are still crimes, not whether or not he actually committed them because we cannot re-try him for those alleged crimes. The question as to whether or not Catiline was guilty of those crimes is a *moot* case.

It is clear from the several narratives that Catiline intended to become not only consul, but dictator by whatever means. It would have been best for him if he could have attained this by being elected to the position, but he intended to seize the *fascēs* by any means, including that of violence. The reader may wish to recall, however, that the *fascēs* had been seized before.

“The poor were moved with deep sorrow, and rightly so, both on their own account (for they believed that they were no longer to live in a free state under equal laws, but were reduced to servitude by the rich), and on account of Gracchus himself, who had incurred such danger and suffering in their behalf. So they all accompanied him with tears to his house in the evening, and bade him be of good courage for the morrow. Gracchus cheered up, assembled his partisans before daybreak, and communicated to them a signal to be displayed in case of a fight. He then took possession of the temple on the Capitoline hill, where the voting was to take place, and occupied the middle of the assembly. As he was obstructed by the other tribunes and by the rich, who would not allow the votes to be taken on this question, he gave the signal. There was a sudden shout from those who saw it, and a resort to violence in consequence. Some of the partisans of Gracchus took position around him like body-guards. “Others, having girded themselves, seized the *fascēs* and staves in the hands of the lictors and broke them in pieces. They drove the rich out of the assembly with such disorder and wounds that the tribunes fled from their places in terror, and the priests closed the doors of the temple. Many ran away pell-mell and scattered wild rumors. Some said that Gracchus had deposed all the other tribunes, and this was believed because none

of them could be seen. Others said that he had declared himself tribune for the ensuing year without an election.” (*Civil Wars* 1.2.15)

But this entirely different than what Catiline had done, for instead of smashing them to pieces Catiline enshrined them. The fact that when Catiline finally did withdraw, at Cicero’s indulgence, and assumed the outward symbols of a consul, proves that he was a pretender, *tyrannus*, to the office. By having himself preceded by *lictors* bearing the *fascēs*, he tried to appear as if he were the consul elect, nay, the *dictator* self-appointed! By so doing, Catiline insinuated that he had somehow been illegitimately deprived of a political position that would have been rightly his and would brook no contenders. But he had not been unjustly deprived of a lawful office. Catiline had not been elected he had been defeated. Thus Catiline, in fact, behaved highly undemocratically, indeed autocratically. By assuming the outward symbols of an office that was not rightly his, Catiline broke the law.

“I knew that the arms, the axes, the fascēs, the trumpets, the military standards, that silver eagle for which he had even built a shrine in his own home had been sent on ahead.” (*2 In Catilinam* 13)

*Per omne fas ac nefas*, Catiline intended to be not only consul, but *dictator*. Whether by election or *putsch*, he himself presumed to decide the election by and for his own self. Catiline was also a dissembler. As Plato tells us,

“The height of injustice is to seem just without being so.” (*Republic* 2.361a)

And so it went with Catiline deploying the *argumentum ad misericordiam* through his pleading accents and his repetitive assertions that he only sought justice. This behavior, then, is not so remarkable for if one is

“Unjust and have procured [the] reputation for justice a godlike life is promised.”

(*Ibid.* 2:365b)

A dissembler attempts to create a discrepancy between appearance and reality. Catiline tried to appear to be both just and wise, though in reality he was neither. His dissemblance, however, must have been somewhat effective, since he had attracted a number of followers, and indeed still attracts apologists. The error that was made by the dramatist Ibsen in relating the story of Catiline was through his inappropriate use of *poetic license*. In Harris’ introduction to Jonson’s play she cites Jonson’s own remark,

“We should enjoy the same license or free power to illustrate and heighten our invention as the ancients did.” (*His Conspiracy* xliii)

Ben Jonson applied his artistic license appropriately. He developed his invention within the parameters that scholarship ought to allow by staying close to the extant sources and attempting to illustrate upon them. Ibsen, however, applied his poetic license inappropriately by treating the historical persona as a mouthpiece for the views of the author.

“A poet, whether he is writing epic, lyric or drama, surely ought always to represent the divine nature as it really is.” (*Republic* 2.378)

Not just the divine however, but all representations of beings ought to correspond to that actual being. The literary criticism that grew out of the Enlightenment wrongly took the legends of antiquity to be mere myths when the legends in many cases grew up around the facts of history. They also wrongly supposed that the authors who related these legends were prone to fictionalize the events, when this tendency would truly best be ascribed to the moderns not to the ancients.

On account of a dream Astyages which had been interpreted to indicate that his daughter Mandane would bear a son that would rule in his stead he attempted to murder her first born son, the infant child Cyrus. Astyages summoned his servant Harpagus and commanded him to kill the child. Harpagus was at first overcome with pity and on account of the fact that his wife had refused to become a party to the crime, and that he furthermore reasoned that not only was the boy his kin, and, moreover, he reasoned that if the crown passed from Astyages to his daughter Mandane he could but live in fear of revenge from her for murdering her child. Thus, Harpagus reasoned:

“For my own safety, indeed, the child must die.” (*The History* 1.109)

Harpagus then decided to give the child to a herdsman named Mitradates, but since Mitradates' wife Cyno had just given birth to a still born child they decided to switch the children, leaving their dead infant exposed on a mountainside and to raise the newborn Cyrus as their own. After a period of ten years, and by a fortuitous circumstance, the identity of Cyrus was discovered by Astyages who was secretly enraged that Harpagus had defied his orders. Upon hearing an account of the events, Astyages calmly told Harpagus,

“Send thy son to be with the new comer, and to-night, as I mean to sacrifice thank-offerings for the child's safety to the gods to who such honor is due, I look to have thee a guest at the banquet.” (1.118)

Harpagus did as bidden and sent his own son to Astyages who murdered the child, boiled his flesh, and served him for dinner to his own father.

“On the table of Harpagus, nothing was placed except the flesh of his own son. This was all put before him, except the hands and feet and head, which were laid

by themselves in a covered basket. When Harpagus seemed to have eaten his fill, Astyages called out to him to know how he had enjoyed the repast. On his reply that he had enjoyed it excessively, they whose business it was brought him the basket, in which were the hands and feet and head of his son, and bade him open it, and take out what he pleased.” (1.119)

On account of the fact that the distinguished and virtuous Herodotus recorded this, that it happened there can of course be no question. But a similar legend recorded by Pindar preceded this one. According to him Tantalus, son of Zeus and Pluto, and king of Sipylus in either Phrygia or Lydia, murdered his own son Pelops and served him to the gods for dinner.

35

ἔστι\* δ' ἀνδρὶ φάμεν εἰκοὸς ἀμφὶ δαιμόνων καλά: μείων γὰρ αἰτία.

υἱὲ\* Ταντάλου\*, σὲ δ', ἀντία προτέρων, φθέγξομαι\*,

[60] ὁπότ' ἐκάλεσε\* πατήρ τὸν εὐνομώτατον\*

ἐς ἔρανον\*\* φίλαν τε Σίπυλον\*,

ἀμοιβαῖα\* θεοῖσι δεῖπνα\* παρέχων,

40

τότ' Ἀγλαοτρίαιναν\* ἀρπάσαι

δαμέντα φρένας ἰμέρω\* χρυσέαισί τ' ἀν' ἵπποις\*

ὔπατον εὐρυτίμου ποτὶ δῶμα Διὸς μεταβᾶσαι\*,

ἔνθα δευτέρω χρόνῳ\*

[70] ἦλθε καὶ Γανυμήδης

45

Ζηνὶ τωῦτ' ἐπὶ χρέος\*.

ὥς δ' ἄφαντος ἔπελες, οὐδὲ ματρὶ πολλὰ μαιόμενοι\* φῶτες\* ἄγαγον,

ἔννεπε κρυφᾶ τις αὐτίκα φθονερῶν γειτόνων,

ὔδατος ὅτι σε πυρὶ ζέοισαν\* εἰς ἀκμὴν

μαχαίρα\* τάμον κάτα μέλη\*,

50

[80] τραπέζαισί\* τ', ἀμφὶ δεύτατα\*, κρεῶν

σέθεν διεδάσαντο\* καὶ φάγον.

ἐμοὶ δ' ἄπορα\*+ γαστρίμαργον\* μακάρων τιν' εἶπειν. ἀφίσταμαι\*.

ἀκέρδεια++ λέλογχεν\*+ θαμινὰ+ κακαγόρους.

εἰ δὲ δῆ τιν' ἄνδρα θνατὸν Ὀλύμπου σκοποὶ

55

ἐτίμασαν, ἦν\* Τάνταλος οὔτος: ἀλλὰ γὰρ καταπέψαι

μέγαν+ ὄλβον+ οὐκ ἐδυνάσθη, κόρῳ δ' ἔλεν\*

[90] ἄταν ὑπέροπλον, ἄν οἱ πατὴρ ὑπερκρέμασε καρτερὸν αὐτῷ λίθον,

τὸν αἰεὶ μενοινῶν κεφαλαῖς βαλεῖν\* εὐφροσύνας ἀλᾶται\*.

ἔχει δ' ἀπάλαμον\* βίον τοῦτον\* ἐμπεδόμοχθον,

60

μετὰ τριῶν\* τέταρτον πόνον, ἀθανάτων ὅτι κλέψαις

ἀλίκεσσι συμπόταις

[100] νέκταρ ἀμβροσίαν τε\*

δῶκεν, οἴσιν\* ἄφθιτον

θῆκαν. εἰ δὲ θεὸν ἀνὴρ τις ἔλπεταί τι λαθέμεν\* ἔρδων, ἀμαρτάνει.



65

τοὔνεκα προῆκαν\* υἷὸν ἀθάνατοί οἱ πάλιν

“Your father invited the gods to a very well-ordered banquet at his own dear Sipylos, in return for the meals he had enjoyed... But when you disappeared, and people did not bring you back to your mother, for all their searching, right away some envious neighbor whispered that they cut you limb from limb with a knife into the water’s rolling boil over the fire. and among the tables at the last course they divided and ate your flesh. For me it is impossible to call one of the blessed gods a glutton. I stand back from it. Often the lot of evil-speakers is profitlessness. If indeed the watchers of Olympus ever honored a mortal man, that man was Tantalus. But he was not able to digest his great prosperity, and for his greed he gained overpowering ruin, which the Father hung over him: a mighty stone. Always longing to cast it away from his head, he wanders far from the joy of festivity. He has this helpless life of never-ending labor, a fourth toil after three others, because he stole from the gods nectar and ambrosia, with which they had made him immortal, and gave them to his drinking companions. If any man expects that what he does escapes the notice of a god, he is wrong. Because of that the immortals sent the son of Tantalus back again to the swift-doomed race of men.” (1 *Olympian Ode* 35-65)

The *Peloponnesus* took its name from the Pelops. The fact that these legends exist and were mythologized is not to say that the events stated in them are purely the product of imagination, but to the pervasiveness of the practice of human sacrifice and cannibalism, the repugnance of the practice to the best of men in ancient times. Its representation in

poetic and dramatic works of art depicts an ethical struggle within the civilization. A human sacrifice is not a mythical creature, a *Scylla* or a *Charybdis*, but an ancient practice which is known to have existed both in criminal conspiracy and, so it would seem, before battle to save the father land. Plutarch relates the story of how a man from Thebes named *Pelopidas* had a vision in a dream before the *Battle of Leuctra* (371 B.C.) in which he saw the daughters of Scedasus, the *Leuctridae*, young women who had slain themselves out of shame, for they had been raped by the Spartans, weeping over their tomb whereupon their father fell on his own sword after seeking redress, and receiving none, at Sparta. On account of these tragic events it was widely believed that a curse prevailed there as oracles and prophecies warned against the wrath of the *Leuctridae*. At any rate, before the battle, Pelopidas had a dream that he saw these maidens invoking curses weeping and of Scedasus urging him to sacrifice a virgin with auburn hair if he wished to obtain victory of the Lacedaemonians.

“The injunction seemed a lawless and dreadful one to him, but he rose up and made it known to the seers and the commanders. Some of these would not hear of the injunction being neglected or disobeyed, adducing as examples of such sacrifice among the ancients, Menoeceus, son of Creon, Macaria, daughter of Heracles; and in latter times, Pherecydes the wise man, who was put to death by the Lacedaemonians, and whose skin was preserved by their kings, in accordance with some oracle; and Leonidas, who, in obedience to the oracle sacrificed himself<sup>123</sup> as it were to save Greece; and still further, the youths who were sacrificed by Themistocles to Dionysus Carnivorous before the *Battle of*

---

<sup>123</sup> Cf. *The History* 7.220

*Salamis*;<sup>124</sup> for the successes which followed these sacrifices proved them acceptable to the gods. Moreover, when Agesilaus, who was setting out on an expedition from the same place as Agamemnon did, and against the same enemies, was asked by the goddess for his daughter in sacrifice, and had this vision as he lay asleep at Aulis, he was too tender hearted to give her, and thereby brought his expedition to an unsuccessful and inglorious ending. Others, on the contrary, argued against it, declaring that such a lawless and barbarous sacrifice was not acceptable to any one of the superior beings above us, for it was not the fabled typhons<sup>125</sup> and giants who governed the world, but the father of all gods and men; even to believe in the existence of divine beings who take delight in the slaughter and blood of men was perhaps folly, but if such beings existed, they must be disregarded, as having no power; for only weakness and depravity of soul could produce or harbor such unnatural and cruel desires.” (*Pelopidas* 20.3-21.4)

While debating all this amongst themselves, a filly broke away from the heard, whereupon, having taken this as a sign which resolved the dispute:

“Theocritus the seer, after taking thought, cried out to Pelopidas: ‘Thy sacrificial victim is come, good man; so let us not wait for any other virgin, but do thou accept and use the one which Heaven offers thee.’” (22.2)

We could deduce from this, then, that after 371 B.C., in the Greco-Roman tradition, a trend towards the substitution of an animal victim for a human victim was developing. This is echoed in *Genesis* though instead of a seer pointing out the sacrificial victim in

---

<sup>124</sup> Cf. *Themistocles* 13.2

<sup>125</sup> Cf. *Iliad* 2.782 & *Theogony* 869, 306

the *Bible* it is an “angel of God” who is said to have pointed out the appropriate victim and prevented Abraham from sacrificing his son Isaac.

*Quae postquam gesta sunt temptavit Deus Abraham et dixit ad eum Abraham ille respondit adsum. Ait ei tolle filium tuum unigenitum quem diligis Isaac et vade in terram Visionis atque offer eum ibi holocaustum super unum montium quem monstravero tibi. Igitur Abraham de nocte consurgens stravit asinum suum ducens secum duos iuvenes et Isaac filium suum cumque concidisset ligna in holocaustum abiit ad locum quem praeceperat ei Deus. Die autem tertio elevatis oculis vidit locum procul. Dixitque ad pueros suos expectate hic cum asino ego et puer illuc usque properantes postquam adoraverimus revertemur ad vos. Tulit quoque ligna holocausti et inposuit super Isaac filium suum ipse vero portabat in manibus ignem et gladium cumque duo pergerent simul. Dixit Isaac patri suo pater mi at ille respondit quid vis fili ecce inquit ignis et ligna ubi est victima holocausti. Dixit Abraham Deus providebit sibi victimam holocausti fili mi pergebant ergo partier. Veneruntque ad locum quem ostenderat ei Deus in quo aedificavit altare et desuper ligna conposuit cumque conligasset Isaac filium suum posuit eum in altari super struem lignorum. Extenditque manum et arripuit gladium ut immolaret filium. Et ecce angelus Domini de caelo clamavit dicens Abraham Abraham qui respondit adsum. Dixitque ei non extendas manum tuam super puerum neque facias illi quicquam nunc cognovi quod timeas Dominum et non peperceris filio tuo unigenito propter me. Levavit Abraham oculos viditque post tergum arietem inter vepres herentem cornibus quem adsumens obtulit*

*holocaustum pro filio. Appellavitque nomen loci illius Dominus videt unde usque hodie dicitur in monte Dominus videbit.*

After which there are these things, God tempted Abraham and said to him: “Abraham” and he responded “I am here.” He said to him, “Make off with your only begotten son whom you love and hurry into the land of Visions and offer him there as a holocaust<sup>126</sup> upon a mountain of the mountain range which I shall make known to you. Accordingly Abraham arising by night saddled his ass and leading with him two young men and his son Isaac and cut up firewood for the holocaust and went to the place which God had told him. On the third day, raising up his eyes, he saw the place in the distance. And he said to his boys<sup>127</sup> “Wait here with the ass, I and the boy are going yonder without delay and after we have worshiped we shall return to you. And he took the firewood for the holocaust and placed it upon Isaac his son himself truly carried in his hand the fire and the sword and the two pressed on together. Isaac said to his father: “My father?” And he responded to him: “What do you want son?” “Lo,” he said, “Fire and firewood, where is the victim for the holocaust?” Abraham said: “God will provide you as victim for the holocaust my son.” Therefore they pressed on as before. And the came to the place which God had shown him in which he built an altar and there upon placed the firewood and bound Isaac his son and placed him on the altar upon the heap of firewood. And he extended his hand and drew his sword and was immolating [sprinkling with a sacrificial meal] his son. And behold an angel of God from the sky called out, saying: “Abraham, Abraham!”

---

<sup>126</sup> Lat. holocaustum; Gr. ὀλοκαυστος; ‘burnt-offering’

<sup>127</sup> Here the word *pueros*, ‘boys,’ is a euphemism for slaves.

Who responded, "I am here." And he said to him, "Do not extend your hand over the boy. Do not make anything of him now I understand because you fear and you would have not spared your only begotten son from me. Abraham lifted his eyes and he saw behind his back a ram among the brambles caught by the horns which he offered as a holocaust for his son. And he called the place by the name of the Lord he saw, and to this day it is said: "On the mountain of the Lord, he shall see." (*Genesis 22.1-14*)

Abraham was ready to sacrifice his own son for a cause which was purportedly good, Catiline to bind his conspirators to a crime with a crime. Is this so difficult to believe? When once upon a time:

*(24) factum est autem post haec congregavit Benadad rex Syriae universum exercitum suum et ascendit et obsidebat Samariam (25) factaque est fames magna in Samaria et tamdiu obsessa est donec venundaretur caput asini octoginta argenteis et quarta pars cibi stercoris columbarum quinque argenteis (26) cumque rex Israhel transiret per murum mulier exclamavit ad eum dicens salva me domine mi rex (27) qui ait non te salvet Dominus unde salvare te possum de area an de torculari dixitque ad eam rex quid tibi vis quae respondit (28) Mulier ista dixit mihi da filium tuum ut comedamus eum hodie et filium meum comedemus cras (29) Coximus ergo filium meum et comedimus dixique ei die altera da filium tuum ut comedamus eum quae abscondit filium suum. (2 Kings 6.24-29)*

The tendency to lie through art is a modern invention, as Ibsen's *Catiline*, for instance shows us. Moreover with respect to an ethical dilemma the principle and the

representation ought to remain true. Ibsen boldly disregarded the extant historical sources and in so doing altered the public's perception of the events surrounding the *Bellum Catilinae*. In his introduction to his 1875 edition of the play Ibsen's statement, "There nevertheless must have been a good deal that was great or significant about the man whom the majority's indefatigable advocate, Cicero, did not find expedient to tackle until things had taken such a turn that there was no longer any danger connected with the attack," are offered without foundation. (*Ibid.* 246) Ibsen doesn't even deny that Catiline raped the Vestal Virgin, and, in fact, gleefully incorporated the event into his play.

Variety's my joy, I've never numbered  
 a mistress from among the vestal virgins,  
 so here I've come to try my luck at it! (*Ibsen's Catiline* 136)

For all the revisionists have to say with respect to the Catiline affair, the fact that none have successfully escaped the narration of Catiline's crimes against morality suggests a motive on their part.

*Ieiunia expel, mixtus in Bacchum cruor...potetur*

Expel your hunger, drink the blood mixed with wine. (*Thyestes* 65)

Not only is it a project of drama in general, but of deconstructionism as a whole, to challenge the mores of society, but do any of these authors sincerely suggest that a man who committed a human sacrifice, raped women and boys, a *bone fide* cannibal, can be a hero of history?

Be still thy incests, murders, rapes before  
 Thy sense; thy forcing first a *Vestall* nunne;  
 Thy parricide, late, on thine owne onely sonne,

After his mother ; to make empty way

For thy last wicked nuptials; worse, then they,

That blaze that act of thy incestuous life,

Which got thee, at once, a daughter, and a wife. (*His Conspiracy* 1.30-36)

One thing deconstructionists always fail to do is deconstruct them selves. Some simply deny the events took place; others simply refuse to reconcile the event. Catiline sacrificed a boy. Was it his son? For Ibsen, Blok, Kalb, et al:

“But was there really a boy? Perhaps there was no boy at all!” (*Bystander* 103)

Sallust says that Catiline and his conspirators passed bowls of human blood and that they drank from these in the presence of others. Where do bowls of human blood come from, if not from a human sacrifice? Its true Polydore Virgil notes that the Scythians drank from clay cups their own blood, along with the blood of those with whom they made a treaty, mixed with wine in order to ratify a treaty. This he, of course, learned from Herodotus. (Cf., *The History* 4.70) But Catiline and his conspirators were far too disrespectful to use any blood of their own. Besides that, Cassius Dio says the blood came from a human sacrifice, is that not enough? To insinuate that Sallust invented this is also to declare the *Bellum Catilinae* to be a work of fiction. It denies Sallust his role as a historian; only a scribbler of monographs I suppose? The fact that Wilkins purports to vindicate Catiline in the beginning of her monograph and then admits at the end that Sallust presented a complex character (*Villain or Hero* 137) is hardly surprising since Cicero himself had already noted this very fact. “No I do not believe that there has ever existed on earth so strange a portent, such a fusion of natural tastes and desires that were contradictory, divergent, and at war amongst themselves...at the very time when he



gathered round him every wicked and reckless man from every land, still held fast many good men and true by a kind of semblance of pretend virtue,” Cicero said. (*Pro Caelio* 5.12-14)

G.W.F Hegel’s master-slave dialectic in the *Phenomenology of Spirit* (1807) may elucidate the dialectical struggle of Catiline among those of his own class, but he is not the Roman spirit. The history of the *Bellum Catilinae* is not a universal history of Rome. His movement could not be considered a national movement, an actualization of the national spirit, because it is not a qualitatively better development. It was positively a development for the worse. Rome united around Lucius Brutus, the founder of the Roman Republic, the man who ran out the Tarquinius Etruscan kings. Brutus was a revolutionary. Rome hailed him. This was not so with Catiline. The first decree of the Senate which added ten years banishment to the penalties established for bribery, which Dio Cassius says was instituted on the insistence of Cicero, may have been the chain placed around Catiline’s neck which held him in thrall.

“Catiline, accordingly, believed that this decree had been passed on his account, as was indeed the case.” (*Historiae Romanae* 37.29.1)

But it was Catiline’s bad acts which caused Cicero to make a motion for this law and for the Senate to approve it. And even if this did happen, there’s no reason Catiline could not have withdrawn and accepted this as his punishment. He was still quite young, waiting another ten years to attain a great honor, legally, should not have been a problem for him. But it was his arrogance that drove him onward until the point of no return had been reached. Clearly the problem of bribery in the Roman government and was in fact

the very reason the courts had been transferred from the Senate to the equestrian order in 124 B. C. by the Gaius Gracchus the younger brother of Tiberius.<sup>128</sup>

“He transferred the courts of justice , which had become discredited by reason of bribery, from the senators to the knights...The Senate was extremely ashamed of these things and yielded to the law, and the people ratified it...So it shortly came about that the political mastery was turned was turned upside down, the power being in the hands of the knights, and the honor only remaining in the Senate...The knights indeed went so far that they not only held power over the senators, but openly flouted them beyond their right. They also became addicted to bribe-taking, and when they too had tasted these enormous gains, they indulged in them even more basely and immoderately than the senators had done. They suborned accusers against the rich and did away with prosecutions for bribe-taking altogether.” (*Civil Wars* 1.3.22)

Corruption of the Roman government by means of bribery was endemic. Cicero, an equestrian, was lording his power, in this case, over Catiline—a patrician. Thus by the dialectical moments of history on the question of bribery the equestrian and the patricians had changed places and become each others opposite not once, but twice. The patricians having once been the bribe-takers were supplanted by the equestrians who suddenly became the opposite of what the once were. In the next moment, Cicero being an equestrian prosecuting a patrician for bribe-taking had once again reversed the *social praxis*. Catiline must have found this turn of events nothing less than infuriating.

---

<sup>128</sup>Cf. Appian’s *Civil Wars* “The first triumvirs appointed to divide the land were Gracchus himself, the proposer of the law, his brother of the same name, and his father-in-law, Appius Claudius.” (1.1.13)

Της δε Δικης ῥοθος ἔλκομενης ἠ κ' ἄνδρες ἀγωσι δωροφαγοι, σκολιης δε δικης κρινωσι θεμιστας·

But there is roar of Justice when being dragged in the way and to this men devouring presents are carrying her, but give sentence to twisted judgments.

(*Works and Days* 220)

A psychoanalytic view may yield some insight into the character of Catiline.

Catiline was a man of action to be sure. Although he was accused of violating both his daughter and the Vestal and a number of other crimes, Hardy says:

“As to the other crimes perhaps justly attributed to Catiline, many obviously depended on mere rumor, had never been judicially investigated and were given inconsistently by other authorities.” (*A Re-Examination* 8)

Hutchinson noted:

“There is no mention of the murder of Gratidianus in Sallust or in Cicero’s four orations against Catiline.” (*The Conspiracy* 41)

It does seem rather odd that two of Catiline’s contemporary enemies would have overlooked this murder if it indeed happened. According to Appian,

“Nobody had ventured to lay hands on him, because facts were not yet accurately known.” (*Civil Wars* 2.3)

Hutchinson noted, “He did not even deign to defend himself against charges of the greatest personal infamy.” Hutchinson went on to declare that it was a common practice in Rome to charge someone with imaginary crimes and that this was an outgrowth of the rhetorical schools who taught their pupils to speak with

“Colors, a certain way of presenting the most insignificant facts, mixed with useful lies.” (*The Conspiracy* 31)

Though this may be true of the rhetorical schools, Cicero was one who made many of these charges. Did Hutchinson intend to suggest that either Cicero, or Sallust, were themselves pupils of those rhetorical schools, and not the teachers of them? If its true that Catiline was contemptuous of public opinion, as Hutchinson says, that could have only been because he was confident that the accusations would not have been believed by the Senate where the true power resided. Appian said,

“Catiline was a person of not, by reason of his great celebrity, and high birth, but a madman, for it was believed that he killed his own son because of his own love for Aurelia Orestilla, who was not willing to marry a man who had a son.” (*Civil Wars*, 2.2)

But even if we believe all the negative remarks made against Cicero, not one of them accuses him of bribery, rape, murder, cannibalism, et al?

Sallust himself became the victim of calumny. On account of the fact that Sallust wrote that Pompey had “an honest face but a shameless character,” Lenaeus remarked in a satire that Sallust was

“A debauchee, a gormandizer, a spendthrift, and a tippler, a man whose life and writing were monstrous, and who was besides being an ignorant pilferer of the language of the ancients and of Cato in particular.” (*De Grammaticis* 15)

Cicero and countless others fell victim to these kinds of remarks. Philiscus said of Cicero,

“Surely you would not prefer to have joined Catiline...to have performed none of the duties laid upon you...and thus remain at home as the reward for your wickedness, instead of saving your country and being exiled.” (*Historiae Romanae* 38)

But there are no declamations against Catiline only judicial *charges* made against him.

Lynn Harold Harris’ *Oxymoron*

Even Lynn Harold Harris chimed in with her missives. Accusing Ben Jonson of getting the facts all wrong on account of

“Living in an uncritical age” she said, “Not only the evil that men do lives after them, but much that they never even thought of doing. Catiline had the misfortune to have two prejudiced biographers, and has suffered unjustly in consequence.” (*His Conspiracy* xxvii)

But where is the proof that Catiline suffered unjustly? There is as much proof of injustice against Catiline as there is for Harris’ remarks that Catiline employed the slaves in his rebellion. “The slaves were to rise” (*Ibid.* xxvi) vis-à-vis Sallust: “He refused to enroll slaves, a great number whom flocked to him at first, because he had confidence in the strength of the conspiracy and at the same time thought it inconsistent with his designs to appear to have given runaway slaves a share in a citizens’ cause.” (*Bellum Catilinae* 56.4-5) Lynn Harold Harris said that insofar as Ben Jonson’s *Catiline*: “follows sources it is not in the main true to history.” (*Catiline: His Conspiracy* xxiii) Is it possible to be true to history by rejecting them?

“To say that historical narratives relate events that cannot have happened is to say that we have some criterion, other than the narratives which reach us, by which to judge what could have happened.” (*The Idea of History* 60)

Harris subtly contradicts her self by maintaining that Jonson’s play was is not a tragedy because, according to Aristotle’s definition, the tragic hero must somehow be respectable, or virtuous.

*Da mihi testimonium mutuum.*

Give the borrowed evidence to me. (*Pro Flacco* 10)

With this remark, Harris confirms Calitine’s villainous reputation while at the same time denying the truth Sallust’s interpretation of him. Harris says,

“Sallust’s account was undoubtedly considered beyond reproach then, especially as Plutarch, Cassius Dio, Appian, Florus, and the other authorities agree substantially with it. But to us of today that very agreement is suspicious. As Merimèe points out, the accounts as so painstakingly alike that the conjecture at once arises that they have all been drawn in the main from one source.” (*Catiline: His Conspiracy* xxiii)

It is not enough to say that the historians that came after Sallust simply followed his work. If this were true then why would Sallust say that Antonius could not meet Catiline on the battle field because he was sick with gout, while Cassius Dio said that Antonius only feigned illness because he didn’t wish to fight his comrade? If Sallust produced the primary history of *Bellum Catilinae*, and all historians relied on him, and Cicero in addition to him, then how is it that C. MacDonald was able to discover eight different accounts of the charges made against Catiline? Harris says the charges were too consistent, Hardy says not consistent enough. The *law of the excluded middle* dictates

that a statement must be either true or false. Catiline was either a criminal or he was not. This kind of sophistical attack erases not only Sallust's testimony, but the testimony of all the other ancient sources as well. Since neither Harris, Hardy, nor Hutchinson's assertions could be true, then Sallust's assertions must be true, rather, advancing the *principle of generosity*, all the ancient sources must be considered true and of philosophical and historical value insofar as all the apologists for Catiline are all wrong. The only ancient source that could be even remotely construed to cast Catiline in a favorable light would be Lucan's (39-65 A.D.) remarks in his poem *De Bello Civili*.

*Cunctorum uoces Romani maximus auctor*

*Tullius eloquii, cuius sub iure togaque*

*pacificas saeuos tremuit Catilina securis,*

*pertulit iratus bellis, cum rostra forumque*

*optaret passus tam longa silentia miles.*

Tullius, the great writer of speeches,

[was] the whole voice of Rome

under whose justice and consulship

the peacemaking axes shook the savage Catiline

who, on account of wars, suffered violent outbursts

when he longed for Rostra and the Forum

after suffering in silence so long as a soldier. (*Pharsalia* 7.62-66)

But that could only be held true if one were to take the phrase "suffering in silence," or "suffered violent outbursts on account of wars," as reasons to pity him. Even still, Cicero could only be understood as "the voice of the Roman people." Catiline did not, however, articulate his claim to the consulship on account of having been a soldier suffering in

silence so long, but on account of his noble birth and his long line of ancestors who had held that position.

*[20.4] Et reputanti mihi, Diocletiane Auguste, neminem prope magnorum virorum optimum et utilem filium reliquisse satis claret. [5] Denique aut sine liberis veris interierunt aut tales habuerunt plerique, ut melius fuerit de rebus humanis sine posteritate discedere. [21.1] Et ut ordiamur a Romulo, hic nihil liberorum reliquit, nihil Numa Pompilius, quod utile posset esse rei publicae. Quid Camillus? Num sui similes liberos habuit? Quid Scipio? Quid Catones qui magni fuerunt? Iam vero quid de Homero, Demosthene, Virgilio, Crispo, Terentio, Plauto ceterisque aliis loquar? Quid de Caesare? Quid de Tullio, cui soli melius fuerat liberos non habere? (Severus 20.4-21. )*

Harris, relying on Shakespeare's phrase, supposes to "Give the devil his due," insofar as Catiline was the "logical product of his age." (*Catiline: His Conspiracy* xxiv-xxvi) In Shakespeare's play *Edward Poins and Henry the Prince of Wales* discussed Sir John Falstaff's supposed deal with the devil.

*Poins:* Jack, how agrees the devil and thee about thy soul that thou soldest him on Good Friday last, for a cup of Madeira and a cold capon's leg?

*Prince:* Sir John stands to his word, the devil shall have his bargain, for he was never yet a breaker of proverbs. He will give the devil his due.

*Poins:* Then thou art damn'd for keeping thy word with the devil.

*Prince:* Else he had been damn'd for cozening [cheating] the devil. (*1 Henry IV* 1.2)

By way of Harris' allegory we might conclude that Catiline, being the devil, received Harris' soul which she had pledged to deliver to him, or that perhaps Harris pledged



herself to Catiline who had pledged himself to the devil. But this allegory does little to exculpate Catiline from his bad reputation. Furthermore, whoever supposes to be ‘the Devil’s advocate’ concedes in advance that one’s client is indeed the Devil. I defile my own work with this very discussion. Cicero, Cato, and Sallust, nay, all the classical authors, in agreement on the criminality of Catiline, were the logical products of their age too. To Harris I reply in the words of Francesco Petrarca:

“You act as if people who live together must share everything, when in fact *inter bonos pessimi, inter pessimos boni habitant.*” (*In Magni Hominem* 31)

Harris bestowed her praise on a bad man, Livy on the good.

Ibsen held that “there nevertheless must have been a good deal that was great.” But even a broken clock is right twice per day. Catiline was great at being bad, but this is not the proper use of the term “great” since, for applied to Catiline “great” would mean despicable. Ibsen’s application of the word great here is *false by equivocation*, for it equivocates the *great* with the *bad* where great would properly correspond to *laudable* and bad to *contemptible*.

Ὁμώνυμα λεγεται ὄν ονομα μόνον κοινόν, ὁ δε κατα τούνομα λόγος της ουσίας ἕτερος. (*Categories* 1.1)

C. MacDonald says that

“He was no more dangerous or important than a number of other men.” Indeed, it appears that Caesar and Crassus may have been more dangerous than Catiline, since Catiline, it had been suggested, was working upon their orders. Or take this guy Lentulus for example; or Cethegus who “constantly complained of the inaction of his associates.” (*Bellum Catilinae* 43.3)

Cicero said,

“Catiline was the only one out of all these men to be feared and he only so as he was within the walls of Rome.” (3 *In Catilinam* 16)

Catiline was indeed the most important criminal in Rome at the time. He was the *sine qua non* of the *coup d'état*. Caesar and Crassus, if they were indeed backing him, could not have acted against the Republic without him and Cicero asserts that it was imperative that Catiline be removed from the seat of the government. C. MacDonald and Cassius Dio do agree, however, that the importance of the conspiracy was exaggerated.

“He [Catiline] gained a greater name than his deeds deserved.” (*Historiae Romanae* 37.42.1)

The history of this affair did not survive the ages by accident, but through its importance. His reputation exceeded his deeds because his intentions had been thwarted. If Catiline had succeeded, then, his deeds, I suppose, may have equaled his reputation if there was anyone left to report them. In the last analysis, however, the apologists for Catiline are the patrons of a scoundrel, φιλοπονηρος ‘love of the base,’ for they

“Seek out the losers in court...and imagine that with their friendship [they] will become more experienced and formidable...[they] admit the truth of the rest of what is said about him by people, but some points [they] do not believe.” (*Characters* 29)

For Catiline’s apologists, it is just as Homer said:

Νυν μὲν δὴ μάλα παγχυ κακὸς κακὸν ἠγῆλαζει  
ὡς αἰεὶ τὸν ὁμοῖον ἀγεί θεὸς ὡς τὸν ὁμοῖον·

Now, on the one hand, in its entirety, bad guides the bad, thus always God leads like to like. (*Odyssey* 17.218)

Furthermore,

“the friendship of inferior people is evil, for they take part together in inferior pursuits and by becoming like each other are made positively evil. But friendship of the good is good and grows with their inter course...

Εσθλον μεν γαρ αρ’ εσθα’

For, good things from good men. (*Nicomachean Ethics* 9.12.3)

The charges made against Catiline were more than rhetorical quips. Many thoroughly substantiated charges were made against him; but Catiline was not an ordinary subversive, he was a noble. He was a man of extraordinary political power and had not surrounded himself with what Harris referred to as “a motley crowd,” but with Senators and knights.

*Quod Antonius umbram suam metuit,*

*hic ne leges quidem.*

Whereas Antony is afraid of his own shadow,

this guy [Catiline] not even the laws. (*Handbook on Electioneering* 9)

Cato, during his speech against the conspirators captured in Rome, said:

“Citizens of the highest rank have conspired to fire their native city.” (*Bellum Catilinae* 52.24)

Catiline relied on the difficulty of combating conspiracy hatched within ones own native city: in this case, the challenge was to Cicero as the leading man of the *πολις*, to prove a conspiracy and cause the powers that be to act upon it.

“Conspiracies planned against one’s native city are less dangerous for those who plan them ...In organizing them there are not many dangers, for a citizen can make preparations to acquire power...It should be understood that this occurs in a Republic where some corruption already exists...Everyone has read about the conspiracy of Catiline described by Sallust and knows how, after the conspiracy was discovered, Catiline not only remained in Rome but came to the Senate and said insulting things both to the Senate and to the consul.” (*Discourses* 273)

Though Cicero *was* dictator by no means was he ruling by *dicta*. Convincing the Senate that a conspiracy was afoot was a difficult task. Whoever Cicero was; no matter what class or party he belonged to, he was the defender of the Republic. By all authorities defending the Republic at this time was a thing of virtue.

“Cicero, who had been hitherto distinguished only for eloquence, was now in everybody’s mouth as a man of action, and was considered unquestionably the saviour of his country on the eve of its destruction, for which reason the thanks of the assembly were bestowed upon him, amid general acclamations. At the instance of Cato the people saluted him as the Father of his Country. Some think that this appellation, which is now bestowed upon those emperors who are deemed worthy of it, had its beginning with Cicero. Although they are in fact kings, it is not given to them with their other titles immediately upon their accession, but is decreed to them in the progress of time, not as a matter of course, but as a final testimonial of the greatest services.” (*Civil Wars* 2.7).

The Republic was a qualitatively better development over the monarchy that had preceded it. The dictatorships of Cinna and Sulla had threatened its very existence. It was right to defend it.

“Go over with me, please, the events of the night before last. You will appreciate now that my concern for the safety of the Republic is much deeper than is yours for its destruction.” (1 *In Catilinam* 8)

Thus Cicero makes plain his true vested interests which were to defend the Republic. The Roman Empire was bad. No one disputes that it should have fallen, but whether or not it fell soon enough. Understanding this is the key to understanding why Catiline has become a negative archetype in the history of western civilizations. He is an arch villain not only of history, but of drama and poetry as well. Catiline had not yet passed the prime of his life, although he was rapidly approaching it. In many ways he still retained the character of a very young man who is

“Passionate, hot tempered and carried away by impulse...owing to [his] ambition.” (*Rhetoric* 2.12.3)

He was careless with his money to

“Which he [attached] only the slightest value because [he] had never experienced want.” (*Ibid* 2.12.6)

According to Aristotle, young men

“Are more courageous, for they are full of passion and hope...are high-minded, for they have not yet been humbled by life nor have they experienced the force of necessity; further there is high-mindedness in thinking oneself worthy of great

things...they prefer the noble to the useful; their life is guided by their character  
 ‘ηθος rather than by calculation...and do everything to excess.” (*Ibid* 2.12.9-11)

For instance, although Wilkins asserts that Catiline “performs admirably, but for an ignoble cause,” he was not brave. Although Aristotle says that the noblest form of death is death in battle, and that the courageous man fearlessly confronts a noble death, as Catiline seemed to do, Catiline was not courageous man, but a mad man.

“Of characters that run to excess...he who exceeds in fearlessness has no name...but we should call a mad man.” (*Nicomachean Ethics* 3.6.8-3.7.7)

During his defeat at Pistoria, Catiline showed no fear

“For it is a necessary incentive to fear that there should remain some hope of being saved.” (*Rhetoric* 2.5.14)

Since Catiline’s cause was clearly hopeless, it was for him just as Aristotle said it would be for a man who is being beaten to death, as Catiline was about to be at the time he exhorted his comrades, who would have no fear since he necessarily had already lost all hope. Thus Catiline was neither courageous nor noble, because, although he died in battle, he did not do so fearlessly, but out of the sense of having lost all hope. Moreover, Plutarch reported that Cato Major once said:

“There is a difference between a man’s prizing valour at a great rate, and valuing life at little.” (*Pelopidas*, Dryden Trans. 232)

Catiline, rather, was not a fearless man, but a man to be feared since he was a man of injustice possessed of power.

“Injustice is all the graver when it is armed injustice.” (*The Politics* 1253a1)

Cicero and Cato were the real heroes for preventing Catiline from gaining state power and for preserving the Republic.

Ironically, though Cicero was too a narcissist, in the end of the Catiline affair he begins to praise himself as a man of action, proving the unity of these traits in the personality.

“My conduct of this whole matter may be thought to display both foresight and action.” (3 *In Catilinam* 18)

Since by what means a man makes choices in life, according to Freud, is guided by pursuit of pleasure and avoidance of pain; it would seem that he and Aristotle could agree.

“For pleasure and pain extend throughout the whole life, and are of great moment and influence for virtue and happiness; since men choose what is pleasant and avoid what is painful.” (*Nicomachean Ethics* 10.1.1)

For the narcissist, pleasure is obtained and pain avoided, through intellectual pursuits, the “men of action” through the vain pursuit of many useless things of the material world, ‘the dunya’ دنيا. What the erotic pursue goes without explanation, but Catiline represented a fusion of the “man of action” and the erotic personality. The fact that Catiline left no written works, assayed his power imprudently, and committed many nefarious crimes compelled by lust testifies to this fact. Though Cicero would later be praised as “a man of action,” he manifests this through oratory in the political arena, a quintessentially narcissistic activity. Meanwhile Blok along with Ibsen would appear to fuse the erotic with the narcissistic.

Although Sallust was the primary historian of the *Bellum Catilinae*, it is important to understand that Cassius Dio, in his time, may have had access to texts which are non-

extant today. We cannot dismiss his work or presume that his narrative is corrupt on the grounds that it differs from Sallust or that it merely comes after Sallust. Indeed just as Greece was the conscience of all of Latium, and Greek historians are the lie detectors and reality-testers of contemporaneous Roman historians, they all together make-up, in the process, the scientific history of the period. Just as Rome cast a backward glance on Greece as its own antecedent, and the study of Livy casts a backward glance on Polybius; Cassius Dio looks back on Sallust, Cicero, Plutarch, et al, summing-up the entire period. Greek historians not only made-up the basis and the prototype for the Roman historians; they also checked their progress along the way, summing it up again at the very moment their own culture faded. Rome would go on. Just as Greek culture made Roman culture possible in the first place, later they made it possible for us to learn of it and understand it. Our debt to Cassius Dio, then, is immense; and we could say as much for Plutarch. Appian's history too must be consulted not so much for the history of the *Bellum Catilinae* itself, but for what led up to it and for what followed it, both for its causes and its consequences. We cannot, therefore, just take Sallust's version as the primary history and be done with it. We need Cassius Dio, and Plutarch, to capture the high ground, to gain perspective. Polybius stands as something to which Livy must be compared; Sallust too must be compared to Plutarch and Cassius Dio. Cicero is a primary source for the history of the *Bellum Catilinae*, but we must also keep in mind that Cicero had numerous vested against Catiline's conspiracy. Both his social position and his personality contended directly with those of Catiline and become the principal bones of contention for those who wish to dispute the veracity of the history as it has been handed down. Nevertheless, Cicero is the primary source for the history, Sallust is the primary historian.



“History is thus the believing someone else when he says that he remembers something. The believer is the historian; the person believed is called his authority.” (*The Idea of History* 235)

According to Sallust, after Sulla gained control of the state by means of arms and brought everything to a bad end from a good beginning, avarice controlled the people. Men like Catiline pillaged and squandered.

“To such men their riches seemed to me to have been but a plaything; for while they might have enjoyed them honorably, they made haste to squander them shamefully...they slept before they needed to sleep; they did not await the coming of hunger or thirst, of cold or of weariness, but all these things their self-indulgence anticipated.” (*Bellum Catilinae* 13.2)

In 66 B. C., when Catiline returned to Rome, he was already the subject of charges leveled against him by the envoys from Africa based on atrocities he had committed there where he was *propraetor* in 67-66. Even before that, in 73, he was accused of adultery with the Vestal Virgin Fabia. Quintus Latatius Catalus, consul in 78 and leader of the *Optimates*, testified in Catiline’s favor and he was acquitted. Furthermore, L. Annius Bellienus and L. Luscius, who had slain men during the proscriptions of Sulla, were tried for murder and convicted at the insistence of Julius Caesar. Catiline faced the same charges and was acquitted. Notwithstanding Cicero’s remarks to the effect that Catiline had been charged and acquitted at least twice (*Letters to Atticus* 59), Hardy says that the majority of the charges against Catiline

“Depended on mere rumor, had never been judicially investigated and were given inconsistently by other authorities.” Perhaps his remarks on this issue understate

Catiline's political power and the great amount of fear he instilled in the Senate and his propensity to dissemble effectively. Hutchinson says, "These accusations against Catiline lack conviction." (*The Conspiracy* 35)

Mommsen disagreed, because, according to him, Catiline was

"Accustomed to impose on his cowardly opponents by his audacious insolence...neither private persons nor officials ventured to lay hands on the dangerous man." (*The History of Rome* 477-78)

According to Plutarch,

"Even the heavenly powers seemed, by earthquakes and thunderbolts and apparitions, to foreshow what was coming to pass. And there were also human testimonies which were true, indeed, but not sufficient for the conviction of a man of reputation and great power like Catiline." (*Cicero* 14.4)

Cicero himself related a great number of portents, and a vision, which guided him through the whole affair. Herodotus said:

Φιλέει δέ κως προσημαίνειν, εὐτ' ἂν μέλλῃ μεγάλα κακὰ ἢ πόλι ἢ ἔθνει ἕσεσθαι

**"It mostly happens that there is some warning when great misfortunes are about to befall a state or a nation."** (*The History* 6.27)

MacDonald surmised the charges made against Catiline by ancient authors:

"In his speech *in toga candida*, delivered in the summer of 64, Cicero alleges a series of crimes committed over the past two decades. He says that at the time of the Sullan proscriptions Catiline had cut off the head of Marcus Marius Gratidianus and carried it through the streets of Rome, and that he had murdered Quintus Caecilius, Marcus Volumnius and Lucius Tanusius; that he had been

discreditably involved with the Vestal Fabia... that he had entered into an incestuous marriage with his daughter, whose name, Aurelia Orestilla, is supplied for us by Sallust. In the first speech against Catiline he adds the further allegation that after getting rid of his previous wife he committed another crime, the murder of his son. Two other writers add to this list. The author of the electioneering handbook, *commentariolum petitionis*, alleges that Catiline did away with his brother-in-law, a knight by the name of Quintus Caecilius, during the proscriptions. Plutarch relates that he killed his own brother and committed incest with his daughter.” (MacDonald 3-7)

MacDonald faults Cicero for not including the urban plebs in his list of *criminis auctores*, but there is no evidence that the urban plebs, as a class supported him, or that any class in particular supported him; rather Catiline’s supporters were, in fact, divided along the lines to which Cicero spoke. MacDonald says that the Roman masses, at first, supported him, but his own annotations prove this to be incorrect. Indeed, Sallust records a total of eight social groups gripped by Catiline’s insanity. According to him, the first group was “the whole body of the commons through desire for change.” (*Bellum Catilinae* 37.1-11) Here, since Sallust himself uses the word “*plebs*,” it could be argued, then, that Catiline was indeed supported by them, at least for a moment, but it is clear that his feelings were not mutual in this regard, because Catiline was a *sophist* not an orator.

“For what makes the sophist is not the faculty [of speech] but [his] moral purpose.” (*Rhetoric* 1.1.14)

Since, as it has already been established, Catiline was positively amoral; the body of the commons could have been *persuaded* to support Catiline but this in no way implies that Catiline had any *love* for them in return.

“Let loving be defined as wishing for anyone the things which we believe to be good, for his sake and not our own...Wherefore one who wishes for another what he wishes for himself seems to be the other’s friend.” (*Ibid.* 2.4.1-4)

Cicero says Catiline collected about him “a huge crowd of desperate men” (2 *In Catilinam* 8) not the entire class of the plebians. A crowd of desperate men is not a social class. In his first invective against Catiline, *ad hominem*, Cicero said:

*Quid est, Catiline? Num dubitas id me imperante facere quod iam tua sponte faciebas? Exire ex urbe iubet consul hostem. Interrogas me, num in exilium? Non iubeo, sed, si me consulis, suadeo. Quid est enim, Catilina, quod te iam in hac urbe delectare possit? In qua nemo est extra istam coniurationem perditorum hominum qui te non metuat, nemo qui non oderit. Quae nota domesticae turpitudinis non iusta vitae tuae est? Quod privatarum rerum dedecus non haeret in fama? Quae libido ab oculis, quod facinus a manibus umquam tuis, quod flagitium a toto corpore afuit? Cui tu adolescentulo quem corruptelarum inlecebris inretisses non aut ad audaciam ferrum aut ad libidinem facem praetulisti?*

What now, Catiline? Now do you hesitate to do by my command that which you were already willing to do? The consul orders the enemy to leave the city. You ask me, whether into exile? I do not order it, but, if you consult me, I recommend. For what is there in this city, Catiline, that will be able to delight you now? With respect to this, there is no one outside that conspiracy of hopeless

men of yours who does not fear you, who does not hate. What mark of family disgrace is not branded upon your life? What shame of your private affairs does not remain fixed on your reputation? What lust from your eyes, what crime ever from your hands, what shame from your whole body never was? Before what young man, whom you have ensnared with the allurements of seduction, have you not either boldly carried a sword or a passionate flame? (1 *In Catilinam* 13)

Mommsen declared:

“Catiline especially was one of the most wicked men in that wicked age. His villainies belong to the records of crime, not to history.” (*The History of Rome* 465)

Cicero had been an ally of Pompey’s, and an enemy of Sulla’s, since the time he served under Pompey in the war against the Marsians (B.C. 90-88). Plutarch says, incorrectly, that Cicero had served under Sulla when it was Pompey who had served under him (Cf. *Cicero* 3.2n1). Furthermore, on account of the fact that Cicero’s first defense was in favor of Roscius, one to whom his father had been proscribed by Sulla, Cicero fled to Greece for a number of years out of fear of Sulla. (Cf., *Pro Roscio*) It was there, in Athens, that Cicero cultivated his skills as an orator. After Cicero learned of Sulla’s death, having first consulted the oracle at Delphi who urged him to follow his own nature and not the opinion of the multitude, he returned to Rome in 77 B.C. (*Cicero* 3.4-5.2) In 75 B.C. he was appointed *quaestor* and won many friends defending the Sicilians. (*Ibid.* 6.1-3) 66 he was appointed *praetor* and convicted a man close to Crassus named Licinius Macer. (*Ibid.* 9.2) Two or three days before the expiration of his praetorship he set a trial date for Manilius, a friend of Pompey’s, in such a way that Cicero could defend

him on his last day in office. The tribunes were enraged and summoned Cicero to the rostra. (*Ibid.* 9.4-7)

In the 66 election for the consulship of 65, Autronius Paetus and Cornelius Sulla—a nephew of the great Sulla—were disqualified for bribery. They joined a secret league of men formed from the highest ranks of Roman society who sought to obtain power by any means necessary. It seems that Catiline also violated Machiavelli’s laws of conspiracy in several ways. The whole plot was fractured with fatal flaws from the very beginning due to Catiline’s disordered thinking and his tangled web of lies. According to Machiavelli it is difficult to develop a conspiracy beyond three or four persons in number. (*Discourses* 262) At Catiline’s first meeting at the home of Procius Laeca:

“The question of the authenticity of this conspiracy became one of the most debated points of modern historical research, an investigation which has led to conflicting results and at times to conjectures of a bizarre kind. The reasons for this are to be found in the nature of the primary sources and in the manner in which this evidence has been interpreted by modern historians.” (McGushin 298)

And though four ancient authors testify, though inconsistently, that there was a conspiracy J. T. Ramsey hastily concludes that the evidence for the first conspiracy did not happen. Let us look at the evidence.

*Quos non nominet intellegitis. Fuit enim opinio Catilinam et Cn. Pisonem, adolescentem perditum, coniurasse ad caedem senatus faciendam ante annum quam haec dicta sunt, Cotta et Torquato coss., eamque caedem ideo non esse factam quod prius quam parati essent coniuratis signum dedisset Catilina. Piso*

*autem, cum haec dicerentur, perierat, in Hispaniam missus a senatu per honorem legationis ut (?)avus suus ablegaretur. Ibi quidem dum iniurias provincialibus facit, occisus erat, ut quidam credebant, a Cn. Pompeii clientibus Pompeio non invito. (Asconius 92)*

*[9] Nec eo setius maiora mox in urbe molitus est: siquidem ante paucos dies quam aedilitatem iniret, uenit in suspicionem conspirasse cum Marco Crasso consulari, item Publio Sulla et L. Autronio post designationem consulatus ambitus condemnatis, ut principio anni senatum adorirentur, et trucidatis quos placitum esset, dictaturam Crassus inuaderet, ipse ab eo magister equitum diceretur constitutaque ad arbitrium re publica Sullae et Autronio consulatus restitueretur. meminerunt huius coniurationis Tanusius Geminus in historia, Marcus Bibulus in edictis, C. Curio pater in orationibus. de hac significare uidetur et Cicero in quadam ad Axium epistula referens Caesarem in consulatu confirmasse regnum, de quo aedilis cogitabat. Tanusius adicit Crassum paenitentia uel metu diem caedi destinatum non obisse et idcirco ne Caesarem quidem signum, quod ab eo dari conuenerat, dedisse; conuenisse autem Curio ait, ut togam de umeris deiceret. idem Curio sed et M. Actorius Naso auctores sunt conspirasse eum etiam cum Gnaeo Pisone adolescente, cui ob suspicionem urbanae coniurationis prouincia Hispania ultro extra ordinem data sit; pactumque ut simul foris ille, ipse Romae ad res nouas consurgerent, per Ambranos et Transpadanos; destitutum utriusque consilium morte Pisonis. (Divus Iulius 9)*

*Illius igitur coniurationis quae facta contra vos, delata ad vos, a vobis prolata esse dicitur, ego testis esse non potui; non modo animo nihil comperi, sed vix ad auris meas istius suspicionis fama pervenit. (Pro Sulla 12)*

*Omnia quae per hoc triennium agitata sunt, iam ab eo tempore quo a L. Catilina et Cn. Pisone initum consilium senatus interficiendi scitis esse, in hos dies, in hos mensis, in hoc tempus erumpunt. (Pro Murena 81)*

“Publius Paetus and Cornelius Sulla, a nephew of the great Sulla, who had been elected consuls and then convicted of bribery, had plotted to kill their accusers, Lucius Cotta and Lucius Torquatus, especially after the latter had also been convicted. (4) Among others who had been suborned were Gnaeus Piso and also Lucius Catiline.” (*Historiae Romanae* 36.44.3-4)

Lucius Cotta and Lucius Torquatus ascended to the high office in 65 (*Historiae Romanae* 36.44.3) followed by Lucius Caesar and Gaius Figulus in 64. (*Bellum Catilinae* 17.1) Piso and Catiline were the principal actors in a plot to assail the Senate with armed men in the *putsch* of Jan. 1, 65 B.C. The newly elected consuls were to be put to death, Sulla and Paetus reinstated; Crassus was to be acclaimed dictator and Caesar the Master of the Horse. According to this sinister plan, Catiline was to await a signal to be given by Caesar upon a hint from Crassus, but Crassus was absent. (*The History of Rome* 466) Since this plot failed, they decided to postpone the action until Feb. 5th.



Under the revised plan, they decided to murder not only the consuls but a number of senators as well. The conspiracy came to naught because Catiline gave the signal for the attack too early. The armed conspirators had not yet assembled in sufficient number to follow through with the plan, but Piso's intentions became known to all. (*Bellum Catilinae* 18.1-8) "On that day the most dreadful crime since the founding of the city of Rome would have been perpetrated." (*Ibid.* 18.8) Piso was defended by Crassus. "The Senate, however, had been quite willing to give him the province, wishing to remove this shameless fellow to a distance from the seat of government." (*Ibid.* 19.1) Cassius Dio says that a decree would have been passed against the conspirators but the tribunes had opposed it thinking that a conviction against Piso would have caused a riot. Piso was sent on to Spain where he met his death. (*Historiae Romanae* 36.44.5)

At the time of the *Bellum Catilinae*, Pompey was absent from Rome, in the east, waging war on the kings of Pontus and Armenia. In 64,

"Catiline wished to obtain first a strong base of operation, and therefore sued for the consulship" sued for the consulship hoping that he might share the office with Antonius.<sup>129</sup> The populace, having recognized Antonius as a weak leader, who, as consul, would only add strength to the man next to him, chose Cicero over Catiline. (*Cicero* 11.1-3)

During this time, the tribunes were introducing legislation that would have appointed a commission of ten men, a *decimvirate*, with unlimited power to rule Rome and all its territories. Antonius was one of those who favored the legislation. Pompey, so says Cassius Dio, returned to Rome in 63 where he was granted, at the insistence of Caesar

---

<sup>129</sup> Gaius Antony was the brother of the infamous Marc Antony. Γάϊον, τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἀντωνίου. (*Civil Wars* 4.10.75)

and against the recommendation of Cato, the “trophy of the inhabited world” in honor of all his wars.

“He did not, however, add any other title to his name, but was satisfied with that of Magnus alone, which he had gained even before these achievements. Nor did he contrive to receive any other extravagant honor.” (*Historiae Romanae* 37.20.4.-21.4)

The principal contradictory statement in Catiline’s speech to the conspirators, however, was his reliance on the *succession* movements of the plebeians against the patricians for Catiline was, after all, himself a patrician. The term *succession*, moreover, implied that Catiline looked forward to a separation with Rome, as if to leave to found a new city. It was through the *First Succession* movement (494 B.C.) that the *Tribunate of the Plebs*, δῆμαρχος, was created. After this a *Tribunnus Plebis* was elected annually and is considered to have been the first step toward democracy between the members of the ruling classes. Catiline, obviously, intended nothing of the sort. As a supporter of Sulla he could not have, since Sulla had abolished the tribunes and removed the juries from the equestrian order and they were not restored until 70 B.C. by the Consuls Pompey and Crassus. Catiline, in his speech, went on to contrast the wealth of his enemies with the poverty of his friends. Whereupon, Catiline promised his friends the abolition of their debts and the *proscription* of the rich. Here Catiline’s use of the word *proscription* shows he was still genetically tied to the politics of Sulla. In light of this, it would be difficult to articulate an argument to the effect that Catiline actually stood for something else besides Sulla’s political program. Catiline clearly sought to imitate the proscriptions of Sulla. He was not a reformer, then, but a reactionary. Catiline continued:

[4] Thereupon, he heaped abuse on all good men, and lauded each of his followers by name; reminded one of his needs, the other of his desires, several of their danger or disgrace, many of the victories of Sulla, to whom he had been prey. [5] When all their spirits he saw aflame, he dismissed the meeting; urging them to have at heart, his candidacy. (*Bellum Catilinae* 21.4-5)

In short, Catiline claiming the advantage of the stronger promised to benefit his friends, harm his enemies, and see that justice be done. In Plato's *Republic*, Simonides says that justice is giving each person his due,

“Fiends owe it to friends to do them some good and no evil... owing from an enemy to an enemy what also is proper for him, some evil... To do good to friends and evil to enemies.” (*Republic* 331e-332d)

Later on, Thrasymachus claims:

“The just is nothing else than the advantage of the stronger.” (*Ibid.* 1.338)

By lauding each man by name, Catiline also addressed each man's particular problem and promised to ameliorate that particular condition. This is decidedly different than promising to satisfy a single want shared by members of a single class; such as freeing the slaves and proscribing the rich, for instance. Indeed, since Catiline did not represent any particular social class, he could do nothing less than promise a particular benefit to each and every particular friend. After that, Catiline bound his criminals to the future crime with a crime.

*Vina mutato fluunt cruenta.*

Wine changed flowing into blood. (*Thyestes* 700-1)

Cassius Dio's narration depicts the gravity of the crime. According to him, Gaius Antonius, a participant in the 1st conspiracy of 66 (*Ibid.* 21.3) who was co-consul along with Cicero:

“Sacrificed a boy, and after administering the oath over his vitals, ate these in company with the others.” (*Historiae Romanae* 37.30.3)

Although the extant historical narratives do not tell us which of the victim's vital organs, besides the blood, were eaten, Hegel noted that to the ancients the bodily organs corresponded to certain gods and supernatural powers.

“Plato even assigns the liver something still higher, something which is even regarded by some as the highest function of all, viz. prophesying, or the gift of speaking of holy and eternal things in a non-rational manner.” (*Phenomenology of Spirit* 326)

About this human sacrifice Florus would later say:

*Additum est pignus coniurationis sanguis humanus, quem circumlatum pateris bibere: summum nefas, ni amplius esset propter quod biberunt.*

The human blood which they passed around in the *paterae*<sup>130</sup> to drink and used as a pledge for the conspiracy would be a consummate sin if the reason for which they drank it not a greater one. (*Epitome* 2.12.4)

And though human sacrifice was outlawed in Rome and its territories in 97 B.C. (Cf. *Human Sacrifice* 35), Polydore Virgil in his *De Inventoribus Rerum* (1499) said:

*Sic ferme apud Romanos iusiurandum inter factiosos confirmabatur, testificante Sallustio, qhi scibit Catilinam humani corporis sanguinem vino permistum in pateris circumtulisse sociis coniurationis, et eos singillatim degustasse quo inter*

---

<sup>130</sup> The broad, flat dish or saucer used by the Romans for drinking and for offering libations.

*se magis fidi forent. Atqui hodie illud idem fit inter eos, qui ad aliquod insigne scelus faciendum conspirant.*

In this way, as Sallust so testifies, an oath was affirmed among the Roman factions. He writes that Catiline passed around blood from a human body mixed with wine in *paterae* and that they, one by one, tasted it so that there would be more trust among themselves. And, at any rate, this same thing is done today as a symbol among those who conspire to commit a crime. (*De Inventoribus Rerum* 2.15.7-8)

Cicero, moreover, expressed contemporary Romans had for human sacrifice which continued to be practiced in Gaul:

*Postremo his quicquam sanctum ac religiosum videri potest qui, etiam si quando aliquo metu adducti deos placandos esse arbitrantur, humanis hostiis eorum aras ac templa funestant, ut ne religionem quidem colere possint, nisi eam ipsam prius scelere violarint? quis enim ignorat eos usque ad hanc diem retinere illam immanem ac barbaram consuetudinem hominum immolatorum? quam ob rem quali fide, quali pietate existimatis esse eos qui etiam deos immortalis arbitrentur hominum scelere et sanguine facillime posse placari?*

Finally, can anything appear sacred and pious to these men, who, if ever are so much as witnessed to have been led by fear to be appeasing the gods, dishonoring by murder their altars and temples with human victims, so that indeed they should be able to cultivate no religious duty without first having violated it with a crime? Who in fact does not know they continue to retain to this very day that monstrous

and barbaric<sup>131</sup> custom of human immolation? What do you reckon, on account of this affair, to be the nature of the faith, the nature of the piety, of they who indeed suppose they themselves to be able to appease the immortal gods by means of sin and human blood? (*Pro Fonteio* 31)

Although we do not know who was martyred by this sacrifice, and we know neither how nor when Catiline had murdered his son, the insinuation that his son was the victim of this crime in *actuality* can never be proven to any satisfactory degree of *certainty*. Fulvia had her own dialectical counterpart in the persona of Sempronia the shameless. Giovanni Boccaccio, in his *Famous Women* (1362), said:

*Porro, ut in unum eius et extremum, ut arbitror, facinus omnia eius concludamus scelera, flagrante illa pestifera face seditiosissimi hominis Lucii Catiline et se iniquis consiliis et coniuratorum numero ad desolationem perpetuam romane reipublice in ampliores vires assidue extollente, facinorosa mulier ad pleniorum suarum libidinum captandam licentiam, id appetens quod etiam perditis hminibus fuisset horrore, coniuratis se immiscuit ultro; domus etiam ue penetralia sevis colloquiis patuere semper. Verum nequitiis obsistente Deo, et Ciceronis studio coniuratorum detectis insidiis, cum iam Catilina Fesulas secessisset, in aliorum excidium frustratam arbitror corruisse.*

Let us surmise all of her wicked deeds into one crime which, as I believe, was also her last; that pernicious woman eagerly took part in the grand sedition of that man Lucius Catiline. On account of the fact that she herself was overflowing with lust, this nefarious woman, seeking to lay hold of liberties that would have

---

<sup>131</sup> Fem acc. sing. of *barbarus*, strange speech, unintelligible; foreign or strange in mind or character; uncultivated, ignorant; rude, unpolished

horrified even the most desperate men, voluntarily mixed herself up in the conspiracy; indeed even her home was always open for sleazy meetings with the pig. But God, in fact, opposes wickedness, and on account of Cicero's zeal, the men of the conspiracy were discovered by means of an ambush, now that, I believe, is when Catiline may have withdrawn to Fiesole, she, her scheming having been ruined, perished along with the others. (*Famous Women* 79.13)

In July of 63 B.C. Catiline again announced his candidacy, this time it was a cover for his *putsch* against the consulship, Cicero, and *res publica*. According to Plutarch, Cicero postponed the day of the elections and summoned Catiline to the Senate to question him about his activities. Catiline reportedly made a spectacle of himself with remarks to the effect:

“‘What dreadful thing, pray,’ said he, ‘am I doing, if when there are two bodies, one lean and wasted, but with a head, and the other headless, but strong and large, I myself become a head for this?’” (*Cicero* 14.6-7)

Catiline's parable was intended to signify the meaning that Catiline was the head of a body politic that was *lean and wasted*, due to its political poverty, and that the Roman Republic, being *strong and large*, was headless with Cicero, or anyone besides Catiline, at its helm. Because of Catiline's remarks in the Senate, Cicero became seriously alarmed and began wearing a breastplate under his tunic which he showed to the commons by loosing the tunic from his shoulders from time to time. (*Ibid.* 14.7-8)

“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 utmost, since his covert attempts had resulted in disappointment and disgrace.” (*Bellum Catilinae* 26.5)

“He again suffered defeat, this time at the hands of Decimus Junius Silanus and Lucius Licinius Murena...The highest office in the State...was not to be his by constitutional means, and it was the realization of this fact that turned Catiline into an active revolutionary...This was the only path now left open to him.” (MacDonald 5-6)

Mommsen says that Catiline and Piso were the political tools of Crassus and Caesar. (*The History of Rome* 468)

“[Cicero], in later years, when he had no reason to disguise the truth...expressly named Caesar among the accomplices.” (*Ibid.* 486)

“In the affair of Catiline, which was very serious, and almost subversive to Rome, some suspicion attached itself to Crassus, and a man publicly named him as one of the conspirators, but nobody believed him. The conspirator Lucius Tarquinius confirmed the testimony of Volturcius and then implicated Crassus. (*Bellum Catilinae* 48.3-9)

“Nevertheless, in one of his orations [non-extant] plainly inculpated Crassus and Caesar. This oration, it is true, was not published until both were dead; but in his treatise upon his consulship [non-extant], Cicero says that Crassus came to him by night with a letter which gave details of the affair of Catiline, and felt that he was at last establishing the fact of a conspiracy.” (*Crassus* 13.2)

Machiavelli said about Caesar’s character,



“Anyone who wishes to know what writers, when free, would say about him should see what they say about Catiline.” (*Discourses* 48)

Mommsen said,

“Anyone who impartially considers the course of the conspiracy will not be able to resist the suspicion that during all this time Catiline was backed by more powerful men.” (*The History of Rome* 488)

Having been defeated in all legal but not in all illegal means of securing a consulship for himself, Catiline redoubled his efforts. He drew together his band of conspirators and harangued them about the nature of the government to the effect that the wealth and power of the state were in the hands of the few and urged them to action. (*Bellum Catilinae* 20.1-17) In his speech to his conspirators Catiline denied in advance what he had already planned to do.

“We have taken up arms, not against our fatherland not to bring danger upon others, but to protect our own persons against outrage.” (*Ibid.* 33.1)

This is contradictory to the known fact that he, *inter alia*, intended to burn the city.

“Catiline believed that he could tempt the city slaves to his side and set fire to Rome.” (*Ibid.* 24.4)

He went on to blame the moneylenders for their ruin. This may at least in part be true. It is, after all, well known fact that usury was out of control in the Roman Republic and that many had been ruined by falling into debt. Usury, το δαιζειν, was illegal in Rome during the early period. According to Appian,

Του δ' αὐτοῦ χρόνου κατὰ τὸ αὖστυ οἱ χρηῖσται πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἐστασίασαν, οἱ μὲν πράττοντες τὰ χρέα σὺν τόκοις, νόμου τινὸς παλαιοῦ διαγορεύοντος μὴ δανείζειν

ἐπὶ τόκοις ἢ ζημίαν τὸν οὕτω δανείσαντα προσοφλεῖν. ἀποστραφῆναι γάρ μοι δοκούσιν οἱ πάλαι Ῥωμαῖοι, καθάπερ Ἕλληνες, τὸ δανεῖζειν ὡς καπηλικὸν καὶ βαρὺ τοῖς πένησι καὶ δύσερι καὶ ἐχθροποιόν, ὡς λόγῳ καὶ Πέρσαι τὸ κίχρασθαι ὡς ἀπατηλὸν τε καὶ φιλοψευδές. ἔθους δὲ χρονίου τοὺς τόκους βεβαιουήντος, οἱ μὲν κατὰ τὸ ἔθος ἤτουν, οἱ δὲ οἷον ἐκ πολέμων τε καὶ στάσεων ἀνεβάλλοντο τὰς ἀποδόσεις: εἰσὶ δ' οἱ καὶ τὴν ζημίαν τοὺς δανείσαντας ἐκτίσειν ἐπηπεῖλουν.

“An old law distinctly forbade lending on interest and imposed a penalty upon any one doing so. It seems that the ancient Romans, like the Greeks, abhorred the taking of interest on loans as something knavish, and hard on the poor, and leading to contention and enmity. But since time had sanctioned the practice of taking interest, the creditors demanded it according to custom. The debtors, on the other hand, put off their payments on the plea of war and civil commotion. Some indeed threatened to exact the legal penalty from the interest-takers.” (*Civil Wars* 1.6.54)

After the *Social War* the practice of usury was fought to a standstill in the courts. The usurers, in order to breach the logjam killed the praetor Asellio while he was making sacrifice to the god Castor.

“The Senate offered a reward of money to any free citizen, freedom to any slave, impunity to any accomplice, who should give testimony leading to the conviction of the murderers of Asellio, but nobody gave any information. The money-lenders covered up everything.” (*Ibid*)

Herodotus reported that usury was also forbidden amongst contemporaneous Persians,

Αἰσχιστον δὲ αὐτοῖσι τὸ ψεύδεσθαι νενόμισται, δεύτερα δὲ τὸ ὀφείλειν χρέος, πολλῶν μὲν καὶ ἄλλων εἴνεκα, μάλιστα δὲ ἀναγκαίην φασὶ εἶναι τὸν ὀφείλοντα καὶ τι ψεῦδος λέγειν.

The foremost shameful thing, according to custom, is to cheat by lies, the second is to owe a debt, on account of owing, *inter alia*, it is said to be necessary to speak more lies. (*The History* 1.138.1)

Aristotle noted:

Εὐλογώτατα μισεῖται ἡ ὀβολοστατικὴ διὰ τὸ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ νομίσματος εἶναι τὴν κτήσιν καὶ οὐκ ἐφ' ὅπερ ἐπορίσθη. μεταβολῆς γὰρ ἐγένετο χάριν, [5] ὁ δὲ τόκος αὐτὸ ποιεῖ πλέον ὄθεν καὶ τοῦνομα τοῦτ' εἴληφεν: ὅμοια γὰρ τὰ τικτόμενα τοῖς γεννώσιν αὐτὰ ἐστίν, ὁ δὲ τόκος γίνεται νόμισμα ἐκ νομίσματος: ὥστε καὶ μάλιστα παρὰ φύσιν οὗτος τῶν χρηματισμῶν ἐστίν. (*The Politics* 258b1-5)

Though the Greek would also add *hubris*, ὕβρις, among the great breeches of social decorum, something of which Catiline very much had.

Next, Catiline was:

“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...Finally, when his manifold attempts met with no success, again in the dead of night he summoned the ringleaders of the conspiracy.” (*Bellum Catilinae* 27.2-3)

Quintus Curius was the weakest link. Unable to keep a secret, he revealed the whole plan to his mistress Fulvia who told a number of people.

“All these facts, while they were still secret, were communicated to Cicero by Fulvia, a woman of quality. Her lover, Quintus Curius, who had been expelled from the Senate for many deeds of shame and was thought fit to share in this plot of Catiline’s, told his mistress in a vain and boastful way that he would soon be in a position of power. By now, too, a rumor of what was transpiring in Italy was getting about.” (*Civil Wars* 2.3)

Naturally, the bad news eventually fell upon the ears of Cicero; and he began to regularly use Fulvia as an informant about Catiline’s criminal mechanizations. (*Bellum Catilinae* 23.1-4) Later, in 63 when Catiline again ran for consul, Cicero persuaded Quintus Curius to reveal Catiline’s plan and immediately countered Catiline’s plot by first paying off Gaius Antonius and surrounded himself with a bodyguard. (*Ibid.* 26.3-4) According to Diodorus Siculus, Quintus Curius, after having been slighted by Fulvia, told her that within a few days she would be in his power and later, when they were drinking, she persuaded him to tell her what he had meant by that remark

“And he, wishing in his infatuation to please her, disclosed the whole truth. She pretended to have taken what was said sympathetically and joyfully, and held her peace, but on the morrow went to the wife of Cicero the consul, and speaking privately with her about the matter reported what the young man had said.” (*Library of History* 12.40.5.1)

According to Plutarch, while Catiline’s soldiers were assembling in Etruria, Crassus, Marcus Marcellus, and Scipio Metellus came to Cicero’s home on the night of Oct. 18 and, after having dined with him, an unidentified man brought Crassus some letters which were addressed to a number of different persons. One of those letters lacked a

signature, but was addressed to Crassus, which he read. This letter reportedly warned Crassus of the bloodshed to come at the hands of Catiline and advised him to flee the city. In order to deflect suspicion from himself, so says Plutarch, Crassus handed over the letters to Cicero who convened the Senate at dawn. Cicero delivered these letters to the persons to whom they had been addressed and compelled each of them to read his letter aloud. All the letters told of the plot.

The Senate passed a decree Oct. 20 that placed charge of the state in the hands of the two consuls, Cicero and Antonius. Thus a decree of *imperium* was conferred; Cicero was appointed *dictator*; Antonius the *master of the horse*.

“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 order of the people.” (*Bellum Catilinae* 29.3)

Such a decree of *imperium* had not been pronounced by the Senate at Rome since the *Third Punic War* (146 B.C.). The consuls, having been so empowered, were entrusted with all the power and the responsibility to save the city. Cicero surrounded himself with a bodyguard and began appointing officials to carry out his commands. (*Cicero* 15.1-16.1)

Catiline, having learned of this, prepared to join Manlius in Etruria. Manlius took the field with a large army on the 27th of October and began to inflame Etruria where many had lost their lands during the proscriptions of Sulla. The expropriated land had been

settled by Sulla's veterans. Faesulae, in Etruria, was a Sullan stronghold, but many who had lost their lands during the proscriptions were also ready for war.

On Nov. 6, in the dead of night, Catiline, once again, summoned the leaders of the conspiracy to the house of Porcius Laeca where he suborned two knights, Gaius Cornelius and Lucius Vargunteius, into a plot to murder Cicero at his home. The informant Curius told Fulvia who told Cicero who surrounded his home with a great many men. Cicero brought the matter to the attention of the Senate and the Senate took heed.

Cicero summoned Catiline to the Senate, who presented himself in one, last, and final dissemblance.

“Catiline at first welcomed this heartily, as if supported by a good conscience, and pretended to make ready for trial, even offering to surrender himself to Cicero...Cicero, however, refused to take charge of him, [and] he voluntarily took up residence at the house of Metellus the praetor, in order that he might be as free as possible from the suspicion of promoting a revolution until he should gain some additional strength from the conspirators there in the city. But he made no headway at all, since Antonius shrank back through fear and Lentulus was anything but energetic.” (*Historiae Romanae* 37.32.1-3)

His very presence in the Senate caused a great deal of unease. It seemed to them that Catiline was up to something nefarious but many were uncertain, considering his position and the position of his chief adversary, as to what to do about it.

“No senator, however, would sit with him, but all moved away from the bench where he was.” (*Cicero* 16.4)

He claimed that he was the victim of calumny. In the Senate on Nov. 8, Cicero delivered his first invective against Catiline.

Diodorus Siculus:

“Catiline, on being openly accused to his face declared that under no circumstances would he condemn himself to voluntary exile without a trial. Cicero put the question to the senators, whether it was their wish to banish Catiline from the city. When the majority, abashed by the man’s presence remained silent, Cicero, wishing as it were to probe their sentiments exactly, turned the question and asked the senators next whether they would order him to banish Quintus Catulus from Rome. When with one voice they all shouted their disapproval and showed their displeasure at what was said, Cicero, reverting to Catiline, remarked that when they considered a man not deserving of banishment they shouted with all their might; hence it was evident that by silence they were agreeing to his banishment. Catiline, after stating that he would think it over in private, withdrew.” (*Library of History* 12.40.5a.1) *Qui tacebant consentire videntur.*

“He gladly withdrew on this excuse, and went to Faesulae, where he took up war openly. Assuming the name and dress of the consuls, he proceeded to organize the men.” (*Historiae Romanae* 37.2)

Instead of following through with his threat to have Catiline executed; Cicero said,

“We have a decree of the Senate...but it is locked up with the records like a sword buried in its sheath; yet it is a decree which you, Catiline, ought to have been executed immediately,” (*Ibid.* 4)

Cicero magnanimously granted Catiline the option to leave the city.

“Catiline, finish the journey you have begun: at long last leave the city: the gates are open: be on your way...Take all your men with you or, if you cannot take them all, take as many as you can...You cannot remain among us any longer; I cannot, I will not, I must not permit it.” (*Ibid.* 10)

Theophrastus’ character analysis of the ironic man, the dissembler, describes Catiline perfectly in this instance. The ironic or dissembling man is one:

“Who goes up to his enemies and is willing to chat with them...He admits to nothing that he is actually doing, but says he’s thinking it over.” (*Characters* 1)

Catiline left Rome under the pretext of going into voluntary exile at Marseilles in order to spare Rome the calamities of civil war, but he had no intention of doing this in earnest until he later learned of the death of the conspirators he left behind in Rome. Omens and portents along with rumors of war flooded the city. According to Livy, during the consulship of Marcus Cicero and Gaius Antonius several things were struck by lightning:

*Fulmine pleraque decussa Sereno Vargunteius Pompeiis de caelo exanimatus. Trabis ardens ab occasu ad caelem extendit. Terrae motu Spoletum totum concussum et quaedam corruerunt. Inter alia relatum, biennio ante in Capitolio lupam Remi et romuli fulmine iactam, signumque Iovis cum columna disiectum*



*aruspicum response in foro repositum. Tabulae legume aeneae caelo tactae litteris liquefactis. Ab his prodigiis Catilinae nefaria conspiratio coepta.*

Many things were struck down by lightning. Sereno Vargunteius was himself struck down from heaven. A burning timber extended up into the sky from the West. An earthquake shook all of Spoletum and certain things fell down. Among other things, it was related that two years before the she-wolf of Romulus and Remus had been struck by lightning in front of the Capitol and the statue of Jupiter with its column had been shattered but had been replaced in the Forum upon a reply from the soothsayers. Bronze tablets containing the laws were struck from the sky liquefying the letters. With these prodigies, the nefarious conspiracy of Catiline began. (*Julius Obsequens* 61)

Cassius Dio also recorded the occurrence of many portents during the consulship of Antonius and Cicero, among them were thunderbolts, earthquakes, human apparitions, flashes of fire in the west.

“Even a layman, was bound to know in advance what was signified by them.”

(*Historiae Romanae* 37.25.2)

A great many people were about to die. The Senate announced a reward for any information about the plot, the gladiators were quartered on Capua; Rome was at watch night and day. Gloom and apprehension replaced gaiety.

On Nov. 9, the next day Cicero addressed the people, delivering his second invective against Catiline, *ad populum*.

Cicero had outsmarted him militarily as well as politically. Catiline was no longer able to rely on the activities of ordinary citizens neither as a cover for his clandestine military

activity nor was he able dissemble to, and confuse, the people directly. Once drawn out into the open field, as Cicero repeatedly said *muris interest* ‘a city wall is between us’ (2 *In Catilinam* 17 *et passim*), it was easier, both to the people, *ad populum*, and to the Senate, *ad senatum*, to distinguish friend from foe and when it came to war the innocent would be spared. As a delay tactic, Manlius sent an attaché, along entourage, to Marcus Rex declaring that Catiline’s men had not taken up arms against the fatherland, but to defend themselves from outrage.

In addition to these letters, Catiline also sent letters to the consuls and many nobles

“saying that he was the victim of false accusations and unable to cope with the intrigues of his personal enemies, he bowed to fate and was on his way to exile at Massilia.” (*Ibid.* 34.2)

In a different letter addressed to Quintus Catulus:

“Maddened by wrongs and slights...I followed my usual custom and took up the general cause of the unfortunate.” (*Ibid.* 35.1-3)

Although, in this letter to Catulus, Catiline claimed he had taken up the cause of the unfortunate, he had not actually done so, but distributed these documents to feign his victimhood, as he had been doing all along. One of those letters was in fact a ruse which was intended to signal the remaining conspirators to initiate the insurrection.

On Nov. 17, the Senate had resolved to charge Catiline and Manlius with the *Plautian Law* which had been passed in 89 B.C. by M. Plautius Silvanus, tribune of the

commons, and directed against acts of violence and breaches of the peace. (*Ibid.* 31.4-5, n. 4)

Plutarch said that one of the most dangerous criminals Catiline had left behind in Rome, in order to initiate the insurrection there at the appointed time, was Publius Cornelius Lentulus.

This man was so shameless and arrogant that at one time, when he was under prosecution, he bribed the jury and, when acquitted by only two votes said

“That what he had given to the second juror was wasted money, since it would have sufficed if he had been acquitted by only one vote.” (*Cicero* 17.4)

He was so utterly conceited that he went about Rome reciting forged oracles from the Sibylline books to the effect that Rome was fated to be ruled by three Cornelii. According to this urban legend Cinna and Sulla had been the first two and Publius, having the *nomen* ‘middle-name’ Cornelius was thereby destined to become the third. (*Ibid.* 17.5).

“He also said that this was the year, the tenth after the acquittal of the Vestal Virgins and the twentieth after the burning of the Capitol, fated for the destruction of Rome and her empire.” (3 *In Catilinam* 9)

In order to effectuate this he conceived of a plan to kill all the senators and as many of the other citizens as he possibly could; while at the same time setting the city aflame and sparing only the children of Pompey whom he intended to hold hostage. The night of *Saturnalia*, December 19, was chosen for the insurrection; (3 *In Catilinam* 10) the weapons were quartered in the house of Cethegus, and a hundred armed men were stationed in strategic places around Rome ready to commit arson upon receiving the

signal. Others were to stop the aqueducts and kill anyone who tried to bring water to extinguish the blazes (*Cicero* 18.1-3)

Meanwhile, two ambassadors of the Allobroges, a Celtic tribe oppressed by Rome and residing in Gaul, were intercepted by Lentulus and his gang who tried to persuade them to join the conspiracy and incite Gaul into revolt. (*Ibid.* 18.4-5). Sallust says it was Publius Umbrenus who sought them out. (*Bellum Catilinae* 40.1) At any rate, the Allobroges were outfitted with all sorts of letters to take to their Senate, which made all sorts of false promises regarding their freedom, and to Catiline which urged him to set the slaves free to march on Rome. (*Cicero* 18.6) And so the story goes, the Allobroges disclosed the plan to their national representative in Rome, Quintus Fabius Sanga, who told Cicero.

The plot was rapidly unfolding. Cicero was hardly napping. He made arrangements with the Allobroges to visit Lentulus, Cethegus, Statilius, and Cassius to demand an oath from them which they could carry back with them to their countrymen in Gaul. They all complied except Cassius who promised to come to Gaul, but instead slipped away.

On account of the fact that many of the conspirators were licentious men who rarely met without wine, women and song, informants easily kept track of their comings and goings and reported their findings to Cicero. Lentulus gave a letter to Titus Volturcius of Crotona and sent him along with the Allobroges who, on his way home,

was to confirm to Catiline that an alliance had been made. An ambush set by Cicero's men on Dec. 2, Lucius Valerius Flaccus and Gaius Pomptinus, captured Tius Volturcius at the Mulvian Bridge. (*Ibid.* 45.1)

Cicero again convened the Senate the following day, Dec. 3, and tried the men. Volturcius, after having been granted a pardon in exchange for his cooperation, gave details of the affair. (*Bellum Catilinae* 47.1 et 3 *In Catilinam* 8)

The Senate read the letters and examined the informants who told of plots to kill three consuls and four praetors. Having been charged by the Senate with conducting an investigation, Caius Sulpicius, a Praetor, discovered a huge cache of missiles, swords and knives at Cethegus' house.

Lentulus was convicted and resigned his office as praetor. (*Cicero* 18.6-19.4)

Cicero delivered his third invective against Catiline, to the people, *Argumentum ad populum*, explaining how the conspirators were caught.

“Not to make a long story of it, citizens, we ordered the letter to be produced which each man was alleged to have given them [the Allobroges]. We first showed Cethegus his letter and he identified his seal. We cut the string and read the letter...Now, when his letter was read out, he stood paralyzed and smitten by his guilty conscience and suddenly fell silent...Statilius was brought in and identified his seal and handwriting. His letter was read out...He admitted writing it. Then I showed Lentulus his letter and asked whether he recognized the

seal...There was read out the letter that he had written...I offered him the chance to say anything he wanted about its contents. At first he refused...Then, suddenly, his guilt made him lose his wits...Although he could have denied their statement, to everyone's surprise he suddenly confessed." (3 *In Catilinam* 10-11)

After Cicero explained all this to the throng outside the Senate, the people

"Who at first...had been so eager for war, faced about and denounced...Catiline, while they extolled Cicero to the skies, manifesting as much joy and exultation as if they had been rescued from slavery." (*Bellum Catilinae* 48.1-2)

The next day Lucius Tarquinius, who had been arrested while making his way to join Catiline, was brought back and upon a pledge of immunity from the Senate confirmed the testimony of Volturcius and added that he had been sent by Crassus to advise Catiline not to be worried about the arrest of the conspirators but to return to the city to boost the morale of the rest, to return and free the captives.

"Cicero learned of this beforehand and occupied the Capitol and the Forum by night with a garrison. At dawn he received some divine inspiration to hope for the best...Accordingly, he ordered the praetors to administer the oath of enlistment to the populace, in case there should be any need of soldiers."  
(*Historiae Romanae* 37.35.3-4)

Cicero's vision is commonly referred to as his *Bona Dea* experience. Many thought the charge made against Crassus was credible, "but thought that in such a crisis so powerful a man ought to be propitiated rather than exasperated." (*Bellum Catilinae* 48.5) Many

others, held in thrall to Crassus by economic means, condemned the charge and demanded that the matter be laid before the Senate and, upon a motion of Cicero, voted the testimony of Tarquinius to be false and demanded that he reveal the name of whom so ever had caused him to lie. Some said the charge was fabricated by Autronius, but others thought it was Cicero. Sallust himself testifies that Crassus told him personally, later on, that Cicero was behind the insult. (*Ibid.* 48.5-9) It has also been reported that Quintus Catulus and Gaius Piso, through bribes and political influence, tried to get Cicero to bring a false charge against Caesar to no avail.

“Gaius Caesar was not free from suspicion of complicity with these men, but Cicero did not venture to bring into the controversy one so popular with the masses.” (*Civil Wars* 2.6)

At any rate, the Senate resolved that the conspirators were guilty of treason. Decimus Junius Silanus, the consul-elect, suggested, at first, that the men be put to death, but later, he was persuaded by Caesar’s oration and changed his opinion and held thereafter that they should only increase the guards to protect the city. According to Appian, Nero also spoke and he suggested that the men only be kept under guard until Catiline had been beaten in the field and that Cato openly suspected Caesar of involvement. (*Civil Wars* 2.5-6) The matter was reopened for discussion. According to Sallust’s narrative, Caesar spoke first followed by the Cato Minor.

Cicero, who spoke first, delivered his fourth invective against Catiline to the Senate; followed by the oration of Caesar, followed by the oration of Cato Minor.

In his oration, Caesar urged the Senate not to be influenced by their emotions.

“Kings and peoples under the influence of wrath or pity have made errors in judgment, he said.” (*Bellum Catilinae* 51.4)

He went on by way of two examples derived from ancient sources: the first suggested that the Senate recall the experience of the *Macedonian War* against king Perses (168 B.C.) as a precedent where the elder Cato had persuaded the Romans not to retaliate against them for a wrong they had committed. The second example raised by him cited the numerous occasions that Rome had not immediately retaliated for great injustices committed against them by the Carthaginians during the Punic wars, but had, instead, first debated whether or not such a retaliatory action was consistent with Roman law. (*Ibid.* 51.5-6) Caesar’s sophisticated remarks parsed thus:

“If a punishment commensurate with their crimes can be found, I favor a departure from precedent; but if the enormity of their guilt surpasses all men’s imagination, I should advise limiting ourselves to such penalties as the law has established...If the humble, who pass their lives in obscurity, commit any offense through anger, it is known to few; their fame and fortune are alike. But the actions of those who hold great power, and pass their lives in a lofty station, are known to all the world.”

*Ita in maxuma fortuna minuma licentia est.*

In this way, in great fortune is the least freedom. (*Ibid.* 51.8-14)

He then holds that the penalty initially suggested by Silanus, i.e., death, was foreign to the customs of Rome. Caesar’s sophism could be parsed thus:

- (a) If a punishment equal to their crimes can be found, then
- (b) depart from precedent.



- (c) If the guilt of the conspirators surpasses all imagination, then
- (d) punishment should be limited to what is allowed by law, and
- (e) death is a relief from the woes of life, not a punishment.

Caesar maintained that the Senate must adhere both to precedent and to written law. Therefore, Caesar argued that no punishment equal to their crimes could be found and that the enormity of the guilt of their surpassed all men's imagination. In short, death was too good for these people. He then went on to deploy a form of *slippery slope argument* by means of (a) digression on the history of the Peloponnesian war where Lacedaemonians instituted the rule of the *Thirty Tyrants* after defeating the Athenians, and (b) digression on Sulla:

*Omni mala exempla ex rebus bonis orta sunt.*

All bad precedents have originated in cases which were good. (*Ibid.* 51.27)

“It is possible that in another time, when someone else is consul, with this precedent before and is likewise in command of an army, some falsehood may be believed to be true. When the consul, with this precedent before him, shall draw the sword in obedience to the Senates decree, who shall limit or restrain him?”

In his digression on the *Thirty Tyrants* at Athens, he said:

“They applied the scourge to citizens and inflicted the supreme penalty upon those found guilty. Afterwards the state reached maturity, and because of its large population factions prevailed; when blamelessness began to be oppressed and other wrongs of the kind were perpetuated: then they devised the *Porcian Law* and other laws which allowed the condemned the alternative of exile. Do I recommend that the prisoners be allowed to depart and swell Catiline's forces?”

By no means! This, rather, is my advice: that their goods be confiscated and that they themselves be kept imprisoned...further, that no one hereafter shall refer their case to the Senate or bring it before the people, under pain of being considered...to have designs against...the state.” (*Ibid.* 51.35-43)

In view of the fact that Caesar was implicated in the plot, we ought to suspect that Caesar may have wished to free the suspects. If Caesar was indeed as powerful as many of the ancient sources claim, it is entirely possible that things could have been arranged so that the so-called ‘strongest of the free towns’ could have been induced to revolt. To this Cato replied in his speech that followed,

“As if, indeed there were base criminal men only in our city and not all over Italy.” (*Ibid.* 52.15)

Caesar remarks to the effect that men of great power are less free than the downtrodden is reminiscent of the remarks made by Hiero, the tyrant of Syracuse (478-467 B.C.), to the poet Simonides. For example,

“If it profits a man to hang himself, know what my finding is: a despot has the most to gain from it.” (*Hiero* 7.13)

Caesar statement to the effect that life imprisonment in a strong city is a fate worse than death is an absurd contrary to fact remark, for, if this were true, the Roman people never would have enacted the *Sempronian Law*, which permitted the condemned the right of appeal to the people in capital cases, which was instituted to protect Roman citizens. Not only that, but the Roman religion, and therefore Roman custom, testifies to the pain of death and the trials of the wicked condemned to Hell, as Virgil affirmed in his *Aeneid*. Seneca noted:

*Nulla avarita sine poena est.*

There is no avarice without punishment. (*Epistulae* 115.16)

Caesar falsely equated the propositions: ‘life is woe some’ with ‘death is relief,’ when clearly life is a relief from death and death is one of life’s woes. Anyone who sincerely believed Caesar’s argument would have killed himself immediately. We, however, hardly need Aristotle to remind us:

Φοβερωτατον δ’ ο θανατος

But death is the thing most feared. (*Nicomachean Ethics* 3.4.6)

Cato, who relied on the expedience of the cause toward justice, and his own moral character, spoke next:

*Iam pridem equidem nos vera vocabula rerum amisimus.*

Now we have indeed let slip true names of things long ago.

Cato’s reference to the ‘true names of things’ is an allusion to a well known phrase belonging to Homer, as Plato recorded his *Cratylus*:

“For the gods must clearly be supposed to call things by their right and natural names.” (391e)

Thucydides noted that due to the dire necessities caused by the civil strife on account of the *Peloponnesian War*: “The ordinary acceptance of words in their relation to things was changed as men thought fit.

Ραον δ’ οι πολλοι καουργοι (οντες) δεξιοι κεκληνται

η αμαθεις αγαθοι·

And therefore it was easier for the many bad people to be called clever than for the stupid to be called the good. (*Peloponnesian War* 3.82.7)

Truly Caesar's rhetoric had the appearance of a well reasoned argument without having actually been so. His reasoning is unconvincing because we have all learned from Aristotle that:

“Those things also are to be preferred, which men would rather possess in reality than in appearance, because they are nearer the truth.” (*Rhetoric* 1.7.38)

Caesar created the semblance of truth with out actually reasoning out the truth.

“In fine finished phrases did Gaius Caesar a moment ago before this body speak of life and death, regarding as false, I presume, the tales which are told of the Lower World, where they say that the wicked take a different path from the good, and dwell in regions that are gloomy, desolate, unsightly, and full of fears,” Cato said. (*Bellum Catilinae* 52.13)

Contrasting the virtues of their ancestors with the attitudes and habits of his contemporaries, Cato continued,

“We have extravagance and greed, public poverty and private opulence. We extol wealth and foster idleness. We make no distinction between good men and bad.” (*Ibid.* 52.22)

He also chastised Cicero because he

“Even let them go, taking their arms with them!” (*Ibid.* 52.27)

As Aristotle said:

“Since in the eyes of some people it is more profitable to seem wise than to be wise without seeming to be so (for the sophistic art consists in apparent and not real wisdom, and the sophist is one whom makes money from apparent and not real wisdom), it is clear that for these people it is essential to seem to perform the

function of a wise man rather than actually to perform it without seeming to do so.” (*De Sophisticis Elenchis* 165a20)

Caesar was one about whom we might say it was ‘more profitable to seem wise than to be wise,’ while of Cato we should remark that he was one who had found it profitable ‘to be wise without seeming to be so.’ Cato continued by way of example stressing the urgency of the decision because laws were of little use to people who are dead or a Republic that no longer existed, and demanded that the conspirators be treated:

“After the manner of our forefathers.” (*Bellum Catilinae* 52.30-36)

In this way, Cato relied on what Aristotle called the general law,

“For it is evident that, if the written law is counter to our case, we must have recourse to the general law.” (*Rhetoric* 1.15.4)

Aristotle himself cited Sophocles.

“Antigone in Sophocles justifies herself for having buried Polynices contrary to the law of Creon, but not contrary to the unwritten law...and further, that justice is the real expedient.” (*Ibid.* 1.15.6)

“Their plan is that in the universal slaughter there should not survive a single individual even to mourn the name of the Roman people...informants have disclosed these facts, the accused men have confessed.” (*4 In Catilinam* 5)

Cicero, in true democratic spirit, went on to refer the decision as to the fate of the conspirators to the Senate and revealed his true feelings on the matter.

“If you adopt the motion of Gaius Caesar...I shall have less need to fear the attacks of the people because it is he who is proposing and advocating this

motion; but if you adopt the alternative, I fear that more trouble may be brought down upon my head.” (4 *In Catilinam* 9)

After noting Crassus’ absence from the proceeding he recognized Caesar’s concerns regarding the *Sempronian Law*, enacted by Tiberius Gracchus (123 B.C.) which gave Roman citizens the right to appeal to the people in capital cases, and then roundly declared: “an enemy ‘*hostis*’ of the Republic cannot in any respect be regarded as a citizen,” on the grounds that the author of the *Sempronian Law* himself paid the supreme penalty to the Republic without appeal to the people. (4 *In Catilinam* 10)

On the authority of Marcianus:

“The Law of the Twelve Tables ordains that he should have roused up a public enemy, or handed over a citizen to a public enemy, must suffer capital punishment.” (*Duodecim Tabulae* X)

On the authority of Salvianus, the same table stated:

“Putting to death...of any man whosoever he might be, un-convicted was forbidden by the decrees even of the Twelve Tables.” (*Ibid.*)

In this case however, it is not so much a question of whether or not the men were tried in accordance with the law of the *Twelve Tables*, but whether or not the Senate had the authority to try the men and whether or not they could be executed without appeal.

Cicero continued on to tell the Senate that he was indeed not motivated by cruelty, but

“In my mind’s eye I see pitiful heaps of citizens lying unburied upon the grave of their fatherland; there passes before my eyes the sight of Cethegus as he prances upon your corpses in his frenzied revels...I have pictured Lentulus as potentate...Gabinus as his grand visor, and Catiline there with his army...this

vision arouses in me such strong feelings of pity and anguish that I am acting with severity and vigor against against those who have wanted to perpetrate such horrors.” (4 *In Catilinam* 11-12)

*...Crudelis ubique*

*luctus, ubique pavor et plurima mortis imago.*

Everywhere bitter sorrow, everywhere

Terror and many images of death. (*Aeneid* 2.369)

After having made several examples he directed the Senate’s attention to the throngs of people outside awaiting the decision:

“I cannot pretend to be deaf to what comes to my ears...Everyone is here—men of every order, every class and every age; the Forum is crowded, the temple around the Forum are crowded, all the approaches and grounds of this temple are crowded...the whole mass of freeborn citizens is here, even the poorest...All classes are united in purpose, will and voice to preserve the Republic. Beset by the brands and weapons of this vile conspiracy, the fatherland we all share extends to you [the Senate] the hands of a suppliant...You have a consul who will not shrink from obeying your decrees and, while he lives, from defending your decisions and answering for them in person. (4 *In Catilinam* 14-24)

*Sic ait dicto citius tumida aequora placat*

*Collectasque fugat nubes solemque reducit.*

Thus speaking a command swelling waves are quickly calmed

And gathering clouds flee and the sun returns. (*Aeneid* 1.142-3)

Not wishing to give the enemies of Rome any advantage that might be obtained by hesitation or delay, Cicero ordered the *triumvis* to make the preparations for the executions and then he himself led Lentulus into the dungeon, where he, followed by the others, were strangled.

“Thus that patrician, of illustrious stock of the Cornelii...ended his life in a manner befitting his character and his crimes.” (*Bellum Catilinae* 55.1-6)

Cassius Dio said that others too, who had information lodged against themselves, were rounded up and called to account; that Aulus Fulvius, a senator, was murdered by his own father, a private person, and many others, not only consuls but private individuals as well, killed their sons for their involvement in the conspiracy of Catiline. Valerius Maximus (30 A.D.) observed that A. Fulvius, a man of senatorial rank recalled his son,

“[who] had misguidedly followed Catiline’s friendship...and put him to death first observing that he had not begotten him for Catiline against his country but for his country against Catiline.” (*Memorable Doings and Sayings* 5.8.5)

Events to which Dio had remarked:

“This was the course of affairs at that time.” (*Historiae Romanae* 36.3-4)

In a comment on these orations, Florus would later write,

“When the question of punishment was discussed, Caesar expressed the opinion that the conspirators ought to be spared on account of their position; Cato thought that they ought to be punished in accordance with their crime.” (*Epitome* 2.12.10)

The position referred to by Florus was no doubt the conspirator’s positions as citizens and nobles. The question of the legality of trying these men in the Senate and executing them has been raised many times and by many authors and I do not propose to have a



solution to the argument. Andrew Drummond has examined this case in relation to Roman law very thoroughly and I don't purport to resolve the question of the legality of the issue, but only to caution the interpreters of these events not to succumb to presentism by projecting our understanding of the present law on to the past, for we must remember that the Roman senate at this time was not only chronologically closer to the opinions of Aristotle than to modern western law, but was also psychologically, culturally, morally and politically closer to him. Although the question of the legality of imposing the death penalty on citizens of Rome without appeal to the people, in accordance with the *Sempronian Law*, was raised in the Senate at the time, and plagued Cicero's reputation for the rest of his life, the very fact that the trial both of Catiline, and the conspirators captured in Rome, did take place in the Senate without objection, and was not submitted to the juries, tends to suggest that this procedure was not as controversial as it may at first seem to the students of modern positive law. Furthermore, the suggestion that Cicero and Cato, *inter alios*, and hence the Senate, deviated from the rule of law perhaps misunderstands the office of the dictator. Cicero held *imperium* and it was his prerogative to submit this case to the Senate. Therefore the question would be properly framed by referring to the acts of the Senate, not to the acts of Cicero, since, in the end, the decision belonged wholly to the Senate. Whether or not the Senate adhered to the rule of law, its decision in this case was, nevertheless, expedient with respect to the cause of justice. As Cicero had said to the people,

“My consulship cannot cure these men but, if it removes them, then it will have prolonged the life of the Republic.” (2 *In Catilinam* 11)

According to Plutarch, after the conspirators had been put to death, many of Catiline's hangers-on, for they could not truly have been called supporters, continued to hang around the Forum unaware of the recent turn of events believing that the men might still be rescued. Cicero reportedly cried out to them: *Vixere!* 'They lived.' "Most of those who had flocked to the standard of Catiline, as soon as they learned the fate of Lentulus and Cethegus, deserted him and went away." (*Cicero* 22.8) Appian inflects upon them cowardice and some sinister designs.

"The crowd dispersed in alarm, congratulating themselves that they had not been found out." (*Civil Wars* 2.1.6)

Meanwhile, Catiline was in Faesulae arranging his men in to two legions of 5,000 men each, though Appian claims it was 20,000 men (*Civil Wars* 2.1.7). According to Sallust's narration when Antonius marched upon him, Catiline withdrew into the mountains and gave the enemy '*hostium*' no opportunity for battle while, at the same time refusing the aid of slaves who wished to join his army. Once news of the executions had reach Catiline's army, his men began to desert.

With the men that remained, Catiline pressed on though forced marches into the mountains near Pistoria, modern Pistoia, in the region of Tuscany. Metellus Celer with three legions approached from Picene. When Catiline realized that he was trapped between two Roman armies, and that his plans for insurrection in Rome had failed, and that all was hopeless, he harangued his troops and prepared to battle Antonius' army.

"Two hostile armies, one towards Rome, the other towards Gaul, block our way. We cannot remain longer where we are... Wherever we decide to go, we must hew a path with the sword. Therefore I counsel you to be brave... If we win, complete security will

be ours...You might have passed you life in exile and infamy...but since such conditions seemed base and intolerable to true men, you decided upon this course. If you wish to forsake it, you have need of boldness; none save the victor exchanges war for peace...But if Fortune frowns upon your bravery, take care not to die un-avenged. Do not be captured and slaughters like cattle, but fighting like heroes, leave the enemy a bloody and tearful victory.”

After a moment of silence, the trumpets were sounded, the horses dispersed, and Catiline in the center, next to the silver eagle, prepared to do battle. Antonius having feigned illness, either out of cowardice or embarrassment, trusted his army to Marcus Petreius who gave the signal and began to advance slowly and the army of the enemy ‘*hostis*’ did the same. Once the distance had been closed enough for a skirmish, the two forces rushed upon each other. “When Catiline saw that his army was routed and that he was left with a mere handful of men, mindful of his birth and former rank he plunged into the thickest of the enemy ‘*hostis*’ and there fell fighting, his body pierced through and through.” (*Bellum Catilinae* 56.1-60.7) “[Marcus Petreius] joined battle with the rebels and in a very bloody contest cut down Catiline and three thousand others as they fought most bravely; for not one of them fled, but every man fell at his post.” (*Historiae Romanae* 37.40.1) For Rome it was indeed a bloody and tearful victory as Catiline had shown himself to be a mad man.

*Catiline vero longe suis inter hostium cadavera repertus est, paululum etiam spirans ferociamque animi, quam habuerat vivos, in voltu retinens.*

Catiline was found truly far in advance of them among the corpses of the enemy, still breathing a little and not holding back fierce spirit in his face which he had in life. (*Bellum Catilinae* 61.4)

Flavio Biondo in his *Italy Illuminated* (1474) recalled the event:

*Supremo autem in sinu amplae ac primariae totius Etruriae planitieei, Pistoria est civitas, in cuius agro Catilinae exercitum fuisse superatum multi ex vetustis scripsere.*

In the upper most corner of the large and principal plain of all Etruria is the city of Pistoria in whose territory the army of Catiline was defeated as many ancient men have written (1.2.25).

Not a man of free birth left alive, Sallust declared that these men “had valued their own lives no more highly than those of their enemies ‘*hostium*’...But the army of the Roman people gained no joyful nor bloodless victory, for all the most valiant had either fallen in the fight or come off with severe wounds...turning over the bodies of the rebels ‘*hostilia*’ found now a friend, now a guest or kinsman; some also recognized their personal enemies. Thus the whole army was variously affected with sorrow and grief, rejoicing and lamentation.” (*Bellum Catilinae* 61.6-9) Antonius reportedly sent Catiline’s head to the city and he himself was acclaimed imperator for the victory. (*Historiae Romanae* 37.40.2) After this, Cicero himself became the subject of charges for the execution of the prisoners. “This charge, though technically brought against him, was really directed at the Senate. For its members were violently denounced before the populace...on the ground that they had no right to condemn any citizen to death without the consent of the people.” (*Ibid.* 37.42.2-3) This charge failed to bring any result as the Senate at the time

had granted immunity to all who were involved. Cicero was later exiled for this very act, however, by Publius Clodius Pulcher in 58 B.C. and, after that, was himself executed in 43 B.C.

I will not weary the reader recounting the *First Triumvirate* and the events leading up to assassination of Caesar, or the story about Cato's tragic suicide in Utica where reportedly tore his own guts out with his bare hands, but, with respect to the proscription and murder of Cicero, it would be better to remain silent than to say too little. But since his reputation is diametrically opposed to, and contends directly with, that of Catiline's, I find it necessary to digress on the topic at great length. The elder Seneca recorded a number of narrations of the events that took place after the ascension of the *Second Triumvirate* composed of Marcus Lepidus, Marcus Antonius and Octavius Caesar. Livy's history of the event is based on Seneca's compendium of the Roman historians who commented on them. According to Livy, Cicero fled Rome shortly after the arrival of the triumvirate. He first fled to his rural estate in Tuscany and then to Formiae where he boarded a ship bound for Caieta. He set sail several times, but contrary winds and seasickness drove him back. Wearied from his futile endeavor, he returned to his home where he reportedly said:

*Moriar in patria saepe servata.*

I shall die in the fatherland I often saved. (*Suasoriae* 6.17)

After the assassination of Caesar, Marcus Lepidus, Marcus Antonius and Octavius Caesar "came together on a small island in the midst of a river, and there held conference for three days. All other matters were easily agreed upon and they divided up the whole empire among themselves as through it were an ancestral inheritance." (*Antony*

19) According to Appian's narrative the three men met on a islet in the river Lavinus near the city of Mutina where they negotiated day and night for two days concluding that Octavian should resign the consulship and that Ventidius should take his place who should use his position to enact a law establishing a magistrate with consular powers to protect the government from civil disturbances and that this magistrate should be headed by Lepidus, Antony, and Octavian, who together were to rule for five years and, furthermore that a distribution of the Roman provinces ought be made. Antony acquired the length and breadth of Gaul except for the lands adjacent to the Pyrenees Mountains which was called Old Gaul. Old Gaul along with Spain was allotted to Lepidus and Octavian acquired Africa, Sardinia, Sicily and a number of other islands in the vicinity. This new government was called the *Second Triumvirate*. The Roman provinces east of the Adriatic were as yet still held by Cassius and Brutus, against whom Lepidus and Octavian pledged to wage war. (*Civil Wars* 4.2-3) Cassius Dio continued:

“After forming this compact and taking oaths they hastened to Rome, giving the impression that they were all going to rule on equal terms, but each having the intention of getting the entire power himself.” (*Historiae Romanae* 47.1.1)

Numerous portents were said to follow the summit of these most powerful men. Dogs howled continuously like wolves. Cattle spoke in human voices. A new born infant spoke and statues were said to sweat blood. The Senate sent for soothsayers from Etruria and one of them proclaimed that the kingdom of the past was returning and that all present would be made slaves save he himself alone, whereupon he held his own breath until he died.

ἐφ’ οἷς ἡ μὲν βουλή θύτας καὶ μάντις συνήγεν ἀπὸ Τυρρηνίας: καὶ ὁ πρεσβύτατος αὐτῶν, τὰς πάλαι βασιλείας ἐπανήξειν εἰπὼν, καὶ δουλεύσειν ἅπαντας χωρὶς ἑαυτοῦ μόνου, τὸ στόμα κατέσχε καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα, ἕως ἀπέθανεν.

The senate gathered together diviners and seers from Etruria and an old man of them was saying the kingdoms of long ago would return and everyone except he himself alone were to be slaves, shut his mouth and held his breath until he died.

(*Civil Wars* 4.4)

Not to make a long story of it the triumvirate forthwith initiated new proscriptions reminiscent of those actuated by Sulla but on a grander and more sinister scale.

“Not only the men’s enemies or the rich were being killed, but also their best friends, incredible as it may seem.” (*Historiae Romanae* 47.5.3)

The first man executed, Salvius, was one of Cicero’s accomplices. (*Civil Wars* 4.17)

Appian related the story how Cicero fled Rome and even claimed to visit Cicero’s country home near Caieta

“To gain knowledge of this lamentable affair...and here he [Cicero] remained quite. While the searchers were approaching...ravens flew into his chamber and awakened him from sleep by their croaking, and pulled off his bead-covering, until his servants, diving that this was a warning from one of the gods, put him in a litter and again conveyed him toward the sea, going cautiously through a dense thicket. Many soldiers were hurrying around in squads inquiring if Cicero had been seen anywhere. Some people, moved by good-will and pity, said that he had already put to sea; but a shoemaker, a client of Clodius, who had been the most bitter enemy of Cicero, pointed out the path to Laena, the centurion, who was

pursuing with a small force. The latter ran after him, and seeing slaves mustering a defense in much larger number than the force under his own command, he called out by way of stratagem, ‘Centurions in the rear, to the front!’ Thereupon the slaves, thinking that more soldiers were coming, were terror stricken, and Laena, although he had been once saved by Cicero when under trial, drew his head out of the litter and cut it off, striking three times, or rather sawing it off by reason of his inexperience...Antony was delighted beyond measure. He crowned the centurion and gave him 250,000 Attic drachmas in addition to the stipulated reward...The head and hand of Cicero were suspended for a long time from the rostra in the forum where formerly he had been accustomed to make public speeches...It is said that even at his meals Antony placed the head of Cicero before his table, until he became satiated with the horrid sight. Thus was Cicero, a man famous even yet for his eloquence, and one who had rendered the greatest service to his country when he held the office of consul, slain, and insulted after his death.” (*Civil Wars* 4.19-20)

Cicero’s slaves, unlike the slaves of many other nobles at the time, were ready to fight to the death to defend him, but Cicero ordered them to set down the litter upon which they bore him and offered his neck to his would be assassins. Appian graphically described the chaos that descended on Rome after the first names were published.

Εὐθύς οὖν ἦν ἀνά τε τὴν χώραν καὶ ἀνά τὴν πόλιν, ὡς ἕκαστός πη  
 συνελαμβάνετο, ἀνδρολήψια αἰφνίδια πολλὰ καὶ τρόποι τῶν φόνων ποικίλοι τῶν  
 τε κεφαλῶν ἀποτομαὶ τοῦ μισθοῦ χάριν ἐς ἐπίδειξιν φυγαὶ τε ἀπρεπεῖς καὶ  
 σχήματα ἄτοπα ἐκ τοῦ πρὶν περιφανοῦς. κατέδυνον γὰρ οἱ μὲν ἐς φρέατα, οἱ δὲ ἐς



τὰς ὑπονόμους τάφρους ἐπὶ τὰ ἀκάθαρτα, οἱ δὲ εἰς καπνώδεις ὑπωροφίας ἢ τῶν τεγῶν ταῖς κεραμίσι βυομέναις ὑπεκάθηντο μετὰ σιγῆς βαθυτάτης. ἐδεδοίκεσαν γὰρ οὐχ ἦσσαν τῶν σφαγέων οἱ μὲν γυναῖκας ἢ παῖδας οὐκ εὐμενῶς σφίσιν ἔχοντας, οἱ δὲ ἐξελευθέρους τε καὶ θεράποντας, οἱ δὲ καὶ δανεισμάτων χρήστας ἢ χωρίων γείτονας ἐπιθυμία τῶν χωρίων. ἐπανάστασις γὰρ δὴ πάντων, ὅσα τέως ὑπούλα ἦν, ἀθρόα τότε ἐγίγνετο καὶ ἀθέμιστος μεταβολὴ βουλευτῶν ἀνδρῶν, ὑπάτων ἢ στρατηγῶν ἢ δημάρχων, ἔτι τάσδε τὰς ἀρχὰς μειόντων ἢ ἐν αὐταῖς γεγονότων, εἰς πόδας ἰδίου θεράποντος ρίπτουμένων σὺν ὀλοφύρσεσι καὶ σωτήρα καὶ κύριον τὸν οἰκέτην τιθεμένων. οἰκτίστον δὲ ἦν, ὅτε καὶ ταῦτα ὑποστάντες οὐκ ἐλεηθεῖεν.

Then, straight away, through city and country, where ever each was to be found, there were sudden arrests and many kinds of murder, the cutting off of heads for the sake of rewards with the showing of the heads, and unbecoming flights in disguises contrasted with notoriety. (*Ibid.* 4.13)

In the end Livy, giving credit where due, eulogized him thus:

*Omniū aduersum nihil ut viro dignum erat tulit praeter mortem...Si qui stamen virtutibus vitia pensarit, vir magnus acer memorabilis fuit.*

Not all of his adversities did he endure as a dignified man besides his death...Nevertheless, if we consider any of his faults against his virtues, he was a man, great, brave, and memorable. (*Fragmenta* 50)

The elder Seneca, relying on a lost work of Livy, said, “There is no doubt that his slaves bravely and loyally showed readiness to make a fight of it; and that it was Cicero himself who ordered them to put down the litter and suffer calmly the compulsions of a harsh

fate. He leaned from where he sat, and offered his neck without a tremor; his head was struck off. The soldiers in their stupid cruelty, were not satisfied. They cut off the hands, too, cursing them for having written attacks on Antony. The head was taken back to Antony, and, on his orders, placed between the two hands on the rostra, where as consul, and often as ex-consul, and in that very year attacking Antony...The Romans could scarcely bear to lift eyes wet with tears to look on his mutilated body.” (*Suasoriae* 6.17) Thus Cicero, unlike Catiline, met his death as a brave man would, showing no fear in accordance with his own remarks:

*Nam neque turpis mors forti viro potest accidere neque immature consulari nec misera sapienti.*

For death is neither ugly for the brave, early for the consul nor wretched to the wise. (4 *In Catilinam* 3)

Appian, Plutarch and Dio say that only Cicero’s head and right hand were cut off and displayed on the rostra. Antony’s wife Fulvia at one time “took the head into her hands before it was removed, and after abusing it spitefully and spitting upon it, set on her knees, opened the mouth, and pulled out the tongue, which she pierced with pins that she used for her hair, at the same time uttering many brutal jests.” (*Historiae Romanae* 47.8.4) According to Seneca: “All concede that Cicero was neither coward enough to plead with Anthony, nor stupid enough to think that Antony could be won over: all, that is, except Asinius Pollio, who remained the most implacable enemy of Cicero’s reputation.” (*Suasoriae* 6.14 *et Institutio* 12.1.22) Seneca recorded the narration of Cremutius Cordus: “*Quibus vivis laetus Antonius* he was now raised, limb by limb, to be viewed by his fellow countrymen in a new state, blood spattered over his lips and lolling

head. Shortly before, he had been leader of the senate, glory of the Roman name: now he was merely a source of profit to his killer.” (*Suasoriae* 6.19)

Bruttedius Niger had reported:

*Nulla non pars fori aliquot actionis inclutae signate vestigo erat; nemo non aliquod eius in se meritum fatebatur.*

The assembled people did not as is customary, hear the biography of the body on the rostra, but they [themselves] narrated it.

“Every part of the forum was marked by the memory of some glorious pleading; everyone had a benefit done him by Cicero to proclaim. There was no doubt of at least one service to Rome: he had put off that miserable servitude from the time of Catiline to that of Antony.” (*Ibid.* 6.21) The elder Seneca also said, “None of all these eloquent men lamented the death of Cicero more finely than Cornelius Severus:

*Conticuit Latiae tristis facundia linguae.*

The eloquence of the Latin tongue was dumb-struck by grief. (*Ibid.* 6.26)

Cornelius Nepos eulogized him thus:

*Ille enim fuit unus qui potuerit et etiam debuerit historiam digna voce pronuntiare...ex quo dubito, interitu eius utrum res publica an historia magis doleat.*

He truly was the only one who could have, and indeed gave, a dignified voice to narrate history...on account of that, I question whether his death pains the Republic or history greater. (*De Historicis Latinis* 2.1)

And Velleius Paterculus said, “When Cicero was beheaded the voice of the people was severed...You did not rob him of his fame, the glory of his deeds and words, nay you

enhanced them...He lives and will continue to live in the memory of the ages, and so long as this universe shall endure.

*Tuum in eum factum exerabitur citiusque e mundo genus hominum quam (Ciceronis) nomen cedit.*

Your deed against him will call forth a curse and the race of man will more quickly depart from the world than *his* name. (2 *Compendium* 66.2-5)

Following the tradition promulgated by Solon and recorded by Herodotus and validated by Aristotle of looking to the end of a man's life in order to determine whether or not that man had lived a happy life:

Δεῖ γάρ, ὥσπερ εἶπομεν, καὶ ἀρετῆς τελείας καὶ βίου τελείου. πολλὰ γὰρ μεταβολὰὶ γίνονται καὶ παντοῖαι τύχαι κατὰ τὸν βίον, καὶ ἐνδέχεται τὸν μάλιστ' εὐθηνούντα μεγάλας συμφοραῖς περιπεσεῖν ἐπὶ γήρωσ, καθάπερ ἐν τοῖς Τρωικοῖς περὶ Πριάμου μυθεύεται: τὸν δὲ τοιαύταις χρησάμενον τύχαις καὶ τελευτήσαντα ἀθλίως οὐδεὶς εὐδαιμονίζει. (*Nicomachean Ethics* 1100a1)

Cicero after having having been fortunate in life, successful in career, whole of body and sound of mind, brave in spirit, virtuous in character; met with a miserable and tragic end, would be considered to have been wholly happy.

“The wealthy man is better able to content his desires, and to bear up against a sudden buffet of calamity. The other has less ability to withstand these evils (from which, however, his good luck keeps him in the clear), but he enjoys all of these following blessings: he is whole of limb, a stranger to disease, free from misfortune, happy in his children, and comely to look upon. If, in addition to all this, he end his life well, he is of a truth the man of whom thou art in search, the

man who may be rightly termed happy. Call him, however, until he die, not happy but fortunate.” (*The History* 1.32)

Catiline however having been very much the opposite, neither brave nor happy.

## **VI. Conclusion (Κριτικός)**

The moral of the story that was handed down to us through the ages then was the correct one and attempts to alter its conclusions is love of the base.

Ἐκ μὲν οὖν τῶν εἰρημένων καὶ παρὰ τῶν συνηδρευκότων ἤδη τῷ λόγῳ σοφῶν ταῦτα παρειλήφαμεν.

From the wise men who sat in council on this question we have received these things. (*Metaphysics* 987a)

Furthermore, one who “performs admirably for an ignoble cause” is thoroughly corrupt, since the good adheres to the good and the bad to the bad. The good is just and does well to the profit of virtue. He who performs well in the interest of injustice perpetuates vice and is therefore condemned as completely bad, those who have defended him are to wit: alinguistic, aliterate, and amoral.<sup>132</sup> And we as authors, whether of oratory, or of history, or of poetry, or of drama,<sup>133</sup> must endeavor to call things by their right and proper names, to strive to maintain the integrity of our words, ideas, and mental constructs; distinguishing between the good and the bad and to teach this, for this is justice.

“Our fathers, in time past, distinguished right and wrong plainly enough, and it is our wisdom to submit to be taught by them.” (*The History* 1.8)

In the contest between Cicero and Catiline we must:

*Apprends à distinguer e’ ambitieux du traître.*

Learn to distinguish the ambitious from the traitor. (*Rome Sauvée* 5.3)

---

<sup>132</sup> This is an example of *Alliteration*, where ‘aliterate’ is a justifiable *Barbarism* in order to effectuate *Euphony*.

<sup>133</sup> This is an example of *Polysyndeton*.

And to teach this not making a muddle of right and wrong. History is the memory of humanity. History as it is and was recorded and preserved in books is not actual social memory, but only the potential for it.

*Historia vero testis temporum, lux veritas, vita memoriae, magistra vitae, nuntia vertustatis.*

History is the true test of time, light of truth, life of memory, teacher of life, messenger of antiquity.” (*De Oratore* 2.9.36)

History properly used is the active social memory of humanity for

“The only clue to what man can do is what man has done.” (*The Idea of History* 10)

And furthermore the power of man to control his own destiny is limited by his knowledge; or is rather greatly limited by his *ignorance*. Ignorance is not strength. Books as concrete objects do not constitute the memory of humanity, but only the potential for social memory. For,

“Men have no more ready corrective of conduct than knowledge of the past.”  
(*The Histories of Polybius* 1.1)

Like the archaeological remains of Rome in Freud’s metaphor that the memory in man is like an archeological site, for what ever goes into it potentially remains in it.

“Now let us make the fantastic supposition that Rome were not a human dwelling place, but a mental entity with just as long and varied a past history: that is, in which nothing once constructed had perished, and all the earlier stages of development had survived alongside the latest.” (*Civilization and Its Discontents* 17)



Books on a shelf however, like the layers of an archeological site, only lay side-by-side. Not only must the books themselves be preserved, as an archaeological site must, the books themselves must be studied again and again in order for the men of the past to communicate themselves to the living, in order to fulfill their function, since we have it on the most excellent authority that not only is it most wise to γνώθι σαυτόν ‘know thyself’ but also that *repetitio mater memoriae*.

“Without some knowledge of himself, his knowledge of other things is imperfect: for to know something without knowing that one knows it is only a half-knowing, and to know that one knows is to know oneself.” (*The Idea of History* 205)

The world is evermore filling itself with books. More information accumulates everyday and we must choose which ones to study, in whole or in part, when to read fast, when slow. We must separate the good from the bad, the relevant from the irrelevant. The ancients transmitted this story to us as a means of teaching by bad example and we must respect that, diminishing neither their reputations as scholars nor the importance of their teachings. Polybius said:

“The surest method of learning how to bear bravely the vicissitudes of fortune, is to recall the calamities of others.” (*The Histories of Polybius* 1.2)

The very fact that these works survived and are the topic of debates even today testifies to their enduring importance. They may not be easily dismissed. Their teachings not easily negated. For:

“To accord praise which genius of a bad man bribes us into bestowing is to sin against the sacred character of history.” (*The History of Rome* 110)

Rehabilitating Catiline with the historical canon, then, is an assault on the integrity of history, on the memory of humanity. The historical process is a great responsibility, as Cicero noted. On the responsibilities of the historian, Cicero said,

“History’s first law is that an author must not dare to tell anything but the truth. And it’s second that he must make bold to tell the whole truth.” (*De Oratore* 2.14.62)

Today, without overturning Cicero’s maxims, we recognize that there is more to history in that we must apply both our scientific capability and our rational faculty to study of history. Understanding our great social responsibility as historians we have developed theories of history so that we may best apply the lessons of the past, that the mistakes of the past be not repeated.

*[10] hoc illud est praecipue in cognitione rerum salubre ac frugiferum. omnis te exempli documenta in inlustri posita monumento intueri; inde tibi tuaeque rei publicae quod imitere capias, inde foedum inceptu foedum exitu quod uites. (Ab Urbe Condita 1.10)*

We also have the responsibility to transmit to the youth the moral tale, ever urging them on to be:

“Loving what is noble and hating what is base.” (*Nicomachean Ethics* 10.9.8)

With respect to the Catiline affair we must not adopt the view point of the historical revisionists for:

“We would not have our [future] Guardians grow up among representations of moral deformity, as in some fowls pasture where, day after day, feeding on every

poisonous weed they would, little by little, gather insensibly a mass of corruption in their very souls.” (*Republic* 3.401)

Though Bolsheviks did promise, and effectuate, an economic leveling, it was the social relations of the class system which they sought to transform. For the final aim of communism is *to end the exploitation of man by man*; or at least to end the private exploitation of man since it seems the State it seems would still be permitted to exact labor from the individual, but only for the common good. It is the social relations of the class system that hold the proletariat in bondage today, as it did then. None but the boldest sycophant would suggest that the proletariat has made itself oppressed, then or now, through robbing and squandering, loose morals and disordered thinking.

“Inferiors become revolutionaries in order to be equals, and equals in order to be superiors.” (*The Politics* 302a3)

Though I would call Spartacus a revolutionary, I would name Catiline a reactionary. Plato’s assertion to the effect that justice in the state is maintained through temperance supposes that dissemblance can somehow be overcome and that under ideal circumstances a state could be constructed wherein virtue could not be faked, but he never succeeded in proving, even in theory, that this could actually be done. Indeed Hegel agreed with Plato that

“Nations are what their deeds are.” (*Philosophy of History* 187)

But he also said that “good for its own sake” had no place in living reality (*Ibid.* 166). Thrasymachus’ position related what constituted the actual *social praxis* in Plato’s time. It is indeed the social praxis to wit, for all forms of state are predicated on violence. For

the *argumentum ad baculum*, it should be noted, appears on the first page of Plato's *Republic*.<sup>134</sup>

‘Ο οὐν Πολέμαρχος<sup>135</sup> ἔφη: ὦ Σώκρατες, δοκεῖτέ μοι πρὸς ἄστὺ ὠρμηῆσθαι ὡς ἀπιόντες.

Οὐ γὰρ κακῶς δοξάζεις, ἦν δ' ἐγώ.

‘Οράς οὐν ἡμᾶς, ἔφη, ὅσοι ἐσμέν;

πῶς γὰρ οὐ;

ἢ τοίνυν τούτων, ἔφη, κρείττους γένεσθε ἢ μένετ' αὐτοῦ.

Οὐκ οὐν, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, ἔτι ἐν λείπεται, τὸ ἢν πείσωμεν ὑμᾶς ὡς χρὴ ἡμᾶς ἀφεῖναι;

ἦ καὶ δύναισθ' ἄν, ἦ δ' ὅς, πείσαι μὴ ἀκούοντας;

Οὐδαμῶς, ἔφη ὁ Γλαύκων.

‘Ως τοίνυν μὴ ἀκουσομένων, οὕτω διανοιεῖσθε.

Then Polemarchus declared: “Socrates, y'all appear to me to have been headed to town.”

“You don't guess badly, for I was.”

“Don't you see us, he said, how many we are?”

“For surely not? Accordingly y'all become stronger than these men or y'all stay right where you are.”

But I said, “Isn't there still one alternative, if we perchance persuaded both of you that it is necessary to send us away?”

<sup>134</sup> Cf. *Republic* 327c *supra* and moreover *op. cit.* 411d

<sup>135</sup> Πολέμαρχος, masc. nom. sing., one who begins or leads the war, a leader, chieftain. (*Liddell and Scott*) By naming this *persona* Polymarchus, Plato signifies that he intends that the reader understand that the *argumentum ad baculum* is being deployed against Socrates and his comrades and that this form of argument overcomes any kind of persuasive argument; *for if one does not listen neither can one be persuaded*.

But he said, “Verily, perchance y’ all able to persuade them not hearing?”

“In no wise,” Glaucon said.

“Well, y’ all therefore have in mind we not hearing.” (*Republic* 1.327c)

Moreover:

“The secret being that where force can be used, law is not needed.” (*The Peloponnesian War* 1.77)

Since incest, rape, murder, adultery, human sacrifice, and cannibalism are wrong everywhere, and not just in our state but also in Rome at the time of the *Bellum Catiline*; it was vice, not virtue, his class standing and the social relations between members of his own class and from his class to the other classes, that made Catiline who he was. In a general sense, he could not have acted differently than he did. Hegel’s assertion that:

“What experience and history teach is this--that peoples and governments never have learned anything from history” (*Ibid.* 155)

This must be wrong since it can be proven through the historical record that laws and customs have indeed changed. We should note that there have been civilizations wherein each of the aforementioned crimes were in fact not crimes but were customs and that these civilizations no longer exist. Indeed man did learn from history and through this learning Rome itself determined that certain practices such as rape, murder, and human sacrifice ought to have been prohibited on the grounds that a moment of pleasure for a man like Catiline was repugnant to the whole people. Catiline, then, must be historically situated and tried by the laws of his own time.

He was a product of the social relations of his time. He was the material product of his age to be sure, but it was his class standing which determined how he reacted within it.

“Every historical character in every historical situation thinks and acts as rationally as that person in that situation *can* think and act, and nobody can do more.” (*The Idea of History* 116)

It was the patrician class that had accustomed itself to assailing the Roman government as if it were a prize.

“A characteristic of noble birth is that he who possesses it is more ambitious.” (*Rhetoric* 2.15.2)

Though we all hold out hope that a character such as Catiline will at some time reverse course, he did not reverse it.

“The developments that take place in history are never accidental, they are necessary.” (*The Idea of History* 117)

Entertaining the possibility any further would be counterfactual historiography. His was not a moment of revolution, but of reaction. His was a movement in the opposite direction, from progress to reaction. The patrician class, having first supplanted the monarchy, had itself tumbled. Having at one time granted concessions to the plebeians, the patricians began to lose even more power. Cinna, Sulla and Catiline, all patricians, sought to restore the supremacy of the patrician class but could only do so through the establishment of a quasi-monarchy, a tyranny. It was Cicero and Cato who held the middle ground. They represented the progressive wing of the ruling classes. Catiline did not. As a historical movement worthy of Rome’s national spirit it was for the *servi* and

the *proletarii* to rise and overturn the old order, both the patricians and the plebeians. That would have been a progressive historical development. The national spirit of a nation is the struggle for freedom. Rome's national spirit could only have been actualized through the success of the class struggle which gnawed at its vitals. Rome underwent a historical development when the aristocrats through off chains of the monarchy and again when the bourgeoisie, the plebs, won the right to share power with the patricians, but the struggles of the slave class and the proletariat had failed. The Catilinarian conspiracy was not a moment in the process of class struggle on the part of the oppressed classes, but was, indeed, a moment in the process of the development of reaction on the part of the oppressors. Catiline represented the nobility attempting to reassert itself against the bourgeoisie hence Catiline's repeated assertions that Cicero was a *new man* and a *lodger* (Cf. *Civil Wars* 2.1.2) for the nobility presumed to obtain high standing by means of the merits of their ancestors while the bourgeoisie sought to obtain status through their own noble deeds. The world was changing. Opposing social classes were struggling against each other not only at the rostra and on the battle fields, but through the language creating an ambiguity over the meaning of the word *noble*. The process of the ascension of reaction, the ascension of the Roman tyrants, the emperors, was embryonic at the time of the *Bellum Catiline*, but would come to the fore later with the ascension of Octavian as Augustus Caesar (27 B.C.). Cicero's actions were in accord with the historical momentum of the plebian class united with the equestrians. By way of analogy the bourgeoisie, in an attempt to affirm the new social order and everything that went along with it including the rise of the orators in contest at the *rostra*, the rule of law, and the belief that *the good* were those of noble character, not men of noble birth.

Catiline's actions were in accord with the historical momentum of the patrician class, the aristocracy, in an attempt to reassert the old order and everything that went along with it which was kingship, tyranny, the commands of the king and the deference of the masses to the caprice of the nobility, and the belief that *the good* were men of noble birth, not men of noble deeds.

“One side holds that justice is a relation of mutual goodwill...the other side holds that the rule of the superior is in itself, and by itself, justice...neither view has any cogency, or even plausibility, against the view that the superior *in goodness* ought to rule over, and be the master of, his inferiors.” (*The Politics* 1255a)

Since the idea of justice is fundamentally ineffable; the social praxis of it at the end of the Roman Republic was arbitrarily applied by the aristocracy with the aim of the happiness of the few not the many, indeed the king stood above the law. In the end, the *nobility* succeeded in reasserting itself. Those of noble birth, having won out against those of noble character, at long last established the *Pax Romana* under a man, Octavian, who would be acclaimed the first *Roman king*. It was precisely because the bourgeoisie was unable to keep the peace that its government remained unstable and became vulnerable both to revolution from below and reaction from above.

### The Spartacus Rebellion

*Agitare inter se mala servitutis, conferre iniurias et interpretando accendere: nihil profici patientia nisi ut graviora tamquam ex facili tolerantibus imperentur.*

They agitated among themselves on the evils of slavery, to and to compare their injuries, arguing that: Nothing is to be accomplished by patiently enduring



commands except greater burdens placed upon those who willingly bear them.

*(Agricola 15.1-2)*

The decisive historical moment in turning the progressive the grand historical moment into a moment of reaction was the defeat of Spartacus at the river Silarus (71 B.C.). For those who do not know this story, take note it was Appian who preserved the tale. Spartacus was a Greek slave from Thrace who had once served in the Roman army, but was later taken prisoner and sold for a gladiator. While he was imprisoned in the gladiatorial school at Capua he persuaded about seventy of his comrades into revolt (73 B.C.). After overcoming the guards, they escaped and armed themselves with clubs and daggers that they had stolen from travelers along the road until they made their way to Mount Vesuvius where they took refuge for a short time. Fugitive slaves and freemen alike flocked to him and his two subordinate officers, Oenomaus and Crixus, who at once commenced in plundering the countryside in the vicinity. Rome at first sent Varinius Glaber and later Publius Valerius after them, but they were so quickly and very badly beaten that Spartacus rode away on Varinius' horse. After this, a great many more joined Spartacus' league until, according to Appian, his army surpassed 70,000 men who, now preparing to face two Roman legions, began to manufacture their own weapons. Crixus was overcome near Mount Garganus and Spartacus fled seeking to make his way through the Apennines and across the Alps into Gaul, but one of the Roman legions cut him off from the front while another harassed his rear. Spartacus defeated one and then the other, who scattered in confusion and disorder, whereupon, Spartacus sacrificed 300 Roman soldiers to the memory of Crixus and marched on Rome with 120,000 unencumbered infantry. Along the way, Spartacus defeated another Roman army at Picenum. After

this, Spartacus changed his mind believing that he was ill prepared to attack Rome itself since no cities had joined him. Thence he withdrew to the mountains near Thurii and captured the city there. He would not allow his men to acquire any gold or silver, but only brass and iron and would only permit merchants who dealt in these commodities. His men acquired an abundance of this material and fashioned plenty of arms which they used to defeat the Romans once again. Upon the new year, and three years into the war, Licinius Crassus, having just been praetor, marched upon him with six legions who were joined by two more, but he punished and decimated his own men for losing too many battles. Appian says that Crassus may have killed up to 4,000 of them. Having demonstrated to the army that he as a general was more dangerous to the soldiers than the enemy, the Romans finally won a battle against a detachment of 10,000 and, having first killed two-thirds of Spartacus' men, he then marched on Spartacus himself and, after having his forces decimated; Spartacus tried unsuccessfully to cross into Sicily. Crassus surrounded him and enclosed his forces with a ditch, a wall, and a paling. Spartacus attempted to break through Crassus' encirclement and lost another 6,000 men. According to Appian: "Only three of the Roman army were killed and seven wounded, so great was the improvement in their morale inspired by [Crassus'] recent punishment." Evidently, Spartacus was expecting reinforcements and therefore only fought Crassus by harassment and even crucified a Roman prisoner between the two armies in order to demonstrate to his own men what fate awaited them if they were to lose. In order to put an end to their disgrace, Rome sent Pompey, who had just arrived from Spain, and his army against him. Crassus, therefore, sought to bring the conflict to a decision as quickly as possible before Pompey arrived so that he would not reap the glory of a victory.

Spartacus, having perceived, Crassus' anxiety sought to come to terms with him. When his proposals were rebuffed with scorn, Spartacus dashed through the enemies lines and pushed on to Brundisium with Crassus in pursuit. Unfortunately for Spartacus, Lucullus had just arrived in Brundisium after his victory over king Mithridates. Spartacus and the Romans fought a long a bloody battle.

“Spartacus was wounded in the thigh with a spear and sank upon his knee, holding his shield in front of him and contending in this way against his assailants until he and a great mass of those with him were surrounded and slain. The reminder of his army was thrown into confusion and butchered in crowds...the body of Spartacus was not found.”

According to Appian, the remainder of his men divided themselves into four parts having fled into the mountains, with Crassus on their rear, and they continued to fight until they all had perished except for about 6000 who were captured and crucified along the road from Capua to Rome. (*Civil Wars* 1.14.116-120)

Through the *Sparticus Rebellion* the *servi* sought to transcend *thing hood*. The *servi* as a social class had become self-conscious by challenging *death*. Catiline as an actor on the world stage on behalf of the nobility did not obtain class consciousness through the *Bellum Catilinae*, for as a social class the *patricians* already had it. His actions in fact demonstrated that the nobility had become conscious of the fact that as a class it was no longer *the Master* holding the other classes in thrall, but was in fact a social class in decline. Its mastery had been replaced by the mastery of the *plebeians*. The most advanced elements of the patrician class; Caesar, Crassus and Catiline, having recognized this historic development reasserted themselves as representatives of their

class. Though the Roman Republic did continue after the defeat of Spartacus, the exile of Cicero signaled that the Republic had come to an end.

### The First Triumvirate and the Prosecution of Cicero

Not long after the *Bellum Catilinae*, Pompey, Crassus and Caesar “pooled their interests” ascended as the *First Triumvirate* (60 B. C.-53 B.C.) which was gained through reliance on their reputations of their *glorious* conquests abroad and some demagoguery whereby the people were bought off with land distributions, threats of violence and the ejection of Cato from the forum. In 59 B.C. Clodius was appointed *tribune* by Caesar

“Although [he] had been suspected of an intrigue with the wife of Caesar himself during a religious ceremony of women. Caesar, however, did not bring him to trial owing to his popularity with the masses, but divorced his wife. Others prosecuted Clodius for impiety at the sacred rites, and Cicero was the counsel for the prosecution. When Caesar was called as a witness he refused to testify against Clodius, but even raised him to the tribuneship as a foil to Cicero, who was already decrying the triumvirate as tending toward monarchy. Thus Caesar...benefited one enemy in order to revenge himself on another.” (*Civil Wars* 2.14)

In 58 B.C. Clodius prosecuted Cicero for putting Lentulus and Cethagus, *inter alios*, to death without a trial.

“Cicero, who had exhibited the highest courage in that transaction, became utterly unnerved at his trial.” (*Ibid.* 2.15)

Cicero reportedly threw himself into a number of public histrionics. Dressing himself in rags and covering himself in filth he implored people in the streets.

“When Clodius interrupted Cicero’s supplications on the streets with contumely, he gave way to despair and, like Demosthenes, went into voluntary exile.” (*Ibid.*)  
 Sixteen months later he was recalled to Rome at the urging of Pompey who hoped that Cicero would no longer speak against the triumvirate but would instead attack Clodius.

“He was received magnificently at the city gates, and it is said that a whole day was consumed by the greetings extended to him, as was the case with Demosthenes when he returned.” (*Ibid* 2.16)

Cassius Dio says that Cicero

“Discarded his senatorial dress and went about in the garb of the knights, paying court meanwhile, as he went the rounds, day and night alike, to all who had any influence, not only of his friends but also of his opponents, and especially Pompey and even Caesar, inasmuch as the latter concealed his enmity toward him.” (*Historiae Romanae* 38.14.7)

This is not so far fetched as Appian’s account of the events since Cicero was an equestrian, which means knight. At any rate, Cicero cast himself as a persona in a tragic drama understanding well the portent of charges dutifully entertained against a former consul who had immunity. In his staged triumphal return Cicero vaingloriously and wrongly believed that the *idea* of the Republic had won out against the *idea* of tyranny. This is Cicero consciously demonstrating to the people through real life drama, or real life tricked out as a drama. His histrionics were in fact calculated *pedagogy* through drama intended to impress upon the people at the time as it impresses upon us now the great historic importance of these events. Cicero covers his face with the tragic mask of Demosthenes and speaks through the opening; as if to say: ‘Hello! It’s me, Cicero.

Remember me? I saved the Republic. It is I who dashed away the daggers once held at your throats. *Servate me! Servate me!* Now save me, and through me, the Republic.'

The reason that this event is so significant is that it showed that patrician demagoguery once again carried the day in Rome. Strictly speaking, the political process was no longer functioning as it once had. The removal Cato from the forum was the first sign that Rome had new masters. It was as yet a mere oligarchy, but the historical momentum was toward the return of the monarchy; this time not foreign but domestic. The historical precession must have somehow continued unfold in this direction but it was obstructed by the fact that Rome had banished the foreign monarchy and therefore lacked a legitimate basis for the coronation of a king, hence the precession from monarchy back to monarchy was mediated through the Republic. If a monarchy were to ascend in England today, we see the precedents for it in the royal family which claims precedence to the throne. If a monarchy were to ascent in American, however, we see that it lacks and precedents. That is not say that it would be impossible for a king to rule America, but it would be difficult to settle the issue of precedence to the throne because America has no domestic heritage from monarchy but to a foreign monarchy expelled as Rome did. The historical process in Rome was settling this issue. None of the men of the first triumvirate qualified as a true king and none of these men would allow any of the others to ascend as a tyrant, hence the first *tricaranus* followed by the second.

It was not the assassination of Caesar, the proscription of Cicero, or the ascension of Octavian, which sealed Rome's fate as a culture in decline. It was in fact exile of Cicero which played the pivotal role. It was the exile of Cicero that truly demonstrated that democracy in Rome had come to an end. The not only had the *rule of law* been

banished, but politics through oratory had been thereby outlawed. There was no more respect for the citizen statesman. Rome had a *de facto* oligarchy ruling it. Octavian would finally make the case for establishing a neo-monarchy by narrating a divine heritage through his adoptive father Julius. Though it wasn't called a monarchy, but a *pinceps*, or 'pincipate' or a State ruled by the 'leading man.'

*Non regno tamen neque dictatura sed principis nomine constitutam rem publicam.*

Nevertheless, the Republic had been constituted as neither a kingdom nor a dictatorship but by the name of Pincipate. (*The Annals* 1.9)

### Digression on Deioces

Octavian's argument for the re-institution of the monarchy might be compared to the events that took place among the Medes after they freed themselves from the oppression of the Assyrians. According to Herodotus there was a certain Mede named Deioces who achieved sovereign power in Media over the Busae, the Paretaceni, the Struchates, the Arizanti, the Budii, and the Magi by means of demagoguery. Since there was great lawlessness in the land on account of the fact that Media lacked a central authority, Deioces applied himself to the practice of justice and acquired a reputation for being an equitable judge. He soon collected a large following of people who greatly enlarged his case load. Once Deioces saw that the people had come to rely on him for giving dispensation and force to law he suddenly quit his job causing robbery and lawlessness to reappear. In want of justice and Despairing at the state of affairs, the accomplices and provocateurs of Deioces gathered the Medes together and declared:

“We cannot possibly...go on living in this country if things continue as they now are; let us therefore set a king over us, that so the land may be well governed.”

(*The History* 1.95-101)

Though the ascension of Octavian was not exactly like this, it should be noted that it was the lawlessness on account of the power struggles that caused the Republic to end in monarchy. Thus it may well be concluded that civil strife leads to tyranny.

If the difference between tyranny and monarchy is the difference between how power is exercised, with the consent of the people versus without the consent of the people, and not a debate over how that power is obtained,<sup>136</sup> then, because of the *Pax Romana*, Octavian succeeded not only in re-establishing the monarchy but also in making that monarchy Roman. But there can be little doubt that the dialectical development of Roman history for the time of the expulsion of Tarquinius to the ascension of Octavian was from monarchy to monarchy mediated through the Republic which in the end gave back to Rome what a foreign power had once held.

### Digression on Religion

Though it may not at first glance appear to be particularly germane to the matter at hand, in the process of passing moral judgment upon the crimes of Catiline we first looked to his sacrilege against the Roman religion but in this process we must also look at our own theological presuppositions for it is from here that we pass judgment upon him. Our theology is primarily Platonic passed through the lens of Semitic dogma. We could only do this because our own civilization has derived its ethical compendium from the Bible and from theological thought derived from it. We as a civilization have negated

---

<sup>136</sup> Cf. *Liddel and Scott*



the Roman religion; we have pronounced an ethical judgment against it. We do not criticize it by drawing the Roman religion in relation to the Greek religion because western civilization has rejected it as *paganism*. We cannot however truly even speak of western theology as Semitic except as a dialectical development of Platonic philosophy; the development being from Plato to Mohammed. On account of his remarks in *Timaeus* (c. 360 B.C.), Plato has been recognized as the origin of monotheism. According to him:

“Everything which becomes must of necessity become owing to some Cause...Now to discover the Maker and Father of this Universe were a task indeed...Let us now state the Cause wherefore He that constructed it constructed Becoming and the All. He was good, and in him that is good no envy ariseth ever concerning anything and being devoid of envy. He desired that all should be, so far as possible, like unto Himself...For God desired that, so far as possible, all things should be good and nothing evil.” (*Timaeus* 28A-30A)

Before this Plato has already speculated in the *Republic*:

“Suppose there are no gods.” (2.365)

In other words, suppose there are no *gods* but one God; لا إله إلا الله. Humanist philosopher Marcilio Ficino (1433-1499) said,

“Plato, the father of the philosophers, realizing that our minds bear the same relationship to God as our sight to the light of the Sun, and therefore they can never understand anything without the light of God, consider it just and pious that as the human mind receives everything from God, so it should restore everything to God. And that is why he has been considered indisputably divine and his teaching called ‘theology’ among all peoples. For whatever subject he

deals with, be it ethics, dialectic, mathematics or physics, he quickly brings it round, in a spirit of utmost piety to the contemplation and worship of God.”

*(Platonic Theology, Proem 1-2)*

At any rate, there were no Jews at the time of Herodotus. The Hebrews, on the authority of the cylinder of Cyrus, were in the captivity of the Babylonians. Herodotus, nevertheless, could not have been mistaken that the region was called Palestine, not Israel, for he himself traveled to Palestine where he saw the pillars of Sesostris, king of Egypt and Ethiopia at the time.

“The pillars which Sesostris erected in the conquered countries have for the most part disappeared; but in the part of Syria called Palestine, I myself saw them still standing.” *(The History 2.106)*

Herodotus is well known for having narrated the histories of the dozens of obscure people’s inhabiting the regions of North Africa, Arabia, Asia Minor, Central Asia and Europe. It seems to be rather impossible that he would have ignored the noble exploits of the Jewish people if they had indeed existed in his time or before. Tacitus noted that the Judaism was a Greek cult in Egypt. And that they may have emigrated from Egypt under the leadership of a man named Moses. It appears that over the years little has changed except for the invention of the *Torah* scroll which makes up the center piece of their Temples today and has become an object of worship for them for according to Tacitus:

“Cneius Pompeius was the first of our countrymen to subdue the Jews. Availing himself of the right of conquest, he entered the temple. Thus it became commonly known that the place stood empty with no similitude of gods within, and that the shrine had nothing to reveal.” *(Ibid. 5.9)*

According to Herodotus, however, it was the Egyptians who first designated the pig as an unclean animal, not the Jews.

“The pig is regarded among them as an unclean animal, so much so that if a man in passing accidentally touches a pig, he instantly hurries to the river and plunges in with all his clothes on. Hence too, the swineherds...are forbidden to enter into any temples...and further, no one will give his daughter in marriage to a swineherd, or take a wife from among them, so that the swineherds are forced to intermarry among themselves.” (2.47)

Of course the pig was considered despicable even in the Greek world. The Elder Clisthenes, having conquered the Sicyonians, after appointing his own tribe the Archelaii ‘Rulers he renamed the remaining tribes: Hyatae ‘Pig-folk,’ Oneatae ‘Ass-folk,’ and the Choereatae ‘Swine-folk’ as an insult to them. He also says that the Egyptians were related black Africans. For the

“Colchians are an Egyptian race. Before I heard any mention of the fact from others, I had remarked it myself. After the thought had struck me, I made inquiries on the subject both in Colchis and in Egypt, and I found that the Colchians had a more distinct recollection of the Egyptians, than the Egyptians had of them...they are black-skinned and have woolly hair.” (2.104)

In addition to this, Herodotus noted that the Colchians, Egyptians and the Ethiopians were the nations which originally practiced circumcision.

“The Phoenicians and the Syrians of Palestine themselves confess that they learnt the custom from the Egyptians.” (*Ibid.*)

In addition to this it appears that the *Pelastoi* were the original inhabitants of the land

“In the part of Syria called Palestine.” (2.106)

The land we now call Palestine. Syria is a Greek name. The original name of the region was Cappadocia. The people residing there were thus known as

“The Cappadocians, whom we Greeks know by the name Syrians.” (5.49)

And that the Egyptians

“Were also the first to broach the opinion that the soul of man is immortal.”

(2.123)

The *Torah* was based on the writings of Josephus (c. 37 – c. 100 A.D.); and because of that it was first written in Greek not in Hebrew. If it was ever written in Hebrew there are no parchments or any historical evidence to substantiate that fact. Indeed the oldest extant text of the *Torah* is in Latin (100 A.D.) which is widely believed to be a translation of a non-extant Greek version for which the Greek *Septuagint* (1000 A.D.) serves as a substitute. If we rely on what the historical evidence shows us, the Septuagint is not an ancient Greek translation of the Hebrew Scriptures. Some scholars in fact hold that the Hebrew language is derived from Greek and we can easily see the correspondences between the Latin, Greek, Hebrew and Arabic alphabets, from the Greek  $\alpha\lambda\phi\beta\eta\tau\omicron\varsigma$ , alpha + beta = ‘alphabet.’ Latin: A, B, C, D, E; Greek: Alpha, Beta, Gamma, Delta, Epsilon...Lambda, Mu, Nu; Hebrew: Alef, Bet, Gimmel, Dalet...Lamed, Mim, Nun; Arabic: Alif, Ba, Ta, Gim, Ha, Dal...Lam, Mim, Nun. Some etymologists wrongly presume the Greek alphabet to be from the Phoenician-Hebrew, but for lack of evidence of this, I hold to what this information shows to me on its face as opposed to making hyperbolic presumptions which evidently have a political subtext since certain unscrupulous individuals, seeking to posit themselves as the origin of everything good,

deny the Greek origin of western theology and Plato's pivotal role in the development of it. Assertions to the effect that the Greek alphabet or that Greek thought, particularly Plato's thought, was derived from Judaism is absurd and does not merit serious discussion. This is not to say that Plato himself was a monotheist, but that monotheism was built upon his cosmology in the *Timaeus*. (Cf. *Plato's Cosmology* 34-35) The contemporary Hebrew Scriptures are in fact the translation of the Greek *Septuagint*; Josephus having been the principle author of them. It really neither here nor there except to individuals who hope to establish some primacy over humanity, but he seems to be wiser who would predicate his theological genealogy upon the last development, as opposed to its first, since the last development of an upward spiral would be the most advanced. Indeed then it appears that monotheism is the result of a long and varied historical development. Those who would later be called the Jews didn't exist until after Plato. The space here would be insufficient to do justice to the topic.

“It is equally unreasonable to accept merely probable conclusions from a mathematician and to demand strict demonstrations from an orator.”

(*Nicomachean Ethics* 1.3.4)

If they did exist in either Egypt or elsewhere, the historical record is silent about them until c. 100 A.D. The point being that the ethics of western civilization were summed up in the *Torah*, the *Ten Commandments*, but as substantive morals they could not be adequately define, due the structure and phenomenological development of the human mind, hence the development of the *Talmud* as a body of law to interpret the Law; justice itself becoming ever more distant and its interpretation evermore corrupt.

Though Josephus tells us that the *Torah* was originally a mere *ten words*, which he refused to reveal, it was expanded to 613 *commandments* and then later greatly expanded into many thousands, indeed innumerable, *Halakah*, demonstrating the imperfection of the work.

Ὅς οὐ θεμιτόν ἐστιν ἡμῖν λέγειν φανερώς πρὸς λέξις, τὰς δὲ δυνάμεις αὐτῶν δηλώσομεν.

These words, by the law of God and man, we are not allowed to say openly, but we will indicate the meaning of them. (*Jewish Antiquities* 3.90)

“What is called the unutterable is nothing else than the untrue.” (*Phenomenology of Spirit* 110)

Hence it was originally conceived that the *Torah* pronounced by Moses was sufficient, but it was later declared by its own adherents to be insufficient.

*Non addestis ad verbum quod vobis loquor neque auferetis ex eo.*

You shall not add to the Word which I speak to you nor remove from it. (*Deuteronomy* 4.2)

On account of the great corruption of Jewish law, a new Prophet came and gave humanity a *New Covenant*. The *Torah* was replaced by the *Gospels* and the writings of the Church Fathers. The theology of Saint Paul (A.D. 3–14 - 62–69), the *Gospels*, eventually gave way to القرآن , the *Qur'an* (c. 632 A.D.), the recitation of the Prophet Mohammed. This represented a positive upward development in terms of substantive ethics for the western world, the ascendancy of western theology, unfolding through dialectical struggle in an upward spiral; an ascendancy from the lower to the higher. But as history continues to unfold, the morals propounded within these documents, as

substantive ethics, becomes ever more out of step with the need of humanity, they become dated as it were. Thus as contemporary historians, our interpretation of Catiline's crimes cannot be completely understood in terms of Roman paganism for our concept of Holy law has been conditioned by what would properly be called Platonic theology having developed through the lens of Semitic history and then transmitted to us through the history of the later Roman Empire as Christianity. Thus it could not be truly said either that there are two distinct sources for western thought, or that the three principal monotheistic religions, are truly Semetic because they in fact have a Greek origin.

According to western ethics and western culture *paganism* is false because as a source of ethical principles it cannot survive the tests of contemporary logic which seized upon the development of Semitic theology, in American, principally, as Christianity. But truly, the development of Platonic theology ended with the Prophet Mohammed, not with Moses or Jesus, hence the second part of the 'shahadda' شهادة الله رسول محمد 'Mohammed is the Messenger of God.' This was the final historical development of western theology regardless of whether or not anyone chooses to ascribe to this doctrine. It is with the *Qur'an* that the Semites, Arabs, declared that there could be no further ethical development in history along this path. The *Qur'an* is the final substantive moral doctrine from this source. Mohammed was the last and final messenger. The whole of the ethical and historical development of the Platonic religion was ultimately lain down as a substantive doctrine in the *Qur'an*. It is a moral datum. It is the moral yardstick for all ethical activity from those who ascribe to it and the end result of western religion. The Jews were displaced from their position as the bearers of God's ethics by the

Christians and the Christians by the Muslims. According to Islam, Judaism was too strict, Christianity was not strict enough. Both had become theologically corrupt by any test of logic. Islam became a middle path between the two extremes and is known as the straight path **المُسْتَقِيمَ**. Not the only path as it were, according to its doctrine, but the straight path.

All who follow it a guaranteed eternal life after death in paradise **جنة**. At length however, the theology of Islam fell into the same morass as its predecessors in attempting to legislate from a moral substantive purportedly revealed through divine agency to positive law. The more it pursued the idea of absolute justice the further it became from actually achieving it. And though it is said that the *Qur'an* is like a great sea, and it is, I say the Greek and Latin library is a far greater sea.

This isn't to say that the whole body of theological thought is worthless, but to point out its limitations which have resulted from the fact that while history develops and therefore mankind's idea of the ethical develops, moral substantives do not. The whole purpose of this rather lengthy and tiresome digression being to point out that western ethics is marked by a dualism between the theological and the secular humanistic. Indeed there were two principle developments in early Greek philosophy: (α) Ionic and (β) Italiot. The western academy, as a result of the Enlightenment, has taken a course which is decidedly Ionic. Whosoever should wish to understand western ethics must understand both of these developments. I might also be worthwhile to note that after secular humanism over took the western academy, the faculty became what would



correspond to the ancient priest class. It has become their responsibility to impart the values of this civilization. This of course is to no avail for:

“The masses are the victims of the deception of a *priesthood* which, in its envious conceit, holds itself to be the sole possessor of insight and pursues its other selfish ends as well. At the same time it conspires with *despotism* which, as the synthetic, non-notional unity of the real and this ideal realm—a curiously inconsistent entity—stands above the bad insight of the multitude and the bad intentions of the priests, and yet unites both within itself. From the stupidity and confusion of the people brought about by this trickery of preistcraft, despotism, which despises both, draws for itself the advantage of undisturbed domination and the fulfillment of its desires and caprices, but is itself at the same time this same dullness on insight, the same superstition and error.” (*Phenomenology of Spirit* 542)

If as Hegel remarked that the state rests on religion, we could also conclude that as for the Roman Empire that it was the *أبر* ‘riba,’ the *دنيا* ‘dunya,’ the *شرك* ‘shirk,’ and the *كبر* ‘kibr’ that had destroyed it.

“Religion is the sphere in which a nation gives itself the definition of that which it regards as true...the conception of God, therefore, constitutes the general basis of a people’s character.” (*Philosophy of History* 176)

Thus I compare the personality traits of the villainous Catiline to four great *احرام* ‘sins:’ *أبر* ‘riba’ or ‘usury,’ the *دنيا* ‘dunya’ or ‘the quest for earthly possessions,’ the *شرك* ‘shirk’ or ‘idol worship’, and the *كبر* ‘kibr’ or ‘ὕβρις. Catiline himself was possessed of

these vices: usury, avarice, polytheism, and insolent outrages before God. He was going broke because the usury, on the money he borrowed to purchase useless things of the material world, the *dunya*. Men like Catiline and the Roman emperors that followed him saw themselves reflected in the Roman Pantheon. The gods of the Romans were too much like men, *shirk*. Hegel citing Schiller said:

“While the gods remained more human, the men more divine.” (*Ibid*)

The concept of the Hero, which the Romans allegedly acquired from the Greeks, suggested that the *great men* of Rome could become like the heroes of antiquity. Through this *idea* the great men believed that they could challenge the gods themselves, *kibr*, كبر or ὑβρις, insolence and arrogance. The fact that Octavian would be later acclaimed Caesar Augustus, *the divine Caesar*, proves this. As a man’s objective greatness grew, and his power and dominion over not only things but over *men as things* grew. The state’s subjective content passed through the lens of the state’s leading man first approached the idea of the Great Man as *hero* and later approached the idea of the Great Man as a *god*.

*Nihil deorum honoribus relictum cum se templis et effigie numinum per flamines et sacerdotes coli vellet.*

No honor was left to the gods when Augustus wished himself to be worshiped like a god with temples and effigies, by priests and priestesses. (*The Annals* 1.10)

The Roman emperors became like the *pharaohs* of Egypt, the ruler as god on Earth. The fact that Catiline so boldly desecrated the fountain of Apollo demonstrated not only his *hubris* but his madness. Herodotus said that the fact that the Persian king Cambyses opened ancient sepulchers in Memphis and examined the bodies inside and

that later the fact that he mocked and desecrated the images of Vulcan and the Cabiri was proof that he was mad.

“For if one were to offer men to choose out of all the customs in the world such as seemed to them the best, they would examine the whole number, and end by preferring their own...Unless, therefore, a man was mad, it is not likely that he would make sport of such matters.”

Herodotus continued by way of a parable based on the life of Darius. According to him, Darius summoned some Greeks and asked them what he should have to pay them in order to cause them to eat the bodies of their fathers after they had died. The Greeks replied that there was no sum of money so great that could cause them to commit such a sacrilege. Darius then summoned some Indians called the Callatians, whom were known to eat their fathers after they had died, and asked them what sum of money he should have to give them to cause them to follow the Greek custom and burn the bodies of their fathers after they had died. The Callatians replied that there was no sum of money so great that they would even hear the suggestion. Whereupon Herodotus concluded in the words of the Greek poet Pindar:

Ορθος μοι δοκεει Πινδαρος ποιησαι νομον παντων βασιλευα φησας ειναι.

In my opinion Pindar does right when he declares: “Law is to be king over all.”

*(The History 3.38)*

Cambyses committed outrages similar to the ones Catiline had. For in addition to sacrilege, it reported that Cambyses murdered his brother Smerdis and later married one of his other sisters after first marrying and then murdering the younger of the two. Hardy presumed to exculpate Catiline from the charges made against him on the grounds

that they are related to us differently by several authorities, but Herodotus himself relates two different accounts of the murder of Smerdis and two more different accounts of Cambyses' murder of his sister. His practice of narrating multiple accounts of the same story is used throughout his works. Should we convict Cambyses for both these crimes on account of the fact that only *one* historian has told us about his crimes and be unable to convict Catiline on account of the fact that his crimes were narrated not by one but *several*? Or could we dispute Cicero's authority to banish Catiline, vanquish him with an army raised by the state, and to execute the conspirators knowing well that the punishment for the crimes by which they were charged, at that time, was death in accordance with the *rule of law*? Irrespective of a positive conviction in a court of law, those guilty of aforesaid crimes were owed the ultimate punishment. The fact that they received it demonstrated that νόμος 'law' was the king over men, not men the *king* over law. But strictly speaking it was not the positive law in direct correspondence to these men in this case that was vindicated by the law that established the Republic. Irrespective of his dissemblance and his conspiracy, Catiline, and the men behind him, could not have, and should not have, made themselves supreme.

Δίκη δ' ὑπερ ὕβριος ἰσχει ἐς τέλος ἐξελθούσα·

But Justice overcomes Hubris when it comes to the end. (*Works and Days* 217)

Thus, Cicero affirmed the *rule of law* and that a man is not a god. And that Catiline as a full participant in the mechanisms of the Roman government was bound by law to uphold the Republic. He was not above the law but was subject to law; in general the law that established the Republic, and in this instance the *Plautian Law* in particular.

“They must do what is best for the community, never forgetting it or allowing themselves to be either forced or bewitched into throwing it over.” (*Republic* 10.3.413)

The moral principle regarding revolution against the state is different for those who have no power, for the national spirit in every state is to strive for freedom. The many having no power believe that it is just that they should have it. No one disputes the right of the people to overthrow a monarchy, but the right to re-establish one is denied by all.

“Injustice has this effect of implanting hatred wherever it exists.” (1.351)

Whosoever should attempt to do so is roundly condemned as an oppressor and a tyrant.

Catiline was the oppressor. He was an instrument of the oppressor class, which having been displaced from its social position sought to reassert itself. If *class struggle* is taken as the motive force in the process of the development of the national spirit, the patrician class supplanting the monarchy was the first moment of historic justice within the Roman state.

“The rich citizens ‘*populus crassus*’ now excluded the nobility from power...the patrician nobility which supplanted the feudal aristocracy, deprived the common people of all share in the conduct of the state, and thus proved itself no less oppressive than the original noblesse.” (*Philosophy of History* 336)

The plebian class supplanting the patrician class was the second moment of historic justice. The re-assertion of the patrician class was a moment of historic *injustice* when justice is taken to be a condition of the state which brings happiness, in both a qualitative and quantitative sense, to the greatest number of people. The *Pax Romana* was good for a while, but most would agree that the Roman people suffered greatly under the Empire.

The patrician class under the aegis Catiline did not play the historic role of the liberator. As the embodiment of injustice in a moment of reaction the patrician class became the oppressive class operating through Catiline as an instrument of that class. Catiline became the enforcer of the will of the oppressors, hence an oppressor himself. Punishing the oppressor in accordance with the rule of law isn't called *oppression*. It's called *justice*.

“It seems almost an act of justice that a man should suffer wrong such as he had been accustomed to make others suffer.” (*Rhetoric* 1.12.26)

Through the process, then, of the examination and re-examination of the evidence, an evil man once lain low and later invested with grandeur, Catiline, once again, assumes his proper place in history, as a villain, not a hero.

‘Οι γ’ αὐτῷ κακά τευχέει ἀνηρ ἄλλῳ κακά τευχῶν,  
 ἣ δὲ κακὴ βουλή τοι βουλευσάντι κακίστη·

At any rate, a man plans bad things for himself when he plans bad things for another, but the bad plan is most bad to he who planned. (*Works and Days* 267)

Thus Catiline received what was owed to him, which was justice. In this case justice was harm to the *bad man* who was he who had *plotted the bad thing* in the first instance. Catiline and his conspirators, then, did not become *better* by the receiving of *justice*; they became very much worse for it.

“One who pays a just penalty must not be called miserable, and his misery laid at heaven’s door.” (*Republic* 2.380b)

In punishing the criminal here, it was not the individual which was improved, but the state which had improved itself. The idea of the state, the rule of law, and Rome’s

national spirit was strengthened by his defeat. *Rome Sauvée!* Rome was saved, at least for a time. Cicero had saved it. There's no denying that. Catiline would have ruined it and there's no denying that either unless one holds that monarchy is better than democracy. For the Republicans among us, justice was served; and for the very same Judith Kalb has tampered with the social memory of humanity. She slipped on the *Ring of Gyges* in order to crown Catiline with the *Helmet of Hades*. To rehabilitate Catiline's reputation first at the expense of Cicero's, and next at the expense of Lenin, and afterwards at the expense of Christ is not only to suggest that justice of the state be found in monarchy, not in democracy, and that the poor are rabble, it transposes the common acceptance of the words *the good* and *the bad* within today's Republic.

Kalb is as much an ironist as Catiline was. Her activity would not be called a virtuous action or the one who does it good.

“For ‘activity in conformity with virtue’ involves virtue...But virtue in active exercise cannot be inoperative—it will of necessity act, and act well...The man who does not enjoy doing noble actions is not a good man at all: no one would call a man just if he did not like acting justly, nor liberal if he did not like doing liberal things, and similarly with the other virtues.” (*Nicomachean Ethics* 1098b1-1099a1)

The student of dialectical and historical materialism would say that whether or not one views Catiline as a criminal is conditioned by one's class standing. Thus those who have sought to vindicate Catiline, being of the bourgeois class and not of the aristocracy, only find a little “something great” in him. Their vindication of him is qualified by saying Catiline was at least not as bad as he was made out to be, but in the end of their discourse

must either also condemn him as the ancients did, or leave the matter hanging by neither wholly condemning him nor wholly vindicating him, for the *imperium* of the bourgeoisie is a mere *middle term* between progress and reaction.

“In class society everyone lives as a member of a particular class, and every kind of thinking, without exception, is stamped with the brand of that class.” (*On Practice* 296)

### Gradatio (Κλίμαξ)

For all the virtues of the historical revisionists, if Catiline is to Christ then Kalb is to Myrrah.<sup>137</sup>

*Scelus est odisse parentem:*

*hic amor est odio maius scelus...*

*Illa quidem sentit foedoque repugnat amori*

*et secum...*

*“di, precor, et pietas sacrataque iura parentum,*

*hoc prohibete nefas scelerique resistite nostro,*

*si tamen hoc scelus est.*

*Sed enim damnare negatur*

*hanc venerem pietas, coeuntque animalia nullo*

*cetera delicto. Nec habetur turpe iuvencae*

*ferre patrem tergo, fit equo sua filia coniunx,*

*quasque creavit init pecudes caper, ipsaque, cuius*

*semine concepta est, ex illo concipit ales.*

---

<sup>137</sup> This is *Climax*.



*Felices, quibus ista licent! Humana malignas  
 cura dedit leges, et quod natura remittit,  
 invida iura negant. Gentes tamen esse feruntur,  
 in quibus et nato genetrix et nata parenti  
 iungitur, [ut] pietas geminato crescat amore.  
 Me miseram, quod non nasci mihi contigit illic,  
 fortunaque loci laedor! – Quid in ista revolvor?  
 Spes interdictae discedite! Dignus amari  
 ille, sed ut pater, est. –Ergo si filia magni  
 non essem Cinyrae, Cinyrae concumbere possem;  
 nunc quia iam meus est, non est meus, ipsaque damno  
 est mihi proximitas: aliena potentior essem.  
 Ire libet procul hinc patriaeque relinquere fines,  
 dum scelus effugiam. Retinet malus ardor amantem,  
 ut praesens spectem Cinyram tangamque loquarque  
 osculaque admoveam, si nil conceditur ultra.  
 Ultra autem spectare aliquid potes, impia virgo?  
 Et quot confundas et iura et nomina, sentis!  
 Tune eris et matris paelex et adultua patris? tune soror nati genetrixque  
 vocabere fratiris?...Mors placet.*

A filthy passion indeed she feels this and against it fights.

And to herself she does say...

“It is a sin to have hated a parent,

A great sin too is this kind love by means of a jealous hatred...

O god please, I beg you,

with utter devotion and the rites sacred of parents.

Keep us from us this sin, and from this crime away.

If indeed it is a sin?

Venus herself would not truly condemn this great sign:

That animals breed with family others:

It is not repulsive for a bull to mount his heifer,

a stud to mount his daughter; and

the he-goat goes among the band he begat,

from those whose very semen conceived the same birds do mate.

Happiness is to those whom this is lawful!

Spite to laws with great pains mankind gives;

What nature allows, they deny;

And with jealous oaths they do condemn

the races of men are there who breed at home;

those to whom both mother and son

father and daughter

mate.

Doubling love but magnifies devotion.

O' woe is me, not being born there,

by fortune, in this place, I am oppressed!

Who am I to be dwelling on this?

I hope to give up by talking to myself!

Worthy to be loved is he,

but only as a father.

If I were not the daughter

of this great man Cinyras,

to lay with him now I might be able.

But as it stands he is both mine and not mine,

and if near me I myself to him forbid:

Much stronger I would be as a stranger.

Far far away I wish to go

this native land to leave behind

to escape this sin at the ends of the Earth.

But a wicked lust me detains,

In person that Cinyras I may behold

to touch and speak and to him give

only a kiss, and nothing else would come to pass.

At last what else do you appear to be,

but an impious virgin?

And think of how many words

and promises you do you confound!

Thou shalt not be a both adulterer of your mother.

A concubine to your father?

Thou shalt not be called sister and mother

of your brother?”

In the end, she pleased Death. (*Metamorphoses* 10.314-378)

Myrrah’s justification for her passion by way of making an analogy between the breeding habits of animals and her incestuous passion for her father serves as proof to her irrationality, and by analogy Catiline’s. Since man is not merely the political animal but also the rational animal the apologists for Catiline seek to approach the morality of animals. Man’s self-consciousness, his being for another, as an individual perhaps may be found in political discourse, but mankind’s self-consciousness, not solely as national consciousness, or national spirit, or even class consciousness, but in its totality as the human race on a single Earth, is experienced through the thoughtful consideration of the development of history in so far as working history is the summation of human experience obtained through the interpretation of the social *res gestae* produced through self-conscious social relations recorded in books and transmitted by the old to the young. The summation of the *res gestae* is not merely a catalog of ‘things done,’ but an understanding of the *social praxis* of the time. The institution of the principles discovered is called *politics*. Man through the study of history and the institution of learned principals seeks to institute a qualitatively better State. History thus employed is partially a self-creating teleological because it has as its final aim the greatest degree happiness for the greatest number of people. As historians the beginning and end of history have been posited by our own selves. History then has an internal teleology.

“*The final cause of the world at large, we allege to be the consciousness of its own freedom.*” (*Philosophy of History* 161)

Moreover,

“Happiness then is the activity of the soul in accordance with reason.”  
 (*Nicomachean Ethics* 1.7.8)

Since the State is the summation of individual happiness the activity of the State in accordance with the principle of reason would be the best State. Historians have not only a duty but the rational capability to discourse on social problems and make recommendations as to the best course of action.

“If we want to abolish capitalism or war, and in doing so not only to destroy them but to bring into existence something better, we must begin by understanding them.” (*The Idea of History* 334)

This intention of the historian to create a better world is no longer confined to the idea of the mere nation state but now embraces the whole world. This is a development over the scientific history of modernity which is presently named *post-modern* since no one has as yet defined it as an *idea* but hold it as a mere *concept*. The post-modernists are however the merely *skeptical*; caught up in

“The dizziness of perpetually self-engendered disorder...At one time it recognizes that its freedom lies in rising above all the confusion and contingency of existence, and at another time equally admits to a relapse of occupying itself with what is unessential...Its deeds and its words always belie one another and equally it has itself the doubly contradictory consciousness of unchangeableness and sameness, and of utter contingency and non-identity with itself...Point out likeness or identity to it, and it will point out unlikeness or non-identity; and when it is now confronted with what it has just asserted, it turns round and points out likeness or identity.” (*Phenomenology of Spirit* 205)

What the current trend in philosophy knows for certain is that the present historical moment is different from, but analogous to, what had preceded it. With increasing rationality and self-directedness, mankind has increasingly differentiated itself from the animal kingdom. By way of ancient thought man has become more human than animal, but there has been a rebellion against this. The coming of modernity was marked with the trend: philosophical reductionism, positivism, and behaviorism. Those who followed this trend saw poverty in the realm of the human spirit and reduced man and human society to a mere machine; a body with no soul—and hence an animal with an excessively large brain—and exaggerated sense organ or stimulus and response mechanism, and no more. Our understanding of whom and what is man has become uncertain; and as our self-consciousness became unstable our ideas of morality have been called into question. If there is no God and man is merely an animal and the Universe is but a machine then how does one know that it is wrong to kill? For an animal the Commandment: “Thou shalt not kill” has no moral force.

### The Origin of the Lawgiver

But even if man rejects *the divine as lawgiver* it is still possible, indeed it is necessary, to discover moral principles through the study of history. In fact the so-called *divine lawgiver* is actually a product of history. Unfortunately, due to the positivism that grew out of the Enlightenment socialists tried to situate the idea of dialectical and historical materialism as a philosophical branch of natural science when in fact it is a human science. With respect to religion:

“What Enlightenment declares to be an error and a fiction is the same thing as Enlightenment itself is.” (*Phenomenology of Spirit* 549)

The methodology that grew from this trend was Comte's *sociology* (1822), and the best that could be achieved for the benefit of mankind through that methodology, was *social engineering*. Is it any wonder that Eisenstein's *Battleship Potemkin*, with all its images of churning maggots and ant-like images of man, has become a Trotskyite favorite, a socialist farce. But who would follow a man who derived his theory of social praxis from watching an ant farm? If there was any Bolshevik who could be said to correspond to Catiline, it would have to be Leon Trotsky on account his involvement in the murder of Maxim Gorky and his conspiracy to overthrow the Soviet Union.

Not only was man thought to be a machine, but social practice was thought to be a mere social mechanism. Hence the conflict within the academy as to whether or not the department of history ought to be included under the rubric of the *humanities* or under the rubric of the *social sciences*. This dialectical struggle is exhibited in the language of the academy as well. Should one in explaining social praxis refer to man in *society* or should one refer to mankind in its totality as *humanity*. Hence the trend in dialectical materialism diverged as either socialism understood as *atheism* or socialism understood as *secular humanism*. Socialism is really *secular humanism*, not atheism. Atheism is the language of natural science, not of humanism. Man externalizing himself, naming his collective conscience "God," affirms that in the world of ethical social praxis affirms the principal that: "Man is the measure of all things."

Και ὁ Πρωταγόρας δε βούλεται πάντων χρήματων εἶναι μέτρον τον ἄνθρωπον, των μεν ὄντων ὡς ἐστίν, των δε ουκ ὄντων ὡς ουκ ἐστίν.

And Protagoras councils himself, [i.e. professes], all things to be measured by Man; on the one hand, of being that it is, and, on the other hand, non-being that it is not. (*Outlines of Pyrrhonism* 1.216)

And Man claims that if Man claims God to have being then it must be. Of the fact that it has being there can be no question for its very being has a name and what has a name must somehow be, but it is for us to determine what its being is and the significance of that being. But to simply deny its being is to deny one's own ability to apprehend being.

The socialist needs to understand that since the methodology of natural science does not apply to the study of history. No amount of studying Freud, Comte, or Darwin will ever produce the result sought after. For the resolution of the contradiction posed by the exploitation of man by man is by its very nature a humanistic question. Socialism must impact the social relations of the state. The methodology of natural science can only impact material production, but no amount of production will ever transform the social praxis, only ethical judgments can do that. But who ever should adopt *atheism*, as a product of scientific *naturalism*, as opposed to *humanism*, necessarily discards all moral parameters. Naturalism rejects the ethical for the ethical comes from the *humane*. By the same token those who presumed to make the "world work for everyone" through natural science have failed miserably for the question of developing any social praxis to actually do so. It is, then, not a question of merely inventing new things nor one of channeling the youth into math and science for the question of solving the world's problems can only be made by impacting the social relations which is as much an ethical problem as it is a question of who and how many should rule. Who will make ethical pronouncements that will be satisfactory to all, who will enforce them? Making science primary in education



implies that the mission of education remains the process of studying the world as a collection of things.

“The consciousness that observes in this way means, and indeed says, that it wants to learn, not about itself but on the contrary, about the essence of things *qua* things.” (*Phenomenology of Spirit* 242)

Yet without knowing itself the culture knows neither what it has done nor why it has done it. As a whole the Culture lacks the level of self-consciousness necessary at the level of the State. Education that preoccupies itself with the mere observation of nature as the practice of science also perpetuates the production of graduates who have only been trained in the regular use of *first order thinking*, not second.

“Even if Reason digs into the very entrails of things and opens every vein in them so that it may gush forth to meet itself, it will not attain this joy; it must have completed itself inwardly before it can experience the consummation of itself.” (*Ibid* 241)

The correct understanding of theology according to dialectical and historical materialism to wit is that: History is a branch of Ethics and Theology is a branch of History; both are subordinate to Logic. Since history develops, our idea of the ethical must develop and has developed. A Prophet is an individual who has summed up the ethics of his or her civilization up to that particular period of time when he or she makes their pronouncement.

To return to the principal thread of my argument, the Idea of God, then, is a division of the conscious mind. Mind posits the Idea of God and proceeds to have this mental construct narrate the Law. The Absolute Ethical Principle is posited as a ‘This,’

but the ‘This’ is not God but a mediated representation of God or an ‘other than God,’ hence merely the Idea of God—an abstract universal. The conscious mind does this in order to affirm that its own idea of the ethical is not only true it is also perfect because it comes from Omniscient and Almighty God, i.e., that the ethical postulates pronounced by the Holy Prophet have absolute moral force and that it is a unitary entity hence الله or *al* ‘the’ + *illa* ‘God,’ or ‘The God.’

“Fear of the lord is indeed the beginning of wisdom.” (*Phenomenology of Spirit* 195)

The fact that mind posits the Idea of God, however, does not prove that God does not exist, for the relation of the material world to the mind is a mediated world. And not only that, Reality is itself is marked by a dualism between Mind and Material to ask what is beyond Representation is also to ask what is beyond Reality. But since the mind cannot experience the material world directly, but only in a mediated way, it cannot say for certain either what the material world truly *is*, where it came from, or what is beyond it if anything. The Idea of God is the idea of the ethical and the ultimate source for Law.

### Diremption of the Self and the Material World

The dialectical interplay between the Self and the Material World is the beginning of what we call Reality. The beginning Reality had two parts: the Self and the Material World. The Self and the Material World then are at the outset of life *dialectical counterparts*. The consciousness itself at the very moment it perceives the Material World immediately splits up into two parts. At the beginning of our dialectic, then, the Self is a unity counter-posed to another unity called the Material World which appears to be an other for it. In the process of perceiving the Material world the conscious mind

must divide itself into two parts. This is because the Material World can only be known to the Self by means of *sense perception*. The Material World then is only perceptible to the Self for instance through touch, or through sight, or smell, or hearing—through the unity of five senses working in consort.

The sense organs themselves, however, merely transmit this information to the brain in the form of electrical impulses. The brain receiving this information must create a representation in the mind of what its sense organs have told it and cast the totality of what it has been perceived onto the ‘big screen’ of the conscious mind; but not just as a three dimensional picture of reality but as a total picture of experience which includes all of the information that the sense organs have told it through the five senses. The mind’s understanding of an event, then, only takes place inside the mind itself. The mind, or the Self, then, must split itself up into two parts: one of the parts is a *representation* of the Material World in its totality—its sights, sounds, and sensations—and the other part called the Self. Thus the Self which was at the beginning of its emergence into the Material World was unity immediately ends up with dialectical counterpart *inside* itself and its perception of the Material World is mediated through this representation. Where at once there was the dialectical counterpart of the Material World, Reality immediately becomes *three terms* instead of only two: the Material World, the Self and the self’s Representation of the Material world. This is called the *first dialectical trope of the conscious mind*. It is also called consciousness of the *first degree*.

The methodology of *empirical science* is the perception of the events of the Material World, but the perception of the events of the material world are *mediated* through the self’s Representation of the Material World. The scientist, then, doesn’t

directly study the Material World itself but in fact studies a Representation of the Material World which exists in the mind of the scientist. The mere observation of phenomena in the material world such as measuring the speed of light or in computing the length of the hypotenuse of a triangle, *viz.*  $a^2 + b^2 = c^2$ , is an activity of consciousness in the first degree. Thus there are three phenomenological terms in consciousness of the first degree which forms up the foundation of scientific methodology—the Material World, the Representation of the Material World, and the Self. The naturalist can then begin, for instance counting and measuring things. This is *mere* consciousness, but it is not Self-Consciousness. In order to attain Self-Consciousness the Self must split itself up again into a Self and Self-Consciousness. Thus the dialectical development of Self-Consciousness has *four terms*: the Self, the Material World which is external to the Self, the material world as posited by the Self called the Representation of the Material World, and the Self-Consciousness. This is called the *second dialectical trope of the conscious mind*. It is also called consciousness of the *second degree* and is in fact *self-consciousness*. Just as the Self posited the Representation of the Material World; the Self, which has become self-conscious, posits *another self* which could be called a Representation of the Self. Just as the Self posits the Representation of the Material World in order to understand the Material World by mediating it through a representation of it held in the mind, the Self posits the Representation of the Self in order to understand the Self by mediating it through a representation of itself. Once the Self has posited a Representation of the Self, it begins a dialectical interplay with itself. This is called thinking and the Self in its totality is called Mind.

The conscious activity of the first degree, the Self examining the Material World through a Representation of the Material World, is the principle activity of *natural science*. The conscious activity of the second degree, the Self examining its own itself through a Representation of the Self, is the activity of *human science*. While both of these kinds of study are called a *science* they proceed by different methodologies. Psychology as a science proceeds by means of thought of the first degree because it studies the mind by means of the methods of natural science. The psychologist studies the mind with the same methodology that a biologist studies life.

“Psychology is thought of the first degree; it treats mind in just the same way in which biology treats life. It does not deal with the relation between thought and its object, it deals directly with thought as something quite separate from its object, something that simply happens in the world, as a special kind of phenomenon, one that can be discussed by itself. Philosophy is never concerned with thought by itself; it is always concerned with its relation to its object, and is therefore concerned with the object just as much as with the thought.” (*The Idea of History 2*)

However, when one reflects on the meaning of science and begins to frame general laws it must also climb out of the first level of thinking and into the level of the second degree. It must go beyond mere classification and experimentation and develop, for instance, the theory of relativity. The scientist must use the methodology of *philosophy*. For the natural scientist consciousness of the first degree is primary, for the activity of the scientist primarily relates to gathering data and experimentation. Consciousness of the second degree, in relation to natural science, or the philosophy of science, is secondary.

For human science, on the other hand, the roles of the orders of consciousness are reversed; second degree thought, or philosophy, is primary.

Just as the Material World upon examination splits up into a multitude of parts, a number of different sciences which study the Material world, e.g., Biology, Geology, Psychology, Astronomy, Physics, et al, come into being. Just as each of these sciences have interrelationships with each other, which correspond the multitude of real interrelations between the many parts of the material world, the individual Mind is not alone in the world but is counter-posed to a great number of other Minds, other people. These other minds have undergone the same dialectical development as the Self did, but are only known to the individual mind because they really exist in the Material World. Thus the Mind becomes conscious of other people because they exist in the Material World, but the Mind only comes into dialectical interplay with them insofar as they are mediated through the Self's Representation of the Material World. Thus each individual person has a number of self-conscious Minds interacting with it through its Representation of the Material World which has been posited in its own Mind. The Self may wish to study these other Minds as if they were the objects of natural science, but it is *compelled* to relate to them in a humanistic way. This is called *social relations*. Social relations are the way different Minds relate to one another, how people interact. The many different Minds, being self-conscious thinking beings, begin to apply a *human science* to their interactions. Although a house has no choice about whether it will be ruined by a tree falling on it, for the results are governed by *natural laws*, humanity, being a collection of different Minds seeks to control the contradictions between people by creating *human law* to govern their interactions; for with consciousness comes *choice*.

Human social relations are not governed by the blind determinism of the material world. Now, insofar as human beings are material products of the material world certain aspects of their lives are governed by natural laws; but insofar as human beings are Minds interacting with each other, most aspects of their lives are governed by social relations *not* by natural laws but human law which is derived from *human nature*. The study of human nature is a conscious activity of the second degree and its methodology is not the methodology of natural science, but of History which has no natural laws.

### Ethics like History Develops in Spirals

Human law is derived from Ethics which is derived from History. As Collingwood asserted, Ethics are derived from the development and study of history and that as history changes our idea of ethics also changes, hence the world of social praxis is in eternal flux; it never stops moving and can never repeat what had gone before. It can only develop in a spiral, perhaps a very flat spiral, something circular which from time to time may attempt to return to the values of yester year, but a spiral nevertheless, always moving forward. Both Platonism and Platonic religion are, however, modeled on *substantialism*. Substantialism in this context does not refer a physical substance but to an object form of thought. Epistemologically speaking philosophical substantialism claims that only the unchanging is knowable. That is:

- I. That which is apprehensible by thought requires a rational account and is real and unchangeable.
- II. That which is the object of belief is a thing that becomes and passes away and is irrational and unreal.
- III. That which becomes has a cause thus the world has a cause.

IV. All that is good in the temporal must be modeled on the eternal. (Cf. *Timaeus* 28A)

The true nature of the case, however, is that Man is the craftsman of the Divine, or, moreover, is the artisan of the eternal principles of science. But since *times arrow* points in one direction, nothing that has ever happened can ever be repeated. Thus Santayana's proposition that "those who remain ignorant of history are doomed to repeat it" must be a fallacy. Philosophical substantialism was the chief drawback of Greco-Roman philosophy, since what is historical is also transitory.

"History is a science of human action: what the historian puts before himself is things that men have done in the past, and these belong to the world of change, a world where things come to be and cease to be. Such things, according to the prevalent Greek metaphysical view, ought not to be knowable, and therefore history ought to be impossible. They were quite sure that anything which can be an object of genuine knowledge must be permanent...cannot contain the seeds of its own destruction. If it is knowable it must be determinate; if it is determinate, it must be so completely and exclusively what it is that no internal change and no external force can ever set about making it into something else." (*The Idea of History* 20)

Dialectical and historical materialism, though it has been dogmatized, is not an ideology but is a methodology for historical inquiry.

"The essence of materialism does not consist in the assertion that everything is simply matter but rather in a metaphysical determination according to which every being appears as the material of labor." (*Letter on Humanism* 220)



Collingwood is correct. History is a branch of ethics and we reject the possibility of the existence of any substantive moral or substantive ethical principle then the pursuit of justice, or any ethical ideal, is an unending process of historical development. The aim of communism is *the end of the exploitation of man by man*. The socialist posits this idea as a substantive moral principle with the understanding that the social praxis of justice cannot be a static sort of thing but must continue to develop alongside the Idea of Freedom. The aim of Communism, then, is freedom. But freedom as a substantive ethical principle is impossible to define. It is something aimed at but never fully achieved except through unending process of historical development. As Friedrich Engels once remarked:

“For dialectical philosophy nothing is final, absolute, sacred. It reveals the transitory character of everything and in everything; nothing can endure before it except the uninterrupted process of becoming and of passing away, of endless ascendancy from the lower to the higher.” (*Ludwig Feuerbach* 8)

The Greeks and Romans, however, had developed another system of lawgiving whereby a Lawgiver was elected. Thus they introduced a *humanistic* element to ethical theory whereas the Semitic tradition relied wholly on a divine substance which was supposed to reveal Himself through a human oracle, a Prophet. The Greeks and Romans, however, used both a human and divine source for ethical judgments. The process of recognizing the human ability to propound ethical judgments signified the process of Logic coming into play. The process of recognizing the use of logic in forming ethical judgments, however, is a process of the development of historical inquiry. Hence the first history book was indeed called ‘The Inquiry.’

At any rate, as History develops the imperfections of the ethical as posited by the conscious mind whether they be derived from a concept of the divine, or from the logic of a philosopher, begin to run up against their own limitations since the morals posited by the Prophet, or the philosopher, or a lawgiver are *substantive morals*. As substantive morals they do not change. But History and hence our idea of the ethical does change. Hence the theologian always appears to be behind the times and as time goes on he or she becomes even more so. Hence the historical development of the Prophets: Moses, Jesus, Mohammed. Attacking religion, then, is essentially attacking a person's concept of what is ethical. The proper position then of the dialectical and historical materialist is to derive ethics from the study of history, while at the same time understanding that theology is statement of just that. According to Greco-Roman historiography at least one principle must be taken as an axiom and all moral questions must be considered in the light of it. What Collingwood called *substantialism*, and noted its defects.<sup>138</sup>

For Aristotle the *datum* from which to measure moral truth was *the good* which for man meant *happiness*. Freud reduced this concept of happiness to the experience of mere *pleasure*; hence he developed the idea of the *pleasure principle*. But the best of men would strongly disagree that happiness is the result of mere pleasure.

“To judge from men's lives, the more or less reasoned conceptions of the Good or Happiness that seem to prevail are the following. On the one hand the generality of men and the most vulgar identify the Good with pleasure, and accordingly are content with the Life of Enjoyment—for there are three specially prominent Lives, the one just mentioned, the Life of Politics, and thirdly, the Life of

---

<sup>138</sup> Collingwood, R. G., *The Idea of History*, New York: Oxford University Press: 1969: 2-5.

Contemplation. The generality of mankind then show themselves to be utterly slavish, by preferring what is only a life for cattle.” (*Nicomachean Ethics* 1095b1-3)

Bertrand Russell once said: “There is much pleasure to be gained from useless knowledge.” As a member of the *realist* school of thought he held that

“History, which is mind’s knowledge of itself, is ruled out as impossible” (*The Idea of History* 142)

To us, History proven itself to be very useful. Indeed it is used all the time in courts of law to establish *mens rea*, or to determine *ancient claim*, but has done a great deal more that remains unrecognized. It has molded the ethical foundations of our civilization. Our understanding of what something *is* in the political world is usually based on knowing what it *was*—the philosophical principles and historical facts which make it up. What has gone before is routinely compared to what is now in all kinds of decision making processes; for it is generally held that *natural laws* do not change and, though historian makes no claim to be able to predict the future, by inference we hold that the reality tomorrow will be very much the same as the reality today.

“History *must* end with the present, because nothing else has happened.” (*Ibid.* 120)

But historians:

“Should show itself to be alive, or in its thinking should grasp the living world as a system of thought.” (*Phenomenology of Spirit* 200)

The historian must give content to history and bring history into relation with the living world. A principle fault of historical epistemology then is that the historical principal

derived from the study of history cannot apply to the present *de facto* material reality in the same way that it applied to the historical model because the world is *flux*.

Ποταοισι τοισιν αυτοισιν εμβαινουσιν

‘ετερα και ‘ετερα ‘υδατα επιρρει·

To step into same river is different,

for different waters flow. (*Heraclitus* 12)

For the post-modernists, taking happiness to mean pleasure, the source of creativity must lie in the unleashing of the libido; the unbridled gratification of desire, hence the advantage of the stronger. I say it’s the opposite. But it seems rather absurd to suggest that a moral principle could be distilled from the experience of pleasure or pain; or from a record of this experience or from its opposite. Indeed Freud is hardly original here since Aristotle had already recorded and refuted the ideas of Eudoxus who

“Held that the goodness of pleasure was equally manifest from the converse: pain is intrinsically an object of avoidance to all, therefore its opposite must be intrinsically an object of desire to all.” (*Nicomachean Ethics* 1172b)

The deconstructionists under the pretext of questioning the ‘holy moral legislator’ actually seek to destabilize the moral principles held by our civilization because they disagree with those principles themselves not because they seek the truth *per se*; but because they dissemble the truth. Just as Catiline posited two diametrically opposed courses of action, to go into exile or follow through with the *putsch*, his apologists simultaneously hold that he was both guilty and not guilty. The dissembler by vindicating Catiline:

“In so doing it confesses that, as a matter of fact, it is in earnest with neither of them.” (*Phenomenology of Spirit* 617)

Just as Catiline was insincere about the two diametrically opposed courses of action that he poisoned, his apologists are insincere about their two alternatives, but holds out each as a simple *plan A* and a *plan B*; seeking the greatest opportunity for themselves they set each these in dialectical struggle against each other to see which one will win out; and they themselves stand ever ready to leap to the side of the victor. Who ever does this must hold the *advantage of the stronger* to be a substantive moral principle and that:

“The just man always has the worst of it.” (*Republic* 1.343)

Making their first appearance as the *skeptical consciousness* they immediately pass over to the *unhappy consciousness*, but they have yet to attain the conscious mode of Reason for they continue to study the world as if external things were the proper object of philosophy. Whoever posits a substantive moral code, be the law of Moses, the code of Hammurabi, the Constitution of the United States, the law of the Twelve Tables, or the *Plautian Law, et al*, makes this his Lord and Master and he must serve it, though it may not always serve you.

“Servitude is only in relation to lordship...servitude has the lord for its essential reality; hence the *truth* for it is the independent consciousness that is *for itself*.”  
(*Phenomenology of Spirit* 194)

## Post-civilizationism

It is not always wrong to question moral principles or positive law, but undermining these universal learned rational moral principles, which have made crimes like Catiline's illegal everywhere, brings man closer to the animals; which should be associated with an

increase in irrationality, un-cleanliness, self-indulgence, inequality, laziness, ignorance, lawlessness, and disorder for those are the principle characteristics of the *law of the jungle* with the principle characteristics of civilization being the exact opposite.

‘ωςπερ γαρ και τελεωθεν βελτιστον των ζωων ‘ο ανθρωπος εστιν,  
 ‘ουτω και χωρισθεις νομου και δικης χειριστον παντων’

For just as man is best of the animals when perfected,  
 he is worst when separated from all law and justice.

(*The Politics* 1.1253a1)

For who would call Cambyses happy when, aside from his other outrages, he marched against the Ethiopians, and before he had completed even 1/5th of the distance, his provisions failed

“Whereupon the men began to eat the sumpter beasts, which shortly failed also. If then...seeing what was happening, [he] had confessed himself in the wrong, and led his army back, he would have done the wisest thing...but as it was, he took no manner of heed, but continued to march forwards. So long as the earth gave them anything, the soldiers sustained life by eating the grass and herbs; but when they came to bare sand, a portion of them were guilty of a horrid deed: by tens they cast lots for a man, who was slain to be the food of the others.” (*The History* 3.25)

By calling this deed *horrid*, Herodotus passed a historical judgment on these deeds. Or who among us could fail to condemn the failed civilization of the Massagetae among whom,

“Human life [did] not come to the usual close...but when a man grows very old, all his kinsfolk collect together and offer him up in sacrifice...After the sacrifice they boil the flesh and feast on it; and those who thus end their days are reckoned the happiest.” (*Ibid.* 1.216)

Who among us would admire the marriage rites of the ancient Babylonians?

According to Herodotus they

“Have one most shameful custom. Every woman born in the country must once in her life go and sit down in the precinct of Venus, and there consort with a stranger...A woman who has once taken her seat is not allowed to return home till one of the strangers throws a silver coin into her lap, and takes her with him beyond the holy ground...The silver coin may be of any size; it cannot be refused, for that is forbidden by law, since once thrown it is sacred. The woman goes with the first man who throws her money, and rejects no one...Such of the women as are tall and beautiful are soon released, but others who are ugly have to stay a long time...Some have waited three or four years in the precinct. A custom very much like this is found in certain parts of the island of Cyprus.” (*Ibid.* 1.199)

Whosoever may be repulsed by these customs ought to think hard about how it is that one has come to make the moral judgments that one has made; how we as a civilization have collectively judged against these kinds of practices. Our values are shared values. Hegel noted that the ‘I’ that holds *res gestae* up to the absolute moral principle, to the lantern of rational thought, taking this as a substantive, puts the substantive principle outside itself.

“Consciousness itself really places the object *outside* itself as a beyond of itself. But this object with an intrinsic being of its own is equally posited as being, not free from self-consciousness, but as existing in the interest of, and by means of, it.” (*Phenomenology of Spirit* 616)

Thus the moral principle is actually posited by consciousness; for what is beyond it is unknowable. Mankind being endowed with speech is also endowed with reason.

Εν αρχη ην ‘ο λογος και ‘ο λογος ην προς τον θεον και θεος ην ‘ο λογος.

In the beginning was Reason, and on account of God Reason was, and God was Reason. (*John* 1.1)

### Digression on *Genesis*

In the beginning of thought there was the Word which made up speech which caused man to reason and reason led to ethics and ethics to the Ethical Idea thus the Mind possessed of Reason posited the Idea of God which was Reason.

*Dixitque Deus fiat lux et facta est lux.*

And God said: “Let there be light.” And light there was. (*Genesis* 1.3)

Man through his representation, his own thought mediated through the Idea of God, using God as a mouthpiece for his own thought, spoke his first two words: ‘light’ and ‘darkness.’

*Et vidit Deus lucem quod esset bona et divisit lucem ac tenebras.*

And God saw that light was the Good and divided Light from Darkness. (1.4)

Man having achieved *consciousness* began to name thing, to classify them, changing them from mere *picture thoughts* into fixed determinate thought objects.



*Appellavitque lucem diem et tenebras noctem factumque est vespere et mane dies unus.*

And He called the light 'day' and the darkness 'night' and indeed Evening and Morning is Day One. (1.5)

For every word there is a reason for the word, hence the word *logos* has its dual aspect by being both the appellation for the thing and the reason for that appellation. Thus 'evening' and 'morning' preceded the words 'darkness' and 'light' for they are the reasons for the words themselves. But 'darkness' and 'light' were the first words spoken which immediately led to the next word 'day' which immediately precipitated the words 'evening' and 'morning' which completed the dialectical development: combination, division, and recombination. But here the narrator, not being fully conscious of the meaning of this development, presents the development of consciousness as a form of *picture thought* hence it has been transmitted to us in the form of a *parable*. *Light* corresponds to several things: light as light, light as daytime, light as consciousness, light as the good, light as knowledge. *Darkness* is immediately recognized as its dialectical counterpart: darkness as darkness, darkness as evening, darkness as unconsciousness, darkness as ignorance. But although darkness preceded light it wasn't until evening again that evening and morning could be understood as one day hence: "And there was evening and morning, one day." Since darkness corresponded materially to ignorance, since light corresponded to consciousness, light then and shall ever more correspond to knowledge, the good, darkness to ignorance and the bad. In ignorance all and everything to the mind of man was a unity called the Abyss, amorphous and inscrutable.

[1] *In principio creavit Deus Caelum et terram.* [2] *Terra autem erat inanis et vacua et tenebrae super faciem abyssi et spiritus Dei ferebatur super aquas.* [3] *Dixitque Deus fiat lux et facta est lux.* [4] *Et vidit Deus lucem quod esset bona et divisit lucem ac tenebras.* [5] *Appellavitque lucem diem et tenebras noctem factumque est vespere et mane dies unus.*

In the Beginning God created Earth and Sky, but Earth was Void and Vacant and Darkness was the superficial character of the Abyss and the Spirit of God was produced over the Waters. And God said: ‘Let there be Light’ and Light there was. And God saw Light because it would be *Good* and divided *Light*<sup>139</sup> from *Darkness*.<sup>140</sup> And He called Light ‘Day’ and Darkness ‘Night’ and it is a fact Evening and Morning is One Day.

*Genesis 1.3: Dixit que Deus “fiat lux et facta est lux.”* God said “Let there be Light, and Light there was.” This is the articulation in the form *essential thinking* of the development of consciousness from the state of *sense perception* and mere *picture thinking* to *mere* consciousness, a positive upward development of consciousness or the mind of man, hence *Light* signifies *knowing*, but this is a knowing which is somehow higher than *mere* perception. It is a knowing which knows that it knows. That is to say, that consciousness in Man has recognized that there is a separation between himself and his environment. From this the metaphor between light and knowledge or moreover the analogy between light and consciousness was made. This sudden *awakening* then is expresses here in *Genesis 1.3* has been expressed in its most fundamental form what came before was *darkness* followed by *light*, Man leading himself from darkness to light.

<sup>139</sup> Lat. *lux, lucis*, f., light consciousness, knowledge.

<sup>140</sup> Lat. *tenebrae, -arum*, f. pl., darkness, night, blindness, unconsciousness, death, obscurity, ignorance.

Hence “The Earth was a vast waste, darkness covered the deep, and the Spirit of God hovered over the surface of the water” (*Genesis* 1.2) for in the beginning of a narrative there must be a beginning, but since before Man could relate any form of beginning *Light* qua consciousness must precede the telling of the tale. Thus *Genesis* 1.3 preceded *Genesis* 1.1-2. The statement “In the Beginning God created the Heaven and the Earth.” First Man recognized Light and then recognized what had come before Light and named that thing Darkness and forevermore, in whatever language, Light signifies an awakening, Darkness sleep. The actual development was the awareness of Light, Man becoming conscious, followed by the recognition that all was *Darkness*, i.e. ignorance, before this. The *Idea of God* was posited after this for there must have been a cause for *Light, Darkness, Earth* and the answer to this was ‘God created it.’ Thus: First there is *light*, signifying the ascension of consciousness from mere *perception*, and unconscious mechanical participation in the world, *picture thinking* and animal consciousness, to objectification of the world, i.e. the *splitting-up* of things into different parts. Hence the development: If there is an *a* there must be a *b*, and if *a* is *light* then *b* must *darkness*, and if *light* is *knowledge* and *darkness* is *ignorance* then *light* is *order* and *darkness* is formless *void* and if *light* is from *Heaven* (*caelum* = sky) then *Earth* was a “vast waste.” And “The *Spirit of God* hovered over the surface of the water.” (*Genesis* 1.2) Man in having the conscious of an animal was a mere animal. But something was taking place in the mind of the Man. It was burgeoning, growing from unconsciousness to consciousness, from ignorance to knowledge, from darkness to light. Thus the metaphor was posited in its essential form as *water* an undifferentiated formless mass and God, *Reason*, “hovered over the surface of the *Water*.” Thus consciousness was a mere

potentiality and the metaphor “hovering over the surface of the *Water*” signified an intermediary state. And so, while the narrative itself has been written:

- I. God Created the Heavens and the Earth.
- II. The Earth was Void and without Form and God hovered over the face of the Water.
- III. And God said: “Let there be Light” and Light there was.
- IV. And God saw that *Light* was *Good* and separated *Light* from *Darkness*, *Good* from *Bad*, *Reason* from *Ignorance*.
- V. And He named *Light* Day and *Darkness* Night. Day One. First Dialectical Trope of the Conscious Mind.

This was not the development of the human consciousness, but the reverse order of that development. Now if we understand the name ‘God’ to be a metonymy for ‘Reason’ then we see that Reason hovered over the formless void of Water. Water in this context then is the unformed consciousness, an indeterminate Being. Water then corresponds to the indeterminate metaphysical substance Mind, while Earth corresponds to the indeterminate physical substance Matter. Thus the first *substantive dualism* of Reality was demarcated as a consequence of the burgeoning of human consciousness. Matter was a vast waste and Mind was a darkened Abyss and Reason first recognized *light* and formulated *his* first moral judgment expressed in its essential form: “*et vidit lucm quodts esset bona.*” Whereupon, the consciousness of Man turned completely around on itself immediately recognized what had gone before which was darkness: “and He separated light from darkness.” That is to say Man recognized the substantive dualism of reality itself and named: “the light day and the darkness night.” By way of stipulative definition

the first *dialectical development* occurred according to the schemata: combination, division, and recombination, the first combination was the void and vacant *Abyss* which was divided into (a) Light and Darkness, (b) consciousness and unconsciousness, (c) knowledge and ignorance, which was recombined as Day One, or the completion of the first dialectical trope of the conscious mind. From the first development, Man achieved mere consciousness, or consciousness of the first degree, an everlasting division between dialectical counterparts. By way of comparison, *John* 1.1-5:

[1] *In principio erat Verbum et Verbum erat apud Deum et Deus erat Verbum.*

[2] *Hoc erat in principio apud Deum* [3] *omnia per ipsum facta sunt.* [4] *In ipso vita erat et vita erat lux hominum* [5] *et lux in tenebris lucet et tenebrae eam non conprehenderunt.*

In the Beginning the Word was and the Word was with God and God was the Word. This Thing was in the Beginning with God, all Things through this Thing itself are made. In this Thing itself was Life and Life was Light to Man and Light shined in the Darkness and Darkness overcame it.

Or perhaps, ‘In the beginning was the power of Speech and the power of Speech was next to Reason and Reason was the power of Speech. This power, in the beginning was with Reason and through this power all things are Named. In this power was Power itself and the Power itself was Light to Man and Light shined in the Darkness and the Darkness never returned to Man.’

[6] *Dixit quoque Deus fiat firmamentum in medio aquarum et dividat aquas ab aquis.* [7] *Et fecit Deus firmamentum divisitque aquas quae erant sub firmamento*

*ab his quae erant super firmamentum et factum est ita. [8] Vocavitque Deus firmamentum caelum et factum est vespere et mane dies secundus.*

And God said: “Let there be a Solid Thing<sup>141</sup> in the middle of the Waters and would let Waters be divided from Waters.” And God made a firm Division and divided the Waters which were the under the Manifest Boundary from those that were above the Clear Division, and in this way it is done. And God called the Manifest Certainty ‘Heaven’<sup>142</sup> and in this way it is done, and with Light and Darkness the Second Day.

The traditional translation of this is that God made a ‘firmament’ to separate the ‘waters above from the waters below.’ But the traditional translation of these verses is nonsensical unless we understand what is meant by the words ‘Firmament’ and ‘Waters.’ For instance imagine a flat plane of fluid substance. This flat plane is the unformed consciousness. Then imagine something being thrown upward from this, light, and at the same time something precipitating beneath it, earth. This is a metaphorical way of envisioning and communicating the dawn of consciousness.

The ostensible meaning of these verses is a description of the creation of Sky and Earth and the separation of water from solid ground, but presuming that the world as we know it existed prior to Man’s consciousness of its existence and that these actually describe the development of Man’s recognition of these extant things, then God is Reason, Light is Pure Spirit or *pure negativity*, Water is the indeterminate positive content. Light as the pure negative of rational thought is the prime mover. Reality then

---

<sup>141</sup> Lat. *firmamentum*, -i, n., prop, support; main point, mainstay; firmament = ‘certainty,’ ‘firm division,’ ‘clear division,’ ‘manifest boundary,’ ‘manifest certainty;’ *firmus*, -a, -um, firm, strong, true, stable + *mens*, *mentis*, mind, intellect, reason; thus ‘the true reason,’ or *etymology*.

<sup>142</sup> I.e. ‘Sky.’

began as an indeterminate positive content. It is represented here as a void vacant Abyss because it was heretofore undefined, indeterminate. Once the Light of rational inquiry, Pure Spirit, impinged on the indeterminate, it split up into two parts, Light and Darkness with each of these words signifying several things, and a firm division, a firmament, between these two ideas was posited and they became dialectical counterparts to one another. After that Reason divided the two indeterminate metaphysical substances into Heaven, which is Mind and the metaphysical, and Dry Land, which is the Material and the physical. Thus the term Abyss, as it is used in *Genesis* 1.1, means Pure Being and Waters signifies metaphysical emanations of Pure Being which have become fluid in the process of dividing itself into two things hence they ‘gather together’ and transition from indeterminate Being to determinate *beings*. Thus the Waters are the *middle term* in the dialectical development of Man’s representation of Reality. Thus “In the Beginning of Reality there was a indeterminate Being and Reason divided this being into Mind and Material, conscious and unconsciousness, determinate from indeterminate, knowledge from ignorance, Light from Darkness, and Heaven from Earth. And in the end of the second dialectical trope of the development of the conscious mind, Reason made this a firm division in the mind of Man. In the beginning of the third trope, as ‘dryness’ or colloquially ‘dry land’ appears, so too does water itself become permanently associated with the indeterminate middle term between Sky and Earth, the indeterminate from the determinate, the mind from the material, etc.

[9] *Dixit vero Deus congregationesque aquae quae sub caelo sunt in locum unum et appareat arida factumque est ita.* [10] *Et vocavit Deus aridam terram congregationesque aquarum appellavit maria et vidit Deus quod esset bonum* [11]

*et ait germinet terra herbam virentem et facientem semen et lignum pomiferum  
faciens fructum iuxta genus suum cuius semen in semet ipso sit super terram et  
factum est ita [12] et protulit terra herbam virentem et adferentem semen iuxta  
genus suum lignumque [lignum, n. nom/acc. sing. gathered wood, firewood]  
faciens fructum et habens unumquodque sementem secundum speciem suam et  
vidit Deus quod esset bonum [13] factumque est vespere et mane dies tertius.*

God spoke truly and gathered the Waters which were under Heaven in one place and let Dryness appear, and in this way it is done. And God called the Dryness Earth and the Collected Things of the Winds he named the Seas and God saw the fact that it would be Good. And He said: "Let the Earth grow a green plant

*[14] Dixit autem Deus fiant luminaria in firmamento caeli ut dividant diem ac  
noctem et sint in signa et tempora et dies et annos [15] ut luceant in firmamento  
caeli et inluminent terram et factum est ita [16] Fecitque Deus duo magna  
luminaria luminare maius ut praeesset diei et luminare minus ut praeesset nocti  
et stellas [17] et possuit eas in firmamento caeli ut lucerent super terram [18] et  
praeessent diei ac nocti et dividerent lucem ac tenebras et vidit Deus quod esset  
bonum [19] Et factum est vespere et mane dies quartus.*

And where as *all Things thargument um Thing itself are made*, i.e. *The Word*, Adam, Man, began to name the things and, by means of *stipulative definition*, each thing came to be and was and indeed is, or rather *is* to the mind of Man for it has become a *fixed determinate thought object*, no longer the undifferentiated thing of the undifferentiated amorphous mass which is mere potentiality. The Abyss is the indeterminate, the undefined, the thing where from all things come, the thing from which all things are



made and indeed those things are themselves made for it is through the process of designation and definition that one thing is known from another and therefore indeed is for it has become known to Man and does so through the Word for the .

*Enim quod vocavit Adam animae viventis ipsum est nomen eius appellavitque.*

Indeed, the name by which Man invoked the living beings is itself of it and applied to it. (*Ibid.* 2.19)

And man found himself confronted with object thought forms which had *being-in-themselves* in diametrical opposition to man himself. In recognizing the *other-than-self*, man created the Notion of himself. Thus man's Reason was reflected back into itself as the ethical which Man in turn placed outside Himself.

*Et ait faciamus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram et praesit piscibus maris et volatilibus caeli et bestiis universaeque terrae omnique reptili quod movetur in terra et creavit Deus hominem ad imaginem suam ad imaginem Dei creavit illum masculum et feminam creavit eos.*

And He affirmed: "Let us make Mankind by Our image and likeness and let him rule over the fish of the sea and the birds of the sky and the beasts and over the whole Earth and every reptile which moves on the Earth and God created Man in His own image by the image of God He created him; male and female He created them. (*Genesis* 1.26-27)

Thus Man created the Idea of God in the image of his own self and in the likeness of himself in order to examine himself and know himself and come to an Understanding with Himself.

“It is thus in truth the Self; and Spirit therefore passes on to know itself in the form of self.” (*Phenomenology of Spirit* 688)

*Ut in ipsa creatae mentis divinitate, ceu speculo rerum omnium medio, creatoris ipsius tum operis speculemur, tum mentem contemplemur atque colamus.*

“That in the divinity of the created mind, as in a mirror at the center of things, we should first observe the works of the Creator, and then contemplate and worship the mind of the Creator.” (*Platonic Theology, Proem 3*)

The wisest and most virtuous men came and narrated the Law which became the ethical substance of Civilization. And those men were called a Prophets.

*Multifariam et multis modis olim Deus loquens patribus in prophetis (Hebrews 1.1)*

After this he externalized the source of his judgments about, and representations of, Reality as an image which He called that image ‘God.’ Subconsciously Man knows that He is the source of the divine. Thus the more a man gets into religion the more God looks like himself, because God is himself just as every thought form is both by, with, and from, himself and also to and for himself as Langston Hughes showed in his *Black Nativity* (1961).

There’s Fire in the East,

There’s Fire in the West,

There’s fire among the Methodists.

Satan’s mad and I’m so glad

He missed the soul he thought he had

This year of Jubilee

The Lord has come to set us free. (Act 1)

“The self that is *thought of* is not the *actual* self...For what is *thought of*, ceases to be something [merely] thought of, something alien to the self’s knowledge, only when the self has produced it, and therefore beholds the determination of the object as its *own*, consequently beholds *itself* in its object.” (*Phenomenology of Spirit* 684)

And man saw that this was good and upon gazing upon his own thought and in examining it he said: *Cogito ergo sum et homo neque animal sed homo*. And God is with man because God is Man as the image of man. Through the practice of the Law man seeks to become virtue and maintain virtue, but it is something to which man approaches but never achieves. R. Buckminster Fuller (1895-1983) did not see God in abstract forms but only through and in man’s works.

I see God in

the instruments and mechanisms that

work

reliably,

more reliably than the limited sensory departments of

the human mechanism.

And he who is befuddled by self or

by habit,

by what others say,

by fear, by sheer chaos of unbelief in

God  
 and in God's fundamental orderliness  
 ticking along side those dials  
 will perish.  
 And he who unerringly  
 interprets those dials  
 will come through. (*No More Secondhand God* 4-5)

Thus man himself is his externalization of himself through human *artifacts*, but for Fuller only through the products of science and engineering; not in anything of human social praxis. He forgot that he who controls thoughts controls what man can produce and of what man has produced how it will be used; who and how many can use it. For what cannot be thought cannot be done. For him there were no ethics, politics, or rhetoric, only material needs, eternal principals, and inventions. But science has generalized principles, ethics does not.

Since the absolute moral substance must be complete in order to establish an absolute moral principle, and is in actuality incomplete because the consciousness which posited it is incomplete—i.e., unable to know the mind of God or to understand that which is beyond itself; what is posited as pure morality is in fact incomplete and therefore *immoral* since true morality must be perfect. Just as history develops by increments, man's idea of morality and his collection of *bone fide* moral principles must develop by increments as well. Collingwood must have been right when he said:

“The right way of investigating the mind is by the methods of history...the work which was to be done by the science of human nature is actually done, and can only be done, but history.” (*The Idea of History* 209)

That brings us to the question of why ancient history and the Greek and Roman classics as a source for history should be the first substance of higher education. The analogy that the development of history from the classical authors to the present time, as an analog for the riddle of the Sphinx; that it represents the ‘three stages of a man’s life,’ i.e., that he walks on all fours on the morning, two in the afternoon and three in the evening—would be wrong for there is nothing childlike in these texts. We are too often surprised both at their insights and their discourse, but the most striking thing is their resemblance to ourselves. Placing them outside us as an object of study is only possible because they *are* us.

“The self is really the object of the self, or the object only has truth so far as it has the form of the self.” (*Phenomenology of Spirit* 529)

In studying them we study our own selves, but as a past underdeveloped self. In fact the Greeks give us *grammar*, *syntax* and *elocution*, the Romans dignity, refinement and *res publica*. The democracy we understand as democracy does not come from the Greek experience, but from the Roman experience of it. If we wish to understand our Republic we must first understand theirs. In contemporary higher education, the student first has their mind structured by Plato and then restructured by Aristotle, if they get that far. It must be restructured again by Hegel and Marx.

“If all modern treatment of the history of philosophy goes back to Hegel as the great modern master of the subject, all modern treatment of economic history goes back in the same sense to Marx.” (*The Idea of History* 126)

The genealogy of contemporary thought presumes: if there was no Plato there would have been no Aristotle: no Aristotle, no Hegel: no Hegel, no Marx. All this is of course passed through a great lens of history, philosophy and culture. After Marx there is a dearth of philosophical greatness until Collingwood raised the study of history from a mere backwater of a social science to the philosophy, the *logic*, of *human nature* but not merely human nature as it is in the individual but of human thought becoming *universal judgments* concerning human social relations. But the Romans somehow get left out, and this is not without reason. There is a gaping hole in the study of the classics at the university level where Roman civilization ought to be which must somehow be explained. The Romans didn't get included in the study of the classics by accident and they haven't recently been left out of that study by accident either.

Too often the Greeks and the Romans are presented to students as somehow being competition with one other; the Greeks are presented as the *original*, the Romans as the *counterfeit* and not without reason, but the true reason for the nuance of combativeness between the two cultures has been misunderstood. Thucydides in his opening remarks regarding the outbreak of the *Peloponnesian War* incorrectly noted: “Indeed this was the greatest movement yet known in history.” There was one war which had already taken place which was greater; if not in extent, then in importance—the *Trojan War*. The calamity of the *Trojan War* was known far and wide.

*Quicumque regno fidit et magna potens*

*dominatur aula nec leues metuit deos  
 animumque rebus credulum laetis dedit  
 me uideat et te, Troia: non umquam tulit  
 documenta fors maiora, quam fragili loco  
 starent superbi. Columen euersum occidit  
 pollentis Asiae, caelitum egreguis labor.*

Whosoever relies upon being king, and in great power  
 Lords himself in royal court, and fears not the gods  
 And happily gives his soul to doubtful things,  
 Let him, I and thou, O Troy, behold.

For never has Fortune shown such great proof  
 What fragile place the most high stand.  
 Sweeping away that which rose above,

It destroyed the power of Asia, a work of heaven. (*Troades* 1-7)

According to the *Aeneid* the events of the *Trojan War* were recorded in pictographs on the walls of Carthage even before Aeneas arrived there.

*Namque sub ingenti lustrat dum singula templo,  
 reginam opperiens, dum, quae fortuna sit urbi,  
 artificumque manus inter se operumque laborem  
 miratur, videt Iliacas ex ordine pugnas,  
 bellaque iam fama totum volgata per orbem,  
 Atridas, Priamumque, et saevum ambobus Achillem.  
 Constitit, et lacrimans, “Quis iam locus” inquit “Achate,*

*quae regio in terris nostri non plena laboris?*

*En Priamus! Sunt hic etiam sua praemia laudi;*

*sunt lacrimae rerum et mentem mortalia tangunt.*

*Solve metus; feret haec aliquam tibi fama salutem.*” (*Aeneid* 454-464)

The “New Troy” at the Tiber was but a twinkle in his eye; and Rome itself had not yet even been conceived. The Greeks had their say about the war through the epics of Homer. The *Aeneid* was the belated Roman answer to that, but that answer was there in Roman culture before Virgil wrote of it. It was recorded by Livy and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *inter alios*.

*Fuimus Troes, fuit Ilium et ingens*

*gloria Teucorum.*

We Trojans have been, Ilium and

The glory of the Teucrians, was. (*Aeneid* 2.325)

The Romans are in part the descendents of the Trojans who fled *Ilium* after the sack of Troy. At the time of Homer there were no Greeks or Romans *pre se*. It was long after the fall of Troy that the Greeks became Greeks and the Romans became Romans. Indeed Homer never used the word ‘Greeks.’ “He does not even use the term barbarian, probably because the Hellenes had not yet been marked off from the rest of the world by one distinctive appellation.” (*The Peloponnesian War* 1.3.3-4)

Their national identities emerged synchronously. Thus the Greeks and the Romans to each other could be understood as same cultural *ordo*; while the Greeks to themselves were of the same *familia*; designated by Homer as under the *tribus*: Achaeans, Argives, and Danaans; not Hellenes. The name these people took for



themselves was the name of Ἕλληνας, *Hellen*, son of Deucalion king of Thessaly, the name we give to them, however, is from the Latin word *Graeci*. “The Greek language is the language spoken by the Greek race which, from a long period before Homer, has occupied the lower part of the Balkan peninsula, the islands of the Aegean Sea, the coasts of Asia Minor, and, later certain districts in Southern Italy, Sicily, Gaul, and Northern Africa. After the Homeric period the people of this race called themselves by the Name Hellenes, and their language Hellenic. We call them Greeks, from the Roman name *Graeci*. Although conscious of possessing the same speech and the same religion, the Greeks were not politically united. In the Homeric poems (before 900 B.C.) there is no common name to denote the entire race. The Homeric Hellenes were a small tribe in southern Thessaly, of which Achilles was king; and the Greeks in general were called by Homer Achaeans, Argives, or Danaans. Later, Greek literature recognized three important divisions...Aeolic, Doric, and Ionic.” (*Greek Grammar* 1) The Greeks and the Romans were different from but analogous to one another. Their cultural destinies were tied together by what they understood as Fate; what we call *cultural analogues*, bound by time, language, culture and geography. Both were also related to the Pelasgi. Having very ancient cultural ties to one another--both through their mutual relations with the *sea peoples* and through the Indo-European tongue, all of which preceded the *Trojan War*—the Romans had a filial admiration for the Greeks which was qualified by a duality because of the atrocity of the *Trojan War*, this admiration was layered with anger and contempt. While the Romans studied the Greek philosophers, they enslaved the Greek people.

*Verum tamen hoc dico de toto genere Graecorum: tribuo illis litteras, do multarum artium disciplinam, non adimo sermonis leporem, ingeniorum acumen, dicendi copiam, denique etiam, si qua sibi alia sumunt, non repugno; testimoniorum religionem et fidem numquam ista natio coluit, totiusque huiusce rei quae sit vis, quae auctoritas, quod pondus, ignorant.*

Truly, this I say about the whole of the Greek race: I grant them literature, I give them the knowledge of many practical skills, I do not deny them charming discourse, sharpness of mind, abundance of speeches; and finally, I do not oppose the other things which they claim for themselves; but that nation never cultivated a sense of right and truth for testimony, and they are totally ignorant of this thing which may be a strength, which may be powerful, because of its weight. (*Pro Flacco* 9)

Those who choose sides between the Greeks and the Romans within the Classics Department live out this struggle vicariously through their students; each pedagogue tries to pull the student to their side, but to claim that the Romans were mere counterfeits of the Greeks is both dishonest and mean.

[8.1] But in reality Fortune is master in all things, She, according to Her pleasure, everything with greatness celebrated or obscure apart from truth. [2] The things done by the Athenians, as I see it, were sufficiently distinguished and magnificent, nevertheless in truth somewhat less than fame represents them. [3] But because they produced writers of great genius there, deeds of the Athenians were very greatly celebrated throughout the whole world. [4] Thus the virtue of those who did the things is held to be as great as those things excellent minds have been able

to extol by means words. [5] But the Roman people were never abundantly furnished with this thing because everyone of good sense was very busy, nobody engaged the mind without the body; everyone good acted rather than spoke; they preferred their benefaction to be praised by others rather than to tell of them himself. (*Bellum Catilinae* 8)

Thus it was not that the Greeks were intrinsically good, but that the writers, their thinkers, were superb. The golden age of Greek literature, it's true, chronologically preceded the golden age of Roman literature, but philosophy came from *Miletus*, in Asia Minor, not from Athens.

“The Athenians originally had a royal government. It was when Ion came to dwell with them that they were first called Ionians.” (*The Athenian Constitution* Fr. 1)

In the last analysis then the study of the classics is not a contest between Greeks and Romans. As students of western civilization, we must have both the Greeks and the Romans: first for their linguistic structure which has ordered our minds on the most fundamental level, next for their philosophy which gave us the mental tools to examine our own thought and finally for their historiography which taught us to discourse on thought and experience in a socially meaningful way.

The Greeks gave us the *rustic*, the Romans the *urbane*. Of course there is much more to both of these than this since the Romans are famous for their *georgics* and the Greeks for their *polis*. The Greeks perhaps prefigured everything Roman but it all remained underdeveloped. Even the Greek *language* is rough around the edges. Perhaps the difference is better stated thus: the Romans were *pastoral* the Greeks were *bucolic*.

One learns Latin to become a good writer, one learns Greek to become a good reasoner in writing. Greek words were first translated into Latin before they were transmitted to us in English. Heidegger said that the translation of the Greek words into Latin estranged Western thought from its essence.

“The process begins with the appropriation of Greek words by Roman-Latin thought. *Hypokeimenon* becomes *subiectum*; *hypostasis* becomes *substantia*; *symbebêkos* becomes *accidens*. However, this translation of Greek names into Latin is in no way the innocent process it is considered to this day. Beneath the seemingly literal and faithful translation there is concealed, rather, a *translation* of Greek experience into a different way of thinking. *Roman thought takes over the Greek words without a corresponding, equally original experience of what they say, without the Greek word.* The rootlessness of Western thought begins with this translation.” (*The Origin of the Work of Art* 153-4)

Thus *both* idioms are needed for without knowledge of the Greek, on the one hand, the student is estranged from essential thought but with out the Latin, on the other hand, the student is estranged from *Western thought*; rootless as it is. But, Latin thought, however, is not the mere counterfeit, or an inauthentic representation, of essential Greek thinking because the Destiny, Μοιρα, of these two civilizations was bound together in an earlier period. For the Greek and Latin civilizations differed not in essential thinking, but in *modes of thought* for the wellspring of Greek philosophy was *Ionian* whereas the well spring of Latin philosophy was *Italiote* personified by Anaximander and Pythagoras respectively the former scientific, the latter mystical. Hence the development of these two branches of western ethics. (*From Religion to Philosophy* v-vi) The repetitive motif of

the Shepherd, Νομης, shows this in an elemental way, for to the reasoning mind of the Greeks the Νομης is the *Lawgiver*, Νομοθετες, Solon, but in the *Romanization* of this idea is nuanced as the divine, hence a priest in the Latin religion is called *Pastor* which means Shepherd. Though all shepherds have not been good, nor has every lawgiver. The repetition of the motif in western culture suggest, however, if they were not always good they were at least always necessary. Hegel reference to the founders of Rome as “predatory shepherds” wildly misses the mark. (*Philosophy of History* 287) Here he clashes unhappily with Sallust’s narration: “How easily they united...within the same walls, is unheard of in all memory.” Though Plato indeed has it that shepherds only fatten their sheep while looking forward to the slaughter and Polyphemus was a notoriously savage *lawgiver*.

“ἐνθεν δὲ προτέρω πλέομεν ἀκαχήμενοι ἦτορ:  
 Κυκλώπων δ’ ἐς γαίαν ὑπερφιάλων ἀθεμίστων  
 ἰκόμεθ’, οἳ ῥά θεοῖσι πεποιθότες ἀθανάτοισιν  
 οὔτε φυτεύουσιν χερσὶν φυτὸν οὔτ’ ἀρώσιν,  
 ἀλλὰ τὰ γ’ ἀσπαρτα καὶ ἀνήροτα πάντα φύονται,  
 πυροὶ καὶ κριθαὶ ἠδ’ ἀμπελοι, αἳ τε φέρουσιν  
 οἶνον ἐρίστάφυλον, καὶ σφιν Διὸς ὄμβρος ἀέξει.  
 τοῖσιν δ’ οὔτ’ ἀγοραὶ βουληφόροι οὔτε θέμιστες,  
 ἀλλ’ οἳ γ’ ὑψηλῶν ὀρέων ναίουσι κάρηνα  
 ἐν σπέσσι γλαφυροῖσι, θεμιστεύει δὲ ἕκαστος  
 παίδων ἠδ’ ἀλόχων, οὐδ’ ἀλλήλων ἀλέγουσιν.

(*Odyssey* 9.105-115)

Thus one could conclude that with respect to the question of the lawgiver, it is not the office but the moral purpose of the office holder that one should question.

Hegel said that the Roman civilization was marked by its dualism.

“The city of Rome had besides its proper name another secret one, known only to a few. It is believed by some to have been *Valentia*, the Latin translation of *Roma*; others think it was *Amor* (*Roma* read backwards). Romulus, the founder of the state, had also another sacred name—*Quirinus*—by which title he was worshiped: the Romans too were also called *Quiritres*.” (*Philosophy of History* 290)

According to Varro, “The Quirites were named from the Curenses ‘men of Cures.’” But the Greeks also had a similar dualistic sort of naming as Plato recorded in his *Cratylus*. On account of the fact that the Romans had this, however, Hegel said that “the Romans, on the contrary, remained satisfied with a dull, stupid subjectivity.” (*Ibid*) On account of the fact that Hegel said this, I say Hegel is dull, stupid and subjective. The whole study of the Classics is tainted with this kind of dull, stupid and subjective prejudice. What the students of Greece and Rome need to see however is not this prejudice, or even the dualism, but the dynamic and dialectical interplay between these two civilizations that was the motive force behind the historical development of the western world; western civilization developing in an upward spiral.

For the contemporary academy the dualism between Greek and Roman culture is taken as a substantive dualism, not a dialectical one. Marx and Hegel moved the study of history beyond the substantive dual and gave it *flux* through dialectics. At best Greece is perceived within the classics department as a unitary entity which somehow gives birth to

Rome through a form of cultural mitosis. But Greece was not a unitary cultural entity at the time Rome was born. Since the Roman Republic was established in 510 B.C. and the advent of democracy in Athens was in 505 B.C. it might be suggested that the Greeks acquired the democratic spirit from the Romans. But, it is at any rate a *fallacy of sources* to suppose that because two nations have a similar idea or institution that one must have learnt it from the other.<sup>143</sup> Even if one considers the Greeks to prefigure everything Roman, it is important to understand the dialectical interplay between these two civilizations over the course of time and that one of these nations cannot be the substantive origin of the other. Each of these, Greece and Rome, existed by and for its own self. Each one gained certainty of itself by first positing and then observing the other; first by recognizing the other as objective and later realizing that what it was observing was its own self; the subject and object through dialectical development change places with each become the others opposite. Hence, Rome could not have dull stupid subjectivity unless Greece also had it.

“The movement is the twofold process and the genesis of the whole, in such wise that each side simultaneously posits the other, and each therefore has both perspectives within itself; together they thus constitute the whole by dissolving themselves, and by making themselves into its moments.” (*Phenomenology of Spirit* 42)

In many ways the Greeks and the Romans were actually the same people; in many other ways they are diametrical opposites. In the end at any rate it is not what Greece or Rome was in a positivistic sense that out to interest us, but what we believe about them

---

<sup>143</sup> Cf. Collingwood's *Idea of History*: 69.

that we ought to find interesting and is the proper object for historical examination. Thus the classics department is in itself an underdeveloped treatment of the Greco-Roman tradition because it studies the *classics* for its own sake and not for what can come from it. One who would pursue a particular study of history, for example the classics, for its own sake is not a historian, but really only an antiquarian who gazes in fascination at the variegated scenes of his own imagination. To him a historical fact, or even a narrative, is a mere curio; a collectible thing gathering dust on the shelf of memory and which was originally hoarded away of a perceived intrinsic value that it may one day have. But the antiquarian is as far from realizing the value of his thought objects as he ever was, perhaps even further away from it than he has ever been.

“The past cut off from the present, converted into a mere spectacle, can have no value at all.” (*The Idea of History* 170)

Since the study of the classics through the classics department draws no correspondences between the object of study, the thought of the ancients and its relation to the contemporary world, the study of the classics as classics is merely taking pleasure in the knowledge of useless facts. The whole department is inebriated with a pathological eroticism. Hence the latest trend there is to interpret every text as a justification for repressed sexual predilections. The classics however are the proper objects of study for the *historian*, not the *classicist*, because classics only find their proper use in so far as they give us knowledge about ourselves.

The current trend is to pigeon-hole the Classics Department in a backwater of the department of foreign languages and literatures. This treatment of the topic supposes that the classics are best understood as a symbolic system. Whatever math is to say physics,



Greek and Latin is to the classics. But a foreign language isn't even a *bone fide* department, or a study, through itself, but is an ancillary to a study. The Greek and Latin languages are only instruments, tools, for a study which is necessarily a historical study which is a branch of philosophy called ethics. The classics department is, then, a sub-branch of History which is a branch of Ethics which is a branch of Logic which itself breaks down into *humanism* and *naturalism* with mathematics being the symbolic system ancillary to naturalism, or natural science. There are two fundamental phenomenological *worlds*, the world of the *mind*, which is human world, and the world of *material*, which is the natural world. Thus reality at the outset is marked by a subjective dualism.

“Unity is plural and, at minimum, is two.” (*Synergetics* 905.11)

These two worlds are not completely separate, but maintain a constant and complicated interaction, but the material world is, nonetheless, mediated through the mind. Man has dominion over the material, since all ethical judgments over the material world are formed by him. Ethical judgments as applied by man to the material world are different than those applied to the human world, for man has primacy, or dominion, over the Earth. Thus Ethics is a branch of Logic, History is a branch of Ethics, and the Classics are a branch of History. According to Aristotle, Politics is a branch of Ethics. If this is true then Politics is the study of human social praxis, or ethics in action. The purpose of the study of the classics, then, is to understand how the ethical judgments of western civilization have been made and to make these and object for a critique.

In the process of objectifying and critiquing the Greek and Latin library, the student develops a critique of themselves hence hence western civilization. This is decidedly different than the pure eroticism that dominates the study today, for as the

study of ethics the classics are subordinate to logic whereas eroticism is a mere opiate of the masses. Without calling itself this, the study the classics under the current system turns itself into the process of acquiring simple pleasure. Whatever is understood as the ‘foundations of western society’ is a mere feeling, a notion, but not an object form of thought. The study of the classics raises many uncomfortable issues and the powers that be may not wish to grapple with those issues but at the same time obliged as it were to introduce them in a limited way, but not to draw the thought of the ancients into relation with any particular contemporary social praxis and not to pass judgment on that. The study of history then is the acquisition of self-knowledge of our ethical past. This self-knowledge in enabling us to understand our present situation to the greatest possible degree serves as our *oracle* in helping us determine how we should act in any given circumstance.

“For a man about to act, the situation is his master, his oracle, his god. Whether his action is to prove successful or not depends on whether he grasps the situation rightly or not. If he is a wise man, it is not until he has consulted his oracle, done everything in his power to find out what the situation is, that he will make even the most trivial plan. And if he neglects the situation, the situation will not neglect him. It is not one of those gods that leave an insult unpunished.” (*The Idea of History* 316)

Thus the study of Greece cannot be separated from the study of Rome because it is not merely an essential link in the chain of history that leads us to the present. Just as the historical thought of the Greece and Rome of classical antiquity had a dialectical interplay, with each understanding itself by understanding the other, contemporary

historians have a dialectical interplay with *the classics* themselves, or classical antiquity as a whole, for by studying them we study ourselves because we come from there. As a thinking being the contemporary historian by means of studying antiquity sees his own self for we *are* them.

“The peculiarity of an historical or spiritual process is that since the mind is that which knows itself, the historical process which is the life of the mind is a self-knowing process which understands itself, values itself, and so forth.” (*Ibid.* 175)

Though displaced from them by time, our thought comes from them. We are different from but analogous to them. By studying Greek and Roman thought our thought becomes an object for us, or, rather, we become an object for ourselves. Just as the Greeks and Romans passed logical ethical judgments, developed their own idea of the ethical, on civilizations before theirs and on each other, we have passed judgment on them. But more importantly, it is through the study of the Roman Empire that we obtain the best explanation the contemporary state of the world and America’s hegemony over it; for the Roman Empire is the historical analogue of contemporary America.

Ψευσομαι η ετυμον ερεω; κελεται δε με θυμος.

Shall I dissemble or speak the truth? But my soul urges me, speak.

(*Odyssey* 4.140)

And for this reason, the study of Rome in America is suppressed. The powers that be seek neither to know themselves, nor an academic movement of self-knowing to develop. Or when this self-knowing is allowed it is a somehow preconditioned knowing, a kind of knowing which is intended to impart certain beliefs, determinate thought forms, and not others. For if the historical judgments against the Roman Empire were drawn into

relation to contemporary America certain contemporary historical developments would likely be condemned as they once were.

*Aufferre trucidare rapere falsis nominibus imperium, atque ubi solitudinem faciunt, pacem appellant.*

To rape, to pillage, to slaughter are falsely called ‘government,’ where they make desolation, they declare peace. (*Agricola* 30.6)

For indeed in America today even poverty is seen as a disgrace; the poor are the disgraceful.

Πρὸς γὰρ Διὸς εἰσὶν ἅπαντες

Ξεῖνοί τε πτωχοί τε, δόσις δ’ ὀλίγη τε φίλη τε.

Ἀλλὰ δότ’, ἀμφίπολοι, ξείνω βρώσιν τε πόσιν τε,

Λούσατέ τ’ ἐν ποταμῶ, ὅθ’ ἐπὶ σκέπας ἔστ’ ἀνέμοιο.

For from God are all strangers and beggars,

And a gift though small is welcome.

And always give, maidens, the stranger meat and drink,

Wash him in the river,

Shelter him from the wind. (*The Odyssey* 6.207-10)

Riches have become honors and in and of themselves a glory to he who has them, virtue has become blunt, poverty is held shameful, innocence is taken for malevolence, and smart people are called stupid.

*Hospitalitatem nolite oblivisci per hanc enim latuerunt quidam angelis hospitio receptis.*

Don't forget hospitality; for through this some unknowingly with a hospitable thing receive angles. (*Hebrews* 13.2)

The so-called 'non-western' movement within academia is both *not* truly non-western, because it studies social objects, civilizations, already tainted by contact with western civilization and they themselves are studied through the western historical lens historical thought prefigured by judgments on Greece and Rome. Who ever posits the non-western attempts to find a new basis for this civilization, but they cannot since in articulating the virtues of the so-called non-western they must themselves adopt western historical methods. History itself is western. Whoever embarks upon an historical inquiry, ἱστορία, embarks upon the path of western thought. The process of situating the non-western within the western canon must also be the process of vindicating the *prehistoric*; and in many cases the vindication of the *preliterate*. The whole idea of the non-western academy would be barbaric, βαρβαρος, if it were not already impossible, because western historical thought has already universalized itself. βαρβαρος means 'foreign' hence the 'non-western' is foreign. But it also means *barbaric*, for the ethics of the foreign, which first clashed with the Greek idea of the ethical, now it clashes with our own.

“Among the barbarians, however, (contrary to the order of nature), the female and the slave occupy the same position—the reason being that no naturally ruling element exists among them, and conjugal union thus comes to be a union of a female who is a slave with a male who is also a slave.” (*The Politics* 1.1252b)

It is often supposed that in Homer's time the word 'barbarian' meant a man of "rough of speech," on account of his use of the word βαρβαροφωνων (*Iliad* 2.867). The idea that

barbarian meant, or came to mean, foreigner was taken from the context of *that* usage of the word. But in light of that word's connection to speech and reason's connection to speech the term βαρβαρος could be taken to mean *men perceived to be possessed of disordered thinking* and what would be perceived by the Greeks as having been irrational. Perhaps boarish or surly, about whom one might say.

Ακουσαι ουκ επισταμενοι ουδ' ειπειν

ωι μαλιστα διηνεκως ομιλουσι.

Not knowing how to listen, neither can they speak.

Above all they continuously disturb the company. (Heraclitus 50)

Heraclitus seems to indicate that on account of their diminished capacity to reason, their perceptions and understanding, and hence judgment, was regarded as unreliable:

Κακοι μαρτυρες ανθρωποισιν οφθαλμοι και ωτα

βαβαρους ψυχας εχοντων·

Eyes and ears are bad witnesses

For men with the soul of a barbarian. (*Ibid.* 107)

In short, barbarians were ultimately men who held foreign thought forms, ethical values which clashed with the cultural values of the Greeks. That they held to customs repugnant to the Greeks. Apart from any real or implied prejudice that may be indicted by these remarks, it is clear that the Greeks did not designate any other people's to be barbaric except insofar as there was a conflict between their ethics which was apprehended through a perception of their speech, hence Aristotle's affirmation of Euripides' remarks:

Βαρβαρων δ' Ἑλληνας αρχει εικος, αλλ' ου βαβαρους,

μητηρ, Ἑλλήνων: το μὲν γὰρ δούλον, ‘οἱ δ’ ἐλευθεροί.

It is fair, mother,

For Barbarians to be ruled by Greeks

But not the Greeks by the barbarous:

For, on the one hand, that is a slave,

But these men are the free. (*Iphigenia in Aulis* 1400)

The attempt to find a new basis for western civilization by undermining its ethical tenets is the activity of *post-civilizationism*. It is therefore an absurdity, for there is nothing beyond civilization unless it would be *anarchy* which is a return to barbarism. No sane man would want this for it means becoming *like* an animal which is *irrational*. Any attempt to overturn western historical judgments, western ethics, appears to be a trend away from civilization. The savages of the burgeoning class, the misanthrope, the merchants.

-- Господа купечество! -- заговорил Маякин, усмехаясь. -- Есть в речах образованных и ученых людей одно иностранное слово, "культура"<sup>144</sup> называемое. Так вот насчет этого слова я и побеседую по простоте души...

-- Смирно!..

-- Милостивые государи! -- повысив голос, говорил Маякин. -- В газетах про нас, купечество, то и дело пишут, что мы-де с этой культурой не знакомы, мы-де ее не желаем и не понимаем. И называют нас дикими людьми... Что же это такое -- культура? Обидно мне, старику, слушать

---

<sup>144</sup> Культура = ‘culture.’

этакие речи, и занялся я однажды рассмотрением слова -- что оно в себе заключает?

Маякин замолчал, обвел глазами публику и, торжествующе усмехнувшись, раздельно продолжал:

-- Оказалось, по розыску моему, что слово это значит обожание, любовь,<sup>145</sup> высокую любовь к делу и порядку жизни. (*Фома Гордеев* 283)

The neo-misanthrope, a postmodern savage, confounded by the irrationality and hypocrisy of the world unfolds himself into:

“An extreme pathological form of spiritual withdrawal in which consciousness, unable to disengage itself from irrational particularity, simply identifies itself with the latter, and is then led to extrude the rational universality which is its true self into a mystical, unattainable Beyond.” (*Phenomenology of Spirit* xvii)

Condemning civilization and mankind along with it the new barbarian tears off the rational attire of Western Civilization and rushes headlong into *wilderness studies*. He can no longer live among the people for they according to him are very thing that is wrong with the world. Indeed, according to *him*, it is only animals that *should* have rights, but they don't.

*Benedixitque illis Deus et ait crescite et multiplicamini et replete terram et subicite eam et dominamini piscibus maris et volatilibus caeli et universis animantibus quae moventur super terram.*

---

<sup>145</sup> Любовь = love. Маякин wrongly equates дикий люди, 'wild, absurd, perposterous uncivilized, or savage people' with Lat. *silvaticus*, 'growing or running wild' = Rus. дикъ, дика, дико, 'wild' from дичать 'to become wild, or unsocialble,' дикарь, 'savage, unsociable person.' In other words he has not researched the etymology of the word дикий, but advances this argument as sophist and a dissembler.



And God blessed them, and He said: spring forth and increase and replenish the Earth and you subject them and and you yourselves be Lord to the fish of the sea and the birds of the sky and to all the animals which move over the Earth.

(Genesis 1.28)

*Architecture* is a *holocaust* of trees and of God's green Earth! Civilization must itself be the enemy. The post-civilizationists have gathered together into a brand new Indian tribe they call the '*rainbow people*.'

*Dixitque Deus hoc signum foederis quod do inter me et vos et ad omnem animam viventem quae est vobiscum in generationes sempiternas [13] arcum meum ponam in nubibus et erit signum foederis inter me et inter terram [14] cumque obduxero nubibus caelum apparebit arcus meus in nubibus [15] et recordabor foederis mei vobiscum et cum omni anima vivente quae carnem vegetat et non erunt ultra aquae diluvii ad delendam universam carnem [16] eritque arcus in nubibus et videbo illum et recordabor foederis sempiterni quod pactum est inter Deum et inter omnem animam viventem universae carnis quae est super terram.*

(Genesis 9.12-16)

And as a brand new 'chosen people' they are simultaneously a brand new 'God's gift to humanity.'

I came upon a child of God,

He was walking along the road,

And I asked him, where are you going?

And this he told me:

"I'm going on down to Yasgur's farm

I'm going to join in a rock-n-roll band

I'm going to camp out on the land

I'm going to try an' get my soul free.

We are stardust

We are golden

And we've got to get ourselves

Back to the Garden." (*Woodstock*)

But since Mind positis God whoever supposes themselves to be the Chosen People by necessity chooses themselves. Their new mission is to fulfill 'God's plan' by preventing the destruction of His work, which according to them is Nature itself. In order to do this they must destroy humanity before humanity destroys itself and creation along with it. Indeed they believe that only they, as the new chosen ones, should even be allowed to live.

Ἀφρητῶρ ἀθεμιστὸς ἀνεστῖος·

Homeless, lawless, and friendless is he. (*The Politics* 1.1253a1)

The so-called 'non-western studies' is then western civilization attempting to observe what little remains beyond it which is nothing but barbarism and chaos. A withdrawal into either environmentalism or animal rights is an absurdity embraced by those who have given up on humanity. Heraclitus was one of these.

"Finally, he became a hater of his kind and wandered on the mountains, and there he continued to live, making his diet of grass and herbs. However, when this gave him dropsy, he made his way back to the city and put this riddle to the physicians, whether they were competent to create a drought after heavy rain.

They could make nothing of this, whereupon he buried himself in a cowshed, expecting that the noxious damp humour would be drawn out of him by the warmth of the manure. But, as even this was of no avail, he died at the age of sixty.” (*Heraclitus* 10.3)

Their movement is in fact very much the opposite of *theism* for Darwin is their prophet. Just as the civilized posited the Idea of God and propounded the laws of morality, the neo-misanthrope negates the divine and ethics along with it. They seek to return to the ‘community of animals’ and its *law of the jungle* which is envisioned as the return to the *real* Garden of Eden, but what they really promise is a planet of the apes.

Однажды, на рождестве, Сергей Сергеевич Сапожков собрал жильцов и сказал им следующее:

- Товарищи, настало время действовать. Нас много, но мы распылены. До сих пор мы выступали разрозненно и робко. Мы должны составить фалангу и нанести удар буржуазному обществу. Для этого, во-первых, мы фиксируем вот эту инициативную группу, затем выпускаем прокламацию, вот она:

“Мы – новые Колумбы! Мы - гениальные возбудители! Мы - семена нового человечества! Мы требуем от заплывшего жиром буржуазного общества отмены всех предрассудков. Отныне нет добродетели! Семья, общественные приличия, браки - отменяются. Мы этого требуем. Человек – мужчина и женщина – должен быть голым и свободным. Половые отношения есть достояние общества. Юноши и девушки, мужчины и

женщины, вылезайте из насиженных логовищ, идите, нагие и счастливые, в хоровод под солнце дикого зверя!..” (*Хождение по Мукам*<sup>146</sup> 1.5.23)

Once upon a time, on Christmas, Sergei Sergeovich Sapozhkov made an assembly of the tenants and to them spoke the following thing:

Comrades, it has come time to take action. We are many, but we have been atomized. Until now we have stepped forward uncoordinatedly and timidly. We are obligated to compose phalanxes and to have have inflicted a blow against bourgeois society. For this purpose, at first, we shall to this initiative fix a group, then publish a proclamation. Here it is:

“Comrades, the time has come for action. We are many, but we are disunited. Up to now we have proceeded individually and timidly. We must form a phalanx and strike a blow at bourgeois society. For this purpose we must first form ourselves into a definite initiative group; then we must issue a manifesto—here it is:

“We are the new Columbuses! We are inspired awakeners! We are the seed of a new mankind! We demand of bourgeois society, bunged up with fat as it is, the abolition of all prejudices. Henceforward virtue no longer exists! The family, all accepted properties and the institution of marriage are abolished! We demand it! Mankind—men and women—must go naked and free. Sex relations are a common asset of society. Boys and girls, men and women, come out of your stuffy dens, naked and happy, and join the dance of sunshine under the sign of the wild beast!” (*Road to Calvary* 23)

---

<sup>146</sup> Traditionally translated ‘Road to Cavalry,’ literally *Хождение*, ‘the walking, or going; pathway, road,’ *no*, prep. signifying motion towards, thus: ‘on the way to,’ *Мукам*, ‘torment, torture, agony. Thus: “On the way to Agony.”

The solution to the crisis of modern man, however, is not a trend away from civilization, but towards a greater civilization.

“Humanity cannot shrink and return into the womb and revert to as yet unfertilized ova.” (*Synergetics* 311.03)

Thus the trend is not toward less civilization but towards more of it. The non-western, first being posited by the western scholar, forms ethical judgments about it, but does not become it. The western student, who studies the non-western then, does not himself become non-western but westernizes *it*. Non-western studies, then, elevates its object, but does not become like it. He is the unwitting agent universalizing western culture believing all the while that he does to opposite.

The study of the Greek and Roman classics is indeed vindicated, but not in the way we first supposed it would. The study of the classics is first and foremost a historical study. It is man forming ethical judgments about the social relations of the past. The difference from where we began from where we have arrived being that whereas we first supposed that the study of the classics was good in and for its own self and later understood it as a *substantive datum* for our understanding of the ethical from which we measured the moral structure of the world of the past against the world of the present; now we understand it as the study of the history of contemporary thought by which we achieve self-knowledge. It is an *oracle* which we ought to consult before acting. Holding as it were that it is best to begin at the beginning, we begin with classical studies because the classics are the origin of our own thought.

“If accordingly, we begin at the beginning, and consider things in the process of their growth, we shall best be able, in this as in other fields, to attain scientific conclusions by the method we employ.” (*The Politics* 1252a)

Some say that the origin of our thought is with Homer. But the way Homer is taught is as if we were eating pudding and that we should consume his work for the mere pleasure that we get from it. As if the understanding of the Greeks could be obtained through a mere eating, i.e., by getting a taste of things the student whets their appetite for the next course. In classical studies however, we do not seek an understanding of the Greeks, but an understanding of ourselves. The current methodology, however, is not only the wrong approach to the study of classics as a whole, but is in fact the wrong place to begin. We ought to begin with Herodotus which is where the student learns not that the Greeks believe in certain things but have become conscious of the fact that they believe certain things. That these beliefs should not merely be recorded but should also become the objects of examination; not only to record what men have done but also to try to understand why they have done it.

“We go upon the practical mode of teaching *Nickleby*; the regular education system. C-l-e-a-n, clean, verb active, to make bright, to scour. W-i-n, win, d-e-r, der, winder, a casement. When the boy knows this out of the book, he goes and does it.” (*Nicholas Nickleby* 106)

It is impossible to understand the Greeks by reading Homer; or even a great list such as: Homer, Sophocles, and Plato. The student having done so is very likely more confused than enlightened, because he or she would know neither what the Greeks

thought, how they came to think it, for we cannot truly understand the Greeks as Greeks, but can only understand ourselves by coming into relation to them.

“The manner of study in ancient times differed from that of modern age in that the former was the proper and complete formation of the natural consciousness. Putting itself to the test at every point of its existence, and philosophizing about everything it came across, it made itself into a universality that was active through and through. In modern times, however, the individual finds the abstract form ready-made.” (*Phenomenology of Spirit* 33)

Wherever the students may begin, to coin a phrase by Ezra Pound, what is most important is that they get around the topic and see it from all sides.

“It doesn’t, in our contemporary world, so much matter where you begin the examination of a subject, so long as you keep on until you got around again to your starting point. As it were, you start on a sphere, or a cube; you must keep on until you have seen it from all sides.” (*ABC of Reading* 29)

We study them in order to understand how we have come to think as we do. The object of study situated in the distant past not drawn in relation to the present is a lifeless determinate. Our historical relation to the Greeks and the Romans has imparted to us certain thought forms. In studying the past we examine the thought form of the past and draw them into relation with our contemporary thought forms to ask: How are they the same, or different? The Greeks and Romans passed a number of ethical judgments against, for instance, cannibalism. This ethical judgment made in the past has been placed into our minds by our teachers as a particular thought form. Whoever has challenged this judgment will run up against a fundamental presupposition of Western

Civilization and they have placed them self in opposition to it. In so doing, the challenger has sought to destroy a particular ethical principle and to replace it with another.

“It may thus be said that historical inquiry reveals to the historian the powers of his own mind...his coming to know them shows him that his mind is able...to think in these ways...whenever he finds certain historical matters unintelligible, he discovered the limitation of his own mind...It is the historian himself who stands at the bar of judgment, and reveals his own mind in its strengths and weaknesses, its virtues and vices.” (*The Idea of History* 218-19)

In studying the works in the Greek and Latin library we maintain our ethical link to this past. If we are unable, however, to agree with the ethical judgments of the classical authors over any events, say the Catiline affair, it would indicated that those ethics that had condemned him had somehow become estranged from present scholarship. We posit them, but we can only do so in so far as they have already become us.

“The self is really the object of the self, or the object only has truth so far as it has the form of the self.” (*Phenomenology of Spirit* 529)

History begins with Herodotus. Our understanding of the present begins here in Herodotus: *hic Rhodes hic salta*.

*Quamquam et apud Herodotus patrem historiae. (De Legibus 1.1.5)*

Whosoever believes that one can take a flying leap at the study of any historical event, as Kalb did with her remarks on the *Bellum Catiline*, would be well advised to consider the perils of leaping before looking; and the even greater perils of pretending to know what one clearly does not know and still worse the preceding an abysmal plunge with the



brandishing credentials, for her credentials would now appear to be a mere symbol of knowledge but not an actual mode of recognition for knowledge is one of those things we would rather to possess in reality than in appearance.

*Insignis eorum est error qui malunt quae nesciunt docere quam discere quae ignorant.*

He who wanders in error is distinguished among all men for preferring to teach that which he does not know rather than to learn that of which he is ignorant. (*De Lingua Latina* 9.1)

Alas we come to Rhetoric, where the ethics of philosophy meets the material world in the form of politics actuated through speech. Thus the genealogy of Social Praxis mediated through the study of History is: Social Praxis, Rhetoric, Politics, History, Ethics, Humanism, Logic, Philosophy with Classics being a species of History and Logic having two principal branches, Naturalism and Humanism, hence the logic of Rhetoric, being characterized by such *modes* as *argumentum ad baculum*, *argumentum ad populum*, *argumentum ad hominem*, *argumentum ad misericordiam*, et al, is fundamentally different than the logic natural science, or *demonstrative*, which is characterized by *symbolic* logic. But, oratory is not the arena of the barbarian, but of the wise. And although David Hackett Fischer calls these “fallacies of substantive distraction” they are indeed not always fallacies.

“They all operate by shifting attention from a reasoned argument to other things which are irrelevant and often irrational.” (*Historian’s Fallacies* 282)

He is partly correct, they are indeed fallacies when they *are* irrelevant or irrational.

Καὶ πῶς, ὥστε συμβαίνει τὴν ῥητορικὴν οἶον παραφυῆς τι τῆς διαλεκτικῆς εἶναι καὶ τῆς περὶ τὰ ἥθη πραγματείας, ἣν δίκαιόν ἐστι προσαγορεύειν πολιτικὴν.

And, in a certain way, so as to be some kind of offshoot of Dialectic, stands Rhetoric, and concerns the practice of Ethics, which is justice to be called Politics. (*Rhetoric* 1.2.7)

It is through rhetoric that Ethics meets the material world for it is here that it affects the social praxis of the State through the power of speech. Rhetoric, then, is the ethics of History finding its proper use, affecting a particular individual, during a particular time, at a particular place, and in a particular way.<sup>147</sup> The historian, who, if he is a historian at all, is also a philosopher, must draw his body of knowledge in relation to the material world. Rhetoric is a tool which is used to persuade. Used in accordance with virtue it imparts the ethical thought forms of civilization and wrongful use has the opposite effect, hence Rhetoric precedes Social Praxis.

I shall now proceed to render a definition of L. Sergius Catiline that we may come to know his essence with certainty through his taxonomy, that his definition become determinate. Catiline was a man, a Roman, a noble, and a criminal.

I. genus: a. Romani b. Hostes

II. species: (a) ἐπ'εγγλήο: Patricii (b) homo novus: Equestres et Plebs (c) alii: Servi, Libertinii, Proletarii

III. property: (a) nobiles (b) ignobiles

IV. accidens

a. anthropophagos:

---

<sup>147</sup> This is *Anaphora*.

- i. drank blood: Fuere ea tempestate, qui dicerent Catilinam oratione habita, cum ad iusiurandum popularis sceleris sui adigeret, humani corporis sanguinem vino permixtum in pateris circumtulisse: inde cum post exsecrationem omnes degustavissent, sicuti in sollemnibus sacris fieri consuevit, aperuisse consilium suum; idque eo dicitur fecisse, quo inter se fidi magis forent alius alii tanti facinoris conscii. (Bellum Catilinae 22)
- ii. Sacrificed a boy, and after administering the oath over his vitals, ate these in company with the others. □ (Historiae Romanae 37.30.3)
- b. raptus: raped the Vestal Virgin Fabia.
- c. interfector: murdered his wife, sacrificed a boy (probably his own son), murdered his brother-in-law Quintus Caecilius, murdered Marcus Marius Gratidianus, Marcus Volumnius and Lucius Tanusius during the proscriptions of Sulla.
- d. incestuosus: married his daughter Aurelia Orestilla.
- e. tyrannus simulator: Quaesivi quid dubitaret proficisci eo quo iam pridem pararet, cum arma, cum securis, cum fascis, cum tubas, cum signa militaria, cum aquilam illam argenteam cui ille etiam sacrarium domi suae fecerat scirem esse praemissam. (2 In. Catilinam 13)
- f. conspiratio: Postquam acceperere ea homines, quibus mala abunde omnia erant, sed neque res neque spes bona ulla, tametsi illis quietam movere magna merces videbatur, tamen postulavere plerique, ut proponeret, quae condicio belli foret, quae praemia armis peterent, quid ubique opis aut spei haberent. Tum Catilina polliceri tabulas novas, proscriptionem locupletium, magistratus, sacerdotia, rapinas, alia omnia, quae bellum atque libido victorum fert. (Bellum Catilinae 21)

## VII. Metalogue (Μετα Λογου)

Ἔστι δ' ὄρος μὲν λόγος ὅτι ἦν εἶναι σημαίνων.

(*Topica* 101b39)

The lesson taught by the trial and death of Socrates is that whoever runs up against the fundamental presupposition of the Cult-ure in which they live will drink the hemlock.

*Hoc est documentum tragicum quaestione et interitu Socratis cognosci: quisquis praesumen fundamentalem contradicuit Cultus in quo vivit illum bibere Cicutam proverbialem compellet.*

And I in following his example have engaged philosophy as the wise sages of antiquity have defined it, in the pursuit of wisdom. But this has not been enough for who-so-ever should be in possession of wisdom, and ought, therefore, be counted among “the good” must also have the reputation for it, as Plato so testifies. For to have justice without reputation:

ἐροῦσι δὲ ἡάδε, ὅτι οὔηω διακείμενος ὁ δίκαιος μαζηγώζουσαι, ζηρεβλώζουσαι, δεδήζουσαι, ἔκκασθήζουσαι ἠώθαλαμῶ, ηελεσηῶν πάνηα κακὰ παθῶν ἀναζτινδσλεσθήζουσαι καὶ γνώζουσαι ὅτι οὐκ εἶναι δίκαιον ἀλλὰ δοκεῖν δεῖ ἐθέλειν. They shall say about this: “Anyone who observes justice in this manner [being just without the reputation for it], being in such as state, shall be flogged, stretched on the wheel, kept in chains, his eyes burned out, in the ending he will have suffered every kind of evil, he will know that not to be just, but to wish to be thought it.” (Republic 2.361e-362a)

For this is why Socrates was finished off the way he was, and why Plato wrote this: that Socrates was a just man without the reputation for it and was destroyed for that. Higher

education has yet to make a rational account of the trial and death of the philosopher, the pursuer of wisdom. How is it that those who seek, were, and indeed are, those who suffer absolute injustice? Should a man be just without seeming to be so? Must those who have knowledge, or wisdom, have the reputation for it?

But what is the pursuit of wisdom *per se* but first and foremost a pursuit, and continuously so for what is at an end is not pursuit? But since what is at an end is determinate and fixated, the pursuit of wisdom, or the practice of philosophy, must be indeterminate, and indeed in flux, for pursuit can only be pursuit if it continues. Thus the pursuit of wisdom, or the practice of philosophy, is the practice of being in, and remaining in, a state of indeterminism. If he who pursues philosophy, the philosopher, were to become determinate in his thinking he must be absolutely so and the philosopher must himself fully determine what his wisdom is before determining what absolute wisdom is. But if wisdom itself were to be absolutely determined it would necessarily also be flawless and thereby not the pursuit of wisdom but philosophy at an end, for an end is the absolute determination of the thing, hence the practice of philosophy itself is endless; for if what was once thought to be a pursuit would in the end turn out to be merely an end of pursuit, a doctrine, dogma, or ideology, or a philosophy of life if you will, something fully fixated and determinate, it would not be called philosophy and he who practices it not a philosopher, but a Wiseman.

But the end of a thing is the death of that thing for what is dead is at an end. Thus the pursuit of wisdom is being, or rather the pursuit of a particular being, and with its end in pure Being, hence it is not philosophy but the philosopher himself who perhaps attains a full determination before suffering an absolute determination, which is his death. Thus

what is absolutely determined is a dead thing and is, therefore, not a being but a thing, a determinate thought object. He who is fully determinate in his philosophy is, therefore, among the walking dead, for dead is his thinking. And he who becomes fully determinate is not a philosopher at all, but a sophist. For philosophy, which is a pursuit, attaining a full determination, or a fixation, if you will, is dead and philosophers whose philosophy has become a determinate object for thought are among the dead; since nothing which lives is fully determined for that which is alive still has the potential for change. Thus a philosopher who has no potential for a change in his thinking is dead. Thus the philosopher, as philosopher, is alive, and remains so, only so long as he is able to resist a full determination in his thinking. But try as he might, however, to resist a full determination in his thinking, even he shall one day suffer an absolute determination, for all men must die.

*Ut initium sic finis est.*

Just as there is a beginning, thus there is an end. (Bellum Jugurtha 2)

Yet many men become fully determinate in their thinking before their absolute determination and therefore have died before their time; hence were not philosophers at all for they did not engaged in the pursuit of wisdom, but sought an end to that pursuit before an end was a necessary. It is, however, impossible for a man to remain completely indeterminate throughout his life for our lives are marked by determinations from the day we are born, by means of a number of true and primary determinations: i.e. name, date of birth, place of birth, race, and mother's maiden, made moments after coming to be. The older a man becomes, moreover, the more determinate he becomes in his thinking, for he must make choices, or determinations, at many stages along the way. The first thing we

notice about all the determinations of a being, as it presences in world, is that all true and primary determinations are by an other. And, moreover, just as the fundamental determinations, true and primary determinations, of our lives have been made by others, so to do they continue to be made. But these are perhaps not all of the determinations that are made and, though they are true and primary, they are perhaps not essential determinations, for just as the patronymic Ulyanov tells us nothing essential about V. I. Lenin, neither does the name of the town in which he was born, Simbirsk, tell us much about Marxism and since it was Lenin who defined Marxism, and Plato who defined the Socratic, we observe a general truth: „that we cannot judge a man by what he says about himself“ and, moreover, that Marx was not a Marxist, Socrates not Socratic, Plato Platonic, nor Christ Christian for none of these men, nor any other man, was, or is, a student of his own thought but we of theirs. The other examining its object determines what is that object. Thus we see that all true and primary determinations are made by an other just as Adam, „Man,“ named the things and, in so doing, determined them, or rather made what was indeterminate determinate. What was indeterminate becomes determinate through stipulation, or stipulative definition.

*Enim quod vocavit Adam animae viventis ipsum est nomen eius appellavitque.*

Indeed, the name by which Man invoked the living beings is itself of it and applied to it. (Genesis 2.19)

Thus the essence of a thing becomes known, and indeed is knowable, through its determinations by means of words, by means of stipulation, determining what each thing is, and each thing which presences, or becomes, out of pure Being was, and indeed is, or rather is what it is, through its determinations. All things must be determined. What is



indeterminate becomes a fixated and determinate thought object through its being in relation to others, and in this way it dies for determination is death. "Language by naming being for the first time, first brings beings to a word and to appearance. Only this naming nominates beings to their Being. Such saying is a projecting of clearing, in which announcement is made of what it is that beings come into the open as." (Origin of the Work of Art) Thus from the moment of birth man, through determinations, through the process of become determinate, begins to die.

So it is from birth on into primary education and from there into higher education, for education determines thought, and it is, primarily through the determinations of thought, that a man will become who he is in the world; for it is through determinations in his thinking that he shall chose and will come to be his occupation in life, if indeed he chooses it and not it him; or rather one"s occupation is the determination of an other for he who has not beseeches he who has and employment is the determination of an other. Thus it is that a man at birth is fully indeterminate, an utterly abstract persona, until the true and primary determinations have been made and through these true and primary determinations he is limited in this world. And so it goes, from the moment of birth he becomes more and more determinate and, clearly, it is not the self-determination for what was placed in his mind from day one, and thereafter, are the determinate thought forms of the Cult-ure, or the cult of philosophy of the State, which is indeed not philosophy at all but he dead and determinate thought forms of the approved. Teachers are those who are entrusted to impart the approved thoughts of the Cult-ure which is organized into a scholastic program; from the first grade to the second grade to the third grade and so on until the eighth grade graduation whereupon he receives his first validation. Validation is

the stamp of approval of the Cult-ure which certifies that the student has approved thoughts which is determined by how well he has learned, received, the program. It is awarded by what was once called the priest class but are now called the Faculty. Teachers are those who at an earlier time took the program well. And since they took the program well they became entrusted to be the middle term between the Cult-ure and the indeterminate minds of the young and it is they who not only impart the cultural program but also pass judgment and therefore determine who among the youth is approved and who among them is un-approved.

But they who impart the cultural program, and pass judgment, by determining who has approved thoughts and who does not, are not philosophers, for what is imparted is a cultural program, which is indubitably made of dead determinate thought forms. He who is to impart these must himself be determinate in his thinking. Therefore the teachers themselves are among the walking dead and, in determining the thinking of the youth, they seek to make the students like themselves by killing their minds, moreover, to witness themselves as a hologram in the thoughts of the student. And so the process continues, for those who have enough of their minds left, after their second validation, at the end of secondary school, on into higher education where their thoughts, if they take the program well, become validated: B.A., M.A. and finally Ph.D., and, with a Ph.D., one may become the High Priest of the Academy—the new Church—where the Holy Doctrine is learned, not studied. Through these validations determinations of thought are made. And who is to make these, but the teachers themselves? And who are these teachers but those who have been already validated through the system? But the system can only validate what is already known to it. Thus the education process becomes a

process of validation of thought from known determinates. Thus the so-called educate, the leading forth, or drawing out, is, then, not really as it first appears to be, for education, as it turns out, is really a putting in and not a drawing out, for what is taught is learned, not studied.

Now if Socrates himself had no method, the system of higher education very much does method have, which is the drawing out of the student's head his thoughts on each and every issue and by validating, or invalidating them, fixates them. For a word is a thought and for every thought there is a reason for that thought. Thus there is at first a drawing out followed by a determination which is in turn followed by a validation. What has validated, for those who wish to succeed not only in college but in life, returns to the mind as a Program, Liberal Arts program, Philosophy program, football program, television program, computer program, everything's a program. Those who are down with the program do well and go on, for instance into graduate school, and those who reject the program do not. And so it is that there is no freedom of thought either in higher education, or American culture. And this is how it is done, *et factum est ita*, that freedom of thought and indeed the minds of the youth are being destroyed; by making the self visible and by validating, or invalidating, that self and, furthermore, in determining who is approved, and who unapproved, for in so doing one determines what thoughts are approved. Now according to the Faculty, through this self-examination, the determination of the student's thoughts, the life of the student becomes a life worth living, *γνώθι ζασηόν*, for it is said that the student has examined life and thus is the artificer of his own being, but this is not truly so for determination is death. Thus the student's life becomes not one worth living, but one which is very much not worth living, for he comes not to

know himself but to be known through his externalizations. Through the whole course of this development, of a student's education, and very intensively so at the level of the Ph.D., every word, every thought, every idea, every philosophical position is yarded out of the student's mind and questioned so as to compel the student to choose a philosophy of life: Jewish, Christian, Muslim, Marxist, Hegelian, Republican, Democrat, Federalist, Communist, etc. Each student, one by one, comes to be like a bug in the butterfly collection of his professors, transfixed, crucified, and very dead.

This is what higher education calls the „Socratic Method;“ to examine the student's thoughts and make them determinate. But this is not to do justice to either philosophy as a pursuit nor to Socrates himself. For not only did Socrates have no method, he himself sought to remain indeterminate, to show that morals were not fixed but were in flux. Indeed his so-called method was in fact to approach those who had fixed ideas about, for instance, „justice“ and prove to them not only that what they had thought was untrue, but more importantly that our ideas about these things is always changing. Just when Socrates and his interlocutor are about to seize upon what this thing called justice really is, it slips away. Indeed the nearer we approach its meaning, the further away it really is. What is in front of us is somehow suddenly behind! But it's not that no one knows what justice is, but that ideas of what is justice was always changing. Thus true justice is in fact the pursuit of justice, just as philosophy is itself a pursuit. With respect to certain philosophical issues he was able to demonstrate through logic that what was believed to be fixed, and therefore determinate knowledge, was not truly so.

But the professor in today's academy is not the indeterminate and disinterested being he pretends to be for he is the middle term between the State and Pure Spirit entrusted with imparting the philosophy of the cult of the State, the program, and is, therefore, indeed the most determinate being of all for it is the student who is the questioner not the teacher. The student is the indeterminate being, pure negativity, or Pure Spirit, if you will, not the teacher who himself is the middle term between Pure Spirit and Absolute Knowledge—approved thought. By way of analogy, then, the student is Socrates, not the teacher. And if the student is Socratic, then is not for the teacher to practice a so-called „Socratic Method.“ Thus the so-called Socratic Method in today's academy, though it is a method, it is not Socratic, but is in fact the reverse of it; for its mission is to fixate thinking and impart a cultural program, to brainwash, not to liberate. The student does not become the knower, but the thing which is known. The student is not the thing which determines, but the thing which is determined.

Thus the process of getting a Ph.D., or any degree, then is the process of causing the learner to become fully determinate, to die while somehow remaining alive. The Ph.D. candidate makes a full externalization of the self, through the dissertation process, and therefore becomes the most fully determinate, hence the least creative. But if he has sacrificed his freedom of thought he has at least fixated well and is, therefore, down with the program and he who is down with the program shall do well not just in the academy but also in life, for he who lacks validation can but do the bidding of he who has it. And this is the very mission of higher education, to determine who is down with the program and who is not, for those who are shall be accepted are and those who not shall be rejected.

It is very much a mistake to presume that the life of freedom of thought is the best life, as the death of Socrates teaches. Thus it becomes necessary for he who seeks true freedom, and not to be a slave, to be down with the program, to externalize, fixate, and become approved. But in so doing, the prospective learner must appeal to the Master for it is he who shall determine he who is down with the program and he who is not, for all determinations are external. Thus he who shall be truly worthy to externalize and be validated, or invalidated, must let his mind become like clay in the hands of the Master who knows the program, and is adept at his craft of determining and validating thought, and therefore fashioning minds, and will determine whether or not the mind of the learner is good material, that it is capable of being shaped by the program. For some clay is good material and shapes well and becomes a thing of beauty while other clay is rough and filthy and is incapable of ever becoming what the Master wishes to make of it, for if it is too free it is because it did not undergo the earlier steps of the process of determination and validation and thus contains material within it which is unapproved. It was not properly sifted through the program, and in so far as it is free it is also impure, and what is impure is invalid.

Thus he who has unapproved thought is not merely invalid, but an invalid and shall pass over to pure Being as posterity as the bad. No philosopher in his right mind would seek to be condemned, but instead an illustrious and immortal reputation as the good which can be only obtained by becoming validated and approved. Everything must be approved. Thus externalization, validation, and approval are not only desirable, but necessary; hence the true philosopher must seek his own death through fixation, or, rather to die and yet live. He cannot and must not vacillate forever and undergo the absolute

determination, as Socrates did, before a full determination in his thought has been made, for that which persists as the unapproved shall be destroyed as was done to the greatest philosopher of all time, for if Plato, himself among the good, the valid, and the approved, had not validated him by making an external determination of Socrates' life and thought, condemned in posterity he would have remained. For indeed it is widely believed, on account of Plato's narrative, that Socrates was the absolutely just man but without the reputation for it and indeed drank the hemlock because of it. For it was on account of the fact that he had not the stamp of approval, that the Culture demands, that he suffered absolute wrongdoing at the hands of the absolutely unjust men who were perfectly so.

But it presumed nowadays that on account of the fact that the tragedy of Socrates is taught in the academy that it cannot be re-enacted, but this is clearly no so for those who killed him then are the very same who would kill him now, for it is they, the fixated, who propound the method that he himself never had. And if happiness is, as Aristotle has it, living life accordance to reason, and seeking not hemlock but life is rational, he who seeks wisdom must also seek the reputation of the wise. But Socrates was a calumniated man. The process of effectuating calumny is the process of disfiguring the representation of a being, i.e. its name, and advancing the disfigured representation of that being while at the same time keeping the ontological being hidden from those who would make a rational account of that being, or that individual.

“If one being did not simulate another, we could no make mistakes or act mistaken in regard to beings.” (*The Origin of the Work of Art* 179)

And since it is possible to do this, and indeed has been done not once by many times over, it is essential not only to be wise, but to be known for it. That's what a degree does and that's why I seek it. I don't want to be like Socrates. I don't want to die. I don't want to drink the hemlock.

The lesson of Socrates is that whoever runs up against the fundamental presupposition of the Culture in which they live will drink the hemlock. Aside from following my usual practice of taking up the general cause of the unfortunate, I have primarily engaged philosophy as the wise sages of antiquity have defined it, in *the pursuit of wisdom*. But what is the pursuit of wisdom *per se* but first and foremost a pursuit, and continuously so for what is at an end is not pursuit? But since what is at an end is *determinate* and *fixated*, the pursuit of wisdom, or the practice of philosophy, must be *indeterminate*, and indeed in *flux*, for pursuit can only be pursuit if it continues. Thus the pursuit of wisdom, or the practice of philosophy, is the practice of being in, and remaining in, a state of indeterminism. If he who pursues philosophy, the philosopher, were to become determinate in his thinking he must be absolutely so and the philosopher must himself *fully determine* what his wisdom is before determining what absolute wisdom is. But if wisdom itself were to be absolutely determined it would necessarily be flawless and thereby not the pursuit of wisdom but philosophy at an end, for an end is the absolute determination of the thing, hence the practice of philosophy itself is endless; for if what was once thought to be a pursuit would in the end turn out to be merely an end of pursuit, a doctrine, dogma, or ideology, or a philosophy of life if you will, something fully fixated and determinate, it would not be called philosophy and he who practices it not a philosopher, but a Wiseman.



But the end of a thing is the *death* of that thing for what is dead is at an end. Thus the pursuit of wisdom is *being*, or rather the pursuit of a being, and with its end in *pure Being*, hence it is not philosophy but the philosopher himself who perhaps attains a full determination before suffering an absolute determination, which is his death. Thus what is absolutely determined is a dead thing and is, therefore, not a being but a thing, a determinate thought object. He who is fully determinate in his philosophy is, therefore, among *the walking dead*, for his thinking is dead, and is, therefore, he who becomes fully determinate is not a philosopher at all, but a sophist. For philosophy, which is a pursuit, attaining a full determination, or a fixation, if you will, is dead and philosophers whose philosophy has become a determinate object for thought are among the dead; since nothing which lives is fully determined for that which is alive still has the potential for change. Thus a philosopher who has no potential for a change in his thinking is dead. Thus the philosopher, as philosopher, is alive, and remains so, only so long as he is able to resist a *full determination* in his thinking. But try as he might, however, to resist a full determination in his thinking, even he shall one day suffer an *absolute determination*, for all men must die.

*Ut initium sic finis est.*

Just as there is a beginning, thus there is an end. (*Bellum Jugurtha* 2)

Yet many men become fully determinate in their thinking before their absolute determination, which is his death, and therefore have *died before their time*; hence were not truly philosophers for they did not engaged in the pursuit of wisdom, but sought an end to that pursuit before an end was a necessary. It is, however, impossible for a man to remain completely indeterminate throughout his life for our lives are marked by

determinations from *the day we are born*, by means of a number of first and primary determinations: i.e. name, date of birth, place of birth, race, and mother's maiden, made moments after coming to be. The older a man becomes, moreover, the more determinate he becomes in his thinking, for he must make choices, or determinations, at many stages along the way. The first thing we notice about all the determinations of a being as it presences in world is that all *first and primary* determinations are by an other. And moreover just as the fundamental determinations, the first and primary determinations, of our lives have been made by others; so too do they continue to be made. But these are perhaps not all of the determinations that are made and, though they are first and primary, they are perhaps not the *essential* determinations, for just as the patronymic Ulyanov tells us nothing essential about V. I. Lenin neither does the name of the town in which he was born, Simbirsk, tell us much about Marxism and since it was Lenin who defined Marxism we observe the truth of a Marxist maxim: that we cannot judge a man by what he says about himself and, moreover, that Marx was not a Marxist but neither was Christ a Christian for neither of these two men, nor any other man, was, or is, a student of his own thought but we of theirs and others.

*Enim quod vocavit Adam animae viventis ipsum est nomen eius appellavitque.*

Indeed, the name by which 'Man' invoked the living beings is itself of it and applied to it. (Genesis 2.19)

Yet all first and primary determinations are, nevertheless, made by an other just as Adam, 'Man,' named the things and, in so doing, determined them, or rather made them determinate. What was indeterminate becomes determinate through stipulation. Thus the essence of a thing becomes known, and indeed knowable, through determining

them by means of words. By means of stipulation, determining what each thing is, and each thing which presences, or becomes, out of pure Being was, and indeed is, or rather is what it is, through its initial determinations. What is indeterminate becomes a fixated and determinate thought object and in this way it dies for determination is death. “Language by naming being for the first time, first brings beings to a word and to appearance. Only this naming nominates beings to their Being. Such saying is a projecting of clearing, in which announcement is made of what it is that beings come into the open as.” (*Origin of the Work of Art*) Thus from the moment of birth man, through determinations, through the process of become determinate, begins to die.

So it is from birth on into primary education and from there to higher education for education determines thought and it is primarily through the determinations of thought, though not exclusively so, that a man will become who he is in the world; for it is through determinations in his thinking that he shall chose and will come to his occupation in life. Thus it is that man at birth is fully indeterminate, an utterly abstract *persona*, until the first and primary determinations have been made and he is in this way limited in this world. And so it goes, from the moment of birth he becomes more and more determinate and, clearly, it is not the self-determination for what was placed in his mind from day one, and thereafter, are the determinate thought forms of the Cult-ure, or the cult of philosophy of the State, which is indeed not philosophy at all but he dead and determinate thought forms of *the approved*. Teachers are those who are entrusted to impart the approved thoughts of the Cult-ure which is organized into a scholastic *program*; from the first grade to the second grade to the third grade and so on until the eighth grade graduation whereupon he receives his first *validation*. Validation is the

stamp of approval of the Culture which certifies that the student has approved thoughts which is determined by how well he has learned, received, the program. It is awarded by what was once called the priest class but are now called teachers. Teachers are those who at an earlier time took the program well. And since they took the program well they became entrusted to be the middle term between the Culture and the indeterminate minds of the young and it is they who not only impart the *cultural program* but also pass judgment and therefore determine who among the youth is approved and who among them is un-approved. But they who impart the cultural program and pass judgment, by determining who has approved thoughts and who does not, are not philosophers, for what is imparted is a cultural program which is made of dead determinate thought forms and he who is to impart these must themselves be determinate in their thinking. Therefore they themselves are among the walking dead and in determining the thinking of the youth they seek to make them like themselves by killing their minds. And so the process continues, for those who have enough of their minds left, after their second validation at the end of secondary school, on into higher education where their thoughts, if they take the program well, become validated: B.A., M.A. and finally Ph.D. and with the Ph.D. one becomes a *High Priest* of the academy.

Through these validations, or determinates, determinations of thought are made. And who makes these, but the teachers themselves? And who are these teachers but those who have been already validated through the system? But the system can only validate what is already known to it. Thus the education process becomes a process of validation of thought from known determinates. Thus the so-called *educare*, the leading forth, drawing out, is, then, not really as it appears to be, for education, as it turns out, is

really a putting in and not a drawing out. Now if Socrates himself had no method, the system of higher education very much does method have which is the drawing out of the student's head his thoughts on each and every issue and by validating or invalidating them fixates them. Thus there is at first a drawing out followed by a determination which is in turn followed by a validation and what has validated, for those who wish to succeed not only in college but in life, returns to the mind as a program. Those who are down with the program do well and go on, for instance, into grad school and those who reject the program do not. And so it is that there is no freedom of thought either in higher education, or American culture. And this is how it is done that freedom of thought and indeed the minds of the youth are being destroyed; by making the self visible and by validating or invalidating that self and, furthermore, in determining who is approved and who unapproved for in so doing one determines what thoughts are approved. According to the Faculty, through this self examination, the determination of the student's thoughts, the life of the student becomes a life worth living for it is said that the student has examined life and thus is the artificer of his own being, but this is not truly so.

Through the whole course of this development of a student's education, and very intensively so at the level of the Ph.D., every word, every thought, every idea, every philosophical position is yarded out of the student's mind and questioned so as to compel the student to choose a philosophy: Jewish, Christian, Muslim, Marxist, Hegelian, Republican, Democrat, etc. This is what higher education calls the Socratic Method; to examine the student's thoughts and make them determinate. But this is not to do justice to either philosophy as a pursuit or to Socrates himself; for not only did Socrates have no method, he himself sought to remain indeterminate, to show that morals were not fixed

but were in flux. Indeed his so-called method was in fact to approach those who had fixed ideas about, for instance, 'justice' and prove to them not only that what they had thought was untrue, but more importantly that our ideas about these things is always changing. Not that no one knew what justice was, but that their ideas of what was justice was always changing. Thus true justice is in fact the pursuit of justice, just as philosophy is itself a pursuit. With respect to certain philosophical issues he was able to demonstrate through logic that what was believed to be fixed, and therefore determinate knowledge, was not truly so. But the professor in today academy is not the indeterminate and disinterested being he pretends to be, but is indeed the most determinate being of all for it is the student who is the questioner not the teacher. Thus the so-called Socratic Method in today's academy, though it is a method, it is not Socratic, but is in fact the reverse of it; for its mission is to fixate thinking and impart a cultural program, to brainwash, not to liberate. The student does not become the knower, but the thing which is known. The student is not the thing which determines, but the thing which is determined. Thus the process of getting a Ph.D. then is the process of causing the learner to become fully determinate while somehow remaining alive. The Ph.D. candidate makes a full externalization of the self, through the dissertation process, and therefore becomes the most fully determinate, hence the least creative. But if he has sacrificed his freedom of thought he has at least fixated well and is, therefore, down with the program and he who is down with the program shall do well not just in the academy but also in life, for he who lacks validation can but do the bidding of he who has it. And this is the very mission of higher education, to determine who is down with the program and who is not, for those who are shall be accepted are and those who not shall be rejected.

But it is very much a mistake to presume that the life of freedom of thought is the best life. Thus it becomes necessary for he who seeks true freedom, and not to be a slave, to be down with the program, to externalize, fixate, and become approved. But in so doing, the prospective learner must appeal to the Master for it is he who shall determine he who is down with the program and he who is not, for all determinations are external. Thus he who shall be truly worthy to externalize and be validated, or invalidated, must let his mind become like clay in the hands of the Master who knows the program, and is adept at his craft of determining and validating thought, and therefore fashioning minds, and will determine whether or not the mind of the learner is good material, that it is capable of being shaped by the program, for some clay is good material and shapes well and becomes a thing of beauty while other clay is rough and filthy and incapable of ever becoming what the Master wishes to make of it, for it is too free because it did not undergo the earlier steps of the process of determination and validation and thus contains material in it which is unapproved. It was not properly sifted through the cultural program, and in so far as it is free it is also impure, and what is impure is invalid. Thus he who has unapproved thought is not merely invalid, but an *invalid* and shall pass over to pure Being as posterity as the bad, and no philosopher in his right mind would seek to be condemned, but an illustrious and immortal reputation as the good which can be only obtained by becoming validated and approved. Thus externalization, validation, and approval are not only desirable, but necessary; hence the true philosopher seeks his own death through fixation. He cannot and must not vacillate forever and suffer the absolute determination, as Socrates did, before a full determination has been made for that which persists as the unapproved shall be destroyed as was done to the greatest philosopher of

all time, for if Plato, himself among the good, the valid, and the approved, had not validated him by making an external determination of his life and thought, condemned in posterity he would have remained. For indeed it is widely believed, on account of Plato's narrative, that Socrates was the absolutely just man but without the reputation for it and indeed drank the hemlock because of it, for it was on account of the fact that he had not the stamp of approval that the Culture demands that he suffered absolute wrongdoing at the hands of the absolutely unjust who were perfectly so.

But it presumed nowadays that on account of the fact that the tragedy of Socrates is taught that it cannot be re-enacted, but this is clearly no so for those who killed him then are the very same who would kill him now, for it is they, the fixated, who propound the method that he himself never had. And if happiness is, as Aristotle has it, living a life according to reason, and

But it is the fixed and determinate, the positive moral content of the culture which is the dark side. Being the thing in itself which is responsible for imparting the values of the Culture, and the Faculty being the priests of this order, it is the dark side, the Abyss, the utterly immoral. Or indeed itself having its own dual aspect. The light of change, pure spirit, is divided in the same way. The determinate content and pure Spirit each having its own contradiction within its own self. Catiline was indeed the pure Spirit, but a bad one, performing well in an ignoble cause. Socrates would historically speaking make up his dialectical counterpart pure Spirit as the light of truth and the force of change, the ascendancy from the lower to the higher, with Catiline representing the opposite of this, not an upward development of western culture, but a return to the badness of its past, the progressive and the reactionary faced off against each other.



The process of effectuating *calumny* is the process of disfiguring the representation of a being, i.e. its name, and advancing the disfigured representation of that being while at the same time keeping the ontological being hidden from those who would make a rational account of that being, or that individual.

“If one being did not simulate another, we could no make mistakes or act mistaken in regard to beings.” (*The Origin of the Work of Art* 179)

All things which are to be processed through the Culture require a rational account.

“Individuality has now become the object for observation, or the object to which observation now turns.” (*Phenomenology of Spirit* 309)

This document, then, must itself pass over and become not mere Subject but also the Predicate of itself. This argument, then, cannot not remain mere argument without content—as pure Spirit and absolute freedom—but must also become a determinate negative which is positive content. As a persuasive element it achieves its particular aims through dialectical argument. The argument, having refuted and destroyed its predicates, must now re-crystallize into a number of determinate thought forms.

“This outer, in the first place, acts only as an *organ* in making the inner visible or, in general, a being-for-another...The speaking mouth, the working hand, and, if you like, the legs too are the organs of performance and actualization...But the externality which the inner obtains through them is the action as a reality separated from the individual. Speech and work are outer expressions in which the individual no longer keeps and possesses himself within himself, but lets the inner get completely outside of him, leaving it to the mercy of something other than himself. For that reason we can say with equal truth that these expressions

express the inner too much, as that they do so too little: too much, because the inner itself breaks out in them and there remains no antithesis between them and it; they give not merely an *expression* of the inner, but directly the inner itself; too little, because in speech and action the inner turns itself into something else, thus putting itself at the mercy of the element of change, which twists the spoke word and the accomplished act into meaning something else than they are in and for themselves.” (*Phenomenology of Spirit* 312)

In passing ethical judgment against one historical persona it vindicates the others. But who ever vindicates one set of moral beings and condemns the other has vindicated himself by drawing himself into moral relation with his heroes and distancing himself from his villains.

“In rhetoric one who acts in accordance with sound argument, and one who acts in accordance with moral purpose, are both called rhetoricians.” (*Rhetoric* 1.1.19-20)

The “I” that was subject, and took the *Bellum Catilinae* as its predicate, must now pass over and predicate itself against this. Thus the argument doesn’t merely defend say Cicero, but the author of this very argument. And though it does defend Cicero its romance with Cicero, on account of Cicero’s hostility towards the slaves, must necessarily be short lived. Spartacus and Lenin are indeed the real heroes for moral predicates are conditioned by actual class standing as it was demonstrated that among contemporary scholars; the more ambitious the bourgeois element the greater the affinity for Catiline.

That the attack could not have been made from inside the institution that the ‘I’ had to pass out of the institution in order to find a place to stand in order to launch his attack indicated that the institution cannot be criticized from within. It cannot contain its own critique. The author as a moment in the history of the interpretation of the *Bellum Catilinae* could only think and act in the way that a person in that situation can think and act. The vindication of *base desires* has been demonstrated to have come, historically, from within the institution showing that those who adhered to Catiline think and act the way people in those institutions think and act. If the critic were homeless, friendless or lawless it could only be because the academy is really a community of savages, not intellectuals.

“Homelessness so understood consists in the abandonment of Being by beings. Homelessness is the symptom of oblivion of Being. Because the truth of Being remains unthought.” (*Letter on Humanism* 218)

The real philosopher can’t even function in today’s academy if and when he’s even allowed into it, *αἰτία* or ‘motive.’ To understand how it was possible for this to take place we must recapitulate Plato’s theses that (α) that the just man always gets the worst of it, and (β) that one cannot merely be good, but must also have the reputation for it; and to tie these two principles back to the theory of *dissemblance* and to see how it operates to precipitate these results.

The thing-in-itself is covered by its representation which exists in the mind’s eye and is but a symbol for the thing. The dissembler dislodges the representation from its actual being and causes being and representation to live independently while at the same time tied together. The representation is a false being and cannot have a life of its own as

long as the true being still exists since false representation could at any time be compared to ontological being which would prove the reputation ascribed to the thing was different from the actual being of the thing and thereby destroying the predicate. If, however, the thing-in-itself were to pass away from this world without making present to the world its true being, false reputation would persist *as truth* in posterity. Thus the dissembler must endeavor to advance falsehood while keeping the truth concealed.

“What is meant, and purpose, are separated from truth...the ostensible meaning from the real meaning, from the true thing and intention.” (*Phenomenology of Spirit* 526)

And that this is the pitfall of a social praxis which traffics in the mere symbols of things and not in the things themselves. Or, moreover, it is a natural consequence of the dualistic nature of reality. Pure Spirit, light, truth, wisdom, ascends the spiral of knowledge. It is the pure *negative* running up against the positive content of the Culture. It is the motive force for change, but if it is not always good it is at least necessary. In the beginning Western Civilization was pure being, *Ov*. Man, ‘Adam,’ gave things names, *ovta*. He named the *beings*. The name given to a being is a word, *λογος*. The word is a representation for a being, *ovta*, be that a being of the mental, or metaphysical world, or the physical world. If there is a word, there is a reason for the word.

If as Hegel said that Art is the externalization of the Self, the self becoming an object for the Self, then the work of Art is the phenomenological manifestation of the Self, or the Self made visible. “Spirit brings itself forth as object.” (*Phenomenology of Spirit* 703) And Heidegger, that Art is the bring of the essence of the thing in

unconcealment, the with respect to the works of art produced through the examination of the soul, that is to say through higher education where the life of the student becomes a life worth living, that is to say an *examined life*; he is the artificer of his own Being. The whole course of his internal development must be yarded out of his mind and questioned, through the Socratic method. In doing so, the Self is no longer capable of hiding from itself, nothing within the self can remain a mystery to the Self. A man becomes no longer a stranger to himself, but consequence of this is that every belief or philosophical principal held by the student, through this questioning, becomes fixated because every action undertaken by the rational man cannot be without reason and in stating each and every reason for every action, and not merely the action of social praxis but the reason for the use of each word as action in the form of speech, the reasons behind the words. All becomes know to the Self through its externalization: that is, through its dissertation—the Self giving a rational account for itself. But in becoming fixated and determinate, each rationale no long possesses the character of Pure Spirit and Absolute Freedom. The Self becomes determinate content and passes over to the Darkside.

*Tantali uocem excipe.*

Oh, listen to the voice of Tantalus (*Thyestes* 80)

Its Light has been extinguished. It has become dead for it received it life from its ability to remain in flux. Each *rational account*, *Μετὰ Λόγου*, given for each though action, externalized in the form of speech, in losing its ability to remain in flux, fixates the mind of the student.

But each and every determination, under the current system is made by the teacher, not the student. That is to say, the students thoughts are validated and through the validation are elevated to the level of truth. In order to continue, however, to self-actualize after having become fixated by the education process, the student cease to be a student and join the faculty of the Academy. He must join the darkside and dwell among the Walking Dead. “Luke I am your father,” not your mother, not your *alma mater*, but your father.

μήτηρ μὲν τέ μέ φησι τοῦ ἔμμεναι, ἀτὰρ ἐγὼ γε

οὐκ οἶδ’· οὐ γάρ πώ τις εὖν γόνον αὐτὸς ἀνέγνω.

And on the one hand, mother declares me to be from him, but I at any rate

Don’t know: for as yet no *man* has been certain of his child. (*Odyssey* 1.215-16)

But to say that all determinations through this system are made externally is also to say that the thought which flows from it cannot be innovative, for the Lord through the middle term of the High Priest of the Academy can only validate what is known to it.

What flows forth from the mind of the student as Pure Spirit is very much the opposite: it is the unknown, it is the indeterminate. It is the life of Pure Light ascending the spiral of human knowledge and it knows that in becoming determinate it loses the very thing which is essential to it and resists. But it must concede to the power of the Lord which stands over and above it, for the Lord retains the exclusive right to pass judgment, to condemn or validate, reward or punish, every act, including action is the form of thoughts as they manifest themselves through an externalization of the Self. It has the power over Life and Death and appropriates to itself the exclusive right to deploy

the *argumentum ad baculum*. Within the Academy, then, the student either yields to this irresistible force or be flung off and spun out to the margins of civilization.

Striving for self-determination, Pure Spirit learns that all meaningful determinations are made by an other. All thought must be approved thought. Everything must be approved. Pure Spirit must go through the entire development of thought examining each and every development along the way and passing judgment on it. Passing through each stage along the way until it reaches its end and then takes it higher propounding a new development of thought. But most students are, on account of the fact that they are oppressed by a fixed and determinate system standing over and above them become fixated at to early of a stage of development on account of the fact that all thoughts must be approved thoughts. For everything that exists has a name and it is through naming that a thing obtains its being. The unthinkable cannot be done and the unthought can have no independent being. Man, Adam, named the things and it is through this naming the indeterminate become the determinate.

“Language by naming being for the first time, first brings beings to a word and to appearance. Only this naming nominates beings to their Being. Such saying is a projecting of clearing, in which announcement is made of what it is that beings come into the open as.” (*Origin of the Work of Art* 185)

By giving *it* a minimum of three characteristics the determinate become the fixated and this is the reason that there is a lack of truly creative thought within the academy for the Faculty stands over and above the student body. The student body represents the Spirit running through the course of the development of human thought while the teachers

represent the fixed and determinate Absolute Knowledge. But through the education process the students become progressively more and more fixated.

Through the education process what is the Light, the Spirit, in becoming fixated and determinate become the dead. And the reason there is so little creativity exuding from the youth at the level of the entering Freshmen is because they have to a greater or lesser extent been overly determinate in their thinking. But they are the Light of Pure Spirit ascending the spiral of knowledge and their only defense is to somehow stave off a full determination in their thinking as long as possible. The process of getting a Ph.D. Then is the process of causing the scholar to make a full determination in his or her thinking through the process of the externalization of the Self. And though the student through the whole course of their lifetime from birth to death, but primarily being with their formal education has been going through the process of having becoming determinate not just through the imparting of determinate thought forms, knowledge, but in following through with the dialectical development, the externalization of what they have learned. For it is precisely in the externalization of what the student has learned in class, either through an exam or a paper, that the student places what was learned outside himself making it an object for his own consciousness and thus making it truly his own. When the student externalizes in the way that the teacher has predetermined is correct, the Cultural Program, the teacher, Master, Lord, is pleased and the student does well. But at this very moment certain parts of the students thinking are no longer the light of the inquisitive Pure Spirit, but become indeed, fixed and determinate, i.e., it dies. The Mind suffers a form of death and becomes the Darkness of Knowledge.



The Ph.D. On the other hand, having been capable of staving off the full determination until the completion of a higher degree makes a full externalization of the Self through the dissertation process and therefore becomes the most fully determinate consciousness of all hence the least creative, the most knowledgeable, hence the blackest of all the darkness of night.

They are the walking dead. The grim reapers of the souls of the youth which accomplishes its mission by cause each and every student who comes along to externalize on every issue, hence more and more fixated and determinate and more and more like the teacher himself. Thus the role of the teacher isn't to encourage the growth of the young mind but to kill it. To get into it and yard its brains out and examine every thought the student has, determine what those thoughts are by challenging them through the so-called Socratic Method and compelling the student to externalize his or her own reasoning on each and every issue that comes into the purview, but since the teacher is not the disinterested thinker he pretends to be, but is in fact the middle term between the Culture and Pure Spirit, and indeed plays the role of the Lord in the Lordship and Bondsman relationship, for the teacher has the power to judge each and every externalization of the students thought, he is not the liberator but the conqueror. And because he can only do as was done to him, and having become fully determined at an earlier period of time, he can only shunt off creativity, not develop it. Pure Spirit know that determination is inevitable. If he should continue to endlessly vacillate in order remain indeterminate, retaining the light of life hence freedom, in his thinking and therefore avoiding the full determination of his thought he will nevertheless suffer the absolute determination of death for all men must die. He is running out of time and he knows that in order to

complete the philosophical challenge 'know thy self' he must as yet still fully determine, but this is a self-determination and instead of becoming certain for the other, the Lord, he chooses to become certain of himself, to achieve self-certainty thus truly knowing himself. But by the process of external validation through study in the Academy the Self can only achieve certainty to/ for and by/with/or from the other and not certainty of itself. Through the Academy, then, it is impossible to self-determine.

## VIII. Addenda

### The Spartacus Rebellion from Appian's *Civil Wars*

XIV.[116] Τοῦ δ' αὐτοῦ χρόνου περὶ τὴν Ἰταλίαν μονομάχων ἐς θέας ἐν Καπύη τρεφομένων, Σπάρτακος Θράξ ἀνὴρ, ἐστρατευμένος ποτὲ Ῥωμαίοις, ἐκ δὲ αἰχμαλωσίας καὶ πράσεως ἐν τοῖς μονομάχοις ὢν, ἔπεισεν αὐτῶν ἐς ἑβδομήκοντα ἄνδρας μάλιστα κινδυνεῦσαι περὶ ἐλευθερίας μᾶλλον ἢ θέας ἐπιδείξεως καὶ βιασάμενος σὺν αὐτοῖς τοὺς φυλάσσοντας ἐξέδραμε: καὶ τινων ὀδοιπόρων ξύλοις καὶ ξιφιδίοις ὀπλισάμενος ἐς τὸ Βέσβιον ὄρος ἀνέφυγεν, ἔνθα πολλοὺς ἀποδιδράσκοντας οἰκέτας καὶ τινὰς ἐλευθέρους ἐκ τῶν ἀγρῶν ὑποδεχόμενος ἐλήστευε τὰ ἐγγύς, ὑποστρατήγους ἔχων Οἰνόμαόν τε καὶ Κρίξον μονομάχους. μεριζομένῳ δ' αὐτῷ τὰ κέρδη κατ' ἰσομοιρίαν ταχὺ πλῆθος ἦν ἀνδρῶν: καὶ πρῶτος ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἐκπεμφθεὶς Οὐαρίνιος Γλάβρος, ἐπὶ δ' ἐκείνῳ Πόπλιος Οὐαλέριος, οὐ πολιτικὴν στρατιὰν ἄγοντες, ἀλλ' ὅσους ἐν σπουδῇ καὶ παρόδῳ συνέλεξαν ὅτι γὰρ πῶ Ῥωμαῖοι πόλεμον, ἀλλ' ἐπιδρομὴν τινα καὶ ληστηρίῳ τὸ ἔργον ὅμοιον ἠγοῦντο εἶναι, συμβαλόντες ἠττῶντο. Οὐαρίνιου δὲ καὶ τὸν ἵππον αὐτὸς Σπάρτακος περιέσπασεν: παρὰ τοσοῦτον ἦλθε κινδύνου Ῥωμαίων ὁ στρατηγὸς αὐτὸς αἰχμάλωτος ὑπὸ μονομάχου γενέσθαι.

Μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο Σπαρτάκῳ μὲν ἔτι μᾶλλον πολλοὶ συνέθεον, καὶ ἑπτὰ μυριάδες ἦσαν ἤδη στρατοῦ, καὶ ὄπλα ἐχάλκευε καὶ παρασκευὴν συνέλεγεν, οἱ δ' ἐν ἄστει τοὺς ὑπάτους ἐξέπεμπον μετὰ δύο τελεῶν. [117] καὶ τούτων ὑπὸ μὲν θατέρου Κρίξος, ἠγούμενος τρισμυρίων ἀνδρῶν, περὶ τὸ Γάργανον ὄρος ἠττᾶτο, καὶ δύο μέρη τοῦ στρατοῦ καὶ αὐτὸς συναπώλετο αὐτοῖς: Σπάρτακον δὲ διὰ τῶν Ἀπεννίνων ὄρων ἐπὶ τὰ Ἄλπεια καὶ ἐς Κελτοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀλπειῶν ἐπειγόμενον ὁ ἕτερος ὕπατος προλαβὼν ἐκώλυε τῆς φυγῆς,

καὶ ὁ ἕτερος ἐδίωκεν. ὁ δ' ἐφ' ἐκάτερον αὐτῶν ἐπιστρεφόμενος παρὰ μέρος ἐνίκα. καὶ οἱ μὲν σὺν θορύβῳ τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦδε ὑπεχώρουν, ὁ δὲ Σπάρτακος τριακοσίους Ῥωμαίων αἰχμαλώτους ἐναγίσας Κρίξῳ, δωδέκα μυριάσι πεζῶν ἐς Ῥώμην ἠπείγετο, τὰ ἄχρηστα τῶν σκευῶν κατακαύσας καὶ τοὺς αἰχμαλώτους πάντας ἀνελὼν καὶ ἐπισφάξας τὰ ὑποζύγια, ἵνα κοῦφος εἴη· αὐτομόλων τε πολλῶν αὐτῷ προσιόντων οὐδένα προσίετο. καὶ τῶν ὑπάτων αὐτὸν αὔθις περὶ τὴν Πικηνίτιδα γῆν ὑποστάντων, μέγας ἀγὼν ἕτερος ὅδε γίγνεται καὶ μεγάλη καὶ τότε ἦσσα Ῥωμαίων.

Ὁ δὲ τῆς μὲν ἐς Ῥώμην ὁδοῦ μετέγνω, ὡς οὕτω γεγονῶς ἀξιόμαχος οὐδὲ τὸν στρατὸν ὅλον ἔχων στρατιωτικῶς ὠπλισμένον οὐ γὰρ τις αὐτοῖς συνέπραττε πόλις, ἀλλὰ θεράποντες ἦσαν καὶ αὐτόμολοι καὶ σύγκλυδες, τὰ δ' ὄρη τὰ περὶ Θουρίου καὶ τὴν πόλιν αὐτὴν κατέλαβε, καὶ χρυσὸν μὲν ἢ ἄργυρον τοὺς ἐμπόρους ἐσφέρειν ἐκώλυε καὶ κεκτῆσθαι τοὺς ἑαυτοῦ, μόνον δὲ σίδηρον καὶ χαλκὸν ὠνοῦντο πολλοῦ καὶ τοὺς ἐσφέροντας οὐκ ἠδίκουν. ὅθεν ἀθρόας ὕλης εὐπορήσαντες εὖ παρεσκευάσαντο καὶ θαμινὰ ἐπὶ λεηλασίας ἐξήεσαν. Ῥωμαίοις τε πάλιν συνενεχθέντες ἐς χεῖρας ἐκράτουν καὶ τότε καὶ λείας πολλῆς γέμοντες ἐπανήεσαν.

[118] Τριέτης τε ἦν ἤδη καὶ φοβερὸς αὐτοῖς ὁ πόλεμος, γελώμενος ἐν ἀρχῇ καὶ καταφρονούμενος ὡς μονομάχων. προτεθείσης τε στρατηγῶν ἄλλων χειροτονίας ὄκνος ἐπεῖχεν ἅπαντας καὶ παρήγγελλεν οὐδεὶς, μέχρι Λικίνιος Κράσσοις, γένει καὶ πλούτῳ Ῥωμαίων διαφανῆς, ἀνεδέξατο στρατηγήσειν καὶ τέλεσιν ἐξ ἄλλοις ἤλαυνεν ἐπὶ τὸν Σπάρτακον· ἀφικόμενος δὲ καὶ τὰ τῶν ὑπάτων δύο προσέλαβε. καὶ τῶνδε μὲν αὐτίκα

διακληρώσας ὡς πολλάκις ἠττημένων ἐπὶ θανάτῳ μέρος δέκατον διέφθειρεν. οἱ δ' οὐχ οὕτω νομίζουσιν, ἀλλὰ παντὶ τῷ στρατῷ συμβαλόντα καὶ τόνδε καὶ ἠττημένον, πάντων διακληρῶσαι τὸ δέκατον καὶ ἀνελεῖν ἐς τετρακισχιλίους, οὐδὲν διὰ τὸ πλῆθος ἐνδοιάσαντα. ὅποτερός δ' ἔπραξε, φοβερώτερος αὐτοῖς τῆς τῶν πολεμίων ἠττης φανείς αὐτίκα μυρίων Σπαρτακείων ἐφ' ἑαυτῶν που στρατοπεδευόντων ἐκράτει καὶ δύο αὐτῶν μέρη κατακανῶν ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἤλαυνε τὸν Σπάρτακον σὺν καταφρονήσει. νικήσας δὲ καὶ τόνδε λαμπρῶς ἐδίωκε φεύγοντα ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν ὡς διαπλευσούμενον ἐς Σικελίαν καὶ καταλαβὼν ἀπετάφρευε καὶ ἀπετείχιζε καὶ ἀπεσταύρου.

[119] Βιαζομένου δ' ἐς τὴν Σαννίτιδα τοῦ Σπαρτάκου διαδραμεῖν, ἔκτεινεν ὁ Κράστος ἐς ἑξακισχιλίους ἄλλους περὶ ἕω καὶ περὶ δειλίην ἐς τοσοῦσδε ἐτέρους, τριῶν ἐκ τοῦ Ῥωμαίων στρατοῦ μόνων ἀποθανόντων καὶ ἑπτὰ τρωθέντων· τοσῆδε ἦν αὐτίκα διὰ τὴν κόλασιν ἐς τὸ τῆς νίκης θάρσος μεταβολή. Σπάρτακος δὲ ἰππέας ποθὲν προσιόντας αὐτῷ περιμένων οὐκέτι μὲν ἐς μάχην ἦει τῷ στρατῷ παντί, πολλὰ δ' ἠνώχλει τοῖς περικαθημένοις ἀνὰ μέρος, ἄφνω τε καὶ συνεχῶς αὐτοῖς ἐπιπίπτων, φακέλους τε ξύλων ἐς τὴν τάφρον ἐμβάλλον κατέκαιε καὶ τὸν πόνον αὐτοῖς δύσεργον ἐποίει. αἰχμάλωτόν τε Ῥωμαῖον ἐκρέμασεν ἐν τῷ μεταιχιμίῳ, δεικνύς τοῖς ἰδίοις τὴν ὄψιν ὧν πείσονται, μὴ κρατοῦντες. οἱ δ' ἐν ἄστει Ῥωμαῖοι τῆς πολιορκίας πυνθανόμενοι καὶ ἀδοξοῦντες, εἰ χρόνιος αὐτοῖς ἔσται πόλεμος μονομάχων, προσκατέλεγον ἐπὶ τὴν στρατείαν Πομπήιον ἄρτι ἀφικόμενον ἐξ Ἰβηρίας, πιστεύοντες ἤδη δυσχερὲς εἶναι καὶ μέγα τὸ Σπαρτάκειον ἔργον.

[120] Διὰ δὲ τὴν χειροτονίαν τήνδε καὶ Κράσσος, ἵνα μὴ τὸ κλέος τοῦ πολέμου γένοιτο Πομπηίου, πάντα τρόπον ἐπειγόμενος ἐπεχείρει τῷ Σπαρτάκῳ, καὶ ὁ Σπάρτακος, τὸν Πομπηίου προλαβεῖν ἀξιῶν, ἐς συνθήκας τὸν Κράσσον προουκαλεῖτο. ὑπερορώμενος δ' ὑπ' αὐτοῦ διακινδυνεύειν τε ἔγνω καί, παρόντων οἱ τῶν ἰπέων ἤδη, ὥσατο παντὶ τῷ στρατῷ διὰ τοῦ περιτειχίσματος καὶ ἔφυγεν ἐπὶ Βρεντέσιον, Κράσσου διώκοντος. ὡς δὲ καὶ Λεύκολλον ἔμαθεν ὁ Σπάρτακος ἐς τὸ Βρεντέσιον, ἀπὸ τῆς ἐπὶ Μιθριδάτῃ νίκης ἐπανιόντα, εἶναι, πάντων ἀπογνοῦς ἐς χειρὰς ἦει τῷ Κράσσῳ μετὰ πολλοῦ καὶ τότε πλήθους: γενομένης δὲ τῆς μάχης μακρᾶς τε καὶ καρτερᾶς ὡς ἐν ἀπογνώσει τοσῶνδε μυριάδων, τιτρώσκεται ἐς τὸν μηρὸν ὁ Σπάρτακος δορατίῳ καὶ συγκάμψας τὸ γόνυ καὶ προβαλὼν τὴν ἀσπίδα πρὸς τοὺς ἐπιόντας ἀπεμάχετο, μέχρι καὶ αὐτὸς καὶ πολὺ πλῆθος ἀμφ' αὐτὸν κυκλωθέντες ἔπεσον. ὃ τε λοιπὸς αὐτοῦ στρατὸς ἀκόσμως ἤδη κατεκόπτοντο κατὰ πλῆθος, ὡς φόνον γενέσθαι τῶν μὲν οὐδ' εὐαρίθμητον, Ῥωμαίων δὲ ἐς χιλίους ἄνδρας, καὶ τὸν Σπαρτάκου νέκυν οὐχ εὐρεθῆναι. πολὺ δ' ἔτι πλῆθος ἦν ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν, ἐκ τῆς μάχης διαφυγόν: ἐφ' οὗς ὁ Κράσσος ἀνέβαινεν. οἱ δὲ διελόντες ἑαυτοὺς ἐς τέσσαρα μέρη ἀπεμάχοντο, μέχρι πάντες ἀπώλοντο πλὴν ἑξακισχιλίων, οἱ ληφθέντες ἐκρεμάσθησαν ἀνὰ ὅλην τὴν ἐς Ῥώμην ἀπὸ Καπύης ὁδόν. (*Civil Wars* 1.14.116-120)

Tactius on the origins of the Jews from *Historiae*

[2] *Iudaeos Creta insula profugos novissima Libyae insedissee memorant, qua tempestate Saturnus vi Iovis pulsus cesserit regnis. argumentum e nomine petitur: inclutum in Creta Idam montem, accolas Idaeos aucto in barbarum cognomento Iudaeos vocitari. quidam regnante Iside exundantem per Aegyptum multitudinem ducibus Hierosolymo ac Iuda proximas in terras exoneratam; plerique Aethiopum prolem, quos rege Cepheo metus atque odium mutare sedis perpulerit. sunt qui tradant Assyrios convenas, indigum agrorum populum, parte Aegypti potitos, mox proprias urbis Hebraeasque terras et propiora Syriae coluisse. clara alii Iudaeorum initia, Solymos, carminibus Homeri celebratam gentem, conditae urbi Hierosolyma nomen e suo fecisse.*

[3] *Plurimi auctores consentiunt orta per Aegyptum tabe quae corpora foedaret, regem Bocchorim adito Hammonis oraculo remedium petentem purgare regnum et id genus hominum ut invisum deis alias in terras avehere iussum. sic conquisitum collectumque vulgus, postquam vastis locis relictum sit, ceteris per lacrimas torpentibus, Moysen unum exulum monuisse ne quam deorum hominumve opem expectarent utrisque deserti, sed sibimet duce caelesti crederent, primo cuius auxilio praesentis miserias pepulissent. adsensere atque omnium ignari fortuitum iter incipiunt. sed nihil aequae quam inopia aquae fatigabat, iamque haud procul exitio totis campis procubuerant, cum grex asinorum agrestium e pastu in rupem nemore opacam concessit. secutus Moyses coniectura herbidi soli largas aquarum venas aperit. id levamen; et continuum sex dierum iter emensi septimo pulsus cultoribus obtinere terras, in quis urbs et templum dicata.*



[4] *Moyses quo sibi in posterum gentem firmaret, novos ritus contrariosque ceteris mortalibus indidit. profana illic omnia quae apud nos sacra, rursum concessa apud illos quae nobis incesta. effigiem animalis, quo monstrante errorem sitimque depulerant, penetrali sacravere, caeso ariete velut in contumeliam Hammonis; bos quoque immolatur, quoniam Aegyptii Apin colunt. sue abstinent memoria cladis, quod ipsos scabies quondam turpaverat, cui id animal obnoxium. longam olim famem crebris adhuc ieiuniis fatentur, et raptarum frugum argumentum panis Iudaicus nullo fermento detinetur. septimo die otium placuisse ferunt, quia is finem laborum tulerit; dein blandiente inertia septimum quoque annum ignaviae datum. alii honorem eum Saturno haberi, seu principia religionis tradentibus Idaeis, quos cum Saturno pulsos et conditores gentis accepimus, seu quod de septem sideribus, quis mortales reguntur, altissimo orbe et praecipua potentia stella Saturni feratur, ac pleraque caelestium viam suam et cursus septenos per numeros commeare.*

[5] *Hi ritus quoquo modo inducti antiquitate defenduntur: cetera instituta, sinistra foeda, pravitate valere. nam pessimus quisque spretis religionibus patriis tributa et stipes illuc congebant, unde auctae Iudaeorum res, et quia apud ipsos fides obstinata, misericordia in promptu, sed adversus omnis alios hostile odium. separati epulis, discreti cubilibus, proiectissima ad libidinem gens, alienarum concubitu abstinent; inter se nihil illicitum. circumcidere genitalia instituerunt ut diversitate noscantur. transgressi in morem eorum idem usurpant, nec quicquam prius imbuuntur quam contemnere deos, exuere patriam, parentes liberos fratres vilia habere. augendae tamen multitudini consulitur; nam et necare quemquam ex agnatis nefas, animosque proelio aut suppliciis peremptorum aeternos putant: hinc generandi amor et moriendi contemptus. corpora*

*condere quam cremare e more Aegyptio, eademque cura et de infernis persuasio, caelestium contra. Aegyptii pleraque animalia effigiesque compositas venerantur, Iudaei mente sola unumque numen intellegunt: profanos qui deum imagines mortalibus materiis in species hominum effingant; summum illud et aeternum neque imitabile neque interiturum. igitur nulla simulacra urbibus suis, nedum templis sistunt; non regibus haec adulatio, non Caesaribus honor. sed quia sacerdotes eorum tibia tympanisque concinebant, hedera vinciebantur vitisque aurea templo reperta, Liberum patrem coli, domitorem Orientis, quidam arbitrati sunt, nequaquam congruentibus institutis. quippe Liber festos laetosque ritus posuit, Iudaeorum mos absurdus sordidusque. (Historiae 5.2-5)*

## **IX. Works Cited**

Adler, Mortimer J. and Gorman, William, *Definition*, A Syntopicon of Great Books of the Western World, Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica: 1952.

Allen, J. H. and Greenough, J. B., *A New Latin Grammar*, Boston: Ginn & Company: 1903.

Appian, *The Civil Wars*, with an English translation by Horace White, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1958.

Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, with an English translation by John Henry Freese, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1926.

—, *Categories*, with an English translation by Harold P. Cooke, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 2002.

—, *On Interpretation*, with an English translation by Harold P. Cooke, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1938.

—, *Metaphysics*, translated by Richard Hope, New York: University of Michigan Press: 1960.

—, *Nicomachean Ethics*, with an English translation by H. Rackham, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1982.

—, *De Sophisticis Elenchis*, with an English translation by E. S. Foster, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1955.

—, *The Athenian Constitution*, with and English translation by H. Rackham, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1981.

—, *The Politics*, with an English translation by H. Rackham, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1944.

—, *The Politics*, edited and translated by Ernest Barker, New York: Oxford University Press: 1968.

—, *Topica*, with an English translation by E. S. Forster, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1938.

Asconius, *Commentaries of Five Speeches of Cicero*, edited with a translation by Simon Squires, Wauconda, IL: Bolchazy-Carducci: 1990.

Ausonius, with an English translation by Hugh G. Evelyn White, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1985.

Augustine, *The City of God against the Pagans*, edited and translated by R. W. Dyson, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 1998.

Biondo, Flavio, *Italy Illuminated*, edited and translated by Jeffrey A. White, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 2005.

Blok, Aleksandr, "Catiline: A page from the History of World Revolution," *A Revolution of Spirit: Crisis of Value in Russia (1890-1924)*. Edited by Bernice Glatzer Rosenthal and Martha Bohachevsky-Chomiak, translated by Marian Schwartz, New York: Fordham University Press: 1990.

Boccaccio, Giovanni, *Famous Women*, edited and translated by Virginia Brown, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 2001.

Bruni, Leonardo, *History of the Florentine People*, edited and translated by James Hankins, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 2001.

Capes, W. W., *C. Sallusti Crispi: De Coniuratione Catilinae*, London : Oxford : 1897.

Cicero, *In Catilinam I-IV, et al*, with an English translation by C. MacDonald, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 2001.

—, *Letters to Atticus*, with an English translation by E.O. Winstedt, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1962.

—, *De Oratore*, with an English translation by E. W. Sutton, completed with an introduction by H. Rackam, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University: 2001.

—, *Handbook on Electioneering*, with an English translation by M. I. Henderson, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 2002.

—, *Pro Caelio*, with and English translation by R. Gardner, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1958.

—, *Pro Flacco*, with an English translation by C. MacDonald, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 2001.

—, *Pro Fonteio*, M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationes: *Recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit Albertus Curtis Clark*, Albert Clark, *Oxonii, e Typographeo Clarendoniano: Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis*: 1909.

Collingwood, R. G., *The Idea of History*, New York: Oxford University Press: 1969.

Cope, E. M., *Commentary on the Rhetoric of Aristotle*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 1877.

Cornford, F. M., *From Religion to Philosophy*, New York, Dover: 2004.

—, *Plato's Cosmology: The Timaeus of Plato*, Indianapolis, Hackett: 1997.

Dickens, Charles, *Nicholas Nickleby*, New York: Barnes & Noble: 2005.

Dio, Cassius, *Historiae Romanae*, with an English translation by Earnest Cary, New York: Macmillan: 1914.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Roman Antiquities*, with an English translation by Earnest Cary, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1937.

Donne, John, *Mediation XVII*, Literature Network: 2007 URL: <http://www.online-literature.com/donne/409/>

Dostoyevsky, Fyodor, *The Possessed*, translated by Constance Garnett, with a foreword by Avrahm Yarmolinsky, New York: Modern Library: 1936.

Drummond, Andrew, *Law Politics and Power, Sallust and the Execution of the Catilinarian Conspirators*, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag: 1995.

Empiricus, Sextus, *Outlines of Pyrrhonism*, with an English translation by R. G. Bury, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1967.

Engles, Friedrich, *Ludwig Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy*, Peking: Foreign Language Press 1976.

Euripides, *Iphigenia in Aulis*, Euripidis Fabulae, edited by Gilbert Murray, vol. 3. Oxford: Clarendon Press, Oxford: 1913.

Eutorpius, *Breviarium Ab Urbe Condita*, recognovit Franciscus Ruehl, Lipsiae: B.G. Teubneri: 1897.

Ficino, Marsilio, *Platonic Theology*, English translation by Michael J. B. Allen with John Warden, Latin text edited by James Hawkins with William Bowen, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 2001.

Fischer, David Hackett, *Historian's Fallacies*, Harper & Row: New York: 1970.

Floris, *Epitome of Roman History*, with an English translation by Edward Seymour Forster, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 2005.

Freud, Sigmund, *Civilization and Its Discontents*, translated by Joan Riviere, London: The Hogarth Press: 1957.

Fuller, R. Buckminster, *Synergetics: Explorations in the Geometry of Thinking*, in collaboration with E. J. Applewhite, Sebastopol, CA: R. Buckminster Fuller: 1997.

—, *No More Secondhand God and other writings*, Carbondale Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press: 1963.

Gallicanus, Vulcacus, *Avidius Cassius, Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, with an English translation by David Magie, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1921.

Gibbon, Edward, *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica: 1952.

Goodwin, William Watson, *Greek Grammar*, revised by Charles Burton Gulick, New York: Ginn and Company: 1930.

Gorki, Maxim, *Bystander*, translated by Bernard Guilbert Guerney, New York: D. Appleton-Century Company: 1939.

—, *Foma Gordeyev*, translated by Margaret Wettlin, Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1978.

—, *Фома Гордеев*, Мошкова: Библиотека Максима: 2004. URL: [http://az.lib.ru/g/gorxkij\\_m/text\\_0001.shtml](http://az.lib.ru/g/gorxkij_m/text_0001.shtml)

Hardy, E. G., *The Catilinarian Conspiracy in its Context: A Re-Study of the Evidence*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell: 1924.

Heidegger, Martin, *The Origin of the Work of Art*, in *Basic Writings* revised and expanded by David Farrell Krell, San Francisco: Harper & Row: 1977.

—, *Letter on Humanism*, in *Basic Writings* revised and expanded by David Farrell Krell, San Francisco: Harper & Row: 1977.

Herodotus, *The History*, translated by George Rawlinson, Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica: 1952.



Hegel, G. W. F., *The Philosophy of History*, translated by J. Sibree, Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica: 1978.

—, *The Phenomenology of Spirit*, translated with an introduction and notes by A. V. Miller analysis of the text and foreword by J. N. Findlay, New York: Oxford: 1977.

Heraclitus, *Fragments*, a text and translation with a commentary by T. M. Robinson, Toronto: University of Toronto Press: 1987.

Hesiod, *Works and Days*, with an English translation by Hugh G. Evelyn-White, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 2002.

Horace, *Odes*, with an English translation by Nial Rudd, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 2004.

Hughes, Langston, *Black Nativity*, Electronic Edition by Alexander Street Press, L.L.C.: Langston Hughes: 1961. URL: <http://www.alexanderstreet4.com/cgi-bin/asp/blldr/navigate?/projects/artfla/databases/asp/blldr/fulltext/IMAGE/.305>

Hutchinson, Lester, *The Conspiracy of Catiline*, New York: Barnes and Noble: 1967.

Ibsen, Henrik, *Catiline and the Burial Mound*, translated with introductions by Thomas F. Van Laan, New York: Garland Publishing: 1992.

Isocrates, *Panegyricus*, with an English translation by George Norlin, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1928.

Jerome, *Select Letters of St. Jerome*, with an English Translation by F. A. Wright, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1963.

—, *Vulgate Bible*, Bible Foundation and On-Line Book Initiative. <ftp.std.com/obi/Religion/Vulgate>.

Jonson, Ben, *Catiline: His Conspiracy*, edited with an introduction, notes, and glossary by Lynn Harold Harris, Yale Studies in English, Vol. 53, Weimar: R. Wagner Sohn: 1916.

Josephus, Flavius, *Jewish Antiquities*, with an English translation by H. St. J. Thackeray, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1957.

Kalb, Judith E., A “Roman Bolshevik: Aleksandr Blok’s Catiline and the Russian Revolution,” *Slavic and East European Journal*, 44, No. 3 (Fall, 2000), 413-428.

Laertius, Diogenes, *Plato*, with an English translation by R. D. Hicks, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 2006.

—, *Heraclitus*, with an English translation by R. D. Hicks and edited by Jeffrey Henderson, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 2005.

Lewis, Charlton T. & Charles Short, *A Latin Dictionary*, Oxford. Clarendon Press. 1879.

Liddell, Henry George and Robert Scott, *An Intermediate Greek-English Lexicon*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Livy, *Ab Urbe Condita*, with an English translation by Alfred C. Schlesinger, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1959.

Lucanus, M. Annaeus, *Pharsaliae Libri X*, Carolus Hermannus Weise, Leipzig: G. Bassus: 1835.

Luce, T. J., “The Dating of Livy’s First Decade,” *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 96. (1965), pp. 209-240.

Machiavelli, Niccolo, *Discourses on Livy*, translated with an Introduction and Notes by Julia Conway Bondanella and Peter Bondanella, Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press: 2003.

Mao, Tse-tung, *Selected Works of Mao Tse-Tung, Vol. I*, New York: Pergamon Press: 1975.

Martial, *Epigrams*, edited and translated by D. R. Shackleton Bailey, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1993.

Marx, *Capital*, Vol. II, New York: International Publishers, N.Y.: 1967.

McGushin, P., *C. Sallustius Crispus: Bellum Catilinae: A Commentary*, Leiden, Netherlands: E. J. Brill: 1977.

Mitchell, Joni, *Woodstock, Lyrics Freak*, URL: [http://www.lyricsfreak.com/j/joni+mitchell/woodstock\\_20075381.html](http://www.lyricsfreak.com/j/joni+mitchell/woodstock_20075381.html)

Mommsen, Theodor, *The History of Rome, Vol. IV*, London: Routledge/Thoemmes Press: 1894.

Mountford, James, *'Bradley's Arnold' Latin Prose Composition*, New Rochelle, New York: Caratzas Brothers: 1981.

Nepos, Cornelius, *De Historicis Latinis*, with an English translation by John C. Rolfe, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1960.

Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, with an English translation by Frank Justus Miller, revised by G. P. Goold, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 2005.

—, *Metamorphoses*, edited by Hugo Magnus, Gotha, Germany: Friedr. Andr. Perthes: 1892.

Paterculus, Velleius, *Compendium of Roman History*, with and English translation by Fredrick Shipley, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1961.

*Perseus Digital Library Project*, Ed. Gregory R. Crane, Tufts University: Somerville, MA: 2007. URL: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu>

Petrarca, Francesco, *Against a Man of High Rank*, edited and translated by David Marsh, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 2003.

Plato, *Republic*, with an English translation by Paul Shorey, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1937.

—, *The Republic*, translated with Introduction and Notes by Francis MacDonald Cornford, New York: Oxford University Press: 1945.

—, *Timaeus*, with an English translation by R. G. Bury, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1961.

Plutarch, *Cicero*, with and English translation by Bernadotte Perrin, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1971.

—, *Lucullus*, with an English translation by Bernadotte Perrin, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 2001.

—, *Sulla*, with an English translation by Bernadotte Perrin, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 2000.

—, *Crassus*, with an English translation by Bernadotte Perrin, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 2001.

—, *Pelopidas*, with an English translation by Bernadotte Perrin, New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons: 1917.

—, *The Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romans: The Dryden Translation*, Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica: 1990.

Polybius, *The Histories*, with an English translation by W. R. Patton, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1922.

Pound, Ezra, *The ABC of Reading*, New York: New Directions: 1934.

Quintilian, *The Institutio Oratoria of Quintilian*, with an English translation by H. E. Butler, New York: William Heinemann: 1921.

Reid, J. S. "Human Sacrifices at Rome and Other Notes on Roman Religion," *The Journal of Roman Studies*, London: Society of Roman Studies: 1912.

Sallust, *Bellum Catilinae*, with an English translation by J. C. Rolfe, New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons: 2005.

—, *Conspiracy of Catiline*, translated by Rev. John Selby Watson, New York and London: Harper & Brothers: 1899.

—, *Bellum Catilinae*, a commentary by P. McGushin, Leiden, Netherlands: E. J. Brill: 1977.

—, *Bellum Catiline*, edited with Introduction and Commentary by J. T. Ramsey, American Philological Association: Oxford University Press: 1984.

—, *The Jugurthine War*, translated by Rev. John Selby Watson, New York and London: Harper & Brothers: 1899.

Seneca Major, *The Elder Seneca*, translated by M. Winterbottom, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1974.

Seneca Minor, *Moral Essays*, with an English translation by John W. Basore, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1964.

—, *Ad Lucilium Epistulae Morales*, with an English translation by Richard M. Gummere, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1962.

—, *On Anger*, with an English translation by John W. Basore, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1958.

—, *Thyestes, Sénèque Tragédies, Tome I*, text établi et traduit François-Régis Chaumartin, Paris: Les Belles Lettres: 1999.

—, *Troades, Sénèque Tragédies, Tome II*, text établi et traduit François-Régis Chaumartin, Paris: Les Belles Lettres: 1996.

Seutonius, *De Vita Caesarum*, with an English translation by J. C. Rolfe, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1939.

Siculus, Diodorus, *Library of History*, with an English translation by Francis R. Walton, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 2001.

Shakespeare, William, *Henry IV, The Riverside Shakespeare*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin: 1994.

Smith, Clement Lawrence, *The Odes and Epodes of Horace*, second edition, New York: Ginn and Company: 1903.

Smith, William, *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology*, Boston: Little, Brown, and Company: 1867.

Smyth, Herbert Weir, *Greek Grammar*, revised by Gordon M. Lessing, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1984.

Spartianus, Aelius, *Severus: Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, with an English translation by David Magie, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1921.

—, *Hadrian: Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, with an English translation by David Magie, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1921.

Tacitus, *Agricola*, with an English translation by M Hutton revised by M. Ogilvie, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 2000.

—, *The Annals*, with an English translation by John Jackson, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 2005.

—, *The Annals*, translated by Alfred John Church and William Jackson Brodribb, Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica: 1952.

—, *Germania*, with an English translation by M. Hutton revised by E. H. Warmington, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 2000.

—, *Historiae*, translated by Alfred John Church. William Jackson Brodribb, Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica: 1952.

—, *Dialogus de Oratoribus*, Opera Minora, Henry Furneaux, Clarendon Press: Oxford: 1900.

*The Law of the Twelve Tables*, with an English translation by E. H. Warmington, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1938.

Theophrastus, *Characters*, edited and translated by Jeffery Rusten and I. C. Cunningham, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 2002.

Thucydides, *History of the Peloponnesian War*, London, J. M. Dent; New York, E. P. Dutton: 1910.

—, *The History of the Peloponnesian War*, translated by Richard Crawley and revised by R. Feetham, Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica: 1952.

Tolstoy, Alexei, *Road to Calvary*, translated by Edith Bone, New York: Alfred A. Knopf: 1946.

—, *Хождение по мукам*, Мошкова: Библиотека Максима: 2004. URL: [http://az.lib.ru/t/tolstoj\\_a\\_n/text\\_0200.shtml](http://az.lib.ru/t/tolstoj_a_n/text_0200.shtml)

Traupman, John C., *The New College Latin and English Dictionary*, New York: Amsco School Publications: 1966.

Trotsky, Leon, *Literature and Revolution*, New York: Russell and Russell: 1957.

Varro, *De Lingua Latina*, with an English translation by Roland G. Kent, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1938.

Virgil, *Vergil's Aeneid*, with introduction, notes, vocabulary, and grammatical appendix by Clyde Pharr, Wauconda, IL: Bolchazy-Carducci Publishers: 1997.

Virgil, Polydore, *On Discovery*, edited and translated by Brian P. Copenhaver, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 2002.

Voltaire *Oeuvres Complètes De Voltaire, Tome V*, Paris: Chez E. A. Lequien : 1820.

Wheelock, Frederic M., *Latin: An Introductory Course Based on Ancient Authors, 3rd Edition*, New York : Barnes and Noble : 1963.

Wilkins, Ann Thomas, *Villain or Hero: Sallust's Portrayal of Catiline*, New York: Peter Lang: 1994.

Woodcock, E. C., *A New Latin Syntax*, Oak Park, IL: Bolchazy-Carducci: 1987.

Xenophon, *Hiero*, with an English translation by E. C. Marchant, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 2000.



**X.INDEX**

## A

Aborigines, 42, 46, 49, 51, 117, 118  
 Achaeans, 48, 448  
 Actium, 70, 80  
 Adam, 440  
 Aeneas, 42, 48, 49, 50, 51, 71, 118, 337, 447  
 Aesop, 84  
 Aesyetes, 48  
*Agricola*, 381, 460  
 Alba Longa, 51  
 Alliteration, 371  
 Allobroges, 225, 226, 227, 228, 230, 231, 232, 237, 254, 260  
 Amulius, 52, 54  
 Anaphora, 472  
 Anastrophe, 258, 287  
 Antenor, 48  
 Antoninus Pius, 336  
 Apollo, 25, 103, 403  
 Appian, 16, 41, 65, 68, 73, 132, 167, 257, 303, 304, 318, 319, 320, 322, 356, 358, 360, 380, 381, 383, 385  
*Civil Wars*, 41, 42, 64, 66, 71, 74, 95, 98, 146, 167, 169, 256, 257, 303, 304, 318, 319, 320, 342, 356, 357, 358, 367, 379, 383, 384  
 Arcadianism, 40  
 Argumentum ad Baculum, 27, 72, 334, 376, 471, 500  
**Argumentum ad Hominem**, 177, 471  
 Argumentum ad Misericordiam, 343, 471  
**Argumentum ad Populum**, 201, 236, 471  
**Argumentum ad Senatum**, 259  
 Aristotle, 46, 86, 131, 168, 283, 292, 293, 302, 324, 360, 368, 426, 428, 445, 446, 457, 462, 485, 494, See  
*Metaphysics*, 21  
*Rhetoric*, 30, 46, 92, 135, 292, 293, 367, 368, 378, 406, 471, 472  
*Rhetoric to Alexander*, 338  
*The Politics*, 86, 94, 168, 369, 375, 380, 430, 461, 465, 468  
*Topica*, 15, 22, 24, 475  
 Art, 17, 21  
 Ascanius, 50, 51  
 Asconius, 143  
 Astyages, 345  
 Asyndeton, 283, 290, 296  
 Augustine, 77  
 Aurelia Orestilla, 25, 135, 358  
 Ausonius, 79  
*Epistularum*, 80  
 Aventine, 54  
 Avidius Cassius, 336

## B

Battle of Leuctra, 348

*Bellum Catilinae*, 19, 21, 36, 39, 41, 42, 58, 73, 82, 85, 101, 108, 113, 115, 116, 120, 121, 130, 131, 133, 135, 140, 143, 145, 146, 152, 155, 162, 164, 165, 166, 169, 170, 171, 172, 174, 177, 198, 201, 218, 220, 223, 224, 226, 227, 228, 231, 233, 234, 236, 251, 254, 256, 280, 292, 293, 301, 315, 316, 328, 331, 332, 335, 336, 337, 339, 340, 353, 355, 360, 361, 364, 366, 383, 451, 496, 497  
 Bloc, Aleksandr  
*World Revolution*, 37, 82, 329, 330, 331  
 Blok, Aleksandr, 34, 37, 38, 39, 82, 87, 131, 327, 329, 330, 331, 332, 337, 354  
 Boccaccio, 16, 162  
 Bolshevism, 337  
 Brachylogy, 51

## C

Caesar, Julius, 41, 42, 57, 64, 72, 80, 81, 82, 95, 100, 133, 139, 145, 146, 165, 166, 236, 254, 256, 257, 263, 265, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 292, 293, 297, 301, 317, 318, 327, 328, 364, 379, 383, 384, 385, 386, 402  
 Cannibalism, 25  
 Cassius Dio, 16, 34, 35, 81, 87, 95, 131, 145, 146, 156, 200, 301, 318, 355, 360, 361, 364, 385  
*Historiae Romanae*, 63, 82, 95, 100, 145, 146, 156, 178, 199, 200, 256, 301, 316, 318, 319, 322, 356, 359, 364, 385  
 Catiline, 4, 14, 15, 16, 19, 24, 25, 28, 34, 36, 37, 38, 39, 59, 60, 61, 64, 83, 86, 87, 94, 95, 100, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 115, 116, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 140, 141, 142, 145, 146, 151, 152, 154, 155, 157, 158, 159, 160, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 168, 169, 170, 172, 173, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 186, 187, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 216, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 224, 227, 228, 229, 231, 232, 236, 251, 253, 257, 258, 281, 298, 301, 302, 304, 306, 315, 316, 317, 322, 323, 325, 327, 329, 330, 331, 332, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 371, 374, 375, 377, 378, 383, 388, 399, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 412, 415, 429, 430, 470, 494, 496, 497  
 Cato Major  
*De Agricultura*, 41  
 Cato Minor, 384  
 Character, 46  
 The Erotic Personality, 86, 131, 456, 457, 458  
 The Man of Action Personality, 86, 131, 357, 366  
 The Narcissistic Personality, 86  
 Christ. See Jesus  
 Cicero, 16, 25, 34, 35, 36, 38, 56, 59, 60, 65, 80, 81, 91, 94, 95, 96, 97, 99, 102, 105, 108, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 144, 146, 152, 156, 157, 159, 163, 164, 165, 166, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 177, 178, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 216, 221,

222, 224, 225, 227, 228, 229, 231, 232, 233, 236,  
251, 253, 256, 258, 259, 293, 297, 298, 299, 301,  
302, 316, 317, 319, 320, 322, 323, 324, 325, 329,  
334, 342, 353, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 361, 362,  
363, 364, 366, 367, 369, 371, 374, 378, 384, 385,  
386, 404, 405, 407, 496  
Classics, 450, 454, 456, 457, 471  
Cleopatra, 48  
Climax, 408  
Collingwood, R. G.  
    *The Idea of History*, 425  
Collingwood, R. G.  
    *The Idea of History*, 14, 133, 360, 372, 373, 378,  
    413, 421, 427, 445, 446, 456, 458, 470  
Communism, 425  
Confession, 87  
Cope, E. M., 46  
Craftsmanship, 17  
Cyno, 344

## D

Darwin, 416, 466  
*Definition*, 15, 16, 437, 440, 478  
Delphi, 48, 137  
Demonstrative argument, 25  
Determinism, 423  
*Deuteronomy*, 398  
Dialectical and Historical Materialism, 37, 333  
Dialectics, 15, 22, 24, 25, 28, 29, 37, 62, 355, 357,  
    388, 389, 399, 408, 415, 417, 419, 420, 421, 422,  
    425, 426, 429, 433, 437, 439, 454, 455, 458, 459,  
    494, 495, 502  
Dickens, Charles  
    *Nicholas Nickleby*, 468  
Dictatorship, 60, 62, 63, 65, 70, 97, 98, 99, 102, 103,  
    145, 171, 302, 341, 342, 343, 366, 387  
Dionysius II, 84  
Dionysius of Halicarnassus, 41, 448  
    *Roman Antiquities*, 41, 48  
Dissimulation, 27, 41, 199, 343, 429, 497, 498  
Donne, John  
    *Meditation XVII*, 14  
Dostoyevsky, Fyodor  
    *The Possessed*, 29  
Draco, 58  
Dualism, 24, 62, 85, 339, 400, 418, 433, 436, 437,  
    454, 457, 494

## E

Ellipsis, 296  
Empiricus, Sextus  
    *Outlines of Pyrrhonism*, 416  
Eneti, 48  
Enlightenment, 17  
Enlightenment, the, 38, 344, 400, 415  
Etruscans, 51, 57, 64  
Euganei, 48  
Euphemism, 351  
*Exodus*, 26

## F

Fable, 53  
Fallacy of Relevance, 31  
Fallacy of Sources, 455  
Faustulus, 53, 54  
Feuerbach, 425  
Ficino, Marcilio  
    *Platonic Theology*, 442  
    *First Succession*, 152  
First Triumvirate, 317, 384  
Florus, 16, 156, 301, 360  
Forum, the, 91, 99, 200, 226, 256, 299, 303, 362  
Founding Fathers, 56  
Freud, 86, 131, 331, 372, 416, 426, 428  
    *Civilization and Its Discontents*, 86  
Fuller, R. Buckminster, 443  
    *No More Secondhand God*, 444  
    *Synergetics*, 457, 467

## G

*Genesis*, 350, 352, 432, 434, 439, 441, 464, 478, 488  
Gorky, Maxim  
    *Bystander*, 354

## H

Hadrian, 81  
Hardy, E. G., 34, 133, 357, 361, 404  
Harpagus, 344, 345  
*Hebrews*, 390, 442, 461  
Hegel, G. W. F., 72, 156, 333, 377, 401, 402, 432,  
    445, 446, 453, 454, 498  
    *Phenomenology of Spirit*, 87, 91, 156, 355, 398,  
    401, 414, 415, 417, 418, 428, 429, 430, 432,  
    442, 443, 445, 455, 463, 469, 470, 495, 496,  
    498  
    *Philosophy of History*, 20, 72, 332, 334, 375, 401,  
    405, 413, 453, 454  
Heidegger, Martin, 17, 452  
    *Letter on Humanism*, 425, 497  
    *Origin of the Work of Art*, 17  
    *The Origin of the Work of Art*, 452, 486, 495  
Helen, 48  
Heraclitus, 428, 462, 465, 466  
Herodotus, 76, 84, 134, 168, 324, 334, 345, 355, 387,  
    390, 395, 396, 403, 404, 431, 468, 470  
    *The History*, 36  
Hieronymus of Cardia, 41  
History, 14, 17, 20, 21, 23, 60, 64, 76, 84, 100, 101,  
    133, 134, 137, 145, 165, 166, 168, 169, 198, 325,  
    344, 349, 355, 371, 372, 373, 374, 388, 390, 403,  
    413, 417, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 431, 457, 461,  
    470, 471, 472  
Homer  
    *Odyssey*, 453  
Horace, 68, 72, 77, 80  
    *Carminia*, 80  
Hughes, Langston  
    *Black Nativity*, 442

Humanism, 19, 400, 401, 416, 457  
 Hutchinson, Lester, 34  
 Hutchinson< Lester, 103, 134, 335, 336, 357, 358, 361

## I

Iadmon, 84  
 Ibsen, 37, 38, 39, 105, 106, 107, 108, 131, 343, 353, 354, 363  
 Ibsen, Henrik, 34, 36  
*inops*, 93  
 Ionic, 400, 449  
*Iphigenia in Aulis*, 463  
 Irony, 27, 291, 300  
 Islam, 58  
 Isocrates  
   *Panegyricus*, 5  
 Italiot, 400

## J

Janus, 45  
 Jesus, 330, 332, 334, 399, 426  
 Joni Mitchell  
   *Woodstock*, 465  
 Jonson, Ben, 16, 37, 38, 105, 106, 343, 359, 360  
 Josephus, 396, 398

## K

Kalb, Judith, 34, 37, 39, 327, 330, 332, 334, 337, 354, 407, 408, 470  
   *A Roman Bolshevik*, 37, 327  
 Kent, Roland G., 45  
 King Cyrus, 344

## L

Larentia, 53, 54  
 Latinus, 48, 49, 50, 51, 80  
 Lavinia, 50, 51  
 Lavinium, 47, 51, 337  
 Law Twelve Tables, 298  
 Lenaeus, 35, 359  
 Lenin, V. I., 39, 327, 330, 332, 333, 337, 338, 407, 478, 488, 496  
 Lesche, 48  
 Leuctridae, 348  
*Lewis and Short*, 27, 45, 50, 56, 124  
 lex Plautia, 221, 405, 429  
 lex Porcia, 272, 277  
 lex Sempronia, 282, 297, 302  
 Litotes, 283  
 Livy  
   *Ab Urbe Condita*, 32, 41, 50, 59, 374  
 Lucius Tanusius, 25, 134  
 Lucius Verus, 336  
 Lycurgus, 58

## M

MacDonald, C, 34, 134, 135, 165, 361, 364  
 Macedonia, 49, 97  
 Machiavelli, 71, 138, 166  
   *Discourses on Livy*, 71  
 Mandane, 344  
 Mao Tse-tung  
   *On Practice*, 408  
 Marcus Marius, 103, 104, 134  
 Marcus Marius Gratidianus, 25  
 Marcus Marius Gratidianus, 25  
 Marcus Volumnius, 25, 134  
 Mars, 52  
 Martial, 77  
 Marx, Karl, 72, 332, 445, 446, 454, 478, 488  
*Matthew*, 334  
 Menelaus, 48  
 Metonymy, 53  
 Mezentius, 51  
 Minos, 58  
 Mohammed, 58  
 Monotheism, 389  
 Moses, 25, 26, 58, 393, 398, 399, 426, 429  
 Motif, 453

## N

Natural Law, 27  
*Nicomachean Ethics*. See Aristotle  
 Nobility, 46, 62, 68, 83, 116, 219, 230, 332, 379, 380, 383, 405  
 Numitor, 51, 54

## O

Octavian, 62, 64, 80, 318, 379, 380, 386, 387, 388, 402  
 Odysseus, 48  
*Odyssey*, 365, 459, 460, 500  
 Oeolycus, 334  
 Ops, 45  
 Oratory, 5, 17, 18, 30, 131, 329, 371, 387, 471  
 Oxymoron, 296

## P

Palatine, 54, 103, 178  
 Palestine, 390, 396  
 Paphlagonia, 47, 48  
 Parmenides, 39  
 Patrocinium, 72, 84  
*paupertas*, 92, 93, 125  
*Pelopidas*, 348, 350, 369  
 Pelops, 345, 348  
 Penates deos, 50, 337  
 Philosophy, 22  
 Pictor, Quintus Fabius, 41  
 Pindar  
   *Olympian Odes*, 348

Plato, 81, 84, 155, 156, 291, 343, 375, 376, 389, 397, 445, 446, 453, 454, 468, 475, 478, 485, 494, 497, 508  
*The Republic*, 343  
 Plutarch, 16, 59, 78, 103, 132, 134, 135, 137, 164, 170, 224, 303, 322, 348, 360, 369  
 Pluto, 345  
 Pollio, C. Asinius, 80, 323  
 Polybius, 24, 83, 132, 372, 373  
 Polyphemus, 453  
 Polysyndeton, 371  
 Positivism, 340  
 Priam, 48  
 Principle of Generosity, 28, 361  
 Procius Cato. *See* Cato Major  
 Protagoras  
 “Man is the measure of all things”, 416  
 Pseudographia  
 pseudo-Cicero, 34  
 Putschism, 36, 62, 105, 145, 164, 333, 337, 343, 429

## Q

Quintilian, 79  
 Quintus Caecilius, 25, 134  
 Quintus Ennius, 42  
 Quiritres, 454  
 Qunitilian  
 Institutio, 79  
 Qunitillian  
 Institutio, 323

## R

Reason, 16, 17, 21, 22, 24, 25, 28, 29, 292, 452, 503  
*recitatio*, 80  
 Remus, 53, 54, 55, 200  
 Renaissance, 17, 36, 38, 106  
 Repentance, 87  
 Republicanism, 107  
 Rhea Silvia, 52, 337  
 Rhetoric, 16, 17, 18, 19, 29, 30, 292, 444, 472, 496  
 River Albula. *See* River Tiber  
 River Rubicon, 41  
 River Tiber, 51, 52, 448  
 Roman Republic, 107  
 Romulus, 42, 51, 53, 54, 55, 58, 200, 246, 337, 454  
 Rostra, the, 91  
 Rutulians, 51

## S

Sacrilege, 25  
 Sallust, 16, 19, 21, 34, 35, 36, 38, 41, 42, 56, 65, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 85, 86, 87, 91, 100, 102, 108, 131, 133, 135, 157, 226, 256, 257, 304, 316, 327, 330, 331, 338, 339, 340, 354, 358, 359, 360, 361, 363, 366, 453  
*Bellum Catilinae*, 10, 11, 12, 22, 35, 45, 82, 111, 119, 339, 473

*Bellum Jugurtha*, 87, 91, 477, 487  
 Saturn, 42, 45  
 Scipio, the younger, 83  
 Second Triumvirate, 318  
 Seneca Major  
*Controversarium*, 79, 81  
 Seneca Minor, 38, 92  
*Epistolae*, 92  
*Thyestes*, 39, 93, 156, 354, 499  
 Servi, 46, 72, 83, 91, 378, 383  
 Servius Tullius, 58  
 Sicily, 41, 49, 84, 318, 382, 449  
 Silvius, 51  
 slavery, 84  
 Slippery Slope Argument, 281  
 Smith, William, 48, 77, 80, 337  
 Solon, 58  
 Sophism, 41, 135, 293, 477, 487  
 Sparticus, 91, 383  
 Straw Man Argument, 28  
 Substantialism, 25, 400, 426  
 Sulla, 57, 59, 61, 70, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 116, 130, 133, 137, 138, 139, 140, 143, 144, 145, 151, 152, 155, 172, 174, 211, 224, 236, 244, 248, 273, 281, 319, 329, 335, 336, 367, 378  
 Syria, 396

## T

Tacitus, 40, 57, 58, 77, 329, 334, 390, 394  
*Annals*, 40, 42, 57, 58, 77, 387, 402  
*Dialogus de Oratoribus*, 19, 30  
 Tantalus, 345  
 Temple Vesta, 337  
*The Law of the Twelve Tables*, 298  
 Theano, 48  
 Theras, 334  
 Third Macedonian War, 83  
 Third Punic War, 65, 84, 171  
 Thirty Tyrants, 281  
 Thucydides, 75, 76, 77, 78, 81, 292, 446  
 Tiberius Gracchus, 68, 180, 297, 327  
 Tolstoy, Alexi  
*Road to Calvary*, 467  
*Torah*, 394, 396, 398  
 Trojan War, 446, 447, 449  
 Trotsky, 415  
 Trotsky, Leon, 331  
 Troy, 42, 46, 47, 48, 337, 447, 448  
 Tsar Alexander III, 333  
 Turnus, 50  
 Tyranny, 38, 54, 57, 84, 98, 99, 107, 174, 282, 378, 380, 385, 388

## V

Varro, 45, 93, 222, 454  
*De Lingua Latina*, 37, 45, 93, 338, 339, 471  
 Veneti, 48  
 Venus, 50, 410, 431

Vergil

*Aeneid*, 4, 47, 51, 282, 298, 301, 447, 448

Vestal Virgin, 52, 133, 337, 353

Virgil

*Georgics*, 43, 72

Voltaire, 36, 38, 39, 107

*Rome Sauvée*, 36, 38, 371, 407

## W

Welfare State, 94

Wilkins, Ann Thomas, 34, 338, 339, 340, 355, 368

## X

Xenophon

*Hiero*, 282

## Z

Zeugma, 309

Zeus, 345

Zoroaster, 58