*Transactions of the American Philological Association* 124 (1994) 211–266

# Cicero's Construction of Consular *Ethos* in the *First Catilinarian* *

William W. Batstone
*The Ohio State University*

Why did Cicero deliver the *First Catilinarian*? Typically, a speech is thought to address a need that arises from outside the speech, such as the guilt or innocence of the accused, the appropriate response to a foreign aggressor, or the praise of the dead. Rhetorical and historical analysis may then proceed to examine how the orator marshals his arguments and uses (or distorts) the historical facts that have created the occasion for the speech. As a unified and persuasive whole, the historical purpose of the speech is seen as answering a rhetorical challenge, and analysis is appropriately referred to that challenge in its historical particularity.

The case of the *First Catilinarian*, however, is complicated in two ways. First, there is the very obscurity of the events, the plans, and the information to which Cicero refers. This has allowed critics to create a wide range of external exigencies motivating Cicero and a diverse set of practical purposes for his speech. It has also allowed skepticism to undermine every positive claim made about events by Cicero himself. Second, there is the problem that these historical circumstances do not cohere so far as we can tell in producing a significant and immediate external rhetorical challenge which requires a specific practical response.

The historical tangle includes matters as basic as the question, who did Cicero intend to address when he convened the Senate? We do not know whether he expected Catiline to have left Rome for Manlius' camp or whether he expected to see Catiline in the Senate that day. This means that we do not know whether the speech which was given was planned as an attack on its addressee, Catiline, or whether the attack was an impromptu performance.[1] And

*A version of this paper was delivered at the 125th meeting of the American Philological Association in Washington D.C. in 1993. I would like to thank William S. Anderson for reading an earlier draft, *TAPA*'s anonymous readers for careful, thoughtful, and generous commentary that has unquestionably improved content and presentation, and Sander Goldberg for his role both as scholar and editor. Finally, I would like to acknowledge the support of that patron of rhetors and indefatigable advocate for Cicero, Christopher P. Craig.

[1]Rawson 74 reflects the gaps in our knowledge: "He probably supposed that Catiline had left the city and hoped at last to get support for action against him. But to the general amazement

when did Cicero deliver the *First Catilinarian*? We do not know whether Cicero convened the Senate on the day of the assassination attempt or on the next day. And, of course, we do not know whether there was an assassination attempt. Nor do we know what, if anything, Cicero had learned about Catiline's plans from a certain Fulvia. Adolf Primmer articulated his approach to the problem of the *First Catilinarian* as the attempt to combine the historical events and the oratorical performance and to treat the speech as a persuasive structure (19–20). But, as his article amply demonstrates, the historical record does not always help: "Ciceros Situation und damit seine 'Überredungsziele' könnten ja ganz andere gewesen sein, je nachdem, ob er Catilinas Abgang aus Rom für die Nacht vor oder nach der Rede erwartete" (21). In fact, many relevant details are either non–events or contested events, and our view of many of the events depends on our interpretation of this speech and the speeches to which it is related.

The evidence of Cicero himself is of no real help in answering so basic a question as, what did Cicero intend to accomplish? In 60 BC, in a letter to Atticus, Cicero catalogues his consular orations and describes this speech in functional terms: *septima [oratione] qua Catilinam emisi*, (Cic. *Att.* 2. 1. 3).[2] But this description of Cicero's active role in Catiline's departure, which is sometimes taken as an accurate representation of Cicero's intention, is not quite so unambiguously asserted on the day after the *First Catilinarian*, when he delivered the *Second Catilinarian* to the Roman people. In the opening sentence of that speech, Cicero's three alternative descriptions of his actions progressively diminish his initiative: *Tandem aliquando, Quirites, L. Catilinam...ex urbe vel eiecimus vel emisimus vel ipsum egredientem verbis prosecuti sumus*, (*II Cat.* 1). And not only does he offer these three descriptions of the effect of his speech, but in his next sentence he immediately capitalizes on his picture of an active and threatening Catiline by shifting his attention and emphasis to the active, even aggressive and self–determined role that Catiline played in his own departure: *abiit, excessit, evasit, erupit*. Later, in his second report to the people in the early days of December, he recalls a similarly contradictory picture of events: *erupit ex urbe...cum ex urbe Catilinam eiciebam* (*III Cat.* 3).

---

Catiline appeared. If Cicero's picture is to be trusted, no one greeted him, and all shrank away from the bench where he sat. But it was not likely that in the circumstances either his fellow–*nobiles* or any Senators with *popularis* links or doubts about the Last Decree would give Cicero full backing..."

[2]All references to Cicero are to the standard editions of the Oxford Classical Texts. At *Pis.* 5 (55 BC) Cicero describes his actions in terms which recall the beginning of *II Cat.* (cited in the text below): *Ego L. Catilinam caedem senatus, interitum urbis non obscure sed palam molientem egredi ex urbe iussi ut, a quo legibus non poteramus, moenibus tuti esse possemus.*

If Cicero's purpose had been to send Catiline from the city, it is striking that he does not clearly claim that his purpose has been accomplished. Even if he had had other intentions, it is striking that he chooses not to take responsibility or credit for the actual outcome of the speech he gave the day before. And it is most striking that he did not modify this description and clarify his intentions when his speeches were published,[3] when the facts were in and the uprising suppressed.

Other direct evidence from Cicero only further complicates our efforts to determine his purpose. We can surmise, for instance, that it was plausible immediately after the speech and upon Catiline's departure from Rome to accuse Cicero of driving Catiline into exile. In the *Second Catilinarian*, Cicero is already defending himself against exactly that charge: *at etiam sunt qui dicant, Quirites, a me eiectum in exsilium esse Catilinam*, (*II Cat.* 12).[4] The implications of this charge were serious, as Cicero himself explains.[5] For our purposes, however, the important considerations are two: 1) it was possible even at the time of the *Second Catilinarian* to misconstrue Cicero and his practical purpose in delivering the *First Catilinarian*, and 2) one's belief about the actual effect of the speech, whether successful or not, depended at first upon an interpretation of Catiline's departure. Yet that was also subject to dispute: did he go into exile at Massilia or did he join forces with Manlius in Etruria? Did he escape or was he driven out?

Thus, even if we could be sure that the speech we have is the speech Cicero delivered, we would still not be able to arrive at a sound understanding of the *First Catilinarian* by the historical method—the historical facts are too dependent upon our interpretation of a speech whose purpose and effect is open to dispute. But we are not even allowed the luxury of assuming that the speech

[3]This will be true whether the speeches were published in 60 BC or in December of 63 BC. On the controversy concerning the publication date for the *Catilinarian orations*, see n. 7 below.

[4]The emphasis here on *a me* marks this claim about the effect of the speech as an interpretation of his purpose: "Some say that it was by my agency that Catiline had been driven into exile." The passage from *II Cat.* 12 to *II Cat.* 15 continues to refer to and refute, even as it recalls, the very terms Cicero wishes to deny. The repetitions constitute a veritable refrain of *eiecere, eiectum,* and *exsilium: ...eiectum in exsilium...istos ipsos eicerem...in exsilium iussus est...* (12) *qui verbo cives in exsilium eicio...*(13) *in exsilium eiciebam...et ille eiectus in exsilium...iter ad fugam atque in exsilium converterit...in exsilium eiectus...* (14) *Dicatur sane eiectus esse a me, dum modo eat in exsilium...multoque magis illud timeo...quod illum emiserim potius quam quod eiecerim...eiectum esse dicant* (15).

[5]*...non de spe conatuque depulsus, sed indemnatus innocens in exsilium eiectus a consule vi et minis esse dicetur: et erunt qui illum, si hoc fecerit, non improbum sed miserum, me non diligentissimum consulem sed crudelissimum tyrannum existimari velint, II Cat.* 14.

we have represents closely the speech Cicero gave in November 63.[6] If it is true that Cicero's consular speeches were first published in 60 BC,[7] we face the possibility of revisions far more extensive than those one would expect in a speech published within a year of its delivery. The circular reasoning inherent in the unsettled facts of the case is, therefore, compounded by a whole set of imponderables created by the possibility that the speech was revised not only when outcomes unknown to Cicero at the time could be represented as plans which Cicero knew, but also when Cicero's actual intentions in 63 BC might be modified in light of new political exigencies, and especially to avoid the *invidia* and accusations of 60 BC. George Kennedy wisely notes that, "We cannot say with certainty of any passage in the *Catilinarians* that it must have been added or revised later" (177). But, it is equally apt to say of the *First Catilinarian* that we cannot say with certainty that any passage was *not* added later.[8]

Under these circumstances, it is not surprising that modern critics and scholars are undecided about the practical function of the *First Catilinarian.* Seager (245) asserts with some confidence, "Cicero's fundamental objective is clear throughout the *First* and *Second Catilinarian*: to force all potential troublemakers out into the open and so to make it possible to suppress them firmly and quickly." But Gould and Whitely (xix) believe that "the consul was hoping to force the Senate's hand and make it say, 'No! arrest him at once.'"[9] Solmsen (400–01) considers the speeches to be "one continuous effort to stir up *indignatio* or to arouse *odium.*" In a similar vein, Primmer (18–38) believes that the speech was intended to alienate Catiline from his fellow citizens. But

[6]For a brief discussion and bibliography see Kennedy 1972: 176–78, including n. 45, 177.

[7]The general issue of publication and revision has a long history which need not be reviewed here; see, most recently, the summary discussion in Vasaly 8–10, esp. 9, nn. 11 and 12. The *First Catilinarian* has been extensively studied for revisionary evidence of the political climate of 60 BC: see, for instance, Draheim 1061–71; Bornecque 145; and Fuchs 463–69. One must also take notice of the argument by McDermott that Cicero published the *Catilinarians* in 63 BC: "serially or as a group, probably in December." He argues for the improbability and anomolousness of a delayed publication date. There is no external evidence to support his argument but the proof from probability and normal practice is rigorous. Crawford 79–80 n. 3 finds the case argued "cogently"; Stroh 1983: 41 distinguishes between the published corpus and the individual speeches; see also Stroh 1975: 51 n. 90. Reservations are recorded by Classen 1985: 3–6: "additions, at least"; and Habicht 36 and 114 n. 7: "perhaps somewhat changed when a second edition was made in 60 BC" The thesis is not accepted by Classen 1988: 297–99 n. 24 or Konstan 12.

[8]See, for instance, Nisbet 62–63: "In the first speech Cicero seems too anxious to justify the expulsion of Catiline...There is too much irrelevant invective...[O]ne does not seem to be listening in on a real debate in one of the most hard headed assemblies that the world has known."

[9]Cp. *CAH* ix. 488, "Cicero probably sought to elicit from the Senate the retort, 'No, no, arrest him at once!'"

this motive had already seemed inadequate to John (650–65), who thought our speech was a conflation of two original speeches, an invective against Catiline and a report to the Senate.[10] Recently, Christopher Craig (255–67) has offered an analysis for pedagogical purposes which emphasizes the "high drama" of Cicero's extemporaneous performance and his continual modifications of purpose and tactic. Finally, among modern scholars as among ancient observers, even the outcome of the speech has been disputed: Gruen (280) believes that Catiline left Rome "on his own schedule" while Seager (243 and 247) thinks that Cicero's speech left Catiline with no alternative but to go to Manlius' camp. Others have offered other variations on these themes, but in the end we come back to the apt summary of Kennedy: "[The *Catilinarians*] do not conform well to the ordinary requirements of deliberative oratory...Indeed, it is difficult to say what is the principal objective of each speech..." (176).

Such uncertainty about the occasion, the purpose and the immediate effect of a speech is rare. In what follows I offer an explanation of the speech which arose from an attempt first of all to make sense of Cicero's words and strategies. In other words, I tried to postpone questions about historical details, about probable events and likely or credible intentions, and to ask a simple question, "What does the speech do?" It becomes immediately apparent that, while the audience of Senators might choose to do any number of things on the basis of the speech, the practical success or failure of the *First Catilinarian* itself does not depend on any particular action, reaction or policy.[11] Cicero does not prove that Catiline is a public enemy; he assumes that fact and attacks him: *Quo usque tandem abutere, Catilina, patientia nostra*? (*I Cat.* 1). He does not seek a judgment against Catiline; in fact, he orders Catiline into exile, invites him into exile, and says that it all makes no difference because Catiline will join Manlius anyway; then, he orders him to undertake his war.[12] Cicero begins by announcing a crisis with operatic impatience, but by the end he has

[10]The basic interpretation is revived by Loutsch who sees the speech as moving its polemic on two fronts: "D'une part, contre Catilina, sur qui il tente de faire pression pour qui'il quitte la ville. D'autre part, contre l'incrédulité d'une partie des sénateurs..." 35.

[11]Compare Primmer; he emphasizes the speech, not as a means to a particular action, but as a means to a psychological effect: "als ein Gebilde, das einen Überredungsteilziele einem von den Gesetzen der Psychagogie (nicht bloss der Logik) bestimmten Gesamtablauf einordnen." 20. In fact, all who see this speech as a form of invective are in basic agreement about the speech's orientation. I will argue that invective, which itself entails both praise and blame (see Cicero *Part. Orat.* 69), only plays a role in Cicero's larger purpose and that the audience is not simply or primarily Catiline, but the Senators themselves who observe the performance.

[12]The details are argued below. The order is given at *I Cat.* 10, 20, 23, and 32; the invitation is given at 13 (taking *suadeo* as a form of invitation) and 23–24; and the prediction is made at 25. At 33, Catiline is ordered to undertake his impious war.

dissipated the crisis and is asking for more patience. He condemns himself for inertia and villainy, but then reconceives his inactivity as prudential wisdom. He turns to the past as a model of decisive action in order to reconstitute that same past as the long history of disease in the body politic that has finally singled out this man and this moment to wait for the cure which is under the provident eye of the consul and the watchful care of Jupiter.

The *First Catilinarian* is, I conclude, finally about Cicero. It is about interpreting Cicero, about who he is and what it means to have and to have had him as consul; it is about what he has done, what he plans, what he knows, and what he has said. In rhetorical terms, this speech constructs and presents Cicero's version of his consular *ethos*.[13] One may, of course, rightfully argue that every Roman speech is in some sense larger than the particular occasion which it addresses (*de Orat.* 3. 120-21). The rhetoric of advocacy[14] insures that the speaker will see his speech as both a kind of political platform, making promises for the future, and a kind of autobiography. The *ethos* of the advocate, no less than the *ethos* of the client, will play a significant role in the proceedings, and so every speech will have to construct and manipulate the speaker's *ethos* for both short term and long range purposes.[15] In these cases, however, *ethos* is still one means, among several, to a specific practical goal—whether that goal is a forensic verdict or the adoption of a particular policy. By my interpretation, Cicero in the *First Catilinarian* neither advances a particular policy as the subject of debate and deliberation nor does he seek a verdict on Catiline. His speech is partly self-defense and autobiography, partly justification and statement of public policy; but it uses the traditional concerns

[13]Cicero himself cites the *First Catilinarian* for its pathetic effects in *Or.* 128–29. This is not a contradiction of my view, for the orator's vehemence, which is certainly in evidence through most of the speech, may serve the purpose of dramatizing his character, especially when the speech itself moves from vehement impatience to reassuring calm. In Aristotelian terms, Cicero's anger and self-accusations demonstrate his disposition with regard to Rome and her citizens; see Aristotle *Rhet.* 2. 1. 1–9. Furthermore, Cicero in *Or.* 129 is discussing the effect of the speech on Catiline, while we are considering the function of the speech as a performance before the Senate.

[14]See Kennedy 1968 and the discussions of those who have followed and profited from this important article, esp. May 1981.

[15]May 1988 studies *ethos* in Roman oratory. This important book evaluates the opportunities Cicero has and the strategies he uses to employ *ethos* as a means to a persuasive end. It will be clear that I differ from May in my focus: my interest is in how a consular *ethos* is constructed in a speech like this, not in how an acquired consular status may be employed. While this may seem more in keeping with the Aristotelian injunction that the speaker should "construct" himself in a certain character (αὐτὸν ποιόν τινα . . . κατασκευάζειν, Arist. *Rhet.* 2. 1. 2), the proximity is probably superficial, since the speaker in an Athenian lawcourt might well be a private individual whose *ethos* is necessarily constructed in his speech.

of forensic and deliberative oratory primarily to display Cicero, his passion and his reason, his wisdom and providence, his powers of oratory.

## THE HISTORICAL DILEMMA AND THE RHETORICAL PROBLEM

"The evaluation of a classical speech is an exercise in both literary and historical judgment." —R. G. M. Nisbet

Interpretation is, nevertheless, historical. Above I suggested that the *First Catilinarian* announces, then dissipates a crisis. This may seem tantamount to saying that there is no rhetorical problem; it is, in fact, more accurate to say that there is no precise external rhetorical problem. But, if the problem is neither to show Catiline's guilt, nor to thwart his plans, nor to motivate the Senate to action, the question becomes, what other purpose does Cicero further in addressing these issues? It is here that some account of Cicero's historical intention intrudes upon the project of asking what this speech does.

First, however, it is important to note that the historical obscurity I have reviewed is not a difficulty faced only by a modern audience trying to uncover details. It will have characterized to a large degree the audience Cicero addressed. In fact, both modern skepticism about Cicero's veracity and the occasional desire to rehabilitate the reputation of Catiline himself would find comfortable agreement among some of those in the Temple of Jupiter on that day. Our questions concerning the rhetorical occasion of the speech, therefore, are to a great extent the result of the historical context and characterize the very context Cicero addresses. In fact, since the precipitating occasion for the speech was the secret night–time meeting at Laeca's house and the subsequent assassination attempt, the immediate occasion of the speech was most likely unknown to many before Cicero spoke.[16] This means that the speech itself must address these uncertainties and provide information or the illusion of information where there was ignorance or skepticism. Furthermore, if we assume that Cicero is motivated by a crisis, we must note that the very setting of the speech in the Temple of Jupiter dramatizes and focuses the audience's attention on the crisis they need to see (cf. Vasaly 50). The speech, then, is our best evidence of Cicero's intention and of the rhetorical problem he set out to address.

[16]Cicero says that everyone does know what Catiline did "last night and the night before" (sec. 1) and that he had predicted the assassination attempt to many (sec. 10)—but we can as easily allow for some exaggeration as we can imagine skepticism and resistance.

Under these circumstances, the general and generally agreed upon features of the context are important. Cicero's need to convince the Senate of a crisis and to persuade them of the importance of this actions; his desire for a glorious consulship and his problematic status as a *novus homo*; the impending return of Pompey; the suspicions of some Senators that there was more imagination than substance to Cicero's theatrics, these general features are the significant forces that shape the context which Cicero addresses.

What Cicero needed was a performance that dramatized the crisis while assuring the Senate that he had everything under control. He needed to construct an image of his passion and his concern, of his selflessness and his providence. To do this he needed an audience not of real or potential *iudices*, nor of willing participants in a public debate, but of spectators. Men of power and influence who could recognized the importance of the occasion Cicero described, who would leave the assembly moved by the power of Cicero's oratory to see the events unfolding before them in a new light[17]—a light that shed as much praise on the speaker as it did blame on Catiline. It was Cicero's genius to see that the oratorical tradition and the Roman context offered untapped resources at a time like this. Aristotle had said that in epideictic oratory the audience, aptly called spectators, passed judgment on the present whose conditions deserve either praise or blame. This is precisely what Cicero needed.

In suggesting that the *First Catilinarian* is epideictic, I do not mean that it conforms strictly to the handbook norms and rules or even that it is a typical example of epideictic oratory. It is not a typical example of any of the *genera causarum*. The designation serves the purpose of bringing the speech's practical function into more precise focus, that is, it allows us to note that the *First Catilinarian* did not require any precise action by the Senate beyond their judgment on the speaker as speaker here and now, and that Cicero at least claims to require no specific action of Catiline. This designation also allows us to understand why the Senate was convened to observe Cicero perform his invective, why the Senate is not addressed for most of the speech,[18] and how praise and

[17]Compare the view of Konstan that the *Catilinarians* as a whole are a "struggle for the control of symbols" (16) and that the "the task of Cicero's rhetoric is to define a point of view as reasonable, as constitutive of society" (21). Konstan's view, however, allows him to see a substantive contest of symbols and values; mine brings to light a more purely rhetorical effort to establish the authority of the consul's voice and *ethos*. The difference is a matter of degree, and I believe that Cicero needed flexible authority supported by a range of symbolic associations more than he needed to establish the legitimacy of a particular symbolic system.

[18]The first 26 sections of this speech of 33 sections are addressed to Catiline, who appears in the vocative in sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 11 (2 times), 13 (2 times), 15, 18, 20 (3 times), 21, 22, and 33. The *patres conscripti* are addressed at 4 and 9 and then in the final part of the

blame in this speech perform the important function of presenting Cicero—both descriptively and performatively. Finally, this specification of Cicero's *genre* allows us to see how Cicero's presentation of himself, which I am designating as a construction of consular *ethos*, serves the political purpose of substituting Cicero's presence and his speech for deliberative oratory. In Aristotelian terms, it is precisely *ethos* which is of particular importance for the deliberative orator (*Rhet.* 2. 1. 4).

Critics have generally been aware of the degree to which the *First Catilinarian* is a form of invective[19] and have rarely missed Cicero's self–praise; they have failed to see, however, that these elements cohere in this speech as part of a general strategy. That is to say, critics have overlooked the rhetorical function of Cicero's self–defense and self–praise, and have treated it only as a personal characteristic. A personal characteristic it may have been, but the strategy was to win recognition for the speaker's own handling of the present crisis, and in doing that to empower his voice as the voice of Rome, of her traditions and values, an empowerment that would effectively substitute the consul himself for the deliberative procedures of the republic. The speaker's praise and blame of the present constitutes the rhetorical challenge of the *First Catilinarian*, and its goal is the spectator's judgment of the speakers ability (Aristotle *Rhet.* 1. 3. 2) as one who speaks now, at this crisis, of his own actions and speeches in the past and of his providence for the future. In this way, the singular importance of *ethos* to deliberative oratory joins with the epideictic display of Ciceronian oratory for the highly political purpose of constructing a consular *ethos* which will substitute for deliberation.

Furthermore, the display itself entails both forensic and deliberative issues. Cicero does not ask for, but nevertheless seeks a judgment on Catiline and on his past actions. For this reason, the speech is at times arguably forensic,[20] that is, it is a speech about the past, employing the language of the

---

speech at 27, 29, 31, and 32. The gods are apostrophized at 9, and Jupiter is addressed at 33. Loutsch 36 considers the address to Catiline in the first sentence to be an apostrophe, that is, an unexpected interposition of a different addressee from the formal addressee. The evidence, however, suggests that the apostrophes of this speech are to the Senators in 4 and 9 (compare the parallel apostrophe to the immortal gods in 9) and that the addressee changes in 27. Furthermore, even when Cicero does finally turn to address the Senate in the final division of the speech (27–32), he does so only to stage the complaint of the Patria and the consul's thoughtful explanation of what he has done, is doing and will do.

[19]In fact our oldest MS., an Ambrosian MS. at Milan ascribed to the 10th or 11th century, assigns the title, *Invectivarum in Catilinam libri IIII.* That *Invectivae in Catilinam* was the name of the *Catilinarians* in medieval catalogues, see Rouse and Reeve 64–65.

[20]That speeches to the Senate could have that force, see Cicero's comment on his speech on Clodius to the Senate: *eum tamquam reum accusavi*: *ad Q. Fr.* 2. 1. 3 (57 BC); for a political

courtroom: *iudicat, iudicium, paricido*; and the postures of the prosecutor: *num negare audes? quid taces? convincam, si negas* (*I Cat.* 8). Thus, in the *Second Catilinarian* Cicero refers to the success of this speech with *vicimus* (*II Cat.* 1) and to Catiline's failure with *convictus* (*II Cat.* 13). Later, in *Or.* 129, he describes his speech as a prosecution: *a nobis homo audacissimus Catilina in senatu accusatus.* The speech is also a defense of Cicero (admittedly, against self–accusations: *inertiae nequitiaeque condemno, I Cat.* 4) which concludes with a self–justifying appeal to Jupiter. But it is not forensic in that it does not ask for a verdict and it insists that the perpetrator leave according to his criminal plan. This is possible because Cicero has linked his self–defense not to his "prosecution" of Catiline—Catiline is beyond hope and beyond correction—but to self–praise, an account of his own past providence, demonstrated in words which these words recall and record, a past providence whose veracity will be apparent in Catiline's future actions and whose virtue will appear in Jupiter's protection. The speech, therefore, cannot have as its goal the restraint and condemnation of Catiline; for that would disturb or influence the actions which Cicero's presentation of consular *ethos* needs to anticipate. Instead, the speech creates a space in which the audience will await an outcome overseen and predicted by Cicero. In this way a positive judgment on this speech also entails accepting a certain policy regarding the future. But, the speech is not deliberative because it does not open any debate. Rather, Cicero silences discussion while posing deliberative questions about the present and the past in an effort to coopt the future.[21]

Considered in this way, the scope of the speech may be seen as one that subsumes the functions of the other *genera causarum*: within the brief scope of 33 sections, the *First Catilinarian* both argues and presents Cicero's oratorical skills. The speech itself becomes a sign: as an *epideixis* which encompasses the

---

*accusatio* see the speech of Antony against Pompey and Cicero's comments *ad Att.* 7. 8. 5. Kennedy 1972: 178 describes the forensic divisions of the speech, "almost as though Catiline were indicted before a court." Heibges 839 says that the speech "comes close to the spirit of a judicial accusation." Cape 42–52 and 69 offers a detailed analysis of the forensic elements. Dio thought that the proceedings issued in a verdict, guilty of βία, 37. 33. 3; but see Gruen 280–81 n. 75.

[21]While the appropriate temporal reference for deliberative oratory is the future, as Aristotle says (*Rhet.*1. 2. 4), he also allows the present at *Rhet.* 1. 6. 1 and 1. 8. 7, and in discussing the signs of the possible considers, of course, the past, *Rhet.* 1. 3. 7–9. Furthermore, it is clear from the practice and theory of Isocrates as well as the theory of Aristotle that one of the most important signs regarding the future is the past; see Isocrates *Demon.* 34 and Batstone, esp. 107. Thus, deliberative oratory poses questions about the present and the past in order to answer questions about the expedient policy for the present and the future. While my discussion of Cicero's *First Catilinarian* always has ancient rhetorical theory in mind, I have not found it useful to debate or enlarge the narrow definitions of handbook rhetoric.

forensic in support of deliberative purposes, it is an emblem, a daring literary emblem, of Cicero's range, his abilities, and his power. The judgment the Senators should make on Cicero's speech, both past and present, is simply that Cicero is the man to listen to, and this listening is ultimately the policy they should adopt.

What Cicero has accomplished then is to give epideictic oratory a broadly political function in terms of his own empowerment, and he has done this by converting the epideictic praise and blame into invective and self–praise, which entails converting the spectator's judgment of the epideictic speaker into a Senatorial judgment of Cicero's consular *ethos* as represented in the consular speech. In effect, not only has Cicero highly politicized *epideixis*, but he has raised an Aristotelian "means of persuasion," *ethos* as represented in the speaker's words, to the level of *telos* for his speech.[22] We can understand Cicero's speech today and even be moved by it, not because of our command of the precise details of its historical context, and, indeed, even in spite of our uncertainty about its historical purpose, narrowly defined in terms of a practical function, because the context it addresses and its function was already general and to a large degree self–referential.

This general interpretation of the *First Catilinarian* makes fundamental sense out of what Cicero says in the *Second Catilinarian*. It was correct and clever of him to remind his audience there that he drove Catiline from the city while affirming that this was merely Catiline's plan. Not only does he benefit if he can reap the rewards of ejecting a pestilence from the city while avoiding the stigma of cruelly abusing a citizen, but in a sense both are true. In fact, his recollection of his performance at the beginning of the *Second Catilinarian* summarizes his *First Catilinarian* accurately: Cicero did eject Catiline; he did dismiss him; and he did escort Catiline with his words as Catiline was leaving the city. This third alternative, moreover, points to a kind of lowest level of expectation or intention for the *First Catilinarian*, one in which the words themselves have no specific effect upon the action: Catiline is already leaving the city (*egredientem*); Cicero's words merely follow him out of the city, like

[22]Arguably the speech seeks as its effective historical *telos* quiescence in the *auctoritas* of Cicero. This is, however, so far from a practical purpose as ordinarily conceived that I have preferred to designate *ethos* as the *telos*. Two considerations support this decision: 1) While quiescence is preferable, any response which recognizes the consul's *auctoritas* and *providentia* is wholly consistent with the speech and is sometimes even urged by the speaker; 2) logic and consistency are manipulated, even sacrificed, for the purposes of ethical presentation not for the purposes of effecting a public action. For the logic of Cicero's injunctions taken literally, see the analysis of Craig; a practical view of the speech necessarily leads to the assumption that Cicero changed tactics.

an escort (*verbis prosecuti sumus*[23]). But this escort is one that redounds to the praise and empowerment of the consul as it creates in its words a voice that speaks for all Rome and in whose presence all Rome is silent

## SKEPTICISM AND PARTICULAR ASSUMPTIONS

Returning to the historical dilemma, it must be admitted that it is a general consequence of my method and its initial question (What does the speech do?) that, without evidence to the contrary, I take Cicero's report of his actions and his knowledge to be substantially true. I assume that Cicero had received most of the information he claims, that he knew Catiline was going to leave Rome, and furthermore that he expected Catiline to be in the Senate on November 8.

A general skepticism, however, is surely healthy in these matters. Seager's carefully detailed dissection of evidence and events is a case in point.[24] He makes a plausible argument that most of what we take to be the second Catilinarian conspiracy is as much a fabrication for political ends as was the so–called first Catilinarian conspiracy. His argument, however, does not avoid the problems inherent in our evidence. In order to disempower certain pieces of evidence, he must assume other speculative events and intentions.[25] Nevertheless, in a general sense, Seager is right: remove the evidence of Cicero himself, practice a radical skepticism, and there is little that can be proved. If this leads us to acknowledge that in the final analysis we cannot know with real certainty what Cicero knew and when or what was planned or what happened and when, this is a useful admission and I am quite comfortable making it.[26] In

[23]Compare Cicero's picture of Catiline leaving the city, escorted by *fortissimi cives*: *eosdem facile adducam ut te haec quae vastare iam pridem studes relinquentem usque ad portas prosequantur, I Cat.* 21. The passage is discussed below.

[24]Seager complements the argument of K. H. Waters, "Cicero, Sallust and Catiline," *Historia* 19 (1970) 195–212. Both Seager and Waters were rebutted by Phillips. In keeping with the nature of the discussion, however, Phillips' rebuttal entails arguments of probability, not proof. He admits as much when he rejects Seager's position as one that "involves one improbability after another," 448.

[25]One example suggests the extremity of his skepticism. Seager (243) grants "that Cornelius and Vargunteius were turned away from Cicero's door." But he objects to Cicero's interpretation: "That they had come not to pay their respects but to murder Cicero is quite unproven." His alternative: "All that Cicero had to do was to pick on two men, preferably known associates of Catilina, who he knew, for whatever reason, would call on the morning in question, announce to selected *summi viri* that they would come on that particular morning to murder him, and leave instructions that they should not be admitted: so the charge could never be put to the proof."

[26]Such an admission, however, does not lend any credence whatsoever to alternative constructions of the events. They remain possible to the extent that evidence supports them, but never more likely than an alternative which has been dismissed because of skepticism about the source. Furthermore, radical skepticism and reconstruction make uneasy bedfellows. Seager's

effect, it may help focus our attention on just what Cicero did accomplish in the *First Catilinarian.*

Having granted, then, that the following reconstruction is, like any other, always susceptible to radical doubt, and that this should be the case, I return to the assumptions upon which I have been working. When did Cicero deliver the *First Catilinarian*?[27] Was it on the day after the meeting at Laeca's house, that is, probably November 7,[28] and the day of the assassination attempt at Cicero's door? or was it the day after the assassination attempt, November 8? There are two possible narratives here. Both begin with the meeting at Laeca's house on the night of Nov. 6/7 and the assassination attempt on the morning of Nov. 7. In the first, the meeting of the Senate takes place on Nov. 7, and Cicero is prepared to see Catiline in the Senate. In the second, the meeting of the Senate takes place on Nov. 8, and Cicero refers to the meeting at Laeca's house as the night before last: *Recognosce tandem mecum noctem illam superiorem* (8), and *Reperti sunt duo equites Romani...et se illa ipsa nocte paulo ante lucem me in meo lectulo interfecturos esse pollicerentur* (9).

For our purposes, there is little to choose between these narratives as narratives.[29] What is really at stake is the nature of Cicero's performance. Was it an extemporaneous address when Cicero unexpectedly saw Catiline in the Senate or was it a planned attack? Here, it must be recognized that the historical details will not help us. If Cicero spoke on November 8, it does not follow that he expected that Catiline had left Rome. A plausible narrative can be constructed. Cicero had learned from Fulvia that Catiline planned to go to Manlius' camp on the night of November 8 or later and that the assassination attempt was to be followed by other forms of civil disorder. Cicero's response

---

effort to dismiss Cicero produces an alternative narrative which itself depends upon the unexamined assumption of a duplicitous consul eager to foil Pompey's ambitions to become another Sulla. If we do not share these predispositions, we cannot share his reconstruction.

[27]I ignore the suggestion of John that the speech was originally two speeches. It was a desperate effort to create order and unity where John found contradictory purposes.

[28]Even this date is disputed. Asconius 6 (Clark) gives November 7 as the date for the *First Catilinarian*; Cicero *pro Sull.* 52 seems to give the date as November 6. The exact date is not directly relevant to our concerns here.

[29]The claim that *II Cat.* 12, *hesterno die, Quirites, cum domi meae paene interfectus essem, senatum in aedem Iovis Statoris convocavi*, refers the assassination to the morning of *I Cat.*, despite the evidence of *proxima nocte* and *superiorem noctem* in *I Cat.* 1 and 8, must be rejected. *Cum* + pluperf. subj. marks the events only as prior and as "stage–setting"; see Woodcock 239. 6b p. 195; *pace* Drexler 147. Furthermore, the sentence is about the contrast between *cum domi* and *senatum in aedem*, between the private man and the public response—not about the time of events preceding *I Cat.* Rhetorically, Cicero is attempting to preempt the criticism that he had abused the power of his office and ejected Catiline. I see no reason, therefore, not to accept the statements of *I Cat.* and interpret the references of *II Cat.* in accordance with that dating.

on November 7, right after the assassination attempt, was to see to it that precautions were made for the night of November 7/8 and to prepare for the Senate's protection: *quid proxima, quid superiore nocte egeris* (1. 1); *quid ea nocte egisset* [Nov. 6/7], *ubi fuisset* [=Laeca's house], *quid in proximam constituisset* [Nov. 7/8], *quem ad modum esset ei ratio totius belli descripta edocui* (2. 13); *nocturnum* [Nov. 7/8][30] *paesidium Palatii...hic munitissimus habendi senatus locus* (1. 1). Furthermore, if Cicero waits until Nov. 8 to convene the Senate, he will have easily had time to consider and plan his strategy for the *First Catilinarian*. But there is also no reason to modify the analysis which follows if it were to become clear that Cicero convened the Senate on November 7. He could on that day have equally expected to see Catiline; he could have known that Catiline was leaving on the night of November 7/8, or some other night; he could still have created a rhetorical strategy that used his knowledge of Catiline's plans against Rome.

The analysis, then, does not make any specific assumptions about the exact date when Cicero spoke; but it does depend upon the assumption that Cicero had sufficient knowledge of Catiline's plans to be able to use that knowledge against Catiline and that he constructed this speech with exactly that expectation in mind. Consistent with this view is the defence Cicero offers in *II Cat.* 15: *dicatur sane eiectus esse a me, dum modo eat in exsilium. Sed mihi credite, non est iturus*. Furthermore, Cicero's eagerness to seem to desire the legally meaningless charge that he ejected Catiline[31] serves a rhetorical purpose: if this desire is construed by any in Cicero's audience as Cicero's real desire, then Catiline's retreat to Manlius must *a fortiori* be construed as voluntary. The content and the strategy of *II Cat.*12–15, therefore, depend upon Cicero's confidence that Catiline will join Manlius. A similar strategy is at work in Cicero's refusal to open the letters of the Allobroges until he has called the Senate into session.

Probable arguments, then, as well as the content of the *First Catilinarian* support the view that Cicero had some general knowledge of Catiline's plans. This was an advantage, but information could always be inaccurate, and Catiline might try to thwart Cicero by changing or delaying his planned departure. The voices which mocked Cicero's "*comperi*" may have already been

[30]It seems to me difficult, but not impossible, to make sense of this *nocturnum praesidium Palatii* under the assumption that the assassination attempt had not taken place; it seems a drastic measure to take on the word of Fulvia, but less drastic in response to the report of the consul that men had appeared at his door to kill him.

[31]*Sed indemnatus innocens in exsilium eiectus a consule vi et minis esse dicetur, II Cat.* 14. See the analysis of Cape 89–93.

heard (cf. *Att.* 1. 14. 5; *Fam.* 5. 5. 2; *Acad. Pr.* 2. 19. 63). For this reason he could not simply make a report to the Senate. The violence of his invective against Catiline was necessary, not simply to turn Senators against Catiline or his followers,[32] it was of equal importance to help insure Catiline's departure from the city. It placed Catiline in the most awkward possible position. He must either fight back or leave—and this is exactly what Cicero wants. His whole speech is a display of oratorical power; it announces beforehand that Catiline and his conspirators cannot win the oratorical fight: *eos nondum voce vulnero* (9). Cicero's speech, which berates, embarrasses, insults, and silences Catiline before his fellow Senators, attempts to leave the conspirator with no alternative.[33] The purpose here is to preempt Catiline's departure with the announcement of Catiline's departure, and in forcing Catiline to do what he had already planned to make the consul appear judicious and provident. We do not know whether Catiline answered Cicero or left in silence: Cicero says that he remained silent[34] which I accept as likely to be true but, more importantly, as an indication of what Cicero wanted from his speech.

Thus, Cicero's display of his providence, an important element of his *ethos*, depends upon the personal invective addressed to Catiline; this means that a fundamental element of Cicero's construction of *ethos* depends on the presence of Catiline. It is, therefore, another assumption of this analysis that just as Cicero expected Catiline to leave Rome shortly after November 8, so he expected to see Catiline in the Senate. Any alternative strategy in which Cicero intended to tell the Senate after the fact that Catiline had departed for Manlius' camp seems much too weak a strategy—one that might have been forced on

[32]"Again hard evidence was lacking. Cicero's *First Catilinarian Oration*, delivered shortly thereafter in early November, is filled with bravado and obloquy, but no sign of evidence that would stand up in court." Gruen 280.

[33]One may compare Sallust's version of Catiline's response in his letter to Catulus:...*iniuriis contumeliisque concitatus, quod fructu laboris industriaeque meae privatus statum dignitatis non obtinebam, publicam miserorum causam pro mea consuetudine suscepi*... (35. 3). Seager, too, senses or allows something of the power of Cicero's invective when he notes, "The *First Catilinarian* provoked Catilina to the limits of endurance; the speech itself undoubtedly played a large part in determining him to leave Rome." 243. Compare also Gruen 280: "Catiline departed from Rome on schedule—his own schedule." Gruen is correct as far as he goes, but Cicero's purpose was to ensure that Catiline stayed on schedule.

[34]Cic. *Orat.* 129: *a nobis homo audacissimus Catilina in senatu accusatus obmutuit.* The evidence of *In Cat. II* 13, *cum ille homo audacissimus conscientia convictus primo reticuisset, patefeci cetera*, has no more validity than the mini-drama of the *First Catilinarian*: *num negare audes? quid taces? convincam, si negas* (8). "It is uncertain whether Catiline answered the speech, as Sallust declares, accusing Cicero of being a mere 'immigrant to Rome'; Cicero himself and Plutarch record that he left the hall without a word. And he also left Rome. How far the speech contributed to that result we cannot say." Rawson 75.

Cicero, if Catiline had left before the speech to the Senate, but hardly one that Cicero would have chosen if he knew he could address Catiline in the presence of the Senate.

In summary, then, the only contextual requirement of the following interpretation is that Cicero plans to address Catiline; all that Cicero needs to know is that Catiline plans to leave Rome and join Manlius; the only action upon which this speech depends is this already planned departure of Catiline. The general historical context is what motivates the speech's strategy: Cicero needed to do something to shore up his *auctoritas* and to prepare for action; there was a growing sense of frustration and failure as well as an approaching crisis. The rhetorical challenge was to reclaim leadership without disturbing the course of events, to empower his voice and the authority of his view and his providence. This speech, then, succeeds best if it changes nothing. One must note, however, that caught up in the flux and unpredictability of events, Cicero has written a speech with which any number of specific actions are compatible: Catiline might leave Rome and go into exile; his followers might show themselves or take precipitous action; the Senate might advise the consul to act; new and convincing information might be forthcoming. But, the scenario that suits Cicero best is, of course, Catiline's departure to Manlius' camp, because this best insures Cicero's providence. This particular action, however, cannot be identified with the purpose of the speech. And the reason is simple: Catiline's departure to Manlius' camp could be accomplished by saying and doing nothing. The speech uses that departure, as it tries to forestall other contingencies, for the purpose of constructing and justifying its image of consular providence. And in the long run it was the construction of this consular *ethos*, one which was as sufficient to the uncertainties of the moment as it was to the memory which he wished to leave behind of his consulship, which motivated the brilliant display of the *First Catilinarian.*

## ANALYSIS OF THE SPEECH

The following *dispositio* summarizes the formal organization of the *First Catilinarian* as developed for this analysis.[35] The analysis itself will serve as justification for these divisions.

[35]The division is my own although it does not diverge much from that of others. For instance, Primmer 28 offers the following *dispositio* based on argument: Exordium: 1–6a, Section 1, part 1: 6b–13a, part 2: 13b–20a, part 3: 20b–21; Section 2: 22–27a; Section 3: 27b–32; Peroration: 33. Bornecque 83 divides the speech according to addressees: Part one: 1–27; Part two: 27–32; Part three: 33. Craig sees the structure dramatically: One=1–10a; Two=10b–27a; Three=27b–32.

Exordium: (1–6a): On the crisis.
Part One (6b–13a): On Catiline's plans and what can be expected from him.
Part Two (13b–21): On Catiline's character.
Part Three (22–27a): On Catiline's immediate future.
Part Four (27b–32): Cicero's self–defense.
Peroration, section 33.

## The Exordium (1–6a): Opening Tactics.

*Quo usque tandem abutere, Catilina, patientia nostra*? So begins the most famous of Cicero's *exordia*. But the spontaneous vehemence, the operatic melodrama with which these words preempt all others is essentially a ruse; they are strategic and thematic.[36] First, it usually goes unnoticed, but the speaker presents himself here as one abused and patient; he imposes upon himself, even stigmatizes himself with, the charge of passivity. This ploy displaces the sins of the reluctant Senate onto the shoulders of the consul as it constructs an underlying self–accusation which the speech can and will refute. Several passages in the exordium confirm the importance of this charge of passivity: his outrage at Catiline's freedom: *senatus haec intellegit, consul videt; hic tamen vivit* (2); his indignant question, *nos consules perferemus*? (3); his open confession, *nos, nos, dico aperte, consules desumus* (3); and his explicit self–accusation, *inertiae nequitiaeque condemno* (4). Most important, however, is the reappearance of these charges in the second half of the speech. In the *patriae querimonia* addressed to Cicero, the last major section of the speech (before the peroration), the issue is given full development, and the same charge is recalled in the same words, *invidia...inertiae ac nequitiae pertimescenda* (29). The voice of outrage with which Cicero begins conceals, then, a figure of the consul, abused, passive and inadequate, which the speech as a whole will refute and which will be represented as the special concern of *patria*, of *cuncta Italia*, of *omnis res publica* (27). To appear at this nadir is Cicero's first action or the first occasion for Cicero's speech, and from this nadir he will reclaim his consular voice and even adopt the vatic authority with

[36]See Loutsch 46–49 for a discussion of the *exordium ex abrupto*. His interpretation as a whole differs from mine in important ways: he sees the *First Catilinarian* as an improvisation and the address to Catiline as an apostrophe. The *exordium ex abrupto* and the address to Catiline both suggest that the speech at its beginning is meant to suggest an invective or a form of declamation: see Quint. *Inst.* 3. 8. 58–59. For the general rule against beginning *abrupte* in deliberative oratory, see Quint. *Inst.* 3. 8. 6. Cicero, however, used apostrophe in the *exordium* of several of his speeches (see the evidence of Quint. *Inst.* 4 66–67) and these rules are not to be considered as compelling an interpretation so much as suggesting the affinities of Cicero's chosen style.

which he ends the speech.[37] The distance between these two images suggests something of where important energies in this speech are focused: the conversion of an accusation into a virtue and of inertia into the prudent patience that fulfills the will of Jupiter.

In fact, simultaneous with this implied self–accusation, the abused consul is already reclaiming authority. He makes his appearance by virtue of a rhetorical question. Since Catiline will not be allowed to answer this or other questions, the rhetoric makes a display of Catiline's silence while it begins a catalogue of peremptory charges against him. These charges, like Cicero's apparent passivity, form the second occasion for Cicero's speech. In this way, Cicero's passivity and Catiline's abuse are joined in a rhetorical question which mixes complaint with the power of imposing silence on Catiline. In fact, there is some reason to believe that as Cicero silences Catiline he also takes Catiline's own idiomatic form of impatient speech: *Quo usque tandem.*[38] The very same gesture, then, which figures the abused and patient consul is itself abusive and is far from patient.[39]

Cicero continues with more rhetorical questions, that is to say, with his display of the silenced and badgered Catiline. But these questions only appear to be parallel questions about the duration or goal of Catiline's uncivil behavior; their real function is to deny to Catiline any reasonable grounds on which to offer an explanation of his actions. In other words, while the rhetoric disal-

[37]Does this mean that the rhetoric here is all a ruse, all deceit, all, as is popular to say today, smoke and mirrors? Not at all. First, I am trying to be analytic about a tactic, not to pass judgment on that tactic. Second, it is legitimate to ask whether Cicero really felt that he had lost his (consular) voice, lost the position of subject in his own discourse. Perhaps he did (and he must have felt so in 60 BC), and, if so, then it is arguable that the tactic arises from this feeling. Was the feeling accurate? Surely some will say yes—that Catiline had nearly succeeded by avoiding any damaging detection, that others were mocking Cicero with his own words. But just as surely some, like Seager, will say no—that the whole thing was a fiction. We can be even more sophisticated about these matters and pose the possibility that a growing sense of impotence combined with a real belief in the danger Catiline presented and that together with the need to write the history of his consulship led Cicero to conceive of his situation in a fashion he felt to be true and accurate but which was as much a construct of his frustrated desire as it was a reflection of the facts; for what else would the failure to demonstrate virtue be for a man like Cicero than a silencing of the subject?

[38]See Malcolm. It would be a neat and psychologically attractive irony that the man whose frequently proclaimed "*comperi*" was being abused by others (including, no doubt, supporters of Catiline) begins his attack by throwing back to Catiline one of his characteristic phrases.

[39]See Quintilian *Inst.* 9. 2. 6–7: *figuram adsumitur...non sciscitandi gratia sed instandi.* That this violates Cicero's own strictures, see *de Orat.* 2. 334 (and cf. Quint. *Inst.* 3. 8. 6). Helm 110 objects to Cicero's practice. Cape 41 makes the apt point that "The meaning of both passages, however, is that the orator should not employ this kind of opening too frequently or in every case, lest the audience grow weary of it..."

lows any answer, the substance denies the possibility of an answer. *Quam diu etiam furor iste tuus nos eludet*? (1). That is hardly a question for a madman to answer; it is either a question for the consul ("How long will you be eluded by a madman?") or a claim that Catiline's behavior is beyond any principle of order or control: it is furor. *Quem ad finem sese effrenata iactabit audacia*? (1). But, Catiline cannot announce the goal of his unbridled audacity; that would, of course, be bridling the audacity. The importance of these terms is indicated by their reappearance elsewhere. Later, Catiline is explicitly characterized by a lack of reason: *Neque enim is es, Catilina, ut te...ratio a furore revocaverit* (22). The madness and rashness which characterizes Catiline is said to have characterized the recent history of Rome: *nescio quo pacto omnium scelerum ac veteris furoris et audaciae maturitas in nostri consulatus tempus erupit* (31). And, the opening words of the *Second Catilinarian* are both an answer to Cicero's questions here and a repetition of this portrait of Catiline: *Tandem aliquando, Quirites, L. Catilinam, furentem audacia...eiecimus... (II Cat.* 1. 1).[40] Thus, while Catiline's answers are being taken away, he is being captured in a portrait that denies his ability to answer. The questions confound the addressee: the abusing Catiline is abused, the mocking Catiline is mocked, his unbridled presumption is checked and silenced by a torrent of unanswerable questions. This is how an angry parent treats a child, and, while Catiline is being mocked, treated and displayed as a child, the consul is preparing and constructing the voice of *pater patriae*. When that voice speaks to Catiline, it will echo *Quo usque tandem* with *discede...ut tandem aliquando timere desinam* (7. 18).[41] The opening section of the *First Catilinarian* sets in motion both the substance of Cicero's speech (Catiline's history of abuse which sets the terms for Cicero's invective, and Cicero's *patientia*, or *inertia*, which focuses his self–defense) and its major strategy (coopting speech, either through the appro-

[40]*Furor*: 1. 1, 2, 15, 22; 2. 1, 19, 25; 3. 4; 4. 6, 11, 20. *Audacia*: 1. 1, 7, 13; 2. 1, 9, 9, 10, 13, 14, 28; 3. 27, 28; 4. 16. The terms are at first applied to Catiline; later they attach to his followers, and finally to the general condition of the times. The careful escalation and expansion of reference is worth noting.

[41]Malcolm speculates that the phrase "*quo usque tandem*" was characteristic of "this impatient, much frustrated man," that is Catiline. Cicero's equally impatient, much frustrated mood in the *First Catilinarian* is marked by the only appearance of *quo usque tandem* in his corpus, two appearances of *tandem aliquando* from a total of 7 in his entire corpus (but see the beginning of the *Second Catilinarian* for its thematic function as a recollection of *quo usque tandem*: *Tandem aliquando, Quirites, L. Catilinam, furentem audacia...* (1)), and 6 appearances of *tandem* from a total of 9 in the *Catilinarians*. For comparison, 2 *Verrine* 5 has eleven instances of *tandem*; 1 *Verrine* 1 has 1; the second *Philippic* has 3, more than any other of the *Phillipics*, and only 3 *Phillipic* has as many as 2. These figures provide hard evidence for the thematic importance of impatience in this speech and suggest that the repetitions are significant.

priation of the speech of others or by displaying and dramatizing their silence). These elements are developed further as the exordium proceeds.

**The Exordium: Substance and Strategy**

As with all of Cicero's exordia, we begin here with a clever setup that goes to the heart of the rhetorical situation.[42] Here, I would like both to isolate the features of that set–up and to follow their broad outlines throughout the speech. Later I will discuss in more detail the individual sections of the speech.

Cicero's construction of consular *ethos* depends upon the effectiveness of this performance, in which he will appear fully appreciative of present dangers and their implications, provident of the will of Jupiter and the course of history, and wholly adequate to all contingencies; but this performance in turn depends upon a view of the past and especially of Cicero's past knowledge as expressed in past speech, which is the warrant for his claim that the present is also under his watchful eye. To impose this view of events and actors, he needs to gain control of the terms of debate and to dominate or silence the narratives of others. If his *auctoritas* and *ethos* are to substitute for a precise public policy, then his voice must become the locus of deliberation in the state. For this reason, we begin with a crisis and a potentially deliberative situation. Substantively, the deliberative question is comprised of two parts: what will Catiline do? and what should or will[43] Rome do? The rhetorical tactic, however, is to create the issues of a deliberative situation without opening a debate. In order to do this, Cicero creates and allays a crisis. He manipulates the specter of blame in order to take that blame upon himself and then to justify his actions; he manipulates history and tradition in order to magnify the danger and then to magnify his own careful response to that danger. Viewed in this way, the substance of his argument is a contradiction: there is and is not a crisis; I condemn myself of inactivity but I am doing the right thing. But, the purpose of these contradictions is consistently to magnify Cicero, and to do so specifically by substituting Cicero's speech for the silence and the speech of others in a climactic movement which first preempts the indifference of others with the announcement of unparalleled danger and then preempts their supposed alarm with the announcement of calm. The contradiction is, from the speaker's position, no contradiction at all; for the audience must first know the enormity of the events and sense the crisis before they can appreciate the provident care of the consul.

[42]See Ferry for an analysis of how the first sentence of the *Third Catilinarian* outlines the issues of that speech. See also Vasaly 75–77.

[43]"Should" implies a deliberative context; "will" implies a report to the Senate.

We noted above that in his opening words Cicero already begins to shift blame that could fall upon a reluctant Senate to his own shoulders: *patientia nostra?...nos eludet?* (1). The details of this self–accusation are in fact carefully orchestrated. At first, he uses the first person plural, and, while *patientia nostra* will later be developed as his own *inertia*, it is at first the collective state, Senators, consuls and *corona*.[44] The possible choices avoid stigmatizing the Senate or making his own position seem too important. After taunting Catiline with the extent of his success in discovering Catiline's plans (*Patere tua consilia non sentis?...quem nostrum ignorare arbitraris?*, 1), Cicero assumes a more magisterial voice. He speaks in the third person of the Senate and the consul, as if he had a separate objective perspective: *senatus haec intellegit, consul videt, hic tamen vivit* (2). Here the potential for blame to fall upon the Senate is as great as it will ever be in this speech. That blame, however, is blunted, first by being shared with the consul and second by Cicero's clever use of the singular. Not only does Cicero pretend to speak objectively of the consul, but, for a brief moment, all the actors (Senate, consul, Catiline) appear in the objective third person under the scrutiny and judgment of the consul: *consul videt: hic tamen vivit...in senatum venit* (2). Both the singular consul and this illusion of objectivity are the first intimations that the consul has singled himself out for praise and blame in the events of recent history and has claimed for himself the role of watchful and provident guardian.

This desire to bring the focus upon himself shapes the movement of sections 2–4. After noting the ineffective response of the Senate and consul (again in the singular at *iussu consulis*, 2), he develops the dangers Catiline presents: *designat oculis ad caedem...istius furorem ac tela vitemus...orbem terrae caede atque incendiis vastare cupientem* (2–3). At first the blame falls again on the general and self–including first person plural (*nos autem, fortes viri...*, 2), but Cicero is simultaneously working to focus on consular responsibility and to exonerate the Senate. A review of historical precedent contrasts P. Scipio, *pontifex maximus...privatus* with a complaint about the consuls present inaction: *nos consules perferemus*? (3). Then, Cicero notes that the consuls have from the Senate the authority they need (*habemus senatus consultum in te, Catilina, vehemens et grave*, 3) and he says openly, *nos, nos, dico aperte, consules desumus* (3).

But the blame here is still too diffuse. Section 4 continues to exonerate the Senate (*Decrevit quondam senatus ut L. Opimius consul...Simili senatus consulto C. Mario et L Valerio consulibus...*) in order to portray the present crisis

[44]Loutsch 39 notes the tactic as one that isolates the adversary Catiline.

as one in which the Senate has done what historically the Senate should do: *habemus enim huiusce modi senatus consultum...quo ex senatus consulto...* (4). Then, in the middle of the second half of the exordium, Cicero addresses the Senators for the first time in the speech, and he does so specifically to distinguish his actions from theirs and to cast them in the role of judge: *Cupio, patres conscripti, me esse clementem* (4). This seems to me clear confirmation that, although the bulk of this speech is addressed to Catiline, it is a performance which throughout has the audience of Senators ultimately in mind. And for those Senators, Cicero is now ready to make explicit his self–accusation, *sed iam me ipse inertiae nequitiaeque condemno* (4). The movement is a climactic revelation both of the danger Catiline presents and of potential blame for government inaction; but, from *patientia nostra* to *me ipse...condemno*, the climax is reserved for Cicero. The acceptance of blame was a feint; for, while Cicero builds his case for moral outrage at governmental failure, the responsible agents are being sorted out: they are Catiline and the consul.

Once responsibility is placed where Cicero wants it, he may proceed to reconstruct his *inertia* and *patientia* as watchful and far–sighted statesmanship. Consequently, in the next paragraph he begins to mute self–blame by referring it to its context and that context includes the consul's full awareness of present dangers, *Castra sunt...* (5), of the pressures of the past, *quod iam pridem factum esse oportuit* (5), of the potential at his disposal, *si [te] interfici iussero* (5), and of the consequences of his actions, *erit verendum...serius a me quam crudelius* (5). At the same time, his language become more periodic as he speaks in conditions, prevention clauses, characteristic clauses and *cum*–clauses. The voice is now the considered voice of a thoughtful man looking into the uncertainties of the future with a certain plan: *certa de cause nondum adducor ut faciam. Tum denique...* (5).

In this way, Cicero orchestrates a movement from the operatic impatience of *Quo usque tandem...*, to the indignant claim, *Senatus haec intellegit, consul videt, hic tamen vivit* (2), to the explicit accusatory invective, *vivis, et vivis... ad confirmandam audaciam* (4), only to tell the Senate that they need more patience: *quam diu quisquam erit qui te defendere audeat, vives,* and that nothing is going to change, *sed vives ita ut nunc vivis...* (6). At the same time, the helpless consul who watches in *consul videt*, becomes the man in charge of all those who continue to watch: *multis meis et firmis praesidiis obsessus...multorum te etiam oculi...speculabuntur atque custodient* (6). Cicero uses the progress of his exordium to dissipate the very panic he has announced without changing anything: he constructs himself as the calm in the middle of the storm he has created. The tactic brings together for Cicero a proper paternalistic concern

(expressed as alarm) against a background of uncertainty and a consular confidence against a background of past providence.

The exordium as a whole, then, gives shape to a crisis and a governmental failure in order to emphasize the importance of the moment. Against this background Cicero then suggests the importance of his role. The movement from aporia and crisis to assurances and calm turns on the shift from invective, *vivis...ad confirmandam audaciam* (4), to information which exemplifies Cicero's knowledge, *castra sunt...* (5), to deliberation, *si te iam Catilina conprehendi* (5), which justifies Cicero and seems to answer *Quo usque tandem* (1) with *Tum denique* (5) and *Quam diu quisquam* (6). Cicero seems to blame the Senate and the consul(s) in order to appear objective, while he is really focusing government action upon himself. In this way he gets to have his cake and eat it too, or, more precisely, he gets to have his crisis with its failures and still be the bulwark against crisis, he gets to have a dangerous situation which is not at all dangerous.

## Two Strategic Principles

The preceding comments set Cicero's goal in this speech at a general level: the construction in consular speech of a consular *ethos* which is in touch with the fears of the people, the precedents of the past, and the dangers of the moment. At this particular moment, with nothing that could be done, Cicero sought to create in his *First Catilinarian* an image of his speech not just as true, truthful and right, but as necessary and sufficient[45] while at the same time and silencing the speech of others. There are two general tactics by which he does this. First, there is the use of questions. Cicero's rhetorical questions turn aporia into invective, silence the protests and deliberations of others and direct the content of the speech. They allow his voice to take the place of or become the place of deliberation. Second, there is the thematics of speech, by which I mean the way Cicero refers explicitly to his own speeches, the way he speaks of his voice and of the speech or the silence of others, and the range of voices Cicero assumes or appropriates in order to present himself as the sole spokesman for the history, traditions and institutions of Rome. The two strategies can

[45]While my own rhetoric speaks of this action as if it were effected by the speech, it is important to realize that this is not necessarily the case. We do not have to imagine that everyone was silent when Cicero ceased speaking, or even while he was speaking—although Cicero himself says that Catiline had nothing to say, *Orat.* 129 (see discussion below). What I am describing is what happens in the speech, what the speech projects as its world, not what is actually effected by the speech. The speech, then, is an imaginative space in which Cicero creates the fiction that his speech is sufficient and he does so for political purposes; the published version of the speech creates a literary and permanent record of that imaginative space.

be addressed separately, even though they are in many cases as inseparable as are speech and silence.

### A: Controlling Questions

First, then, there is the simple device by which the speaker poses the questions that he will either answer or that he will not allow to be answered. In either case, the speaker presents himself as the origin and limit of dialogue; he either controls the terms of deliberation (*num unum diem postea...*?, 4; compare the questions of the *patriae querimonia* 27–29 and Cicero's response, *pauca respondebo*, 29) or expresses the aporia of all (*Quo usque tandem...*, 1). Both as a strategy of control and as a formal device which shapes and moves the speech, questions and their near relative, exclamations, characterize more than any other feature this speech. The exordium is typical. The whole first paragraph is composed of seven rhetorical questions[46] leading to the magisterial climax, *O tempora, o mores*!—which is itself a cooptation and expression of aporia.[47] But then the opening torrent of questions abates: there are none in sections 5 and 6a. In their place we hear the reasonable voice of the consul offering his plan for the future and offering it as an (implied) answer to the questions he has posed. The questions set the stage for Cicero's progress here as well as define the issues Cicero will address.

As Cicero creates this opportunity for his speech, his questions require the silence of the Senate and the silence of Catiline. The first is initially gained by diverting the deliberative potential of these questions into invective by making Catiline the addressee. This is a necessary move, for Cicero is not asking the Senate to act nor is he asking them to deliberate. We noted above that the only time he explicitly addresses the Senate in the exordium he does so to confess his responsibility: *Cupio, patres conscripti me esse clementem...sed iam me ipse inertiae nequitiaeque condemno* (4). Thus, while the questions

[46]There will be disagreement about how to count questions in a situation like that of *I Cat.* 1. 1. By my count there are really twelve questions, because I consider the anaphora of *Nihilne te nocturnum praesidium Palati, nihil urbis vigiliae, nihil timor populi, nihil concursus bonorum omnium, nihil hic munitissimus habendi senatus locus, nihil horum ora vultusque moverunt*? to mark six questions. However, since the text I am using (Clark 1905) marks this sentence as one question, I have simply counted question marks. Since any standard here seems arbitrary, I have accepted the judgment of others so as not to seem to have prejudiced the results.

[47]The implications of this exclamation are drawn out at the beginning of *II Cat.*—the times prevent Cicero from acting in accordance with the *mos maiorum* and simply seizing and killing Catiline: *Ac si quis est talis qualis esse omnis oportebat, qui in hoc ipso in quo exsultat et triumphat oratio mea me vehementer accuset, quod tam capitalem hostem non comprehenderim potius quam emiserim, non est ista mea culpa, Quirites, sed temporum. Interfectum esse L. Catlinam et gravissimo supplicio adfectum iam pridem oportebat, idque a me et mos maiorum et huius imperi severitas et res publica postulabat. II Cat.* 3.

themselves create the sense of urgency that requires deliberation, the content and addressee of these questions deflect that deliberative crisis upon the character of Catiline and the intentions of the consul. The second, the silence of Catiline, is gained and dramatized by Cicero's impetuous assault, by his mocking adaptation of Catiline's impatience, if not his words,[48] and by announcing for Catiline his plans. This last move is an appropriation of Catiline's speech which will eventually allow the substance of Cicero's invective (*vivis, et vivis non ad deponendam, sed ad confirmandam audaciam*, 4) to become the evidence of his providence (*vives, sed vives ita ut nunc vivis, multis meis et firmis praesidiis obsessus*, 6; cp. *patere tua consilia non sentis?*, 1).

The rhetorical questions of the exordium, by setting the terms of Cicero's speech, thus play an important dramatic role in Cicero's cooptation of speech. This continues to be their role throughout the speech: questions are the formal device by which Cicero divides and disposes his substantive issues. In fact, their second function in the exordium, to shape a general movement from aporia and uncertainty to answers and calm, is also repeated in the *First Catilinarian*, both in its general movement and in the movement of its individual sections. In the speech as a whole, questions rise in frequency from the aporetic outrage of the opening to their greatest density in the center, the formal invective against Catiline's character, and then they become fewer and fewer until they fade away after section 29a, when we are left with commands and assurances of the vengeance of Jupiter. By the end, the speaker who articulated the general aporia is now sufficient to all uncertainties.[49] Similarly, the individual divisions of the speech are each organized as a set of questions with their answers, and in each division those questions cease as the answers are given. Consequently, one may outline the structure of the speech in terms of the questions which introduce each section. Cicero creates a movement from the rhetorical questions of the exordium which Catiline cannot answer, *Quo usque tandem...?*, to Part One which raises the question of Catiline's specific plans and begins (6b), *Etenim quid est, Catilina, quod iam amplius expectes...?*; to Part Two which raises the general question of Catiline's life as a citizen: *Quid est enim, Catilina, quod te iam in hac urbe delectare possit?* (13b); to Part Three, Cicero's analysis of the possible outcomes of his speech *Quamquam, quid loquor?* (22). Part Four is the only major division which does not begin immediately with a question; in that place, however, Cicero introduces the Patria,

[48]On the possibility that *Quo usque tandem* was a phrase characteristic of Catiline, see Malcolm.

[49]The invective performs a double purpose: it both attacks Catiline and his vices and, by contrast, points to Cicero's virtues. See Cic. *Part. Or.* 69.

and it is the *patriae querimonia* which begins immediately with a question, *"Marce Tulli, quid agis?"* (27b). In fact, the *patriae querimonia* is a speech composed almost entirely of eight questions. And when we note that after her complaint, there are no more questions, we may see that in a very formal sense the *First Catilinarian* has been aiming at this last question, *Marce Tulli, quid agis?* From this point there are only answers.

The following outline summarizes the speech's formal organization in terms of its content and the questions that introduce and shape that content. It will be noted that the first sentence of the exordium sets up the major terms of Cicero's *dispositio*:

Exordium: On the crisis.
*Quo usque tandem abutere, Catilina, patientia nostra?.*
11 questions; 2 per paragraph; no questions in 4b, 5 or 6a.
Part One (6b–13a): On Catiline's plans (*Quo usque...*?).
*Etenim, quid est, Catilina, quod iam expectes...?*
16 questions; 2.1 per paragraph; no questions in 9b, 10, 11, 12.
Part Two (13b–21): On Catiline's character (*...abutere, Catilina...*).
*Quid est enim, Catilina, quod te iam...delectare possit?*
30 questions; 3.5 per paragraph; no questions in 20b or 21.
Part Three (22–27a): On Catiline's immediate future (*Quo usque...?*)
*quamquam quid loquor?*
9 questions; 1.6 per paragraph; no questions in 25, 26, or 27.
Part Four (27b–32): Cicero's self–defense (*...patientia nostra*?).
The complaint of the Patria: *Marce Tulli, quid agis?*
8 questions; 1.5 per paragraph; no questions in 29b, 30, 31, and 32.
Peroration, section 33.
There are no questions; only future indicatives.

This formal structure dramatizes the speaker and his speech as the locus of deliberation while it dramatizes Catiline as the source of the most baffling questions. As the need for action yields through the answers of Cicero to the need for patience, the urgency of the present is replaced by the long view of history[50] and by assurances about the future. The process constructs a figure of consular providence, a point of security and confidence in the face of uncertainties. Both this structure and its content have been anticipated by the exordium.

### B: Thematics of Speech

Parallel to the dramatic and thematic use of rhetorical questions is Cicero's second strategy, the thematics of speech itself. Explicitly in his refer-

[50]See paragraph 30, where he refuses to act because that would only "suppress the evil for a while, not for ever": *paulisper reprimi, non in perpetuum.*

ences to his own speech and to the silence of others and implicitly in the range of authority his speech assumes, Cicero attempts to become more than the locus of deliberation in this crisis; he becomes the voice of all Rome. My review of the parts of the *First Catilinarian* will discuss the details of these tactics in each division of the speech. Here we may note both the sheer number of references to speech[51] and the emphasis on Cicero's speech as what explains, predicts, and protects. His speech is presented as the revelation of the past, guardian of the present, and guarantor of the future: *dico aperte* (3); *dicere in senatu* (7); *dixi ego idem in senatu* (7); *dico te* (8); *praedixeram* (10); *ut dixi* (19); *si...dixissem* (21); and *quae dicam* (27). In fact, the range of events for which Cicero speaks throughout and from which he seeks empowerment is again neatly set forth in the exordium where questions about the future (*Quo usque tandem abutere...?*, 1) change to questions about the present (*nihil te...hic munitissimus habendi senatus locus...?*, 1) and then to implied declarations about the past (*Quid proxima, quid superiore nocte egeris...?*, 1). This order is then reversed as Cicero's review of past precedent (*An vero vir amplissimus, P. Scipio...*, 3) yields to his information about present conditions (*Castra sunt in Italia...*, 5) and then a provisional and provident plan for the future (*vives sed vives ita ut nunc vivis*, 6). The range of knowledge thereby represented in the speech of the consul lends authority both to his providence (*Nunc intellego si iste quo intendit...*, 30) and his commands (*ut saepe iam dixi, proficiscere*, 23, and *muro denique, quod saepe iam dixi, secernantur a nobis*, 32). It is this range of experience and providence which Cicero relies upon and which provides the ground upon which Cicero toys with the heroic formula of *unus ille vir*,[52] that single man whom history has selected to be the sole salvation of the state.

[51] dicere: *dico aperte* (3); *quam quisquam crudelius factum esse dicat* (5); *me...dicere in senatu* (7); *dixi ego idem in senatu* (7); *caede contentum te esse dicebas* (8); *dico te* (9); *dixisti* (9); *praedixeram* (10); *ut dixi* (19); *dixisti* (19); *obtemperaturum te esse dicis* 20); *si...dixissem* (21); *ut saepe iam dixi* (23); *ut praedicas* (23); *percipite, quaeso, diligenter quae dicam* (27); *factum esse dicerent* (30); *quod saepe iam dixi* (32). || loqui: *sic enim iam tecum loquar* (16); *[Patria] quodam modo tacita loquitur* (18); *patria loquatur* (19); *auctoritatem loquentium* (21); *quamquam quid loquor*? (22); *si mecum patria...si cuncta Italia, si omnis res publica sic loquatur* (27). || *negare: num negare audes?...convincam, si negas* (8). || praeteritio (things left unsaid): *praetereo* (3); *quod ego praetermitto et facile patior sileri...praetermitto...* (14). || silence of others: *quid taces* (8); *animadvertis horum silentium*, 20; *cum quiescunt probant, cum patiuntur decernunt, cum tacent clamant* (21). || polliceri: *me in meo lecto interfecturos esse pollicerentur* (10;) *polliceor hoc vobis, patres conscripti...* (32).

[52] See the discussion of Hardie 3–6. In brief, Hardie identifies the epic hero's preeminence as "the individual who stands for the totality of his people present and future." This theme often appears in Latin literature with the key word *unus*: *unus homo nobis cunctando restituit rem*, Ennius *Ann.* 363 Skutsch; *unus erit quem tu tolles in caerula caeli | templa*, Ennius *Ann.* 54–55 Skutsch; *tu Maximus ille es | unus qui nobis cunctando restituis rem*, Vergil *Aen.* 6. 845–46;

Cicero further claims for himself the moral authority of one who speaks for the values of Roman traditions and institutions. One could refer this strategy to the range of voices for which Cicero speaks—and it is certainly a broad range of voices: he speaks for the Senate (*faciam ut intellegas quid hi de te sentiant*, 20), for *Patria, cuncta Italia, omnis res publica* (19 and 27), for the consuls, equites and *omnes boni* (32); he even speaks for Catiline, but to expose and preempt him (from *tua consilia*, 1, to *"refer" inquis "ad senatum,"* 20, and *qua laetitia perfruere!*, 26). But this range is more accurately described as the range of moral authority Cicero assumes. Such a description makes space for Cicero's assumption of traditional Roman moral values in *O tempora, o mores!*, his ability to speak for the values of the *viri fortes* of Rome's past in his review of historical exempla: *Fuit, fuit ista quondam in hac re publica virtus...* (3), his claim on the moral high ground in his eagerness to condemn himself of his failings (*nos, nos, dico aperte, consules desumus*, 3, and *sed iam me ipse inertiae nequitiaeque condemno*, 4) and his assumption of disinterested moral authority when he speaks of himself in the third person: *consul videt* (2). In adopting the voice of the Fatherland, he sympathizes with and gives voice to the complaints and fears of his countrymen. Even in speaking for Catiline, he retains the moral authority of one who refuses to allow evil men to lie to the Senate. This is all an attempt to assume within the speech itself the objectivity and moral judgment necessary to be the sole spokesman for public policy.

## Appropriating Speech: A Look Forward

The ability to speak for many men, traditions, and institutions depends on the silence of others and it is here that the rhetorical questions and the thematics of speech most clearly intersect. Cicero provokes Catiline and silences him, preempting him for the future, the present, and the past. At the same time, the speech is addressed to and constructing another body—the Senate, which has also failed to act. The Senators' questions and fears are here given Cicero's voice. As that happens, Cicero constructs a second silence, the silence of the Senate, and that silence is implicit in almost the entire performance, especially when we note that the Senators merely observe this display of *auctoritas*, invective and providence. But Cicero's general intention, to create an opportunity to make his voice speak for all, and the interrelation of his questions and his explicit use of speech and silence can be more precisely demonstrated by the explicit development later in the speech of the silent Senate and the silent citi-

---

*unus ille vir, ipse consul, rem publicam sustinuit*, Livy 2. 43. 6. See further Hardie's discussion and literature cited there.

zens. It may be useful at this point to turn to that development so that the importance and impact of these tactics may be clear from the beginning.

At the climax of his central invective against Catiline, Cicero imagines Catiline's request that the issue of his exile be taken up by the Senate. For a moment, then, he presents himself as the representative of Catiline's interests and desires: *"Refer," inquis, "ad senatum"* (20). But Cicero speaks for Catiline only in order that he might then speak for the Senate's response to Catiline. He will not and cannot put the question of Catiline's exile to the Senate: he needs Catiline to join Manlius in order to justify his providence and he needs to assume univocal authority in the state. He must maintain rhetorical control in order to bolster the illusion of political control he wants to create. Consequently, he uses Catiline's demand as a setup for him to coopt the speech of the Senate: *de te autem, Catilina, cum quiescunt, probant, cum patiuntur, decernunt, cum tacent clamant* (21). The authority which enunciates the meaning of the Senate's silence is remarkable in itself, but the fact that this authority depends on the silence of others, here enforced by the refusal to bring the matter to discussion,[53] will be further developed in a chilling climax when Cicero imagines that he alone need speak for the citizens of Rome: *sit denique inscriptum in fronte unius cuiusque quid de re publica sentiat* (32). Cicero has expanded the field of interests for which he speaks from the deliberative speech of the Senate, which he deflected and subverted at the beginning, to the silent and silenced Senate whose opinion will not be sought, *non referam...quid exspectas auctoritatem loquentium, quorum voluntatem tacitorum perspicis?* (20), and finally to this powerful image of a branded consensus of compliance among the citizens. The interplay of speech and silence throughout is a rhetorical effort to reshape *audientia* as *oboedientia* under the aegis of Cicero's speech.

The discussion of tactics and themes so far has emphasized Cicero's rhetoric as a display of verbal power, a self–conscious coercion of silence and control of accusation and argument. These elements of self–presentation may all become the constituent elements of *auctoritas*, *gravitas*, and *severitas*. Complementary with this aspect of the speech, however, is a gentler movement, already suggested above in the curve of *exordium*'s movement from urgency to assurances, but which does not appear fully until later in the speech. As Cicero moves away from the imposition of his urgent questions and the

[53]The fact that such a *relatio* would have no legal force or the speculation that the Senate would not go along with Cicero have no bearing on how Cicero uses his refusal here. There was no need for him to represent Catiline's putative request if such a request did not serve Cicero's larger purposes.

mock hysteria of his opening imitation of Catiline, he begins to construct a less severe, even urbane, image of himself. Here other elements of Cicero's *ethos* come into play, elements which are more like those recommended in the handbooks: *lenitas*, irony, considered explanation, and wise restraint (*de Or.* 2. 182–84; Quint. *Inst.* 6. 2. 8–19). The power with which these elements appear is based in large part on the contrast they represent to those other aspects of consular authority with which Cicero begins.[54]

Cicero needs to empower his view of events and his judgment of what is needed. Between "How long will you abuse our patience" and "You, Jupiter, will punish the evil men" this speech is a call for and justification of more patience. Which is to say that this speech is, in part, a justification of Cicero's policy to date, and a claim that both the policy and the man responsible for the policy represent the wisest and best of Rome. I run the risk here, however, of describing the *First Catilinarian* too much in terms of its particular substantive arguments. Ultimately, Cicero does not speak to justify his actions, rather he justifies his actions in order to claim the role of sole spokesman, now and in the future. Thus, what is of primary importance in these opening lines is not the implicit claim that Cicero has everything under control; it is the rhetorical tactic by which he controls his speech and the speech of others so that he may become the voice which articulates the crisis and the calm, that enunciates when no others will the potential for blame, the standards which must be applied and the plan which is already in place.

## REVIEW OF THE MAJOR PARTS OF THE SPEECH

I would like now to review the major sections of the speech, pointing to the tactics Cicero uses and suggesting how the sections work together to create the speech's powerful image of consular authority. While the elements of Cicero's strategy can often be addressed separately, it is important to keep in mind that they operate synergistically and that the effect of the whole often exceeds the effect of the individual tactic. Similarly, it is important to keep in mind that the speech is "a document of progressive manipulation," to use Leeman's phrase (199), and that its final effect is to be measured not simply by the conclusion

[54]Just as in the speech Cicero gets to be fierce and suave, so in the argument he presents himself as severe and lenient: see Classen 1988: 297–98 n. 24. The terms become explicit in his self-description in *II Cat.* 6: *Ne illi vehementer errant, si illam meam pristinam lenitatem perpetuam sperant futuram...Non est iam lenitati locus; severitatem res ipsa flagitat.* The image is developed specifically in terms of this crisis as the *togatus dux* et *imperator* of 2. 28 and 3. 23. Compare *I Cat.* 4: *Cupio, patres conscripti, me esse clementem...*

but also by the intellectual and emotional distance the audience has traversed and the range of responses and capacities the consul has demonstrated.

## Part One: On Catiline's Plans

### General and Formal Considerations

The exordium ended with the explicit claim that Catiline's past life and plans had been so well observed and guarded by the consul that he posed no immediate threat: *vives et vives ita ut nunc vivis* (6). Cicero concluded: *Multorum te etiam oculi et aures non sentientem, sicut adhuc fecerunt, speculabuntur atque custodient* (6). In Part One (6b–13), Cicero develops this representation of himself as the all–seeing, all–hearing observer of Catiline and overseer of those who see: *multis meis et firmis praesidiis obsessus* (6). Part One is a demonstration of the effectiveness of his custodianship. Here, he preempts Catiline's plans by exposing them; in this way, he answers the question *"Quo usque?"* from the perspective of Catiline's plans and desires: *templa deorum immortalium, tecta urbis, vitam omnium civium, Italiam totam ad exitium et vastitatem vocas* (12). In doing this, however, he displays his own past and present speech as the source of precise information, sound advice, and accurate prediction. To some extent Cicero here repeats what he introduced in the exordium; the difference is that here he provides more information, more answers. We are moving in a climax from *patere tua consilia* (1), to *luce sunt clariora nobis tua consilia omnia* (6). And in exposing the extent of Catiline's hostile desires Cicero suggests that the real limit will be eventually imposed by the consul: *Qua re, quoniam id...facere nondum audeo...Nam si te interfici iussero...* (12).

This section 6b–13a, like the others in this *dispositio*, moves from questions to answers; here, Cicero begins, as he does in the first three divisions, with a question addressed to Catiline (*quid est, Catilina, quod iam amplius expectes*, 6), and concludes the major movement with a set of dismissive imperatives, *Perge...*, *egeredere...*, *proficiscere...Duc...Purga...* (11). This conclusion is then modulated in a kind of Coda which places the occasion in an historical context. This context includes the immediate past (*totiens iam effugimus*, 11), the present (*Nunc iam aperte rem publicam universam petis*, 11), and the immediate future (*faciam id...*, 12), and in this context Cicero then reconceives his severe commands as a piece of friendly advice. It should be clear that here, as in the exordium, the speech is engaged in manipulating perspectives and in shaping an image of the speaker who controls them.

### 1.1 Cicero's Speech and Catiline's Silence.

Cicero develops and expands his tactic of silencing Catiline by revealing and saying aloud what (he claims) is in Catiline's plans and therefore in his mind. In other words, Cicero not only speaks for the silent Catiline, but he takes away Catiline's power to lie: he says in public what Catiline would not say in public. *Muta iam istam mentem, mihi crede* (6) sounds like an effort to be what we call the voice of conscience, but it is an ironic effort and it is the voice only of a practical conscience: *si illustrantur, si erumpunt omnia* (6). The practical consideration here, namely that Cicero knows the truth about Catiline's plans (*nihil...nihil...nihil...quod ego non modo audiam sed etiam videam*, 8) turns out to be based upon past evidence (*tua consilia omnia, quae iam mecum licet recognoscas. Meministine...? Num me fefellit...? Recognosce...*, 6–8.) which depends on past and present speech: *Meministine me ante diem xii Kalendas Novembris dicere in senatu fore...Dixi ego idem in senatu...* (7); *Recognosce tandem mecum noctem illam superiorem...Dico te priore nocte...* (8). "Change your mind," Cicero says, "because of what I said and what I say." While Cicero is creating and recalling this picture of the importance and veracity of his speech, he keeps turning to Catiline in a refrain that emphasizes Catiline's silence: *Num infitiari potes?* (7) *...Num negare audes? quid taces?* (8). In other words, not only does the past show that Cicero's speech was right, but Catiline's present silence is evidence[55] that Cicero is now again speaking the hidden truth: *Nihil agis, nihil moliris, nihil cogitas, quod non ego modo audiam, sed etiam videam planeque sentiam* (8).[56] This is the trick that Cicero needs: to make silence of another the warrant for

[55]The tactic here is a common one. That silence convicts, see *ad Her.* 2. 8, Cic. *Sest.* 40, *de Inv.* 1. 54; Seneca *Controv.* 10. 2. 6; Terence *Eun.* 476. For silence as a sign of the conspirators' guilt, see also *III Cat.* 13.

[56]It may seem curious that in a speech and especially in a section which so vigorously emphasize speech, Cicero would here turn to sight. Sight, however, remains subordinate to speech, as is clear in expressions like *si illustrantur, si erumpunt omnia* (6), which really describe what happens when *nec privata domus parietibus continere voces coniurationis tuae potest* (6), and like *luce sunt clariora* are applied to *consilia* which can only appear in words. Compare as well the ending: *neminem...qui non videat...neminem tam improbum qui non fateatur* (30). The role of sight, however, while it may be secondary to that of speech, is nevertheless an important theme, especially as it portrays Cicero as the all–seeing observer: *consul videt* (2); *multorum te etiam oculi et aures...speculabuntur atque custodient* (6); *si illustrantur* (6); *hos ego video consul* (9); etc. By the beginning of the *Fourth Catilinarian,* sight plays an important role in the imagery and diction. There the visual and physical elements of the place dominate Cicero's words, while he himself becomes the cynosure of Senatorial sight. See Vasaly 49–59 on the symbolic value of Jupiter and his temple for the *First Catilinarian.* She too notes "the images of Catiline as watched, beset, surrounded," 49 n. 16.

the validity of his own speech. In this section, claims about the accuracy of Cicero's reports, both regarding October 21st (*Meministi me...dicere in senatu,* 7) and regarding the recent assassination attempt (*quos ego...venturos esse praedixeram,* 10), surround Catiline's silence and support what Cicero says today: *Dico te priore nocte* (8). Catiline's silence is not only the opportunity for Cicero to speak and the result of Cicero's speech; it is the guarantor of Cicero's veracity. This recollection of Cicero's actual past speeches in the context of Catiline's silence provides the ground for Cicero to take up again the mantle of traditional Roman morality: *O di immortales! ubinam gentium sumus? quam rem publicam habemus? in qua urbe vivimus?* (9). Thus, Catiline's silence is made proof that Cicero's speech is the voice of truth and of religious and republican piety.

There are, then, two systems operating to support Cicero's claims: a past record of accurate speech and the present silence of Catiline. The argumentative structure may be outlined:

To be proved: *Teneris undique; luce sunt clariora consilia tua omnia.*
First Evidence: Past Speech about October 21 and 27.
*licet recognoscas*:
*Meministi me ante diem xii Kalendas Novembres dicere in senatu*
*Num me fefellit*?: Lack of refutation
+ Fulfillment of Prediction=Proof
*Dixi ego idem in senatu...in ante diem v Kalendas Novembres*
*Num infitiari potes*: Lack of denial
+Fulfillment of Prediction=Proof
To be proved: Present Speech about Laeca's house
*Recognosce tandem mecum noctem illam superiorem*
*Dico te priore nocte*
*Num negare audes? Quid taces? convincam si negas.*
Lack of Denial implies veracity=Proof
*Fuisti igitur...statuisti...deligisti...discripsisti...dixisti*:
Second Evidence: Past Speech about Laeca's house
*haec ego omnia...comperi.*
*exclusi eos...quos...praedixeram.*
Fulfillment of Report=Proof

These past predictions are then further construed as the evidence of divine blessing: *Magna dis gratia...totiens iam effugimus*, and divine blessing is the token of Cicero's status as the *unus ille vir* of Ennius, the man to whom the safety and strength of the republic is tied: *denique, quotienscumque me petisti, per me tibi obstiti, quamquam videbam perniciem meam cum magna calamitate rei publicae esse coniunctam* (11). This is an extraordinary edifice to build upon that *"comperi"* which others may have already and would soon begin to mock, and it will need more than the evidence of the past. It will need a certain suavity.

### 1.2 Urbanity.

Having raised himself so far upon the shoulders of this horrific monster, Cicero may seem to surprise his audience at this point with a gesture of urbanity: Does he order Catiline into exile? *Non iubeo, sed si me consulis suadeo* (13). The handbooks tell us that the orator must project a winning or conciliatory *ethos*, that *lenitas* wins the good will of the audience and that irony is a form of urbanity and wit (*de Or.* 2. 260–61; Quint. *Inst.* 7. 6. 54–56). *"Suadeo,"* he says, and the humor is suave and fetching. The irony here fits the textbook prescriptions, and the rhetorical tactic is to rise above the fray Cicero has already helped create. But Cicero's rhetoric is a malleable creature, and what seems like a surprise in the analysis turns out to be the result of clever planning: in other words, urbanity is not a surprise at all since it was already at work. In this speech, Cicero has already suggested that this detachment, this irony and urbanity, was part of his persona. The posture was implicit in the transition from what could be the consul's first imperious command, *muta iam istam mentem* (6), to its casual and personalized addition, *mihi crede.* Detachment also glimmered briefly in the mocking wordplay of his first set of orders: *Perge quo coepisti, egredere aliquando ex urbe. Patent portae: proficiscere... Purga urbem* (11). At the end of Part One, this posture of feigned personal interest and involvement dissipates the exaggerated and shrill theatricality of the opening and forms the transition to Part Two, in which Cicero will continue to rise above the Catilinarian dangers as he urbanely mocks Catiline's pretensions to power, leadership, and friends. He had already warned of his powers: *...et quos ferro trucidari oportebat, eos nondum voce vulnero* (9).

## Part Two: The Central Invective on Catiline's Character.

### General and Formal Considerations.

The section (13b–21) again begins with a question that defines the substantive issue, the nature of Catiline's life in Rome—that is, his moral and political isolation[57]—and ends with the suggestion that he leave Rome. The tone of that suggestion, *Quae cum ita sint, Catilina, dubitas...abire in aliquas terras et vitam istam...fugae solitudinique mandare?* (20), is a direct reflection of the modulation we have just traced at the ending of Part One. To this another Coda is attached, this time dealing with the constitutional issue of exile, the same issue which in the coda to Part One Cicero dodged by converting a consular

[57]This particularly apt formulation of the issue is due to Primmer 32–36, although he sees the details somewhat differently. On Catiline's alienation from all citizens see also Büchner 183–84.

order into a piece of advice. Throughout this section, Cicero is interested in creating an expanded image of the power and importance of his speech while further softening the imperious outrage with which he began. He must wound Catiline, to use his own image, and isolate him from his fellow citizens while not seeming to act with unreasonable violence, *regie* or *crudelius*.[58] The solution he attempts combines mockery and irony, which depends on the moral depravity of Catiline, with Cicero's posturing as the solicitous friend and as the voice of the frightened Fatherland.

## 2.1 Appropriating Speech

The *prosopoieia* by which Cicero speaks as the Patria is one full extension of the device by which Cicero makes his speech speak for others: he becomes for a moment the voice of Patria, which is to say that the Fatherland lends *auctoritas* to Cicero's voice while that voice gives words to the fears of others. It is not surprising, then, that when this happens the voice of Patria echoes the gerundives of the consul: *ad neglegendas leges...ad evertendas perfringendasque* (18), recalls *ad confirmandam audaciam* (4), as the *Patria*'s fears recall the fears of the consul: *me totam esse in metu...hunc mihi timorem eripe...ut tandem aliquando timere desinam* (18), recalls *magno me metu liberabis* (11). These echoes are clever because, while the argument is that Cicero speaks for the fears of the state, the experience is that the State echoes Cicero's fears. The two, as Cicero says, are interlocked: *videbam perniciem meam cum magna calamitate rei publicae esse coniunctam* (11). Thus, this simple device allows him to figure his own charges as the fears and hatred of the citizens, his own fears as confirmed by the fears of the state, while he seems to be the one who sympathizes with the emotions of others.

Cicero introduced the tactic of explicitly speaking for the silent in Part One. There, Catiline's silence was arguably an inability to deny and so a confession. Now, he moves through a broad range of voices, speaking for all the interested parties in this situation. Having portrayed Catiline as isolated through fear and hatred from all in Rome (*in qua nemo est extra istam coniurationem perditorum hominum qui te non metuat, nemo qui non oderit*, 13), he sardonically adopts the posture of one who pities Catiline: *Sic enim iam tecum loquar, non ut odio permotus esse videar, quo debeo, sed ut misericordia, quae tibi nulla debetur* (16). Then, in the sequence discussed above, he

[58]The terms have particular resonance in the context of 60 BC; they are used explicitly by Cicero in *erit verendum mihi ne non potius hoc omnes boni serius a me quam quisquam crudelius factum esse dicat* (5), and in *quorum auctoritate multi non solum improbi verum etiam imperiti, si in hunc animadvertissem, crudeliter et regie factum esse dicerent* (30).

speaks first for the silent Fatherland *Quae tecum, Catilina, sic agit et quodam modo tacita loquitur* (18), then for the silenced Catiline, *"Refer," inquis "ad senatum"* (20), and in order to speak for the unconsulted Senators: "I will let you know what their opinion is...Why do you await the vocal authority of those whose meaning you see in their silence?...In your case, Catiline, when they're quiet, they approve; when they are patient they decree; when they are silent, they clamor."[59]

The tactic here is parallel to the earlier display of Catiline's silence: anyone who dissents or disagrees will speak up; they do not speak up; therefore, they agree. In this way, Cicero modulates from the voice which expresses the abstract interests of *Patria* into the voice which represents the particular opinions of the Senators.[60] For our purposes, we should note that what is important in this passage is not the validity of the argument or even its content. In fact, the recommendation that Catiline go into exile is not a recommendation Cicero wants to make in this speech, and so, he will soon back off from the invitation: *Quamquam quid ego te invitem, a quo iam sciam esse praemissos qui tibi ad forum Aurelium praestolarentur armati?...* (23, compare the argument in *II Cat.* 12–14). What is important here is the fact that the argument allows Cicero to present himself as the voice of an imagined friend who pities Catiline, of the silent Fatherland who fears Catiline, of Catiline himself (that is, a voice that again preempts Catiline, that says what is on his mind) and of the silent Senators whose silence judges Catiline. The second part of the speech is a veritable *tour de force* of speech for others. And it builds to a powerful climax: when Cicero speaks, good men may be silent; only the wicked, like Catiline, need to fear the consul whose speech reveals what is within Catiline's mind and in the hearts and minds of others.

### 2.2 Urbane Moral Superiority

Complementary to the tactic of speaking for others, a tactic which always borders on arrogance, is the second resource from which Cicero here constructs his *ethos*: the clever and magisterial perspective which he adopts throughout. One sign of this perspective is the *praeteritio*. To be sure, the form is useful in invective, where the details of a debauched private life are best

[59]*faciam ut intellegas quid hi de te sentiant...Quid exspectas auctoritatem loquentium, quorum voluntatem tacitorum perspicis?...De te autem, Catilina, cum quiescunt, probant, cum patiuntur, decernunt, cum tacent, clamant.* (20–21).

[60]This argument will have been much more powerful when put in writing and when read in the silence of one's room than when spoken before an unruly audience of Senators.

mentioned in passing: *praetermitto...praetermitto...* (14).[61] But when Cicero comes to the charge of public impiety, Catiline's appearance with a sword in the *comitia* on December 31, 66 BC, the speech devolves into a *praeteritio* of exclamations: *illa omitto...quotiens...quotiens...quot...* (15). *Nihil agis,* he says, *nihil adsequeris, neque tamen conari ac velle desistis* (15), but the sentence is only a parenthesis: *quotiens...quotiens...* (16), he continues. He concludes the image of public impiety with the sacred altars and secret rites by which Catiline dedicated his dagger to his god. In all of this, the figure of *praeteritio* allows Cicero some space above the details of this tawdry affair—and this is an important element of Cicero's presentation of *ethos*.[62] Not only does he know the facts, but he is sensitive to their monstrosity: *quod ego praetermitto et facile patior sileri, ne in hac civitate tanti facinoris immanitas aut exstitisse aut non vidicata esse videatur* (14). In fact, the figure allows him at one point to confess ignorance of the details, at the same time that he turns this putative ignorance into a sardonic weapon: *Quae quidem quibus abs te initiata sacris ac devota sit nescio* (16). There are two measures of the distance Cicero is establishing here between his own persona and these ignoble deeds: first, he takes the time to develop a quick metaphor, picturing himself as the graceful gladiator who dodges his opponent's thrusts (*petitiones*) with a slight swerve of the body (*parva quadam declinatione et, ut aiunt, corpore effugi*, 15), and in doing so rehabilitates the image of his culpability he had offered in the exordium: *Nos autem fortes viri satis facere rei publicae videmus, si istius furorem ac tela vitemus* (2); second, while he pictures himself in the arena as the object of the gaze of others, he speaks again in the third person: *quod eam [sicam] necesse putas esse in consulis corpore defigere* (16).

Another element of Cicero's magisterial perspective is his manipulation of a standard emblem of tyranny. The phrase *oderint dum metuant*, probably from the Atreus of Accius (170–ca. 90 BC), was a favorite of Cicero and is cited as exemplary of the attitude of *improbi cives* (*Sest.* 102) and as contrary to the character of the *iusti* (*Off.* 1. 97). More telling, however, is its echo at *I Phil.* 34. There, in terms which recall his earlier image of Catiline, Cicero

[61]See, for instance, Cic. *Verr.* 2. 3. 58 and 59. See the classic study of Usher. He points out that the increasing frequency of *occultatio* in Cicero's later works is not a direct result of its special affinity for invective. In fact, it is not frequent in the *Catilinarians*; Usher cites only *I Cat.* 3 and 14 and *III Cat.* 18, omitting *I Cat.* 15. However, considering the *tour de force* of *prateritiones* here it is perhaps unfair to characterize the passage as a single example of the figure.

[62]The author of the *Ad Herennium* lists four categories of material suitable for *occultatio*: *longum, ignobile, planum non potest fieri,* and *facile potest reprehendi.* At least one of the categories (*ignobile*) pertains to *ethos.*

characterizes Antony as one who desires regal power: *gloriosum putes plus te unum posse quam omnes et metui a civibus tuis.* This he contrasts with the citizen dear to all: *carum esse civem, bene de re publica mereri, laudari, coli, diligi, gloriosum est; metui vero et in odio esse invidiosum, detestable, inbecillum, caducum.* Then, as a climactic example of his point, he cites the words of Atreus, *oderint dum metuant,* words he calls *dira et abominanda.*[63]

The power and tyrannical indifference expressed by this phrase, and caught in Cicero's image of Antony's desire to be more powerful than all citizens, motivates Cicero's diction in sections 13–18 of the *First Catilinarian.* This time, however, the tyrannical arrogance of this attitude is assigned to a man without position or power, a man who had failed at the polls, and has just been described holding his secret midnight meetings. In this context, it is an image not of tyranny but of isolation. *Quid est enim, Catilina, quod te iam in hac urbe delectare possit? in qua nemo est extra istam coniurationem perditorum hominum qui te non metuat, nemo qui non oderit* (13). Part Two, beginning with this question and especially in section 17, resonates with the terms *metuere, timere,* and *odisse*: *Servi...si me...metuerent ut te metuunt omnes cives...Si te parentes timerent atque odissent...Nunc te patria, quae communis est parens..., odit ac metuit...* (17); *nunc vero me totam esse in metu...ut tandem aliquando timere desinam* (18). But since the terms do not apply to a real tyrant, Cicero's language catches Catiline in mocking an empty image of who he would want to be. In a sense, Cicero again speaks what is on Catiline's mind. It is a clever trick to sympathize with the citizens' fears and hatred while identifying and mocking the hidden desires of a would–be tyrant, but, when the consul with *summum imperium* suddenly sets aside his own hatred, the effect is devastating: *Sic enim iam tecum loquar, non ut odio permotus esse videar, quo debeo, sed ut misericordia, qua tibi nulla debetur* (16). Pity? Is Cicero now the sympathetic *amicus* as before he was the understanding advisor (*si me consulis, suadeo,* 13)? One thing is sure; even the fear and hatred Catiline arouses elsewhere are void of meaning when filtered through the urbane contempt of this consul.

### 2.3 Rhetorical Inversions for a Moral Invert

Cicero has arisen above the very fray he has created, moved away from the hysteria of the opening lines, and his chief means to this end is the ironic

[63]See also Suet. *Cal.* 30, Seneca *de Ira* 1. 20 and *de Clem.* 1. 12. 4 and 2. 2. 2. Cicero's *abominanda* is, of course, apt to Catiline; the general issue reappears at *I Cat.* 33: *hisce ominibus...*

posture of the pitying counselor.[64] This irony depends in large part on the contrast Cicero draws between himself and Catiline and on the manipulation and inversion of common figures: thus, the feared and hated tyrant is an empty, isolated shell; a practical view of the wisdom of Catiline's exile is a mocking form of friendship; but that is not all. We have already noted that the speech of the Fatherland to Catiline is meant to portray Cicero as a leader sympathetic to the fears of the Fatherland: *discede...ut tandem aliquando timere desinam*, she says (18). But this sympathy finds expression in the inversion of a common literary form, the kletic hymn.[65] This inversion can be seen quite clearly if we contrast the content and the form of the Fatherland's speech. Cicero's sentences display the formal devices of hymnic structure: *nullum...nisi per te... nullum...sine te; tibi uni...tibi...tu non solum ad neglegend[um]...verum etiam ad...evertend[um]...Superiora illa...ut potui, tuli; nunc vero me...propter unum te, quidquid increpuerit, Catilinam...nullum videri...quod a tuo...Quam ob rem...* and there follows the prayer. But the content is not that of a kletic hymn, but of an apotropaic hymn, sending away a *sacrum* who a few sentences earlier was dedicating his dagger at his secret altars (*Quae [sica] quidem quibus abs te initiata sacris ac devota sit nescio...*, 16). The coherence of the whole is striking as Cicero turns his gaudy imagination of a predictable charge of impiety into a literary inversion which parallels and mocks the ethical inversion of Catiline's character and actions.

At this point, Cicero may bring his invective to a close. But not without another inversion. Part Two ends with Cicero's picture of Catiline leaving the city. He is escorted[66] out *not* by relatives and friends, as might be expected for an exile, but by the crowd of Senators, equites, and brave men for whom

[64]Quintilian treats irony as a form of *iocum* (*Inst.* 6. 3.68), whose effect is disparagement (*Inst.* 4. 1.39, 9. 3. 29), and which is an effective element in the presentation of *ethos* (that is, *lenitas*, 4. 2. 16) for an orator. Cicero has Caesar in *de Oratore* describe irony: *Genus est perelegans et cum gravitate salsum cumque oratoriis dictionibus tum urbanis sermonibus accommodatum* (2. 270). It is worth noting that Quintilian explicitly identifies *I Cat.* 19 as irony: *Inst.* 9. 2. 45. See also the brief discussion of Haury 132–33.

[65]The analysis of hymnic features comes from Ratkowitsch. Its function in the speech in terms of other inversions and in terms of urbane superiority belongs to the author.

[66]The terms, *relinquentem...prosequantur* (21), recall Cicero's third alternative in his description of the *First Catilinarian* at the beginning of the *Second Catilinarian*: *vel ipsum egredientem verbis prosecuti sumus* (*II Cat.* 1). The parallel, whether accidental or intentional, suggests the mocking and jeering effect that Cicero intended for his speech: *quorum ego vix abs te iam diu manus ac tela contineo, eosdem facile adducam, ut te haec, quae vastare iam pridem studes, relinquentem usque ad portas prosequantur*. For a further parallel between the speech and this action, see *Verum ego hoc* [=*interfici iubere*] *quod iam pridem factum esse oportuit certa de causa nondum adducor ut faciam* (5), and *quos ferro trudicari oportebat, eos nondum voce vulnero* (9).

Cicero speaks and who quietly approve, patiently decree, and silently clamor for his departure. Moral invert, failed tyrant, a religious mockery, and now a voluntary exile, he is cheered on his way by his fellow citizens—the images are powerful, and in creating and using them Cicero, unmoved by contemporary fears and hatreds, has done what words can do to establish his view of events and to establish his own magisterial position above the fears and uncertainties of others.

Looking back on the course of the speech, we see that what began as invective has issued in a kind of mock *suasoria* (*suadeo*, 13) and in the image of a perverse *propemptikon* (*usque ad portas prosequantur*, 21). But this *tour de force* of simultaneous disdain for Catiline and appropriation of the voices of others was motivated by Cicero's orders, *Egredere ex urbe, Catilina, libera rem publicam metu, in exsilium, si hanc vocem expectas, proficiscere* (20). It is now time to deflect as far as possible the potential charge that he has driven Catiline out of the city. To do this he turns to reflect on what he is doing and what he can accomplish. The third part of the speech asks the pivotal question, "And yet, why am I talking?"

## Part Three: On the Immediate Future

### General and Formal Considerations

Formally, Part Three (22–27a) may be viewed in two ways. By one analysis, this is another section which begins with a question defining the argumentative issue, *quamquam quid loquor*? (22), then proceeds to a command, *proficiscere...perge...* (23), and finally attaches a coda dealing with the constitutional question of exile, first from Cicero's perspective (*laus* and *invidia*), then from Catiline's perspective (*laetitia* and *exsul*). By another analysis, we have two smaller sections, each beginning with a question which defines their issue (*quamquam quid loquor*, 22, and *quamquam quid ego te invitem*, 24), and then each proceeds to Catiline's departure. That departure is commanded in the first part, *quam ob rem, ut saepe iam dixi, proficiscere...* (23), and announced in the second part, *ibis tandem aliquando...* (25). If we identify two movements beginning with separate questions, we may also identify two appended codas in each part: in the first, Cicero imagines the alternative to exile, *sin autem servire meae laudi...* (23), and in the second, he develops an image of Catiline in Manlius' camp, *hic tu qua laetitia perfruere!* (26). Put another way, in the analysis which yields a single movement, the Coda which deflects the constitutional question of exile by treating Catiline's departure as an event over which the consul has no control, is itself given the form of Question—Departure Announced—Coda. An abbreviated outline will illustrate both possibilities (the

first analysis is in bold and corresponds to Ia, Ib and Ic [Ic is composed of IIa, IIb and IIc]; the second analysis treats I as separate from II).

| | |
|---|---|
| 22. *Quamquam quid loquor?* | I a: **QUESTION** |
| 23. *Quam ob rem, proficiscere...* | I b: **COMMAND** |
| *vix feram sermones hominem...* | I c: **CODA: The future** |
| *egredere, confer te ad Manlium...* | **CONCLUSION** |
| 24. *Quamquam quid ego te invitem...?* | II a: Question |
| 25. *Ibis tandem aliquando...* | II b: "Command" |
| 26. *hic tu qua laetitia! quibus gaudiis!* | II c: Coda |
| *quanta in voluptate!* | |
| *ut exsul...atque ut bellum nominaretur.* | Conclusion |

### 3.1 The Uses and Dangers of Invective

Having imagined Catiline's departure into exile at the end of Part Two, Cicero now grants that the advice of the pitying consul, the fears of the Fatherland, and the tacit judgment of the Senate make no difference to Catiline. Cicero cannot drive him into exile because he is going willingly to Manlius' camp. This means that the invective and the commands have really had no effect on Catiline; they have, however, served the purpose of presenting Cicero's concerned selflessness and moral superiority. Furthermore, Catiline's indifference to the fears and hatred of his fellow citizens is the very thing that excuses Cicero from responsibility for the potential effects of his invective. It is a neat trick: the invective insures that Catiline will leave Rome, but the conclusion to the invective (itself a continuation of invective) asserts that Catiline's departure will reveal his nature and, thus, has not been affected by Cicero. At the same time that the speech begins to suggest these grounds for exonerating Cicero from blame for Catiline's departure, it turns its emphasis away from Catiline and moves to Cicero himself—what he will suffer (*vix feram sermones hominum...vix molem invidiae...*, 23), what he should gain[67] (*sin autem servire meae laudi et gloriae mavis...*, 23), and how his action should be perceived (*a me non eiectus...sed invitatus...videaris*, 23).

In doing this, Cicero takes on both the logic and the purpose of his speech: Why order Catiline out of the city? Why talk at all, if Catiline is going to leave Rome anyway? If Catiline will not be persuaded to go into exile, and if he will join Manlius regardless, why is Cicero talking? The answer is that you may know Cicero, know his selflessness, his burdens, his knowledge, and his

[67]If Cicero knows, as he says he does, that Catiline is going to Manlius' camp, then the claim that such a move will serve his *laus* is both a prediction and a paraenesis, that is, Cicero suggests that he should be praised for the subsequent events.

providence. This is significant because not only is Cicero talking about himself, but he is doing so at the major transition of the speech, one which was prepared for by the issues of the exordium. We noted above that even in the opening question to Catiline, there were two questions implicit in the rhetoric: Catiline why don't you stop yourself? and, Consul, why don't you stop Catiline? Here we get the final and definitive answer to the first question before Part Four takes up the second question. This answer takes us back rhetorically and verbally to the terms of the exordium: *Quo usque tandem...* (1) is recalled in *ibis tandem aliquando* (25); *quam diu etiam furor iste tuus* and *quem ad finem sese effrenata iactabit audacia?* (1), in *quo te iam pridem ista tua cupiditas effrenata ac furiosa rapiebat* (25). Even the interpretation of Catiline's madness offered above and based on the terms *furor* and *effrenata* surfaces in Cicero's description: *Neque enim is es, Catilina, ut te...ratio a furore revocaverit* (22). The answer, then, to the question, "Catiline, why don't you stop yourself?", is simply that he will not because he cannot; it is his nature: *Ad hanc te amentiam natura peperit* (25). But in getting to this answer we have heard about the accuracy of Cicero's speech, and we have heard that speech give voice to the concerns of citizens and state as well as to the hidden desires of Catiline. By the end of Part Three, with no orders left to give Catiline, Cicero easily returns to the standard topics of invective: *quandam incredibilem voluptatem, amentiam, bellum nefarium, ex perditis atque ab omni non modo fortuna verum etiam spe derelictis conflatam improborum manum*, and so on.

There is a danger, however, in all of this, and that danger is what I have identified as the second question: what is Cicero doing? Cicero cannot allow Catiline's depravity to overshadow his control and understanding of the situation. As he remarked in the exordium: *sed iam me ipse inertiae nequitiaeque condemno* (4), and that charge remains implicit here in *quamquam quid loquor?* (22).[68] Cicero's solution is to subordinate the attack on Catiline to the presentation of his thoughts and actions. First, he entertains a hypothetical: *si mea voce perterritus ire in exsilium animum induxeris...* in order to imagine the cost to himself, *quanta tempestas invidiae nobis*,[69] and to proclaim his selflessness, *Sed est tanti*,[70] in language that recalls the *unus ille vir* theme, *dum*

[68]The question can mean both of the following: what is the purpose of my talking? and why am I only talking and not taking some action?

[69]This is another argument whose resonance is particularly strong from the perspective of 60 BC, as the language itself seems to suggest: *video...quanta tempestas invidiae nobis, si minus in praesens tempus recenti memoria scelerum tuorum, at in posteritatem impendeat* (22).

[70]The theme of selflessness is also developed in 23: *vix feram sermones hominum, si id feceris, vix molem istius invidiae, si in exsilium iussu consulis ieris, sustinebo.*

*modo tua ista sit privata calamitas et a rei publicae periculis seiungatur* (22).[71] Then, when Cicero contemplates the alternative, that Catiline will join Manlius, he makes the very possibility a version of the history he desires: *sin autem servire meae laudi et gloriae mavis...* (23). In order to subordinate to his own authority what he has himself described as Catiline's unswervable and mad purpose, he first orders Catiline from the city (*egredere...*, *confer te...*, *concita...*, *secerne te...*, *infer patriae bellum, exsulta impio latricinio*, 23) and then, in order to divert the charge of kingly abuse of power, he reconceives his command with magisterial irony as an invitation: *ut a me non eiectus ad alienos, sed invitatus ad tuos isse videaris.* (23). After this, Cicero will not again order Catiline from Rome until the next to the last sentence of the speech.

### 3.2 Ciceronian Providence

The speech here is a high–wire act. Each tactic has its risks. Even Cicero's cavalier contempt for Catiline may suggest indifference to Rome. Consequently, the nature of the invitation concerns the second half of Part Three: *quamquam quid ego te invitem...?* (24). It is a meaningless invitation because all the evidence shows that Catiline has already made plans to go to Manlius' camp. But in adducing the evidence Cicero explicitly converts Catiline's unchangeable plans into elements of his present knowledge (*sciam*) of past activities (*praemissos...pactam ac constitutam...praemissos...*) which are themselves but the warrant for Catiline's future actions, as the prefix *prae–* and the meaning of *pactam ac constitutam* make clear. With extraordinary finesse, Cicero then inserts into this *tour de force* of information and foreknowledge what amounts to a prediction that has nothing to do with what Cicero knows[72] but which depends upon the fact that Cicero is presenting himself as one who does know: *aquilam illam argenteam quam tibi ac tuis omnibus confido perniciosam ac funestam futuram* (24). The repeated *"sciam"* is designed to create confidence in Cicero's own *"confido,"* itself marked by being in the indicative. At this easily overlooked point in the speech, Cicero is converting his past information and his present knowledge about Catiline's past preliminary actions into deliberative capital; that is, in accepting Cicero's confidence in his own knowledge the Senate is to put their confidence in Cicero's handling of the future. Here, Cicero constructs a deliberative *ethos* that takes the place of

[71]Compare: *quam diu mihi consuli designato, Catilina, insidiatus es, non publico me praesidio, sed privata diligentia defendi...quotienscumque me petisti, per me tibi obstiti, quamquam videbam perniciem meam cum magna calamitate rei publicae esse coniunctam* (11).

[72]That is, what Cicero knows in November 63 BC. Here, in particular, one can see how a revision for publication in 60 BC could easily take advantage of the 63 BC speech if it was in general the speech I have been describing, a construction of consular *ethos*.

deliberation. In response to the deliberative dilemma, What must be done?, Cicero is saying to the Senate, "Trust me. It will be the death of him."

Part Three ends, as I have noted, with a miniature return to invective. Its tenor depends in part on the moral isolation of Catiline established in Parts One and Two; but what is remarkable about this attack is that the vicious actions which are cited are located in the future. *Hic tu qua laetitia perfruere, quibus gaudiis exsultabis, quanta in voluptate bacchabere, cum in tanto numero tuorum neque audies virum bonum quemquam neque videbis!* (26). In a sense this is "pre–invective"; and, while the practical function of the earlier invective (to lend moral authority to Cicero's command that Catiline leave the city) has been lost (*Ibis tandem aliquando...*, 23), this new invective depends entirely on and capitalizes on Cicero's claims to knowledge about the future. Just as earlier Cicero had avoided the entanglements of a potentially deliberative occasion by referring the dilemma to Catiline's character and so converting deliberation into invective, so here the loss of his ability to command Catiline's departure is converted to provident wisdom and this predictive foreknowledge underwrites the new invective—first of Catiline's pleasures, and then (for the second time) of his defeat: *Habes ubi ostentes tuam illam praeclaram patientiam famis, frigoris, inopiae rerum omnium quibus te brevi tempore confectum esse senties* (26). The last sentence then carries the implicit claim that this pass where Rome stands, with its dangers and its inevitable victory over Catiline, was all along under the watchful eye of Cicero. Such is the function of the backward glance at the elections of 63 BC with which Cicero ends Part Three. There, Cicero claims, in Catiline's last republican participation in normal government functions, the consul's providence was already guiding events: *Tantum profeci tum...ut exul potius temptare quam consul vexare rem publicam posses...* (27). Part Three has completed the answer to the question addressed to Catiline, "When will you stop?", with a definitive prediction, and has laid the ground for Cicero's answer to the second question, "Consul, why do you not stop Catiline?" That question is now given the august voice of *Patria* in Part Four.

## Part Four: The *Patria*'s Fears and Cicero's Self–Defense

### General and Formal Considerations

The basic structure of question—command—coda that I have outlined for the earlier sections of the speech is modulated but not lost in Part Four (27b–32). This modulation may itself be indicative of a certain relaxation in the tensions Cicero has created. The opening sentence of Part Four introduces the speech of *res publica*, that is to say it only postpones republic's questions, but those questions, like those which begin the other parts of the speech, will also define the

issues of this part of the speech: *Marce Tulli, quid agis?* (27). The answer Cicero gives is concluded not with a command addressed as before to Catiline, but with a command to all the *improbi, Qua re secedant improbi* (32). Doubtless, the reason is that there is no sense in telling Catiline at this point to do what Cicero has just argued he will do anyway. The coda then imagines the response of Rome to the departure of the Catilinarians, *Polliceor hoc vobis, patres conscripti.*

### 4.1 Praise and Blame

In Part Four, Cicero again adopts the voice of the Fatherland,[73] a tactic that allows him to construct the charges he wants to answer regarding his handling of Catiline, and, incidentally, to validate his own self–praise[74] as the authoritative view of Rome herself. This oblique praise from the mouth of Rome marks the point where the autobiographical function of the speech becomes most explicit. As the *res publica* dismisses Cicero's putative fear of the *invidia* that will arise from any proactive initiative, her language mixes praise and blame in an elegant balance, which serves to erase any real *invidia* for Cicero's self–praise with an expression of gratitude for his success joined with an acknowledgment of his responsibilities: *An invidiam posteritatis times? Praeclaram vero populo Romano refers gratiam qui te, hominem per te cognitum, nulla commendatione maiorum tam mature ad summum imperium per omnis honorum gradus extulit, si propter invidiam aut alicuius periculi metum salutem civium tuorum neglegis* (28).

The primary purpose of Part Four, however, is to take on the charge of *inertia*, and return the audience again to the issues that opened the speech: *sed si quis est invidiae metus, non est vehementius severitatis ac fortitudinis invidia quam inertiae ac nequitiae pertimescenda* (29).[75] Once again the deliberative point, "What are we to do?", is deflected, this time into the complaint Cicero

[73]The two speeches given to *Patria* are sometimes cited as a weakness in the speech; see Nisbet 62–63 and Wilkins 83. This judgment is greatly weakened when it is noted that the two speeches articulate the two central issues (Catiline's character and Cicero's *inertia*) as defined by the opening of the *exordium.*

[74]When the Fatherland herself describes the Roman people (note that Cicero not only gives words to the abstract *Patria* but assigns to her an interpretation of his Career: this is autobiography) as follows: [*populus Romanus*] *qui te, hominem per te cognitum, nulla comendatione maiorum tam mature ad summum imperium per omnis honorum gradus extulit...* (28), and again in Cicero's answer when he says, *Etenim iam diu, patres conscripti, in his periculis coniurationis insidiisque versamur, sed nescio quo pacto omnium scelerum ac veteris furoris et audaciae maturitas in nostri consulatus tempus erupit* (31).

[75]As described above these charges were lurking in *quo usque tandem* (1) and explicit in *sed iam me ipse inertiae nequitiaeque condemno* (4).

wishes to address, "Cicero, why do you do nothing?" In articulating the accusation against him at some length, and doing it through the figure of the *Patria*, Cicero not only makes the issue which concerns him appear to be the concern of the state, but again he rises above the urgency others feel (or he imagines they should feel) at the moment. In fact, even the future dangers of *invidia* will not move him. Cicero concludes: *Quod si ea [invidia] mihi maxime impenderet, tamen hoc animo fui semper ut invidiam virtute partam gloriam, non invidiam putarem* (29). Aristotle provides the gloss: "Similarly, those who praise or blame do not consider whether a man has done what was expedient or harmful, but frequently make it a matter for praise that, disregarding his own interest, he performed some deed of honor" (*Rhet.* 1. 3. 6). In thus presenting himself as the one who understands the State's putative fears and in response acts as the advisor to the state, he takes a big step in presenting himself as one who understands honor and the common good, who does not hasten to precipitous action. He is sympathetic and understanding, while remaining the picture of a rational advisor.

### 4.2 The Thoughtful Advisor

This new attitude is clearly marked in the fact that all the questions of Part Four are spoken by the *Patria*; that is to say, after his last question in Part Three (sec. 24), Cicero has adopted the persona of one who has no more questions. He is now the man who has the answers and who is sufficient to the questions of others. This new attitude is also marked by the tone of Cicero's response. He is now offering a rational and carefully considered explanation.[76] There are no exclamations, no instances of anaphora, no asyndeta. He takes on the gravity of his country's questions, *his ego sanctissimis rei publicae vocibus* (29), with the polite request for only a little time, *pauca respondebo* (29). There are two sides, he says, an apparent logic and the true understanding. First, he grants the apparent logic of acting immediately, *Ego si hoc optimum factu iudicarem, patres constripti...* (29), and he accepts the precedent of the past as an irrefutable reason to be unafraid: *Etenim si summi viri...certe verendum mihi non erat...* (29). And yet, he notes, there are other considerations: *quamquam non nulli sunt...*, and these considerations will have consequences: *quorum auctoritate multi...crudeliter et regie factum esse dicerent* (30). To all this, then, he opposes his understanding, *nunc intellego*, which also has two sides: On the one hand, Catiline's departure, *si iste, quo intendit...*, will remove the problem of the sympathizers and the unconvinced mentioned

[76]This new found *lenitas* conforms to the requirements of the *ethos* recommended by both Cicero, *de Or.* 2. 182–84, and Quintilian, *Inst.* 4. 2. 8–19.

above: *neminem...qui non fateatur* (30). On the other hand, Catiline's immediate death, *hoc autem uno interfecto...*, would only postpone the real problem, *pestem paulisper reprimi, non in perpetuum comprimi* (30). The conclusion is clearly that Catiline should leave voluntarily: *Quodsi sese eiecerit secumque suos eduxerit...* (30).

In these calm and reasonable deliberations, Cicero has moved far from the shrill impetuosity of his opening attack on Catiline, and yet it is stunning that the substance of his position remains exactly the same: *Tum denique interficiere, cum iam nemo tam improbus, tam perditus, tam tui similis inveniri poterit qui id non iure factum esse fateatur* (5), is recalled in thought and word by *Nunc intellego, si iste, quo intendit...pervenerit, neminem tam stultum fore qui non videat coniurationem esse factam, neminem tam improbum qui non fateatur* (30). The speech closes around itself, and the reasonable conclusion is the formal validation for the impassioned introduction. In fact, Cicero's answer, "Wait, so that the remedy may be *in perpetuum*," depends upon that knowledge of events which Cicero has been so carefully constructing throughout the speech. *Nunc intellego...* he says, and the audience has been prepared for this by a long string of assertions: from *Patere tua consilia non sentis...?* (1) and *Meministine me ante diem xii Kalendas Novembris dicere in senatu...Num me fefellit...? Dixi ego idem in senatu...Num infitiari potes...?* (7), to *Quamquam quid ego te invitem, a quo iam sciam esse...cui sciam...a quo...sciam...?* (24), to *Quamquam non nulli sunt in hoc ordine...* (30).

One might say that at this point the deliberative issue has been diverted and answered in the person and policy of Cicero, and substantively Cicero adds nothing more to his position. But this speech is only secondarily about policy; it is fundamentally about who Cicero is. For this reason Cicero ends Part Four by re-situating and diffusing the charge of inaction into a long history of dangers and treachery: *Etenim iam diu, patres conscripti, in his periculis coniurationis insidiisque versamur* (31). The precedents that have been used against Cicero—by himself in this speech, it must be remembered—and the charges of *inertia ac nequitia* are now disempowered. The *summi viri et clarissimi cives*, for all their brave action and love of country, have only treated symptoms. Not only is this a special moment in the history of Rome, but it is an occasion that requires the special talents of this consul: *sed nescio quo pacto omnium scelerum ac veteris furoris et audaciae maturitas in nostri consulatus tempus erupit* (31). This is the last appearance of the *unus ille vir* theme.

### 4.3 Appropriating Speech

At this point, since it no longer makes sense to tell Catiline to get out of Rome, Cicero asserts his command by telling all the *improbi* to leave with Catiline, and then he promises victory to the Senate. This is all to be expected and it follows from what Cicero has argued. However, the last two sentences again reveal the underlying intention and the dangerous implications of Cicero's speech. After telling the *improbi* to leave, Cicero adds a final command that applies to all in Rome: *sit denique inscriptum in fronte unius cuiusque quid de re publica sentiat* (32). Cicero, who has so vigorously isolated Catiline from his fellow citizens, does not need, it turns out, the speech of others.[77] There is no room here for deliberation; and, while one may sense in the extremity of the command something of Cicero's frustration at the failed deliberations of the past, one must also sense a failure of republicanism. That failure, however, is brief; and Cicero's eagerness for the silence of others, his willingness to speak for all, is soon modulated in the next sentence into an extraordinary set of promises. Here, amid the silence of friends and enemies alike, we hear Cicero announcing as his own promise what only others can promise; he speaks in the name of consuls, Senators, equites and all good men: *Polliceor hoc vobis, patres conscripti, tantam in nobis consulibus fore diligentiam, tantam in vobis auctoritatem, tantam in equitibus Romanis virtutem, tantam in omnibus bonis consensionem ut Catilinae profectione omnia patefacta, inlustrata, oppressa, vindicata esse videatis* (32).

Part Four is another *tour de force* of the range of Ciceronian speech: first, he gives voice to the Fatherland's complaint; then he speaks of the long view of history; he gives consular commands to the wicked, and demands the silence of all, and finally makes these promises. In this grand gesture, objectivity and moral authority so coincide that in his transition to the peroration he can call the very promises of others to which he has given voice the omens that attend the safety of the state and the destruction of Catiline (*hisce ominibus, Catilina...*, 35). There is almost nothing left for anyone to say.

[77]The use of mute signs in the *Catilinarians* deserves full attention. Konstan 18 mentions them in reference with *III Cat.* 13 as betrayals of the guilty and with reference to our passage, 25, as outward signs of conscience. However, Cicero does not in general desire silence: see for example *III Cat.* 26: *Nihil me mutum potest delectare, nihil tacitum.* In *I Cat.* 32 the silent citizenry is an opportunity for Cicero's speech, as was the *tacita patria* at 18 and again at 27–28, and the silent Senators. But there is a difference here: Cicero demands both their silence and a branded sign of their patriotic agreement. We are, I think, at the heart of a paradox in Cicero's own political aspirations.

### Peroration.

The Peroration (sec. 33) is but two sentences. Here, the order to leave is given for the last time, a mere formality, but one that allows Cicero to adopt new roles. As he announces the omens, he speaks as priest, prophet and magistrate. Then he turns to Jupiter, with whom he recalls the pious voice of tradition and of Roman dreams for empire: *quem Statorem huius urbis atque imperi vere nominamus*. But then, in a final extraordinary move, Cicero changes the prayer which is typical of a peroration into what can only be described as a variation on vatic prophecy. As Cicero announces in the future indicative the will of Jupiter both now and in the future, the eternal punishment for enemies of the state both while they live and after they are dead, and as he speaks to Jupiter in the second person about the future of Rome, we seem to overhear Jupiter's priest in consultation with his god. So ends the rhetorical aria in which Cicero became the consul he wished to be.

## CONCLUSION

Amid the uncertainties of 63 Cicero needed to empower not so much any particular view of events as the authority of his view. Between "How long will you abuse our patience" and "You, Jupiter, will punish these evil men forever," this speech is a call for and justification for...more patience. Which is to say it is a justification of Cicero, a form of autobiography and self–construction. But Cicero does not speak merely to justify his actions, rather he justifies his actions in order to claim the role of sole spokesman, now and in the future. That is why a specific policy or practical purpose is so hard to find for this oration.

Cicero's hands were tied in November 63. His theatricality, his cuirass at the elections, his repeated and mysterious, "I have been informed,"[78] his general alarmism had put him in a precarious position. Since October 21st, Cicero had had the Senatorial decree which we know by the mocking name Julius Caesar gave it in another context, the *senatus consultum ultimum*, but it was a decree which earlier that year had been at the center of the accusations of *perduellio* against Gaius Rabirius and had raised questions about the authority of the *senatus consultum* in terms of events which were thirty–seven years old. Authority and action were precarious. And to make matters worse, Cicero's information had been inaccurate: nothing had happened, at least not in Rome

[78]*comperi*, repeated here in *haec ego omnia vixdum etiam coetu vestro dimisso comperi* (10); and then again, as if in justification, in the opening words of the *Patria, M. Tulli, quid agis? Tune eum quem esse hostem comperisti...?* (27).

on October 28 or at Praeneste on November 1. At the end of October, there were rumors of slave revolts in Capua and Apulia, and apparently Manlius did take up arms on October 27th, though this was only confirmed later (Sal. *Cat.* 30. 1, cf. Cic. *I Cat.* 7). The Senate took the precaution of sending Q. Marcius Rex and Q. Metellus Creticus to Apulia and Faesula. But Catiline remained in Rome; indicted *de vi*, he offered to go into custody; he attended the Senate. At this point, then, regardless of Cicero's knowledge about Catiline's plans, as his consulship was coming to its end, as Pompey was about to arrive back in Rome, and as he was preparing in early November to take some action, he needed most of all to reconstruct and reassert his authority.[79]

Given the non–events of the past, it would seem wise for him, regardless of what had been reported to him, not to count on an explicit or precise political reaction by others. He either had been wrong too many times before, or Catiline had been too clever, or he had himself acted with such providence that there was no evidence upon which to act now. And so he spoke. It was a commanding performance, and as such it had a tendency to remove from politics that which is essential to politics: negotiation, discussion and persuasion. Perhaps the fiercest moment comes at the end when Cicero demands that each man's opinion be branded on his forehead. Such is the power of relinquishing speech to the authorities. It is striking that in the contemporary world his demand for a branded citizenry has not been marked with the stigma of tyrannical aspirations,[80] or noted as an image of an enslaved citizenry, and perhaps this oversight is a lingering mark of Cicero's rhetorical success.

But this was an imaginative performance, a space on the public stage where Cicero knew that the audience had to let his voice speak—for them, for their traditions, for their past history, and for their present indecision. He could, therefore, in the end demand from the Senators the very silence which was part of the inaction that had hampered him. Having set Cicero's historical intention at this general level, we may now return to the historical context and note the broader historical purposes that were served by this strategy. He will have silenced the mocking chorus of *"comperi,"* itself an effort to disempower the consul by questioning, not just his knowledge, but his word. He will have aligned himself with the powers of providence. He will have gained what most he needed, that quality of *auctoritas* that depends on *virtus* conjoined with *fata* and the gods. He will have made it hard to oppose him; he will have made even

[79]See Dio Cass. 37. 29. 3 and 31. 3; see also Seager 246, describing the confusion and fears in Rome as they may have affected Cicero.

[80]Some sense of the political dangers here can be found in the discussion of Konstan 17 and 21–22.

the skeptics and those who sympathized with Catiline afraid of his voice: *eos nondum voce vulnero.*[81] I personally believe that this voice of magisterial authority and ironic contempt was meant to escort Catiline to Manlius' camp, and that knowing that Catiline was about to leave, Cicero chose to take advantage of Catiline's plans. But under any circumstances, he would have had to ensure enough flexibility to deal effectively with many possible outcomes. That is why I have characterized the speech as one that primarily constructs a consular *ethos*, something Cicero could do in his words, not something that depended entirely upon the unpredictable responses of others.

It was this same purpose that led to the revisions (whatever they were) and the (probable) publication of the *First Catilinarian* in 60 BC, when political calamity was again on the horizon.[82] Then Cicero especially needed to seem to speak for the state as a whole, to construct again in his oratory the authority which silences the political agendas and voices of others, and to make his own voice of personal and public outrage speak again, this time for a retrospective view of the history he had himself created. The record of modern scholarship seems to show that there are several possible and plausible scenarios for the *First Catilinarian*, that the details of the speech do not unambiguously cohere in an indisputable practical purpose. For this reason, I would like to suggest that they do cohere in a rhetorical purpose—and that that rhetorical purpose suited the ambiguities of 63 BC as well as it suited the ominous events of 60 BC. It constructs an image in words of the consul whose present empowerment and whose future memory depended wholly on his words. And those words, this speech, stand in the present and in the future as the monument of his consulship[83]: *isdem ex libris perspicies et quae gesserim et quae dixerim* (*Att.* 2. 1. 3).[84]

[81]Gruber has compared the portrait of Pompey with the virtue of the Hellenistic ruler. The three categories, justice and goodwill with regard to men, intelligence and zeal as a leader, and piety with regard to the gods, can with little modification be made to fit Cicero's self–portrait here.

[82]I have on occasion remarked in the notes on the appropriateness of a particular argument to the circumstances of 60 BC.

[83]Cape's general argument is that the *Catilinarian* speeches as a group accomplish something like this in that they present a new kind of ideal leader, the *togatus imperator*. He is absolutely correct. However, the *First Catilinarian* is unlike the others in that, outside this purpose of constructing a consular *ethos* and creating in escrow (as it were) an enhanced *auctoritas*, there is no discernible practical purpose.

[84]Cp. *Memoria vestra, Quirites, nostrae res alentur, sermonibus crescent, litterarum monumentis inveterascent et conroborabuntur* (*III Cat.* 26).

## EPILOGUE

Having described the *First Catilinarian* up to this point in terms of its power to create a consular *ethos* and a consular voice, one which speaks for and cares for all, it is appropriate to note in conclusion the degree to which that voice, its urgency and its impatient grandeur, was also a frightened voice—and one reasonably frightened, because there were things bigger than Catiline to fear. A mere word count confirms the impression that a fear of hidden evil helped motivate the speech and lingered in the background: *metus* and *metuere*[85] occur eleven times in the *First Catilinarian*, but hardly at all in the other *Catilinarian* speeches.[86] For the *Second Catilinarian*, with the immediate danger out of the city and Cicero's predictions now true, he turns to *timor* and *timere* to characterize emotions: ten occurrences. But this version of fear is equally at work in the rhetoric of the *First Catilinarian*, and it is relatively absent from the third and fourth.[87] The general picture, then, is startling and stark: the *First Catilinarian* takes up fear twice to four times as often as the other speeches.[88]

It is certainly the case that the first two speeches have as part of their function the declaration and arousal of fear and odium against Catiline. In the *First Catilinarian* most of Cicero's references to fear are found in the central invective where with fine rhetorical climaxes Cicero contrasts Catiline's lack of fear and respect with the Patria's fear of him, and Catiline's response to that fear with the proper response of a man feared by slaves and parents.[89] This is, of course, part of a strategy to alienate Catiline and to picture him as alienated from his fellow citizens. However, it does not take a very sophisticated view of displacement and projection to suspect that these fears were in some sense Cicero's.[90] The *Patria*, after all, both spoke of her fear of Catiline in terms that

[85]Lewis and Short accurately distinguishes *metuere* and *timere* as follows *s. v. metuo*: "esp. as the effect of the idea of threatening evil (whereas *timere* usually denotes the effect of some external cause of terror)."

[86]The figures are for *II Cat.*=1 occurrence; for *III Cat.*=0; for *IV Cat.*=2.

[87]The figures are: I Cat.=10; II Cat.=10; III Cat.=4; IV Cat.=2.

[88]

| Oration | metu– | time–/o–/u– | vereri | terrere | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *In Cat. I* | 11 | 10 | 3 | 1 | 25 |
| *In Cat. II* | 1 | 10 | 1 | 1 | 13 |
| *In Cat. III* | 0 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 7 |
| *In Cat. IV* | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 6 |

[89]*Servi mehercle mei si me isto pacto metuerent, ut te metuunt omnes cives tui...Si te parentes timerent atque odissent tui...Nunc te patria...odit ac metuit...: huius tu neque auctoritatem verebere nec iudicium sequere nec vim pertimesces?... [Patria loquitur] "...nunc vero me totam esse in metu propter unum te, quidquid increpuerit Catilinam timeri...hunc mihi timorem eripe...ut tandem aliquando timere desinam."* (17–18).

[90]For Cicero's fears in the *Fourth Catilinarian*, see Konstan 19 and 28.

recalled Cicero's words and spoke of Cicero's fears. He himself says that there was something bigger than Catiline, more durative but hidden in the body politic: *Nunc si ex tanto latrocinio iste unus tolletur, videbimur fortasse ad breve quoddam tempus cura et metu esse relevati, periculum autem residebit et erit inclusum penitus in venis atque in visceribus rei publicae* (31). In a context that so depends upon consensus and upon the word of Cicero, it is not unreasonable to suspect that the real danger was not just a possible resurgence of revolutionary efforts; it was the state's inability to cohere in speech, judgment and action for the public good: "You will then be finally killed," Cicero says, "when it is no longer possible to find someone so evil, so corrupt, so similar to you that he would claim (*fateatur*) that this was done unjustly" (5) and again at the end of the speech, "And yet there are some in this order who either do not see what is imminent or pretend they do not see what they see, who have nourished Catiline's hopes with their soft-headed judgments and have strengthened his growing conspiracy with their disbelief; and because of their authority many, not only among the evil but even among the ignorant, would, if I had punished him, say (*dicerent*) that it had been done cruelly or royally. Now I know that if he goes to Manlius' camp no one will be so stupid that he does not see that a conspiracy has been formed, no one so evil that he will not admit it (*fateatur*)" (30). From the consul's perspective, it was this consensus that was threatened by and in the *sermones hominum.*

The power of those voices to destroy *virtus* and *gloria* goes by the name of *invidia*, and it is not surprising that Cicero has framed this speech with references to *invidia*[91] and tried to cover his fears with the thin veil of bluster and contorted denials and double denials: *Si te iam, Catilina, comprehendi, si interfici iussero, credo, erit verendum mihi ne non potius hoc omnes boni serius a me quam quisquam crudelius factum esse dicat* (5); *certe verendum mihi non erat ne quid hoc parricida civium interfecto invidiae mihi in posteritatem redundaret* (29). But no sooner has he made this last claim than invidia returns: *quod si ea mihi maxime impenderet, tamen hoc animo fui semper, ut invidiam virtute partam gloriam, non invidiam putarem* (29)—surely here as the name re-echoes in his speech the damage remains in the mind. This conclusion is Cicero's brave response to his own imagination of the fatherland's insistent pressure, but perhaps he was more the voice of Rome than even he realized: *An invidiam posteritatis times?...non est vehementius*

[91]The relative frequency of the term *invidia* in the *First Catilinarian* suggests the extent of Cicero's concern with its effects: *I Cat.*=11 times; *II Cat.*=4; *III Cat.*=3; *IV Cat.*=0. Its placement in the speech demonstrates how the issue becomes more prominent as Cicero comes to focus on himself: 22=1 occurrence; 23=2; 28=2; 29=5.

*severitatis ac fortitudinis invidia quam inertiae ac nequitiae pertimescenda*, 1. 28–29. Correct; both were equally to be feared: *video...quanta tempestas invidiae nobis, si minus in praesens tempus recenti memoria scelerum tuorum, at in posteritatem impendeat* 1. 22.[92]

I suggest that what Cicero tries so hard to deflect here is the very power of speech that he set his speech against, and for him that dissent meant the disintegration of virtue. *vix feram sermones hominum* he had bravely promised as he imagined failure. But he had yet to feel the weight of that *vix feram*. Late in 44 BC as he catalogued the disasters that might befall a man, he was more precise and more trenchant about the cost: *invidiae praeterea multitudinis atque ob eas bene meritorum saepe civium expulsiones, calamitates, fugae* (*de Off.* 2. 20).

[92]See also *si mihi inimico, ut praedicas, tuo conflare vis invidiam, recta perge in exsilium;...vix molem istius invidiae...sustinebo* (23).

## Works Cited


Batstone, William W. 1985. "Oratory, Philosophy, and the Common World," in *Proceedings of the Boston Area Colloquium in Ancient Philosophy* vol. 1. John J. Cleary, ed. 97–113.

Bornecque, H. 1936. *Les Catilinaires de Cicéron, Étude et Analyse.* Paris.

Büchner, Karl. 1964. *Cicero: Bestand und Wandel Seiner Geistigen Welt.* Heidelberg.

Cape, Robert W., Jr. 1991. *On Reading Cicero's Catilinarian Orations.* Diss. University of California, Los Angeles.

Classen, C. J. 1988. "Virtutes Romanorum: Römische Tradition und griechischer Einfluss." *Gymnasium* 95: 289–302.

_____. 1985. *Recht—Rhetorik—Politik: Untersuchungen zu Ciceros rhetorischer Strategie.* Darmstadt.

Craig, Christopher P. 1993. "Three Simple Questions for Teaching Cicero's *First Catilinarian.*" *CJ* 88: 255–67.

Crawford, J. M. 1984. *Tullius Cicero, The Lost and Unpublished Orations. Hypomnemata* 80. Göttingen.

Draheim, H. 1917. "Die ursprüngliche Form der katilinarischen Reden Ciceros." *Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie* 34: 1061–71.

Drexler, H. 1976. *Die Caltilinarische Verschwörung: Ein Quellenheft, Texte zur Forschung* Band 25. Darmstadt.

Ferry, J. J. 1968. "The Art of Cicero." *CJ* 63: 201–04.

Fuchs, H. 1959. "Eine Doppelfassung in Ciceros catilinarishen Reden." *Hermes* 87: 463–69.

Gould, H. E. and J. L. Whitely (edd.). 1982. Cicero, *In Catilinam I & II.* Bristol.

Gruber, Joachim. 1981. "Cicero und das hellenistische Herrscherideal: Überlegungen zur Rede 'De imperio Cn. Pompei.'" *WS* 101: 243–58.

Gruen, Erich. 1974. *The Last Generation of the Roman Republic.* Berkeley, Los Angeles, London.

Habicht, C. 1990. *Cicero the Politician.* Baltimore.

Hardie, Philip. 1993. *The Epic Successors of Virgil: A Study in the Dynamics of a Tradition.* Cambridge.

Haury, Auguste. 1955. *L'Ironie et L'Humour chez Ciceron.* Leiden.

Heibges, U. 1969. "Religion and Rhetoric in Cicero's Speeches." *Latomus* 28: 833–49.

Helm, Christoph. 1979. *Zur Redaktion de Ciceronischen Konsulatsreden.* Diss. Göttingen.

John, C. 1888. "Der Tag der ersten Rede Ciceros gegen Catilina." *Philologus* 46: 650–65.

Kennedy, George. 1972. *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World: 300 BC–AD 300.* Princeton.

_____. 1968. "The Rhetoric of Advocacy in Greece and Rome." *AJP* 89: 419–36.

Konstan, David. 1993. "Rhetoric and the Crisis of Legitimacy in Cicero's Catilinarian Orations," in *Rethinking the History of Rhetoric.* Takis Poulakos, ed. Boulder, San Francisco, Oxford. 11–30.

Leeman, A. D. 1982. "The Technique of Persuasion in Cicero's *Pro Murena,*" in *Eloquence et rhétorique chez Cicéron.* W. Stroh, ed. Geneva. 193–236.

Loutsch, Claude. 1990. "L'Exorde Dit Ex Abrupto de la Premiére Catilinaire de Cicéron." *REL* 68: 31–49.

McDermott, W. C. 1972. "Cicero's Publication of his Consular Orations." *Philologus* 116: 277–84.

Malcolm, D. A. 1979. "Quo usque tandem...?" *CQ* 29: 219–20.

May, James M. 1981. "The Rhetoric of Advocacy and Patron–Client Identification: Variation on a Theme." *AJP* 102: 308–15

_____. 1988. *Trials of Character.* Chapel Hill and London.

Nisbet, R. G. M. 1964. "The Speeches" in *Cicero*. T. A. Dorey, ed. London. 47–79.
Phillips, E. J. 1976. "Catiline's Conspiracy." *Historia* 25: 441–48.
Primmer, Adolf. 1977. "Historisches und Oratorisches zur ersten Catilinaria." *Gymnasium* 84: 18–38.
Ratkowitsch, C. 1981. "Ein Hymnus in Ciceros erst. Cat." *WS* 94: 157–67.
Rawson, E. 1975. *Cicero: A Portrait*. London.
Rouse, R. and M. Reeve. 1983. "Cicero" in *Texts and Transmission*. L. D. Reynolds, ed. Oxford. 54–98.
Seager, Robin. 1973. "Iusta Catilina." *Historia* 22: 240–48.
Solmsen, Friedrich. 1938. "Aristotle and Cicero on the Orator's Playing upon the Feelings." *CP* 33: 390–404.
Stroh, W. 1975. *Taxis und Taktik: Die advokatische Dispositionskunst in Ciceros Gerichtsreden*. Stuttgart.
_____. 1983. "Cicero's demosthenische Redezyklen." *MH* 40: 35–50.
Usher, S. 1965. "Occultatio." *AJP* 86: 175–92.
Vasaly, Ann. 1993. *Representations: Images of the World in Ciceronian Oratory*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, Oxford.
Waters, K. H. 1970. "Cicero, Sallust and Catiline." *Historia* 19: 195–212.
Wilkins, A. S. 1964. *The Orations of Cicero Against Catiline*. Edited after Karl Halm. London, New York.
Woodcock, E. C. 1959 (repr. 1987). *A New Latin Syntax*. Cambridge, MA.