

CICERO
CATILINARIANS

EDITED BY
ANDREW R. DYCK

Professor Emeritus of Classics, University of California, Los Angeles

2008



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

COMMENTARY

CATILINARIAN I

Following a visit by assassins to his house on the pretext of the morning *salutatio*, C., as consul, summoned a meeting of the senate to the temple of Jupiter Stator that same day (8 or possibly 7 November; cf. appendix 2). The speech for this occasion was written up and published (cf. the Introduction section 4) and is known as the *First Catilinarian*. It has as its subject not a bill proposed for enactment but rather Catiline himself and his future.

C. was evidently launched on a narrative of the frustrated assassination attempt (cf. 2.12.5–7 *hesterno die, Quirites, cum domi meae paene interfectus essem, senatum in aedem Iouis Statoris conuocaui, rem omnem ad patres conscriptos detuli*) when Catiline entered the chamber; our speech responds to Catiline's arrival; cf. Stroh (2000) 70. This scenario will account for the focus on Catiline as principal addressee of the speech, the other senators' shunning of Catiline, and the fact that the speech contains only two brief references to the attempted assassination (§§9.11–13 and 32.3).

C. described the effect of the speech this way: *L. Catilinam . . . ex urbe uel* (1) *ieicimus uel* (2) *emisimus uel* (3) *ipsum egredientem uerbis prosecuti sumus* (*Cat.* 2.1.1–4; see *ad loc.*). The first alternative is overstated: the senate was not a court (though C. sometimes spoke as if it were; cf. *Qfr.* 2.1.3 (describing a speech before the senate) *tamquam reum* [sc. *Clodium*] *accusauit*; *Orat.* 129, cited on §1.2–3) and could not impose penalties, nor was a consul empowered to demand a citizen's exile (cf. 2.12.1–3n.). Some of Catiline's sympathizers, ancient and modern, have seen C.'s actions in that light, however. C. mocked these ancient critics (2.12.3–4 *homo enim uidelicet timidus aut etiam permodestus uocem consulis ferre non potuit*). For the modern version, whereby C. drove the wavering Catiline into the arms of Manlius (Seager (1973)) cf. §5.1–5n. Taking (1) as out of the question, other critics have seized upon (3) as the true account of C.'s actions. Inclined to dismiss C. anyway as a windbag, Mommsen (1898) iv 574–5 claimed that he “thundered against Catilina when his departure was already settled,” i.e. the speech is essentially redundant. But was it settled? Catiline expressed himself unwilling to leave Rome while C. was still alive (§9.10–11). Not satisfied with Mommsen's analysis, Meyer (1922) 30 sought an explanation for C.'s speech in the moral/psychological realm: his aim was to give Catiline's departure, when it occurred, the character of a confession of guilt. But Meyer fails to take account of the urgent pressure C. applies in this speech: the *timing* of the departure is clearly critical.

C.'s speech had a double target audience – both Catiline and the other assembled senators. Cary, *CAH* ix¹ 498 thinks that the latter was primary and that C. was hoping to elicit the retort “No, no, arrest him at once!” Certainly C. would have welcomed such a response, but given the deep divisions in the senate (§5.9–6.3; §30.1–8), his own position as a *nouus homo* (§28.4–8n.) and his lack of hard evidence, it seems doubtful that this was his goal. Rather, his aims are subtler: to isolate Catiline from the other

senators morally as he has been isolated physically (cf. §§12–16.5 and for physical isolation §16.11–14) and to put beyond dispute the link between the city conspirators and Manlius' rebels in Etruria so that *coniuratio*, a key motif in this speech (cf. §1.5–9n.), would apply to the movement with its full force. At the same time C. wanted to put a quick end to Catiline's plotting *intra moenia*, of which he himself was now the chief target (§§5.1–5 and 9.11; cf. §11.4–11, 2.1.7–9, *Mur.* 6), and to defend his own way of proceeding (esp. §§29–30). Cf. Primmer (1977); Cape (1991) 39; in general Stroh (2000) 67–9.

In a certain sense, though, the speech is also about C. himself: it constructs his *ethos* as a provident statesman, fully aware of his responsibilities as well as ancient precedent but one who realizes that the times require a more moderate approach. Drawing a sharp characterological contrast between himself and Catiline before the divided senate serves to bolster his *auctoritas* and, if Catiline does depart for Manlius' camp, credibility; see the detailed interpretation by Batstone (1994).

The speech is a masterpiece of concentrated innuendo and vituperation, based upon a limited stock of themes and images, skillfully interwoven and subtly varied: Catiline is a public enemy (*hostis*) and has organized a conspiracy against the Roman state; strong precedent argues for his execution, but C. instead calls upon him to lead his followers out of Rome. The speech is calculated for effect both on Catiline, who must be convinced of his isolation and the futility of continuing to plot within Rome, and on the other senators, who need to be persuaded that Catiline poses a danger but that the consul has the situation under control; cf. Batstone (1994) 218. This explains the changing tone of the speech, which caused Craig (1992–3) to assume an improvised change of course. Price (1998) highlights the inconsistencies in arguing that the speech was a “failure”; but perhaps one ought to distinguish between the policies of the period leading up to the speech and the speech itself, which seems to have succeeded in convincing Catiline that his position in Rome was untenable. On the possible revision of this speech for publication cf. the Introduction section 4.

The traditional analysis of speeches had forensic oratory in view; while our speech, delivered in the senate, is basically deliberative, it is in some ways comparable to a prosecution speech, so that an analysis along traditional lines can be helpful, albeit the line between *narratio* and *argumentatio* is blurred; the speech may be divided as follows (for other schemes cf. Craig (1992–3) 262–6; Batstone (1994) 226–7 and n. 35):

- I. *Exordium*: the current paradoxical situation (1–2)
 - A. Tightened security
 - B. Catiline alive and participating in the senate's deliberations
- II. *Digressio* I: historical precedents contrasted with the current inaction (3–6)
 - A. P. Scipio: Tiberius Gracchus
 - B. C. Servilius Ahala: Sp. Maelius
 - C. L. Opimius: C. Gracchus
 - D. C. Marius, L. Valerius: L. Saturninus, C. Servilius

- E. The current consuls: Catiline
 - 1. The danger to the state
 - a. In Etruria
 - b. In the city
 - 2. The potential charge of cruelty
- III. *Narratio/Argumentatio*: the conspirators' plans (7-10.4)
 - A. C.'s prediction of C. Manlius' rising on 27 October
 - B. Plan to kill leading citizens on 28 October
 - C. Plan to occupy Praeneste on 1 November
 - D. Meeting at Laeca's house the night of 6-7 November
 - 1. Division of Italy among the conspirators
 - 2. Plan to assassinate C.
- IV. *Argumentatio*: Catiline called upon to leave Rome (10.5-27.3)
 - A. It is in the public interest (11-12)
 - 1. Attacks on C. individually
 - 2. Attack on the entire state
 - B. There is nothing to detain him here (13-17)
 - 1. His domestic disgrace
 - 2. The ruin of his fortune
 - 3. The plot of the last day of December 66
 - 4. The plots against C.
 - 5. He is shunned in the senate
 - C. Rome's appeal to Catiline (18)
 - D. Catiline in voluntary custody (19-20.3)
 - E. Catiline's demand that the matter be put to a vote (20.4-21)
 - F. Catiline's departure (22-7a)
 - 1. Possible *invidia Ciceronis* (§§22-3)
 - 2. Catiline's preparations (§§24-27.3)
- V. *Digressio* II: Rome's appeal to C. for action and his reply (27.4-32)
 - A. The senate divided
 - B. The solution: the departure of Catiline and his followers
- VI. *Peroratio* (33)
 - A. Renewed call for Catiline's departure
 - B. Prophecy that Jupiter will protect Rome and punish her enemies.

Exordium: the current paradoxical situation (1-2)

A deliberative speech, Quintilian advises, need not have an *exordium* in the strict sense but should have elements that do the work of an *exordium* (*prohoemii species*: 3.8.6). In particular, the *exordium* of a deliberative no less than a judicial speech aims, according to rhetorical precept, to render the listeners attentive, docile and well-disposed (*Rhet. Her.* 1.7 and 3.7). This *exordium* breaks with tradition in several respects. One expects a speech in the senate to begin with an address to the assembled senators (*patres*

conscripti), as C. does in *Cat.* 4 as well as the senatorial *Philippics* (with the exception of nos. 8 and 10, addressed to the consul Pansa, who had called on him for his opinion). Here by the figure *apostrophe* (banned from the *exordium* by some rhetoricians: Quint. 4.1.63) C. begins by addressing Catiline. Moreover, Catiline is less formally treated here in direct address (the simple *Catilina* without *praenomen*) than in the third-person reference at *Cat.* 2.1.1 (*L. Catilinam*); in *Sul.* he is nowhere dignified with a *praenomen*: Berry on *Sul.* 1.1; cf. Dickey (2002) 51–2. Comparable is the grilling of Vatinius on the witness stand that begins unceremoniously *si tantum modo, Vatini, quid indignitas postulare spectare uoluisset . . .* (*Vat.* 1). Though Quintilian counsels against beginning *abrupte* or arbitrarily (*unde libuit.* 3.8.6), our speech opens with a series of aggressive interrogations. Quintilian was, however, sensitive to the move and its effect (*quanto enim magis ardet quam si diceretur ‘diu abuteris patientia nostra’ . . . ?* (9.2.8) and *plura acriter et instanter incipient: ‘nihilne te nocturnum praesidium Palatii . . . mouerunt?’* (9.3.30)). The aim is clearly not to elicit information but to throw off balance and intimidate, or, as Quintilian puts it, *non sciscitandi gratia . . . sed instandi* (9.2.7); cf. Loutsch (1990) and (1994) 287 and 298 and his entire ch. 4; Batstone (1994) 228 (“their real function is to deny to Catiline any reasonable grounds on which to offer an explanation of his actions”). Stroh (2000) 69–70 emphasizes the singularity of this *exordium* in the entire corpus of ancient oratory and suggests that C. delivered two speeches on this day, one in which he gave information about the frustrated attempt to assassinate him (cf. 2.12.6–7) and this speech, which alone he published. Finally, this *exordium* also encapsulates the main themes to be developed in the body of the speech.

1.1 Quo usque tandem . . . patientia nostra?: the famous opening was first parodied by Sallust in the revolutionary speech he gives to Catiline (*Cat.* 20.9; cf. Syme (1964) 106; *aliter* Vretska *ad loc.*); in light of the recurrence of *quo usque tandem* “in a Catiline-style speech by Manlius (Livy 6.18.5),” Malcolm (1979) supposes that the phrase was Catiline’s, the mockery C.’s; but the point is undercut by further Ciceronian allusions in this speech; cf. Livy 6.18.8 with Oakley’s n. Parodic citation continues at Apul. *Met.* 3.27 (a slave complaining of a donkey, with further Ciceronian burlesque following; cf. von Albrecht (1989) 174). C.’s son also cited the opening sentence but to show his familiarity with his father’s oratory (*Sen. Suas.* 7.14). One can only speculate whether Catiline’s appearance in the senate that day was anticipated; contrast Stroh (2000) 70, who believes our speech to be an improvised reaction to Catiline’s unexpected appearance, and Batstone (1994) 225, who thinks C. “expected to see Catiline in the Senate.” In any case, C. peppers his opponent with three short rhetorical questions artfully varied: each has a different interrogative expression, a different subject and verb. The direct form appears first; in the latter two queries *furor iste tuus* and *audacia* clearly stand for Catiline and his activities (see below); cf. *furorem et audaciam* at *Rab. perd.* 4. **tandem** is a frequent marker of impatient questions (“really, I ask you, after all”): *OLD* s.v. 1b; Berry on *Sul.* 21.7. **abutere** shows the older second-person singular ending, preferred by C. in fut. indicative (as well as impf. and in subj. forms), whereas he prefers *-ris* in the present indicative, as in *arbitraris* (l. 9);

cf. Neue and Wagener (1892–1905) III 204–6. C. had denounced Catiline's designs in the senate on 21 October (see §7.1–4n.), and it had passed the *consultum ultimum* (§3.7–8); yet the *audacia* of Catiline is merely gaining strength (§4.11–12); further reasons for strained *patientia* appear in §§7–8, 11, and 15. With *patientia* C. begins to prepare the ground for his self-criticism for inaction: *Catilinam . . . perferemus?* (§3.2–4); *nos . . . consules desumus* (§3.9–10); *patimur hebescere aciem horum auctoritatis* (§4.8); *me ipse inertiae nequitiaeque condemno* (§4.14–15); cf. Batstone (1994) 227.

1–2 quam diu . . . eludet?: *furor iste tuus* forms a unit and thus forces the enclitic *nos* into fourth place; cf. Adams (1994b) 154. *furor* was, for C., the quality of all who tried to undermine the *status quo*; in this speech such demonization substitutes for proof; C. speaks of Catiline as having a *uultus . . . plenus furoris* (*Mur.* 49); other symptoms are described at *Sal.* 15.5; cf. §22.9–10 *neque enim is es, Catilina, ut te . . . ratio a furore reuocarit*; similarly 2.1.1–3 *L. Catilinam, furem audacia . . . eiecimus*; similarly *amentia* is ascribed to the conspirators at §§8.10 and 25.3 and 2.11.9 and 25.12; cf. Achard (1981) 239–47 esp. 246; Taldone (1993) 10–14. *eludo* (“avoid, escape from; frustrate, mock”) is used with various points of reference, including weapons or judicial proceedings (cf. *TLL* s.v.); and indeed Catiline had had to defend himself in court in 73 on a charge of seducing a Vestal Virgin (cf. §13.7–9n.), in 65 for peculation as governor of Africa, and in 63 on murder charges, but each time escaped conviction (see the Introduction section 1). At *Ver.* 2.3.9 C. paints the defendant as *rebus omnibus undique ereptis impune eludentem*; cf. also *Leg.* 2.43, cited on §18.2–6.

2–3 quem ad finem . . . audacia?: a metaphor previously attested in tragedy (*Acc. trag.* 133), *effrenatus* “unbridled” (< *frenum*) is deployed by C. here and elsewhere; cf. the *effrenatus furor* of the Clodiani as described at *Sest.* 82; similar metaphor at *Phil.* 13.20 *tamquam frenos furoris iniecit*. The hyperbaton *effrenata . . . audacia* by creating slight suspense emphasizes both words (as well as effecting a fine clausula; see appendix 3). Our passage is the first of 17 instances of *audacia/audax* in this corpus; *audacia* and *libido* will prove to be antithetical to *uirtus* (2.9.7–8); cf. Bruggisser (2002) 282–4; for *audacia* in political contexts implying revolutionary designs cf. Achard (1981) 247–8 and Wirszubski (1961); as the subject of a verb *audacia* is personified; at §7.3–4 the quality virtually stands for Catiline *C. Manlium, audaciae satellitem . . . tuae*, at 3.22.10 for the conspiracy in general; cf. also *Orat.* 129 *a nobis homo audacissimus Catilina in senatu accusatus ommutuit. iactare se* is to “flaunt oneself, show off”; our passage is its earliest attestation with an abstract subject; cf. *OLD* s.v. *iacto* 12b; *TLL* s.v. 58.80.

3–5 nihilne te nocturnum . . . ora uultusque mouerunt?: further questions, this time in the periodic style for which C. is famous and marked by the particle *-ne* rather than an interrogative pronoun or adverb. **nihilne** is a strengthened version of *nonne* and hence anticipates a positive response; cf. *OLD* s.v. *nonne*; G–L §455. On *-ne* as host for the clitic pronoun (*te*) cf. Adams (1994b) 149. On C.'s fondness for *nihil* in emphatic anaphora cf. Pease on *N.D.* 1.75. **nocturnum** precedes its noun for emphasis (cf. G–L §291). The conspirators were active at night in spite of the ban on nocturnal meetings at *Lex XII* 8.26; *Sal.* 42.2 alludes to their *nocturna consilia*; cf. line 7 below *quid proxima, quid superiore nocte egeris . . .*; §6.5–10n.; 3.5.3–7. Night guards

were hired individually by citizens to protect their own houses (cf. 2.26.1–2; 3.29.6–9); in addition, night watches organized by the minor magistrates guarded against arson (Sal. 30.7 and 32.1); only later, under Augustus, was a regular system of *uigiles* put in place; cf. Nippel (1995) 37, 67, and 96. The wealthy community of the Palatine Hill is perhaps singled out because security there was especially tight. Sallust provides a vivid portrait of the *timor populi* at *Cat.* 31.1–3; cf. Grilli (2006). **concursum bonorum omnium** suggests an informal and spontaneous gathering of people wanting to protect the senators (on the threat see the next n.); cf. *Phil.* 10.7 *cumque concursu cotidiano bonorum omnium*; *Phil.* 14.18 *si ad me bonorum concursum fieri uidebis*.

4–5 hic munitissimus habendi senatus locus: for *hic* referring to what is actually present cf. Roby §2258; K–S 1 621; hence it is used of the senators in line 5 (*horum ora uultusque*) and of Catiline at §2.1–2 (*hic tamen uiuit*) and elsewhere. Here C. glances at the venue of the speech, later clarified as the temple of Jupiter Stator (§11.1–2); it was built after 294 on a site supposedly designated by Romulus as the turning point in a battle against the Sabines (Stator = “stayer”: the Romans halted their flight and rallied there). Our temple was in the vicinity of the north slope of the Palatine Hill, though there was another temple dedicated to the deity in the Campus Martius; cf. Richardson s.v. Iuppiter Stator, Aedes; Vasaly (1993) 41–2 n. 3; Ramsey on *Phil.* 2.64.24; Bonnefond-Coudry (1989) 121–5; Coarelli, *LTUR* s.v. A recent incident in which armed thugs tried to intimidate the senators (cf. §32.4 with n.) contributed to the choice of this fortress-like venue; the senate is not otherwise known to have met there; presumably the strategic advantage (*munitissimus*) lay in its elevation. C. uses the antiquity of the cult, thought to be virtually coeval with the city itself (cf. §33.3–4n.), to rhetorical advantage and interprets the deity as *custos urbis* in a broad sense (§11.1–4n.); cf. Vasaly (1993) 41–59. For *habere senatum* = “hold <a meeting of> the senate” cf. *Sest.* 74 *dies pauci . . . per quos senatum haberi liceret*; *OLD* s.v. *habeo* 20a.

5 horum ora uultusque: having begun with an interrogation of Catiline, not an address to the senate as a whole, here for the first time C. refers to the other senators present (for *hic* see the previous n.). The ancients were well aware of the facial expression as an indicator of emotion (cf. 3.13.1–6n.; Dyck on *Leg.* 1.27); at §16.11–14 C. notes a further detail of the senators’ behavior.

5–9 patere tua consilia . . . ignorare arbitraris?: C. continues to multiply his questions, now using a third form of interrogative, *non* + verb. The three questions, consisting successively of five, ten, and 17 words, produce a crescendo. In his choice of verbs C. again achieves variety, moving from perception (*sentis*, *uides*) to judgment (*arbitraris*). Catiline’s plans are exposed to scrutiny, as is *patere* by its unusual initial placement; cf. also *Sul.* 81 *nulla tum* [sc. at Catiline’s trial in 73] *patebat . . . coniuratio*. C. elaborates on his intimate knowledge of Catiline’s schemes at §§6–10. *constringo* is to “tie together,” hence “place in bonds” (*OLD* s.v. 1); cf. *Mil.* 34 *nisi esset is consul qui eam* [sc. *praeturam Clodi*] . . . *posset . . . constringere*; *constrictam* is emphasized by separation from its referent, *coniurationem* (hyperbaton). *teneri* doubles the idea of confinement (cf. also G–L §238, noting that the construction stresses that the result is maintained). C. makes his policy explicit at §6.1–3 and 9 (*uiues . . . multis meis . . . praesidiis obsessus, ne commouere*

te contra rem publicam possis . . . teneris undique; similarly §7.9–11). *coniuratio*, in a sense the thematic word of the speech (Offermann (1995) 231), makes its first appearance here; it is taken up at §6.7 *uoces coniurationis*, §27.10–11 *principem coniurationis*, §30.3–4 *coniurationem . . . corroborauerunt*; cf. also 4.5.4 *coniurationem patefactam esse decreuistis*, and 4.18.6 *facibus et telis impiae coniurationis*; similarly *Sul.* 70–1 and Sallust (27.3 and 43.1), who at 22.1 (cited on §16.1–5) offers lurid details about how the pact was sealed; cf. Dio 37.30.3; the fact of the conspiracy was, however, controversial at the time of this speech (cf. §30.7–8 *neminem tam stultum fore qui non uideat coniurationem esse factam*). The verb *coniuro* is attested as early as Plautus and famously in the *SC de Bacchanalibus* (line 13); the corresponding noun is first attested in C. (*Ver.* 2.3.68); cf. *TLL* s.vv.

7 quid proxima, quid superiore nocte egeris: this appears to be a precise distinction of nights; cf. also 2.13.4–5 *quid ea nocte egisset, quid in proximam constituisset . . . edocui*; 3.6.10–12 *tardissime autem Lentulus uenit, credo quod . . . proxima nocte uigilarat*. Hence the majority opinion that C.'s speech was delivered on 8 November; see further appendix 2. The perfect subjunctives *egeris . . . fueris . . . conuocaueris . . . ceperis* are expected of past time in indirect questions in primary sequence. **quos conuocaueris:** Sallust lists the names of fifteen men who attended a meeting of the conspirators before the elections of 64 (17.3–4), albeit he has evidently antedated the conspiracy by at least a year; cf. Syme (1964) 75–7; Vretska on *Sal.* 17.1.

2.1 o tempora, o mores!: for exclamations with *o* cf. in general Winterbottom (2004) 223 n. 38. This particular example was Ciceronian property and quoted as such by later authors; besides our passage it also occurs at *Ver.* 2.4.56, *Dom.* 137, and *Deiot.* 31; cf. also *Phil.* 8.23 *ubi est ille mos uirtusque maiorum?* Porcius Latro quotes the words back to C. in a declamation urging him not to beg pardon from Antony (*Sen. Suas.* 6.3), and Martial satirizes his acquaintance Caecilianus for using the phrase out of season (9.70); later references at Otto (1890) 343. Quintilian cites the exclamation as an example of heightening emotion by means of pretense (*simulatio*: 9.2.26; cf. *Cic. Tusc.* 4.55). The criticism of times and customs is elaborated in §§3–4 with reference to the sterner measures previously taken in such cases; cf. also 2.3.4n. (*culpa . . . temporum*). **senatus haec intellegit, consul uidet:** cf. Batstone (1994) 231: "Here the potential for blame to fall upon the Senate is as great as it will ever be in this speech. That blame, however, is blunted, first by being shared with the consul and second by Cicero's clever use of the singular." *consul uidet* implicitly sidelines C.'s colleague C. Antonius, who had once been in electoral alliance with Catiline but whom C. had neutralized by agreeing to cede to him his allotted province of Macedonia: *Sal.* 21.3 and 26.4; Gelzer (1969) 69.

1–3 hic tamen uiuit. uiuit? . . . particeps: the repetition with query of a single word or phrase is characteristic of dialogue between two speakers (cf. examples from comedy cited by Wills (1996) 342), imitated for liveliness; similarly *Sex. Rosc.* 40 *'patri' inquit 'non placebat.' patri non placebat?*; *Q. Rosc.* 48 *dic nunc . . . Cluuium esse mentitum. mentitus est Cluuius?*; *Phil.* 2.25 *cuius . . . qui in eo numero [sc. of Caesar's assassins] fuisset nomen est occultatum? occultatum dico?* When this form is combined with the following *immo*

uero, the result is a *correctio* (cf. Lausberg §785.2) with *immo* ("rather") as the correction and *uero* signaling the reaction; cf. Kroon (1995) 295. *in senatum* is marked as emphatic by *etiam*; emphasis also falls on the initial verbs *fit* and *notat*; cf. 3.6.3 *fit in eos impetus*; *Mil.* 29 *fit obuiam Clodio*; Marouzeau (1938) 69. Given his exalted conception of the senate, C. is shocked by this fact as by the presence of Catiline's confederates at this meeting (§9.1-5 with n.). The three descriptions of Catiline's behavior, at successively nine, 11, and 18 syllables form a crescendo (cf. Berry on *Sul.* 4.13), with the truly sinister point reserved for elaboration and the final position. As a former magistrate (the praetorship for 68 is attested as well as propraetorship of Africa for 67: *MRR* II 138 and 147), Catiline was, of course, a member of the senate and entitled to participate in its deliberations.

3-5 notat et designat . . . uitemus: *noto* is to "place a distinguishing mark on," then "pick out, distinguish" and hence in our passage, in conjunction with *designo*, "single out for some purpose" (*OLD* s.v. *noto* 1 and 6-7), though the common construction is dative, not *ad* + acc.: *OLD* s.v. *designo* 5. The addition of *oculis* clarifies that the action is metaphorical; Seneca imitates (*colla taurorum popa designat oculis*: *Ag.* 899); similarly *Ben.* 3.17.2. Catiline's target is not merely C. (in spite of §9.11) or even *nos* generally but *unum quemque nostrum* ("each one of us individually"), reserved to the end of the sentence for emphasis; cf. 4.12.13-14 for the conspirators as those *qui singulas unius cuiusque nostrum domos . . . delere conati sunt*. In contrast to the three actions of Catiline stand the purely reactive moves of *nos*. *uir forti(ssimu)s* is a conventional commendation found 12x elsewhere in the *Catilinarians*; only here is it applied with palpable sarcasm. *nos* is used with various points of reference; here C. seems to have members of the senate generally in view (cf. §7.7-9, where he puts the best face he can on their flight before Catiline); the self-criticism resumes at §3.9-10, where *nos* has a different reference (*nos, nos . . . consules desumus*). The *res publica* was famously defined by C. as the *res populi*, with further specifications of *populus*, at *Rep.* 1.39; the mere survival of the consul(s), though important (cf. §11.4-5), was hardly sufficient; for C.'s oft-repeated concern about the survival of the *res publica* cf. Meier (1966) I n. 1. *iste* conveys, as often, a note of contempt (*OLD* s.v. B5b). *furor* has been associated with Catiline since the second sentence; now the still more ominous *tela* is added to form a hendiadys ("his armed madness"); cf. §21.9 *manus ac tela*; C. speaks specifically of Catiline's *sica* at §16.1-5 (similarly 2.1.7). The escape is merely potential, not a certainty; hence *si . . . uitemus* ("if we manage to avoid"), the protasis of an ideal conditional (G-L §596); cf. §15.7-10. Contrast Pansa's heroic vow as reported at *Phil.* 14.26 *cum aut morte aut uictoria se satis facturum rei publicae spopondisset . . .*

5-7 ad mortem te . . . machinaris: the direct address to Catiline resumes with *ad mortem* emphasizing again the paradox of his continued existence (cf. l. 2 above: *uiuitt*); the pronoun *te* is, as usual, the second constituent. *ad mortem* marks the beginning of a veritable "rhetorical bloodbath," with five terms for killing occurring a total of ten times in §§2-4 alone; the imagery continues to §9.6-7 (*quos ferro trucidari oportebat*); the apparent goal is to intimidate Catiline and convince him that exile (the theme of §§10.5-19) is preferable to his remaining in Rome; cf. Stroh (2000) 70-1. The consul

did not, however, ordinarily have the right to order the death of a Roman citizen; opportunity had to be given for appeal to a citizen assembly (*prouocatio*); cf. *Lex XII* 9.2 *de capite cuius ni maximus comitiatus est, ne ferunto*, reaffirmed by the *lex Sempronia* of 123; cf. Rotondi (1912) 309-10; Bleicken, *RE* XXIII 2.2454.12 (s.v. *prouocatio*); Lintott (1972) esp. 259-62, who sees the force of *prouocatio* diminished in the late Republic; cf. also §12.3-6 and 4.10.7-10. C. is relying, however, on the precedents cited in §§3-4. **oportebat** is explained by some grammars as indicative for subjunctive (e.g. G-L §254.1 render "it behooved you to be (you ought to have been)"; cf. Roby §1535); Latin treats it as a necessity that existed in the past rather than emphasizing its non-fulfillment, as English does; cf. 2.3.4-5 *interfectum esse L. Catilinam et grauissimo supplicio affectum iam pridem oportebat*; H-S 327-8; *NLS* §125. **pestem istam** is the reading of βγ and the corrector of C, *pestem* of α alone; such small words unnecessary to the sense are sometimes omitted by scribes as they commit to memory phrases to be copied; here the omission was assisted by the similar shape of the three adjacent endings *-stem -stam quam*; cf. Alberti (1987) 209-11, comparing *Vér.* 2.5.162 *qui numquam istam pestem* [sc. *crucem*] *uiderat. pestis* has here, as in §33.1-2 (*cum tua peste ac pernicie*), its literal sense ("physical destruction, death"), rather than the metaphorical one found in §§11.3 and 30.9 ("instrument of death or destruction"; cf. *OLD* s.v. 1 and 3). It is a bit surprising to see *confero*, so often used of benefits and the like, with *pestem* as object; but the sense is "transfer"; cf. *Att.* 11.8.2 *neque uero destitit* [sc. *Quintus minor*] . . . *omnia in me maledicta conferre*; cf. *TLL* s.v. 181.32 and 184.30. After *in nos* two 12th-century MSS omit *omnes iam diu* and thus effect a slightly commoner Ciceronian clausula; but C. is emphasizing that the conspiracy is directed against all, not just himself (cf. *unum quemque nostrum* in l. 3; §14.9 *ad omnium nostrum uitam salutemque*; 4.4.6 *ad uestram omnium caedem*), and the clausula of the generally transmitted text is acceptable. *machinor* < *machina*, like the parallel Gk formation μηχανάομαι, is frequently used of "devising" evils, as in the description of Medea at *N.D.* 3.66 *uidetur et sibi ipsa nefariam pestem machinari*; similarly *Sal.* 18.7 of the "first conspiracy": *iam tum non consulibus modo, sed plerisque senatoribus perniciem machinabantur*.

Digressio I: *historical precedents contrasted with the current inaction* (3-6)

In the *exordium* C. has described the fear and tightened security of the city and called attention to Catiline's continued presence in the senate in spite of the general awareness of his designs; he concludes that Catiline should be put to death, or rather, should have been long ago. The proposition is not obvious on its face (see the last n.) and must be supported. This section provides a series of examples from earlier Roman history as a foil for the current predicament. Rhetorical theory recognized the example (παράδειγμα, *exemplum*) as a means of persuasion (πίστις, *probatio*) introduced from outside the case (*Quint.* 5.11.1); it might be either similar to or contrasting with the matter at issue (*Rhet. ad Alex.* 1429a21); cf. Lausberg §§410-25. The Roman Republic was based upon a balance of power among the various aristocratic families and the people's representatives; a fairly standard set of examples developed of leaders whose

drive for power went too far and resulted in drastic punishment; C. invokes them repeatedly; cf. e.g. 4.4.2-5, *Mil.* 8 and 83; Schoenberger (1911) 23-5. At §29.8-11 C. summarizes these as instances in which *summi uiri et clarissimi ciues . . . sanguine . . . se . . . honestarunt*. In contrast he elaborates his own more complex situation (a result of the times, he explains at 2.3.1-4): his desire to be seen as *clemens* rather than cruel and yet not *dissolutus* (§4.13-14) yields the compromise whereby Catiline remains alive and *intra moenia*, albeit held in check.

3.1-2 An uero uir amplissimus . . . priuatus interfecit: the *an* is expected in a question raised in remonstrance or disbelief; cf. *OLD* s.v. 5e. C. hedges P. Scipio Nasica Serapio about with honorable titles (*uir amplissimus* ("a most distinguished man": *OLD* s.v. *amplus* 8), *pontifex maximus*) so as to leave no doubt of his approval of the deed. A hard-line aristocrat, Scipio rose to consul for 138 (*MRR* I 483). He confronted a public meeting demanding relief from rising grain prices with the proud assertion that he knew better than they what the public interest required (V. Max. 3.7.3). He bitterly opposed Tiberius Gracchus' commission for redistributing the public land and persuaded the senate to refuse to fund its work; he likewise combated Gracchus' plans for the legacy of Attalus of Pergamum. During the unrest at the elections of 133, with Gracchus a candidate for a second term as tribune, when the consul P. Mucius Scaevola declined to take action, Scipio called upon all senators who wanted to save the state to follow him; in the ensuing bloodshed Gracchus and many of his followers were killed. He likewise participated in the persecution of Gracchus' remaining followers in 132. But he was threatened with prosecution by M. Fulvius Flaccus (*De orat.* 2.285) and was by then so hated that he thought it prudent to depart Rome, his senatorial friends providing the honorable pretext of an embassy to Asia; he died not long afterward in Pergamum. Cf. Münzer, *RE* IV 1.1502.47 (Cornelius no. 354).

1 pontifex maximus: so the majority of accounts; the assertion of Vell. 2.3.1 that he was elected pontifex maximus *in absentia* while in Asia is incredible; possibly he has confused the fact that Scipio was the first pontifex maximus to die abroad: Münzer, *RE* IV 1.1503.53.

1-2 Ti. Gracchum . . . statum rei publicae: Tiberius Gracchus is accorded no such titles as are attached to P. Scipio, though C. could have mentioned that he was tribune of the *plebs* at the time of the attack and that his person was thus supposed to be sacrosanct; on the sacrosanctity of the tribune and its origin cf. Bleicken (1955) 5-7. On Tiberius Gracchus, his policies and death cf. Stockton (1979) chs. 2-4; for C.'s differing interpretations of Tiberius and his brother Gaius (cf. §4.1-4) in speeches before the senate and before the people cf. Robinson (1986) ch. 2. **mediocriter labefactantem statum rei publicae** is said not so much in extenuation of Gracchus as in contrast to Catiline's graver threat (*orbem terrae caede atque incendiis uastare cupientem*) (adversative asyndeton; cf. H-S 830); cf. also 4.13.6-8n. Latin presents two participial phrases whereas English would probably use a subordinating structure. *labefacto* (< *labes* "a fall, physical defect") is to "loosen, make unsteady" and hence

metaphorically "weaken, undermine" (*OLD* s.vv.). For *status* = "stability" cf. Berry on *Sul.* 63.5.

2 priuatus, included for contrast with *nos consules* in the next clause, receives emphasis by its placement before the verb. It applies to Scipio since the pontificate did not count as a magistracy.

2-4 Catilinam . . . nos consules perferemus?: the contrast is heightened by the initial placement of *Catilinam* and the final placement in their respective clauses of *priuatus interfecit* – *nos consules perferemus*. **caede atque incendiis**: a paraphrase for Catiline's program also at §6.8-9, 2.10.5, 3.15.4 (the senate's decree), 19.8, and 21.4; *Sul.* 52; for the alliterative *iunctura* cf. Wölfflin (1933) 255. Both murder and arson fell within the scope of the *lex Cornelia de sicariis et ueneficis*; cf. *Dig.* 48.8.1. In spite of C.'s claims (also at 3.1 and 22.1-3; *Sul.* 3 and 57; *Mur.* 85; *Har. resp.* 18; cf. *Att.* 1.14.3 *totum hunc locum, quem ego uarie meis orationibus . . . soleo pingere, de flamma, de ferro*), it is doubtful that Catiline wanted to incinerate Rome; at most he may have planned to set small fires so as to sow terror and confusion; cf. Introduction section 3; Berry (2006) 142; on §9.10 (*urbis partes*); Berry on *Sul.* 3.6. **orbem terrae** is hyperbolic (cf. 4.6.8-10): the conspiracy was centered on Rome, albeit with some support in Etruria (cf. §5.1-2) and designs on other parts of Italy (cf. §8.1-3 (Praeneste) and §9.8 (*distribuisti partes Italiae*) with n.). Is *nos consules* an instance of the *pluralis maiestatis*, or is C., for once, including his colleague Antonius (cf. on §2.1)?

4-5 nam illa nimis . . . manu sua occidit: *nam* is used in an *occupatio*, i.e. it forestalls a potential objection, in this case that other, more ancient examples could be adduced; cf. Hand iv 16-17; Seyffert and Müller on *Amic.* 45 (p. 313): *OLD* s.v. 5. *praeteritio*, the ostensible omission of certain points which are then nonetheless listed, is a well-known rhetorical technique, often exploited by C.; cf. Lausberg §§882-5. C. could have offered a chronological list of examples, but that would have been tiresome; instead he gives emphasis to the striking example of recent times involving action by a private citizen and downplays the cases of C. Servilius Ahala and Spurius Maelius as belonging to the *nimis antiqua*. C. offers his most detailed account of these events at *Mil.* 72: Milo could have said *occidi, occidi, non Sp. Maelium, qui annona leuanda iacturisque rei familiaris, quia nimis amplecti plebem uidebatur, in suspicionem incidit regni appetendi*. The circumstances point to the famine years 440-39; cf. Rickman (1980) 30-1. The sources diverge as to whether C. Servilius Ahala was delegated to assassinate Maelius by the senate or was acting as *magister equitum* under orders of Cincinnatus, secretly appointed dictator (the secrecy obviates the absence from the *fasti* of a dictatorship in this period). It seems likely that the deed was known to tradition simply as a political assassination with background variously supplied according to the historian's political standpoint; the incident became topical in light of the Gracchi, whose defenders no doubt preferred the version in which Ahala acted as a magistrate and under orders from higher authority (in contrast to Scipio's action as a *priuatus*). Cf. Münzer, *RE* II A 2.1768.38 (Servilius no. 32) esp. 1770.9 and 54; *RE* XIV 1.239.24 (Maelius no. 2); Ogilvie on Livy 4.12-16 and (on the name Ahala) 4.13.14. In a traditional, agrarian society the *nouum* is not necessarily welcome, and it is striking in how many of its

usages *nouus* has negative connotations, including *res nouae*, "constitutional changes" or "revolution"; cf. *OLD* s.v. *nouus* esp. 10a; 4.6.3-4 *noua quaedam misceri et concitari mala*. The participial description *nouis rebus studentem* sets Maelius in parallel with Tiberius Gracchus and Catiline, but the facts are less clear in his case; cf. *Mil.* 72, cited above.

5-7 fuit, fuit . . . hostem coercerent: C. often geminates the verb (as here *fuit fuit*) to create emphasis or excitement in the speeches; cf. examples cited by Wills (1996) 103; Wölfflin (1882) 437. **ista . . . uirtus:** *iste* can be used non-contemptuously to refer to something well known (cf. *OLD* s.v. 3) and can prompt a following consecutive clause (cf. K-S II 248). *uirtus* is "courage" rather than "virtue" in light of the following *uiri fortes*. The *ut*-clause is carefully ordered to mirror the content, with the *uiri fortes* and their verb *coercerent* surrounding their adversaries, just as they are described as "holding them in check" (*OLD* s.v. *coerceo* 6). C. often uses the sg. *hostis* as a collective (cf. Lebreton (1901) 79-80); here *ciuis* follows suit. C. leaves no doubt that he assigns Catiline to the category of *ciuis perniciosus*; cf. his description at §5.4-5 as *perniciem rei publicae molientem*; similarly §§8.7-8 and 28.2; and his followers are called a *magna et perniciosa sentina rei publicae* at §12.8-9. **acerbissimum hostem:** there were different types of war to be fought with different degrees of severity; cf. Cic. *Off.* 1.38. C.'s argument implicitly erases the distinction between *hostis* and *ciuis*, a topic of deliberation on 5 December; cf. 4.10.7-10n.; for the term *hostis* implying a foreign enemy cf. 2.11.5-10n.; *Off.* 1.37; Jal (1963) esp. 65-6.

7-10 habemus senatus consultum . . . consules desumus: the senate's decree is given greater weight by the epithets *uehemens et graue*, often juxtaposed by C. beginning with *Ver.* 2.3.130 (*graue crimen est hoc et uehemens*). With these epithets as well as *eius modi senatus consultum* (§4.9) C., while avoiding the technical term, implies that he has at his disposal the *senatus consultum ultimum* (s.c.u.; cf. Sal. 29.2; Dio 37.31.2; Plut. *Cic.* 15.5; Asc. *Pis.* 6C), and this is generally assumed by scholars (e.g. Syme (1964) 78; Ungern-Sternberg (1970) 87); but Madden (1977-8) 277 denies this on the grounds that the only decree available at this time was the one passed on 21 October at a meeting described at *Mur.* 51; C. adds (*ibid.*) that it was formulated *non satis seuerē*; possibly he had hoped for Catiline to be declared a *hostis* by name, as he later was when he joined Manlius (Sal. 36.2). The immediate cause for the decree was a report by the ex-praetor Q. Arrius about the massing of forces in Etruria (Plut. *Cic.* 15.5; cf. §5.1-5n.). In general *ordo* is a social group defined by civic function; for the term and its limitations as a basis for analysing Roman society cf. Harris (1988) 600-1. In senate speeches *hic ordo* refers specifically to the senate; cf. §§20.4 and 30.1, 4.15.7-8, and other examples at *OLD* s.v. *ordo* 4a. *nos* as optional subject would be emphatic, especially at the beginning of its clause, but the effect is reinforced by the repetition (see the previous note); for *desum* cf. 4.18.1-2n. Again one wonders if the plural includes his colleague (see on lines 2-4 above); §4.14-15 clarifies: *iam me ipse inertiae nequitiaeque condemno*; cf. the remark at *Phil.* 10.23 *M. Bruti . . . exercitus . . . uidete ne nimium paene patientis*. The self-accusation is, however, merely put forward to clear the way for a defense of his procedure (cf. §30); cf. *Phil.* 2.96 *nos quidem contemnendi, qui auctorem odimus, acta defendimus*.

4.1-4 decreuit quondam senatus . . . M. Fulvius consularis: the senate had been unable to take effective counter-measures against Tiberius Gracchus' encroachment upon its traditional prerogatives; its failure was exposed for all to see when its members, as *priuati*, resorted to violence (see on §3.1-2). Eleven years after Tiberius' death, the tribunate of his brother, C. Gracchus (122-1), posed a similar challenge to the senate, but a new tool was created for dealing with it. The senate did not name a dictator, the traditional crisis-manager of the Roman state; the office, military in origin, as the older designation *magister populi* shows (cf. Dyck on *Leg.* 3.9.2), had been out of use since the Hannibalic War and suffered from various disadvantages in dealing with internal disorder; hence the use for the first time in the crisis of 121 of the *senatus consultum ultimum* (s.c.u.). The wording of the decree was, however, vague (*uideant consules ne quid res publica detrimenti capiat*: lines 1-2; similarly C.'s proposal at *Phil.* 5.34), its constitutional status unclarified; cf. in general Mendner (1966); Ungern-Sternberg (1970); Mitchell (1971); Vanderbroeck (1987) 156-60; Burckhardt (1988) 88-110, esp. 92-3 (disadvantages of the dictatorship); Ansuategui (1990); Lintott (1999a) 89-93. L. Opimius alone figures in the decree since his colleague Q. Fabius Maximus was waging war in southern Gaul. On the day when a vote was to be taken to repeal the founding of a colony at Carthage (a part of the Gracchan reform program) tensions ran high on both sides; the murder of Q. Antullius, an assistant of Opimius, triggered the senatorial decree, armed with which the consul took the actions C. describes; the casualties, which included Gracchus, are put at 3,000 by our sources. On C. Gracchus' legislative achievements, decline, and fall cf. Stockton (1979) chs. 6-8. C. is vague about the charges (*propter quasdam seditionum suspiciones*; 4.4.3-4 is a bit more explicit: *quod agrarios concitare conatus est*; cf. also 4.13.6-8n.) but detailed about Gracchus' lineage; the suggestion is that suspected *seditio* outweighs nobility of birth (a warning to Catiline, who invoked the latter against C. (Sal. 31.7)) or rank (cf. *consularis* attached to M. Fulvius). The elder Tiberius Gracchus celebrated a triumph over the Celtiberians and their allies (178) and was twice consul (177, 163) as well as censor (169); C. often contrasts him with his sons (cf. Dyck on *Off.* 2.43); for a similar technique of defamation cf. on 3.10.14-17 and 4.13.1-6. **clarissimo . . . auo** refers to the maternal grandfather, Scipio Africanus (the paternal grandfather Publius is unknown and presumed to have died young; cf. Münzer, *RE* IIA 2 s.v. Sempronius no. 53). After serving as consul in 125 M. Fulvius Flaccus gained election as tribune for 122. A staunch supporter of Gracchus, on the fatal day he organized armed resistance on the Aventine and sent his younger son to negotiate with Opimius and the senate; Opimius sent him back with word that he would engage in no negotiation but expected unconditional surrender; when the boy returned to negotiate further he was arrested and later put to death. After the collapse of the resistance Fulvius and his other son were likewise killed. Cf. Münzer, *RE* VII 1.242.50 (Fulvius no. 58). The repeated placement of verbs at the head of clauses in this section suggests drastic and energetic action (*decreuit . . . interfectus est . . . occisus est*); cf. *Mil.* 35 *fecit iratus, fecit inimicus, fuit ultor iniuriae*; von Albrecht (1989) 42 and n. 45.

5–7 simili senatus consulto . . . poena remorata est? earlier in 63 C. had revisited these events in defending the elderly senator C. Rabirius before a popular court on charges of treason (*perduellio*) for his part in the attack on Saturninus and Glaucia. **simili senatus consulto:** the second known application of the *s.c.u.* In 100 C. Marius was consul for the sixth of his seven times (for his biography cf. Carney (1970) with *OCD* ³ s.v.); his colleague L. Valerius Flaccus was hereditary *flamen Martialis* (whether holding the office by 100 is uncertain). He went on to be censor (97) and *princeps senatus* (by 86); in 82 as *interrex* he proposed the law naming Sulla dictator and was rewarded with the title *magister equitum*; in *Rab. perd.* 27 C. speaks of him as already dead. Cf. F. Münzer, *RE* VIII A 1.22.60 (Valerius no. 176). **est permissa res publica:** this order of elements of the periphrastic verb secures the double cretic clausula. *permitto* is to “commit, entrust” (*OLD* s.v. 3b); its use of a government is forestalled by Acc. *trag.* 18 *regnum tibi permitti malunt?* **num** implies that a negative answer is expected (*OLD* s.v. 3); *unum diem* is accusative of extent of time’ (G–L §336). The reformists L. Appuleius Saturninus (tr. pl. 100) and C. Servilius Glaucia (tr. pl. 101; pr. 100) are, unlike the Gracchi, identified by office (cf. *M. Fulvius consularis*). The violence occurred in connection with the consular elections for 99, when Glaucia’s candidature was disallowed and another candidate, C. Memmius, was beaten to death by Saturninus’ followers. Acting under the decree, Marius formed an *ad hoc* militia and surrounded Saturninus and his men on the Capitoline Hill; they surrendered to Marius under an agreement by which they would not face summary justice, but they were nonetheless killed by a citizen posse; Glaucia was later captured and killed. For a full account of the reform program and the deaths of Saturninus and Glaucia cf. A. Lintott, *CAH* ix 95–103; Schneider (1982–3). **mors ac . . . poena** form a hendiadys: “the death penalty.” *remoror* is to “detain” a person, “keep (him) waiting”: *OLD* s.v. 2a. C. does not distinguish between the actions of Marius under the *s.c.u.* and the posse that killed Saturninus and his followers after their surrender; cf. also 3.15.10–13n.

7–8 at uero nos . . . horum auctoritatis: with *at . . . nos* C. shapes a stark contrast between the present and the past; for *uero* see on §2.2 (*immo uero*). **uicesimum iam diem** contrasts sharply with the timing of previous action under the *s.c.u.* (*nox nulla intercessit* and *num unum diem*); C. pursued a similarly cautious policy in 43: *malui uiginti diebus post sententiam meam laudari ab omnibus quam a paucis hodie uituperari* (*Phil.* 6.16). The chronology is problematic: Asconius 6C gives 18 days between the senate’s decree and the current meeting; C. has evidently rounded the figure up. Asconius’ figure is the basis for the majority view that our speech was delivered on 8 November; cf. appendix 2. *acies* is the sharp edge, e.g. of a sword, used metaphorically as early as Plautus (*orationis aciem contra conferam*: *Epid.* 547); cf. *OLD* s.v. 1. C. elaborates the metaphor with *hebescere* (“grow dull”) and *tamquam in uagina reconditum*. **horum** alludes to the senators, as in §1.5 (*horum ora uultusque*), a reminder that C. is still haranguing Catiline.

9–12 habemus enim . . . ad confirmandam audaciam: *habemus enim . . . consultum*: the wording echoes §3.7–8 (*habemus senatus consultum in te*; see *ad loc.*); *eius modi*

connects with the foregoing *exempla*; *enim* relates this thought as background to the preceding assertion. **inclusum in tabulis**: senatorial decrees were inscribed on tablets and stored under supervision of the urban quaestors in the *aerarium*, where, however, they were not easy to consult; cf. Livy 39.4.8; Plut. *Cat. min.* 17.3; Mommsen (1887–8) II 546 and III 1010; Culham (1989) esp. 102–3 and n. 12; on the *aerarium* 2.25.1–6n.; the problem in this case is that the measure has *merely* been inscribed, not acted upon. **senatus consultum . . . quo ex senatus consulto**: the antecedent is repeated within the relative clause, a feature of the fussy Latinity of official reports that becomes less common in C.’s mature style; cf. Parzinger (1910) 83–6; Landgraf on *Sex. Rosc.* 8; K–S II 283–84; H–S 563–64; G–L §615; many examples are cited by Ellendt on *De orat.* 1.174. The impersonal *conuenit* (“it is fitting”) is used, as often, with the acc. + inf. construction; cf. *OLD* s.v. *conuenio* 6b. This is now the fourth direct address to Catiline, each after the first connected with a particularly telling point (*ad mortem te . . . duci . . . oportebat*; *habemus senatus consultum in te*; *confestim interfectum te esse . . . conuenit*), whereby the last example combines the points of the previous two. In stark contradiction to the preceding is the asyndetic *uiuus*; for the effect see §5.1–5n. As in §2.2 the verb *uiuio* is geminated leading to amplification, but this time not only is a description of Catiline’s activities appended but also their purpose (*ad* + gerundive); the verb will be geminated again at §6.1; see *ad loc.* It is not as though Catiline has entered into an agreement to change his behavior; rather, his continued existence serves merely to strengthen the *audacia* C. excoriated at §1.1–3.

13–15 Cupio, patres conscripti . . . nequitiaeque condemno: Catiline’s *uiuus . . . uiuis* seems to be answered by C.’s *cupio . . . cupio* (for Catiline’s quite different desire cf. §3.3); the difficulty is that C.’s two “desires” pull him in different directions. C.’s instincts were toward *clementia* (cf. 4.11.6–9n.), which he would later display as governor of Cilicia (cf. *Att.* 5.16.3); on the concept in general cf. Konstan (2005). **patres conscripti** is the regular way of referring to members of the senate of the Republic (the *conscripti* being presumably those added from the *plebs*), whereas the senators under the monarchy are called *patres tout court* (but even C. does not always observe the distinction); cf. Mommsen (1887–8) III 837–8; *OLD* s.v. *pater* 7b. It is remarkable that in this senate speech the senators are addressed directly only here and at §§9.3, 27.3–4, 29.7, 31.2, and 32.6; cf. Batstone (1994) 218–19 n. 18. *dissolutus*, originally used with reference to clothing (Kinsey on *Quinct.* 38), is “loose,” shading toward “lax, weak” in a moral sense (cf. *OLD* s.v. 2); similarly 2.27.3–4 *mea lenitas adhuc si cui solutior uisa est*; and *dissolute* appears as the antonym of *seuere* at *Phil.* 6.1. *dissolutus* is thus an adjectival correlate of the following *inertia nequitiaeque* (the latter in this context surely “dereliction of duty,” not “criminality”: cf. *OLD* s.v.: our passage belongs under 1 rather than 2); for the genitive of the charge cf. G–L §378. *ipse* is employed, as often, for emphasis with the reflexive pronoun: *OLD* s.v. 2. *iners* was originally “lacking in skill” (< *in* + *ars*) but soon develops to “lazy, inactive”; *inertia* is also a quality of the ne’er-do-wells at 2.21.2–3; cf. *OLD* s.v.; Ernout and Meillet s.v. *ars*. As Batstone (1994) 216 notes, this self-condemnation is only temporary; C. will later (§§29.5–31) “reconceive his inactivity as prudential wisdom.”

5.1-5 castra sunt in Italia . . . perniciem rei publicae molientem: the reason for urgency now follows without any connective particle, the *castra* seemingly bumping up against C.'s self-condemnation for *inertia*. *castra . . . in Italia contra populum Romanum . . . collocata* raises the spectre of another Social War such as the bloody one which raged from 91 to 88, in which young C. served as a *tiro* (*Phil.* 12.27; *Div.* 1.72 and 2.65); cf. in general E. Gabba, *CAH* ix 104-28. *fauces* denotes the maw of a voracious animal (cf. 2.2.6); here the word is applied metaphorically to "a pass forming the approach to a country" (*OLD* s.v. 3c). The site was, more specifically, the Etruscan city of Faesulae (mod. Fiesole), where, almost 20 years previously, Sulla had established a colony of veterans (3.14.12-13; *Mur.* 49; *Gran. Lic.* 36.10) which proved to be the conspiracy's most fertile recruiting-ground. The site had other advantages: it was close enough that Rome could be threatened (cf. *Sal.* 32.2) but could also permit escape into Transalpine Gaul (cf. *Sal.* 57.1). The urgency is further underlined by the emphatically placed *crescit* specified temporally, *in singulos dies* "day by day": Roby §1970(a). The two "halves" of the conspiracy are joined by *autem* and by *castra* being taken up in the second clause (*eorum . . . castrorum*); in both parts of the sentence the point is made that these are public enemies (*hostes*); cf. on §3.5-7. *imperator* designates an officer of the state endowed with *imperium* (the power to command troops: cf. Mommsen (1887-8) I 22-4; Bleicken (1981) 295-7); its application to Catiline is therefore ironic (for Catiline's appropriation of the visible symbols of Roman authority cf. 2.13.6-9 with n.). Was Catiline in fact the *imperator duxque* of the camp as well as the head of the urban conspiracy? This has been doubted (Seager (1973) 240-1), primarily on the basis of the letter addressed by the camp commander C. Manlius (on whom cf. §7.1-4n.) to Q. Marcius Rex (who had been ordered to march his army to Faesulae: *Sal.* 30.3), in which he offers to lay down arms if his demands are met (*Sal.* 33); this does not look like the move of a second in command. There is the possibility that the group in Etruria was more independent, the coordination with the city conspirators looser, than C. suggests here, where he is keen to highlight the threat of Catiline; it is doubtful, however, *pace* Seager, that C.'s rhetoric drove Catiline into Manlius' arms: Catiline was after all the camp's paymaster (*Sal.* 24.2; *App. BC* 2.2.10; cf. also *Phil.* 4.15 *ille* [sc. Catiline] *cum exercitum nullum habuisset, repente conflavit*), and his sudden departure for the camp looks like the execution of a plan previously set (albeit on a different schedule); cf. §§9, 11, and 24.2-3 (*a quo sciam pactam et constitutam cum Manlio diem . . . ?*) and the headnote to this speech. Madden (1977-8) 277 points to the words in the letter Catiline sent to Catulus after his departure, *nuntiatum est uim mihi parari* (*Sal.* 35.5), and suggests that "the beaten reformer may have been deflected by force from exile into Manlius' arms." But in that letter Catiline maintains that he is going to Massilia (*Sal.* 34.2, quoted on §23.1-3); he mentions the preparation of armed resistance as a hindrance from writing at greater length, not as a reason for changing his itinerary. The reference is probably to the despatch of Q. Metellus to the *ager Picenus et Gallicus* to levy troops and deal with the armed enemy (2.5.1-4 and 26.8-10); had Catiline wanted to go in exile to Massilia, as he and his followers claimed (cf. 2.14.5 and 16.1-3), it was evidently open to him to do so at the time of his departure

by continuing north on the Via Aemilia Scauri (cf. §24.1-2n.). If Sallust's chronology can be trusted, Metellus cut off access to Gaul only after Catiline had joined Manlius (57.2-3; Sumner (1963) 216). For relations of Manlius and Catiline see further Phillips (1976) 443-4. **intra moenia:** Vasaly (1993) 52-3 follows the theme of the city walls through the speech and argues that C. seeks to make them "a physical and moral boundary between patriots and traitors"; similarly *Phil.* 3.13 *cum enim tuto haberi senatum sine praesidio non posse iudicauistis, tum statuistis etiam intra muros Antoni scelus audaciamque uersari*. *intra moenia* is bad enough, still worse for the director of the conspiracy to be *in senatu*; the point is joined with *atque adeo* "and moreover," commonly used in C.'s earlier works for an emphatic addition; cf. Parzinger (1910) 111; *OLD* s.v. *atque* 4b; the full implications of §2.2 (*in senatum uenit*) are becoming clear. The transmission is divided between *uidemus* and *uidetis* (see app. crit.); the former seems preferable in view of the apparent blindness of some senators (§30.1-2 *nonnulli sunt in hoc ordine qui . . . quae imminet non uideant*). **intestinam . . . perniciem rei publicae molientem** varies *istam pestem quam tu in nos . . . machinaris* (§2.6-7) by adding the first of the images of penetration that Konstan (1993) 14 finds running throughout the Catilinarian corpus. *cotidie* makes the urban threat no less urgent than the one in Etruria (*in dies singulos*, line 2). *molior* suggests ambitious or large-scale actions ("engineer" or the like; cf. *TLL* s.v. 1358.65-6).

5-8 si te iam . . . adducor ut faciam: *comprehendo* is to "seize, arrest" (*OLD* s.v. 5a); such action lay within the curule magistrates' (and tribunes') power of *coercitio*; cf. Mommsen (1887-8) I 136-61. A consul's power to order execution (*interfici*) was, however, controversial; cf. on §2.5-7. **credo** is, as often, ironic (*OLD* s.v. 8c): "I think I shall have less cause to fear . . . than . . ."; cf. *Agr.* 1.24 *uerendum, credo, nobis erit, ne uestra ista praeclara lex agraria magis popularis uideatur*. In other words, C. fears the charge of cruelty less than that of tardiness; cf. the non-ironic version at *Sest.* 39 *quos homines si . . . ui armisque superassem, non uerebar ne quis . . . uim ui depulsam reprehenderet*. Clauses of fearing were originally independent wishes; hence *ne* introduces the outcome that is to be feared or averted, *ut* the one wished for; but when a single word is negated, as here *potius, ne non* is required; cf. Mayer (1989) 111; K-S II 252. *bonus* began as a purely evaluative term and continues as such; but C. uses it in political contexts of persons loyal to the senate and the inherited constitution; cf. Hellegouarc'h (1972) 484-93; on C.'s policy of seeking a *consensus bonorum omnium* cf. Strasburger (1931) 62-3. **serius . . . crudelius:** the Latin comparative often appears without an explicit point of reference; in such cases the general practice or norm is to be understood ("too late . . . too cruelly"); cf. 4.13.2 (*crudelior*); G-L §297.2; K-S II 475-6. On Roman notions of cruelty cf. Lintott (1999b) ch. 3; charges of *crudelitas* were, in fact, leveled at C. in the sequel; cf. Berry on *Sul.* 7.10. *uerum* "but" introduces a contrasting point (cf. *OLD* s.v. 2), the explanation of why he nonetheless does not yet act. *quod iam pridem factum esse oportuit* is repeated from §2.5-6 *fin.*; it was argued for at §§3-4. The *certa causa* is the senate's lack of unanimity, hinted at in the next two sentences and described in full at §30. This is the first of three references in the speech to what C.

is “not yet” going to do (*nondum*); cf. §§9.7 and 12.5; he thus holds out the threat of future action.

9–10 tum denique interficere . . . esse fateatur: *denique* is often strengthened by *tum* (“then and only then”); cf. *OLD* s.v. 1b with examples. C. has just said that he can count on the approval of the execution by *omnes boni*; nonetheless he acknowledges that there is not yet consensus and offers three characteristics of possible objectors (with anaphora of *tum*); at §30.5–6 he acknowledges that the *imperiti* might also complain. The opposite of the *bonus* is, in C., ordinarily not the *malus* but the *improbis*, the scoundrel, the man without rectitude; cf. Hellegouarc’h (1972) 528; Achard (1981) 197–8; also often opposed to *bonus* is *perditus*, which develops from “debilitated, financially ruined” to “morally depraved”: Hellegouarc’h (1972) 532–4; *OLD* s.v. esp. 1 and 4. The final term *tui similis* summarizes and adds the point that these epithets apply to Catiline as well; cf. *Phil.* 2.2 *non existimavit sui similibus probari posse se esse hostem patriae, nisi mihi esset inimicus*; similarly *Phil.* 3.18 *a sui similibus invidiam aliquam in me commoueri putat*. **qui id non iure . . . esse fateatur:** Roman law

recognized a case in which a person could be said to have been *iure caesus* (*Lex XII* 1.17 *si nox furtum faxit, ast in occisit, iure caesus esto*); similarly, Scipio Aemilianus, asked in a public meeting about the death of Tiberius Gracchus, replied *iure caesum uideri* (*Cic. Mil.* 8; see Rieger (1991) 176–88). C. is looking for unanimous approval along such lines. The relative clause has consecutive force; cf. G–L §631.1.

6.1–4 quam diu quisquam . . . atque custodient: having delineated the crisis of state at length, C. adds that nothing is going to change; this follows from the policy just stated, *uiues* with the given restriction (*quam diu . . .*) corresponding to the preceding *interficere* with its qualifier; cf. Batstone (1994) 232. The behavior of the hypothetical defender (*qui te defendere audeat*) mirrors the *audacia* of Catiline himself (§§1.1–3 and 4.11–12); the subjunctive (*audeat*) follows the relative with indefinite, antecedent (G–L §631.2). **uiues, et uiues** is a response to Catiline’s *uiuis et uiuis . . . ad confirmandam audaciam* (§4.11–12). *-es ita ut uiuis* (βγ) yields C.’s favorite clausula (cretic + trochee);

in addition, Latin sometimes uses the present of a continuing action where in English one must insert “now” or emphasize the auxiliary; for these reasons *ut uiuis* deserves preference to the version (αο) in which *nunc* is inserted after *ut*. C. has previously spoken of guards (*praesidium, uigiliae*: §1.3), but only here does he acknowledge the measures to have been taken on his initiative (*meis*); this implies that these are private guards deployed on C.’s advice (2.26.1–2; 3.29.7–9); see further on §11.5–6. *obsideo* is to “surround in a hostile way”; it takes up the idea of confinement from §1.6–7 (*constrictam . . . teneri coniurationem tuam*); contrast §32.3–4 where Catiline and his followers are the subject: *desinant . . . obsidere cum gladiis curiam* (for a metaphorical usage cf. §26.3–7n.). *commouere se* is to “take action”: *OLD* s.v. *commoueo* 8; the expression recurs at §7.10 and 2.27.8; for the conspiracy’s being directed *contra rem publicam* cf. also 2.6.8 and 18.15. The word order of the next sentence is so managed that the senses of the *multi* and the verbs they govern dominate, with Catiline and his attribute divided and

trumped by their neighbors: the *multi* beside *te*; the eyes and ears that act to control the conspiracy juxtaposed with Catiline's attribute *non sentientem* ("unaware": *OLD* s.v. *sentio* 2). *speculabuntur* would have sufficed to denote the action of the eyes and ears, but *atque custodient* summarizes the overall effect of his measures and yields a double cretic clausula.

5–10 Etenim quid est . . . licet recognoscas: *etenim*, as often, introduces a rhetorical question (*OLD* s.v. b); for the mood of *expectes* cf. the previous note (*audeat*). Conspirators tend to operate at night, as C.'s counter-measures show he was aware (*nocturnum praesidium, uigiliae*: §1.3), but thanks to the effective eyes and ears of his spies Catiline's evasive moves (*tenebris obscurare . . . parietibus continere*) have been thwarted. Has Catiline sought to conceal *coeptus nefarios* (βγ) or *coetus nefarios* (α)? Surely the former has been corrupted to the latter; cf. §10.1 *uixdum etiam coetu uestro dimisso* and §11.8 *conatus tuos nefarios*. *fas* and *nefas* are terms for the religiously permissible and impermissible; the adj. *nefarius* derives from the latter and is used from the time of C. onward in the general sense "wicked": Ernout and Meillet s.v. *fas*; Latte (1960) 38; *OLD* s.v. *nefarius*; the word recurs at §§25.5 and 33.3. *illustrantur* ("be illuminated") and *erumpunt* ("burst out"; cf. §31.4) continue the reference to the senses of seeing and hearing. The breach of security is ominous; in C.'s pledge at §32.9–10 the disclosure of the conspiracy leads to its being crushed: *ut . . . omnia patefacta, illustrata, oppressa, uindicata esse uideatis*. With *priuata domus* C. evidently alludes to Laeca's house, the scene of the conspirators' meeting on the night of 6–7 November; cf. §§8–10. *coniuratio* is abstract for concrete (= *coniurati*); cf. Lebreton (1901) 53. *tuae* is inserted after *coniurationis* in α and β, an unnecessary clarification that destroys a double cretic clausula. **muta iam istam mentem:** *mens* is the "purpose, design, intention" (*OLD* s.v. 7) of Catiline (second person reference of *iste*: *OLD* s.v. 1; H–S 183–4). **mihi crede** personalizes the tone and softens the command. For *caedes atque incendia* cf. on §3.3. **teneris undique** summarizes the position and repeats more pithily the point of §1.6–7 *constrictam iam . . . teneri coniurationem tuam non uides?* **luce clarius:** the proverbial phrase is first attested here; cf. Otto (1890) 203. *recognosco*, here with reference to a long series of past events, means "review," whereas in §8.6, alluding to a specific night, it has the sense "recall": *OLD* s.v. 1 and 3; in this context *licet* seems unusually polite.

Narratio/Argumentatio: the conspirators' plans (7–10.4)

The *narratio* of a forensic speech provides the jury with needed facts and background. Here C. has the different aim of showing Catiline that he possesses detailed advance knowledge of his plans and moves (hence his accurate predictions of 21 October (§7)) and receives it instantly (*haec ego omnia, uixdum etiam coetu uestro dimisso, comperi*: §10.1). The section does, however, conform to the precept that the narrative should be *breuis*, *aperta*, and *probabilis* (*Inu.* 1.28; similarly *De orat.* 2.80; *Orat.* 122); cf. Lausberg §294. In spite of the insertion of the digression *o di immortales! . . . uoce uulnero* in §9.1–7, this passage gives a fairly brisk account of Catiline's recent plans and C.'s counter-measures. The accumulation of specific detail (the exact location of the meeting of

6–7 November, Catiline's detailed plans for Italy and Rome, the identification of the assassins as two *equites Romani*, their promise to act *ea ipsa nocte*) helps to make the narrative *aperta* (cf. §8.8–9 *non agam obscure*) and *probabilis*.

7.1–4 meministine me . . . administrum tuae?: the direct address to Catiline continues; the sentence contains two indirect statements, one depending on the other; hence for clarity C. begins with the leading verb *meministi* with the interrogative particle *-ne* attached. *memini* is followed in older Latin by the present infinitive (hence here *dicere*, not *dixisse*); cf. H–S 357. C. is painstaking about the chronology, with two explicit dates, 21 and 27 October. **ante diem XII Kalendas Nouembres** was probably originally *ante die XII Kalendas Nouembres* “before (namely on the 12th day before) the Kalends of November,” with abl. changed to acc. following *ante* by misunderstanding of the construction; cf. H–B §667a. For a theory as to why C. chose not to publish the speech he delivered in the senate on 21 October cf. J. Crawford (1984) 88–9. C. varies future forms of *sum*, which were based upon *fu-*, originally a reduplication (cf. Oscan pf. *fufens*) but reinterpreted as a verb stem, first *fore* (< **fu-se*), then *futurus esset*; cf. Meiser §129. To be *in* (or *sub*) *armis* is to be “under arms, mobilized”: OLD s.v. *arma* 5e. **certo die:** on a fixed or prearranged day: OLD s.v. *certus* 1a and d. For repetition of the antecedent with the relative (*die, qui dies*), cf. §4.9–12n. The source of C.'s foreknowledge is unclear; possibly this was part of the intelligence supplied by Q. Arrius (cf. §3.7–10n.). Madden (1977–8) 277 thinks that

these apparently mantic powers are easily explained by assuming October 21 as the originally scheduled and October 22 or thereabouts as the eventual election day, thus allowing a plausible five days or so for news of Catiline's defeat by the hated Murena . . . to reach Faesolae and provoke Manlius and his now desperate followers to revolt.

But for time for word to travel from Faesulae see 2.15.5–7n.; and Benson (1986) convincingly places the elections in July. **audaciae satellitem . . . tuae:** as his leading characteristic *audacia tua* substitutes for Catiline himself; cf. §1.2–3n. *satelles*, a loan-word, perhaps from Etruscan, was originally a bodyguard, as when Pyrgopolynices commands *sequimini, satellites* (Plaut. *Mil.* 78); from C. onward it acquires a negative connotation as “an accomplice (in crime)”: OLD s.v. 2; Ernout and Meillet s.v.; the new usage is assisted by the clarifying addition *atque administrum*, which, followed by *tuae*, secures the double cretic clausula; for the phrasing cf. *Phil.* 11.3 *a socio furoris sui*; *Phil.* 13.43 *adiutor . . . dementiae*. C. Manlius had enriched himself as a centurion under Sulla (one Sullan centurion is reported to have exceeded a census of 10 million sesterces: Asc. 90C) and apparently settled at Faesulae as a member of the Sullan military colony (cf. §5.1–5n.). He is known to have visited Rome to aid Catiline's second campaign for the consulate (Plut. *Cic.* 14.3), apparently in the company of other veterans from Faesulae (*Mur.* 49). At 2.20 C. treats him as typical of the class of Sullan colonists who squandered their living and were reduced to desperate measures. Cf. Münzer, *RE* XIV 1.1156–7 (s.v. Manlius 18).

4-6 num me fefellit . . . dies?: a second question amplifies both the quality of the act (*res tanta, tam atrox tamque incredibilis*) and the precision of C.'s foreknowledge (*id quod multo magis est admirandum, dies*). For *num* cf. §4.5-7n. Cf. *Mil.* 45 *quem ad modum igitur eum dies non fefellit?* The verb (*fefellit*) agrees, as usual, with the nearer subject (cf. G-L §211), *res. atrox* is expressive of a viscerally negative reaction ("shocking" or the like); it is formed from *ater* with the suffix -ωψ/-ox (= "with the aspect of, looking like"); cf. *OLD* s.v. 6; Ernout and Meillet s.v.; Leumann (1977) 377.

6-9 dixi ego idem . . . profugerunt: *dixi ego idem in senatu* continues the narrative begun with *meministine me . . . dicere in senatu* (hence *idem*: *OLD* s.v. 3b). C. obtained this knowledge from anonymous letters brought to him by Crassus, M. Marcellus, and Metellus Scipio on the night of 20-21 October (Plut. *Cic.* 15.1-3; Dio 37.31.1; Ward (1977) 181-5; for the date Marinone (2004) 83). The timing (28 October) suggests that the action in the city was to take place more or less simultaneously with the rising in Etruria. *optimates*, no less than *boni* (cf. §5.5-8n.), could be used to designate the upper class. The word derives from *optimus* extended with the ethnic suffix -as as in *Arpinas*; hence perhaps the cutting power of the phrase *natio optimatum*, at which C. bristles at *Sest.* 96-7; cf. Hellegouarc'h (1972) 500-5; Achard (1981) 370-3. A *caedes optimatum* was, according to C., what Catiline and Cn. Piso were planning in the "first conspiracy" (fr. orat. *tog. cand.* 21; cf. Introduction section 1); similarly at *Mur.* 81 C. speaks in that connection of a *consilium senatus interficiendi*. Cf. also §15.3-4 *consulium et principum ciuitatis interficiendorum causa*; §21.5 of the senators *quorum tibi . . . est . . . uita uilissima. confero* here is to "assign (an event to a particular date)": *OLD* s.v. 6c. *tum* as well as the indicative mood signals that the *cum*-clause is purely temporal (cf. Roby §1721; G-L §580), though, if he had wanted, C. could have connected the announcement and the flight as cause and effect. *profugio* ("run away, make one's escape, flee": *OLD* s.v. 1a) suggests terror; but *non tam . . . quam* attributes a more honorable motive to the *principes ciuitatis* than might at first appear. The *principes ciuitatis* are "leading citizens"; the limiting genitive is optional; cf. *OLD* s.v. *princeps* 3; Kaster on *Sest.* 84. *sui* is both the gen. sg. and (as here) pl. of the reflexive pronoun; cf. G-L §102.

9-12 num infitiri potes . . . contentum esse dicebas?: one might have thought that Catiline's plan was forestalled by the mass exodus of the *principes ciuitatis*, but C. claims that he planned to proceed nonetheless and was only foiled by C.'s counter-measures. The aggressive questioning resumes with "railroading" *num* (cf. §4.5-7n.). *te* appears twice as both the subject of *potuisse* and object of *commouere*; ambiguity is avoided by the separation of the two pronouns and the fact that *commouere te contra rem publicam* is repeated virtually as a fixed phrase from §6.2-3 (see *ad loc.*). C.'s chronology is emphatic and precise: *illo ipso die*, i.e. 28 October. In *meis praesidiis, mea diligentia* the possessive adjective is emphatic; this would accord with their having been privately organized; cf. Nippel (1995) 52; cf. §6.2 *multis meis et firmis praesidiis obsessus* with n. This is the earliest attestation of *circumcludo* ("hedge in," here metaphorical); cf. 2.14.8; *OLD* s.v. 2b; *TLL* s.v. 1126.33-4. There is a chiasmic arrangement of nouns and modifiers *discessu ceterorum nostra . . . caede* in adversative relation (indicated by *tamen*); in English perhaps "in spite of the departure of the rest, nevertheless." *discessu*

is abl. of attendant circumstances (Roby §1240; K-S 1410-11), the abl. absolute being impossible for lack of a perfect active pple.; cf. *Att.* 1.16.5 *ita summo discessu bonorum, pleno foro seruorum, iudices ita fortes tamen fuerunt ut* etc. *nostra* functions as antecedent of *qui*, as if C. had written *nostrorum*, a common *constructio ad sensum*; cf. K-S 1599. **qui remansissemus**: the pluperfect subj. is expected of a completed action in clauses in past sequence of *oratio obliqua*; cf. G-L §§510 and 654. The hyperbaton *nostra . . . caede* emphasizes the noun. **cum . . . dicebas** "at a time when you were saying," a purely temporal use of the indicative in a *cum*-clause; cf. H-S 622. One wonders, however, whether Catiline actually "said" this; more probably C. has inferred this from his behavior. C. pictures Catiline obsessed with getting rid of him (cf. §§9, 11, 19), albeit since his defeat in the recent elections the planned assassination has been "coordinated with his larger scheme for a *coup d'état*" (Price (1996) 247).

8.1-3 quid? cum tu te Praeneste . . . uigiliis esse munitam?: like the Spanish inverted question mark, *quid?* signals that a query is coming; cf. *OLD* s.v. *quis* 14. The polyptoton of the pronoun (*tu te* (the reading of βγ)) underlines Catiline's self-confidence; cf. Alberti (1987) 211-12. **cum . . . confideres**: the imperfect subj. is expected in a *cum*-clause in past narrative; cf. G-L §585. Located on a spur of the Apennines 23 miles to the east, Praeneste (mod. Palestrina) was a colony of Alba and early member of the Latin League; the city allied with Rome c. 500, but beginning with the Gallic sack of 390, the early annals told of her repeated defections. Most recently Praeneste had served as a redoubt for Cinna and the younger Marius when expelled from Rome. Though under siege the Praenestines surrendered to Sulla's lieutenant Q. Lucretius Ofella, it did them no good: the town was sacked and stripped of its fortifications; most of its citizens were executed, and a Sullan military colony (*illam coloniam*) was installed on the site. Catiline targeted Praeneste as a strong point from which Rome could be threatened and in the hope that the Sullan veterans settled there would, like those at Faesulae, be ripe for revolution; cf. §5.1-5n. and 2.20 with nn.; in general E. H. Bunbury in Smith (1865) s.v.; G. Radke, *RE* xxii 2.1549-56 s.v. **Kalendis ipsis Nouembribus**: *ipse* signals a climax: we have now reached the Kalends themselves after a series of dates prior to them (*OLD* s.v. *ipse* 1 and 8). **nocturno impetu**: for night as Catiline's favored time of action cf. on §§1.3-5 (*nocturnum praesidium*) and 6.5-10; as an integral part of the plan the words are folded in between *occupaturum* and *esse*, the juxtaposition of which with *confideres* effects a fine double cretic. *confido* accords with the portrait of Catiline's *audacia* beginning in §1; it contrasts with the implications of *sensistine* "did you become aware that . . .," followed by acc. + inf. (*OLD* s.v. *sensio* 2b); Catiline's late realization of the situation likewise contrasts with C.'s own prior awareness and precautions (see next n.). **meo iussu meis praesidiis** again lays emphasis on the pronominal adj.; cf. §§ 6.2 (*meis . . . praesidiis*) and 7.9-10 (*meis praesidiis, mea diligentia*). **praesidiis, custodiis, uigiliis**: an example of συνωνυμία and asyndeton, the reinforced and tightly packed words for guard seeming to mirror the tight security imposed. *custodia* is abstract for concrete (cf. *OLD* s.v. 5; Lebreton (1901) 59), perhaps chosen in preference

to *custos* for the sake of assonance of endings when combined with *praesidiis* and *uigiliis*; similarly 2.26.2. The order *esse munitam* effects the equivalent of cretic + trochee.

4-5 nihil agis . . . planeque sentiam: for anaphora of *nihil* cf. §1.3-5n. Catiline's three actions are held in check by C.'s three verbs of perceiving. *ago* is the verb for acting in the most general sense; for *molior* cf. §5.1-5n.; C. claims access even to what Catiline thinks or devises (*cogitas*). **quod . . . audiam . . . uideam . . . sentiam:** the subj. is expected in the relative clause with *nihil* or other indefinite as antecedent; cf. §6.1-4n. The thought moves from the weaker to the stronger sense (cf. *De orat.* 2.357 *acerrimum autem ex omnibus nostris sensibus esse sensum uidendi*; 3.4.1-7n.) and concludes with perception itself.

6-8 Recognosce mecum tandem . . . rei publicae: for the sense of *recognosco* cf. on §6.5-10. *tandem* is a marker of impatience in commands no less than in questions; cf. §1.1n.; *OLD* s.v. 1c. With *noctem illam superiorem* C. seems to refer back to the *superior nox* of §1.7 (cf. *OLD* s.v. *ille* 2; Vretska (1961) 186-7), i.e. the night of 6-7 November (cf. *Sul.* 52 *nocte ea quae consecuta est posterum diem nonarum Nouembrium*). In the next sentence C. refers to the same night more loosely as *priore nocte* and then, after a digression, remarks *fuisti igitur apud Laecam illa nocte* (§9.7-8). **iam intelleges** continues Catiline's learning process (cf. *sensistine* §8.2). Catiline was noted for his endurance of wakefulness and other privations; cf. §26.3-8, 3.16-17; *Sal.* 5.3; similar, ironic characterization of his men at 2.22.8-9. C. is prepared to compete with him here, however, and even claim superiority (*multo . . . acrius*, emphasized by hyperbaton); cf. 2.19.6-7 and 27.10 and 3.3.6-8. The contrast lies in their goals (*ad salutem . . . ad perniciem rei publicae*). For the *salus populi* as the supreme principle guiding the consuls cf. *Leg.* 3.8.2 with Dyck's n. Attested from Plautus onward, *perniciem* is derived from *nex* expanded with *per-* (though this is unusual in a substantive) and the *-ies* suffix that forms abstracts or qualities; cf. *OLD* s.vv. *perniciem*, *per-*, *-ies*; Ernout and Meillet s.v. *nex*. C. finds plentiful use for it and the related adj. *perniciosus* in the *Catilinarians*; most commonly it is the *perniciem rei publicae* or the like that C. is working to avert (besides our passage: §5.4-5, 2.11.12, 4.2.13, 10.11 and 15, and 22.5; cf. also 2.1.4-6 *nulla iam perniciem . . . moenibus ipsis intra moenia comparabitur*), once his own *perniciem* (§11.10); and at §33.1-2 C. bids Catiline depart *cum tua peste ac perniciem*; similarly at §24.4 he expresses confidence that the Marian eagle will be *perniciosus*, rather than helpful, to Catiline and his followers; these latter are described as the *magna et perniciosus sentina rei publicae* at §12.8-9; and C. discusses the treatment of a *ciuis* or *ciues perniciosus*/-i at §§3.7 and 28.2.

8-10 dico te priore nocte . . . scelerisque socios: *dico* is emphatic: "I assert"; for *priore nocte* see the previous n. **inter falcarios** "Scythemakers' Street": the Romans designated their streets after the trades or ethnic groups represented there; cf. *Livy* 35.41.10 *et iidem* [sc. *aediles curules*] *porticum extra portam Trigemina inter lignarios fecerunt* and other parallels cited by Knapp (1920) 193-4. **non agam obscure:** a self-correction, as if C. originally meant to let the name of the street suffice. Gradual revelation is a conscious rhetorical technique, the addition of the precise house enhancing credibility. M. Porcius Laeca, a senator, was placed by Sallust at a meeting of the conspirators alleged to have taken place in 64 (17.3; but cf. §1.7n.);

his house also figures as the venue for the meeting of 6–7 November at *Sal.* 27.3, who adds that it occurred *intempesta nocte*, and at *Sul.* 52; Laeca was later convicted for his rôle in the conspiracy (*Sul.* 6). Cf. H. Gundel, *RE* xxii 1.213.28 (s.v. Porcius 18). **uenisse . . . conuenisse:** the compound verb may be followed by the simplex to repeat the idea (cf. 4.1.6–9n.), but here the sequence is reversed, Catiline's individual action appropriately expressed by the simplex, the gathering of the rest of the group with *conuenisse*. **eodem** "to the same place" (*OLD* s.v. a). *socius* is *per se* a partner in any sort of undertaking (cf. Wegner (1969) 30–8); but in certain contexts it can take on negative connotations, as here ("confederates" or the like). *amentia* varies *furor* (cf. on §§1.1–2 and 25.3–4) and forms a hendiadys with *scelus* ("mad wickedness"); similarly 3.3.5–6 *sceleris sui socios*. *scelus* seems originally to have denoted "crookedness," referring to physical deformity, and to have been extended to the religious sphere as an antonym of *pietas*; cf. Petersmann (1996) 272–3; 2.25.7–8 *hinc pietas, illinc scelus*.

io num negare audes? quid taces?: occurring precisely at the point where a denial from Catiline might be expected, these are not merely rhetorical questions; C. uses Catiline's silence here as the proof of his complicity; cf. 2.13.3–4 *cum ille homo audacissimus conscientia conuictus primo reticuisset, patefeci cetera*; *Orat.* 129, cited on §1.2–3; Batstone (1994) 243; Stroh (2000) 71–2. For *taciturnitas* as an implicit confession of guilt cf. *Soph. Tr.* 813–14; *Inu.* 1.54; *Sest.* 40; *Sen. Con.* 10.2.6.

io–ii conuincam . . . qui tecum una fuerunt: C. can call on potential witnesses to buttress his claim (*enim*) in the event of denial. Here he does not, however, name individuals, whether because he lacks specifics or merely wants to intimidate Catiline by his claimed knowledge. Sallust 17.3 lists besides Catiline 11 conspirators of senatorial rank (for the status of L. Vargunteius cf. §9.11–13n.); on their (not necessarily financial) motives for joining the conspiracy cf. Shatzman (1975) 223–4.

9.1–5 o di immortales! . . . exitio cogitent!: C. reverts to the mode of exclamatory lamentation; cf. §2.1 *o tempora, o mores!* The colloquial exclamation *di immortales* recurs at 4.15.3 and elsewhere in the speeches 43 times; cf. *OLD* s.v. *deus* 1c and for the *iunctura* §11.1–4n. **ubinam gentium sumus?** for the partitive genitive depending on a local adv. cf. *Att.* 5.10.4 *ubi terrarum esses ne suspicabar quidem* and other examples at K–S 1 434–5; *-nam* adds urgency to the question: "where in the world are we?" (*OLD* s.v. 7). C. drives home the point by repeating the question in several forms. **hic, hic:** the gemination of the local adv. conveys the speaker's excitement; this and other examples are collected by Wölfflin (1882) 433–4; cf. also Winterbottom (2004) 229. **nostro in numero** emphasizes the adj. For *patres conscripti* cf. §4.13–15n. **in hoc orbis . . . consilio:** *sanctus* develops from the sense "guaranteed" to (as here) "sacred"; cf. Fugier (1963) 181–5; *Mur.* 84 *in illo sacrario rei publicae, in ipsa, inquam, curia non nemo hostis est*. *grauitas* is the seriousness of conduct or temperament expected of those who play certain rôles in society and also the entailed influence; hence e.g. the *grauitas censoria* alluded to at *Cael.* 35; C. often associates it with the senate (*De orat.* 1.31; *Phil.* 7.27) or the optimates (*Leg.* 3.17; Achard (1981) 392–9); cf. *OLD* s.v. 6–7; *TLL* s.v. 11A 1a; Hellegouarc'h (1972) 279–82. *consilium* is a deliberative

body or council of state; cf. 3.7.1–4n.; *OLD* s.v. 3b; the honorific epithets make it clear that he is referring to the senate; cf. *Phil.* 3.34, where the senate is the *amplissimum orbis terrae consilium*; *Phil.* 4.14 *senatum, id est orbis terrae consilium, delere gestit*; C. ironically attributes his own *consilium* to Catiline at *Mur.* 83 (*L. Catilina cum sui consilio nefariorum hominum*). **de nostro omnium interitu:** *noster* has the gen. in apposition with it, a common *constructio ad sensum*: *OLD* s.v. 1a; cf. §7.9–12n.; 4.4.6 *ad uestram omnium caedem*. For *atque adeo* cf. §5.4n. **de orbis terrarum exitio:** for the hyperbole cf. §3.2–4n.

6–7 hos ego uideo . . . uoce uulnero!: *hos* takes up and focuses on the preceding *qui . . . cogitent*; for the demonstrative as host of the clitic *ego* cf. §10.2–4n.; here the juxtaposition mirrors the proximity of the two antithetical forces. For the intensification of *uideo . . . et . . . sententiam rogo* cf. §2.2 *uiuuit? immo uero etiam in senatum uenit. res publica* here is the “affairs of state” in a broad sense (*OLD* s.v. 1a). **sententiam rogo** is a technical phrase for asking a senator for his opinion during official deliberations (*OLD* s.v. *rogo* 4). **et** joins an indignant exclamation (*OLD* s.v. 15a). **quos ferro trucidari oportebat:** perhaps referring originally to the slaughter of animals, *trucido* was metaphorically applied to the brutal murder of humans by C. Gracchus (*orat.* 18); it occurs 5 times in the *Catilinarians*; cf. *OLD* s.v. This is the last appearance until §20.2 (*si emori aequo animo non potes*) of the “death motif” so prominent since §2.5–6 (*ad mortem te . . . duci . . . oportebat*; see *ad loc.*), the theme of exile dominating the following sections; cf. Offermann (1995) 234. For *oportebat* cf. §2.5–7n. **uoce uulnero:** *uoce* “by so much as a word”; the combination with *uulnero*, unique in classical Latin, is for contrast with *ferro trucidari*. His voice is C.’s weapon of choice, in contrast to Catiline’s *sica* (§16.2; 2.1.7); cf. *Phil.* 2.1 *ne uerbo quidem uiolatus*; *Phil.* 2.86 *haec te, si ullam partem habes sensus, lacerat, haec cruentat oratio*; for the metaphorical “barbs” of oratory see Berry on *Sul.* 47.3. C. appears to be the first to use *uulnero* metaphorically (“hurt, distress”); cf. *OLD* s.v. 2 and §17.6–7 (*quorum mentes sensusque uulneras*).

7–11 fuisti igitur . . . quod ego uiuerem: Seager (1973) 242–4 argues that the meeting at Laeca’s house was a Ciceronian invention, but he has not adequately explained how, in that case, C. knew in advance that the conspirators Cornelius and Vargunteius would appear at his door the following morning (see on §10.3–4) or why Catiline failed to set the record straight (even if he could not defeat C. in a verbal duel, a simple denial would have been possible). The series of verbs placed at the head of clauses (*fuisti . . . statuisti . . . delegisti . . . discipisti . . . confirmasti . . . dixisti*) suggests Catiline as a leader pursuing a vigorous, goal-oriented program; cf. 3.16.7–17.8. Stroh (2000) 72 takes *igitur* as drawing an inference from Catiline’s silence (*quid taces?* §8.10), whereas Primmer *apud* Stroh (2000) 72 n. 18 sees it as resumptive after the digression *o di immortales! . . . uoce uulnero* (“well then” or “then”): *OLD* s.v. 5; Berry on *Sul.* 87.1. In any case what had been C.’s assertion (§8.8 *dico*) is now treated as fact. **illa nocte** refers back to the *priore nocte* of §8.8, i.e. 6–7 November; cf. *OLD* s.v. *ille* 2. **distribuisti partes Italiae . . . ad incendia:** cf. *Phil.* 5.7 *hic omnem Italiam . . . L. Antonio diuidendam dedit*; *Phil.* 11.13 *Nuculam et Lentonem, Italiae diuisores*; *Phil.* 13.40 and 47 and 14.10. The *prouvinciae* of the conspirators are broken down (*enumeratio*:

Lausberg §§669–70) at 2.6.1–3 *uideo cui sit Apulia attributa, quis habeat Etruriam, quis agrum Picenum, quis Gallicum, quis sibi has urbanas insidias caedis atque incendiorum depoposcerit*; cf. the more general reference (*ad certas res conficiendas certos homines delectos ac descriptos habebat*) at 3.16.10–11. Apulia was first assigned to C. Julius (Sal. 27.1), later to M. Caeparius (3.14.11–12; Sal. 46.3; cf. Sirago (1982) 71–3); C. Manlius was in charge in Etruria (2.20.2–3; Sal. 27.1); a local notable, Septimius Camers, was despatched to the *ager Picenus* (Sal. 27.1; Sirago (1982) 75). There may have been deep resentments going back to Spartacus' revolt, the Social War, the revolt of the slave shepherds in 185, and the suppression of the Bacchanalia (so Sirago (1982); see further 2.6.1–3n.); Stewart (1995) argues, however, that, contrary to the impression left by C., the unrest in Italy at this period is primarily connected with difficulties in enfranchising the *socii*, a problem Catiline may have sought to exploit for his purposes. On plans for the city cf. *Sul.* 53 *cum . . . Cassius incendiis, Cethegus caedi praeponeretur, Autronio ut occuparet curiam praescriberetur*. The specification *urbis partes* suggests tactical use of fire rather than general conflagration, the spectre which C. so often raises (cf. on §3.2–4). **confirmasti**: the syncopated second-person pf. forms, though most common in the dramatists and other poets, are also found in C.; cf. Neue and Wagener (1892–1905) III 500–05. **paulum tibi etiam esse nunc morae**: the separation of *paulum* from the dependent partitive gen. *morae* seems to mirror the suspense felt by Catiline himself.

11–13 reperti sunt . . . interfectores esse pollicerentur: the would-be assassins were L. Vargunteius and C. Cornelius. The former is called *senator* at Sal. 28.1 (cf. also 17.3); he is known to have been tried *de ambitu* (*TLRR* no. 202); a conviction on that charge may have resulted in the loss of his senate seat and the reference to him as an *eques* here: so Linderski (1995) 224–5; *contra* Robinson (1947), proposing instead M. Caeparius; cf. Nicolet (1966–74) II 1060–1. He was later convicted for his rôle in the conspiracy (*TLRR* no. 232). Cf. H. Gundel, *RE* VIII A 1.377 (Vargunteius no. 3). C. describes C. Cornelius' rôle at *Sul.* 6 and 52; he, too, was tried and convicted in 62 for his part in the conspiracy (*TLRR* no. 228). Cf. Münzer, *RE* IV 1.1255 (Cornelius no. 19), who, however, misreads *Sul.* 51 (Cornelius received no *praemium*). **qui . . . pollicerentur** is a final relative clause; cf. G–L §630; the sequel is illogically formulated, perhaps a crossing of *et . . . me . . . interficerent* and *et sese . . . me . . . interfectores esse polliciti sunt*. **in meo lectulo**: the diminutive may seem at first glance surprising in a speech before the senate (cf. 4.2.4 *lectus ad quietem datus* but also 4.17.6 *lectulum suum*) or the bar (*Sul.* 52), but Hanssen (1951) 209 suggests that in general *lectulus* “in C. denotes ‘good, comfortable bed’, often meaning ‘safety at home’”; for the practice of conducting the *salutatio in lectulo* cf. *Rep.* 1.17–18; Allen (1953).

10.1–3 haec ego omnia . . . mane miseras: *haec . . . omnia* summarizes the content of the meeting just described, the demonstrative (*haec*), as usual, serving as host to the clitic pronoun (Adams (1994b) 122–30). **uixdum etiam coetu uestro dimisso** calls attention to the speed and efficiency of C.'s intelligence-gathering. C.'s claim to knowledge about the conspiracy (*comperi*, line 1) was later cast in his teeth by

critics; cf. *Att.* 1.14.5; *Fam.* 5.5.2; *Luc.* 63; [Sal.] *Cic.* 3; Syme (1964) 106; Gelzer (1969) 86 n. 158; Koster (1980) 117 and n. 400; Berry on *Sul.* 12.14. C. does not elaborate here on his source of information since the conspiracy is ongoing; later it emerged that the tip came from Fulvia, a noblewoman involved in an affair with the conspirator Q. Curius. Plutarch (*Cic.* 16.2) mentions Fulvia alone in connection with the warning to C. on the critical night (cf. Nippel (1995) 28), whereas Sallust (28.2) claims that Curius used Fulvia as his agent (*per Fulviam*) to carry word to the consul. Cf. Münzer, *RE* VII 1.280 (s.v. Fulvius 112) and *RE* IV 2.1840 (s.v. Curius 7). C.'s energetic action, emphasized by verbs strategically placed at the end and beginning of clauses (*muniui atque firmaui; exclusi*), averted the danger. **quos tu ad me salutatum mane miseris:** by Roman custom, in the first two hours of the morning clients, friends, and others who wished to pay their respects visited the house of a great man, gained admission, and offered greetings; cf. Hug, *RE* IA 2.2066.64 (s.v. *salutatio*); according to C., the plan was that Cornelius would be admitted *et meo more et iure amicitiae* (*Sul.* 52); at *Sul.* 18 C. claims that Cornelius was set on (*immissum*) by Autronius, not Catiline.

3-4 cum illi ipsi uenissent . . . praedixeram: in this way C. corroborates his allegations: he disclosed the identities of the would-be assassins in advance to *multi ac summi uiri*, presumably the members of his *consilium* (cf. 3.7.1-4n.). Seager (1973) 243 is skeptical: "All that Cicero had to do was to pick on two men, preferably known associates of Catilina, who he knew, for whatever reason, would call on the morning in question, announce to selected *summi uiri* that they would come on that particular morning to murder him, and leave instructions that they should not be admitted: so the charge could never be put to the test." He tries to shore up the weak "for whatever reason" with the attached n.: "They might for instance have called every morning, or regularly on that day of the week." One can substitute such a possible scenario for C.'s own, but did C. need, or think he needed, to indulge in such a charade? Cf. Batstone (1994) 222-3 n. 26: "Seager's effort to dismiss Cicero produces an alternative narrative which itself depends upon the unexamined assumption of a duplicitous consul eager to foil Pompey's ambitions to become another Sulla." **ipsi** "in person"; cf. *TLL* s.v. *ipse* 327.69. **id temporis**, like *id aetatis*, originated as appositional to nominative or accusative substantives but came to be felt as quasi-adverbial and was so used in colloquial Latin; the gen. is partitive; cf. H-S 47 and 52; G-L 336.4 N.2.

Argumentatio: *Catiline called upon to leave Rome* (10.5-27.3)

The point to be argued is introduced as a consequence of the preceding section, namely that Catiline's continued presence in the city is simply too dangerous in view of his recent plots (*Quae cum ita sint . . . egredere aliquando ex urbe*: §10.5-6). This section falls into two halves (A-C vs. D-F on the outline on p. 62). The first half offers one new point about Catiline's plotting, namely the planned attack on C. during this year's elections (§11.6-9). C.'s personal danger is also connected with a danger to the state, however (*uidebam perniciem meam cum magna calamitate rei publicae esse coniunctam*: §11.10-11); and Catiline has in the meantime gone over to an attack on *rem publicam*

uniuersam (§12.1-2). By ring-composition the appeal to Catiline to depart appears both at the beginning and end of A (§§10.5-6 and 13.2). The next section, B, is organized as a *refutatio* of the notion that Catiline can lead a life of *dignitas* at Rome. Here C. begins with Catiline's domestic disgrace, a standard topic of invective (cf. Nisbet on *Pis.*, pp. 194-5) and one previously rehearsed by C. (fr. orat *tog. cand.* 10 and 19); the reproach of poverty was likewise conventional (Nisbet, on *Pis.*, p. 195). The plot of the last day of December 66 also found a place in the earlier invective (fr. orat *tog. cand.* 21). C. goes on to generalized plots against himself but offers no new specifics (§§15.7-16.5). The one new point in this section is the senate's shunning of Catiline that very day (§16.8-14). C. effects an adroit transition from the fear of the senators, inferred from their avoidance of Catiline, to that of *omnes ciues tui*, including Catiline's own parents, and from the parents to the *patria* as the *communis . . . parens omnium nostrum* (§17.9-10). This section achieves an emotional climax in the *prosopopoeia* of the *patria*, speaking with the voice of the average senator, not necessarily convinced of Catiline's guilt, but nonetheless urging his departure *ut tandem aliquando timere desinam* (§18.11).

The second half of the section leaves the *genus grande* behind and exploits pragmatic arguments. C. uses Catiline's having placed himself in voluntary custody as a *fortiori* proof that he belongs in custody (§19.11-13). He sidesteps Catiline's demand that his exile be put to a formal vote with the argument that a call for P. Sestius or M. Marcellus to go into exile would have roused a storm of protest, unlike Catiline's case (§21.1-4). This last point may have been improvised to meet an interjection by Catiline (cf. §20.4 '*Refer' inquit 'ad senatum'*'). At any rate §22 turns from considerations of what is honorable (it could more easily have followed §18 or, at a pinch, §19) to other points that may weigh more heavily with Catiline. By a kind of reverse psychology C. urges Catiline that his departure for exile would lead to C.'s incurring *invidia*, whereas for him to link up with Manlius would redound to C.'s glory (an argument not necessarily added merely to the version published in 60; cf. §22.3-6n.). C. describes the concrete preparations that Catiline has already undertaken for his departure (§24) and goes on to depict the pleasure and fulfillment Catiline will find when joined with this band of desperados (§§25-27.3). This *argumentatio*, written as if to persuade Catiline, really serves to complete his isolation from the rest of the senate in terms of both lifestyle and goals.

10.5-6 Quae cum ita sint . . . proficiscere: this is the eighth time Catiline is addressed by name in this speech; elsewhere the direct address accompanies a question, a threatening possibility, or a damning fact; here alone it introduces a series of commands, all of them with the same purport (an example of *συνωνυμία*, as Quintilian notes (9.3.45-6); cf. 2.1.4. Though in the slave-owning society of Rome commands to an equal were often softened by periphrasis (B. A. §141; K-S I 205), C. does not hesitate to use the imperative, just as he has addressed Catiline from the beginning without *praenomen* (§1.1n.). **quo coepisti:** this specification somewhat softens the command. Like *tandem* (§1.1n.), *aliquando* implies impatience (cf. *OLD* s.v. 5); cf. the famous instance *respice, quaeso, aliquando rem publicam, M. Antoni* (*Phil.* 2.118). **patent**

portae: proficiscere: this is one of a number of notable examples of Ciceronian alliteration; cf. Volkmann (1885) 516. For *patent portae* cf. 2.27.7–8 *nullus est portis custos, nullus insidiator uiae; si qui exire uolunt, coniuere possum*. At §33.3 C. specifies the destination: *proficiscere ad impium bellum ac nefarium*.

6–7 nimium diu te . . . Manliana castra desiderant: *castra* is used of the occupants of the camp (*OLD* s.v. 1d). *desidero* “lack, feel need for” is very often used of lovers or close relatives (cf. examples at *TLL* s.v. 702.29); cf. 2.6.11, where C. says of Catiline’s followers *ne patiantur desiderio sui Catilinam miserum tabescere*. The application of amatory language to Catiline and his followers continues at 2.22.4–8 (see *ad loc.*). For doubts that Catiline was, in fact, the *imperator* of the camp cf. §5.1–5n.

7–10 educ tecum etiam . . . non sinam: C. explains his underlying strategy at 3.3.10–12 *sed tum cum illum exterminari uolebam, aut reliquam coniuratorum manum simul exituram aut eos qui restitissent infirmos sine illo ac debiles fore putabam*. C. was initially disappointed that Catiline had not taken all his confederates with him (2.4.4–11), but the remaining city conspirators proved themselves, in fact, *infirmos ac debiles*. **purga urbem:** cleaning or purging can be done for religious, hygienic, or medical reasons (cf. *OLD* s.v. *purgo* 1, 4, 5). The following amplification determines the metaphor as hygienic (the draining of bilgewater: *exhaustetur ex urbe tuorum comitum magna et pernicio sentina rei publicae*: §12.8–9). At the end of the speech, however, the medical implications come to the fore (§31); Leff (1973) especially 171–4 traces the disease and medical imagery of the Catilinarian corpus and argues for allusion to scapegoat rituals as well. **magno me metu . . . murus intersit:** this is the first instance of *metus/metuere* in the *Catilinarians*; on the much greater frequency of words for “fear” in our speech than the rest of the corpus cf. Batstone (1994) 262. Apart from C.’s personal danger delineated in §§9 and 11, the fact that the Romans were better at dealing with military crises outside the city than police matters within contributed to this attitude; cf. Stroh (2000) 69; Nippel (1995) 27–30; §5.1–5n. (*intra moenia*); for Ciceronian alliteration cf. on lines 5–6. *uersor* is to “be active” (*OLD* s.v. *uerso* 10a); the situation is more drastically expressed at 2.1.7 *non . . . iam inter latera nostra sic illa uersabitur*. **non feram . . . sinam:** here the pent-up anger hinted at from the beginning (*quo usque tandem . . . ?*) finds release; similarly §18.9 *non est ferendum*. C. strongly emphasizes by stating the idea three times (συνωνυμία) with anaphora of the negative (cf. §1.3–5n. *nihil*).

11.1–4 magna dis immortalibus . . . effugimus: *magna . . . habenda est . . . gratia* is a remarkable example of hyperbaton, with the substantive that determines the meaning (*gratia*) postponed for emphasis. The monosyllabic *dis*, lacking sufficient weight on its own, is standardly reinforced with the epithet *immortalibus* in C.’s speeches (the formulas *dis hominibusque* (*Ver.* 2.1.48) and *si dis placet* (*Pis.* 38) are exceptions). *atque*, as often, joins the more particular to the general term: *OLD* s.v. 1a. To pass valid decrees the Roman senate had to meet in an inaugurated *templum*: Var. *apud* Gel. 14.7.7; cf. Stambaugh (1978) 580–2. C. has chosen this site carefully both for its

strategic advantages (cf. §1.4-5n.) and for rhetorical effect both here and in §33.3-4 (see *ad loc.*). **huic ipsi Ioui Statori . . . huius urbis:** *huic* is said perhaps with a gesture toward the deity's cult statue. Jupiter Stator was the god who stayed the flight of troops, causing them to stand and fight; cf. Romulus' prayer at Livy 1.12.6 *deme terrorem Romanis fugamque foedam siste*; similarly, Stata Mater was the deity appealed to to halt the advance of fire; cf. Wissowa, *RE* IIIA 2.2167.10 (s.v.). The original sense of the cult title may not have been clear to most Romans of the late Republic, however. Certainly C. wants to give the deity a wider function as *custos urbis* (cf. on §33.5 and 3.29.6-9), a rôle sometimes associated with Minerva (cf. von Hesberg (1998)) or Juno Regina (cf. Wissowa (1912) 187-90). At *Fin.* 3.66 he implies that the various cult titles are more or less synonymous: *atque etiam Iouem cum Optimum et Maximum dicimus cumque eundem Salutare, Hospitale, Statorem, hoc intellegi uolumus, salutem hominum in eius esse tutela*. Cf. Wissowa (1912) 122-3; Ogilvie on Livy 1.12.6; Vasaly (1993) 57-8. **quod hanc . . . effugimus:** rising tricolon intensified by anaphora of *tam. infestus* + dat. can be either "hostile" or "harmful (to)" (*OLD* s.v. 1 and 4); here both meanings are implicated. For *pestis* cf. §2.5-7n.

4-5 non est saepius . . . rei publicae: by litotes *non . . . saepius* = "rarely." **in uno homine** "in the case of a single man," i.e. Cicero, not Catiline; cf. 4.12.12 *in his hominibus*; *Ver.* 2.2.155 *quod nullo in homine ante fecerant*; *OLD* s.v. *in* 42. For the thought cf. the preceding *tam . . . infestam rei publicae pestem totiens iam effugimus* (lines 2-4) and the following *uidebam perniciem meam cum magna calamitate rei publicae esse coniunctam* (lines 10-11). The similarity of expression to Thuc. 2.35.1 noted by Tabachovitz (1949) 136-7 is probably accidental. *unus* is sometimes used expressively of the one man who makes all the difference, most famously *unus homo nobis cunctando restituit rem* (Enn. *Ann.* 363 Sk); cf. Batstone (1994) 237 and n. 52; on situations where the well-being of a single person can be decisive cf. also Weinstock (1971) 219-20. *Salus* or *Salus publica* was a goddess at Rome (Wissowa (1912) 131-3) but becomes in C. a political ideal; cf. Winkler (1995) 30-5. **summa salus . . . rei publicae** "the total well-being of the state" or the like; cf. §33.1, 4.24.1; *OLD* s.v. *summus* 9.

5-6 quam diu mihi . . . defendi: until he takes office on 1 January the consul-designate is vulnerable, since he does not yet have a *publicum praesidium*, in particular the lictors and their *fascēs*, at his disposal; cf. Mommsen (1887-8) I 373-84; A. J. Marshall (1984). The plotting presumably occurred after Catiline's acquittal on murder charges following the consular elections for 63 (*TLRR* no. 217; see further the Introduction section 1). Sallust, too, speaks of Catiline's plotting around this time and C.'s response: *neque interea quietus erat, sed omnibus modis insidias parabat Ciceroni. neque illi tamen ad cauendum dolus aut astutiae deerant* (26.1-2). C. implies similar plotting by Catiline at the end of 66; cf. §15.1-6. **insidiatus es . . . defendi:** one might rather have expected imperfects (*insidiabar . . . defendebam*), but rhythmical considerations were apparently decisive (*-atus es* yielding a cretic, *-a defendi* cretic plus molossus). **non publico me praesidio:** for the intrusion of the pronoun into the adj./noun phrase and its adherence to an antithetical term cf. Adams (1994b) 115 and 133-4. Nowak (1973) 71-2 criticizes C.'s use of private guards as illegal; see further on §6.1-4 and 3.5.7-10.

6–9 cum proximis comitiis . . . tumultu publice concitato: for the holding of elections in the Saepta within the Campus Martius cf. Richardson s.vv. Campus Martius, Saepta Iulia. Catiline's rival candidates included those actually elected, D. Junius Silanus and L. Licinius Murena (*MRR* II 172). The plan to murder a rival or rivals for office is a reprise of Glaucia's action in 100; cf. §4.5–7n. Dio 37.29.1–2 represents Catiline's plot as a reaction to the *lex Tullia de ambitu*, stiffening the penalty for electoral bribery to ten years' exile; cf. Rotondi (1912) 379; Alexander (2002) 120. The formulation at *Sul.* 51 is similar: *ego tectus praesidio firmo amicorum Catilinae tum et Autroni copias et conatum repressi*; cf. also *Mur.* 52; *Sal.* 26.4. Possibly the private bodyguard was organized because the senate declined C.'s request for public security (so Berry on *Sul.* 51.12, citing Dio 37.29.3); there is no need to suppose that C. invented murder plans later because these are not mentioned at *Mur.* 52 (pace Berry on *Sul.* 51.7); there the indication *coniuratos cum gladiis in campum deduci a Catilina* suffices. At *Mur.* 52 C. adds the detail of the breastplate (*lorica*) that he wore beneath his clothing but in such a way as to be a visible signal of danger; cf. also *Plut. Cic.* 14.7; Dio 37.29.4.

9–11 denique, quotienscumque . . . esse coniunctam: *petisti*: for the syn-copated perfect form, preferred by most prose authors for this verb, cf. *TLL* s.v. *peto* 1946.22; *OLD* s.v. *init.*; cf. also §9.7–11n. (*confirmasti*). *per me* in emphatic position underlines C.'s acting independently of the senate (see previous n.). **quamquam**

uidebam . . . esse coniunctam: under various circumstances such as death or resignation a consul could function *sine collega*, and it was left to the discretion of the remaining consul when or whether elections would be held to choose a replacement (*consul suffectus*); cf. Mommsen (1887–8) I 29 and II 81. The *calamitas rei publicae* foreseen by C. was thus not so much constitutional as political, given his colleague C. Antonius' ties to Catiline; cf. §2.1n.; *Sal.* 21.3, 26.1. Therefore C.'s self-identification with the well-being of the Roman state, often repeated in his later writings (cf. MacKendrick (1995) index s.v. *L'État c'est moi syndrome*), has in this case a factual basis.

12.1–3 nunc iam aperte . . . uastitatem uocas: *nunc iam* sharply demarcates the present from the past; cf. *TLL* s.v. *iam* II 4.42. *aperte* would apply to Manlius' uprising (§7.1–6) if one assumes, with C., Manlius' connection with Catiline at this time (cf. §5.1–5n.); the conspiracy within the city has operated clandestinely, however; cf. §1.3–5n. (*nocturnum praesidium*); C. repeats the point at *Pis.* 5 *ego L. Catilinam, caedem senatus, interitum urbis non obscure sed palam molientem, egredi ex urbe iussi*. **rem publicam**

uniuersam petis contrasts with *me petisti* (§11.9). **templa . . . tecta** is one of the alliterative pairs of which C. is fond; cf. Wölfflin (1933) 276. *templa, tecta, and uita ciuium omnium* recur in the same order in the concluding prophecy (§33.6–7). C.'s list begins with the spiritual center, the *templa deorum immortalium*, then broadens to the *tecta urbis* generally; next he embraces the *uita ciuium omnium*, who, since 89, include all Italians south of the Po River (cf. Sherwin-White (1973) ch. 6), and concludes with the comprehensive *Italia tota* so often invoked in his speeches; cf. Merguet (1877–84) IV 757; H. D. Meyer (1957) 30–7, 51. **ad . . . uastitatem uocas** concludes the period with an alliterative double cretic clausula. *uastitas* (“desolation, devastation”) is

previously attested in tragedy; cf. *Acc. trag.* 175 (*Astyanax*) *te propter tot tantasque habemus uastitates funerum*; *OLD* s.v. 1b.

3–6 quare, quoniam id . . . utilius: *quare*: i.e. in light of Catiline's open assault upon the state (*nunc iam aperte rem publicam uniuersam petis*: lines 1–2). **quod est primum . . . proprium est** is a periphrasis for putting Catiline to death (cf. §2.5–7 *ad mortem te, Catilina, duci* etc.); it is *primum* in the sense of “the best or prime” alternative; cf. *OLD* s.v. *primus* 13. As consul, C. possessed *imperium*, the power to command troops (cf. on §5.1–5), and had at his disposal the coercive power of the lictors with their *fascēs* (cf. §11.5–6n.), though in his day the consul's power was limited by the citizen's right of appeal to a citizen assembly (*prouocatio*); cf. §2.5–7n. Under the “teaching of the ancestors” (*disciplina maiorum*) C. has in mind such examples as he has cited at §§3–4. **facere nondum audeo:** C. has already explained the lack of consensus (§§5–6). He makes a virtue of necessity by claiming two advantages for his chosen course of action. *ad* is “in point of, in respect of”: *OLD* s.v. 37. *seueritas* and *crudelitas* (cf. §5.7 *crudelius factum*; §30.6 *crudeliter et regie factum*) were the charges that action according to the *disciplina maiorum* would encounter; cf. Bernardo (2000) 54–5. Contrast 2.6.9–10 *non est iam lenitati locus; seueritatem res ipsa flagitat*, for the *popularis* associations of *lenitas* cf. 4.10.12–15n. The *ad communem salutem utile* replaces in this context the commoner *utilitas rei publicae*; cf. 4.9.5–6n.

6–9 nam si te . . . sentina rei publicae: the explanation (*nam*) follows upon the claim (see above). *resideo* is to “be left over from the past, remain in existence, persist”: *OLD* s.v. 3a. *coniuratus* is the participle of *coniuro* and is treated as meaning *iureiurando coniunctus*; it is used as a substantive for the first time at Plaut *As.* 318 (*si quidem omnes coniurati cruciamenta conferant . . .*); our passage is its first attestation in C. (cf. also 3.21.9); cf. *TLL* s.v. *coniuro*; for Catiline's movement as a *coniuratio* cf. §1.5–9n. (*coniurationem tuam*). **manus** develops from the hand as an instrument of violence to an armed force or band; cf. *OLD* s.v. 8 and 22; Ernout and Meillet s.v. For *perniciosa* cf. §8.6–8n. (*perniciem*). Also found at 2.7.2, *sentina* “bilge-water,” possibly connected with Gk ἄντλος (cf. Frisk s.v.), emphasizes not just the filth (so Opelt (1965) 139) but also the fact of collecting at the bottom (of the ship or, metaphorically, of society); cf. §30.11 *undique collectos. exhaustietur* is the *mot juste* for its removal; cf. Spencer (2001) 159 on Catiline's departure “characterized as the flushing of a sewer.” C. first used the metaphor earlier in the year to criticize a speech of Rullus: *et nimirum id est quod ab hoc tribuno plebis dictum est in senatu, urbanam plebem nimum in re publica posse; exhaustiendum esse; hoc enim uerbo est usus quasi de aliqua sentina . . . loqueretur* (*Agr.* 2.70); cf. also *Att.* 1.19.4; such terms are used for the *plebs urbana* as a whole in the correspondence but not in the speeches; cf. Kühnert (1989) 440. On C.'s disappointment at the paucity of the confederates Catiline took with him cf. 2.4.4–11 with nn.

13.1–3 Quid est, Catilina? . . . suadeo: here rhetorical questions addressed to Catiline resume (cf. §§1 and 8.1–3); C. can thus suggest private misconduct without providing proof; cf. Cape (1991) 46; the technique is supplemented in §14 with

praeteritio. On *num* anticipating a negative response cf. §4.5-7n. **me imperante** "at my command" balances *tua sponte*; the abl. absolute belongs to the type in which its subject is the chief agent of the sentence; cf. Laughton (1964) 106-7; Hintzen (1993) 80-1. **quod iam tua sponte faciebas**: cf. §9.10 *confirmasti te ipsum iam esse exiturum*; further detail at §24. The progressive aspect of the imperfect is thus critical: "you were in the process of doing." C. chooses his words carefully, using *iubet*, rather than the stronger *imperat*; cf. Donat. Ter. *Eun.* 389 *plus esse imperare quam iubere*; C.'s ironic comment at 2.12.4-5 *simul atque ire in exilium iussus est, paruit*; Pis. 5 *ego L. Catilinam . . . egredi ex urbe iussi ut a quo legibus non poteramus, moenibus tuti esse possemus*. With the juxtaposition *consul hostem* the sentence has a sting in its tail; cf. *Cael.* 13 (of Catiline) *quis taetrior hostis huic ciuitati?* The implications of *hostis* (cf. §3.5-7n.) must have rankled with Catiline; cf. Sal. 31.7 and 9 (quoted on §23.1-3). **interrogas me: num in exilium?**: Stroh (2000) 73, pointing to the indicative (*interrogas*), argues that C. is responding to a question interposed by Catiline, rather than merely raising a hypothetical question; cf. *Dom.* 8 *cur ego non timuerim quaeris?* If so, it is Catiline who first applies the word *exilium*, hitherto avoided by C. and replaced by him in §20.3 with the euphemistic *fuga*; the two terms are used interchangeably at §22.2; Catiline's sympathizers also use the word (2.12.1); the aim of Catiline and his partisans would be to stir up *invidia* against C. (cf. §23). On the other hand, Offermann (1995) 232-3 sees C. cautiously preparing the way step by step for acceptance of the idea of Catiline's exile beginning with §9.10 *confirmasti te ipsum iam esse exiturum* and taken up in our passage (*exire ex urbe*). **si me consulis** plays upon the name of the office (Stroh (2000) 73); cf. the derivation of *consul* from *patriae consulere* at *De orat.* 2.165 (where it is attributed to Carbo) and elsewhere (cf. Dyck on *Leg.* 3.8.2). **non iubeo . . . suadeo**: an ironic reply to Catiline's query, taken as calling for advice (*si me consulis*), but at the same time, like *muta istam mentem, mihi crede* (§6.8), a mark of C.'s *lenitas*; cf. Batstone (1994) 244. For the pretense of offering friendly advice to an opponent cf. e.g. *Div. Caec.* 37 *de te, Caecili, . . . familiariter tecum loquar*; for C.'s adoption of the rôle of advisor in our speech cf. Steel (2006).

3-6 quid est enim . . . qui non oderit: speaking now ostensibly as a counselor, C. elaborates the reasons (*enim*) for his advice to leave Rome. **quid est . . . quod . . . possit?**: the subj. is potential (G-L §257), implying that there is nothing. The underlying ethics are implicitly Epicurean: life at Rome can provide Catiline with nothing to enjoy (*delectare*, line 4) but only, as C. will show, with pain. He argues similarly at *Phil.* 2.68 (addressed to Antony) *in qua* [sc. *domo Pompei*] . . . *nihil tibi potest esse iucundum*. **in qua nemo est . . . non oderit**: relative clauses of tendency; hence the subjunctives ("no one who is the kind of person not to fear you" etc.); cf. G-L §631.2. Accius' Atreus showed himself unconcerned about such a state of affairs with his notorious remark *oderint dum metuant* (*trag.* 203-4 quoted *Off.* 1.97); cf. Pis. 98; *Phil.* 1.33-4. For *coniuratio* cf. §1.5-9n.; for *perditus* cf. §5.9-10n. The general point anticipates the behavior of the other senators upon Catiline's arrival (described at §16.8-14); but the claimed community solidarity is evidently overstated; cf. §9.1-7 and §30.

6–7 quae nota . . . haeret in fama? here C. begins a survey of Catiline's private life (*domestica turpitudine, priuatae res*); this continues to §14.5, where, with ostensible generosity (*praetermitto ruinas fortunarum tuarum*), he turns to *illa . . . quae non ad priuatam ignominiam uitiorum tuorum . . . pertinent*. The two rhetorical questions have essentially the same content (συμωυυμία), with *dedecus* substituted for *nota turpitudinis* and *fama* for *uita*. *nota* was the mark placed beside a citizen's name by the censors to indicate degradation of status and hence generally "a mark of disgrace or disapproval, stigma" (*OLD* s.v. 4); *inuro* is "to impress indelibly, brand" (*OLD* s.v. 3); C. liked to use the two words in combination (cf. Berry on *Sul.* 88.4).

7–9 quae libido . . . afuit? the tricolon delineates stages and types of wrongdoing: first the passion (*libido*) incited by the eyes (cf. Apul. *Met.* 8.12, where Charite explains that she is taking vengeance on Thrasyllus' eyes, since they caused him to lust after her: *oculi isti, quibus male placui*); following from this are both the *facinus* committed by the hands as instruments of violence (cf. §12.6–9n.) and the disgraceful act (*flagitium*) in which the entire body is implicated; for the possible connection of *flagitium* with *flagellum* ("whip") and original reference to public discipline cf. Usener (1913) esp. 369; Reichenbecher (1913) 43–6; for *facinus* cf. 2.9.1–5n. For the *iunctura ab oculis abesse* cf. *Rab. perd.* 16; *Sul.* 74. In spite of such general charges, few details are known. Catiline was tried (and acquitted) in 73 for alleged fornication with a Vestal Virgin: cf. the Introduction section 1. For Catiline's alleged marriage with his own daughter cf. fr. orat. *tog. cand.* 19 *ex eodem stupro tibi et uxorem et filiam inuenisti* (the apparent source of Plut. *Cic.* 10.3); repeating the story Asc. 92C adds *nomina harum mulierum nondum inueni*.

9–10 cui tu adolescentulo . . . facem praetulisti? Catiline especially targeted the youth of Rome (here denoted by the contemptuous diminutive, *adolescentulus*). Sal. 15.5 (cf. 16.1) explains: *sed maxume adolescentium familiaritates adpetebat: eorum animi molles etiam et fluxi dolis haud difficulter capiebantur*; cf. Eyben (1993) 56–8. *illecebra* is "a means of attraction, allurements" and can be used with a defining genitive (cf. Roby §1302), as here, or an objective genitive, as at 2.8.1–2 (*iuentutis illecebra*); at *Cael.* 12 Catiline's *illecebrae libidinum* are "incitements to lust": cf. *OLD* s.v. 1a–b. *corruptela* is a "corrupting influence" (*OLD* s.v. 2a). *irretio* ("catch in a net," hence "ensnare, entangle") implicitly pictures Catiline as a fisherman or huntsman; the metaphor is first attested at Lucil. 990 M. = 1107 W. *sic laqueis manicis pedicis mens irretita est*; cf. *OLD* s.v. *facem praefero* is "to light the way," an office typically performed by slaves for masters; here it is metaphorical for "lead the way," as at Tac. *Hist.* 2.86.3 *acerrimam bello facem praetulit*; cf. *TLL* s.v. *praefero* 610.65 and 82–4. The well-known expression facilitates the extension to *ferrum . . . praetulisti* (though Kübler (1896) 158 wanted to insert either *praebuisti* or *porrexisti* after *ferrum*). For *audacia* cf. §1.2–3n. *ferrum* is "iron" or "steel," hence a sword, especially as an instrument of violence; cf. *OLD* s.v. 1, 4, 5; for C.'s usage Achard (1981) 339 and n. 807.

14.1–3 quid uero? . . . hoc scelus cumulasti? for *quid* cf. on §8.1–3; *uero* calls attention; cf. Kroon (1995) 319–25. Sal. 15.2 provides further detail: *postremo*

captus amore Aureliae Orestillae . . . quod ea nubere illi dubitabat timens priuignum adulta aetate, pro certo creditur necato filio uacuam domum scelestis nuptiis fecisse. uacuefacio ("clear a place, make vacant" (here metaphorical)) is first used here in extant Latin; it recurs in the literal sense at §16.12. **alio incredibili scelere hoc scelus cumulasti:** i.e. he added the murder of his son to that of his previous wife; cf. *OLD* s.v. *cumulo* 5 ("increase, augment"); for the instrumental abl. cf. *Sex. Rosc.* 30 *haec aliis nefariis cumulant atque adaugent*. Similarly, according to *Chu.* 27-8, Oppianicus murdered two of his sons in order to clear the way for his marriage to Sassia. For *scelus* cf. §8.8-10n.; for the polyptoton *scelere . . . scelus* cf. Lausberg §§640-8. The perversion of normal familial relations helps prepare for C.'s depiction of Catiline as a *monstrum* (2.1.5); cf. Lévy (1998) 148-9.

3-5 quod ego praetermitto . . . esse uideatur: for Ciceronian *praeteritio* cf. §3.4-5n. *immanitas* is the "enormity" or "barbarity" of an act; cf. *OLD* s.v. 2; on C.'s usage of *immanis/-itas* cf. Achard (1981) 338 and n. 790. **non uindicata esse:** the *paterfamilias* could inflict capital punishment on his child or, in case of a *manus* marriage, wife, though the right was seldom exercised over adult children in the late Republic, and those who abused it could be punished with *infamia* by the censors; cf. Berger (1953) s.v. *ius uitae necisque*; Eyben (1991) 121-4. At 4.7 percent frequency the *esse uideatur* type was not one of C.'s very favorite clausulae (cf. appendix 3) but was nonetheless regarded in later times as his trademark; cf. Tac. *Dial.* 23.1; Quint. 9.4.73 (cf. 10.2.18).

5-9 praetermitto ruinas . . . salutemque pertinent: the Ides are only five or six days away depending on whether this speech was delivered on 7 or 8 November; cf. appendix 2. Does C. have definite information about Catiline's debts, or is this point merely based on the general principle *Idibus soluto* (Cato *Agr.* 146.2)? Certainly Catiline was at pains to rebut such charges in his letter to Catulus (Sal. 35.3). *ruina* is a "headlong fall, collapse" or the like; C. appears to be the first to use it metaphorically of the "ruin" or "collapse" of a person or one's resources: *OLD* s.v., esp. 5. A senator's property was supposed to amount to a million sesterces, and neglect of one's property was a cause for censorial expulsion from the senate; cf. Mommsen (1887-8) II 382 and III 802. The Romans were accustomed to distinguish between public and private in law and generally (cf. Kaser (1986)), a fact which assists C.'s transition here. *summa res publica* is "the welfare of the state"; cf. *OLD* s.v. *summus* 16b. **ad omnium nostrum uitam salutemque:** similarly the *summa salus . . . rei publicae* of §11.4-5; for C.'s (exaggerated) picture of the scope and aims of the conspiracy cf. on §§3.3-4 and 4.6.7-10.

15.1-4 potestne tibi . . . parauisse: the new line of questioning begins similarly to the previous one (§13.3-4 *quid est . . . quod te iam . . . delectare possit?*). Enjoying the light of the sun and drawing breath are two features common to living things (*Sex. Rosc.* 72 and 150); Catiline, however, cannot enjoy them. The avoidance of the light by Catiline and his confederates has been implied at §1.3 (*nocturnum praesidium*); see *ad loc.* *iucundus* agrees in gender with the nearer subject, as usual (cf. §7.4-6n.). **horum:**

i.e. the senators'; cf. §1.5 (*horum ora uultusque*) with n. The reference is to 66, the year of the consulate of M'. Aemilius Lepidus and L. Volcatius Tullus: *MRR* II 151. The *comitium* was a broad rectangle between the Curia Hostilia and the forum, used as a place of assembly, in particular for the meetings of the *comitia centuriata*; cf. Richardson s.v. **cum telo**: to carry a weapon with criminal intent was a violation of the *lex Cornelia de sicariis et ueneficis*; cf. Alexander (2002) 146 with literature; *Att.* 2.24.3 *fit senatus consultum ut Vettius, quod confessus esset se cum telo fuisse, in uincula coniceretur*. C. seems to connect Catiline's action on that day with his preparation of a band (*manus*: cf. on §12.6–9) to kill the consuls and leading men of the state (see further the Introduction section 1).

4–6 sceleri ac furori . . . obstitisse?: for *furor* used of Catiline cf. §1.1–2n.; with *scelus* it forms a hendiadys ("raging wickedness" or the like). Sal. 18.6 explains apropos the alleged "first conspiracy," which he places on 1 January 65, *ea re cognita rursus in Nonas Februarias consilium caedis transtulerant*. He goes on to relate (§8) that that plan, too, was frustrated when Catiline gave the signal to his associates prematurely. *tuum* is placed last in its clause for emphasis: there was no hindrance on Catiline's part, whether rooted in reason or emotion (*mentem . . . aut timorem*). The *fortuna populi Romani* is personified as the subject of *obstitisse*. The Romans believed that a special Fortuna watched over their community, and indeed the *Fortuna populi Romani Quiritium* received cult: a temple was vowed by P. Sempronius Tuditanus in 204 and dedicated on the Quirinal a decade later; the foundation was celebrated on 25 May; cf. Wissowa (1912) 261; Latte (1960) 178 and n. 3; Scullard (1981) 123; Orlin (1997) 183–4 and 187. C. invokes the *fortuna populi Romani* six times in his speeches (cf. Merguet (1877–84) III 658), usually as an explanation of success, though once with a complaint attached (*Mil.* 87); cf. §25.3–4n.

6–8 ac iam illa . . . interficere conatus es!: *illa* "those well known points": *OLD* s.v. *ille* 14; H–S 185. For the *praeteritio* cf. on §3.4–5; *uero* calls attention to the more serious charge; cf. §14.1–3n. The attacks on C. as consul-designate and the plan to kill him as consul presiding over the elections have been discussed at §11.

8–10 quot ego . . . ac uelle desistis: *petitio* has here its literal sense designating the action related to *peto* (cf. §11.9 *quotienscumque me petisti*; §12.1–2 *rem publicam uniuersam petis*): "attack" (*OLD* s.v. 1). **ita coniectas ut uitari posse non uiderentur**: cf. C.'s explanation of his wearing the *lorica* on election day: *non quae me tegeret – etenim sciebam Catilinam non latus aut uentrem sed caput et collum solere petere – uerum ut omnes boni uiderent* (*Mur.* 52). To escape a blow *corpore* is to do so by a twist of the body, rather than e.g. by means of armor; it was perhaps an expression from gladiatorial games (C. takes care to explain in advance: *quadam declinatione*); cf. Curt. 6.1.4 (of the Spartan king Agis) *alia tela clipeo excipiebat, corpore alia uitabat*; Otto (1890) s.v. *corpus*. C. would later describe his escape from Clodius in similar terms: *quotiens ego ipse . . . ex P. Clodi telis et ex cruentis eius manibus effugi!* (*Mil.* 20). Catiline's dogged persistence in the face of ill success and the fear that the *Fortuna populi Romani* (see on lines 4–6 above) might not hold indefinitely will explain C.'s keenness to pressure him into leaving Rome; see the headnote to this speech.

16.1-5 quotiens iam tibi . . . corpore defigere: the *sica* or dagger (pointed, with a curved blade) was the weapon associated with the Thracians and Illyrians (cf. Enn. *An.* 528 *Sk Illyrii restant sicis sybinisque fodentes*); the frightening raids across the Adriatic of Illyrians so armed led to the designation of murderers generally as *sicarii*. The gladiators called *Thraeces* by the Romans likewise carried the *sica*. Cf. Hug, *RE* IIA 2.2184 (s.v. *sica*). C. may have taken over the use of *sica* as a metaphor for violence from the speeches of C. Gracchus; cf. 2.1.7-9; Dyck on *Leg.* 3.20; the word also suggests Catiline's recent trial under the *lex Cornelia de sicariis et ueneficis* (*TLRR* no. 217). Catiline could be disarmed either by superior force or by chance; C. claims that both possibilities apply. For *extorquere* cf. 2.2.2-3 (*ei ferrum e manibus extorsimus*), *Sul.* 28 (*horum . . . gladios extorquere potui*), and *Mil.* 18 (of Clodius' slave assigned to kill Pompey: *extorta est ei confitenti sica de manibus*). *uero* lends focus to its clause, as often; cf. §14.1-3n. **casu aliquo** substitutes for the more exalted *fortuna populi Romani* of §15.4-6 (see *ad loc.*). **quae quidem . . . nescio:** again one wonders whether this is mere guesswork or C. has definite information at his disposal. **quae . . . quibus . . . initiata sacris . . . sit:** C. hints at private, possibly magical rites, and quasi-religious rites were attributed to the conspirators: *Sal.* 22.1 *fuere . . . qui dicerent Catilinam . . . humani corporis sanguinem uino permixtum in pateris circumtulisse; inde quom post execrationem omnes degustauissent, sicuti in sollemnibus sacris fieri consuevit, aperuisse consilium suum*. At *Sul.* 70 C. refers in general to *peruersam atque impiam religionem* in connection with Catiline; see further §24.3-5n. At the same time C. claims that Catiline menaces the state religion by targeting the *templa deorum immortalium* (§12.2; cf. §33.6 *a tuis ceterisque templis*). A special dedicated weapon (*quae . . . deuota sit*) might be used for an important or risky task; cf. Tac. *An.* 15.53.2 (on Piso's conspiracy against Nero) . . . *primas sibi partes expostulante Scaevino, qui pugionem templo Salutis siue, ut alii tradidere, Fortunae Ferentino in oppido detraxerat gestabatque uelut magno operi sacrum*. The hyperbaton *quibus . . . sacris* and *necesse . . . esse* lends emphasis, as does the placement of *consulis* before *corpore*. This is the first of three occurrences of the slightly archaic *abs te* in the *Catilinarians* (also §§21.8 and 27.12); it disappears from speeches after *Rab. post.*; cf. von Albrecht (2003) 12. *abs* was used before the plosives *c* and *t* instead of *ab* both in compounds and in phrases; it was either inherited (cf. Gk ἄψ) or formed on the analogy of *ex* beside *ec*; cf. Leumann (1977) 157-8; Ernout and Meillet s.v. *ab, abs, a*; Berry on *Sul.* 3.1.

6-8 Nunc uero . . . nulla debetur: *nunc*, i.e. in light of the points C. has made since §13.3; *uero* again calls attention (§14.1-3n.). The line of questioning continues from §§13.3 (*quid est . . . quod te iam in hac urbe delectare possit?*) and 15.1 (*potestne tibi haec lux . . . aut huius caeli spiritus esse iucundus . . . ?*), the most general term (*uita*) being saved for last. *sic . . . debetur* makes explicit the tone of *misericordia* C. has sought to establish as Catiline's counselor (*si me consulis*: §13.3), even though it is undeserved (*nullus* is used colloquially as an emphatic *non*; cf. Hofmann (2003) 208). Similarly, Sallust's Cato argues against a misguided sense of pity for the five conspirators captured *in urbe*: 52.26-35; cf. Konstan (2001) 95.

8-9 uenisti paulo ante . . . salutauit?: for the general scenario see the head-note to the speech. C. often makes reference to the senate as *frequens* so as to give weight

to certain deliberations or decisions; cf. Merguet (1877–84) s.v. *frequens*; Bonnefond-Coudry (1989) 425–35; Ryan (1998) 36–41 and 46; here the effect is to stress Catiline's isolation. **amicis ac necessariis**: the two terms are related as genus and species; *necessitudo/necessarius* denotes a tie that entails certain *officia* that can be called upon as needed; cf. Hellegouarc'h (1972) 71–6; Shackleton Bailey on *Fam.* 116.1.4 of his edn.; Berry on *Sul.* 2.1. Catiline certainly had friends among the consulars, above all Q. Catulus, who helped him gain acquittal at his trial in 73 (cf. §13.7–9n.) and to whom Catiline entrusted the care of his wife Aurelia Orestilla upon departing Rome (*Sal.* 35.6). Nonetheless C. appears to have enjoyed a bulwark of support from the *consulares*, 12 in number (in addition to the two consuls-designate), in his handling of the conspiracy; cf. 4.7.1–4n.

9–11 si hoc . . . oppressus?: *post hominum memoriam* encompasses for C.'s audience ordinarily a span of about a generation, possibly a bit more in some cases; cf. Morstein-Marx (2004) ch. 3. The emphasis rests on *nemini*, its finality marked by a double cretic rhythm, and the first item of the new clause, *uocis*. Here it becomes clear that Catiline has asked that the question of his exile be put to a vote of the senate (cf. §13.3 *num in exsilium?*). Exile was the loss of one's rights as a Roman citizen; it was a criminal penalty, imposed by a court, not the senate; cf. Mommsen (1887–8) III 48–52 and (1899) 964–7. With this request Catiline has, then, set a trap for C., which the orator adroitly avoids, appealing instead to the *grauissimum iudicium taciturnitatis* (defining gen.; cf. §13.9–10n.). **contumeliam** is a *color*, i.e. a one-sided expression chosen to help one's case (cf. Lausberg §§329 and 1061); the neutral term *iudicium* is avoided in part for variety given its occurrence later in the sentence. *iudicio opprimere* is elsewhere used of a judicial verdict: *Quinct.* 7; *Clu.* 30.

11–14 quid, quod aduentu tuo . . . tibi ferendum putas?: *ista subsellia* are “the benches near you,” whereby *iste* has a second-person reference; cf. *partem istam subselliorum* and §6.5–10n. The *subsellia* were the wooden benches where the senators sat as distinct from the *sella curulis* of the presiding magistrate (cf. 4.2.1–5n.); at *Phil.* 5.18 C. complains *illud uero taeterrimum . . . opertis ualuis Concordiae, cum inter subsellia senatus uersarentur latrones, patres conscriptos sententias dicere*. Cf. Hug, *RE* IVA 1.503.51; Taylor and Scott (1969) 543–7. It is interesting that C. has reserved mention of the shunning of Catiline upon his entry for this place, where it caps the argument that his life in Rome can only be joyless; cf. Offermann (1995) 228. **qui tibi persaepe ad caedem constituti fuerunt**: cf. what is said at §§2.3, 7.6–9, and 15.1–4. *nudam atque inanem reliquerunt* varies and explains what was previously expressed with *uacuefacio*; cf. §14.1–3n.

17.1–3 serui mehercule mei . . . urbem non arbitraris?: Quint. 8.4.10 cites our passage to illustrate the type of amplification which *incrementum ex minoribus petit*. The analogy of the state to the household was drawn by Aristotle (*Pol.* 1252b20–1 πᾶσα γὰρ οἰκία βασιλεύεται ὑπὸ τοῦ πρεσβυτάτου (“every household is ruled by the eldest”)), who famously posited a genetic relation between the two (*Pol.* 1252a26, b9–10, 15–16, 27–9). According to C.'s analogy, C. is to his slaves as Catiline to his

fellow-citizens (for the *timor populi* cf. §1.3-5n.). But fear was considered a justified method of control in the case of slaves, as C. himself implies elsewhere (*Off.* 2.24 *sed iis qui ui oppressos imperio coercent, sit sane adhibenda saeuitia, ut eris in famulos, si aliter teneri non possunt*). It must be the intensity of the fear (*isto pacto*) that would cause C. to leave his house (presumably out of fear for his life; cf. *Off.* 2.23). **serui** is doubly emphasized by initial position and by interposition of the interjection *mehercule* between it and its modifier. **mehercule**, ordinarily used only by men, is a shortened version of the apotropaic formula *ita me Hercules iuuat*; in his later works C. favors the form *mehercle*, a crossing of *hercle* and *mehercules*; cf. *OLD* s.v. *mehercule*; Hofmann (2003) 136-8.

3-7 et si me . . . praesentiamque uitare? another comparison between the attitudes of C. and Catiline couched as a question with the goal of persuading the latter to leave Rome; in C.'s case the matter is hypothetical and therefore cast as an unreal condition (*si . . . uiderem . . . mallet*), whereas for Catiline causes and facts are at issue (*cum . . . agnoscas . . . dubitas . . .*). *suspectus* is used with both the dat. of person (*meis ciuibus*) and the abl. of cause (*iniuria*); cf. *OLD* s.v. 1b. *offensus* has here, as sometimes elsewhere in C., the active sense "causing offence, odious, offensive": *OLD* s.v. 2. **carere me aspectu . . . conspici mallet:** *aspectus* can be either "sight" or "gaze": *OLD* s.v. 1b and 4a; at first one assumes the former sense but the sequel suggests the latter. The eye, like the *uultus* in general (cf. §1.5 *nihil horum ora uultusque mouerunt?*), conveys the individual's feelings; cf. *Culex* 254-6 *at discordantes Cadmeo semine fratres | iam truculenta ferunt infestaque lumina corpus | alter in alterius. tu* is strongly emphasized by its initial placement. **conscientia** here has its original sense "the shared knowledge" of something; cf. *OLD* s.v. 1. The *odium omnium iustum et iam diu tibi debitum* was foreshadowed by *non . . . odio . . . quo debeo* (§16.6-7). For the metaphorical use of *uulnero* cf. §9.6-7n. (*uoce uulnero*). **aspectum praesentiamque:** the two terms are more or less synonymous (on *aspectus* see above), but *-amque uitare* secures C.'s favorite clausula (cretic + trochee); see appendix 3.

7-12 si te parentes . . . nec uim pertimesces? another counterfactual hypothesis, this time involving Catiline himself. If Catiline is identical with the L. Sergius who is attested as a member of the *consilium* of the consul Cn. Pompeius Strabo in 89 (see Introduction section 1), his father's name was also Lucius; but nothing else is known of his parents. *placo* is to "make favourably disposed, placate": *OLD* s.v. *placo*¹ 1; cf. *Balb.* 62 *si certorum hominum mentes nulla ratione . . . placare possumus*. The parenthetical *ut opinor* ("presumably") is used here without irony; cf. *OLD* s.v. *opinor* i.e. *aliquo* is the indefinite local adv. ("to some place"): *OLD* s.v. 1. *nunc* "as it is" in asyndeton contrasts the reality with the preceding counterfactual proposition; cf. Risselada (1996) 113-14. C.'s exploration of the hatred and fear of Catiline begins with *omnes ciues*, moves on to the *parentes*, and reaches a climax in the personified *patria*; cf. *TLL* s.v. *patrius* 770.24-53. Plato, too, argues *a fortiori* from the rights of parents over one to those of the homeland (*Cri.* 51a7-c3). The laws present themselves as the parents of Athenian citizens at *Pl.* *Cri.* 51c8-9 and 36; cf. also Isoc. *Paneg.* 25 "for it is fitting for us [sc. Athenians] alone of the Greeks to call the same one nurse and homeland (πατρίς) and mother"; cf. *Flac.* 62 (translated from Isocrates) *et eorum eadem terra parens, altrix, patria dicitur*; *De orat.* 1.196

est patria parens omnium nostrum. In ranking claimants on one's *officia* C. places the *patria* and *parentes* on the same level (*Off.* 1.58). The attitude attributed to the *patria* (*odit ac metuit*) is, of course, simply that previously ascribed to *omnes ciues*. **de parricidio suo**: an arresting phrase; the concept is previously attested in a speech by M. Aemilius Scaurus (cos. 115; cf. Bates (1986)), an acquaintance of C.'s grandfather (*Leg.* 3.36), who excoriated Q. Caepio as *patriae parricida* (*orat.* no. 43, fr. 9). The phrase *parricida/-ium patriae* goes on to become part of C.'s standard lexicon of abuse; for the former cf. *Vat.* 35 and *Phil.* 4.5, for the latter *Sul.* 6.12 (with Berry *ad loc.* as well as on 19.9), *Phil.* 2.17, and *Off.* 3.83; cf. in general Opelt (1965) 131–2; Achard (1981) 291–5. *huius* is emphatically placed. The tricolon indicates three points that might deter Catiline from his course of action, each with a verb indicating the appropriate response. For Roman attitudes toward *auctoritas* cf. Heinze (1960) 43–58. *uereor* differs from *metuo* and *timeo* in shading more toward “show respect, reverence for”: *OLD* s.v. 1; cf. also the distinction at *Quinct.* 1 with Kinsey's n. **iudicium**: Catiline had not, of course, been convicted in court; C. perhaps has in mind the decree passed against Catiline and referred to at §3.7–10, where see n.; cf. also §4.9. **uim**: the consuls' police powers were ordinarily deployed outside the city, however; cf. on §10.7–10. This is the first of 14 occurrences of *pertimesco* (“I am terrified”) in the *Catilinarians*; later C. would come to prefer *extimesco*; cf. Kinsey on *Quinct.* 1; von Albrecht (2003) 106.

18.1–2 quae tecum, Catilina . . . tacita loquitur: an instance of *prosopopoeia*, the introduction of a fictitious speaker, a technique praised as lending variety and excitement; cf. *Quint.* 6.1.25 and 9.2.29; Lausberg §828. C. previously used it to give voice to *Sicilia tota* at *Div. Caec.* 19; in our passage he may have been inspired by the speech of the personified “laws and the whole city” (οἱ νόμοι καὶ τὸ κοινὸν τῆς πόλεως) at *Pl. Cri.* 50a–4d, where, however, the argument is that Socrates should remain in Athens and endure the punishment meted out by the court. C., in turn, is imitated by [Sal.] *Rep.* 2.13.1 *quodsi tecum patria atque parentes possent loqui, scilicet haec tibi dicerent*. Quintilian calls our example *audacius* than the address of the *patria* to himself at §27.8–29.4 (9.2.32). Nisbet (1964) 62–3 criticizes both passages for “theatricality” and adds “one does not seem to be listening in on a real debate in one of the most hard-headed assemblies that the world has known.” But standards of effective rhetoric vary from culture to culture, and the *prosopopoeia* has a rhetorical purpose; cf. Batstone (1994) 255 n. 73 on the function of the two passages as articulating “the two central issues (Catiline's character and Cicero's *inertia*) as defined by the opening of the *exordium*”; and by making the *patria* speak with the voice of the average senator and citizen (see below) C. further isolates Catiline. *ago cum aliquo* is to “speak, discuss, reason about” with that person; cf. *OLD* s.v. *ago* 40. **tacita loquitur** glances at the senators' silence while at the same time suggesting something like the voice of conscience; the oxymoron, a favorite of C.'s (cf. Berry on *Sul.* 82.5), is softened by *quodam modo*.

2–11 ‘Nullum iam . . . timere desinam’: the typical prayer consists of a direct address, an aretology or recital of past achievements, and the request. This form is ironically used in the speech of the *patria* except that the direct address to

Catiline is subsumed in C.'s introductory sentence. C. was, of course, well aware of the traditional hymnic form and used it in his famous address to *philosophia* at *Tusc.* 5.5-6 (cf. Hommel (1968)). Cf. Ratkowsch (1981) esp. 164.

2-6 'Nullum iam . . . ualuisti: the attribution of exceptional powers and unique agency (*nisi per te . . . tibi uni* and *propter unum te*, line 7) is characteristic of the aretology of hymns to deities, as is the use of anaphora (*nullum . . . nullum*) and the polyptoton of the second-person pronoun (*per te . . . sine te; tibi . . . tibi . . . tu*); cf. Ratkowsch (1981) with extensive citation of parallels; La Bua (1998) 134-5. **aliquot annis** expresses "time in the course of which": Roby §1182. The phrase puts a somewhat finer point on C.'s previous *iam pridem* and *iam diu* (§§2.5, 5.7-8, etc.). At *Sul.* 67 C. speaks of *furorem incredibilem biennio ante conceptum*, but there he is evidently thinking only of the conspiracy itself, not Catiline's other crimes; cf. Drummond (1999a) 305. **nullum flagitium sine te:** for Catiline's *flagitia* see on §§13-14. **tibi uni multorum ciuium neces:** an apparent reference to Catiline's activity as Sulla's henchman during the civil war and the proscriptions; cf. the Introduction section 1. **tibi uexatio . . . ac libera:** during his term as proprator in Africa in 67 (*MRR* II 147); *impunita ac libera* because Catiline's trial *de repetundis* in the latter half of 65 resulted in his acquittal, whether because the jury was bribed (Q. Cic. (?) *Comm. pet.* 10) or because of collusion (*praeuaricatio*) on the part of the prosecutor, P. Clodius (hinted at by Cic. *Att.* 1.2.1; cf. *contra* Tatum (1999) 53-5) or some combination of the two; cf. *TLRR* no. 212. **tu non solum . . . perfringendasque ualuisti:** cf. §1.1-2n.; the similar criticism of *iudicia perrupta* at *Leg.* 2.43 probably has reference to Catiline as well as Clodius; see Dyck *ad loc.*

6-11 superiora illa . . . timere desinam': *superiora illa* summarizes Catiline's past record; *ille*, referring to the more remote, prepares for the following contrast; cf. H-S 184-5. The insertion *quamquam ferenda non fuerunt* anticipates and perhaps detracts a bit from the climactic force of the following *non est ferendum*. **nunc uero:** with these words (cf. §16.6-8n.) the *patria* begins describing the current situation, her bulletin consisting of individual items in asyndeton. She begins with her own mood, the fear of the *patria* being simply the *timor populi* writ large; cf. §1.3-5n. **propter unum te:** see previous n. **quicquid increpauerit:** a disguised protasis = *si quid increpauerit*: "every time there has been a loud noise" (*OLD* s.v. *increpo* 1); cf. *Pis.* 99 *quicquid increpauisset pertimescentem* with Nisbet's n.; less plausibly, *TLL* s.v. 1051.70-3 finds the original force lost in such passages and would render "whatever has arisen, supervened" or the like. **quod a tuo scelere abhorreat:** *abhorreo* is "to be incompatible with" (cf. *OLD* s.v. 3 and 5b); the subjunctive is that of a dependent clause in *oratio obliqua* that forms an integral part of the main thought; cf. G-L §629. **non est ferendum** caps and summarizes, the force somewhat blunted, however, by the preceding *quamquam ferenda non fuerunt . . .* (see above). This is also a more general reformulation of C.'s personal *non feram, non patiar, non sinam* (§10.10-11; see *ad loc.*); cf. *Sex. Rosc.* 34 *quia fit a Chrysogono non est ferendum*. **quam ob rem . . . timere desinam':** the conclusion from the foregoing is not exactly a prayer, as one expects at the conclusion of a hymn to a god, but nonetheless a request (see on lines 2-11

above): Catiline's help can only take the form of his departure; cf. Ratkowitsch (1981) 163. Interestingly, the *patria* does not commit to the correctness of C.'s allegations (*si est uerus . . . si falsus*); C. thus seeks to construct the *patria* as a spokesperson for the average senator; cf. Stroh (2000) 74; she also reflects the fear of the Roman people in general (§1.4 *timor populi*). *tandem* and *aliquando*, in combination, reinforce one another: "at long last"; cf. 2.1.1; OLD s.v. *quando* 2b; Kinsey on *Quinct.* 94; cf. also §10.5–6n.

19.1–3 haec si tecum . . . non possit? *haec* summarizes the preceding speech. C. naturally couches this in an ideal conditional sentence, in which "the supposition is more or less fanciful" (G–L §596). *nonne*, as usual, anticipates a positive response (cf. §1.3–5n.). **etiam si uim adhibere non possit?** at §§5–6 C. explains why he so far declines to use force; he holds out a vague threat of force at §17.11–12, however.

3–4 quid, quod tu . . . uelle dixisti? the public jail (*carcer*), located at the foot of the Capitoline between the temple of Concordia and the curia, was small, its security unreliable; it was a temporary holding pen not meant for long-term detention, which was not a regular penalty; cf. 2.22.2–4n. Upper-class defendants awaiting trial were standardly free on bail. Alternatively, citizens of standing who were suspected of a crime could, at the magistrate's discretion, be consigned to *libera custodia* (called *libera* because the prisoner was not chained; contrast Caes. *Gal.* 1.4.1 *Orgetorigem ex uinculis causam dicere coegerunt*), a kind of house arrest by which the host in effect stood bail; this method was later used for the conspirators captured in the city (cf. 3.14.7–9n.; Sal. 47.3–4). Cf. Richardson s.v. *carcer*; Mommsen (1899) 305; Nippel (1995) 52. Catiline's offer to submit to *libera custodia* was evidently in connection with his prosecution after 21 October 63 by L. Aemilius Lepidus Paullus under the *lex Plautia de ui* (TLRR no. 223); cf. MRR II 166. **ad M'. Lepidum:** *ad* is colloquial in the sense "at the house of" (= *apud*); cf. OLD s.v. 16a; it is attested here in the older MSS as well as the citation at Serv. *A.* 1.24; elsewhere it has been changed to *apud*. It is unclear why Catiline chose in the first instance M'. Lepidus (cos. 66) as his guardian. Was he perhaps one of the *consulares* who spoke for him at his trial *de repetundis* (TLRR no. 212)? He was said to be one of the *inimici tribuniciae potestatis* (Cic. fr. orat. *Corn.* II 3 with Asc. 79C) and so was hardly in political agreement with Catiline (hence *uitandae suspicionis causa*). Like the other *consulares* (cf. §16.8–9n.), he approved C.'s handling of the conspiracy. Cf. Klebs, *RE* I 1.550 (s.v. Aemilius no. 62); MRR III 6.

4–6 a quo non receptus . . . rogasti: C. represents this request as another example of Catiline's *audacia* (*ausus es*; cf. §1.2–3n.), but it was, in fact, routine: since such detention lay within the magistrate's power of *coercitio* (cf. §5.5–8n.), the magistrate also determined the means; thus Lentulus Sura, one of the captured urban conspirators, was lodged at the home of his relative P. Lentulus Spinther (later cos. 57), who was then aedile (MRR II 167); cf. Mommsen (1899) 305.

6–8 cum a me quoque . . . praetorem uenisti: only in his own case does C. give a reason for the refusal. For the colloquial negation *nullo modo* cf. Hofmann (2003) 209. The reply is an *a fortiori* argument from the stronger city walls (*moenia*) to the less substantial house walls (*parietes*); cf. *Phil.* 12.24 *domesticis me parietibus uix tueor*

sine amicorum custodiis. **tuto esse** is "to exist safely": *OLD* s.v. *tuto* b. **magno in periculo:** the placement of the adj. in front of the preposition in such phrases is characteristic of C.'s early style; cf. Kinsey on *Quinct.* 20. After §§9-10, 11, and 15, C. no longer needs to explain the danger. Even if it were not in a clause within *oratio obliqua*, *esse* would have to be subjunctive since the relative clause is causal; cf. G-L §633. Q. Caecilius Metellus Celer was a *praetor* of optimate sentiments and hence a logical magistrate after C. to be asked, given that a request to Catiline's friend, the other consul C. Antonius, would hardly serve to avert suspicion (cf. §2.1n.). In the following year he was proconsul of Cisalpine Gaul, a post C. had renounced; cf. 4.23.1-8n. C's information is contradicted by Dio 37.32.2, who, however, must have confused Q. Metellus with M. Metellus. Celer was effective in levying troops in the *ager Picenus et Gallicus* and blocking the Catilinarians' escape route to Transalpine Gaul (cf. §5.1-5n.); C. later eulogized him as *socius laborum, periculorum, consiliorum meorum* (*Sest.* 131). In early 62 he reacted angrily to what he perceived as C.'s insulting treatment of his brother Nepos but was apparently mollified by C.'s carefully crafted reply (*Fam.* 5.1-2). After serving as consul for 60, he died suddenly in 59; poisoning by his wife Clodia was the rumored cause. Cf. Münzer, *RE* III 1.1208 (s.v. Caecilius 86).

8-11 a quo repudiatus . . . fore putasti: *M. Metellum* is the reading of the older MSS and should be retained (it also facilitates Dio's error (see previous n.); cf. also Quint. 9.2.45 (*Metellum*)); the others have *M. Marcellum*, perhaps imported from §21.2. All that is known of him is what is said in this passage. Münzer, *RE* III 1.1206 (Caecilius no. 80) and 2.2733 (Claudius no. 215) prefers *M. Marcellum*; on this basis he wants to connect our passage with Oros. 6.6.7 (*motus in Paelignis ortus a Marcellis patre et filio*), with C. Marcellus of *Sest.* 9 as the son and the M. Marcellus of our passage as the father; but there is nothing binding in this identification. Gwatkin (1934) esp. 276-7 suggests that the reading was simply *Metellum*, referring to Q. Caecilius Metellus Nepos, tribune designate at the time of the speech, but one expects the man to be identified initially with the praenomen; cf. Adams (1978) 145-6. *sodalitates* were old religious associations in charge of certain rites (see Berry on *Sul.* 7.1; Wissowa (1912) 404 and 481); it is not known to which *sodalitas* Catiline and Metellus belonged. The irony of the characterization of Catiline's *sodalis* as *uir optimus* is manifest; cf. also Kinsey on *Quinct.* 16. **quem tu . . . fore putasti:** the irony continues, marked by *uidelicet* ("of course, no doubt": *OLD* s.v. 3), with Metellus receiving a superlative rating under each of the guardian's duties; one can imagine the *-issimum* endings recurring with mocking emphasis in delivery. *sagax* was originally "keen-scented"; the word was then metaphorically applied to mental faculties in comedy (*quis tam sagaci corde . . . ?*: Afran. *com.* 15) and generally; our passage is its only occurrence in C's speeches; cf. *OLD* and Merguet (1877-84) s.v.

11-13 sed quam longe . . . iudicarit?: Catiline could reply that he placed himself in *libera custodia* to show that he was obedient to the magistrates and the criminal justice system; the fact need not be taken, as C. does, as a confession of guilt. For this passage as an example of C.'s "appropriation and reversal" of an opponent's

argument cf. Riggsby (1995) 247. **a carcere atque a uinculis:** *libera custodia* obviated these more severe forms of confinement; see on lines 3–4 above.

20.1–3 quae cum ita sint . . . solitudinique mandare?: *quae cum ita sint* summarizes the points made since §13 about Catiline's life in Rome; the causal construction (*cum . . . sint*) prepares the listener/reader for an inference. Direct address to Catiline resumes for the first time since §18 and recurs twice more in this chapter and once in §21, the heaviest concentration of the speech. *dubitas* resumes from §13.1. **si emori aequo animo non potes:** C. presents departure from Rome and death as Catiline's alternatives. But he has already said that he is not going to put Catiline to death as long as there is opposition in the senate (§§5–6). **aequo animo** ("with patience, resignation": *OLD* s.v. *aequus* 8a) implies voluntary death, i.e. suicide. Caesar famously declared *satis diu uel naturae uixi uel gloriae* (Cic. *Marc.* 25; similarly C. himself at *Phil.* 1.38), and philosophers offered advice on facing death *aequo animo* (e.g. *Lucr.* 3; Cic. *Tusc.* 1 and *Sen.* 66–85); cf. also C.'s declaration at 4.3.5–6 *si quid obtigerit, aequo animo paratoque moriar*. **in aliquas terras** varies *aliquo* of §17.9; for *aliqui* conveying a note of contempt cf. Kinsey on *Quinct.* 72; similarly §28.8, 2.19.14, 4.4.5 and 22.4. **uitam istam** "that life of yours," continues the contemptuous tone; cf. §2.3–5n. (on *iste*); §16.6 *quae tua est ista uita?* **multis suppliciis . . . ereptam:** for *eripio* with plain abl. of separation in C.'s prose cf. *Brut.* 90 *isque se tum eripuit flamma*; *TLL* s.v. *eripio* 795.10. For *iustis debitisque* see §17.5–6 (*odium omnium iustum et iam diu tibi debitum*). *fuga* (literally "flight") can be used as a euphemism for exile, as at *Div.* 1.59 (on C.'s avoidance of *exsilium*, *exsul*, *exsulo* etc. with reference to himself cf. A. Robinson (1994)); only at lines 7–8 does he say plainly *in exsilium, si hanc uocem exspectas, proficiscere*; cf. §22.1–3n. Catiline and his followers would later claim Massilia (mod. Marseilles) as his destination (2.14.5 and 16.1–3; *Sal.* 34.2).

4–7 'Refer' inquis . . . de te sentiant: *refero* is technical for "raising" a matter before the senate or "making a proposal" before that body; cf. *OLD* s.v. 7. That Catiline wanted the question of his exile so handled was already implied at §16.10 (*uocis exspectas contumeliam*). The use of *postulo* (rather than *flagito* or *posco*) implies a certain justice in the demand; cf. *OLD* s.v. *postulo* 1; Kinsey on *Quinct.* 13. **si hic ordo . . . obtemperatum te esse:** the direct form would be *si hic ordo sibi placere decreuerit me ire in exsilium, obtemperabo*; cf. G–L §§595 and 656–7. For *hic ordo* referring to the senate cf. §3.7–10n.; for *exsilium* cf. §13.1–3n. C.'s reply strongly emphasizes the negative by position. **id quod abhorret a meis moribus:** for *abhorreo* cf. §18.6–11n. One might ask why C. finds it acceptable to force Catiline out of Rome by threatening language but not by formal vote of the senate. The answer is probably that, in view of the lack of precedent (cf. on §16.9–11 and 2.12.1–3) and the fact that, in what was evidently the most recent vote on Catiline, he regarded the senate's resolution as inadequate (cf. §3.7–10n.), he feels his position is too weak to risk a formal vote. *hi* are the senators (cf. §1.3–5n. (*horum ora uultusque*)).

7–10 egredere ex urbe . . . tacitorum perspicis?: the command *egredere* is repeated from §10.5 and will recur at §23.5. **libera rem publicam metu:** the

metus was first C.'s (*magno me metu liberabis . . .*: §10.8), then that of the *patria* (*me totam esse in metu*; cf. *ut tandem aliquando timere desinam*: §18.7 and 11); cf. also §31.5–6 *uidebimur fortasse ad breue quoddam tempus cura et metu esse releuati*. Since §13.3 C. has avoided the term *exsilium*, which might seem harsh to some senators (see above). *proficiscor* is to set out with some definite goal; cf. Fordyce on Catul. 46.10; OLD s.v. 1b. **quid est . . . horum silentium?**: *ecquid* is used to signal an urgent question (cf. K–S II 515); its repetition is like a boxer's repeated jabbing at his opponent. C.'s art in this passage is making the senators' silence speak, just as he had in the speech of the *patria*, who *tacita loquitur* (§18.2 with n.); cf. §21.4 *cum tacent, clamant*. **patiuntur** i.e. they do not raise a storm of protest at Catiline's treatment by C. **loquentium** would not need to be specified but for the contrast with *tacitorum*; cf. §16.10–11 *uocis . . . contumeliam . . . iudicio taciturnitatis*. Contrast the situation described at *Mil.* 12 *quotiens enim est illa causa a nobis acta in senatu, quibus assensionibus uniuersi ordinis, quam nec tacitis nec occultis!*

21.1–3 at si hoc . . . manus intulisset: *hoc idem* refers to the command *egredere ex urbe* etc. Diodorus 40.5a presents an alternative account of the proceedings at this point: he confirms Catiline's refusal to go into voluntary exile and claims that C. actually put the question to the senate whether Catiline should depart Rome or not and was met with silence; then C. asked whether Q. Catulus should leave and there was a storm of protest, whereupon C. remarked that the senators raise an outcry when they do not think a man worthy of exile and that the meaning of their silence is therefore clear; Catiline then withdrew saying that he would take his own counsel. Diodorus' version shows C. making a mistake in actually putting the question of Catiline's exile to the senate but then recovering with brilliant improvisation. This account has been held to be the true one, our passage a "retouching" in the version of the speech C. published as part of the corpus of his consular speeches in 60 (so Ungern-Sternberg (1971)). It seems more likely, however, that Diodorus was merely using C.'s speech as his source and modifying it so as to make the scene more dramatic: C.'s references to the senators' silence (to his request that Catiline go into exile) have become a question to the senate as to whether Catiline should go into exile, something C. had good reason to avoid (cf. §20.4–7n.); for the two junior senators P. Sestius and M. Marcellus, used as examples by C. (chosen as typical senators of good repute), is substituted (partly for the sake of the similarity of the name?) the famous optimate consular Q. Catulus; and C. is said actually to have proposed his exile. Stroh (2000) 76 is surely right that this is inconceivable, even as part of a ruse. On the publication of the speech see the Introduction section 4.

1 huic adolescenti optimo P. Sestio: for *hic* referring to a person or thing actually present cf. §1.4–5n. Sestius was serving this year as quaestor assigned to C.'s colleague C. Antonius, whom he accompanied the following year to the province of Macedonia. As tribune of the *plebs* in 57 he fought for C.'s recall from exile; when he reported unfavorable omens to hinder Clodius' election as curule aedile, he received more than 20 wounds in a vicious assault. C. defended him twice in court, *de ui* in 56 (source of the preserved speeches *Sest.* and *Vat.*) and in his second trial *de ambitu*

(52; cf. *TLRR* nos. 270–1, 323). He was praetor before 49, in which year he governed a province and took the Pompeian side in the civil war, but he sought and received Caesar's pardon after Pharsalus; he was still active as late as 35. Cf. Münzer, *RE* II A 2.1886–90 s.v. *Sestius* no. 6; *MRR* III 197. If, as the dates of his offices suggest, he was born c. 95 (so Münzer, *RE* II A 2.1886.19–21), he will have been c. 32 at this time; hence *adulescens* is loosely used; C. referred to himself as *adulescens* at the time of his consulship (*Phil.* 2.118); see further Kinsey on *Quinct.* 12.

1–2 fortissimo uiro M. Marcello: M. Claudius Marcellus was quaestor in 65 and was among those who warned C. of planned murders by Catiline and his followers (*Plut. Cic.* 15.1–4); for *uir forti(ssimu)s* cf. §2.3–5n. He twice defended Milo (*TLRR* nos. 263 and 309, the latter the famous trial *de ui* for murder of Clodius) and served in 54 as praetor. During and immediately after his consulship (51), he took a hard line against Caesar's attempts to stand for consul *in absentia* (and thus avoid prosecution). He took no part in the civil war but in the aftermath of Pharsalus went into exile at Mytilene. Caesar pardoned him in 45 (the occasion commemorated by C.'s speech misnamed *Pro Marcello*), but on his way back to Rome he was assassinated in Athens. Cf. Münzer, *RE* III 2.2760–4 (s.v. Claudius no. 229).

2–3 iam mihi consuli . . . manus intulisset: the counterfactual apodosis is, of course, hyperbolic; C.'s office (*consuli*) is added to make the breach of order still more striking. **iure optimo** is a set phrase ("rightly, justifiably"): *OLD* s.v. *ius* 7b. **uim et manus** is a hendiadys (similarly *manus ac tela*, line 9, *furorem ac tela*: §2.4–5): "would have laid violent hands upon me."

3–4 de te autem . . . clamant: the initial *de te* sharply opposes Catiline's case to the hypothesis just described. The tricolon offers at each stage a stronger affirmation, from mere approval to judgment and ending with shouting. C. was fond of the oxymoron *cum tacent, clamant*; see Berry on *Sul.* 82.5. The *cum* is explicative, virtually the equivalent of *quod* ("in that they are silent"); cf. G–L §582; the use of the indicative emphasizes that the two acts coincide; cf. *Phil.* 1.23 with Ramsey's n.

4–8 neque hi solum . . . exaudire potuisti: for *hi* referring to the assembled senators cf. §1.5n. (*horum ora uultusque*). **uidelicet** ("apparently") inserts a strong hint of sarcasm within the claim that the senate's authority is precious to Catiline (inferred from his request *refer ad senatum*: §20.4). The claim is further undercut by the immediately following *uita uilissima*; for Catiline's plotting against the senators cf. §2.3 and §7.6–12. In exceptional circumstances the security of senate meetings could be insured by the deployment of an armed posse; in this case, as later on 5 December (*Att.* 2.1.7; *Sal.* 49.4), the backbone consisted of Roman *equites*, who receive honorable epithets here (*honestissimi atque optimi uiri*); cf. Bleicken (1995) 59–60; Nippel (1995) 52; Berry (2003) 226; there is no need to assume, with Ungern-Sternberg (1971) 53 n. 12, that this reference was added to the written version of the speech. Three characteristics of this band are singled out with a different verb by which Catiline was able to confirm each *paulo ante* (i.e. when he arrived and entered the temple). *studium* often appears in the plural when it refers to "partisan spirit" or the like: *OLD* s.v. 6; Hellegouarc'h (1972) 175–6. **exaudire:** the prefix conveys the idea of catching

a sound at a distance; cf. 4.14.1; *Mil.* 67 *sed tuas, Cn. Pompei – te enim appello et ea uoce ut me exaudire possis . . . suspiciones perhorrescimus*; Reid on *Luc.* 20; Tarrant on *Sen. Thy.* 114.

8–10 quorum ego uix . . . ad portas prosequantur: such a posse could be hard to control, as was shown after the debate of 5 December, when the *equites* threatened Caesar with swords as he left the senate: *Sal.* 49.4; *Plut. Caes.* 8.2–3; *Suet. Jul.* 14.2; cf. 4.7.1–4n. On *abs te* cf. §16.1–5n. **manus ac tela:** cf. Catiline's *furorem ac tela* (§2.4–5), as well as the *uim et manus* at line 3. Following the relative clause *eosdem* has adversative force ("I have been hard pressed to . . . but I will have no trouble"); cf. *OLD* s.v. *idem* 10b. **quae uastare iam pridem studes:** he could simply have said *urbem*, but this periphrasis heightens the irony; such designs are attributed to Catiline at §§3.3 and 12.1–3; cf. also §29.2–3 *cum bello uastabitur Italia*. C. mockingly promises to convert this hostile force into a friendly escort such as accompanied high magistrates to the gates of the city as they departed to take up military commands; for the custom cf. Mommsen (1887–8) I 63–4; for the general tone of the passage cf. Primmer (1977) 33.

22.1–3 Quamquam quid loquor? . . . di immortales duint!: *dubitatio* is a figure by which the orator claims to be in doubt how to proceed (cf. Volkmann (1885) 496–8; Lausberg §776); here *dubitatio* shades into *correctio*, since C. implies that trying to persuade Catiline, as he has done since §13, is futile; similarly *Phil.* 1.35 *sed quid oratione te flectam?* *quamquam* is adversative rather than subordinating here: "and yet"; cf. *OLD* s.v. 3. *frango* is to "soften"; cf. *Tusc.* 2.48 *saepe . . . uidemus fractos pudore, qui ratione nulla uincerentur*; *OLD* s.v. 10. **tu ut umquam te colligas?:** *colligas* is to be preferred over *corrigas* (cf. the app. crit.) as the more difficult reading; cf. *Tusc.* 4.78 *quid est . . . se ipsum colligere nisi dissipatas animi partes rursum in suum locum cogere?* The hopelessness of any change is suggested at §4.11–12 *uiuis non ad deponendam sed ad confirmandam audaciam*. C. at first refers to his preferred solution with the euphemistic *fuga* but then makes no bones about calling it *exsilium* (cf. §20.1–3n.). For *di immortales* cf. §11.1–4n. **duint** is an old subjunctive form used in wishes; it is from *dou-*, a form parallel with *do* and having the same meaning; cf. Leumann (1977) 528; Meiser §122.3; unless one adopts the conjecture *di duint* at *Phil.* 10.13, our passage is the only one in which C. uses the form (cf. Neue and Wagener (1892–1905) III 311–13). For the idea cf. *Dem.* 18.324 quoted on 2.11.3–5.

3–6 tametsi uideo . . . in posteritatem impendeat: *sed* of the following sentence correlates with the concessive *tametsi*, a conjunction favored in C.'s early speeches but used sparingly from the consular speeches onward; cf. von Albrecht (2003) 100. **mea uoce perterritus:** cf. on §9.6–7 *eos nondum uoce uulnere. inducere animum* is used from Plautus onward with dependent acc. + inf. in the sense "prevail on oneself" (to do something). **tempestas** is often used as a metaphor for disordered circumstances of various kinds; cf. *OLD* s.v. 4; the *iunctura tempestas inuidiae* appeared already at *Clu.* 94 and will recur at 2.15.2; cf. also *Clu.* 153 (*procellae inuidiarum*); in the

sequel *invidia* will be figured as a mass (*moles*: §23.4) and as a conflagration (§29.4); cf. Pöschl (1983) 13. In fact, *invidia Ciceronis* would be stirred up in the sequel, first by Metellus Nepos, who, as tribune for 62 intervened to prevent C. from delivering the consul's traditional valedictory speech (*MRR* II 174) and later, more damagingly, by P. Clodius following C.'s testimony against him in the trial for profaning the rites of the Bona Dea (*TLRR* no. 236); hence the orator's exile of 58–7; cf. Christopherson (1989); Tatum (1999) 151–5. Is it credible to suppose that the possible *invidia* from the Catilinarian affair was already exercising C. in November 63? The analytic school, led by Draheim (1917) 1063–4, has supposed that it was not and that the references to *invidia* here must have been inserted later when the consular speeches were published together as a corpus (cf. Introduction section 4); Kennedy (1972) 177 leaves open the possibility that this and other passages related to C.'s fears "could have been added"; cf. Helm (1979) 138–40 and Primmer (1977) 38, who argues that with their serious tone they interrupt the train of thought. But the argument about *invidia* as hypothetically framed here makes perfect sense: C. wants Catiline to go into exile (rather than to Manlius' camp); Catiline wants to harm his *inimicus*, Cicero; to do so he has only to go into exile, rather than to Manlius; C.'s critics in the senate will then be proved right, and *invidia* will be directed at him. There is no necessary reflection of the *invidia* that would later affect C. **recenti memoria scelerum tuorum** is an abl. absolute with a predicate adjective rather than a participle; cf. Roby §1242; K–S I 779–80; *recenti*, emphatically placed, negates the possibility of *invidia in praesens tempus*. *impendeo* can describe a storm as "hanging over" but also implies "threaten"; cf. §29.13, 2.28.6–7 and 4.4.2; *OLD* s.v.

6–7 sed est tanti . . . periculis seiungatur: *tanti* is genitive of the amount: "of such value" (cf. Roby §1186), i.e. it is worth C.'s risking *invidia*. **dummodo . . . seiungatur:** i.e. provided that Catiline's departure merely leads to his exile (*a priuata calamitas*) and not to a civil war.

7–9 sed tu . . . non est postulandum: here C. reverts to points similar to the ones raised at the beginning this section, this time expressed dogmatically, rather than interrogatively, *te ut ulla res frangat?* (line 1) corresponding to *tu ut uitis tuis commoueare*; the change of behavior (*tu ut umquam te colligas?* (lines 1–2)) could be motivated either by fear of the laws (cf. §17.11–12 *huius* [sc. *patriae*] *tu . . . nec uim pertimesces?*; *Pis.* 5, cited on §13.1–3) or an inclination to yield to "conditions of the state" (*temporibus rei publicae*: cf. *OLD* s.v. *tempus* 12; cf. *Fam.* 4.9.2 (to M. Marcellus c. August–September 46): *primum tempori cedere, id est necessitati parere, semper sapientis est habitum*). For C.'s use of *cedo* of his own departure for exile cf. *Sest.* 53; *Leg.* 3.25.

9–10 neque enim is es . . . a furore reuocarit: this sentence offers a point-by-point justification (*enim*) of the preceding one: *pudor* follows upon consciousness of *uitia*, *metus* would keep one clear of the *legum poenae* (cf. *Leg.* 1.40–1), and *ratio* would indicate that the *tempora rei publicae* are not ripe for his designs; its opposite, *furor*, has been Catiline's attribute since the first sentence of this speech. *is* is one of the locutions that regularly prompt a result clause; cf. K–S II 248–9.

23 C. outlines two alternative paths for Catiline: he can either go into exile with *invidia* accruing to C. as a result, or he can join Manlius and thus justify C.'s course of action.

1-3 quam ob rem . . . perge in exsilium: *quam ob rem* draws the conclusion from the futility of trying to persuade Catiline (see above). This is the third occurrence of the command *proficiscere* (after §§10.6 and 20.8); it will recur again at §33.3. **si mihi inimico . . . tuo** glances at Catiline's alternative account of C.'s motives. Sallust gives Catiline a response to our speech that reduces C.'s claims *ad absurdum*: *ea familia ortum, ita se ab adolescentia uitam instituisse ut omnia bona in spe haberet; nec existimarent sibi, patricio homini, quous ipsius atque maiorum plurima beneficia in plebem Romanam essent, perdita re publica opus esse, quom eam seruaret M. Tullius, inquilinus ciuis urbis Romae*; when such rhetoric failed in its purpose, he went on to claim *quoniam quidem circumuentus ab inimicis praeceptis agor, incendium meum ruina restinguam* (31.7 and 9; Sallust has, however, inserted this threat in the wrong place; it was directed to Cato prior to the elections of 63; cf. *Mur.* 51). When he departed Rome, Catiline wrote to his consular and other noble friends: *se falsis criminibus circumuentum, quoniam factioni inimicorum resistere nequiuert, fortunae cedere, Massiliam in exilium profisci* (Sal. 34.2). If previously a part of his persuasive rhetoric, Catiline's invocation of *inimici* in this last passage should be seen as a means of saving face (cf. Epstein (1987) 68). **ut praedicas:** *praedicare* is to proclaim, make known publicly (*OLD* s.v. *praedico*¹ 1). **conflare** is to join together while blowing, hence "to smelt" and then "to forge or form" in general; C. uses it five times in his speeches with *invidia* as its object; translate "arouse, stir up, engineer"; cf. Nägelsbach (1905) 589; Ernout and Meillet s.v. *flo*; *OLD* and Merguet (1877-84) s.v. *conflo*; Austin on *Cael.* 29.21. **recta** stands for *recta uia* ("straight, directly"), as also at *Ver.* 2.5.160 *sibi recta iter esse Romam*; cf. Merguet (1877-84) s.v.

3-5 uix feram . . . sustinebo: the irony of *uix feram sermones* is palpable; cf. Primmer (1977) 35. The point is repeated in different terms and with anaphora of *uix* for emphasis; the conditional sentences are of the future more vivid form (cf. A-G §516c), expressing the consequence as a certainty. *moles* is a large mass, the earliest metaphorical attestation (of the Trojan War) in Accius: *quantam . . . molem excitavit belli* (*trag.* 609-10: *Telephus*); it is always used of evils or burdens; cf. also 3.17.5-6 *non facile hanc tantam molem mali a ceruicibus uestris depulissem*; *OLD* s.v. 1 and 5. For *exsilium* cf. §13.1-3n.; for *iussu consulis* cf. §§2.5 and 13.2 (*exire ex urbe iubet consul hostem*).

5-8 sin autem seruire . . . isse uidearis: *sin . . . mauis* poses the other horn of the dilemma; cf. *OLD* s.v. *sin* 1; G-L §592. *seruio* evolves from "be a slave to" (a master) to "act in subservience to" (an interest or principle); cf. *Ver.* 2.1.5 *neque . . . magis meae quam uestrae laudi existimationique seruisse*; *Sest.* 143 *posteritatis gloriae seruiamus*; *OLD* s.v. 1 and 4; Merguet (1877-84) s.v. *laus* and *gloria* are frequently juxtaposed with a distinction of meaning ("reputation" and "glory"); cf. Thomas (1994) 98. *importunus* was formed as an antonym to *opportunus* (= "toward port," hence in general "favorable"); it appears here and elsewhere in the *Catilinarians* in the sense "cruel, harsh, barbarous"; cf. 2.12.9 *importunissimum hostem*; 4.12.11 *importunus ac ferreus*; Ernout and Meillet s.v.; Nettleship s.v. *portus*. C. reserves *sceleratus* for persons, *scelestus* for things; the substantival use in our

passage is anticipated at Plaut. *Per.* 275 *scelerate, etiam respicis?* Cf. Reichenbecher (1913) 19–29; *OLD* s.v. *sceleratus* 2a; Ernout and Meillet s.v. *scelus*. For *manus* cf. §12.6–9n. Used reflexively, *confero* is to “to go for refuge, go over (to a side or party)”; *OLD* s.v. 2a. *confer te* is a command such as is used to familiars or subordinates; cf. *Cael.* 36 (P. Clodius to his sister) *confer te alio*. For C. Manlius cf. §7.1–4n.; for *perditus* cf. §5.9–10n. **secerne te a bonis:** this is C.’s immediate goal; cf. §10.7–10 with n. Catiline had friends among the *boni*, notably Q. Catulus and other consulars (cf. §19.3–4n.; Sal. 34.2–35); if Catiline’s influence were removed, C. would have a freer hand in the senate. C. advisedly uses the affective term *patriae*, instead of e.g. *rei publicae*; he can qualify the *latrocinium* as *impium*, since *pietas* had by his day been broadened to encompass one’s attitude and behavior toward the homeland as well as blood relations; cf. C. Koch, *RE* xx 1.1222.3–60. (s.v. *Pietas*); cf. also *Mur.* 84 (*nefarium latrocinium*). At §27.3 *latrocinium* corrects *bellum* as the *mot juste* for Catiline’s project, but here the two terms are offered as alternative designations; *bellum* will recur at §§25.5, 27.3, 29.2, and 33.3 and will dominate *Cat.* 2; see its headnote. Beginning with our speech C. often defames his adversaries as *latrones* (§33.8), their actions as *latrocinium*; cf. *TLL* s.v. *latro*² IIA 1.b; Opelt (1965) 132–3; Burian (1984). The implication is that they have surrendered the legal rights of citizens; this accords with the branding of the conspirators as *hostes* (§33.7, 2.11.9, 12.9, 3.14.17, 22.8, 4.10.8, 15.3); cf. Shaw (1984) 22–3 and n. 56; Achard (1981) 328–9; Habinek (1998) 69–87. **inuitatus ad tuos:** cf. §10.6–7 *nimum diu te imperatorem tua illa Manliana castra desiderant*.

24 A correctio: it is redundant for C. to add his invitation to depart to the one Catiline was, to judge by his extensive preparations, inclined to accept anyway (*inuitatus ad tuos . . . quid ego te inuitem*, where *ego* is emphatic). Following the description of the meeting at Laeca’s (§§8.6–9) C. provides further confirmation of his knowledge of Catiline’s moves; cf. the claims at §§1.5–6 (*patere tua consilia*) and §6.9 (*luce sunt clariora nobis tua consilia omnia*). Various details, expressed in a series of relative clauses (*a quo . . . qui . . . a quo*), argue that Catiline’s departure is a foregone conclusion, among them the fact that his prized eagle has already been sent ahead, which itself is characterized in several relative clauses (*quam . . . cui . . . cuius*). Our passage illustrates the older practice of resuming a relative pronoun with a demonstrative giving way to simple repetition of the relative; cf. K–S II 324–5.

1–2 quamquam quid ego . . . praestolarentur armati: *sciam* is attracted to the mood of the preceding *inuitem*; cf. G–L §§265 and 508.4. *ad* + the name of a town denotes the vicinity of that place: *OLD* s.v. 13a. Forum Aurelium was located at the 65th milestone north of Rome on the Via Aurelia; the site will have been in the vicinity of Montalto di Castro, where a modern road branches off to Vulci; it was thus ambiguous whether Catiline intended to continue up the coast to Massilia (as he would later claim; cf. on §5.1–5 and 20.1–3) or take a local road from Cosa to the Via Clodia, then turn east on another local road to the Via Cassia and proceed north to the vicinity of Faesulae; cf. Weiss, *RE* vii 1.65.2 (s.v. Forum Aureli) and G. Radke, *RE* suppl. xiii 1618 and 1623.56 (s.v. *Viae publicae Romanae*); Talbert no. 42, 4A.

praestolor appears to be colloquial: it is attested in archaic authors as well as Suetonius, Apuleius, the Vulgate, and Christian texts; this is its sole occurrence in C.'s speeches; he also uses it at *Att.* 2.15.3 and 3.20.1; it appears to be connected with the adv. *praesto* ("ready, at hand"), albeit the suffixation is obscure; translate: "to wait for"; cf. *OLD* s.v.; *TLL* s.v., esp. 932.62–3 and 933.60; Ernout and Meillet s.v.; *praestolarentur* follows the past sequence of *esse praemissos*, the subjunctive expressive of purpose (G–L §630). *armati* is strategically placed to unsettle: these are not innocent well-wishers. For a theory about the timing of these preparations cf. appendix 2 n. 3.

2–3 a quo sciam . . . cum Manlio diem: *sciam* continues the previous subjunctive construction (see above). *dies* as a feminine is usually an appointed day or deadline (cf. *OLD* s.v. 7). *pactam et constitutam* ("negotiated and set") implies a certain independence on Manlius' part; cf. §5.1–5n.

3–5 a quo etiam . . . sciam esse praemissam?: here and at 2.13.8 C. alludes to the silver eagle Catiline kept as a kind of talisman in a *sacrarium* in his home, presumably the same as the *aquila* which C. Marius kept with him during the war with the Cimbri. Its despatch is a further sign (besides *armati*, line 2) that he is expecting a fight, and it would, in fact, be beside him during the battle of Pistoria (Sal. 59.3). **confido** ("be confident that") is followed by acc. + inf.; cf. *OLD* s.v. 2; C. augurs that the eagle will have the reverse of the hoped-for effect (*perniciosa ac funestam futurum*). **sacrarium** is a room containing sacred objects; it could be, as in this case, a room in a private house and thus not itself consecrated; cf. Wissowa (1912) 469 n. 5; Baldo on *Ver.* 2.4.4. Legionary standards were in general objects of worship by Roman soldiers, a stumbling-block for Christians in the military; cf. Wissowa (1912) 178 n. 4; Watson (1969) 127–9. After *sacrarium* the transmitted words *scelerum tuorum* were rightly deleted by Halm; no further limitation is wanted.

6–8 tu ut illa . . . transtulisti?: the emphatic *tu* shifts the focus back to Catiline. *ut . . . carere . . . possis* depends on *inuitem*, line 1: "am I to induce you to deprive yourself of"; cf. *OLD* s.v. *inuito* 6. **illa** is the aforementioned silver eagle, the worship of which provides a colorful backcloth for the real point: Catiline's violence against his fellow citizens, which C. represents as part of his regular routine. *proficiscor* is to set out with some definite object, here expressed (*ad caedem*); cf. §20.7–10n. *altaria* is a *plurale tantum* not distinguished in meaning from *ara*; cf. *OLD* s.v. 1a. Catiline's right hand is *impia* because engaged in such violence; cf. §23.5–8n. (*impio latrocinio*).

25.1–2 ibis tandem . . . rapiebat: C. draws the conclusion implied by the preceding rhetorical questions. For the initial placement of *ibis* cf. §2.1–3n. *tandem* and *aliquando* both express impatience; cf. on §§1.1 and 10.5–6; for the combination cf. §18.6–11n. *iam pridem* has been applied to Catiline's condign punishment (§§2.5 and 5.7–8) or his destructive impulses (§21.9–10 *quae uastare iam pridem studes*). C. has spoken of Catiline's *furor* and *effrenata audacia* in §1.2–3 and of him as *orbem terrae caede atque incendiis uastare cupientem* (§3.3); these qualities are now fused in the phrase *cupiditas effrenata ac furiosa*, personified as the subject of an action (*rapiebat* "was all along carrying you away"; cf. Kenney on Ov. *Her.* 21.29).

2–3 neque enim tibi . . . quandam incredibilem uoluptatem: C. evidently infers this paradox from Catiline's general demeanor. *quidam* is often used to emphasize the extraordinary; cf. Seyffert-Müller on *Amic.* 29 (pp. 210ff.). Greater *uoluptas* was the implicit basis for C.'s argument for Catiline's departure at §§13–18 (cf. on §13.3–6).

3–4 ad hanc . . . fortuna seruauit: the tricolon highlights different aspects of Catiline's *amentia*, the state of being out of one's mind; cf. *Tusc.* 3.10 *animi affectionem lumine mentis carentem nominauerunt amentiam*. Achard (1981) 242–5 treats *amentia* as an attenuated equivalent of *furor*. But as the permanent disposition (*natura peperit*; cf. *Sul.* 70 (of Catiline) *ad ciuile latrocinium natum*) *amentia* is the graver charge, whereas *furor* (§1.2) might come in fits and starts. *natura* and practice (*exercitatio*; cf. *exercuit*, line 4) were two of the three requisites for achieving eloquence (*Arch.* 1; *De orat.* 1.113–59; Quint. 3.5.1; for the Greek background cf. Isoc. 15.196–208 with Shorey (1909)); ironically, the third element, *ratio*, does not apply, because its opposite, *amentia*, is Catiline's leading characteristic. Here, as usually elsewhere in C.'s speeches, *fortuna* is the leading cause; cf. e.g. *Mil.* 87 *dura . . . mihi iam fortuna populi Romani et crudelis uidebatur, quae tot annos illum [sc. Clodium] in hanc rem publicam insultare pateretur*. At §15.4–6 *fortuna populi Romani* is said to have blocked Catiline's moves; *fortuna* has thus created an uneasy balance of forces, keeping Catiline in action (*fortuna seruauit*) but also hindering his success. In a series of late philosophical works, *N.D.*, *Div.*, and *Fat.*, C. would explore whether a rational principle underlies the workings of the universe; cf. Bennett (1995) ch. 3.

4–5 numquam tu . . . nisi nefarium concupisti: *otium nefarium* is a *iunctura* not otherwise found in classical Latin, clearly for contrast with *bellum nefarium*; *otium* is leisure (cf. in general J.-M. André (1966)), shading, as contrasted with *bellum*, to “time of peace”: *OLD* s.v. For *nefarius* cf. §6.5–10n.; C. often applies the word to Catiline's designs; cf. Fugier (1963) 138 and n. 83; for *bellum* §23.5–8n.; for *bellum nefarium* cf. 1.33.3, 2.15.3, 3.3.6, and *Sul.* 58; for later instances with other points of reference cf. Merguet (1877–84) III 278 s.v. *nefarius*.

5–7 nactus es . . . improborum manum: *nanciscor* is to “get (a person) attached to one in a particular relation,” here as a supporter: *OLD* s.v. 3b. **ab omni . . . fortuna . . . derelictis:** the followers were thus like their leader; cf. §14.6 *ruinas fortunarum tuarum. spe derelictus* also applies to Catiline: it was apparently when his hopes of election to the consulate in 63 were dashed that he turned to revolutionary violence; cf. Introduction section 3; Syme (1964) 76–7; at 2.18–23 C. offers a detailed analysis of Catiline's supporters. *conflo* here is to “rake together, assemble”: *OLD* s.v. 7a (a different sense at §23.2–3); for *improbus* §5.9–10n.; for *manus* §12.6–9n.

26.1–3 hic tu qua laetitia . . . neque uidebis!: *hic* “in the circumstances just indicated” (*OLD* s.v. 5), i.e. given the nature of his followers. Catiline's joy is thrice described, with the longest description (11 syllables) reserved for last. *bacchor* was derived from the divine name Bacchus; the verb denotes the behavior of those participating in Bacchic revels (cf. Ernout and Meillet s.v.), which had a bad reputation at Rome (cf. Dyck on *Leg.* 2.37 with literature). Our passage is the first metaphorical attestation of the word, though there was precedent in the use of βακχεύω in Greek tragedy;

cf. LSJ s.v. 1.2; *TLL* and *OLD* s.v. *bacchor*; for the construction with *in* + abl. cf. 4.11.12-13 *uersatur mihi ante oculos aspectus Cethegi . . . in uestra caede bacchantis*. **uirum bonum quemquam**: *quisquam* lends emphasis (cf. *OLD* s.v. 6); the point follows from their being a *manus improborum* (§25.5-7 with n.).

3-7 ad huius uitae studium . . . bonis otiosorum: Catiline's labors are personified; they have "trained, practiced" (*OLD* s.v. *meditor* 6) for the pursuit of this life, i.e. the life of brigandage masquerading as war that would follow upon his departure from Rome (cf. §27.3). **illi . . . qui feruntur** "the famous ones that are being talked about" (*OLD* s.v. *ille* 4 and *fero* 34; cf. *illam praeclaram patientiam*, line 7). For details of Catiline's endurance see the next n. Usually such privations were undertaken in the course of military training and campaigning, and his activities are described with military language in the sequel (see below); hence the irony of Catiline's perversion of public virtues for private ends. In apposition with *labores* are two infinitive phrases illustrating the continuity between Catiline's former life of private depravity and his new rôle. *obsideo* is a military term meaning "besiege" or "blockade"; it is metaphorically applied here and elsewhere to hostile actions of various kinds; cf. *TLL* s.v. esp. 223.5; it was probably chosen here instead of *speculandum* because of the similar sound to *obeundum*; cf. Holst (1925) 85. *stuprum*, originally a disgraceful act of any kind, is used here of an illicit sexual act in general, not in the narrower juristic sense in which it pertained to virgins and widows, *adulterium* to married women; cf. Williams (1999) 98; Fantham (1991) esp. 269-71. The function of the gerundive phrases *ad obsidendum stuprum* and *ad facinus obeundum* is for variety's sake taken up by the participial phrase *insidiantem somno maritorum . . . bonis otiosorum*; cf. Laughton (1964) 23. *insidior* ("plot against": *OLD* s.v. 3; it also has a military sense "lay ambush": *OLD* s.v. 2) can be used both with *somno* and *bonis*, but C. must use a different verb with *facinus* than *stuprum*; the transition is facilitated, however, by the persistence of the *ob-* prefix. For Catiline as vigilant (*uigilare*) cf. §8.6-8 and 3.16.12-13 and 17.2-3. The *otiosi* are the "peaceable" (*OLD* s.v. *otiosus* 4): Catiline makes war even on non-combatants; cf. *Marc.* 18 *quidam enim non modo armatis sed interdum etiam otiosis minabantur*.

7-8 habes ubi ostentes . . . confectum esse senties: *habes ubi ostentes* "you have a field on which to display"; the expression is equivalent to *habes eius modi locum ut ibi ostentes*, i.e. the subjunctive is consecutive; cf. K-S II 296; cf. *Phil.* 14.17 *magnus est in re publica campus . . . multis apertus cursus ad laudem*. For Catiline's feats of endurance cf. 3.16.12-13; similarly *Sal.* 5.3 *corpus patiens inediae algoris uigiliae supra quam quoiquam credibile est*. *patientia* here is physical endurance, as opposed to the sense "patience" found at §1.1 (*OLD* s.v. 2 vs. 3). The items *famis*, *frigoris*, *inopiae rerum omnium* follow the "law of increasing members." **quibus** refers back to *fames*, *frigus*, and *inopia*, not the immediately preceding *omnes res*. *conficio* is to "exhaust, wear out": *OLD* s.v. 13b. Stroh (2000) 75 thinks that Catiline, not being addressed hereafter, may have left the senate at this point; cf., however, §33.1 and 5 with direct address and the deictic pronoun *hunc* (cf. also §27.13).

27.1-3 tantum profeci . . . quam bellum nominaretur: by presiding over the elections undeterred by threats of violence (cf. §11.6-9n.) C. could be said to have "repulsed" Catiline from the consulship: *OLD* s.v. *repello* 2. For *exsul/exsilium* cf. §13.1-3n.; here there is a play on *exsul* and *consul*, similar in sound but opposed in meaning; cf. Primmer (1977) 36. *tempto* is to "make an attempt on by military force": *OLD* s.v. 9a; *Sex. Rosc.* 148. C. has the *iunctura uexare rem publicam* 8x, usually with reference to P. Clodius; cf. e.g. *Mil.* 24 *cum statuisset omni scelere in praetura uexare rem publicam*; Merguet (1877-84) s.v. *res publica* IV 330-1; *OLD* s.v. *uexo* 6 ("to disturb, trouble, upset"). The adverb *scelerate* appears to be attested here for the first time; cf. *OLD* s.v.; Reichenbecher (1913) 29. **latrocinium potius quam bellum** corrects C.'s previous usage (§23.7), where the two are treated as interchangeable; *latrocinium* will resurface at §31.4 and *latrones Italiae* at §33.8; the difference is essentially that between regular and irregular adversaries; cf. *Dig.* 50.16.118 'hostes' *hi sunt qui nobis aut quibus nos publice bellum decreuimus, ceteri 'latrones' aut 'praedones' sunt*. The disparagement of opposing forces will be an important topic of *Cat.* 2 (cf. 2.21.6n.).

Digressio II: *Rome's appeal to Cicero for action and his reply* (27.4-32)

Various strands of the speech come together in this digression: the problem that C.'s handling of Catiline has been at odds with Roman tradition (§§3-4); the problem of the senate's being divided against itself (§§5.5-6, 9); and the problem of C.'s personal position and possible exposure to *inuidia* (§§22-3). To forestall any possible misunderstanding, C. begins with an explanation of his purpose (*ut . . . quandam prope iustam patriae querimoniam detester ac deprecari*, 27.4-5), which is followed by an urgent appeal for close attention such as one often finds in the proem; cf. Volkmann (1885) 134-5. In the previous *prosopopoeia* (§18) the *patria* was not necessarily convinced that the fear of Catiline had a legitimate basis (*si est uerus . . . sin falsus*, lines 10-11); C. thus gives voice to the mood of the average senator (see further *ad loc.*). In our passage, however, the *patria* reproaches C. for seeking Catiline's departure rather than his death; various possible obstacles (*mos maiorum, leges, inuidiae metus*) are considered and dismissed, the last in quite personal terms (*praeclaram uero populo Romano refert gratiam, qui te, hominem per te cognitum . . .* 28.5-8); the *patria* thus approximates the voice of C.'s conscience. C. replies with an explanation of his tactics: the death of Catiline alone is not the goal or *inuidia* the obstacle. He adds that the doubters in the senate will be convinced if Catiline, in fact, joins Manlius at Faesulae. His hope is that Catiline will take all his followers with him and thus clear Rome of the *pestis*; the desirability of this course is reinforced with medical analogies. The digression concludes with two stirring periods: a call for the conspirators to desist from their activities and depart from Rome and a promise that by Catiline's departure everything will be clarified and set right.

27.4-6 Nunc, ut a me . . . mentibusque mandate: *prope iustam* equivocates slightly; he has approved the hard line in §§2-4. From the time of Plautus on *querimonia*

and *querela* are alternative substantives derived from *queror*, though the suffix *-monia* generally denotes a quality (*castimonia*, *parsimonia*); C. uses both forms freely in his speeches; the cretic rhythm of *-moniam* was no doubt decisive here; cf. *OLD* and Merguet (1877–84) s.vv. *querela*, *querimonia*; *OLD* s.v. *-monia*; Ernout and Meillet s.v. *queror*; H–S 745. *detestor* is to “avert or ward off by entreaty” with the thing protected governed, as here, by *a(b)*; cf. *Pis.* 96 *omnes memoriam consulatus tui . . . a re publica detestantur*; *OLD* s.v. 3; similarly *deprecor* “avert by prayer” (*OLD* s.v.). *percipite* and esp. *diligenter* receive emphasis by the insertion of *quaeso*. The parallelism of the two acts is chiastically reinforced: *percipite . . . diligenter . . . penitus . . . mandate. animus* and *mens* were originally distinct, the former the mind as opposed to the body, the latter the faculty of reasoning (< **men-* “think”); by C.’s time they are used more or less interchangeably: “minds and hearts” or the like; cf. *OLD* and Ernout and Meillet s.vv. The sentence ends impressively with the alliteration and assonance of *mentibusque mandate* and a rhythm of cretic + trochee.

6–8 etenim si mecum . . . sic loquatur: for the personified *patria* cf. on §18.1–2. *quae mihi uita mea multo est carior*: cf. *Off.* 1.57 *omnes omnium caritates patria una complexa est, pro qua quis bonus dubitet mortem oppetere si ei sit profuturus?* with Dyck *ad loc.*; *Phil.* 13.7 *quae* [sc. *res publica*] *mihi uita mea semper fuit carior*. **cuncta Italia**, like *Italia tota* (cf. §12.1–3n.), is a common Ciceronian *iunctura*; cf. Merguet (1877–84) s.v. *cunctus* 751–2.

8–12 ‘M. Tulli, quid agis? . . . esse uideatur?’: the *patria* addresses C. formally, with two names; cf. Dickey (2002) 51. **quid agis?** is not used in the common colloquial sense “how are you?” (*OLD* s.v. *ago* 21f) but rather “what are you doing, what are you about?” in a broad sense, questioning the direction of his policy. This question and C.’s response may be said to be the goal of the speech; cf. Batstone (1994) 236. The incredulous query of the *patria* sets up the relation of subject and object clearly at the beginning (*tune eum*); the latter is then qualified with three relative clauses (each with a different verb of perceiving: *comperisti . . . uides . . . sentis*), followed by three nouns in apposition, mostly summarizing points already made; the main verb (*patiere*) stands, as expected, at the end of the main clause; a consecutive clause is then appended to underline the paradox. For Catiline as a *hostis* cf. §13.2 and n.; for C.’s claim to knowledge about the conspiracy and later criticisms cf. §10.1–3n. For the implication or prediction that Catiline will be a leader in (civil) war cf. §33.3; 2.1.6–7. **quem expectari . . . sentis:** cf. §5.3 *eorum . . . castrorum imperatorem*; §10.6–7 *nimum diu te imperatorem tua illa Manliana castra desiderant*. Catiline is not a *princeps ciuitatis* (cf. §7.7 and n.) but a *princeps coniurationis*; cf. §1.5–9n. *euoco* is to “order out troops” (*OLD* s.v. 3c); C. was fond of agent nouns, which enabled him to depict an individual act as a standing characteristic; cf. Werner (1933) 20–1; Kinsey on *Quinct.* 30. *euocator* may perhaps be his ironic coinage *ad hoc*; certainly this is its sole occurrence in classical Latin; cf. *OLD* and *TLL* s.v. For Catiline’s followers as *perditi* cf. §13.5; for the semantics of the word §5.9–10n. It is less clear, however, that Catiline was an *euocator seruorum*: certainly Lentulus urged him to take advantage of such help (cf. 3.8.6–7 and 12.6; *Sal.* 44.5), but in the end Catiline rejected that advice: *interea seruitia repudiabat, quouis initio ad eum magnae copiae concurrebant . . . alienum suis rationibus existumans uidere causam ciuium*

cum seruis fugitiuis communicauisse (Sal. 56.5); *aliter* Welwei (1981) 61–2 based on Sal. 59.3 (but cf. 4.16.4–8 n. on *libertus* vs. *libertinus*). **patiere:** for the form cf. §1.1n. (*abutere*).

The wordplay *non emissus ex urbe sed immissus in urbem* focuses attention on the verbal prefixes, *emitto* being to “send out, despatch” (on a mission), *immitto* to “send (against or into) with hostile purpose” (*OLD* s.vv. 1 and 2a respectively; for the latter cf. *Mil.* 76); similarly *reprimi* / *comprimi* (§30.10); cf. Holst (1925) 38 and 65.

12–14 nonne hunc in uincla . . . mactari imperabis?: for *nonne* anticipating a positive response cf. §1.3–5n. The tricolon amplifies Catiline’s punishment by dividing it into three stages. **in uincla duci:** at §19.12–13 C. already implied that Catiline belonged in chains. **ad mortem rapi:** cf. §2.5–6. *summum supplicium* ordinarily implies the death penalty or an aggravated form thereof; cf. Dyck on *Leg.* p. 318 and n. 67. *macto* was understood by the ancients to mean *magis augere* (Non. p. 539.35 L), hence to “honor” a deity in various ways, hence “sacrifice” and generally “slay”; it is a poetic word first attested in prose at Cato *Agr.* 134.2; it is used by C. in speeches to describe ritual acts or strike an august tone (cf. §33.9); cf. *OLD*, Nettleship, and Merguet (1877–84) s.v.

28 The *patria* suggests three alternative causes for C.’s inaction, moving from public to private: custom, laws, or the ill-will of posterity; each receives its own answer, and each question + answer unit is richer in number of syllables than the preceding one.

1–2 quid tandem . . . morte multarunt: *impedio* is to restrict a person’s movement, originally by binding the feet (< *pes*); cf. *OLD* s.v.; Ernout and Meillet s.v. *pes*. Interesting that the first possible hindrance mentioned is not the laws but the *mos maiorum*; the *maiores* were appealed to by C. as an authority on a variety of topics; in criminal law they usually served to undergird a case for tough sanctions; cf. Roloff (1938) 104 and in general; Earl (1961) 25–6. **persaepe:** the “urbane” prefix *per-* obviates the need for the fussier superlative (*saepissime*); cf. André (1951). C. evidently exaggerates here: he has cited only one clear instance of a *priuatus* so acting (P. Scipio Nasica in §3). For Catiline as a *perniciosus ciuis* cf. §3.5–7n. *multa* applied at early Rome to a loss of property (in cattle), then a monetary fine, and finally punishment in general, the sense here of the related verb *multo* (see *OLD* s.vv.), chosen perhaps for its alliteration with *morte*; the contracted 3rd pl. perf. form provides the equivalent of cretic + trochee.

2–4 an leges . . . ciuium iura tenuerunt: C. restates the previous suggestion and reply in juristic terms. Three *leges Porciae* of the early second century provided for appeal (*prouocatio*) to a citizen assembly against caning by magistrates first inside and then also outside the city and sanctions for magistrates who failed to comply; cf. Rotondi (1912) 268–9; Santalucia (1998) 71–4; Lintott (1999a) 97–9. **at**

numquam . . . tenuerunt: the point is implicit in the examples cited at §§3–4; it is repeated at 4.10.8–9. **qui a re publica defecerunt** varies the *perniciosi ciues* of the previous response. *deficio* can be used of an individual or an allied power “falling away” from a state; cf. *Fam.* 12.10.1 *Lepidus . . . hostis a senatu iudicatus est ceterique qui una*

cum illo a re publica defecerunt and other testimonies at *OLD* s.v. 10a.

4–8 an inuidiam . . . salutem ciuium tuorum neglegis: C. incorporates a bit of autobiography summarizing the facts of his public career. The reference to *inuidia* here might raise suspicions of later retouching similar to those voiced in connection with §§22–3 (see on §22.3–6). But that *inuidia* must be avoided by a public figure was well known, as was the fact that *inuidia* could attach itself to a citizen who violated another citizen's rights (cf. the reference to the *inuidia Nasicae* at *Rep.* 1.6); hence the reference to *inuidia* seems appropriate in this context and need not have been added in 60. **uero** ("of course") is ironic: *OLD* s.v. 3b. **hominem per te cognitum** etc. characterizes C. as a *nouus homo*, the first member of his family to hold public office, an inherently tricky position in Roman politics. C. shows himself well aware of the implications; cf. *Ver.* 2.5.180 *non idem licet mihi quod iis qui nobili genere nati sunt, quibus omnia populi Romani beneficia dormientibus deferuntur; longe alia mihi lege in hac ciuitate et condicione uiuendum est*; cf. *Agr.* 1.27; *Phil.* 6.17; the past as depicted at *Phil.* 9.4 *nemo tum nouitati inuidebat*; in general Wiseman (1971) esp. 153–69 on the *cursus honorum* of *noui homines* and 173–81 ("the new man's means of advancement"); Brunt (1982); Burckhardt (1990). **tam mature ad summum imperium:** for the rest of his life C. remained proud that he had achieved the consulate (*summum imperium*) *suo anno*, i.e. at the minimum allowable age; cf. *Brut.* 323 *cum . . . ego anno meo . . . consul factus essem*; Gelzer (1969) 68. **propter . . . alicuius periculi metum** "some danger or other," the adjectival *aliqui* implies contempt, as often; cf. §20.1–3n. For the *salus* of the populace or citizens as the consul's charge cf. on §8.6–8 as well as on §11.4–5; *tuorum* reinforces the point.

29.1–2 sed si quis est . . . pertimescenda: *seueritas* here, where it is paired with *fortitudo*, one of the virtues, takes on a more positive aspect than in §12.5; see *ad loc.* *inuidia* can attach even to the virtuous exercise of power; cf. lines 12–14 below; 3.29.3; Pöschl (1983) 13–14 and n. 8. For the *iunctura inertia ac nequitia* and the sense of the latter cf. §4.13–15 and n. For *pertimesco* cf. §17.7–12n.

2–4 an, cum bello . . . incendio conflagraturum?: for the point that the cost of inaction is greater than any possible loss of public esteem cf. 4.12, where it is framed in terms of *crudelitas* and *clementia*. The images of destruction are repeated from §12.2–3 *tecta urbis . . . Italiam denique totam ad exitium et uastitatem uocas*, the incendiaryism from §3.3 *orbem terrae caede atque incendiis uastare cupientem*. **urbes:** plots at Rome and Praeneste have been mentioned (§§7–9); P. Sulla would later be alleged to have fomented *seditiones* at Pompeii (*Sul.* 60–2), and P. Sestius was despatched at the height of the crisis to secure Capua (*Sest.* 9–10); possibly the *seditiones Neapolitanae* laid to the charge of M. Caelius Rufus belong to this context as well (*Cael.* 23). **inuidiae incendio:** the literal burning (*tecta ardebunt*) is taken up by the metaphorical burning; for the *iunctura* cf. *Clu.* 137 *quod senatus decreuerat ad illud inuidiae praesens incendium restinguendum*; for *inuidia* (*con*)*flagrare* cf. *Ver.* 1.5, 2.1.41 and 157; Pöschl (1983) 13 n. 4.

5–6 His ego sanctissimis . . . pauca respondebo: the deictic *his*, though split from its noun (*uocibus*), can serve as host to the clitic pronoun *ego* (cf. Adams (1994b) 122–4 and 132–6). For the semantic development of *sanctus* cf. §9.1–5n. **uocibus**

et . . . mentibus: the *prosopopoeia* of the *res publica* was, of course, designed to articulate these hard-line views and thus give C. the opportunity to respond.

6–8 ego, si hoc optimum . . . non dedissem: *ego* is emphatic, signalling the beginning of C.'s reply. The acc. + inf. phrase *Catilinam morte multari* defines the content of the preceding *hoc*; for *morte multari* cf. §28.1–2n. **unius** is emphasized by initial placement in its clause and its separation from *horae*. **usuram horae:** as far back as Plautus, *usura* is the use or enjoyment of something in a broad sense; cf. Zellmer (1976) 290. For the phrase cf. *Ver.* 2.5.75 *cur . . . ipsis piratis lucis usuram tam diuturnam dedisti?*; *OLD* s.v. *usura* and Merguet (1877–84) s.v. *utor*; for the thought cf. 4.7.5–8 *alter eos . . . punctum temporis frui uita et hoc communi spiritu non putat oportere*. **gladiator:** a slave trained to kill in the arena; Catiline is the first in the line of C.'s adversaries to be branded as such ("cutthroat"; cf. 2.24.4 and *Mur.* 50 and 83); the label was later applied to Clodius (*Red. sen.* 18) and Antony (*Phil.* 2.7, 3.18 etc.); cf. Opelt (1965) 136. **ad uiuendum** takes up Catiline's continued existence, a stumbling-block since §§2.1–2 (*hic tamen uiuit*) and 4.11–12, albeit hedged about at §6.1–4.

8–12 etenim si summi uiri . . . in posteritatem redundaret: C. reserves the descriptions *summi uiri* and *clarissimi ciues* for those who have occupied high office; cf. Berry on *Sul.* 3.4 and 4.10; similarly, P. Scipio (Nasica) is called *uir amplissimus* at §3.1. **Saturnini et Gracchorum et Flacci:** the examples are repeated from §§3–4. Related to *tango*, *contamino* is originally to "enter into contact with." These words belong to a sphere of old religious ideas, as illustrated by Paul. *Fest.* p. 248.5 L. *paelex aram Iunonis ne tangito* etc.; cf. Ernout and Meillet s.v. *contamino*. From early times the shedding of blood was regarded as polluting; cf. R. Parker (1983) ch. 4. Here, paradoxically, C. denies that pollution occurred in view of the higher state interests served. He goes even further and, deploying terminology from the sphere of public recognition (cf. Klose (1933) esp. 133–6), claims that the act enhanced the standing (*honestare*) of the murderers. He evidently means in the long run, for both Scipio Nasica and L. Opimius died in exile; for Nasica cf. §3.1–2n.; Opimius, though acquitted for his persecution of C. Gracchus and his followers (*TLRR* 27) was convicted in 109 of corruption in adjudicating a land dispute involving Jugurtha and went into exile; cf. *TLRR* 53; F. Münzer, *RE* xviii 1.676.68–77.54 (s.v. Opimius 4); cf. C.'s reflections at *Off.* 2.43. **certe uerendum mihi non erat:** for the indicative instead of subjunctive here cf. §2.5–7n. (*oportebat*); C. expresses similar confidence in ironic form at §5.6 (*credo, erit uerendum mihi*). **parricida** is the murderer of a near relation, here with *ciuium* applied metaphorically; cf. §17.7–12n. and 2.7.5; *OLD* s.v. 1. **inuidiae** receives emphasis through its separation from *quid*. C. has found a different equivalent for *in posteritatem impendere* of §22.6 (*impendere* is needed for the next sentence); similarly *Dom.* 69 *prospexistis ne quae popularis in nos aliquando inuidia redundaret*.

12–14 quodsi ea mihi . . . non inuidiam putarem: in spite of C.'s last claim, *inuidia* raises its head again here; cf. Batstone (1994) 262–4. **si . . . maxime** "even granted that, even if": cf. *OLD* s.v. *maxime* 5b. For *impendeo* cf. §22.3–6n.; for *inuidiam uirtute partam* cf. on lines 1–2 above; *Agr.* 2.103 *hunc statum, quem habetis uestra non ignauia quaesitum sed uirtute partum*; *Leg.* 2.60 *coronam uirtute partam. gloria*, however gained,

could be subject to *invidia*, indeed *invidia* was proverbially the concomitant of *gloria* (Otto (1890) 176). *invidia* and *gloria* are two possible effects of an act; C. is speaking not empirically but normatively: the presence of *uirtus* should be the criterion; cf. *Off.* 1.14 (*etiamsi a nullo laudetur, natura esse laudabile*).

30.1-6 quamquam nonnulli . . . esse dicerent: C. now comes to the sticking point: the block in the senate that cannot or will not see the threat. He describes them in a series of three relative clauses of increasing length.

1-2 quamquam nonnulli . . . dissimulent: for the adversative *quamquam* see §22.1-3n.; *hic ordo* refers to the senate (§3.7-10n.). **uideant . . . dissimulent:** the subjunctives follow the indefinite antecedent (similarly below: *neminem . . . qui non uideat . . . qui non fateatur*); cf. §6.1-4n. *immineo* develops from the physical sense "overhang" to the psychological realm ("threaten"); cf. *OLD* s.v. 1, 5-6a. *dissimulo* is to "pretend not to notice, turn a blind eye to, ignore" (*OLD* s.v. 3); cf. 4.14.1 *ea quae exaudio . . . dissimulare non possum*.

2-4 qui spem Catilinae . . . corroborauerunt: the strength of the conspiracy is in proportion to the softness of the senate's "doves": their opinions expressed in response to the query of the presiding official (*OLD* s.v. *sententia* 3) were conciliatory or complaisant (*OLD* s.v. *mollis* 3b); hence no doubt the senate's decree of 21 October which delighted Catiline (*erupit e senatu triumphans gaudio*) but was lamented by C. as insufficiently severe (*Mur.* 51); cf. §3.7-10n. *alo* used of feelings is first attested in C.; cf. *OLD* 7b ("foster, keep alive"); *TLL* s.v. 1711.35. The transition from subjunctive to indicative (*non uideant . . . dissimulent . . . aluerunt . . . corroborauerunt*) neatly illustrates the different functions of the moods: that they are the kinds of men they are leads them to actions that, in fact, help Catiline. For Catiline's movement as a *coniuratio* cf. §1.5-9n.; it is personified by the modifier *nascens*, as indeed various evils (*facinus, malum, monstrum, scelus*) are personified as subjects of *nascor* (Merguet (1877-84) s.v.). The instrumental ablative (as here *non credendo*) is the commonest use of the gerund and the only one to survive in the Romance languages; cf. H-S 369. *robur* is an oak tree and hence a metaphor for strength in general; its derivatives *roboro* and *corroboro* are used for strengthening in a literal and metaphorical sense (*OLD* s.vv.; Ernout and Meillet s.v. *robur*); cf. *Mil.* 32 *frangere hominis . . . corroboratam iam uetustate audaciam*; here the 3rd pl. perfect yields the cretic + spondee.

4-6 quorum auctoritatem secuti . . . esse dicerent: *auctoritas* was of great importance in Roman society and politics; cf. §17.7-12n.; for *auctoritatem sequi* cf. *Phil.* 10.21 *Caesaris auctoritatem secuti*. On the *improbis* cf. §5.9-10n.; here C. widens the circle of protesters to include the *imperiti*, on whom cf. Dyck on *Leg.* 1.4; cf. *Rab. perd.* 18, where those who protest C.'s wish to be able to claim that Rabirius killed Saturninus with his own hand are called *ciues imperiti*; similarly Demosthenes (18.20) finds that the "ignorance" (ἄγνοια) of the other Greeks helped Philip dupe the Athenians. *animum aduerto* ("turn the mind toward, notice") coalesces as early as Plautus to *animaduerto*, usually in the special sense "punish," often implying capital punishment; in this latter sense it is often used, as here, with *in* + acc.; cf. *OLD* s.v. 8b. **crudeliter et regie:**

for cruelty cf. §5.5–8n. *regie* need mean nothing more than “in the manner of a king,” but in a Roman context the connotations can be markedly negative (“tyrannically” will give the flavor), as this passage shows; similarly C.’s complaints of the dictator Caesar as a *rex* were highly charged; cf. Riemer (2001) 75–84.

6–8 nunc intellego . . . qui non fateatur: with the verbal echo *qui non fateatur* (cf. §5.9–10) C. returns to the problem of the division within the senate that has so far hindered action; he now foresees an end to the impasse. **iste** is Catiline, now referred to in the third person (cf. §26.7–8n.); for the contemptuous connotations cf. §2.3–5n. **quo intendit:** *intendo* is “direct one’s steps, set out (for)” (*OLD* s.v. 10); on Catiline’s departure plans cf. §§9.10–11 and 24; on his pretended destination on §§5.1–5 and 23.1–3. The counterpart of the *improbis* is now unflatteringly called *stultus* rather than *imperitus*. *facio* is the verb most commonly governing *coniuratio* in C.’s speeches (six times, including 2.6.7–8), a colloquialism; cf. Merguet (1877–84) s.v. *coniuratio*; von Albrecht (2003) 99; cf. also Hirt. *Gal.* 8.2.2. **non fateatur** is a hexameter ending, which C. tends to avoid; cf. Laurand (1911) 82; Berry on *Sul.* p. 52; von Albrecht (2003) 14–15. To see the facts is one thing but to acknowledge them publicly (*fateri*) may be quite different.

9–10 hoc autem uno . . . comprimi posse: with *autem* C. subjoins a second reason for his adopted tactic. **uno**, emphatically placed (“alone, only”: *OLD* s.v. *unus* 7), anticipates a broadening of the discussion to take account of *sui*. For *pestis* cf. §2.5–7n. This passage well illustrates the difference of nuance between *reprimis* and *comprimis*, the former meaning “hold back, restrain,” whereas the latter, with the *con-* prefix expressive of completeness, “check, suppress, frustrate, put down”: cf. *OLD* s.vv. *reprimis* 4a; *con-* 6; *comprimis* 10a; for the type of wordplay cf. Holst (1925) 63 and 65; the difference is reinforced by the two adverbial qualifiers *paulisper* and *in perpetuum*.

10–13 quodsi se eiecerit . . . semen malorum omnium: at §23.8 C. bade Catiline go to Manlius *ut a me non eiectus ad alienos . . . uidearis*; here the hypothesis is that Catiline casts himself out (*se eicere*). **secumque suos eduxerit:** to C.’s bitter disappointment, this did not come to pass; cf. 2.4.7 *utinam ille omnes secum suas copias eduxisset!* Stroh (2000) 77 cites our passage as evidence that the speech was hardly revised for publication, since C. might have been expected to conceal the unsuccessful tactic. **undique collectos** is reminiscent of C.’s previous description of them as the *sentina rei publicae* (§12.9; see *ad loc.*). *naufragus* (literally “a shipwreck”) is first attested in C. as a metaphor for someone reduced to desperate circumstances, though *Inc. trag.* 84 has *naufragium* of such a state (*naufragia, labes generis ignoras, senex?* (conjecturally assigned by Ribbeck to Pacuvius’ *Teucer*)); cf. *OLD* s.vv. *aggrego* is to add to the flock (*grex*); this is its first attestation; it suggests that Catiline’s followers are mere sheep (cf. §32.1–2 *unum in locum congregentur*; 2.10.2 *desperatorum hominum flagitiosi greges* and 23.1 *in his gregibus*; cf. Berry on *Sul.* 77.1); cf. Nettleship and *OLD* s.v. **haec tam adulta rei publicae pestis:** the phrase is repeated from the previous sentence with addition of *tam adulta*, implicit in the preceding point that the senate’s “doves” *coniurationem nascentem . . . corroborauerunt*. *stirps* is the stem or, more particularly, the root of a tree or shrub; to remove such a thing *a stirpe* is to do so completely; hence the

destruction of the “root and seed” will be the total destruction. C.’s view was that evils that had been developing in the state for some time came to a head during his consulate; cf. the next n.

31.1–4 etenim iam diu . . . in nostri consulatus tempus erupit: for Catiline’s machinations continuing *iam diu* cf. §17.10 and 2.7.9; the chronology is thus left vague; more specific is *Sul.* 67 *furorē incredibilem biennio ante conceptum erupisse in meo consulatu scripsi*, where see Berry’s n. *erumpo* “break out,” is often used of war, passions, etc.: *OLD* s.v. 6a; cf. 2.27.4–5 *ut id quod latebat erumperet*; *Mur.* 81 *omnia quae per hoc triennium agitata sunt . . . in hoc tempus erumpunt*; *Sest.* 9 *cum illa coniuratio ex latebris atque ex tenebris erupisset palamque armata uolaret*; Livy exploits such imagery at 42.6.2–3 *insigne aduersus Persea odium Romanorum fecit; quod ut maturius erumperet, Eumenes rex . . . Romam uenit. insidiae* (“plots”) characteristically occurs only in the plural; the word derives from *insideo* (“lie in wait,” i.e. in ambush); cf. *OLD* s.vv.; for Catiline’s *insidiae* cf. §11.5 *quam diu mihi consuli designato, Catilina, insidiatus es* and §32.3 *desinant insidiari domi suae consuli*; for his *furor* and *audacia* cf. on §1.1–2 and 2–3.

4–7 hic si ex tanto latrocinio . . . in uisceribus rei publicae: *latrocinium* is abstract for concrete and at the same time collective: “band of robbers”; cf. *OLD* s.v. 3; Lebreton (1901) 44. *releuo* is to relieve of anxiety and the like, here + abl.: *OLD* s.v. 2b; for *resideo* cf. §12.6–9n. **in uenis atque in uisceribus:** for other examples of the alliterative pair cf. Wölfflin (1933) 278. For imagery of penetration cf. §5.1–5n.

7–12 ut saepe homines aegri . . . reliquis uiuis ingrauescet: *grauis* is a more or less standing epithet of *morbus* in C.; cf. Merguet (1877–84) and (1887–94) s.v. *grauis*. **aestu febrique** “the heat of fever” by hendiadys. *iacto* is to “toss to and fro, buffet”; it is used of the effect of sea or storm on ships or of illness on the human body; cf. *Hor. S.* 2.3.121 *maxima pars hominum morbo iactatur eodem*; *OLD* s.v. esp. 7b and 8. **si aquam gelidam . . . afflictantur:** ancient physicians recognized that fever increases thirst and the greater the fever, the greater the thirst (*Cels.* 3.6.1); the patients probably show improvement merely insofar as the symptoms are relieved; then they revert to the previous condition (which may seem worse by contrast); but the draught of water would not in itself be a cause of worsening, as C. implies; and cold water in particular was not proscribed when the fever was at its height, but recommended (*Cels.* 3.7.2c). **sic hic morbus qui est in re publica:** for disease imagery applied to Catiline’s conspiracy cf. Berry on *Sul.* 76.12. *releuatus* corresponds to *primo releuari uidentur*. **iste** is Catiline; cf. §30.6 with n. **reliquis uiuis:** for the abl. absolute with predicate adj. rather than participle cf. §22.3–6n. *ingrauesco* is to increase in weight or intensity and is often applied to disease; cf. *Phil.* 9.2 *illum* [sc. *Seru. Sulpicium*] . . . *non morbus ingrauescens retardauit*; *OLD* s.v. 2b. C.’s model, Demosthenes, was also fond of medical imagery; cf. Wooten (1979).

32.1–3 quare secedant improbi . . . secernantur a nobis: the idea of separation is reinforced by verbs with the *se-* prefix (“apart”): *secedant . . . secernant . . . secernantur*; cf. §23.7 *secerne te a bonis. congrebo*, used from the time of C. onward, is to

“assemble, collect”; similarly Plin. *Nat.* 17.266 *pisce suspensio iuxta in unum locum* [sc. *formicas*] *congregant*. **quod saepe iam dixi**: an exaggeration, but cf. §10.8–9 *magno me metu liberabis modo inter me atque te murus intersit*; §19.6–8 *me nullo modo posse isdem parietibus tuto esse tecum, qui magno in periculo essem, quod isdem moenibus contineremur*; similarly, in retrospect, *Pis.* 5 *ego L. Catilinam caedem senatus, interitum urbis non obscure sed palam molientem egredi ex urbe iussi ut, a quo legibus non poteramus, moenibus tuti esse possemus*. Konstan (1993) 15 speaks of C.’s “moral geography, by which inside and outside, at Rome and abroad, were to be read as loci of good and evil.”

3–5 desinant insidiari . . . comparare: the jussive *desinant* governs four successive infinitive phrases, of which the last is the longest and has the infinitive, for variety, in final, rather than initial position. *domi* is the locative and *suae* the possessive genitive; cf. G–L §411 R.2 and 4; K–S I 482–3; *suus* is used with reference to *consuli* as the dominant idea of the phrase, albeit not the grammatical subject: K–S I 601–2. For this particular plot cf. §§9–10.4. The *tribunal* was the platform from which the *praetor urbanus* pronounced judgments (cf. *OLD* s.v. *tribunal*); it is unclear on what occasion the conspirators surrounded it: was this to protest the harsh treatment of condemned persons unable to meet the imposed judgment (so Drummond (1999b) 136)? **obsidere cum gladiis curiam**: again the occasion is unclear but surely recent (possibly 21 October; cf. §3.7–10n.); such circumstances help account for C.’s choice of venue for this speech (cf. §1.4–5 with n.). *malleolus*, diminutive of *malleus* “hammer,” becomes specialized in the sense “an incendiary missile, firedart” without implying small size; perhaps it was so called from its being shaped like a hammer for ease in throwing; cf. *OLD* s.v. 3; Paul. *Fest.* p. 119.12–14 L.; Daremberg-Saglio s.v.; cf. *Mil.* 64 *plena omnia malleolorum ad urbis incendia comparatorum*; for the imputation of incendiarism cf. §3.2–4n.

5–6 sit denique inscriptum . . . quid de re publica sentiat: this wish (taken too literally by Batstone (1994) 260) is similar to that of Theseus at Eur. *Hipp.* 925–31 for a mark to distinguish true and false friends; cf. Barrett *ad loc.*; Solmsen (1975) 71–2. The idea is transferred from the branding of slaves, on which see Jones (1987).

6–10 polliceor uobis hoc . . . uindicata esse uideatis: *hoc* receives emphasis from its placement before the vocative; it will be defined by the sequel; *uobis* is therefore relegated to the unemphatic second position (it is not surprising, however, that some witnesses fell into the usual word order; cf. app. crit.). For C.’s *diligentia* cf. 2.14.10–13n. For *auctoritas* in general cf. §17.7–12n.; it was an aim of the legislation of *Leg.* to strengthen the *senatus auctoritas* (cf. 3.27 with Dyck’s n.). C. has already referred (§21.5–7) to *illi equites Romani . . . ceterique fortissimi ciues, qui circumstant senatum*. *consensio* is somewhat earlier attested (*Font.* 16) than *consensus* (*Fam.* 5.2.2 and 21; mid-January 62), though the latter is more frequently used; the *consensio bonorum* appears at *Rab. perd.* 2; cf. *TLL* s.vv.; for C.’s ideal, the *consensus bonorum omnium*, cf. §5.5–8n. For *proficiscor* used to command Catiline’s departure cf. §33.1–3n.; here the corresponding noun of action, *profectio*, becomes the means by which the desired outcome is achieved. **patefacta, illustrata** are more or less synonymous; they are

juxtaposed also at 3.21.12–13 and *Amic.* 97; cf. also §1.5–6 *patere tua consilia non sentis?* and for *illustro* §6.5–10n. C. leaves the passive participles without an agent, but this changes at *Sul.* 85 *eum qui inuestigarit coniurationem, qui patefecerit, qui oppresserit*. The actions achieve a climax with *uindicta* (“punished”: *OLD* s.v. *uindico* 5a). **esse uideatis** secures C.’s seventh favorite clausula; cf. appendix 3.

Peroratio (33)

This passage certainly possesses what has been considered the chief virtue of the *peroratio*, *brevitas* (cf. Lausberg §440), but it also stirs the feelings, as a *peroratio* should (Lausberg §§432 and 436). It forms a somber coda, reiterating the call for Catiline’s departure, this time with a curse attached; the religious language here (*ominibus, impium, nefarium*) culminates in two prophecies, which add “a note of solemnity after a long passage of vituperation” (Goar (1972) 36).

33.1–3 Hisce ominibus . . . impium bellum ac nefarium: in *hisce* the deictic force of the pronoun is further strengthened by addition of the suffix *-ce*; cf. *OLD* s.v. *-ce*; Leumann (1977) 468: “with these very omens,” i.e. the ones he is about to list; cf. §24.4–5 of the Marian eagle *quam tibi ac tuis omnibus confido perniciosam ac funestam futuram*; *Sex. Rosc.* 139 *nolo in eos grauius quicquam ne ominis quidem causa dicere*; *Sest.* 71 (of Piso and Gabinius) *exierunt malis ominibus atque exsecrationibus duo uulturi paludati*. For *summa rei publicae salus* cf. §11.4–5n. **cum tua peste ac pernicie:** for the alliterative pair cf. Wölfflin (1933) 270. That the destruction with which Catiline and his followers threaten the Roman state (§§11 and 30; §12.8–9 *perniciosa sentina rei publicae*) should be turned against him was already suggested at §2.6–7 (*in te conferri pestem istam quam tu in nos omnes iam diu machinaris*). Of the two nouns derived from *exeo*, *exitus* and *exitium*, the latter becomes specialized in the sense “(violent) death, destruction”; cf. Ernout and Meillet s.v. *eo*. Does C. mean *parricidium patriae* (cf. §17.7–12n.) or *parricidium* in the usual sense? For the latter cf. 2.8.3 (*mortem parentum*) and the division of tasks among the conspirators at *Sal.* 43.2 *filiis familiarum, quorum ex nobilitate maxima pars erat, parentis interficerent*. **proficiscere:** this is now the fourth time that C. has bidden Catiline to depart; cf. §§10.6, 20.8, 23.2. Catiline’s war is *impium* because directed at the *patria*; cf. §23.7 (*infer patriae bellum*) and n. there on *impio latrocinio*. For *nefarius* cf. §6.5–10n.; the *iunctura nefarium bellum* also occurs at §25.5 and 2.15.3 and 3.3.6.

3–4 tu, Iuppiter . . . es constitutus: the invocation of a god or gods often lends solemnity to the peroration; cf. *Ver.* 2.5, *Mur.*, *Dom.*; Winterbottom (2004) 225–6. According to Roman tradition, Romulus in the heat of battle with the Sabines vowed (*Livy* 1.12.6) and later built (*Dion. Hal.* 2.50) a temple to Jupiter Stator; in that sense the cult could be said to have been established *isdem quibus haec urbs auspiciis*, i.e. *Romuli auspiciis* (*aliter* Vasaly (1993) 55–6). The temple in which C. was speaking was, however, much later, having been vowed by M. Atilius Regulus in 294 during the

Third Samnite War; cf. Livy 10.37.15; Wissowa (1912) 122-3; Goar (1972) 36; Orlin (1997) 55. Establishing a connection with Romulus was evidently important to C.; cf. 3.2.4-7 *illum qui hanc urbem condidit . . . is qui eandem hanc urbem conditam amplificatamque servauit*; see *ad loc.* The order *es constitutus* effects a ditrochaic clausula.

5 quem Statorem . . . uere nominamus: for the broadening of the sense of the cult title cf. §11.1-4n.; Var. *gram.* pp. 236-7, fr. 137 *dixerunt eum* [sc. *Iouem*]. . . *Statorem . . . quod haberet statuendi stabiliendique potestatem*; similarly Sen. *Ben.* 4.7.1 *quod stant beneficio eius omnia, stator stabilitorque est*. The *iunctura urbs atque imperium* first occurs at *Agr.* 1.18; cf. also *Cat.* 3.19.9 and 20.6-7 and 4.12.15-16; *Arch.* 28 (where *urbis* was restored by Naugerius); *Flac.* 1; *Dom.* 143; *Sest.* 53.

5-9 hunc et huius socios . . . uiuos mortuosque mactabis: instead of a concluding prayer (as e.g. in *Dem.* 18), C. pronounces two prophesies joined by *et*, the first of protection, the second of the destruction of enemies. For *socius* cf. §8.8-10n. Three different groups (of which the last is richest in number of syllables) are to be protected, each expressed as an object of *a*; the movement is from the sacred to the profane and from objects to humans and their interests; at §12.2-3 the same list is reduced to essentials: *templa . . . tecta urbis, uitam omnium ciuium*; cf. also 3.2.7-8 *templis, delubris, tectis ac moenibus*; *Sest.* 53 (of his exile) *cum meum illum casum . . . non solum homines sed tecta urbis ac templa lugerent*; for *teca* and *moenia* in combination cf. also *Agr.* 1.5; *Pis.* 52. In the second prophesy Catiline is no longer distinguished from the others. The neutral *homines* is immediately clarified by three appositives: *bonorum inimicos* and *hostes patriae* are contrasted through chiasmus, *inimicus* being a personal or political enemy (cf. Catiline's characterization of C. as such cited on §23.1-3) as opposed to a public enemy (*hostis*; cf. on §3.5-7 and 4.10.7-10; *Mur* 83: Catiline as *hostis rei publicae*); for *bonus* cf. §5.5-8n.; for Catiline's band as *latrones* cf. §23.5-8n.; at *Phil.* 12.20 L. Antonius is qualified as *latro Italiae* (as opposed to *myrmillo Asiaticus*). Here *foedus* is an agreement between private persons; for the descriptive genitive cf. 2.8.8 *hoc incredibile sceleris foedus*; *Cael.* 34 *amorum turpissimorum . . . foedera*; *OLD* s.v. 2. The contrast of *uiuus* and *mortuus* is exceedingly common in C. (approaching 100 passages); cf. e.g. *Sex. Rosc.* 72 *quid tam est commune quam spiritus uiuis, terra mortuis?* For *macto* in general cf. §27.12-14n.; with abl. it is to "afflict (with)": *OLD* s.v. 2. C. presupposes the conventional picture of punishments after death, in contrast to the view of Caesar reported at 4.7.9-12 (similarly *Sal.* 51.20); cf. also the view of T. Labienus cited at *Cic. Rab. perd.* 29.

CATILINARIAN 2

The higher magistrates of Rome had the right to call the people together for a public meeting (*contio*, also used of the speech given there) in the forum and there express their views; cf. Mommsen (1887-8) 1191-3; Morstein-Marx (2004) ch. 2. *De lege Manilia* represents a *contio* from the year of C.'s praetorship (65); our speech, *Cat.* 3, and *Agr.* 2 are the *contiones* preserved from his consular year; also preserved are later speeches