

IMAGES, IMAGERY, AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF POLITICAL “REALITY”
IN CICERO’S *CATILINARIAN* ORATIONS

By

ANGELA BROOK MILLER REED

A THESIS PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

2007

© 2007 Angela Brook Miller Reed

amabilissimae meae magistrae, Mrs. Linda Renick

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I thank my supervising committee chair, Dr. Lewis Sussman, for his patient mentoring and expertise, Dr. Timothy Johnson for his guidance and support, and Dr. Hans-Friedrich Mueller for planting the seed that became this study. I am grateful to the Department of Classics at the University of Florida for being my academic home for the last seven years and to those graduate students who helped me survive my first year—Jarrod, Becky, Jennifer, Will, Andy, Jon, and Randy. I am thankful to my church family for their encouragement through gifts of food during the final weeks of writing, which gave me the strength to complete this project. I especially thank my parents, Tim and Renee Miller, for both inspiring and grounding me with their love—and for reminding me of what matters most in life. And finally, I thank my husband David, who brought me back to Gainesville to finish what I started and has since endured with me through countless hours of study. I am grateful for his sacrifices, his partnership, and his love.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	4
LIST OF FIGURES	7
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	8
Classical Authors and Works.....	8
Classical Journals.....	9
ABSTRACT.....	10
CHAPTER	
1 CICERO ON RHETORIC.....	11
The Orator’s Devices	11
Interpretation.....	15
Setting of the <i>Catilinarians</i>	18
2 THE ENEMY PERCEIVED	21
Introduction.....	21
A Portrait of Catiline	22
Associates of Catiline	26
Conspiracy as <i>Pestis</i>	32
3 A RAVAGED <i>RES PUBLICA</i>	36
<i>Res Publica</i> at Risk	36
Rumor and Report.....	38
Failed Plots	40
Slaves and Gladiators	42
Slaughter, Arson, and Looting.....	43
Evidence in Hand.....	46
4 THE CONSUL SEES ALL	55
The Importance of <i>Ethos</i>	57
Maintaining Appearances	60
A Visionary Consul	61
<i>Imperator Togatus</i>	64
Savior of the Republic	67

5	DIVINE OVERSIGHT	72
	Religion in Speech-Making	72
	Jupiter's <i>Providentia</i>	74
	His Temple	74
	His Statue.....	77
	Other Portents	84
	The Temple of Concord.....	88
6	CONSTRUCTION OF A POLITICAL "REALITY"	94
	LIST OF REFERENCES	96
	BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH	101

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Figure</u>		<u>page</u>
1	Painting by Cesare Maccari (1840-1919), <i>Cicero Denounces Catiline</i>	35

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Classical Authors and Works

Arist.	Aristotle
<i>Poet.</i>	<i>Poetics</i>
<i>Rhet.</i>	<i>Rhetoric</i>
Cic.	Marcus Tullius Cicero
<i>Att.</i>	<i>Epistulae ad Atticum</i>
<i>Cael.</i>	<i>Pro Caelio</i>
<i>Catil.</i>	<i>In Catilinam</i>
<i>Cons. fr.</i>	<i>De Consulatu suo</i>
<i>De Orat.</i>	<i>De Oratore</i>
<i>Inv.</i>	<i>De Inventione</i>
<i>Mur.</i>	<i>Pro Murena</i>
<i>Off.</i>	<i>De Officiis</i>
<i>Orat.</i>	<i>Orator</i>
<i>Part.</i>	<i>Partitiones Oratoriae</i>
<i>Sul.</i>	<i>Pro Sulla</i>
Plin.	Gaius Plinius Secundus
<i>Nat.</i>	<i>Naturalis Historia</i>
Quint.	Marcus Fabius Quintilianus
<i>Inst.</i>	<i>Institutio Oratoria</i>
Rhet. Her.	Rhetor ad Herennium (<i>Rhetorica ad Herennium</i>)
Sall.	Gaius Sallustius Crispus
<i>Cat.</i>	<i>Catilinae</i>
<i>Jug.</i>	<i>Iugurtha</i>

Classical Journals

<i>AJPh</i>	<i>American Journal of Philology</i>
<i>CJ</i>	<i>The Classical journal</i>
<i>CPh</i>	<i>Classical Philology</i>
<i>G&R</i>	<i>Greece and Rome</i>
<i>HSPh</i>	<i>Harvard Studies in Classical Philology</i>
<i>JRS</i>	<i>Journal of Roman Studies</i>
<i>SyllClass</i>	<i>Syllecta Classica</i>
<i>TAPhA</i>	<i>Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association</i>

Abstract of Thesis Presented to the Graduate School
of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts

IMAGES, IMAGERY, AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF POLITICAL “REALITY”
IN CICERO’S *CATILINARIAN* ORATIONS

By

Angela Brook Miller Reed

August 2007

Chair: Lewis Sussman

Major: Latin

As a great orator and literary stylist, Marcus Tullius Cicero had a talent for employing words to evoke vivid pictorial images. In his four orations against the conspirator L. Sergius Catilina (*In Catilinam* 1-4), Cicero employs this technique, which the Greeks called *enargeia*, with the aid of certain stylistic devices and a pattern of imagery that centers around sight and perception. This study will show how Cicero’s use of such imagery, in creating a vivid “reality” in the minds of his listeners, is integral to his persuasive strategy in the *Catilinarians*.

Many scholars have speculated on the historical accuracy of the events and characterizations recorded in these four speeches; however, such disputes do not concern us here. Rather, this study will emphasize the literary aspects of the *Catilinarians* through a close study of certain stylistic techniques. This project will begin by examining how Cicero’s rhetorical theory employs imagery in persuasion. Then in the following chapters the *Catilinarian* orations will be discussed in detail, with emphasis on Cicero’s use of visual imagery and how it animates his portrayal of the following: Catiline and his supporters, the insecurity of the *res publica*, Cicero himself, and the divine protection of the gods. The evidence reveals that Cicero’s colorful evocations are vital constituents of his construction of political “reality” and contribute substantially to the persuasive power of his oratory.

CHAPTER 1
CICERO ON RHETORIC

The Orator's Devices

An anonymous Latin proverb goes thus: *Campus habet lumen, et habet nemus auris acumen*. The field has sight (literally, “an eye”), and the grove a sharp ear. This sentiment has been echoed throughout the centuries by such notable authors as Chaucer, Cervantes, and Tennyson.¹ In fact, Marcus Tullius Cicero may have had this thought in mind when he said, as recorded in his *First Catilinarian*: *multorum te etiam oculi et aures non sentientem, sicut adhuc fecerunt, speculabuntur atque custodient*.² “Indeed, the eyes and ears of many will be observing and keeping watch upon you unawares, just as they have done up until now.” Cicero’s figurative *oculi* and *aures* seem a close parallel to the *lumen* and *auris* of the proverb. These concurrent images serve as a reminder that one cannot hide from the world; despite attempts to fade into oblivion, one will always encounter observation, even unwittingly. Thus, with the aid of vivid sensory imagery, Cicero passes along a stern warning to Catiline that his evil character will never go unnoticed.

In like manner to Cicero’s *oculi et aures*, other authors have crafted images of sight and perception to enhance the vividness of their style. In the Old Testament book of Proverbs, the writer declares that the Lord God made both the “hearing ear” and the “seeing eye,”³ thus describing the God-given parts of the body in terms of their relationship and benefit to the whole. In keeping with his succinct style, the writer of Proverbs uses a literary device known as metonymy, substituting qualities (seeing and hearing) for their proper names (visual and auditory

¹Original author unknown. See *Bartlett’s Familiar Quotations*, 16th ed. (1992) 130:14 and accompanying footnote for a list of related quotations. This sentiment has been repeated so often that it is now considered cliché.

² *Catil.* 1.6. The Latin text of the *Catilinarians* is adopted from the Oxford Classical Texts.

³ Prov. 20.12, KJV.

senses), to animate his point. William Butler Yeats employs the related device synecdoche, substituting a part for the whole or the whole for a part, in one of his last poems. Contemplating death, he writes, “Cast a cold eye / On life, on death. / Horseman pass by!”⁴ This “cold eye” with which he admonishes his readers to glance upon the start and finish of life seems to encourage a stoic regard for the sum of human existence. His declaration, “Horseman pass by!” suggests that this glance be brief and uninvolved. Synecdoche allows Yeats to substitute a part (the eye) for the whole (introspective observation of life), which well conveys the starkness in his admonition.

These devices of metonymy and synecdoche fall under the broader category of metaphor, a figure of speech in which a “name or descriptive word or phrase is transferred to an object or action different from, but analogous to, that to which it is literally applicable.”⁵ Examples of sensory metaphor in literature include Shakespeare’s “mind’s eye,” the means by which Hamlet, in mourning, vividly recalls the life of his father;⁶ and Wordsworth’s “inward eye,” his “bliss of solitude,” through which he reminisces about his childhood.⁷ Modern readers might equate this eye with the memory or imagination; nevertheless, metaphor allowed these writers to describe by analogy something for which they had no scientific understanding. They conveyed a seemingly invisible concept (the imagination) by comparing it to an image (the eye) that was visible and familiar.

⁴ “Under Ben Bulben” 6.9-11.

⁵ “metaphor” in *OED Online*.

⁶ *Hamlet* 1.2.185.

⁷ “I Wandered Lonely as a Cloud,” 3.3,4.

Metaphor has a tradition extending from the ancient world. Aristotle, in the earliest extant discussion of metaphor, outlined its types and functions in his *Poetics*.⁸ Cicero would take up the topic later in book three of his *De Oratore*, in which he defined metaphor as a “form of simile abbreviated to a single word and offering pleasure from the recognition of likeness.”⁹ He then outlines four reasons why people appreciate metaphor: it is a mark of natural talent; it gives intellectual stimulation; it offers a compressed identification (in a single word) of both terms of comparison; and it provides sensual and visual stimulation.¹⁰ In fact, he notes how metaphor appeals especially to the sense of sight, the “keenest of senses.”¹¹ Such a point could hardly escape an orator’s notice, since it was his job to capture the minds of his listeners. Thus metaphor, in addition to its value as a literary device, had powerful application as a rhetorical device in antiquity.

Cicero’s works dealing with rhetoric, particularly the *De Oratore*, confirm that Cicero was well versed in stylistic devices such as metaphor and, likewise, thoroughly acquainted with imagery.¹² He knew, as an accomplished speaker, that with a sleight of tongue he could manipulate the emotions of his audience. He understood, as a rhetorician, that by scaling down his images via metonymy or synecdoche, he could intensify the drama of his speech.¹³ The total

⁸ *Poet.* 21-2.

⁹ *De. Orat.* 3.157. May (2001) 270 n. 195 stresses the difficulties with this passage and opts for deletion. Translation is from Innes (1988) 316.

¹⁰ *De Orat.* 3.159-61.

¹¹ *Ibid.* 3.160: vel quod omnis translatio, quae quidem sumpta ratione est, ad sensus ipsos admovetur, maxime oculorum, qui est sensus acerrimus.

¹² *Ibid.* 3.156-65; cf. *Orat.* 39.137-39; see also the contemporaneous *Rhet. Her.* 4.34.45, 4.39.51, and Quintilian’s later comments in *Inst.* 8.6.4-28. Cicero also composed a good deal of poetry, though he is not especially renowned for his efforts. See W.W. Ewbank, *The Poems of Cicero* (London 1933).

¹³ For scale change see Lanham (1991) 102 and 148 (entries “Metonymy” and “Synecdoche”). In short, this scale change is accomplished when experience is described in terms of other experience, but at a different level of

combined effect of these techniques helped to achieve what the Greeks referred to as *enargeia*. This “palpability” or “vividness,” as the word translates, is highly effective in etching the “facts” in the listeners’ imaginations through word-pictures—the verbal equivalent of “showing” as opposed to “telling.”¹⁴ Cicero relished the visually potent effect that recreated scenes before the very eyes of his audiences. Quintilian, moreover, emphasizes how *enargeia*, “makes us seem not so much to narrate as to exhibit the actual scene, while our emotions will be no less actively stirred than if we were present at the actual occurrence.”¹⁵ Through its “vivid effect,” *enargeia* contributes to the overall persuasiveness of a speech, with an aim toward influencing behavior.¹⁶ As will be shown, Cicero did not haphazardly inject imagery into his speeches; he was critically mindful of the appropriate usage of oratorical devices and technique. Thus, he had a distinct purpose for every image and manipulated their scale according to his objectives.¹⁷

This study will attempt to show how Cicero’s use of vivid imagery is integral to his persuasive strategy in the *Catilinarians*. An examination of the literary and rhetorical devices within the speeches, coupled with a survey of Cicero’s rhetorical theories as promoted in the *De Oratore*, lends support to the argument that Cicero liberally and deliberately employs images of sight and perception (which, for the purpose of this paper, is also referred to as visual imagery) to accomplish four distinct yet interconnected goals with his speeches. First (1), Cicero dramatizes his enemy. He encourages his listeners *to view* Catiline as a wicked conspirator,

magnification. As will be discussed in a later chapter, devices of scale change easily become devices of scale manipulation, a form of power.

¹⁴ Corbett (1965) 319. Cf. Fantham (2004) 272. Cicero mentions the same in *De Orat.* 3.160-61: *omnis translatio, quae quidem sumpta ratione est, ad sensus ipsos admovetur, maxime oculorum, qui est sensus acerrimus...illa vero oculorum multo acriora, quae paene ponunt in conspectus animi, quae cernere et videre non possumus.*

¹⁵ *Inst.* 6.2.32. Translation borrowed from Corbett (1965) 27.

¹⁶ Mueller (1995) 293.

¹⁷ See Lanham note above (n. 13) regarding the impact of “scale change.”

armed and allied with men of the meanest ilk. Then (2), he *illustrates* the grave danger that threatens the Roman people and the city Rome, appealing to their fears to stimulate their allegiance to the republic. Next (3), he rallies the Senate and the masses to his cause, positioning himself as their omniscient leader and savior, whom all can *look to* for guidance. Lastly (4), he aligns himself with the gods and their divine *oversight*, thus securing divine sanction for his suppression of the conspiracy and uniting all Romans in their retributive action against the conspirators. Thus, Cicero's colorful description (or *enargeia*) is actually his artistic and careful construction of political "reality." In effect, this verbal animation of events and characters contributes substantially to the persuasive power of his oratory in the *Catilinarians*.

Interpretation

The historical accuracy of events surrounding the *Catilinarian* orations has been much debated.¹⁸ However, this study does not propose to evaluate historical evidence in Cicero's speeches. Nor is this an attempt to discuss or analyze his representation of events by judging his personal motives, since a persuasive text, by its very nature, tends more to illuminate the subjective character of its author than to reveal objective fact. The aim, rather, is to delve into the literary world that Cicero creates within his four speeches against Catiline—a world and reality unto itself for the purpose of persuading his audience—in order to appreciate a history richly illustrated just as the orator wanted it recorded and remembered.

¹⁸ Yavetz (1963) 485-87 has outlined four categories into which historical-critical discussions of the conspiracy may be organized. For simplicity, I have placed the discussions into two categories, which follow. The traditional account (as given by Cicero in the *Catilinarians* and Sallust in the *Bellum Catillinae*) has been largely upheld by E.G. Hardy, *The Catilinarian Conspiracy in Its Context: A Restudy of the Evidence* (Oxford 1924); E.D. Eagle, "Catiline and the *Concordia Ordinum*" in *Phoenix* 3.1 (1949); H.H. Scullard, *From the Gracchi to Nero* (London 1965); D.R. Shackleton Bailey, *Cicero* (New York 1971); E.J. Phillips, "Catiline's Conspiracy" in *Historia* 25.4 (1976); and T.N. Mitchell, *Cicero: The Ascending Years* (New Haven 1979). Challenges to the traditional account have issued from D.R. Dudley, *The Civilization of Rome* (New York 1960) see p. 92; K.H. Waters, "Cicero, Sallust, and Catilina" in *Historia* 19 (1970); and R. Seager, "Iusta Catilinae" in *Historia* 22.2 (1973). For a moderate, more recent interpretation of the conspiracy, see A. Everitt, *Cicero: The Life and Times of Rome's Greatest Politician* (New York 2003) 87-112.

Most speeches, as Fantham points out, were fully written prior to oral delivery. The text that has survived, however, is usually a “revised version, preserved as a record after the performance.”¹⁹ Cicero’s remarks in a letter imply that his *Catilinarians* were not published as a corpus until 60 BC, about three years after the events of the conspiracy.²⁰ Scholars generally concur on this date of publication, though some have looked suspiciously on its timing, noting how the negative political fallout resulting from Cicero’s handling of the conspiracy may have influenced his editing of the speeches for the public record.²¹ This leaves the reader with a transcript that, to modern sensibilities, seems to compromise the original interchange. In effect, one cannot know how accurately the extant text reflects what was actually said.²²

At the same time, one must be mindful not to approach the text too cynically. Contemporary readers have a tendency to impose modern preconceptions upon the ancient world, expecting a precision from the texts that was never intended by the authors. Therefore, one should be careful about interpreting the speeches literally since, as Rawson stresses, “we should take care not to be over-indulgent to much ancient historical writing on the grounds that ancient standards were altogether different from our own.”²³ Although he never wrote a history of Rome, it may be presumed that Cicero would have made a model historian in the ancient view because he exemplified through his writings that blend of “artist and scholar” which was highly

¹⁹ Fantham (2004) 132.

²⁰ *Att.* 2.1.3.

²¹ See Craig (1993) 256-58; Kennedy (1972) 176-77; Stockton (1971) 118ff; Nisbet (1965) 62-3. Cf. Steel (2005) 51-3 who leaves open the possibility that Cicero may be editing previously published work in 60 BC. For a contrary view, see McDermott (1972) 284 who concludes that the Catilinarian speeches were published right after the conspiracy, in December of 63 BC. Price (1998) 108 n. 10 appears to agree, emphasizing that Cicero would have had no need to edit speeches that would be published as a “record of his proud success” (128).

²² Millar (1998) 109. Specifically referencing *Catil.* 1 and 2, he comments, “As in all such cases, we can tell neither how accurately the text as preserved reflects what was said at the time nor how the propositions in it were received.”

²³ Rawson (1972) 44.

prized in antiquity.²⁴ In the modern era, the “artist” and the “scholar” tend to be consigned to separate realms; the man who attempts to be both the one and the other often endangers his credibility (American society in particular tends to reinforce this dichotomy).

Despite the limitations inherent in the text, the language of oratory and rhetoric “is not to be looked through, as if to find some other ‘reality’ underneath, but looked at, for it is the stuff of Roman political transactions.”²⁵ Correspondingly, it is best to withhold judgment on rhetorical methods that seem theatrical, proud, or demeaning; Cicero was a man of the ancient world—not the modern—therefore he speaks more authoritatively than the modern reader concerning issues and events of his day.²⁶ Let the reader, then, dispense with efforts to “read between the lines” (as the saying goes). Let him instead appreciate the text of the speeches as a literary encapsulation of the political drama of a moment in time. Therein lies the value of these oratorical texts.

As early as 60 BC, Cicero described his consular orations of 63 BC as offering a model for study by Roman youths.²⁷ In fact, Quintilian found the *First Catilinarian* to be a ripe source of rhetorical *exempla*, as evidenced by seventeen quotations from the speech that appear in books eight and nine of his *Institutio Oratoria*.²⁸ His use of the speech as a model for teaching principles of oratory as well as Cicero’s own expectation that his consular speeches be employed in pedagogy suggests that it is appropriate for modern readers to approach the *Catilinarians* likewise. We must view them, not as a perfect transcript of events but, rather, as a demonstration

²⁴ Rawson (1972) 45. Atticus expressed similar thoughts, according to *Att.* 14.14.5 and 16.13.2, which Cicero champions later in *De Orat.* 2.36. See D. S. Potter (1999) 135-38 for the negotiation between fact and style in the ancient historian’s presentation of events.

²⁵ Cape (1995) 256.

²⁶ May (2002) 50; Cf. Nisbet (1965) 62.

²⁷ *Att.* 2.1.3.

²⁸ Leeman (1986) 133.

of Cicero's expertise in handling what he portrays as a critical situation in the life of a Roman statesman—and essentially, the ideal statesman's response to such a crisis. Analyzing these speeches as a polished representation of Cicero's talents offers one a glimpse of Cicero the orator at his highest peak of performance. He did, after all, regard himself as the “embodiment of Roman oratory in its perfection.”²⁹

Setting of the *Catilinarians*

Without the electronic media and press as exists today, the Roman people were very dependent upon the spoken word in political discourse. Through a mastery of oratory, therefore, even an upstart or *novus homo* like Cicero could acquire political power.³⁰ Undoubtedly, the young student Cicero must have recognized that his education was “paving his way to the capital city.”³¹ In attaining the consulship he acquired not only political stature but also social authority, becoming, in essence, the “media” to the people of Rome. He gained access to their rapt and impressionable attention by revealing to them *in contione* the inner workings of the republic.³²

In his role as newscaster to the public, Cicero made the most of rumors circulating that Catiline had intended to assassinate him.³³ He may have even originated the rumors,³⁴ but whatever the case, he *acted* as if the reports were true, appearing at the elections in July of 63 BC with a breastplate imperfectly hidden beneath his toga. This bold move fed the sensationalist appetite of the public and placed pressure on a reluctant senate to act on Cicero's accusations.

²⁹ Hadas (1952) 122. This conclusion is fairly drawn from Cicero's autobiographical account in *Brutus* 308-33.

³⁰ To the chagrin of conservatives and old-line Roman families who had for generations controlled the reins of power. See Scullard (1965).

³¹ Butler (2002) 5.

³² Morstein-Marx (2004) 251.

³³ *Catil.* 1.11; *Mur.* 52.

³⁴ Eagle (1949) 25.

Furthermore, his act prefigured a major theme for Cicero's term of office: *cedant arma togae*.³⁵ Cicero, the *imperator togatus* ("general dressed in the toga"), would overcome the conspiracy of Catiline, not with swords, but with the mighty artillery of his words.³⁶

Catiline's reputation prior to Cicero's public display was undoubtedly negative. Though records of his alleged first conspiracy in 66-65 BC are clouded by uncertainty, invective, and propaganda,³⁷ his regular prosecution in court (despite subsequent acquittals) was enough to warrant bad press.³⁸ What is clear is that by late 63 BC Catiline had become involved in illegal revolutionary activities that, as Everitt suggests, may have originated as a "secret alliance around a radical programme" of land redistribution and debt cancellation.³⁹ Whatever threat Catiline's conspiracy posed in actuality, the movement itself was indicative of widespread discontent with the current political/social system.⁴⁰ Such an atmosphere begged for a leader, and the politically dead-ended Catiline saw it as a golden opportunity.

Cicero, however, was consul at the time and as the rightfully elected leader would hardly ignore Catiline's rumored machinations. Instead Cicero would wield his power less conspicuously than Catiline, although his political office granted him considerable official and unofficial authority. Rather than take up arms, he would report the events.

The consul's *oculi et aures* would appraise the situation in Rome. What he saw and heard, he would convey to the senate and the people with imagery so vivid that his listeners could

³⁵*Off.* 1.77.

³⁶ May (1988) 57. This theme will be discussed in chapter 4.

³⁷ Everitt (2003) 90-1; Ramsey (1982) 131; Phillips (1976) 441; Gruen (1969) 21; Seager (1964) 342. Much of the invective came from Cicero's *In Toga Candida*, what fragments we have are preserved by Asconius 82-94 C. For this speech, see Crawford (1994) 159-99.

³⁸ MacDonald (1977) 3-6.

³⁹ Everitt (2003) 101.

⁴⁰ Hadas (1952) 114).

experience vicariously the events he described. By appealing to the senses, Cicero would rely on authority that could scarcely be argued—observational proof. In so doing, he would construct a “reality” in the minds of his listeners, an effect he has in common with the media of today:

. . . like a divining rod that is oriented to water, the media are by nature oriented to what is novel and dramatic. In their emphasis and selective reporting of newsworthy happenings, they help *to fashion a picture of reality and define for others what is important or unimportant.*⁴¹

In the following chapters, this study will consider how Cicero’s “emphasis” on observables and his “selective reporting” of vivid details in the *Catilinarians* helped him convince all of Rome that his political “picture of reality” matched the historical reality of 63 BC. To this end, he would aim first at persuading the senate that their “important” responsibility was to cast the visibly depraved Catiline out of Rome.

⁴¹ Rosnow and Fine (1976) 105. Italics mine.

CHAPTER 2 THE ENEMY PERCEIVED

Introduction

Early in his defense of Marcus Caelius in 56 BC, Cicero counters the prosecution's charge that Caelius had pursued *familiaritas* with the conspirator Catiline (*Cael.* 10-14). He mollifies this allegation with the acknowledgment that many other men, indeed many good patrician men, had shared an association with Catiline. To underscore his point, he admits that Catiline had nearly deceived him—an astonishing revelation, in light of Cicero's crucial role in thwarting his conspiracy against the Roman Republic.⁴²

While Cicero readily admits to Catiline's evil side, he struggles to downplay the effect that Catiline had on his client.⁴³ His endeavor to defend Caelius demonstrates that Cicero, though adapting his rhetoric to suit the occasion, continued to view Catiline as a narrowly averted threat to the safety of Rome. Indeed, his characterization—given seven years after the conspiracy in a speech where he is concerned to emphasize the positive aspects of Catiline's character—remains fundamentally the same as it was in his speeches of 63 BC. Granted, some view his depiction of Catiline as “garish” or “exaggerated,” and judging from the nature of political invective, this is likely the case.⁴⁴ But, as Mitchell points out, even the allegations of invective “like all other forms of propaganda, must have some level of credibility to be effective.”⁴⁵

⁴² *Me ipsum, me, inquam, quondam paene ille decepit* (*Cael.* 14). Whether Cicero's admission shocked his audience as much as it presumably shocked himself is unknown; regardless, he played the part to the benefit of Caelius' defense.

⁴³ Mitchell (1979) 222. Price (1998) 118 n.35 also comments on this “interesting spectacle.”

⁴⁴ Everitt (2003) 90. Cf. Phillips (1976) 441.

⁴⁵ Mitchell (1979) 222: “Due allowance must, of course, be made for the distortions, exaggerations, and additions of the forensic and political invective which forms the foundation of the tradition [of Catiline's reputed character] . . .

It is precisely this need for credibility that led Cicero to point out all the observable manifestations of his claims in the *Catilinarians*. In this chapter we consider how the orator uses visual imagery borrowed from Catiline's appearance, actions, and associates to support his conclusions about Catiline's evil character. In so doing, he lessens his own burden of proof since the evidence is apparent to all who follow his line of sight.

A Portrait of Catiline

Cicero begins his *First Catilinarian* appalled to see Catiline present in the senate.⁴⁶ Being thus offended, he launches into the invective that would characterize his first oration. He opens with a rhetorical question directed at Catiline: "How long, Catiline, will you continually abuse our patience?"⁴⁷ Such an opening immediately sets Catiline in opposition to the speaker and his listeners, alluded to in the possessive pronoun *nostra*. Cicero summarily recounts specific examples of the heightened security and increased tensions in the city, seeking to know if any of these references provoke Catiline's emotion. The answer to the orator's question *Nihilne te . . . moverunt?* is implied in his six repetitions of *nihil*. His catalog of visible evidence recalls what all have witnessed and by association these images indict Catiline, who is clearly affected "not at all."

Cicero wastes no time with formalities. To the point, he declares his disbelief that a man so dangerous as Catiline is yet allowed to live—a man whose *oculi* observe and single out each one of them for slaughter.⁴⁸ Cicero's close scrutiny of Catiline transports the audience from a

and all the varied charges of criminality and immorality, particularly those in sources such as the *In Toga Candida* and the *Commentariolum Petitionis*, which predate the conspiracy, can hardly be dismissed as total fabrications."

⁴⁶ According to Sallust (*Cat.* 31), this speech was an impromptu reaction to Catiline's audacity, rather than a thorough exposé of the conspiracy. Cf. Cic. *Catil.* 1.1,2.

⁴⁷ *Catil.* 1.1. This and subsequent translations are mine, unless otherwise indicated.

⁴⁸ 1.2: *...notat et designat oculis ad caedem unum quemque nostrum.*

distant vantage point to a close encounter with the enemy. With his magnification, he reinforces the danger that Catiline poses to all present, as indicated in his shifty eyes that presumably conceal diabolic intentions.

Cicero continues to rely on visual references as he depicts for the audience his impression of the man Catiline. In 1.5 he describes the scene of an enemy camp in Etruria; he then brings the danger into close range, announcing that the commander of that camp and leader of enemies sits before their very eyes (*videtis*). He does not sit idly; rather, he plots in public view—within the city walls (*intra moenia*) and even in the Senate (*in senatu*)—making daily preparations for the destruction of the Republic. That an enemy lives *intra moenia* obviously compromises the security of the city; that this same enemy has gained access to the inner sanctum of political power *in senatu* is an infiltration of extreme urgency. Cicero recalls these broken defenses to reinforce a discomfiting truth: there is a traitor in their midst. Though he vows to keep Catiline physically contained by guards as a preventative measure, the *oculi et aures* of many will still be watching, waiting for Catiline to slip up and betray himself (1.6).

These images of Catiline's intrusion appear frequently in the beginning of the first speech.⁴⁹ Such images allow Cicero to exploit Catiline's presence in the senate, transforming his mere appearance into covert invasion. Cicero then introduces images of concealment to persuade his audience of Catiline's proclivity for deceit.⁵⁰ Why should Catiline continue his charade (1.7)? Night cannot hide (*obscurare*), nor can walls enclose (*continere*) the evidences of his deceit, Cicero reasons. Everything has in fact come to light (*inlustrantur*) and has burst forth

⁴⁹ Konstan (1993) 14.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

(*erumpunt*) in full view.⁵¹ All efforts that Catiline might make to conceal his plans are futile since they are now clearer than daylight (*luce sunt clariora*) to Cicero and the senators.

After recounting in detail the nefarious plots of Catiline in 1.7-10 and exhorting him to leave the city in 1.10-13,⁵² Cicero reexamines the visible signs of Catiline's depraved character. He puts another rhetorical question to Catiline: *quae libido ab oculis, quod facinus a manibus umquam tuis, quod flagitium a toto corpore a fuit* (1.13)? Cicero prods the senators, whose eyes had just observed the truth of Cicero's earlier impressions, to witness the libidinous eyes (*oculis*) of Catiline, whose hands (*manibus*) are given to crime, and whose entire body (*toto corpore*) is complicit in scandal. Synecdoche reduces Catiline to the vileness of his parts, suggesting a detachment both horrible and unnatural. The *enargeia* of his description is powerful, but Cicero does not end with this picture alone. In his continued censure of Catiline, he reminds the senators of their own actions when first confronted with Catiline's appearance in the Senate—how they shunned him at his entrance and quickly vacated the seats nearest to him (1.16). Presumably, all maintained their distance during the speech, leaving Catiline visibly isolated and thus an easy target for the orator's exploitation (see Fig.1).

Cicero next considers what he would do if he were in Catiline's position:

et si me meis civibus iniuria suspectum tam graviter atque offensum viderem,
carere me aspectu civium quam infestis omnium oculis conspici mallet . . .
dubitas quorum mentis sensusque volneras, eorum aspectum praesentiamque
vitare? . . . ab eorum oculis aliquo concederes (1.17).

Reasoning aloud, he presents the options to Catiline. Since he has been publicly branded as mistrusted (*suspectum*, literally “under watch”) and offensive, just as he himself can witness (*me*

⁵¹ Maclardy (2004) 55 notes how *inlustrantur* and *erumpunt* oppose, respectively, *obscuarare* and *continere*.

⁵² Cicero's recommendation that Catiline leave the city seems counterproductive and even contradictory to the orator's argument concerning the immediate danger that Catiline poses. Catiline threatens the Republic with danger, so the senate should let him leave? See Craig (1993) 261. On the other hand, there are good tactical reasons for Cicero to request Catiline's departure—by so doing, Catiline *proves* Cicero's allegations!

. . . *viderem*—Cicero speaking as if Catiline), he must endure one of two consequences. He can either withdraw from the sight of the citizens (*carere . . . aspectu civium*) as Cicero would prefer, or suffer the gaze by the hostile eyes of all (*infestis omnium oculis*). Neither option would appeal to a Roman, for to be away from the city was exile and to be the object of the uninhibited gaze was “desouling,” which Barton likens to “visual assassination.”⁵³ With this suggestion, Cicero directs all eyes to look without remorse upon the enemy of the state.

As they scrutinize Catiline, Cicero asks him why he hesitates to avoid the sight and presence (*aspectum praesentiamque*) of those men he is harming. He reminds the senators what damage this man has done to their minds and hearts; he has threatened not just their external bodies, but has rather wounded them to the core of their being. By charging Catiline with terrorism, Cicero hopes to provoke an emotional response, or *pathos*, from the intended victims. For evidence he points to the behavior of Catiline, who boldly sits without remorse in their presence (*praesentiam*), challenging their gaze (*aspectum*). Hardy affirms that Catiline came to the senate that day “determined to bluff the matter out”;⁵⁴ but his blatant affront, to the contrary, demonstrated that he did not possess the proper sensitivities and *pudor* of a respectable Roman citizen.⁵⁵ In fact, Cicero perceived this same shameless nature when he later observed, *Neque enim is es, Catilina, ut te . . . pudor a turpitudine . . . revocarit* (“Indeed, you are not the man, Catiline, to be reclaimed from disgrace by a sense of shame,” 1.22). A man whose actions reveal such emotional displacement poses a considerable risk to the safety of others, he concludes,

⁵³ Barton (1999) 255. In Roman society, the gaze had the power to confer respect, through inhibition, or to shamelessly expose and cannibalize when uninhibited. Barton continues, “The gaze without compunction signaled the loss of trust, the end of the collusion between the seer and the seen, the breakdown of a common bond and of the security and camaraderie created by the mutual inhibition of the eyes. The uninhibited gaze made every *Thou* an *It*, something one could consume, something one could destroy with impunity and without regret.”

⁵⁴ Hardy (1924) 66.

⁵⁵ See Barton (1999) for the psychology of Roman *pudor*.

invoking for dramatic effect the voice of the *patria* for corroboration (1.18).

Cicero's allusions to this "highly charged ambiance" within the temple (and in the city at large) serve, in the words of Vasaly:

. . . to focus the attention of his listeners on the crisis that was being played out before their eyes. Everything they saw and heard around them became a perceptible demonstration of Cicero's contentions Most of all, such scenes become a visible sign of Catiline's alienation from the city and its inhabitants, an isolation so complete that now the very light and air of Rome could no longer hold any pleasure for him⁵⁶

What then is left for Catiline to do? Just as he would accept estrangement from his own parents if reconciliation were impossible and withdraw somewhere away from their *oculis*, so he should admit alienation from the *patria*, the common parent of them all, and do likewise (1.17).

Cicero's feminine personification and prosopopoeia of the *patria* (in 1.18) makes Catiline's crimes against the state, the *communis parens*, seem most insidious and provides yet another "eyewitness testimony" of a man so depraved that he would betray his own mother.

In this first speech to the senate, Cicero reinterprets Catiline's appearance and actions to his detriment. He invites the audience to see firsthand the guilt in his eyes, hands, and in his entire body. He also reminds them of Catiline's behavior that the senate had observed that very day. Through his appraisal of Catiline's behavior, the senate clearly sees Catiline's evident disregard for Rome and her people.

Associates of Catiline

As if Catiline's dark portraiture were not sufficiently revealing, Cicero turns next to depicting the accomplices to Catiline's evil endeavors. That there existed certain "disaffected elements" to whom Catiline's agenda of social reform and financial relief might appeal is well

⁵⁶ Vasaly (1993) 50.

established.⁵⁷ Sallust's catalog (*Cat.* 14) unites Catiline with all manner of criminal and immoral persons, many of whom were bankrupted or impoverished because of extravagant spending. His adherents included the "descendants of the proscribed, bankrupt aristocrats, a band of unprincipled and Bohemian young bloods, and, from the rural areas, dispossessed farmers and Sullan veterans. . . ."⁵⁸ In addition, Cicero suggests that Catiline's supporters came from both high (i.e. senatorial) and low (servile) stations in life, affirming that the conspiracy was deeply and dangerously entrenched within the walls of Rome. This reputed community of profligates would prove a source of ample illustration for Cicero in his negative portrayal of Catiline.

For the greater part of Cicero's first speech to the Senate, the associates of Catiline receive minor attention. They are referred to collectively as a *castra . . . contra populum Romanum* in 1.5, though mention of their location *in Italia . . . in Etruriae faucibus* adds visual proximity to the threat they represent. Cicero names certain members of the conspiracy, Gaius Manlius (1.7) and Marcus Laeca (1.8), when recounting the so-called first Catilinarian conspiracy,⁵⁹ but offers few details beyond their involvement as partners in the same criminal madness.⁶⁰ Then Cicero eyes the senatorial crowd, noting that he clearly sees (*video enim*) a few of those who were with Catiline—men whose ambition drives them toward the destruction of Rome (1.8-9).

Cicero alludes further, though without immediate identification, to Catiline's senatorial supporters in his *Second Catilinarian*. He portrays those who supported Catiline as lacking in integrity, despite their high-born status (2.3), enemy soldiers in disguise, with their flashy purple

⁵⁷ Hardy (1924) 52-3. See also Edwards (1993) 178 who adopts the view that Sallust's narrative serves as a "paradigmatic example of the terrible consequences of luxurious habits for young Romans."

⁵⁸ Eagle (1949) 24.

⁵⁹ For further information on the alleged first conspiracy of Catiline, see Gruen (1969), Phillips (1976), Seager (1964), and Waters (1970).

⁶⁰ 1.8. It was at M. Laeca's house that . . . *convenisse eodem compluris eiusdem amentiae scelerisque socios*.

garments and skin glistening with oils (2.5), and debt-ridden, but unwilling to part with their rich estates (2.18) or give up their desire for power (2.19). Cicero's allusions to these noble audience members who were privy to the conspiracy likely indicate his anxiety about the number of Catiline's supporters in the Senate.⁶¹ Indeed, his display of knowledge about the secret goings-on of the conspirators may have been intended to indicate his potential for revealing their complicity—a bold move calculated to flush out the sympathizers from their midst.⁶² With each of his examples, Cicero seems also to draw out a common theme—how appearance, or what is visible to the eye, differs markedly from reality. Cicero's main advantage would come, therefore, from magnifying the contradiction most apparent to all present: those entrusted with the public safety were among the traitors to the public trust.

The very intimation of senatorial treachery made the rumors of another group alleged to have close ties with Catiline take on enlarged significance. Cicero first alludes to this group when he dubs Catiline the *evocatorem servorum et civium perditorum*, “the recruiter of slaves and ruined citizens” (1.27). The mere suggestion that he had allied himself with slaves, a claim affirmed by some scholars but completely dismissed by others,⁶³ was a powerful image likely to conjure up a host of negative associations, especially due to recent historical events—namely, Spartacus' slave revolt of 73-71 BC.⁶⁴ Thus, when implanting the slave motif into his speech, Cicero well understood that his audience would unconsciously replay before their minds' eyes all the accumulated personal experiences, rumors, tales, and horror stories to which they had been

⁶¹ Mitchell (1979) 228.

⁶² Price (1998) 126.

⁶³ For acceptance of Cicero's assertion, see Mitchell (1979) 233, Yavetz (1963) 493, and Bradley (1978) 329. For rejection, see Gruen (1974) 428-9 and MacDonald (1977) 13, 28, 60 n. a.

⁶⁴ Stockton (1971) 103.

exposed. Undoubtedly, much of their recall would stir up unpleasant emotion. Cicero's "slave imagery" was made effective by the fact that the typical Roman harbored deep prejudice, mistrust, and even fear toward slaves. Although loyal slaves did exist,⁶⁵ many Romans viewed slaves as "outsider[s] brought in" who were "ignorant of *pietas*. . . lacking in *fides*. . . and imbued with treachery, imperiling their master's very life."⁶⁶

It is no wonder then that Cicero highlights Catiline's slave connections in his *Second Catilinarian*, which he delivered to the people the following day. He includes the *gladiator* in a listing of Catiline's contacts, whose depravity and criminality illustrate that no lowlife was too corrupt to be his companion (2.7). Even toward the end of the speech, he reminds the crowd that every *gladiator* considers himself an intimate friend of Catiline (2.9) and would soon stand with his army to fight for his cause (2.24). Cicero's depiction of the lowest members of society taking up arms, as Yavetz convincingly argues, enabled him to convince his listeners that Catiline's intent was anarchy.⁶⁷ In any case, this collaboration of runaway slaves represented the fulfillment of their worst nightmares and served, consequently, as a highly effective scare tactic.

Yet Cicero, while not relying exclusively on stereotyping, seems most definitely to profit from it at the expense (literally) of his enemies. He outlines a much clearer picture in 2.18-23 of six distinct groups, who for various reasons have allied themselves with Catiline. They include (1) the debt-ridden wealthy who are unwilling to part with their rich estates; (2) politically-frustrated debtors who hunger for power; (3) indebted Sullan veterans who partied themselves

⁶⁵ Valerius Maximus, Appian, and Cassius Dio, among others, attested to the existence of loyal slaves. Many such stories existed as *exempla*, "ready-made devices for showing the effects of the breakdown of society, while simultaneously offering an affirmation of its fundamental values." For more on loyal slaves and the role of *exemplum* literature in Roman society, see Parker (2001). Quotation occurs on p.153. For an overview of slave accounts, see Yavetz 1988: 158-60.

⁶⁶ Parker (2001) 154-5. For the *topos* of the deceptive slave in Greek and Latin comedy, see Harsh (1955).

⁶⁷ Yavetz (1963) 493.

into poverty; (4) financially-ailing businessmen whose laziness and luxurious habits have brought about their ruin; (5) criminals of every sort; and (6) debauched and decadent young men, representing Catiline's inner circle. Significantly, the common denominator among the men in the first four groups is financial insecurity resulting from debt. Hardy notes this as well, insisting, "That there were many disaffected elements . . . —to whom Catiline's propaganda of social and, above all, financial relief might appeal—is certain."⁶⁸ Cicero points to the swiftness with which Catiline had collected a vast number of such ruined men, a force whose sheer size (*ingentem numerum*, 2.8) heightened their perceived threat. It is evident in his portrayal of these desperate men that he recognized Catiline's appeal to the oppressed.

The motivation for both classes—slaves, whose enslavement meant physical bondage, and senators, whose enslavement was to debt—to join with Catiline was the promise of freedom.⁶⁹ Certainly, slaves figured in among the criminal element of group five, while the senators Cicero suspected of treasonous activity fit in with groups one and two. Inherent in freedom, however, was a license that would appeal to men within *all* six groups: the license to pursue pleasure, free from financial worries.

In his *De Officiis*, Cicero explains his disapprobation of men who shamelessly follow their pleasures, likening them to animals.⁷⁰ He further contrasts, "how dishonorable it is to sink into luxury and to live a soft and effeminate lifestyle, but how honorable to live thriftily, strictly, with self-restraint, and soberly."⁷¹ Cicero depicts Catiline's friends as possessing no scruples of their own. Indeed they appear, as he describes them, with all the trappings of decadence and the

⁶⁸ Hardy (1924) 52.

⁶⁹ Bradley (1978) 335.

⁷⁰ *Off.* 1.105-6

⁷¹ Translation from Griffin and Atkins (1991) 42.

reckless abandon of hedonism. He paints them thus:

Patrimonia sua profuderunt, fortunas suas obligaverunt; res eos iam pridem, fides nuper deficere coepit: eadem tamen illa quae erat in abundantia libido permanet
Qui mihi accubantes in conviviis, complexi mulieres impudicas, vino languidi, conferti cibo, sertis redimiti, unguentis obliti, debilitati stupris eructant sermonibus suis caedem bonorum atque urbis incendia (2.10).

Again Cicero recalls the extravagant estates belonging to men who can no longer afford them, who yet persist in a manner of living that increases their debt. Cicero would openly question this paradox later, asking, *Tu agris, tu aedificiis, tu argento, tu familia, tu rebus omnibus ornatus et copiosus sis, et dubites de possessione detrahere, acquirere ad fidem?*⁷² His allusions to the numerous properties and fine possessions of these men emphasize their gross materialism while the graphic portrait above—rife with samples of their excessive behaviors—displays the evidence of their descent into vulgarity. He describes their lifestyle with participles (*accubantes, complexi, conferti, redimiti, debilitati*) and substantive adjectives (*languidi, obliti*), thereby defining the men in terms of their actions and appearance—and essentially stripping them of individuality and conscience. Cicero’s colorful words animate this disturbing scene and readily imprint these images of Catiline’s degenerate companions within the people’s imaginations.

What citizen had not walked past the Palatine and seen the opulent residences there? Who had not heard rumors of the wild parties of the rich? Cicero uses memories of things seen and heard to reconstruct for his audience scenes so realistic that eventually his images become conflated with reality. In his overview of Catiline’s friends, he focuses on visible signs of depravity among the wealthy and relies on stereotyping to illustrate his warnings about slaves and gladiators. Since these are the types of men that Catiline embraced, he concludes that their

⁷² 2.18: “Could you be rich and abundant in your lands, houses, silver, household slaves, and all other possessions and still doubt [whether] to subtract from your possession [in order] to add to your credit?”

character must mirror Catiline's own.

Conspiracy as *Pestis*

Toward the end of the *First Catilinarian*, Cicero concludes his invective with a frightening metaphor: the conspiracy is a *pestis*, a cancer, and the root and seed of all evil.⁷³ In this illustration, Catiline's conspiracy becomes a disease—a plague, even—that threatens to decimate the populace of Rome. He is an unseen evil, attacking from within and devastating if undetected and uneradicated. There can be no doubt about the terror of such an image to a society with little medical defense against epidemic infection.⁷⁴ Furthermore, Cicero has stripped Catiline of his final vestige of human appearance; he is no longer a man, but a monstrous cancer and the breeding ground of all other pestilence—and as *pestis*, he will aim for the vital organs of the republic.

Cicero urges the senate that the disease must be eradicated. Unless the senators scour the republic of every trace of *pestis*, the cancer will spread, eventually settling deep “within the veins and vitals” (*in venis atque in visceribus*, 1.31) of the republic. Clearly, Catiline threatens more than just the *oculi et aures* of the Roman people; he endangers the heart and life blood of the Roman government and threatens the safety of every citizen. Cicero expands the metaphor: just as a drink of cold water offers temporary relief to the man afflicted with illness, until he is wracked with more intense suffering, so the republic will gain quick security from the banishment of Catiline; but if his followers and co-conspirators are not exiled with him, the *pestis* will enlarge (1.31).

⁷³ 1.30: *stirps ac semen malorum omnium*. Cf. 1.11.

⁷⁴ Webb (1997) 124 notes that the ancient “imagination” was based on “pre-existing reality” and was therefore bounded by the values and truths accepted by society. An orator could rely on the stability and endurance of this imagination to produce the desired effect on his audience. This idea is comparable to the “common place” (κοινὸς τοπος). Thus, the orator would tailor his appeals to benefit from the shared cultural experiences of his audience.

Cicero bids the traitors to depart: *sit denique inscriptum in fronte unius cuiusque quid de re publica sentiat* (1.32). Let there be written, he says, on the brow (*in fronte*) of every citizen, his resolve to stand against the conspiracy for the sake of the republic. Cicero requests this explicit commitment from the senators, knowing that the citizens will follow their lead. If all Romans openly display what they feel about the republic, the protector of their livelihood, the *pestis* of Catiline and his conspiracy will not prevail. With this final entreaty, Cicero unites himself with the senators against the Catilinarian threat to Rome.

Though his careful and sustained development of this metaphor, Cicero evokes dreadful images of plague and death—which, by association, drench the conspirators in Roman blood. Cicero admonishes the senators for their inaction in the impending crisis, chiding them for neglecting the safety of their fellow citizens *propter invidiam aut alicuius periculi metum* (“because of unpopularity or some fear of danger,” 1.28). He reminds them of the result, envisioning *cum bello vastabitur Italia, vexabuntur urbes, tecta ardebunt* (“when Italy is ravaged by war, her cities are destroyed, and her buildings are aflame,” 1.29). Rather than speculate about the danger that Catiline may bring to the city, he imagines a future in which the devastation is evident. He reminds them to consider the damage that will also be done to their reputations, which will burn in a fire of unpopularity (*invidiae*) if they fail to act on Cicero’s warnings.⁷⁵

Cicero, at the time of his first speech, did not know exactly how many supporters Catiline had among the crowd. Much of his rhetoric was meant to blacken his enemy’s reputation, but would also effectively distinguish the good men from the bad.⁷⁶ To this end, Cicero asks for Catiline’s departure, hoping this will rid the city of the “deadly sewage” (*perniciosa sentina*,

⁷⁵ 1.29: . . . *te non existimas invidiae incendio conflagraturum?*

⁷⁶ Konstan (1993) 13: “Who counts among the *boni*—is what he must decide . . . and also bring about the majority he desires” by his rhetoric.

1.12). We will examine in the next chapter how Cicero expands upon this metaphor to paint a horrific picture of Rome exposed to the plague of Catiline and his cronies.



Figure 1. Painting by Cesare Maccari (1840-1919), *Cicero Denounces Catiline*.

CHAPTER 3
A RAVAGED *RES PUBLICA*

Res Publica at Risk

On November 8th, 63 BC, Cicero delivered his *First Catilinarian* before the Senate, precipitating Catiline's departure from Rome. In his *Second Catilinarian*, delivered to the people on the following day, Cicero triumphantly announces the news of Catiline's hasty departure and calls for the subsequent cleansing of the city from the "bilge water" (*sentinam*, 2.7) of his accomplices. Through Cicero's protracted vilification of Catiline and his companions, the orator had effectively convinced his listeners of Catiline's depravity. Now that the enemy leader has taken leave of the city, he stands convicted by his action of complicity in the conspiracy. But the danger has not yet been averted, only delayed; Catiline left in his wake many criminal partners, who remained in the city, awaiting his directives. Accordingly, Cicero proceeds to the second phase of his argumentation: namely, to convince Rome and all her citizens that a dire crisis is at hand—by the hand of Catiline and his agents.

To this end, Cicero devotes himself to illustrating the mass destruction of which the enemy is yet capable. By displaying a war-torn, waste-laid, fire-ravaged Rome to the imagination of his listeners—a predictive technique that the *Auctor ad Herennium* calls *descriptio*—he arouses within them strong feelings of anger (*indignatio*) and pity (*miser cordia*).⁷⁷ This stirring up of the emotions, or *pathos*, relies heavily on sensory imagery and proves, as Cicero discusses at length in his *De Oratore*,⁷⁸ to be a powerful means of persuasion. Thus he aims to convince all that Catiline's conspiracy, though its leader is now outside the city walls, still subjects Rome to grave risk.

⁷⁷ *Rhet. Her.* 4.51. See also Webb (1997) 120.

⁷⁸ *De Orat.* 2.114-15; 121; 128-29; 176; 179-81; 185-211. Despite such a protracted discussion, Cicero actually manages to avoid the term *pathos*. See May and Wisse (2001) 34-35.

Quintilian offers several examples of how this vivid illustration (similar to *descriptio* above, but he uses the terms *enargeia* and *repraesentatio*) renders the facts *exprimi et oculis mentis ostendi* (“to be portrayed and displayed to the eyes of the mind”).⁷⁹ He notes in particular how an orator may augment the sympathies of his audience by recounting the sack of a city.⁸⁰ It is not enough, he suggests, for the speaker merely to report that a city had been stormed; in order to “penetrate the emotions” of the hearer, he must conjure up in detail all the horrifying sights and sounds of the pillage, from the flames seen pouring from the houses and temples to the wailing cries of women and children.⁸¹ This is the precisely the strategy that Cicero employs in his *Catilinarians*. By constructing potentiality (what might be) with all the vividness of reality (what is), he transports his audience to a Rome where Catiline’s conspiracy has most disastrously prevailed. In concert, these four speeches reflect “one continuous effort” by Cicero to stir up *indignatio* and arouse *odium* within his audience.⁸²

Cicero’s speeches to the people (*Catil.* 2 and 3) show how greatly he depended on “stressing the immediate risk” to themselves, their families, and livelihoods.⁸³ He appeals first to their anxieties by making the most of rumors and reports that were circulating at the time, much of which had probably originated from claims made in the *First Catilinarian*.⁸⁴ This strategy serves him well in the beginning when he discourses on the reputed immorality of his enemies

⁷⁹ *Inst.* 8.3.62

⁸⁰ *Inst.* 8.3.67: *Sic et urbium captarum crescit miseratio.*

⁸¹ *Inst.* 8.3.67-8: *in adfectus...penetrat.*

⁸² Solmsen (1968) 226,7

⁸³ Fantham (1997) 114.

⁸⁴ Cicero clearly had insufficient proof at the time of the first speech; despite his “confident assertions,” it was a “case of suspicion only” and his reports must be regarded in that light. Hardy (1924) 67.

and the manifold dangers of the conspiracy; but, by the end of his second speech, he is left “long on bravado and obloquy, [yet] short on evidence.”⁸⁵

To remedy this problem, Cicero emerges for his third speech with evidence conspicuously in hand. Displaying his presentation of visible and incontrovertible proof to the senate, he makes a powerful appeal to reason by substantiating his allegations against the conspirators—all the while reminding his audience of *what might have been*, had he not perceived the danger. Through these efforts, Cicero hoped to arouse the passionate emotions and fears of the Roman citizens, ultimately persuading them to seek due vengeance upon the enemies of the republic.

Rumor and Report

In *Pro Milone* 64, Cicero responds to rumors that had circulated regarding his client’s alleged stockpiling of munitions for the destruction of Rome. It was reported (likely by Milo’s enemy P. Clodius Pulcher) that these were even floated down the Tiber to Milo’s villa at Oriculum in preparation for his firing of the city. Such rumors had a “welcome, if fearful audience”; furthermore, in relating this anecdote, Cicero shows how Clodius used rumor to his advantage to play upon the fears of the people and “galvanize support for his own violent methods.”⁸⁶

Cicero’s comments regarding these rumors and their adverse effect on his client’s reputation are not at all surprising. As a public figure, Cicero was frequently the subject of malicious talk and was well aware of the damage that rumor could do to one’s public image. It was therefore indispensable for an orator to acquire successful methods for managing the flames

⁸⁵ Gruen (1974) 280. This quotation is also referenced by MacKendrick (1995) 62.

⁸⁶ Laurence (1994) 71.

of public gossip. Cicero's contemporary, the *Auctor ad Herennium* (whom some have believed to be Cicero himself), outlines several techniques that an orator might employ for alternately bolstering and debunking *rumores* to his benefit.⁸⁷

Because of its potential for malleability, rumor could hardly be trusted, especially when broadcast from the lips of a practiced speaker. One characteristic of rumor that lessened its believability was its tendency to evolve over time. Since political knowledge in Cicero's day spread largely by word of mouth, a report was often susceptible to revision and permutation. Indeed, as information was communicated among friends, it was "interpreted and speculated about," thus altering what would be passed on to the next hearer.⁸⁸ In addition to what would be lost due to failure of memory, it is estimated that only 40% of the original information would be reliably passed on after 4 interchanges.⁸⁹ Yet another interesting phenomenon concerns how speculation became part of the oral tradition. As news passed from one person to the next, any missing details would be reconstructed according to the teller's inclination. As a result, the details of a report tended to become "more interesting" as the information became less reliable.⁹⁰

Cicero cites a number of rumors and reports to his advantage in the *Catilinarians*. He concentrates initially on Catiline's schemes of the recent past, looking to the rumored "first conspiracy" as a precedent that validates his fears about a new plot against the government.⁹¹ He sprinkles other rumors throughout the speeches as well, reporting on Catiline's collusion with slaves, while envisioning mass slaughter, raging fires, and looting throughout the city. Once

⁸⁷ *Rhet. Her.* 2.8

⁸⁸ Laurence (1994) 63.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*

⁹¹ See Chapter 1, n. 37 for a list of scholars who have commented on the "confused business" known as the first Catilinarian conspiracy. Quotation is from Everitt (2003) 90.

delivered to the crowd, Cicero's reports likely evolved—as hearsay has been shown to do—thus making Cicero the author and beneficiary of a self-sustaining rumor mill. His objective, in stimulating this process, was to cultivate the anxieties and fears of the people, and eventually harvest their loyalty in the impending danger.

Failed Plots

In his first speech, Cicero repeatedly asserts that Catiline is a murderer, posing a continuous threat to anyone who interferes with his ambitions. Cicero accuses him of plotting the deaths of those in the senate assembly (1.2), and then details all of Catiline's nefarious plots of times past. He recollects Catiline's plans for a massacre on October 27th, plans that were postponed and then thwarted (1.7-8); he accuses him of slaughtering his former wife and son (1.14);⁹² and he attributes the deaths of many citizens (a reference to Catiline's role in the Sullan proscriptions)⁹³ to him as well (1.18).

Cicero also recounts the times when, as consul-designate in 64, he had to defend himself against Catiline's treachery through his own personal vigilance.⁹⁴ Additionally, he recalls the consular elections of July 63, reminding the audience that Catiline had intended to strike him and others down on that occasion (1.11). In all likelihood, Cicero hoped his allusion to the elections would conjure up a vivid image of his appearance before the crowd that day—resplendent in consular white, with the flash of a metal breastplate poorly concealed beneath his toga.⁹⁵ He admitted later that his attire had been selected more for its effect on the citizens than for his own

⁹² Cicero's reference here to the son's murder is veiled. Sallust clearly connects this crime to Catiline in *Cat.* 15.2.

⁹³ MacDonald (1977) 50 n. a.

⁹⁴ *Catil.* 1.11: *privata diligentia defendi*.

⁹⁵ Eagle (1946) 25. Cf. Stockton (1971) 100; Phillips (1976) 442; Everitt (2003) 100.

safety; and indeed, when the crowd beheld their consul armed in fear and danger, they rushed to his aid, just as he had anticipated.⁹⁶

Cicero claims, too, that Catiline had planned to kill the consuls and other prominent men on the 29th of December 66 (1.15)—a coup frequently referred to as the first Catilinarian conspiracy. He repeats this account in other speeches, adding new details concerning Catiline’s intention to massacre the Senate that day,⁹⁷ and his intent to seize the consulship by force.⁹⁸ Though the tradition of this supposed conspiracy is “hopelessly muddled,”⁹⁹ it is clear from Catiline’s regular appearances in court and his defeated campaigns for consular office that he was not a favorite of Roman voters.¹⁰⁰

These reports of Catiline’s violent past, if true, attest to his capacity for violence in the future. Even if untrue, they still implanted violent images and impressions in the minds of political men who had experienced firsthand the personal scrutiny and exposure of living in the public eye. It is precisely this *potentiality*, or the mere suggestion of it, that enables Cicero to capitalize on his enemy’s dark reputation; accordingly, he has depicted Catiline with knife in hand, menacingly poised to strike his opponents—just as he intends to wound his next victim, Rome.

⁹⁶ Cic. *Mur.* 52: *ut omnes boni animadverterent et, cum in metu et periculo consulem viderent, id quod est factum, ad opem praesidiumque concurrerent.*

⁹⁷ Cic. *Mur.* 81

⁹⁸ Cic. *Sul.* 67-8. Cf. Sall. *Cat.* 18.5.

⁹⁹ Gruen (1969) 21.

¹⁰⁰ He was indicted in 65 for extortion and in 63 for crimes during the Sullan proscriptions, though acquitted of the charges in both cases. He was disqualified from candidacy in the consular elections for 65, legally ineligible for 64 (he was still dealing with court proceedings following his indictment for extortion), and defeated in election for 63 and 62—thanks largely in part to Cicero’s invective. See MacDonald’s introduction (1977) 2- 6.

Slaves and Gladiators

Additional strong evidence of Catiline's intent to overthrow the government stems from the report (promulgated by Cicero) that fugitive slaves had joined Catiline's camp.¹⁰¹ As discussed in the previous chapter, the threat of a slave insurrection struck terror into the hearts of Roman citizens, whose recollection of Spartacus' revolt of the previous decade was still fresh. Though Cicero refers to slaves only once in his first speech, characterizing Catiline as an *evocatorem servorum*, or "recruiter of slaves" (1.27), in his second speech to the people, Cicero employs the slave motif with a bit more drama, emphasizing Catiline's intimate dealings with *gladiatores* (2.7,9), slaves whose very name identifies them as "the ones brandishing swords."¹⁰² He readily envisions the *gladiator* and *fugitivus* plundering wealthy estates (2.19). He even foresees the days of battle, when gladiators contend with consuls and generals in hand-to-hand combat (2.24), though he assures the crowd later that Roman forces would subdue this most formidable group (2.26).

Cicero's aim, in pointing to the dangerous accumulation of slaves in Catiline's camp was, as Yavetz concludes,

. . . [to] support . . . his propaganda: conflagration, burglary and the release of slaves were all of the same cloth. It was difficult to control freed slaves in their fight against Roman citizens, and this is the reason why Cicero's warnings bore fruit."¹⁰³

By giving credence to the reports of slave involvement in Catiline's conspiracy, Cicero reinforces his claims about the destruction that would befall the city. Fires and robberies, in the mindset of most Romans, were the casualties to be expected when slaves roamed at large; thus

¹⁰¹ Yavetz (1963) 493, however, treats the report as fact. Refer to Chapter 2, n. 22 for my summary on this topic.

¹⁰² And, of course, Spartacus and his first followers were gladiators—a historical precedent that would have made Cicero's image even more terrifying to Cicero's audience.

¹⁰³ Yavetz (1963) 495.

slaves and ruin shared a common thread within “the same cloth.” Cicero therefore inserts numerous references to these and other dangers when stressing to his audience the far-reaching devastation of Catiline’s conspiracy.

Slaughter, Arson, and Looting

Cicero’s earliest warnings concern the slaughter of citizens (*caede* in 1.2, 3, 6, 7, 16, 24, 2.6, 7, 10; *necem* in 1.24) and figuratively, the murder of the fatherland (*parricidium* in 1.17, 33). These violent crimes loom in the minds of the audience; but they quickly assume the more menacing silhouette of a knife as Cicero individualizes the mass slaughter—some will die by *tela* (1.2, 15) or *ferrum* (1.13, 2.1, 2); others by *sica* (1.16, 2.1), *gladius* (1.32), or *mucro* (2.2); and yet others will fall by *arma* (2.13, 14, 15). In naming specific weapons, the orator uses metonymy to animate their shared function in the conspiracy: to kill. In similar fashion, he employs synecdoche to describe the particular talents of those who will bear the weapons. There are those who specialize in parricide and treason (*parricidas*, 2.22); those skilled in assassination and murder (*sicarios*, 2.22); those who will take up the arms of soldiers (*armati*, 1.24); and, of course, those trained in the gladiatorial schools (*gladiatores*, 2.7, 9, 24, 26).

Cicero warns too of fires that will ravage the city. In almost every instance, he invokes this image in conjunction with slaughter, as in *caed atque incendium*, which occurs four times (1.3, 6, 2.6, 10—though the terms *caedis* and *incendium* are mentioned twice in 2.10). The only reference to *incendium* in the city without any direct mention of slaughter is in 1.9, when Cicero discloses the plans made by Catiline and the other conspirators at the house of Marcus Laeca. At that meeting, Cicero reveals, Catiline distributed tasks, allocated the regions of Italy, and assigned parts of the city for burning. The *incendium* in this passage, mentioned singly, implies

that arson was a concerted effort in itself, and not merely a by-product of the plans for slaughter.¹⁰⁴

Cicero focuses not only on the *act* of arson, but also on the *action* of it. Just as he had specified the various implements to be used in murdering, Cicero considers the instruments that will carry fire throughout the city. These tools of conflagration include torches (*faces*; 1.13, 32) and burning arrows (*maleolos*, 1.32), both of which are listed secondly, as accompaniments to weapons of slaughter. Cicero then brings the burning closer, prompting his audience to imagine the heat of the flames. In his appeal to the people (2.1), he reports that Catiline had threatened *ferro flammaque* as he took leave from the city.¹⁰⁵ This metaphor offers the audience a close-up view of sword and flame that places them in the midst of attack, where they can see the sharpness of the blade and feel the ferocity of the blaze. This scene, Cicero recalls, should hardly be a surprise since Catiline was known to supply readily the *ferrum aut...facem* to each one of his entranced and impassioned disciples (1.13).

With his singeing rhetoric, Cicero sets Rome aflame. He uses the future tense verb *ardebunt* (1.29) and the future participle *inflammanda* (1.32), to vivify the flames hungrily consuming the buildings and the city. He does not, however, suspend the horror of the scene for long. Every fire eventually dies; thus he invites his audience to glimpse even further into the future and witness for themselves the charred aftermath. He envisions the remains of Rome with her homes and people destroyed as evidenced *in cinere urbis et in sanguine civium* (“in the ashes of the city and in the blood of its citizens,” 2.19).

¹⁰⁴ The fear of *incendium* was great and well justified in a city that lacked a fire department and fire suppression technology.

¹⁰⁵ In this example, Cicero is blending metonymy and synecdoche. First of all, the iron and the flame are parts representing a larger whole, the sword and the fire; this is a function of synecdoche. Second, Cicero is substituting these images for their associated uses—as tools to kill and destroy—which is a function of metonymy. Cf. *ferrum aut...facem* in 1.13.

Looting and burglaries throughout the city comprise yet another series of ruinous images that Cicero parades before the crowd as vividly as if fact. He forecasts that, amid the havoc, thieves (*latrones*; 1.33, 2.7)—under the command of that chief of bandits, Catiline (2.24)—will descend upon the state to ransack the residences and public places of Rome. Pillagers and plunderers (*praedatores* and *direptores*, 2.19) will swarm to the melee, pillaging the city (*latrocinium*; 1.23, 27, 31), and perhaps even the city’s women (*rapina*, 2.10).¹⁰⁶ With or without the conspiracy, Catiline will not be derailed; for, who can stop a man who prefers death in the pursuit of brigandage (*latrocinantem*, 2.16), to a life spent in exile? Cicero’s use of the present active participle emphasizes how unceasingly Catiline’s fatalistic obsession with banditry has dominated his life. Despite living outside the city walls, it seems that Catiline is still fantasizing and contriving plans to gratify his unrelenting lust for Rome’s despoilment and downfall.

In appraising Cicero’s second speech, Stockton maintains that, “murder, plunder, rape, [and] the burning of Rome are dangled before the audience’s eyes to terrify them.”¹⁰⁷ Clearly, the profuse number of references in the text to these specific perils is evidence in support of his assessment. Moreover, many of Cicero’s images appear stereotyped,¹⁰⁸ which suggests that Cicero was cognizant of various rumors circulating at the time and realized how to exploit them

¹⁰⁶ *Rapina* is an ambiguous term. Though commonly translated as “plunder” in this passage, “rape” is also an appropriate, and in this context, relevant, translation. Rape has a long history as a weapon in times of war. In her study of war-rape crimes in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Croatia during the early 1990’s, Olujic (1998) 39 notes the psychological impact of rape on an entire society, how it “constitutes a physical and moral attack against women, as well as an attack by humiliation and dishonor on the husbands, brothers, fathers, and sons of the victims.” She continues, “In war individual bodies become metaphoric representatives of the social body”; thus, the raping of that body symbolizes the raping of the individual’s family, and more significantly, the society as a whole.

¹⁰⁷ Stockton (1971) 120).

¹⁰⁸ Seager (1973) 242 proposes that the orator’s stereotyped “tales of arson and murder in the city, of peasant uprisings and slave revolts up and down Italy” are to be expected of one inventing a conspiracy. While an intriguing perspective, his conclusion is difficult to defend.

as evidence for Catiline's conspiracy. He understood fear's motivating force—in the case of the senators, most feared for the security of their possessions more than the well being of the republic.¹⁰⁹ It seems too that in “reducing revolution to incendiarism,” Cicero was appealing directly to the practical fears of the people.¹¹⁰ Correspondingly, he commences his address to the people in 2.1 with the declaration, *non in campo, non in foro, non in curia, non denique intra domesticos parietes pertimescemus* (“neither in the Campus Martius, nor Forum, nor Senate, nor indeed even within the walls of our own homes, shall we tremble”)—a sentiment which, for its suggestiveness, serves to alert fear rather than allay it. Throughout the course of this speech, Cicero, in the guise of protector and comforter to the people, inspires their fear by informing it.

Although images of ruination abound in both the first and second speeches, Cicero has yet to provide substantial proof of these dangers. For a “dozen murderous attempts, and several cases of attempted arson,” Waters points out, “we do not hear of one house burned down, not one consular killed or even wounded.”¹¹¹ History does not in fact confirm whether any of Catiline's deadly schemes ever came to fruition—only that they were obstructed and publicized, by Cicero. As Waters indicates, we simply lack evidence beyond Cicero's eager postulations that these events *might* occur. In the next section, we will see how Cicero procured enough seeming proof to convince his audience that Catiline's rumored conspiracy was an ominous reality.

Evidence in Hand

If Cicero was to prevent his attack on Catiline from being interpreted as only conspiracy theory, he needed to present compelling hard evidence. Prior to his delivery of the *Third Catilinarian*, the only ostensible evidence that Cicero could point to in support of his conspiracy

¹⁰⁹ Cape (1995) 263.

¹¹⁰ Konstan (1993) 25.

¹¹¹ Waters (1970) 196.

theory was the fact of Catiline's hasty departure from Rome after Cicero's censure of him in the senate (2.1, 6), which had delayed the conspirators' plans. In his view, the preservation of the status quo within the city—i.e., the continued safety of Rome and her citizens—further confirmed that all had indeed been saved from ruin when Catiline left (2.2). However, Cicero did not believe that this security would last. Within a few days' time of his second speech, he expected to hear the report that Catiline was marching at the head of an enemy army (2.14-5). In addition, he knew that many of Catiline's accomplices still remained in the city, men whose traitorous association continually threatened the public safety (2.4, 6).

In less than a month, Cicero arranged and executed a plan to flush some of these enemies out of hiding. His efforts were fruitful, resulting in the arrest and confession of a number of prominent men on the 2nd and 3rd of December. Triumphantly, Cicero announces this news to the people on December 3rd in his third speech, avidly detailing the success of his sting operation and the subsequent hearing before the senate in which letters, seals, confessions, and guilty expressions convicted these men of conspiring with Catiline to make war against the Roman republic.

Cicero opens loftily with the words *Rem publicam*, which he then defines in terms that people value—their lives, properties and possessions, wives, children, and the city, the very heart of the empire (3.1). Right away, these domestic comforts are juxtaposed with the imagery of *flamma atque ferro*, as Cicero informs the audience that on that very day the republic had been *ereptam...conservatam...restitutam* (“snatched,” “preserved,” and “restored”) from the destruction of “fire and sword.” Vasaly notes how Cicero's “suspension” of the verb *videtis* (“as you see”) to the end of the sentence is significant, given its meaning in the context of the speech, since “throughout the oration as a whole, Cicero continually emphasizes the importance of the

visual and perceptible.” In essence, Cicero is here laying out the theme and “avowed purpose” of the *Third Catilinarian*: “to inform the people of the incontrovertible evidence that had at long last been secured,”¹¹² which they could now see with their own eyes (*cum oculis*, 3.4).

Cicero wastes little time leading into his account of how the plots came to be “detected, revealed, and displayed” (*comperta, patefacta, inlustrata*; 3.3). When he discovered that Publius Lentulus had talked with the envoys of the Allobroges in an attempt to involve them in the conspiracy, Cicero knew that his opportunity to share the “full disclosure” of events was within grasp (*manifesto*; 3.5). He staged an ambush for the night of December 2nd, sending the praetors Lucius Flaccus and Gaius Pomptinus with a contingent of armed men to intercept the Allobrogian envoys, who were accompanied by Titus Volturcius, at the Mulvian Bridge (3.5). Cicero anticipated that they would have in their possession a letter for Catiline—a presupposition that was quickly verified when the ambush was conducted without incident around 3 a.m. the next morning (3.6).

Not merely one, but in fact several letters were handed over to the praetors “with their seals intact” (*integris signis*). From the moment of their seizure, Cicero handles these letters with utmost delicacy, careful not to invalidate the contents with even the slightest suggestion of their being compromised. To this end, he shares how the letters were delivered to his home early that morning and, once news of the ambush had spread, many distinguished citizens gathered in his home to see the evidence for themselves; but he refused to open the letters at their urging (3.7). Despite their concern that he might embarrass himself if the contents prove benign, Cicero expressed confidence in his own intuition, choosing to subject himself to charges of excessive zeal rather than risk disqualifying the evidence by tampering with it.

¹¹² Vasaly (1993) 75-76.

Having at long last a group of culprits in custody after the ambush, Cicero did not delay in revealing the identities of the men whom he suspected of covert involvement in the conspiracy—namely, Gabinius, Statilius, Cethegus, and Lentulus (3.6). He summoned these four men and called directly for a meeting of the senate—an action he affirms that many in his audience had witnessed (*ut vidistis*, 3.6-7). In the interim, he sent another praetor, Gaius Sulpicius, to conduct a search of Cethegus’ house, following a tip from the Allobroges (3.8). Cicero also notes how easily the reported stockpile of deadly weapons, consisting of *sicae* and *gladii* (“daggers” and “swords”), was recovered from Cethegus’ residence.

Cicero then transports his audience to the senate meeting where, according to his account, Volturcius was the first to testify (3.8). Under duress, but doubtless encouraged by a guarantee of immunity, Volturcius implicated Lentulus in the conspiracy, claiming that Lentulus had given him instructions and sent him with a letter (*litteras*) for Catiline. Cicero obviously paraphrases his testimony,¹¹³ highlighting certain details—Catiline’s anticipated use of slaves in his march against Rome (*servorum praesidio uteretur*), and his plans for fire and slaughter throughout the city (*incendissent caedemque...fecissent*)—that correspond to the rumored tales he had portrayed as inevitable fact. Furthermore, these plans had been *descriptum* (“apportioned,” or more literally, “written down”), by which Cicero means “to conjure in the minds of his listeners the specter of a written plan, perhaps even a map.”¹¹⁴ His allusion to this yet undisclosed document outlining the destruction of the city evokes a visual image that lends additional weight to his case.

¹¹³ Butler (2002) 95.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*

The envoys of the Allobroges were brought in next for their testimony (3.9). They acknowledged the receipt of three letters addressed to their people, given to them by Lentulus, Cethegus, and Statilius. In addition, they divulged information about the request made by these men (and Lucius Cassius) that the Allobroges send cavalry forces into Italy as soon as possible, to join with the infantry already there. Lentulus had even attempted to persuade them, they admitted, with prophetic pronouncements concerning the destruction (*interitum*) of the city and empire; these events, he proclaimed, would coincide with his fated rise as the third Cornelius, after Cinna and Sulla. In replaying this imagery, as well as the now clichéd references to slaughter and arson in 3.10 (*caedem fieri atque urbem incendi*), where Cethegus is said to have argued with the other conspirators on the timing of their revolt, Cicero reiterates to the audience how great a devastation had threatened the city.

After this testimony, Cicero ordered the letters to be brought forth and read aloud to each of the accused in turn (3.10). During the process, Cicero repeatedly underscores the physical evidence against the four men he had indicted. He called for Cethegus first, who identified his seal (*signum*) on the letter; Cicero then cut the string (*incidimus*) and read the letter (*legimus*) to the senate. In revisiting this critical moment, Cicero uses plural first-person verbs to indicate that these actions were collectively done, thereby reaffirming that he had not opened or read the contents of the letter prior to the senate meeting. The letter, he determined, was written *ipsius manu* (by Cethegus' "own hand"); furthermore, while it was read, he observed Cethegus exhibiting certain *signa conscientiae*:¹¹⁵ weakness in the knees (*debilitates*), downcast countenance (*abiectus*), and protracted silence (*conticuit*)—all indicators of a guilty conscience.

¹¹⁵ *Rhet. Her. 2.8: Accusator dicet, si poterit, adversarium, cum ad eum ventum sit, eribuisse, expalluisse, titubasse, inconstanter locutum esse, concidisse, pollicitum esse aliquid; quae signa conscientiae sint.* Cf. *Cic. Inv. 1.48 and Part. 114.*

Cicero shifted his attention next to Statilius (3.10). Again, Cicero presented a letter, soliciting his identification of its seal (*signum*) and handwriting (*manum suam*). Statilius, he reports, readily acknowledged the marks as his own and, after the letter was read aloud, conceded to authoring it (*confessus est*). Likewise Lentulus, when shown his letter, admitted its seal (*signum*) to be his own; however, once the letter was read aloud (3.11), he struggled against the implication of his guilt. Only when all the evidence had been produced and read out (*toto iam indicio exposito atque edito*), and Lentulus recognized that Volturcius and the Allobroges had unequivocally betrayed him, did the “force of conscience” (*conscientiae vis*) finally compel him to confess.

Just then, Volturcius demanded that the letter Lentulus gave him for Catiline be brought forth and opened before them all (3.12). In obvious distress (*vehementissime perturbatus*), Lentulus again acknowledged his seal and handwriting (*signum et manum suam*) when shown the letter, even though he had composed it anonymously (*sine nomine*). The contents therein were brief but incriminating, furnishing Cicero with his most damning evidence on record, the conspiratorial word, which he quotes verbatim to the crowd. In that letter, as Butler concludes, “the conspiracy’s final, irrevocable undoing arguably comes from a single guarded phrase . . . *etiam infimorum*, the suggestion that Catiline should make use ‘even of the lowliest members of society,’ presumably slaves.”¹¹⁶ Just as before, Cicero makes the most of the “horror stories” surrounding the conspirator’s plans;¹¹⁷ in so doing, he provokes fear and leaves the people with a lasting impression of the disasters which they had fortuitously escaped.

¹¹⁶ Butler (2002) 90.

¹¹⁷ Everitt (2003) 107.

Having thus itemized his store of evidence against the conspirators, it seems almost superfluous for Cicero to mention Gabinius and his confession (3.12). However, with the weight of evidence resting firmly in Cicero's favor, it still benefits him to relate his success in extracting every confession, as this further bolsters his credibility; for none could argue against his claims in the face of such blatant proofs, and all would agree that his judgment had been correct from the beginning. So, Cicero took great care to display the evidence: he did not open the letters, but rather gave them to the senate with unbroken seals (3.7); he commissioned four senators to make a transcript of the senate proceedings, which he distributed over all Italy;¹¹⁸ and he delivered all the details to the people in his *Third Catilinarian*, demonstrating his conviction (in 3.3) that the conspiracy should be exposed "to the fullest possible extent."¹¹⁹

Gabinius' confession, then, is a fitting conclusion to Cicero's version of events that had unfolded at the senate house; figuratively, it is the last page of his record book. In 3.13, he overviews the evidence, and appends the following epilogue:

Ac mihi quidem, Quirites, cum illa certissima visa sunt argumenta atque indicia sceleris, tabellae, signa, manus, denique unius cuiusque confessio tum multo certiora illa, color, oculi, voltus, taciturnitas. Sic enim obstupuerant, sic terram intuebantur, sic furtim non numquam inter sese aspiciebant ut non iam ab aliis indicari sed indicare se ipsi viderentur.

Cicero had exhibited sufficient and convincing proofs—the testimonies of witnesses, the letters (*tabellae*), seals (*signa*), handwriting (*manus*), and confessions of the conspirators (*unius cuiusque confessio*); but these were not the only testaments to the men's guilt. As the interrogation progressed, it was the demeanor of the accused—their pallor (*color*), eyes (*oculi*), expressions (*voltus*), and growing silence (*taciturnitas*)—that virtually underlined their

¹¹⁸ Cic. *Sul.* 41-3.

¹¹⁹ Mitchell (1979) 237.

culpability.”¹²⁰ By relaying these visual details of the scene in his speech, Cicero stresses the import of *signa conscientiae* while offering his listeners a vicarious glimpse of the conspirators, shamefaced and confronted with their crimes.

From a tactical perspective, it is likely that Cicero exaggerated the “directness with which the conspiracy had been revealed by the confiscated letters.”¹²¹ As mediator to the people, he had to abridge what had taken hours to unfold, in essence simplifying the evidence “for the crowd’s consumption.”¹²² Contrary to what some have suggested, there is really no reason to believe that he was purposely falsifying evidence, since many could have exposed him if that were the case—but none did.¹²³

Cicero’s major objective, in his addresses to the people, was to impress upon their minds the “indelible image of the city as it might have been,” had Catiline succeeded in his conspiracy.¹²⁴ Initially, Cicero had to rely on rumors and reports of the conspirator’s plans in order to help his audience appreciate the “unchanged aspect” of their city in contrast to ruined city he depicts for them.¹²⁵ But within a month of Catiline’s departure from the Rome, Cicero was able to procure the documentary evidence requisite for substantiating his allegations. In the wake of such convincing proof, Cicero’s tales of looting, arson, bloodshed, and slave uprisings that would accompany Catiline’s rise to power assumed much greater influence with the people. In the assessment of Edelman, this effect was easily achieved because:

¹²⁰ Stockton (1971) 129.

¹²¹ Butler (2002) 96.

¹²² Ibid.

¹²³ Phillips (1976) 448. Seager and Waters, in particular, have discussed Cicero’s presumed deception.

¹²⁴ Vasaly (1993) 77.

¹²⁵ Ibid.

. . . the potency of political language does not stem from its descriptions of a “real” world but rather from its reconstructions of the past and its evocation of unobservables in the present and of potentialities in the future, [thus] language usage is strategic. It is always part of a course of action to enable people to live with themselves and with what they do and to marshal support for causes”¹²⁶

Cicero’s language, with its emphasis on what had been seen and what could therefore be foreseen, was vastly effective in convincing the Roman people of the conspiracy’s threat. While his “embroidery” on this theme is undeniably a meshing of the real and the imagined,¹²⁷ he imprinted vivid images of “unobservables” and “potentialities” upon his listeners’ minds in an appeal to *pathos*, that they might be “moved in such a way as to be ruled by some strong emotional impulse rather than by reasoned judgment.”¹²⁸

Persuading Rome of a conspiracy required concentrated effort and a methodically refined rhetoric; but this persuasion was not accomplished by *pathos* alone. As Cicero developed his argument against the conspirators based on the destruction they devised for the city, he was at the same time promoting his own authority, or *ethos*, in accordance with his view that “nothing in oratory . . . is more important than for the orator to be favorably regarded by the audience.”¹²⁹ As we will see in the next chapter, Cicero anticipated their need for guidance in the mounting crisis, and cleverly adapted his rhetoric to recommend himself as Rome’s foremost leader, whose superior vision had exposed the “behind-the-scenes machinations” of the conspiracy to all.¹³⁰

¹²⁶ Edelman (1988) 108.

¹²⁷ Vasaly (1993) 78.

¹²⁸ Cic. *De Orat.* 2.178: *moveatur, ut impeto quodam animi et perturbatione magis quam iudicio aut consilio regatur.* Translation quoted from May and Wisse (2001) 170.

¹²⁹ Ibid: *nihil est enim in dicendo, . . . maius, quam ut faveat oratori is [qui audiet]* Translation is from May and Wisse (2001) 170.

¹³⁰ Butler (2002) 98. Cf. Cic. *Catil.* 1.2; 2.1; 3.2. Cicero expresses similar thoughts in the poem he later wrote about his consulship, *de Consulatu suo* 57-65.

CHAPTER 4 THE CONSUL SEES ALL

Midway through the *Third Catilinarian*, Cicero evokes the memory of Gaius Marius, a “very illustrious man” (*clarissimo viro*, 3.15), whose military accomplishments had garnered popular admiration and the title, “protector of this city” (*custodem huius urbis*, 3.24). Indeed, few Romans could boast the status of a national hero, particularly one celebrated as a “founder” or “preserver” of the state.¹³¹ Cicero’s allusions to Marius, though brief, seem to emphasize the orator’s affinity to this icon. This is especially apparent when one considers how extensively he covers his own personal role in exposing the conspiracy: he credits himself with driving Catiline from the city (3.16, 17), preventing widespread destruction (3.15, 17), apprehending the conspirators (3.5, 6), and eliciting their confessions of guilt (3.10-12). Inevitably, he believed it was his due when the senate decreed a thanksgiving to the gods in his honor.

In reporting this news to the people (3.15), Cicero proudly announces his distinction as the first civilian (*mihi primum...togato*) since the founding of the city to receive this official honor. In a similar vein, he notes how his thanksgiving would be unique from all others in this regard—that it would commemorate the salvation (*conservata*) of the city. Perhaps to lend an air of ceremony to his proclamation, he quotes from the senatorial decree, which designates (and reiterates) the reason for their continued safety: *quod urbem incendiis, caede civis, Italiam bello liberassem* (“because I had delivered the city from fires, the citizens from slaughter, and Italy from war”). While the first-person verb *liberassem* seems suspect in a direct quotation of the senate’s decree, Cicero nevertheless proclaims himself a *liberator*, effectively aligning himself with, in fact, even surpassing, Marius the “protector.”

¹³¹ Bell (1997) 19.

Cicero had first named Marius, his fellow townsman and a *novus homo* consul, in his initial speech before the senate. In 1.4, he recalled two previous times in Rome's history when the senate, in passing the *senatus consultum ultimum*, had acted in the best interest of the state by transferring its power to competent, honorable leaders. Marius, he reminded them, had nobly served as one of those leaders. According to Sallust, Marius had a grave sense of the responsibility placed upon his shoulders, and correspondingly, foresaw the effect it would have on his public image when he declared, "I understand, citizens, that the faces of all have been turned upon me."¹³² To secure the citizens' votes of confidence, he advertised his "manly courage," or *virtus*,¹³³ to them in a rousing speech, in essence making his own self a "political spectacle."¹³⁴

Cicero would strive in like manner to magnify his visibility during the city's conspiratorial scare. However, there was one inherent difference between Cicero and Marius that would make it difficult for him to convince the audience of his own *virtus*. Since Marius was a man of war, his *virtus* was an inarguable fact, evidenced by his "scars of battle"; Cicero, on the other hand, was a man of oratory, whose glory was entirely dependant upon the people's perceptions of—and reactions to—him.¹³⁵ As a *novus homo* and a civilian, Cicero had to rely on audience feedback to substantiate his claim to the *virtus* he so coveted. Consequently, the people held the power to make him "the sort of man he could never be on solely his own merits."¹³⁶

¹³² Sall. *Jug.* 85.5: *Et illud intellego, Quirites, omnium ora in me conuersa esse.*

¹³³ *Virtus* is hard to define. Bell (1997) comments, "In general, *virtus* had no easily articulated essential meaning except that it made Roman men distinctive. It signified the ideal of manliness. And it made men deserving of a reward, particularly in dignity of office." Quotation is found on page 19.

¹³⁴ Bell (1997) 19. Marius' speech is presented in Sall. *Jug.* 85.

¹³⁵ Bell (1997) 19.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*

Cicero therefore endeavored to present himself to his audience in the best possible light. To this end, he projects the persona of one immensely qualified to lead. He reminds them, first of all (in *Catil.* 1), of the superiority of his vision, which enabled him to detect early on the subtle workings of the conspiracy. Then (in *Catil.* 2), he portrays himself as the *imperator togatus* (“general in toga”), ready to combat the enemies of Rome with the weapons of rhetoric. Lastly (in *Catil.* 3), with the conspiracy exposed and the traitors in custody, he receives the laurels for his efforts, glorying in his nomination as savior of the republic. A common theme that emerges in each of these speeches concerns Cicero’s preoccupation with the appearance and validity of his own authority. In leading his listeners to observe, appreciate, and reward his efforts, he aimed to elevate his status and influence in the public arena. Before we examine Cicero’s self-depictions, let us first consider the importance of *ethos*, the method by which the orator, in advertising his character, increases the persuasive effect of his oratory.

The Importance of *Ethos*

In *De Oratore* 2.115, Cicero outlines three means of persuasion available to the orator: (1) arguing with logic; (2) inspiring the audience’s goodwill; and (3) appealing to emotion.¹³⁷ These methods are also referred to respectively as *logos*, *ethos*, and *pathos*, though Cicero avoids using these specific terms.¹³⁸ We have already seen numerous examples of *pathos* in the *Catilinarians*; in the last chapter, we analyzed how Cicero employed it in his description of the city ravaged by fire and sword. Moreover, in chapter 2, we explored how Cicero appealed to *pathos* in his vivid portrayal of Catiline, his friends, and their depravity, so as to foment the audience’s animosity toward them. Cicero’s tactic here is not entirely pathetic, however; in

¹³⁷ *Ita omnis ratio dicendi tribus ad persuadendum rebus est nixa: ut probemus vera esse, quae defendimus; ut conciliemus eos nobis, qui audiunt; ut animos eorum, ad quemcumque causa postulabit motum, vocemus.*

¹³⁸ The terms derive from Aristotle. See Corbett (1965) 50; May and Wisse (2001) 30, 34.

devoting his attention to the negative aspects of Catiline's character, he is in fact basing his argument on ethical considerations.¹³⁹ This, therefore, may perhaps be regarded as an instance when *pathos* is "fueled" by *ethos*.¹⁴⁰

At first, such an example may not seem entirely consistent with Cicero's definition of *ethos* in the *De Oratore* as referred to above. He presents an *ethos* that esteems the speaker or those for whom he pleads (*commendationem habet nostram aut eorum, quos defendimus*, 2.114), wins the favor of the audience (*ut conciliemus eos nobis, qui audiunt*, 2.115), and must, by recommending his integrity, support his image as a good man (*probitatis commendatione boni viri debet speciem tueri*, 2.211). In short, his *ethos* seems primarily concerned with the character of the orator. If, however, one considers the fuller explication of *ethos* that Cicero provides in 2.182-4, it becomes clear that *ethos* relies dually upon convincing the audience of one's own good qualities, while at the same time ascribing "opposite qualities to [one's] opponents."¹⁴¹ It is in this debasement of one's enemies that the ethical can be said to "bleed" into the pathological.

Cicero anticipated that this blending of *ethos* and *pathos* would occur in the ideal, finely orchestrated speech. In 2.310, he speaks about the proper balance of the three persuasive elements within an oration and the relationship that each should have to the others:

. . . una ex tribus his rebus res prae nobis est ferenda, ut nihil aliud nisi docere velle videamur; reliquae duae, sicuti sanguis in corporibus, sic illae in perpetuis orationibus fusae esse debebunt;

¹³⁹ May and Wisse (2001) 34 n. 42 note the difference between the Greek word *ethos* (ἦθος), meaning "character," and the modern term "ethos," which usually applies in a more restrictive sense to the method of persuasion "consisting in a *positive* portrayal of *the speaker's* character." Cicero's *ethos*, as a rhetorical conceit, seems to fit neither the broad scope of the former, nor the narrow designation of the latter. What the particular nature of his *ethos* is will be considered presently.

¹⁴⁰ Barber (2004) 42. She argues similarly for the collaboration of *pathos* and *ethos* in Cicero's depiction of Marius in *Pro Balbo*.

¹⁴¹ *De. Orat.* 2.182: *...eaeque omnia, quae proborum, demissorum, non acrium, non pertinacium, non litigiosorum, non acerborum sunt, valde benevolentiam conciliant abalienantque ab eis, in quibus haec non sunt; itaque eademsunt in adversarios ex contrario conferenda.* Translation adopted from May and Wisse (2001) 171.

Logos should be displayed openly, appearing only to instruct, he says; *pathos* and *ethos*, meanwhile, ought to flow throughout the entire speech just as blood courses through the body. Schick puts the relationship another way, suggesting that, “logical appeal should be the basis, or the warp, of the oration, while the ethical and pathetic are interwoven as the woof.”¹⁴²

Additionally, in their own ways both *ethos* and *pathos* stir the emotions.¹⁴³ The types and degrees of emotion elicited vary with either means of persuasion, and are thus dependent upon the orator’s manner of speaking. In 2.211-2, Cicero characterizes the ethical tone as *lenis* (“gentle”) and *summissa* (“moderate”), which, through its show of calmness and reflection,¹⁴⁴ encourages the audience to feel respect and admiration for the speaker. The pathetic tone, on the other hand, is *intenta* (“intense”) and *vehemens* (“vehement”), provoking a more energetic, and radical emotional response from the audience. Despite this difference, Cicero concedes that these two kinds of speaking possess a certain similarity that makes distinguishing between them at times very difficult:

Nam et ex illa lenitate, qua conciliamur eis, qui audiunt, ad hanc vim acerrimam, qua eosdem excitamus, influat oportet aliquid, et ex hac vi non numquam animi aliquid inflandum est illi lenitate; neque est ulla temperatior oratio quam illa (2.212)

The well-seasoned oration, he believes, embraces an *ethos* that integrates seamlessly with *pathos*: it imparts a measure of gentleness to impassioned speech, lends animation to soft words, and imbues the entire discourse with persuasive power. Ideally, the oration should be organic, with each of these elements complementing and enhancing the other, as the need of the moment requires.

¹⁴² Schick (1965) 18.

¹⁴³ In *De Orat.* 2.211, Cicero distinguishes between the rational, argumentative function of *logos* and collective emotional appeal of *ethos* and *pathos*.

¹⁴⁴ Cf. *De Orat.* 2.182.

While *ethos* is often intertwined with *pathos*, it differs considerably from *pathos* in the effect it has in the listener's mind. *Pathos* endows a speech with "vividness" or "palpability," enabling the listener to envision what is being described (a function of *enargeia*); *ethos* contributes to its "plausibility," inviting him to regard the integrity of the messenger as a testament to the truth of his message.¹⁴⁵ *Ethos*, therefore, is the most important factor in swaying an audience, since people will believe a descriptive account if they trust the authority or character of the speaker.¹⁴⁶ In fact, Cicero reveals that *ethos*, if handled with taste and understanding, has the power to determine an entire case (2.184).

In these speeches, Cicero encourages the audience's observation. He displays his character, or *ethos*, to the crowds openly, presenting it as the measure by which they may judge the veracity of his words. In underscoring his personal virtue, he not only exhibits a marked contrast to his enemies, but also increases for himself his "authority, glory, and dignity."¹⁴⁷

Maintaining Appearances

As Cicero has established, the orator's persona and the audience's perception of his disposition toward them greatly influence the overall persuasiveness of his discourse.¹⁴⁸ It follows then that the effective orator must, in facing the people, know to whom he speaks and understand the dynamics of "mass psychology."¹⁴⁹ Just as time and place mold the character of an audience, so an orator should adjust his manner of speaking to suit his crowd (*De Orat.* 2.336-7).

¹⁴⁵ Corbett (1965) 319-20.

¹⁴⁶ Corbett (1965) 320.

¹⁴⁷ May (1988) 51.

¹⁴⁸ May (1988) 51. Cf. Cic. *De Orat.* 2.182-4; Arist. *Rhet.* 2.1.1377b.

¹⁴⁹ Fantham (2004) 219. Cf. May (2002) 68.

It is likely that Cicero would have “utilized his network” of personal *amici* and clients to help manage his public image.¹⁵⁰ The patron-client relationship was very important in the gathering and dispensation of information throughout Rome¹⁵¹—in elections especially, the elite (*amici*) held enough influence over public opinion to determine outcomes.¹⁵² Cicero could therefore rely on his powerful friends and associates to provide him with a supplementary means of image control. Despite this advantage, he still shouldered the primary burden of establishing and maintaining his reputation before the people. For this purpose then he ascended the rostra, to craft his image as the preeminent leader of the day.

A Visionary Consul

Cicero sought first to recommend the superiority of his vision. Thus, on the 8th of November he convened the senate in a place that provided him with prominent visual aids: the Temple of Jupiter Stator. This setting, staunchly encircled by armed knights whom he had commissioned,¹⁵³ allowed Cicero to show the senators what he had already seen for himself:

Nihilne te nocturnum praesidium Palati, nihil urbis vigiliae, nihil timor populi, nihil concursus bonorum omnium, nihil hic munitissimus habendi senatus locus, nihil horum ora voltusque moverunt? (1.1)

Cicero recalls the scenery of their situation as he addresses Catiline. The senators have seen the armed guards standing night watch on the Palatine (near which they are convened); they have witnessed the fear that has seized the people; and they have just observed the loyal citizens who are assembled outside the temple.¹⁵⁴ Cicero then alludes to the imagery of their immediate

¹⁵⁰ Laurence (1994) 66.

¹⁵¹ Laurence (1994) 64ff.

¹⁵² Laurence (1994) 67.

¹⁵³ MacDonald (1977) 18. Cf. *Catil.* 1.6.

¹⁵⁴ The “crowd of all honest men” (*conkursus bonorum omnium*) consisting of *equites* and *cives* is clearly situated outside the temple in 1.21, where Cicero describes the *equites* as *honestissimi* and *optimi*, and the *cives* as *fortissimi*

surroundings. They can clearly see the well-fortified place (*munitissimus . . . locus*) in which they are gathered; furthermore, they cannot overlook the faces and expressions (*ora voltusque*) of the senators who sit within their midst. Cicero builds this crescendo of visual stimuli and peaks with the exclamation, *O tempora, o mores!* (1.2). Although the senate is now alerted to these circumstances, the man responsible for them remains free! But, the senators can look to the vigilance of their leader Cicero, who reminds them, *consul videt*.¹⁵⁵

This introduction is followed by a show of humility as Cicero expresses regret for not acting sooner to quash the conspiracy in its infancy (1.2-4). His sorrow, however, quickly gives way to zeal as he segues into the *argumentatio* of his speech. He asks, *meministine* (“do you remember?”), a question directed to Catiline, but within this particular assembly, intended for everyone’s consideration (1.7). He then supplies the memorable details, all of which center around his early awareness of the conspiracy: did they remember that Cicero had spoken (*me . . . dicere*) about the treachery that was to occur on the 27th of October? Had he not been right about the plot (*Num me fefellit*), just as he was right about other reports he had shared (*Dixi ego idem*), and the precautions he took (*mea diligentia*) which had blocked Catiline’s moves against the republic on more than one occasion (1.7-8)?

Cicero had warned Catiline that the *ures et oculi* of many would keep watch over his every move (1.6). Now Cicero claims for himself eyes and ears superior to the rest as he declares, *nihil agis, nihil moliris, nihil cogitas quod non ego non modo audiam sed etiam videam planeque sentiam* (1.8). Nothing Catiline attempts will escape Cicero’s observation, because Cicero will “hear of it, see it, and know it all”¹⁵⁶—a claim which imputes prescience to his

¹⁵⁵ 1.2: *Senatus haec intellegit, consul videt; hic tamen vivit.*

¹⁵⁶ Translation from MacDonald (1977) 41.

vision. Cicero will dedicate much of the remainder of this speech (along with frequent reminders in his succeeding speeches) to proving the transcendent power of his consular vision.

“Review with me” (*Recognosce mecum*, 1.8), the orator next entreats his audience, asking, in essence, that they reevaluate what he knows about the conspiracy.¹⁵⁷ Cicero expresses confidence that his listeners, in so doing, will appreciate his vigilance (*intelleges . . . me vigilare*) for the safety of the republic—which, he says, is much keener than Catiline’s vigilance for its destruction. This clear contrast between the orator and his enemy is an established device of *ethos*, allowing Cicero to emphasize the polarity between them.¹⁵⁸ However, as it speaks to Cicero’s watchful devotion, it also admits Catiline’s devotion to watching—and waiting—for his next opportunity to strike. Inevitably, this realization should bring the audience even closer to trusting Cicero who positions himself to be the best match for such a formidable opponent.

Through the repeated assurance of his exceptional perception, Cicero secures the audience’s faith. He spends considerable time detailing his knowledge of the conspirators’ secret activities (1.8-10), Catiline’s murderous past (1.14-15), and what he predicts will be Catiline’s response to his censure (1.24-26)—a forecast he can easily make because he knows (*sciam . . . sciam . . . sciam*, 1.24) what preparations Catiline has already set in place. He sees (*video*, 1.8; *Ego video consul*, 1.9), moreover, men within the audience who were just two nights ago plotting with Catiline. This is an especially potent evocation, inviting the listeners to imagine who among them appears blackened in Cicero’s eyes. Clearly, none were in doubt of Catiline’s dark character, as Cicero illustrates when revisiting Catiline’s shunned entrance to the senate assembly (1.16).

¹⁵⁷ Here, as elsewhere, Cicero uses the second-person singular to address Catiline. Given the context of the speech, however, it is evident that the orator is appealing to his senatorial audience as well.

¹⁵⁸ See the discussion above concerning *ethos*. Refer also to Cic, *De Orat.* 2.182-4.

Toward the close of the speech, Cicero begs the senate to listen carefully as he shares what the fatherland has to say about the danger. In this hypothetical conversation (1.27), Cicero, speaking as the *patria*, promptly endorses the authority of his perception; it was he who ‘discovered’ (*comperisti*), “sees” (*vides*), and “perceives” (*sentis*). Cicero’s powerful awareness at this point is now a given, but what if communicating his observations puts him at risk for “unpopularity” (*invidiae*—the “evil eye” of disfavor, 1.29)? Since there are some who cannot see (*non videant*) or pretend that they cannot (*quae vident dissimulent*), their disapproval is a probability (1.30). Cicero responds with his conviction, *ut invidiam virtute partam gloriam, non invidiam*—that unpopularity born of virtue is not really unpopularity, but rather, honor (1.29). With this statement, he seals his commitment to Rome’s safety at any cost, bolstering his *ethos* in the process.

Having “revealed” and “illuminated” (*patefacta; inlustrata*: 1.32) the conspiracy to them through the power of his vision, Cicero now vows to show it to them (*videatis*) also “crushed” and “punished” (*oppressa; vindicata*). He leaves his audience with a promise that signals his transition from passive observer to active combatant. Though he would continue to disclose his observations and insights when speaking to the people in the *Second Catilinarian*,¹⁵⁹ Catiline’s departure will make it necessary for him to swiftly adopt a more militaristic persona.

Imperator Togatus

When Cicero opens his address to the people, he launches directly into invective against the “one certain leader” (*quidem unum . . . ducem*, 2.1) of civil war—Catiline. May sees his harangue as a deliberate setup, allowing Cicero’s *ethos* to appear all the more brilliant by contrast when he offers himself to the people as their leader (*Huic ego me bello ducem profiteor*,

¹⁵⁹ More examples of Cicero’s continual vigilance occur at 2.19, 26; 3.3, 4, and 27.

2.11).¹⁶⁰ Indeed, Catiline's flight the night before had only confirmed the truth of Cicero's allegations; thus, the time had come for all of Rome to join with the consul in preparing for war against this public enemy (2.1).

While Cicero's tone is noticeably more aggressive in his second speech, he still needed to secure the people's trust in his leadership before he could take action. He deflects blame, first of all, for allowing an enemy so dangerous to leave the city, insisting, "That fault is not mine, citizens, but is rather a result of the circumstances."¹⁶¹ He would have removed Catiline long ago, he assures them, and would have risked unpopularity (*invidiae*, 2.3) and even his own life if he thought this would have freed them all from danger. But Cicero saw (*viderem*, 2.4) the complications—indeed, he foresaw how Catiline's execution would obstruct his pursuit of the other conspirators. He therefore arranged (*deduxi*) the situation so that the people could see (*videretis*) their enemy clearly and fight him in the open. He grants them, in essence, the means to see what he had long been seeing.

Repeatedly, he emphasizes the power of his perception: he "knows" the enemies' plans (*me scire*, 2.5), he "sees" how they are organized (*Video*, 2.6), and now he has "exposed" them (*patefecit*). He helps the audience visualize the corruption of Catiline and his companions (2.7-10), the tense senate proceedings of the day before (2.12-13), and the sorts of men—debtors, criminals, and the like—who sympathize with the conspiracy (2.17-23). Informed by such vivid detail, the people can have no doubt about the seriousness of the conspiracy and their dire need for a capable, effective leader.

¹⁶⁰ May (1988) 52-4.

¹⁶¹ 2.3: . . . *non est ista mea culpa, Quirites, sed temporum.*

Beginning in 2.24, Cicero's discourse turns urgent as he depicts the battlefield of Rome's imminent civil war. He uses a "vocabulary of war" to illustrate the combatants (*cohortem; praetoriam; praesidia; exercitus; and imperatores*: 2.24) and their conflict (*contendere; pugnat; certamine; proelio*: 2.25; *defendite*, 2.26).¹⁶² Though he had proffered his leadership early in the speech (2.11), Cicero takes time to construct this war imagery before assuming the role of *togato duce et imperatore* ("general-commander in toga," 2.28). The word *togatus*, appearing here for the first time and juxtaposed with the military title *dux*, is significant because the *toga* is a civilian garment, connoting peace.¹⁶³ This is an image of striking contrast, which May interprets as follows:

By creating the role of a *dux* or *imperator togatus* for himself, a "civilian general" if you will, Cicero can share in the glory of a kind of military command and victory, but still maintain the persona of the man of peace who, in favorable contrast to those men of war who resort to violence in order to solve the political problems of Rome, is able to save the state without recourse to arms¹⁶⁴

Although the conspiracy would eventually have to be checked by military power, Cicero presents himself as the "essential civilian counterpart" to the Republic's military leaders—a favorable contrast to men like Marius, Sulla, and Pompey.¹⁶⁵

Cicero had alluded to Pompey earlier (*unius virtute*, 2.11), crediting him with the establishment of peace in Rome's territories abroad. He reminded the people quickly, however, that such peace did not exist at home. Unlike Pompey's battles that were fought against foreigners and kings, these looming domestic battles would be fought against less tangible adversaries: luxury, madness, and crime. Cicero promises them in 2.28 that, as their *imperator*

¹⁶² Steel (2001) 168.

¹⁶³ MacDonald (1977) 96-7 n. b.

¹⁶⁴ May (1988) 57.

¹⁶⁵ Steel (2001) 168.

togatus, he will defeat these vices with the “least commotion” (*minimo motu*) and “without a disturbance” (*nullo tumulto*), effectually suppressing the *bellum intestinum ac domesticum post hominum memoriam crudelissimum et maximum* (“greatest and most savage civil war in the memory of mankind”). Such an accomplishment could be said to rival the bloody victories of Pompey, he suggests later in 3.26 and 4.20-22.¹⁶⁶

When Cicero appeared at the consular elections in 63 with armed bodyguards and a breastplate showing beneath his toga, he was prepared, at least outwardly, to defend himself against Catiline. He had been informed that Catiline was intending to assassinate him at the elections, but when he summoned the senate to apprise them of the threat his concerns were disregarded. Not one to be ignored, Cicero devised this spectacle as a way to alert the public and also, incidentally (or not?), prefigured the “quasi-military role” he would assume in suppressing the conspiracy.¹⁶⁷ He appeared then, literally, as the *imperator togatus*. Cicero would recycle this theme in other speeches,¹⁶⁸ but ultimately he hoped to be remembered for his glorious leadership in saving the republic.

Savior of the Republic

Cicero’s evolutionary journey from mere consul to “visionary” and “civilian general” takes him, upon the successful capture of several of Catiline’s top men, to the rank of “savior.” He opens the *Third Catilinarian* with joyful proclamation, announcing that the republic, the lives and properties of all, and the empire itself were that very day “rescued” (*ereptam*, 3.1) and “preserved” (*conservatam*) from fire and sword, thanks to his personal sacrifices. He speaks too

¹⁶⁶ Habicht (1990) 39-40.

¹⁶⁷ Steel (2001) 168.

¹⁶⁸ See *Pro Mur.* 84 and *Sul.* 85. He also reflects on these events in *Off.* 1.77 and in the poem he wrote commemorating his consulship, *Cons. fr.* 57-65.

of the “security” (*salutis*, 3.2) they gained when they were “saved” (*conservamur*) and “protected” (*servamur*). Cicero openly presumes that the people will offer thanks to the gods for the man who founded their city, Romulus,¹⁶⁹ but he means also to prompt them, with so much emphasis on his role in the city’s salvation, to direct gratitude to the one who “saved” (*servavit*) the city—Cicero himself.

Much of Cicero’s third speech is devoted to recounting the events that led up to the arrest and confessions of four men intimately involved in the conspiracy (3.3-13). Cicero tells the story from his own authoritative perspective, using many first-person verbs to describe his active role in the proceedings: he was watchful (*vigilavi*; *providi*: 3.3), perceptive (*sentirem*; *viderem*: 3.4), committed (*consumpsi*, 3.4), informed (*comprehenderem*; *comperi*: 3.4), contemplative (*putavi*, 3.4), vocal (*vocavi*, 3.5), revelatory (3.5: *exposui*; *ostendi*: 3.5; *ostendi*, 3.10), and collaborative (*consului*, 3.13). The senate acknowledged all his labors, he reports (3.14), noting in particular the *virtute*, *consilio*, and *providentia* (“courage, wisdom, and foresight”) he demonstrated, which “freed” (*sit liberata*) the republic from many dangers.

The senate decreed that a public thanksgiving be offered to the gods in Cicero’s honor (3.15). While Cicero takes pleasure in the distinction of being the first civilian (*togato*) to receive such an honor, particularly because it was the also the first time that a thanksgiving had been awarded for saving (*conservata*) the republic, he spends relatively little time speaking about it. He seems more concerned with the people’s impression of his deeds, as he continues to review his role in detecting and defeating the conspiracy. He emphasizes again his remarkable

¹⁶⁹ Romulus, as well as Marius (whom I discussed at the beginning of this chapter), represent the archetypes of “founder” and “savior” with which Cicero seeks to equate himself. See Habicht (1990) 33.

foresight (*providebam*, 3.16; *provisa*, 3.18; *ego providi*, 3.27)¹⁷⁰ and his preemptive action (3.17: *occuri*; *obstiti*: 3.17; *a me administrata*; *gesta*: 3.18; *me gessi*, 3.25), which prevented all the horrors of civil war—*interitu*, *caede*, *sanguine*, *exercitu*, *dimicatione* (3.23); *infinite caedi*, and *flamma* (3.27)—from destroying the republic. He affirms that they were “rescued” (*erepti* . . . *erepti*) from a most savage and cruel fate, due to the victorious leadership that he provided—he, the *uno togato duce et imperatore*. Yes, he did believe a thanksgiving was in order (3.23), but there was a higher prize that he desired for himself: everlasting remembrance.

In 3.26, Cicero begs this one reward from the people:

Quibus pro tantis rebus, Quirites, nullum ego a vobis praemium virtutis, nullum insigne honoris, nullum monumentum laudis postulabo praeterquam huius diei memoriam sempiternam. In animis ego vestris omnis triumphos meos, omnia ornamenta honoris, monumenta gloriae, laudis insignia condi et conlocari volo.

He does not want a reward (*praemium*), a special emblem (*insigne*), or a physical memorial set up in his name (*monumentum*); he requests only that they commemorate this day within their hearts for all time.¹⁷¹ Their remembrance will provide all the *triumphos*, *ornamenta*, *monumenta*, and *insignia* that he could ever want. He hopes, furthermore, that his legacy will be “cherished” in memory (*alentur*), “elevated” in conversation (*crescent*), “time-honored” (*inveterascent*), and “established” (*conroborabuntur*) in the written records.

Cicero’s seeming obsession with his own glory, especially in this speech, may give the impression that he was arrogant.¹⁷² There were good reasons for an orator to speak well of

¹⁷⁰ *Providere* means “to take appropriate steps in anticipation” of something, but does not neglect the idea of vision contained in its verbal root. See Morstein-Marx (2004) 251-2. Cicero’s repeated use of the word signals his expansion of the consular vision motif to fit his new role as “savior,” for whom prescience was implicit.

¹⁷¹ Both May (1988) 57 and Konstan (1993) 18 note the significance of this passage as it relates to Cicero’s ambition.

¹⁷² See Allen (1954) for a thorough treatment of this topic. Cf. Quint. *Inst.* 11.1.17-26.

himself,¹⁷³ and while Cicero certainly took many opportunities to do so, Quintilian tells us that self-praise does not win an audience.¹⁷⁴ Cicero's primary concern seems to have been for the projection of *ethos* and the influence of his authority. He was not concerned so much with promoting his oratorical abilities (which Quintilian specifically criticizes), but rather with convincing Rome of the reality of Catiline's conspiracy and bolstering confidence in his leadership during a period of insecurity. As time passed and political opinion concerning Cicero's execution of the conspirators began to shift, Cicero likely reedited his speeches to reinforce his authority when he had them published about three years later.¹⁷⁵

Cicero had a talent for "engineer[ing] persuasiveness," which he developed by "presenting a congruence between his verbal argument and his dignity [*ethos*] as a speaker."¹⁷⁶ Through the testimony of his sensory perception, Cicero showed the senate and the citizens of Rome the dangers of the conspiracy. As consul, he assumed a special type of leadership, dubbing himself the *imperator togatus*, who would overpower the conspirators with rhetorical force. When several of Catiline's men were captured and Cicero elicited their confessions of guilt before the senate, he was triumphant, believing that his efforts had averted the most horrible civil war of all time. Cicero was thoroughly convincing in presenting his personal merits, and while he could not imagine any glory more exalted than his own (3.28), he recognized, nevertheless, that his fame rested on a reputation that could fall out of favor. He therefore needed some means of permanent endorsement to uphold the righteousness of his actions for all

¹⁷³ Allen (1954) 128-30 outlines four: (1) to win *benevolentia*; (2) in self-defense; (3) in a personal narrative given publicly; and (4) so one's deeds not be thought accidental.

¹⁷⁴ *Inst.* 11.1.15-17

¹⁷⁵ Kennedy (1972) 176-7. Cf. Bailey (1971) 32-3; Stockton (1971) 118; Fantham (2004) 132.

¹⁷⁶ Bell (1997) 1.

time. We will see in the next chapter how Cicero obtains divine sanction for his actions by portraying himself, like Romulus, as the agent of the gods.

CHAPTER 5
DIVINE OVERSIGHT

Religion in Speech-Making

Exclamations invoking the gods, such as *O di immortales!* (*Catil.* 1.9) and *mehercule!* (1.17) typically appear in oratory for dramatic effect. Cicero uttered these words in his first speech to the senate and declared similar sentiments when he spoke to them again in his fourth speech (*per deos immortales!*, 4.1; *di immortales!*, 4.15). However, when Cicero appeared before the people in *Catil.* 2 and 3, he appealed to the gods in a more lengthy manner. He entreated them, offered up his thanks, criticized the false religion of his enemies, and convinced his audience that divine intervention and oversight had played a vital role in the republic's salvation—a view that even the senate came to share. This effect suggests that religious allusions, even within seemingly innocuous exclamations, were part of Cicero's overall persuasive strategy, and should not be overlooked.

Ancient rhetoricians list the “authority of the gods” as the first commonplace to be used in *amplificatio*, for “the raising of the individual case to a question of general concern, and for the stirring up of the emotions.”¹⁷⁷ They also include the gods among subjects effective for use in the *exordium*, or beginning of a speech, to make listeners “*benevolus, attentus, docilis.*”¹⁷⁸ Cicero introduces three of his extant speeches in this way, although he more frequently, as Heibges points out, appeals to religious feeling in the *peroratio*, or conclusion, of his speeches.¹⁷⁹ While we cannot fairly deduce Cicero's religious beliefs from speeches intended to persuade, e.g. the *Catilinarians*, what mattered most was how the audience perceived his beliefs,

¹⁷⁷ *Rhet. Her.* 2.48; *Inv.* 1.101.

¹⁷⁸ Heibges (1969) 835. Cf. *Inv.* 1.20-3; Cf. *Rhet. Her.* 1.6.

¹⁷⁹ See Heibges (1969) for Cicero's various applications of religion within his speeches.

since this determined the impression his speech made. So whatever his beliefs actually were, he would have known how to use the gods within his speech to influence the audience in his favor.

Cicero understood how critical it was for the orator to adapt his methods to his audience.¹⁸⁰ He knew, too, the importance of conveying the emotion he wished to stir up in his audience; so if he desired to stir up religious feeling, he had to first demonstrate it himself.¹⁸¹ As we will see, he depended very much upon “invoking [this] patriotic religious fervor” in *Catil.* 2 and 3,¹⁸² though there are some who suspect that the lavish attention he devotes to the gods was really his way of “play[ing] on the credulity of the common people,” who were altogether less “sophisticated” than the senate.¹⁸³ In truth, Cicero would not have used religious allusions unless he was certain that they would resonate, being “latent” in the minds and hearts of his listeners.¹⁸⁴ This did not necessarily mean, however, that the senate was less inclined to believe in the divine intervention of the gods. Since Cicero employed religious imagery throughout all four of his *Catilinarian* orations, he must have had a persuasive reason for doing so.

In this final chapter, we will examine how Cicero employs visual imagery to convince his audience of the gods’ protection and guidance during the conspiracy. In the Temple of Jupiter Stator, the Forum, and the Temple of Concord, Cicero exploits the religious connotations of his surroundings to validate his god-given authority of leadership, and also attacks the pseudo-religion of his enemies to discredit their impious ambitions. Once he convinces the senate and the people that his divine partnership is responsible for the republic’s salvation, he strives to

¹⁸⁰ *De Orat.* 2.336-7; *Or.* 24.

¹⁸¹ *De Orat.* 2.189-96; *Or.* 132. Cf. Grube (1962) 252; Clarke (1996) 78-9.

¹⁸² Fantham (1997) 114.

¹⁸³ MacDonald (1977) 124 n. a. Cf. Heibges (1969) 845.

¹⁸⁴ Heibges (1969) 848. Cf. Taylor (1949) 78.

emphasize their unity with each other and with the gods when urging the senate to execute the conspirators. In this way, he procures divine approval for their action—overseen, as it was, by the immortal gods.

Jupiter's *Providentia*

In his discussion of boasting, Quintilian defends Cicero's self-promotion in the *Catilinarians*, excusing it because he had attributed his victory either to the *virtus* of the senate or to the *providentia* of the immortal gods.¹⁸⁵ Cicero would acknowledge this divine assistance in other speeches as well, most notably in *Pro Murena* 82 and in *Pro Sulla* 5. His comments in a letter to Atticus seem to indicate that the faith he professed in divine providence may even have been genuine, though this is not conclusive.¹⁸⁶ Whatever the authenticity of his faith, it is clear that Cicero utilized the gods, and in particular the supreme god Jupiter, to focus the audience's attention on the seriousness of the conspiracy and, moreover, to prove that his role in saving the republic was, in fact, divinely appointed.

His Temple

Cicero addresses Jupiter directly for the first time while speaking to the senate inside the god's temple: the Temple of Jupiter Stator. Vasaly provides a thorough overview of the history of this temple, which, while it is too lengthy to rehearse here, is helpful for understanding the characters and events that Cicero's audience would have associated with this site.¹⁸⁷ In short, the temple was established as a reminder of the city's salvation by divine intervention in the war with the Sabines, in fulfillment of Romulus' promise to Jupiter. The temple thus commemorated Jupiter's role as the *Stator*, or "Stayer" who had defended the city at its weakest moment.

¹⁸⁵ Quint. *Inst.* 11.1.23.

¹⁸⁶ *Att.* 1.16.6: *Rei publicae statum illum quem tu meo consilio, ego divino confirmatum putabam . . .*

¹⁸⁷ Vasaly (1993) 43-6.

Cicero's audience would have then remembered Jupiter as a "god of battle" who had been their "divine protector" and "heavenly ally" in Rome's "first great military crisis."¹⁸⁸

Cicero's introduction in 1.1-2 was designed to center attention right away on the tense atmosphere surrounding the temple—a sacred locale in which Catiline's presence was immediately jarring.¹⁸⁹ Cicero assures the senate by pointing out the *munitissimus locus* in which they were gathered, though his observation served the additional purpose of alerting them to the potential danger of their situation. There were other places that would have been more secure for the senate's meeting, but Cicero was concerned "not with the *reality* of security but with the *perception* of security."¹⁹⁰ Therefore, the history and associations of the temple, as well as the armed *equites* Cicero had stationed around it, made it the best location to serve this symbolic purpose.

Cicero's first outcry to the gods, *O di immortales!*, caps his synopsis of Catiline's secret, traitorous activities and his stunned observation (*Video*) that many of Catiline's cohorts were present in the midst of their "most sacred" (*sanctissimo*) senate proceedings (1.9). That these men's presence within the inviolate temple of Rome's protecting god was grossly incongruous is affirmed when Cicero mentions Jupiter directly, the "protector" (*custodi*) of their city, who had many times in the past ensured their escape from such debilitating "cancer" (*tam horribilem tamque infestam . . . pestem*, 1.11). Though Cicero would later characterize Catiline's conspiracy with this same term, *pestem*,¹⁹¹ his oblique reference here speaks enough to the

¹⁸⁸ Ibid.

¹⁸⁹ Ibid. 50.

¹⁹⁰ Ibid. 59. Italics *sic*.

¹⁹¹ As discussed in chapter 2 of this study. See 1.30-1.

deseccration their very presence implies, especially since they were openly seeking to destroy the “temples of the immortal gods” (*templa deorum immortalium*, 1.12).

Cicero’s second exclamation, *mehercule!*, punctuates his review of Catiline’s ostracism within their assembly—an isolation which further mirrors the inappropriateness of his presence there (1.17). Cicero again reminds the senators of their temple locale (1.21: *hoc ipso in templo*), again he directs their minds to the fortification enveloping it (*illi equites Romani . . . ceterique fortissimi cives . . . videre . . . perspicere . . . exaudire potuisti*), and then he cries out with yet another exclamation (*Utinam tibi istam mentem di immortales duint!*, 1.22). While he trusts in the security of these visible safeguards, he laments their ineffectiveness in deterring Catiline who he wishes—albeit vainly—would follow the prompting of the gods to leave the city in peace.

Cicero speaks again of Jupiter in the climactic ending of his speech (1.33), only this time he tells not of what the god had done for the city, but rather what he will do. Cicero makes a direct appeal to *Tu, Iuppiter*, “who were established by the same auspices as those by which Romulus established the city.”¹⁹² Vasaly discusses the syntax here at length, interpreting the allusion to Romulus and the auspices thus: that just as Romulus had received divine sanction for founding the city, so too did he establish a covenant with Jupiter, whom he “founded” as *Stator* of the city for all time.¹⁹³ She notes further:

. . . in this place, closely connected both with the founding of the city by Romulus and his defense of it in the battle against the Sabines, Cicero could foster his own “Romulean” role as political, moral, and spiritual leader of Rome in its hour of crisis.¹⁹⁴

¹⁹² 1.33: *Tu, Iuppiter, qui isdem quibus haec urbs auspiciis a Romulo es constitutus . . .* Translation from Vasaly (1993) 55.

¹⁹³ Vasaly (1993) 55-6.

¹⁹⁴ *Ibid.* 59.

Cicero was, in fact, petitioning Jupiter from the very same spot where Romulus had “prayed for the intercession of the same god at a moment of similarly grave danger to the continued existence of the city.” In so doing, he “implicitly assumes” the role of a new Romulus who had come to rescue the city in its distress.¹⁹⁵ Cicero’s speech would have been made all the more dramatic since, in addressing Jupiter, he likely gestured to the statue of the god which would have “dominated” the interior of the temple in which they were assembled.¹⁹⁶

Cicero forecasts that Catiline, in waging an “impious war” (*impium bellum*), will only bring upon himself the *pestis* that he thinks to inflict on the republic (1.33). He then closes with a warning to Catiline and all who had partnered with him in his conspiracy. Though they may sit his temple now, Jupiter the *Stator* of Rome will keep them far away from it and from all other temples (*a tuis certerisque templis*) in the future—of that, Cicero is certain. He closes with an expectant prayer for retribution, trusting that Jupiter will recompense the conspirators’ irreverence with eternal punishment.

His Statue

In Jupiter’s temple Cicero was easily able to exploit the site of his speech to “embellish its persuasiveness.”¹⁹⁷ He accomplished this by focusing on the symbolic significance of his location, though his allusions would not have been quite so spectacular without the imposing image of Jupiter that stood as a statue within the temple. Understanding the power of the visual, Cicero would rely, likewise, on the “potent visual aids” afforded by the Roman Forum to enhance the illustrative energy of his speeches to the people.¹⁹⁸ The most impressive of these

¹⁹⁵ Vasaly (1993) 53.

¹⁹⁶ Ibid. 50-1.

¹⁹⁷ Aldrette (1999) 25.

¹⁹⁸ Ibid.

aids was also a statue of Jupiter, which just so happened (presumably) to be re-erected on the day of Cicero's *Third Catilinarian*.

In order to understand the full effect of Cicero's allusions to this statue, we must first consider how he prepared his audience for the illusion of divine intervention in the matter of the conspiracy. In his *Second Catilinarian*, Cicero refers to the gods several times when he apprises the people, as he had the senate, of the danger of the conspiracy. He describes the scene of the senate meeting the day before, the "temple" (*aedem*, 2.12) of Jupiter Stator, in which Catiline, the "degenerate citizen" (*perditum civem*) and "most offensive enemy" (*importunissimum hostem*) had appeared and was appropriately rebuffed by all those in attendance. In the interval since that meeting, Catiline had left the city, thereby proving Cicero's contentions; but Cicero, who was committed to keeping the people abreast of Catiline's whereabouts and activities, warns them that they would in three days hear report that Catiline had assumed leadership of an "army of enemies" (*exercitum hostium*, 2.15). Though his news is distressing, Cicero declares that he will never desire the immortal gods (*dis immortalibus*) to ease the burden of unpopularity (*invidiae*) that he must endure for sharing this unpleasant report with the people.

Cicero displays his confidence in the gods' protection at three moments in the second speech. In 2.19, after affirming his own loyalty to Rome and reminding the crowd of the many devoted men and soldiers that support the republic, he expresses his conviction that the *deos immortalis* will bring them help against their enemies, who are "so great a force of present wickedness" (*tantam vim sceleris praesentis*). In 2.25, he describes the scene of the impending battle with the enemy, pitting the "sink of iniquity" (*tot et tanta vitia*) of Catiline's army against the "sterling virtues" (*praeclarissimis virtutibus*) of those under Cicero's command.¹⁹⁹ In this

¹⁹⁹ These more poetic translations are from MacDonald (1977) 95.

conflict, Cicero asserts, the *di ipsi immortales* will certainly, even if men's zeal wanes, ensure that good triumphs over evil. Finally, in 2.29, Cicero testifies to the oversight of the gods, whose omens (*significationibus*) continue to guide his leadership. The gods will, he believes, defend their temples (*sua templa*) in person by their divine will and might (*suo numine atque auxilio*); nevertheless, he encourages the people to pray, worship, and beseech (*precari, venerari, implorare*) the gods for their continued protection. At the conclusion of this speech, the people would have had the distinct impression, because of Cicero's portrayal, that the gods' favor would ultimately secure the republic from harm.

Having established this idea of the gods' intervention in the minds of his audience, Cicero was then considerably advantaged when the arrest and indictment of several of Catiline's men appeared to demonstrate the truth of his assertions. It only made sense for Cicero, therefore, in announcing his special role in saving the republic, also to pay homage to the gods—and in particular, to Jupiter—for their preservation of the city. Cicero's focus in *Third Catilinarian* is, according to Millar, “unique . . . in putting so much emphasis on the role of the gods.”²⁰⁰ Kennedy too notes the “religious element” so pervasive throughout the speech.²⁰¹ In order to put all of this religious language into perspective, it is helpful to visualize the location where Cicero delivered this third speech:

The audience facing the Rostra would have seen the speaker, then, flanked by . . . statues and monuments and against the backdrop of the enlarged Curia of Sulla. To the east stood the Basilica Aemilia; to the west, behind Sulla's Tabularium, rose the twin heights of the Capitoline Hill: the Capitolium, which included the sacred precinct of Jupiter Optimus Maximus, and the Arx, the most prominent building of which was the Temple of Juno Moneta.²⁰²

²⁰⁰ Millar (1998) 109.

²⁰¹ Kennedy (1972) 180.

²⁰² Vasaly (1993) 68.

Surrounding the orator were buildings and monuments that conveyed a multitude of associations, simultaneously political, historical, and religious.²⁰³ Indeed, there was perhaps “no place in ancient Rome more intricate and multilayered” in meaning than the Forum.²⁰⁴ Even the Rostra from which Cicero spoke, which elevated him above the crowd, would have added its own symbolic meaning to the panorama.²⁰⁵ In this setting, therefore, Cicero’s allusions to the gods would undoubtedly have maximum impact.

He opens his third speech proclaiming the city’s salvation, which was accomplished “by the highest love” (*summo . . . amore*, 3.1) of the immortal gods for the people. He attributes this success to his own efforts as well: it was through his labors, deliberations, and personal risks (*laboribus, consiliis, periculis meis*) that the city was “snatched” (*ereptam*) and “preserved” (*conservatam*) from destruction. As Cicero describes the peril that the people had avoided, one can easily envision them looking around at their surroundings and imagining how the Forum might have appeared if the conspiracy had succeeded. Furthermore, in claiming responsibility for saving the “temples” and “shrines” (*temples; delubris*, 3.2) as well as the rest of the city from the fires of the enemy, Cicero depicts himself as the “agent” of the gods, who had, like Romulus, faithfully carried out the gods’ will for Rome and ought to receive like recognition.²⁰⁶ The day of the city’s salvation is just as important as the day of its founding, he reasons; therefore, as they

²⁰³ Vasaly (1993) 69. See pp. 60-75 for a detailed analysis of these structures and their various connotations for Cicero’s audience.

²⁰⁴ Vasaly (1993) 61.

²⁰⁵ Morstein-Marx (2004) 252 suggests that the height of the Rostra above the crowd symbolized the “power of [Cicero’s] metaphorical vision,” a view that fits well with the concept of the visual we have been exploring throughout this study.

²⁰⁶ Habicht (1990) 33. Cf. Morstein-Marx (2004) 252.

offer thanks to the gods for their founder, so they ought to remember and revere their “re-founder.”²⁰⁷

Cicero has now been given the opportunity *ab dis immortalibus* (“from the immortal gods,” 3.4)—and one for which he had long waited—to reveal all that he had “plainly” (*manifesto*) discerned to the senate and the people. He proceeds then, in 3.5-15, to relate the circumstances resulting in the arrest of several conspirators and their subsequent prosecution in the senate. He mentions, of course, the honor of a *supplicatio*, or “thanksgiving,” that the senate had decreed to the immortal gods (*dis immortalibus*) in his behalf, which, one can safely assume, he intended as further justification for his authority. After reminding them again of Catiline’s depravity in 3.16-17, Cicero launches into an extended review (3.18-22) of how the gods’ involvement and his own guidance had guaranteed the preservation of Rome.

He readily attributes his deeds and foresight (3.18: *et gesta et provisa*) to divine direction; specifically, he claims that all his actions were dependent upon the “will and purpose” (*nutu atque consilio*) of the immortal gods. Because they were continually “at hand” (*praesentes*) to offer their “power and assistance” (*opem et auxilium*) to them, he suggests that the deities could almost be seen there in the Forum, before their very eyes (. . . *ut eos paene oculis videre possimus*). Following this intimation, Cicero begins to survey the many portents, or observable manifestations of the gods’ power—the most conspicuous of which was the inauguration that day of new statue of the supreme god Jupiter (3.20). Acknowledging this “miraculous coincidence,”²⁰⁸ he regards this statue not as a mere image, but as the “sacrosanct visible

²⁰⁷ Vasaly (1993) 80.

²⁰⁸ Konstan (1993) 18.

manifestation of a god.”²⁰⁹ Literally then, it seems that the people *could* behold Jupiter there “with [their own] eyes” (*oculis*, 3.18).²¹⁰

Cicero directs the audience’s attention to this statue in 3.20 (*illud signum quod videtis*: “that statue that you see”) and explains how its particular orientation was in keeping with the recommendation of the soothsayers (*haruspices*, 3.19), who believed that by facing it eastward—toward the rising sun, the Forum, and the Senate house—the secret plots of the conspirators would be illuminated (*inlustrarentur*), and therefore visible (*ut . . . perspicere possunt*) to all. Having just revealed the truth of the conspiracy to them (in 3.5-15), as Jupiter had revealed it to him, Cicero highlights the propitiousness of the statue’s appearance that very day. He wonders (3.21), since they had witnessed this omen for themselves, how any of them could disbelieve that the gods were, by their “will and might” (*nutu ac potestate*), sustaining Rome when there were so many evidences (*haec omnia quae videmus*) that indicated divine involvement. He laments that some could be “so turned from the truth” (*tam adversus a vero*). Cicero plays on the theme of the visual here by presenting a contrast between Jupiter who, by seeing, illumines truth and those who, by refusing to see, deny it. The consul hoped that, just as the god had enhanced his own vision, he could help the audience to see and perceive what they could not, thereby revealing the truth that had been hidden from their view.²¹¹

This truth, according to Cicero (3.21), is that the statue’s re-erection early that morning, while the conspirators were led through the Forum to the senate meeting, signified the direct intervention of Jupiter Optimus Maximus, whose temple was in the vicinity. What could be

²⁰⁹ Aldrette (1999) 26.

²¹⁰ It is possible that there was another statue of Jupiter (that would have “loomed” over the audience), as well as a statue of the god Apollo erected on the Capitolium. Pliny mentions these statues in *HN* 34.39-40. See also Vasaly (1993) 68-9 n. 57.

²¹¹ Morstein-Marx (2004) 252.

more convincing than the fact that, as Jupiter's gaze fell on the senate and the people, all did indeed see (*vidistis*) the secret schemes of the conspiracy "illuminated and revealed" (*inlustrata et patefacta*), just as the soothsayers had predicted? Most scholars now suspect that Cicero had, in actuality, specially timed the statue's replacement for his use as a "prop in an elaborate stunt."²¹² Admittedly, there does seem to have been an element of theatricality in the day's events, as Butler argues:

. . . Cicero acted out his command performance, with all Rome as his stage. First the morning crowd in the Forum was startled to see the consul Cicero leading the praetor Lentulus down from the Palatine to the temple of Concord, holding him by the wrist in a well-recognized Roman gesture of violence. (Here the pantomime enacted Cicero's superior *imperium* as consul.) They were followed by several other men under armed guard. At that very moment, a statue of Jupiter was being hoisted into place on the Capitoline, his face turned toward the Forum below. . . . [and] hundreds of hurriedly summoned senators were filing into the temple.²¹³

Whether or not Cicero "carefully orchestrated the whole affair,"²¹⁴ it is clearly indisputable that he exhibited "superb stage management" by recognizing and exploiting the rhetorical opportunities of his locale.²¹⁵ Through his numerous allusions to the "immortal gods," the greatest and most powerful of whom was looking down upon their assembly, Cicero was able to convince the people of the gods' abiding presence in the city and concern for the plight of its citizens. In this drama of Rome's conspiratorial crisis, Cicero points to Jupiter (*ille, ille, Iuppiter*, 3.22) as the city's protector, who would not see the "temples and shrines of the gods" (*deorum templuis atque delubris*) desecrated by the enemy. For this reason, the gods guided

²¹² Butler (2002) 97. While originally, in the context of this speech, Cicero attributes the statue's reestablishment to divine involvement, he would later (in the *De Divinatione*) ascribe it to "mere coincidence," though Butler believes that he "makes even this suggestion with a bemused smugness that implies he knows better." Cf. Vasaly (1993) 81; Aldrette (1999) 25-6; Heibges (1969) 844.

²¹³ Butler (2002) 86.

²¹⁴ *Ibid.*

²¹⁵ Fantham (1997) 114. Cf. Aldrette (1999) 26.

Cicero (*Dis ego immortalibus ducibus hanc mentem voluntatemque suscepi*: “I undertook this plan and purpose with the immortal gods as my leaders”), who in turn guided the people (*togati me uno togato duce et imperatore vicistis*: “you civilians conquered with one civilian, me, as your leader and general,” 3.23) to victory over the conspiracy. As Cicero stands there speaking atop the Rostra, he becomes the intermediary—both physically and figuratively—between the people and their gods.²¹⁶

Other Portents

There were additional visible signs from the gods, besides the coincidental appearance of Jupiter’s statue, which Cicero mentions in the *Catilinarians*. Some of these signs he connects with the conspiracy, interpreting them as early warnings from the gods that trouble would befall the city. Others of these signs he associates with the bogus religion of his enemies who had hoped to use the illusion of divine help to further their irreligious enterprise. As Cicero reviews these portents with his audience, he discloses their meaning with this symbolic message: that the gods offer protection to those who are reverent, but punish those who are irreverent.

In 3.18-20, Cicero recalls several portents that, he claims, foretold of an imminent threat to the republic. There were “fires from the west at nighttime” (*nocturno tempore ab occidente faces*, 3.18) and a “brightness of the sky” (*ardore[m] caeli*)—apparitions which can probably be attributed to astronomical phenomena, such as a meteor shower (a rare occurrence in central Italy). There was also the “throwing of lightning” (*fulminum iactus*), a sign that would have, by association, conjured up the image of Jupiter, the “thrower” of lightning. Cicero speaks too of earthquakes (*terrae motus*: “movements of the earth”) and alludes to other unspecified portents that occurred during the time of his consulship. In the guise of omitting or passing over all of

²¹⁶ Taylor (1949) 87.

these signs (*Nam ut illa omittam . . . relinquam, ut omittam cetera*), he effectively draws attention to them so that the audience can connect these occurrences with an event he is about to describe, which “must not be omitted or overlooked” (*neque praetermittendum neque reliquendum est*).

During the consulship of Cotta and Torquatus in 65 B.C., Cicero reminds them, a lightning storm damaged many objects on the Capitoline (3.19). Images of the gods (*simulacra deorum*), statues of forefathers (*statuae veterum hominum*), and bronze tablets of the law (*legum aera*) were respectively “knocked over,” “thrown down,” and “melted” (*depulsa, deiectae, and liquefacta*). In every instance, sacred and symbolic items—including a statue of Romulus, the revered founder of Rome—suffered violence. When the soothsayers from Etruria gathered together to interpret these signs, they prophesied that

. . . caedis atque incendia et legum interitum et bellum civile ac domesticum et totius urbis atque imperi occasum appropinquare dixerunt, nisi di immortales omni ratione placati suo numine prope fata ipsa flexissent (3.19).

All the horrors of death and destruction could be averted if the gods were “appeased” (*placati*) by every method to redirect “that nearby fate” (*prope fata ipsa*) by their divine power. Cicero points out that that everything was done to satisfy the gods (3.20); games were held for ten days and a larger statue of Jupiter was commissioned for replacement overlooking the Forum. These efforts culminated in the spectacle that greeted the audience that morning—the raising up of Jupiter’s *simulacrum* at the moment that Catiline’s conspiracy became apparent to all—suggesting that the gods had indeed been placated and had used their influence to save the Republic from an ominous fate.

These signs from the gods were not, therefore, an indication of “divine displeasure”; rather, they served as physical warnings of “conceptual” dangers.²¹⁷ Vasaly elaborates:

Just as lightning had struck the capital, destructive plans that would strike at the heart of the city were being formed; as the Capitolium had been ravaged by fire, so the plans would include an attack by fire on Rome; and as the physical monument of the Laws had been destroyed, in the future the conceptual laws would be overturned.²¹⁸

The desecration of these symbols represented the future destruction of all that was sacred to Rome and her citizens. For this reason the soothsayers recommended that the people demonstrate their reverence for the sacred gods who had the power to circumvent fate. Cicero, therefore, encouraged the people to pray (2.29, 3.29),²¹⁹ and offered up prayers himself (1.15, 33), which were answered by the gods’ kindly intervention on their behalf.²²⁰

The enemies of Rome also claimed to have received portents from the gods. In 3.9, Cicero reveals that Lentulus had tried to convince the Allobroges of his destiny as the “third Cornelius” to rule.²²¹ Lentulus told them that his rise had been foretold by the Sibylline books and the soothsayers (*ex fatis Sibyllinis haruspicumque responsis*), and that there were other signs—that this was the year fated (*fatalem*) for the republic’s destruction, as it had been ten years since the acquittal of the Vestal Virgins, and twenty years since the burning of the Capital—which also supported his claim to power. When later confronted with his assertions in

²¹⁷ Vasaly (1993) 82.

²¹⁸ Ibid.

²¹⁹ In the end, Cicero could trust that his overview of these portents would meet with the “full understanding and consent [of] his audience,” who would participate in whatever way they could to suppress the conspiracy. See Altheim (1938) 422.

²²⁰ Cicero also stresses the necessity of offering up a prayer of thanksgiving (*supplicatio*) to the gods after the city’s salvation in 3.15 and 23. Curiously, he omits the gods when mentioning this thanksgiving in his fourth speech (4.5, 10, 20), which he delivered to the senate—who decreed the thanksgiving to the gods in the first place!

²²¹ The first “Cornelius” was L. Cornelius Cinna, the Marian leader and consul from 87-85. The second “Cornelius” was L. Cornelius Sulla, the dictator. MacDonald (1977) 108 n. b.

the senate, and asked specifically about the Sibylline books, Lentulus suddenly confessed his guilt (3.11).

Like Lentulus, Catiline and the other conspirators had also deceived themselves with the trappings of a false religion. When Cicero spoke to Catiline in the senate on November 8th, he exposed Catiline's intent to meet up with Manlius and his camp that was assembling at Etruria (1.24; Cf. 2.13-4). In preparation for his departure, Catiline had apparently sent some men ahead with military weapons and accoutrements, but Cicero noted one item in particular that seemed most incongruous as insignia for his enemy army: the silver eagle (*aquilam . . . argenteam*). This standard had been implemented in the legionary insignia by Marius years before, so it possessed a certain historical appeal.²²² Jupiter also was associated with this symbol, as the eagle was his sacred bird. Cicero, however, dismisses Catiline's attempts to use the emblem of this bird for his benefit. Though he had set up a shrine at his home for worshiping (*venerari*) this eagle, this seeming holy place proved instead to be a "shrine of wickedness" (*sacrarium scelerum*)²²³ for one whose "impious hand" (*impiam dexteram*) could readily go from altar (*altaribus*) to slaughter (*necem*).²²⁴ The gods did not recognize his worship (nor that of his followers) because his sacrilegious actions rendered it vain.²²⁵

Cicero repeatedly emphasizes the conspirators' gross irreverence for the gods and their sacred places. Again and again, he speaks of the enemy's desire to violate the holy temples (*templa*, 1.12, 33; 2.29; 3.2, 22; 4.2), the sacred shrines (*delubra*, 3.2, 22; 4.2) and even the

²²² MacDonald (1977) 56 n. b.

²²³ Catiline's *sacrarium* stands in stark contrast to the legitimate *delubrum* of the gods. Though both of these terms mean "shrine" or "sanctuary," Cicero never interchanges them in the *Catilinarians*.

²²⁴ Cicero presents a similar contrast between the sacred and the profane in 1.16. Since Catiline had attempted to kill Cicero, he wonders "by which rites" (*quibus . . . sacris*) his dagger had been "consecrated" (*initiata*) and "dedicated" (*devota*) in order to (justifiably) thrust it into a consul.

²²⁵ Ironically, Cicero himself would later suffer charges of "religious sacrilege" concerning his handling of matters in the conspiracy. See Barlow (1994) for an interesting article that explores this subject.

Vestal Virgins (4.13), who devote their lives to the service of the gods. These vile men are criminals (1.33, 2.19), traitors (1.33, 2.29), and collectively, a *pestis* deadly to the republic (1.11, 30). All of Cicero's labels relate these men to parasites, who thrive by harming the "body" (literally and metaphorically) that sustains them.

According to Cicero, the gods were displeased with the conspirators' blatant disregard for their worship and impious ambition for the destruction of their sacred places. These men would receive from the gods, therefore, the due penalty of their error. Because of their irreverence, they would bring *pestem* upon themselves (1.2, 33); be given "eternal tortures" (*aeternis suppliciis*, 1.33); suffer punishment (*poena*, 2.11, 3.15, 4.6; *vindicandum*, 4.6; *supplicium*, 1.33, 3.22, 4.7), "destruction" (*pernicies*, 1.33), "doom" (*fatum*, 2.11), "hatred" (*odium*: 3.22); and eventually, for many of them, meet death (*damnati*, 4.5; *mors*, 4.7; *mortis poenam*, 4.7). In the end, the gods actively thwarted the conspirators (3.22) and redirected the *fatum* that these men had planned for the republic (3.1) back onto themselves. And so Cicero could confidently assert that it was he—and not Lentulus—who had been truly destined (*fatalem*) to interpret the signs of the gods, since he had, by his reverence, procured their divine favor (4.2).

The Temple of Concord

Cicero delivers his fourth and final *Catilinarian* to the senate assembled in the Temple of Concord. The setting of this speech was, as with the other orations, explicitly suited to the purpose of his rhetoric, which in this case aimed at unifying the senate (or inspiring "concord," if you will)²²⁶ in a course of action against the conspirators. Cicero believed that the senate held

²²⁶ *Concordia ordinum* was Cicero's ordained political policy. See Eagle (1949) 15; Butler (2002) 99.

the absolute authority to suspend usual legal procedures “when the public safety demanded [it].”²²⁷ The problem he encountered, however, was that

. . . [a] formal sentence by the Senate, which was not a court of law, lacked precedent and ran counter to the citizen’s legal right of appeal to the People against a death penalty . . . the Senate might vote for the execution of the five plotters, but as prime mover and executive Cicero would become the target for reprisals.²²⁸

As consul, Cicero had good reason to be concerned about the political backlash of the senate’s decision. Consequently, in the *Fourth Catilinarian*, he stresses, “for the reassurance of senators who feared that the physical force needed to carry through the executions was lacking, the sense of the whole area being full of carefully prepared supporters.”²²⁹ In emphasizing this prevailing atmosphere of unanimity, Cicero could minimize the public perception of his personal involvement in the executions, and thereby deflect responsibility “fairly and squarely on the broad shoulders of the Senate.”²³⁰

Cicero commences his speech with the observation, ‘I see’ (*Video*, twice in 4.1). In the last of a series of speeches that have relied extensively upon the concept of the visual, this word provides a fitting segue to the orator’s final exploration of this theme. As Cicero looks at his audience, he sees his gaze returned by their eyes (*conversos oculis*). He also observes (*video*) their anxiety about the danger to themselves, the republic, and to him as their consul. He then evokes their remembrance of several locations in the city—including the Forum, the Campus Martius, and the Senate house—and notes the symbolic meaning that they would have attached to each (4.2). In focusing their attention right away on the visual (i.e. on what can either be seen

²²⁷ Mitchell (1971) 52-3.

²²⁸ Bailey (1971) 33.

²²⁹ Millar (1998) 110-11. See *Catil.* 4.14.

²³⁰ Stockton (1971) 135. See Robinson (1994) for a thorough analysis of Cicero’s deflective techniques.

or easily imagined), Cicero alludes back to the authority of his consular vision, which had enabled him to detect and suppress a conspiracy that had threatened the security of their public places and was responsible for their existing concern. He desires them to trust his vision still, so he strives to alleviate their worry by helping them see what it is that he sees—a room full of people who are united in a common purpose, and are collectively empowered to make a decision for the good of the republic.

Cicero acknowledges the potential for discord in the assembly, stemming from a disagreement between Silanus and Caesar regarding the best punishment for the conspirators (4.7-8). Though Cicero sided in opinion with Silanus, who favored execution, he had to be very careful not to appear to lead the senate to this decision. The dilemma of his situation was that he needed “to speak persuasively in a venue that precluded his arguing explicitly for either side.”²³¹ The record of his speech, therefore, shows his efforts to demonstrate the solidarity of the senate, who needed assurance that the consul would uphold whatever decision they made as a unified body (4.14).

Cicero embarks on this theme of unity beginning in 4.14, where he assesses, once again, the scenery of his surroundings. “Everyone” (*Omnes*) is present—men “of every rank” (*omnium ordinum*), “of every class” (*omnium generum*), and “of every age” (*omnium . . . aetatum*). Despite their inherent differences, these men can be seen crowding the Forum, the temples around the Forum, and the spaces surrounding the temples, filling them to capacity (*plenum . . . plena . . . pleni*). In this massive gathering of people, Cicero perceives something remarkable, something that the city had not experienced since its founding: unanimity (*omnes sentirent unum*).

²³¹ Cape (1995) 272. Put another way, he would need to manipulate his audience “by appearing not to manipulate” (274).

There were some who were incapable of relating to this common bond among the populace and who, because of their crimes against the state, proved that they were actually quite hostile to the concept of unity. Cicero, in removing (*excipio*) and separating (*secerno*) these men—the conspirators—from society, had only made their moral and social isolation visibly official (4.15). But here, Cicero makes a very important distinction concerning their identity: the conspirators are not to be classed as wicked citizens, he advises the senate; they are to be viewed, rather, as most despicable enemies.²³² He echoes a similar sentiment in 4.16 when he contrasts the freedman who greatly prizes his citizenship—or the slave who would eagerly possess it—with the aristocrat who disdains it because he see his countrymen as enemies.

But Cicero does not consider these men for long. He calls upon the gods (*di immortales!*, 4.15), as he had the senate, to observe “with what crowds, enthusiasm, and courage” (*qua frequentia, quo studio, qua virtute*) the people “join together” (*consentiunt*) to promote the security and worth of all (*communem*). Cicero represents these loyal and supportive people as the very heart of Rome, including among them: knights (4.15, 22), tribunes (4.15), clerks (4.15), freeborn citizens (4.16), the poor (4.16), freedmen, (4.16), slaves (4.16), and tradesmen (4.17); in short, all classes (4.18, 19), all Roman people (4.19), and all loyal citizens (4.22), he says, support the senate’s decision. Just as he could see (*video . . . video*, 4.15) all these people gathered, so too could the senate. Cicero also focuses the senators’ minds on the appearance (*aspectus*, 4.16) of the city, which could be seen outside in the area of the Forum. The city, he reminds them, and all that composes it—temples, freedoms, daylight, soil—is the common (*commune*) possession of them all, and is yet another example of their shared interests.

²³² If Cicero could successfully “create the impression” that these men were enemies, and not citizens, this distinction would help to justify their execution. Cf. Habicht (1990) 37.

Similar language emphasizing this “dramatic show of unity” continues throughout much of the rest of the speech.²³³ All the people were joined together (*coniungit*, 4.15) in a “harmonious alliance” (*societatem concordia[m]*) and “bond” (*coniunctionem*). All classes were of the same mind (*consentiunt*, 4.18) in the best interest of their “common homeland” (*patria communis*). “All” men (*omnis . . . omnis . . . universum*, 4.19) were truly united in a common mindset (*unum atque idem sentientem*), and no force would ever be strong enough “to break or weaken” (*confringere et labefactare*, 4.22) this bond (*coniunctionem*) between the senate, the Equites, and all loyal citizens (*bonorum omnium*). In closing (4.24), Cicero impresses upon their minds the images of all they cherish and have in common—their family ties (*coniungibus as liberis*), the sacred places (*aris; focis; fanis; templis*), the public and private places (*urbis tectis ac sedibus*), and their values (*imperio; libertate; salute* and *universa re publica*: “the entire republic”). As the senate decides how to punish the men who put all their interests at risk, Cicero reaffirms his loyalty to them and vows always to defend their cooperative decision on the country’s behalf.

Cicero’s selection of the Temple of Concord for the setting of this speech was intended to reinforce his imagery of the “unity of the classes,” or *concordia ordinum*, in support of the conspirators’ execution.²³⁴ This was no “casual choice,”²³⁵ since it enabled Cicero to paint an idealized picture of the masses rallying around the senate in a place where this was easily conceivable. Indeed, the people were out in hordes that day and some were highly interested in the senate proceedings, but Cicero did not need to embellish this scene. In the end, he knew that

²³³ Mitchell (1979) 238.

²³⁴ Eagle (1949) 15; Butler (2002) 99.

²³⁵ *Ibid.*

“it is not creativity that wins an audience...but rather telling people what they want to hear in a context that makes the message credible.”²³⁶

²³⁶ Edelman (1988) 113.

CHAPTER 6 CONSTRUCTION OF A POLITICAL “REALITY”

Cicero’s *Catilinarian* orations showcase, to great effect, a descriptive technique that has traditionally been relegated to the poet: imagery. While Cicero did write his share of poetry, he displayed his linguistic finesse most remarkably in the genre of oratory, where he excelled in the art of persuasion. With devices and methods that lent themselves to the visual, such as metaphor and *enargeia*, Cicero was able to construct in the mind’s eye of his audience a picture of reality that favored his political advancement, and detracted, correspondingly, from the image of his enemies.

Cicero employs imagery in all four of his speeches, vividly animating his depiction of characters and events. He exhibits to his audience, first of all, the depraved character of Catiline who, with his friends, engages in activities so immoral and vile that the orator likens his influence to a *pestis*, or cancerous disease. Cicero then focuses on the symptoms and casualties of this disease, displaying an apocalyptic vision of the republic that jars shockingly with the grandeur that the people could see around them in the Forum. In order to prevent the ruin of fire and slaughter from destroying the city, Cicero projects an image of himself that recommends his authority as a consul, visionary, and *imperator togatus*, suggesting that he alone is capable of saving the republic from harm. And indeed, when he does succeed in capturing the conspirators, he seems prideful at first as he announces his official recognition as Rome’s “savior.” However, he is quick to attribute the ultimate preservation of the city to the immortal gods, and in particular, to Jupiter, who presided over the Forum on the day that the conspiracy was revealed and adopted the consul as his proxy. In these ways, Cicero employs visual imagery, evokes scenes from his audience’s memory and imagination, and exploits the images of his surroundings to construct an image of reality that was most useful to his purpose.

Most scholars agree that Catiline's conspiracy was not some "trifling episode"; as we discussed, Cicero's contemporaries acknowledged the seriousness of these events and none disputed his claim of preserving the state from harm.²³⁷ Twenty years after the crisis of the conspiracy, Cicero reflected thus:

For never was the republic in more serious peril, never was peace more profound. Thus, as a result of my counsels and my vigilance, their weapons slipped suddenly from the hands of the most desperate traitors—dropped to the ground of their own accord! What achievement in war, then, was ever so great? What triumph can be compared with that?²³⁸

After so many years, Cicero's memory of the conspiracy and the glory of his personal role in suppressing it remained fresh in his mind. From the moment his account, in four illustrative speeches, was recorded in writing, the Catilinarian conspiracy assumed a place within the annals of history. While it is possible that Cicero's evocations may not have presented an accurate portrayal of the events as they unfolded, his speeches reveal to us, in their vivid construction of Cicero's political "reality," the persuasive power of his oratory.

²³⁷ Mitchell (1979) 239-40. Cf. Wood (1988) 50-1.

²³⁸ *Off.* 1.77. Translation from Wood (1988) 51.

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Aldrette, G.S. 1999. *Gestures and Acclamations in Ancient Rome*. Baltimore.
- Allen, Jr., W. 1954. "Cicero's Conceit." *TAPhA* 85:121-44.
- Altheim, F. 1938. *A History of Roman Religion*. London.
- Bailey, D.R.S. 1971. *Cicero*. New York.
- Barber, K.A. 2004. *Rhetoric in Cicero's Pro Balbo*. New York.
- Barlow, J. 1994. "Cicero's Sacrilege in 63 B.C." *Studies in Latin Literature* 7: 180-89.
- Bartlett, J. 1992. *Bartlett's Familiar Quotations*, 16th ed. Edited by J. Kaplan. Boston.
- Barton, C.A. 1999. "The Roman Blush: The Delicate Matter of Self-Control." In *Constructions of the Classical Body*, edited by J.I. Porter, pp. 212-34. Ann Arbor.
- Bell, A.J.E. 1997. "Cicero and the Spectacle of Power." *JRS* 87: 1-22.
- Bible. 1971. King James Version. Nashville.
- Bradley, K.R. 1978. "Slaves and the Conspiracy of Catiline." *CPh* 73.4: 329-36.
- Butler, S. 2002. *The Hand of Cicero*. London.
- Cape Jr., R.W. 1995. "The Rhetoric of Politics in Cicero's *Fourth Catilinarian*." *AJPh* 116.2: 255-77.
- Clark, A.C., ed. 1989. *M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationes: Pro Sex. Roscio, De Imperio Cn. Pompei, Pro Cluentio, In Catilinam, Pro Murena, Pro Caelio*. Oxford.
- Clarke, M.L. 1996. *Rhetoric at Rome: A Historical Survey*. London.
- Craig, C.P. 1993. "Three Simple Questions for Teaching Cicero's *First Catilinarian*." *CJ* 88.3: 255-67.
- Crawford, J.W. 1994. *M. Tullius Cicero The Fragmentary Speeches: An Edition with Commentary*, 2nd ed. Atlanta.
- Corbett, E.P.J. 1965. *Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student*. New York.
- Dudley, D.R. 1960. *The Civilization of Rome*. New York.
- Eagle, E.D. 1949. "Catiline and the *Concordia Ordinum*." *Phoenix* 3.1: 15-30.
- Edelman, M. 1988. *Constructing the Political Spectacle*. Chicago.

- Edwards, C. 1993. *The Politics of Immorality in Ancient Rome*. Cambridge.
- Ewbank, W.W. 1933. *The Poems of Cicero*. London.
- Everitt, A. 2003. *Cicero: The Life and Times of Rome's Greatest Politician*. New York.
- Fantham, E. 1997. "The Contexts and Occasions of Roman Public Rhetoric." In *Roman Eloquence: Rhetoric in Society and Literature*, edited by W.J. Dominik. London.
- . 2004. *The Roman World of Cicero's De Oratore*. Oxford.
- Gould, H.E. and J.L. Whiteley, eds. 1982. *Cicero: In Catilinam I & II*. Bristol.
- Griffin, M.T. and E.M. Atkins, trans. 1991. *Cicero: On Duties*. Cambridge.
- Grube, G.M.A. 1962. "Educational, Rhetorical, and Literary Theory in Cicero." *Phoenix* 16.4: 234-57.
- Gruen, E.S. 1974. *The Last Generation of the Roman Republic*. Berkeley.
- . 1969. "Notes on the First Catilinarian Conspiracy." *CPh* 64:1: 20-24.
- Habicht, C. 1990. *Cicero the Politician*. Baltimore.
- Hadas, M. 1952. *A History of Latin Literature*. New York.
- Hardy, E.G. 1924. "The Catilinarian Conspiracy in Its Context: A Re-study of the Evidence." Oxford.
- Harsh, P.W. 1955. "The Intriguing Slave in Greek Comedy." *TAPhA* 86: 135-42.
- Heibges, U. 1969. "Religion and Rhetoric in Cicero's Speeches." *Latomus* 28: 833-49.
- Innes, D. 1988. "Cicero on Tropes." *Rhetorica* 6.3: 307-25.
- Kennedy, G.A. 1972. *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World, 300 B.C.-A.D. 300*. Princeton.
- Konstan, D. 1993. "Rhetoric and the Crisis of Legitimacy in Cicero's *Catilinarian Orations*." In *Rethinking the History of Rhetoric: Multidisciplinary Essays on the Rhetorical Tradition*, edited by T. Poulakos, pp. 11-30. Boulder.
- Lanham, R.A. 1991. *A Handlist of Rhetorical Terms*, 2nd ed. Berkeley.
- Laurence, R. 1994. "Rumour and Communication in Roman Politics." *G&R* 41.1: 62-74.
- Leeman, A.D. 1986. *Orationis Ratio: The Stylistic Theories and Practice of the Roman Orators Historians and Philosophers*, vol. 1. Amsterdam.

- Maccari, C. Public domain. "Image:Maccari-Cicero.jpg." *Wikipedia*. 16 Jan. 2007.
<<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Image:Maccari-Cicero.jpg>>.
- MacDonald, C., tran. 1977. *Cicero: In Catilinam I-IV, Pro Murena, Pro Sulla, Pro Flacco*. Cambridge.
- MacKendrick, P. 1995. *The Speeches of Cicero: Context, Law, Rhetoric*. London.
- Maclardy, A.A. 2004. *Completely Parsed Cicero: The First Oration of Cicero Against Catiline*. Wauconda, IL.
- May, J.M. 2002. "Ciceronian Oratory in Context." In *Brill's Companion to Cicero: Oratory and Rhetoric*, edited by, J. M. May, pp. 49-70. Boston.
- . 1988. *Trials of Character: The Eloquence of Ciceronian Ethos*. Chapel Hill.
- May, J.M and J. Wisse, trans. 2001. *Cicero: On the Ideal Orator (De Oratore)*. Oxford.
- McDermott, W.C. 1972. "Cicero's Publication of His Consular Orations." *Philologus* 116.2: 277-84.
- "metaphor, *n.*" *OED Online*. Dec. 2001. Oxford University Press. 12 July 2007
<<http://dictionary.oed.com.lp.hscl.ufl.edu/cgi/entry/00307429>>.
- Millar, F. 1998. *The Crowd in Rome in the Late Republic*. Ann Arbor.
- Mitchell, T.N. 1971. "Cicero and the *Senatus Consultum Ultimum*." *Historia* 20: 47-61.
- . 1979. *Cicero: The Ascending Years*. New Haven.
- Morstein-Marx, R. 2004. *Mass Oratory and Political Power in the Late Roman Republic*. Cambridge.
- Mueller, H.-F. 1993. "Images of Excellence: Visual Rhetoric and Political Behavior." In *Teoria E Prassi Politica Nelle Opere Di Plutarco* (Atti del V Convegno plutarco, Certosa di Pontignano, 7-9 giugno 1993), edited by I. Gallo and B. Scadigli, pp. 287-300. Napoli.
- Nisbet, R.G.M. 1965. "The Speeches." In *Cicero*, edited by T.A. Dorey, pp. 47-79. New York.
- Olujic, M.B. 1998. "Embodiment of Terror: Gendered Violence in Peacetime and Wartime in Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina." *Medical Anthropology Quarterly* 12.1: 31-50.
- Oxford Latin Dictionary*. 1982. Edited by P.G.W. Glare. Oxford.
- Parker, H. 2001. "Loyal Slaves and Loyal Wives." In *Women and Slaves in Greco-Roman Culture: Differential Equations*, edited by J. Murnagham, S.R. Murnagham, and S. Murnaghan, pp. 152-73. New York.

- Phillips, E.J. 1976. "Catiline's Conspiracy." *Historia* 25: 441-48.
- Potter, D. S. 1999. *Literary Texts and the Roman Historian*. London.
- Price, J.J. 1998. "The Failure of Cicero's *First Catilinarian*." *Studies in Latin Literature* 10: 106-28.
- Ramsey, J.T. 1982. "Cicero, *pro Sulla* 68 and Catiline's Candidacy in 66 BC." *HSPH* 86: 121-31.
- Rawson, E. 1972. "Cicero the Historian and Cicero the Antiquarian." *JRS* 62: 33-45.
- Robinson, A. 1994. "Avoiding the Responsibility: Cicero and the Suppression of Catiline's Conspiracy." *SyllClass* 5: 43-51.
- Rosnow, R.L. and G.A. Fine. 1976. *Rumor and Gossip: The Social Psychology of Hearsay*. New York.
- Schick, T. 1965. "Cicero and Pathetic Appeal in Oratory." *The Classical Bulletin* 42.2: 17-18.
- Scullard, H.H. 1965a. *From the Gracchi to Nero*. London.
- . 1965b. "The Political Career of a *Novus Homo*." In *Cicero*, edited by T.A. Dorey, pp. 1-25. New York.
- Seager, R. 1964. "The First Catilinarian Conspiracy." *Historia* 13: 338-47.
- . 1973. "*Iusta Catilinae*" *Historia* 22.2: 240-48.
- Shakespeare, W. 1998. *The Tragedy of Hamlet Prince of Denmark*. Edited by S. Barnet. New York.
- Solmson, F. 1968. "Aristotle and Cicero on the Orator's Playing upon the Feelings." In *Kleine Schriften* 2: 216-30.
- Steel, C.E.W. 2001. *Cicero, Rhetoric, and Empire*. Oxford.
- . 2005. *Reading Cicero: Genre and Performance in Late Republican Rome*. London.
- Stockton, D. 1971. *Cicero: A Political Biography*. Oxford.
- Taylor, L.R. 1949. *Party Politics in the Age of Caesar*. Berkeley.
- Vasaly, A. 1993. *Representations: Images of the World in Ciceronian Oratory*. Berkeley.
- Waters, K.H. 1970. "Cicero, Sallust, and Catilina." *Historia* 19: 195-215.

- Webb, R. 1997. "Imagination and the Arousal of the Emotions in Greco-Roman Rhetoric." In *The Passions in Roman Thought and Literature*, edited by S.M. Braund and C. Gill, pp. 112-27. Cambridge.
- Wilkins, A.S., ed. 1989. *M. Tulli Ciceronis Rhetorica, Tomus I: Libros De Oratore Tres*. Oxford.
- Wood, N. 1988. *Cicero's Social and Political Thought*. Berkeley.
- Wordsworth, W. 2004. "I Wandered Lonely As a Cloud." In *William Wordsworth: Selected Poems*. Edited by S. Gill. London.
- Yavetz, Z. 1963. "The Failure of Catiline's Conspiracy." *Historia* 12: 485-99.
- . Yavetz, Z. 1988. *Slaves and Slavery in Ancient Rome*. New Brunswick.
- Yeats, W.B. 2002. "Under Ben Bulbin." In *W. B. Yeats: Selected Poems*. Edited by J. Kelly. London.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Angela Brook Miller Reed was born on May 8th, 1980 in Montgomery, Alabama. The oldest of four children, she grew up mostly in Ocala, Florida, graduating from Forest High School in 1998. She earned her A.A. from Florida College in Temple Terrace before transferring to the University of Florida where in 2002 she received her B.A. in classical studies, with minors in English and secondary education. She began work on her M.A. in Latin that fall, but after a year of full time graduate study, left Gainesville to marry David Reed, a UF alumnus.

Angela and her husband returned to Gainesville the following year so she could continue her graduate coursework. Between remodeling a fixer-upper and working full-time as a teacher at Union County High School in Lake Butler, she finally managed to complete her degree requirements, receiving her M.A in Latin in August 2007. Angela will continue teaching in the Gainesville area in the fall, when she begin a new position at Cornerstone Academy, instructing middle and upper level Latin students.