

U. M.

"THE CONSPIRACY OF CATILINE, A POLITICAL EPISODE."

A thesis submitted to the faculty of the
Graduate School of the University of
Minnesota by Richard Ager Newhall in
partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts,
May 20, 1911.

PREFACE.

At first thought the conspiracy of Catiline may be regarded as a subject already worn thread-bare by repeated re-telling, but when we consider that ^{it} ~~he~~ has seldom been treated in English by itself, a study of its progress becomes permissible. In most of the books where it has been handled it has held a subordinate place and has merely been an incident in a biography or a history. Consequently it has usually been colored by the author's predilection for Caesar or Cicero, or his attempt to fit it into the mosaic of forces marking the decline of the Roman Republic. This paper has attempted to regard it more alone and to determine as nearly as possible just what took place. It is of course impossible to regard it as an incident entirely apart from the other events of the time, but when looked at critically it permits of this separate treatment more readily than might be supposed, because the great conspiracy of 63 B. C. does not seem to have been part of the political struggle between Optimates and Populares, but an attempt of a few desperate men to avail themselves of the popular discontent and obtain office. Furthermore the writer can disavow any favoritism for Caesar, Cicero, Crassus, Catiline, or any of the other persons involved and has

SEP 15 1911 *8.70*

II.

consequently tried to avoid any appearance of partizanship.

Two things must be always kept in mind in forming judgments about the conspiracy. First that the return of Pompey in the near future, at the head of a large army of victorious veterans must have been in the minds of everyone, Catiline included, and that every political move was probably influenced by that consideration. Secondly that Julius Caesar as aedile and praetor was probably not aiming deliberately at the supreme power with the conscious purpose of instituting the reforms which he established as dictator, but was only a political opportunist of unusual ability and a successful popularity hunter.

The only sources for this subject are Cicero and Sallust. The former of these is in large part immediately contemporaneous with the events described but is strongly colored with party bias, personal fears and rhetoric. The ^{work of} latter was written about twenty years after the conspiracy and probably embodies the authors personal recollections. However, I am of the opinion that the latter part of the "Bellum Catilinae", which is more accurate than the rest, is based either on a knowledge of Cicero, or upon the stenographic reports of the sittings of the Senate in December 63 B.C. Plutarch and Dio add important details

III.

which are valuable because these authors apparently had access to the lost works of Cicero, "*scripta invaluēis*" and "*Arēkōla*". Dio is also thought to have drawn from Livy, which may account for his hostility to Cicero. It will be seen therefore that we only learn about Catiline through his enemies and it is difficult, in consequence, to determine just what the facts are. I have confined my study of the sources almost wholly to the so-called two conspiracies of Catiline. For the intervening activities of the Democrats I have depended on such modern authorities as Heitland, Long, and with caution, Ferrero. Special mention should also be made of Prof. H. C. Nutting's monograph on "The Conspiracy at Rome in 66-65 B. C." from which I got several valuable suggestions.

R. A. N.

"THE CONSPIRACY OF CATILINE -- A POLITICAL EPISODE"

The history of the late Roman Republic is not primarily a tale of parties, of constitutional contests or of social and economic reforms. It is rather a series of biographies telling us the lives of the men who seized power or struggled to control the affairs of the state. Some of them were great, others less capable, but all left their influence more or less deeply imprinted upon the record of the declining years of the republic. In the year 70 B.C. the man who dominated Rome was Cn. Pompey the Great who at the age of thirty-five had been elected to the consulship with M. Licinius Crassus "Dives" in the face of the ill-will of the Oligarchy. Neither Pompey nor Crassus can be credited with democratic beliefs, but they found in the popular support a means of attaining their own ambitious ends. Since the days of Sulla the aristocrats had controlled the government under the working of the constitutional rearrangements of the dictator. The return of Pompey from Spain a popular hero, and the undisguised hostility of the Senate to his demands threw him into the arms of the Democrats who were quite willing to relieve him of the burdens of political leadership in return for the prestige of his name.^{1.}

These then were the conditions which led to the consul-

1. Mommsen IV, 117-119.

ship of Pompey and Crassus, and the year of their joint rule was marked by the reversal of Sulla's legislation clearing the field for the factional struggles of the years 66-62 B. C. However it was not in the interests of democracy that this anti-Sullan revolution was carried out. The two consuls were intent rather on destroying the domination of the aristocracy which hated and feared them and paving the way for the realization of their own ambitions. The result of their consulship was in consequence, a return to the chaotic conditions which had been inaugurated by the Gracchi.^{1.} In 67 B. C. Pompey reaped the benefits of his restoration of the tribunate when the Gabinian Law gave him the imperium against the pirates. A similar act brought forward by the tribune Manilius in the following year appointed him to the coveted command against Mithradates.ⁱ His absence from Rome left the two rival factions of Optimates and Populares glaring at each other, without sufficient strength or competent leaders to secure or maintain a firm hold on the government.

There were no real political parties according to the modern conception, merely small cliques of politicians with their partisans who strove to outbid each other in the popular favor and win the support of the voters.^{2.} The

1. Oman p 174
 2. Sallust. c. 38-39.

political question of the day was not whether democratic or aristocratic principles should prevail but whether the Populares or Optimates should hold office and enjoy the advantages of provincial command.¹ Elections were consequently decided by personal influence and the electors were more prone to consider individual candidates than party platforms. The actual control of the government was in the hands of the aristocratic party, whose organ was the Senate. Strong in prestige, this body was weak and indolent, with only such leaders as Catulus and Hortensius, unpopular and discredited by its misuse of power. Nevertheless it was the only body capable of governing under the existing constitution and it retained the support of traditional Roman conservatism.²

Opposed to the nobility and the Senate were the Populares through whom the overthrow of the Sullan constitution had been accomplished. However without their Peerless Leader the democrats were powerless to do more than act as an opposition and annoy the government. Their strength lay in the many elements of discontent existing within the state which chafed under the senatorial rule. However it was from this source that the gravest menace of the republican constitution threatened. The Assembly was a disorderly mob and when any tribune who aspired to become a demagogue could bring

1. Merivale, I: 81-82
 2. Mommsen, IV: p 127; Heitland, III: 70; Fowler, 65.

important administrative questions before the proletariat and raise to extraordinary power the popular hero of the hour, the very continuance of the republic was endangered. 1. Outside of these two factions was the moneyed class, embracing the Equestrian order, which while not posing as a political party itself, held the balance between the oligarchs and their opponents. The interests of the capitalists were commercial and they allied themselves with the party which offered the most hopeful promises of stable business conditions. Since 71 B.C. the Equites had been joined to the democrats and the Manilian Law had been passed largely in their interest. Cicero was a member of this order and by his support of Manilius had become popular in business circles. 2.

The period between 66 B.C. and 63 B.C. is one of factional struggle, but a struggle colored throughout by the growing imminence of Pompey's return at the head of his victorious legions. All the politicians expected that Pompey would assume the control of the state just as Sulla had done and acted according. 3. The absence of his traditional enemy left Crassus at liberty to strengthen his own position. He had formerly been attached to the Optimates in their opposition to the Gabinian and Manilian Laws, but in 66 B.C. he began to pay court to the Populares and aimed to become their

1. Mommsen, IV: 128,138; Heitland, III: 69-70; Merivale, I: 85-6
 2. See Cicero, "Pro Imp. Pomp."
 3. Heitland III: 69, 77.

leader. His first step was to attach to himself some democratic politician through whom he could act, for Crassus had been a conservative too long to openly espouse the popular cause without arousing suspicion. He found the man whom he wanted in C. Julius Caesar, whose eloquence and geniality had just secured his election as aedile, but who was in need of money and "a trifle disreputable."^{1.} With this ally the Millionaire found the field ready for intrigues against the absent Pompey. The democrats were fearful of what Pompey might do when he had finished the Eastern war. They had pushed through the Gabinian and ^MManilian Laws because they were afraid to antagonize him. They knew that the ambitions of the general were not favorable to them and they sought to strengthen their position at Rome in anticipation of his return. The senatorial party on the other hand looked forward with comparative calm towards the event which the democrats so feared. They could foresee that Pompey and the Populares must inevitably break and they thought that they could lose nothing and might gain a great deal. In the eyes of the masses Pompey was a national hero and any attempt of either faction to lessen his power or prestige was sure of popular opposition.^{2.}

Political conditions seemed to invite intrigue. The

-
1. Oman, p 179-180; Ferrero, 213-216.
 2. Mommsen, IV: 200; Heitland III: 76.

legislation of the year 70 B.C. had thrown considerable power into the hands of the proletariat. The practice of organized ruffianism for political purposes was becoming common. Bribery in elections was almost an admitted fact. Any attempt to curb this form of corruption was strenuously opposed by the Optimates,¹ who were monopolizing the offices of government.² In 67 B.C. when the tribune C. Cornelius introduced a bill for severely punishing bribery, making those convicted incapable of holding office or sitting in the Senate, the elections were postponed three times, while the aristocrats strove to hinder the legislation. The popular support of Cornelius showed itself in the form of rioting and bloodshed until the consuls were voted a guard by the Senate.³ The oligarchy had no scruples in using the machinery of government to maintain its position and it could in this way exercise considerable influence over elections and continue to monopolize the chief magistracies. The Populares were consequently forced to adopt a policy of annoyance⁴ with occasional attempts to achieve their aims through unusual means. There seems to have been general discontent with the senatorial regime on the part of the people both in Rome and Italy so that they were quite willing to support an active⁵ opposition but any return to civil war was decidedly unpopular.

1. Dio, 36, 38 & 39.

2. Sallust C 39.

3. Cicero's Letters I,9. Cicero, "De Imp. Pomp." Par. 2. Forsyth, 70.

4. Heitland III:71; Ferrero, I: 213

5. Oman, 164.

A gloomy background to this disturbed condition was the depressed financial condition. Business was bad, money was tight, bankruptcies were frequent, and the burden of debt was felt by all classes. ^{1.} **P**In the year 66 there appear to have been four contestants for the consulship L. Aurelius Cotta and L. Manlius Torquatus whom we may consider as the senatorial candidates, and P. Autronius Paetus a "novus homo" and P. Cornelius Sulla, nephew of the dictator, who were supported by the Populares. ^{2.} In the regular election the democrats were successful but before their induction ^{3.} into office the son of the defeated Torquatus charged them with bribery and brought them to trial where they were convicted. They were probably guilty since corrupt practices at elections were notoriously common but their condemnation was without doubt political and we may well imagine the Senate using its influence to secure the disqualification of its successful opponents. Their condemnation necessitated a new election to choose other consuls for the following year.

Before this could take place a new candidate appeared in the person of L. Sergius Catiline. He had been propraetor of Africa during the year 67 and had plundered the province in the conventional fashion so that the Africans had made complaints against him even before he reached Rome. Whether

1. Mommsen IV: 202; Ferrero I: 223.

2: Dio, 36,44; Sallust, 18. There are no definite statements in the sources for this classification of candidates but subsequent events seem to make it permissible. The two brothers of Cotta had been consuls in 75 and 74 respectively (Ascon. p 59) He was himself censor in 64 after the abdication of Crassus and Catulus (Plut. "Cic" 27). His career on the whole shows him to have been a respectable aristocrat. Torquatus came of a long and illustrious line of consuls and dictators and in the events of the following years showed himself uniformly an Optimatus, despite the fact that he defended Catiline in 65. Autronius was the first of his family to obtain the consulship and his subsequent career was hostile to the ³ (See next page Note 3).

the Senate regarded him as a dangerous political enemy yet
 or not cannot be said. ^{1.} At any rate the Optimates did not
 want another candidate in the field to oppose Cotta and
 Torquatus a second time. Consequently when he announced
 his candidacy for this special election, the consul

1. The attitude of the senators seems to have been hostile:-
 "Multaeque graves sententiae in senatu de eo dictae sunt."
 Asconius p 76.

②. Oligarchic government. Sulla seems to have been less
 of a pronounced radical than Autronius, but his tendencies
 were towards the Democrats. He was one of Caesar's lieutenants
 at Pharsalia: Caesar "Bell Civ." III;89 (See previous page)

③. Dio makes Cotta and Torquatus the accusers (36. 45) and
 they were of course the instigators of the accusation, but
 the younger Torquatus appears to have been the actual
 plaintiff. Cicero says: "te (Torquatus minor) ipsum,
 dignissimum maioribus tuis, voluptasne induxit, ut adulescentulus
 eriperes P. Sullae consulatum?" (de Fin. II:19) see
 also pro Sulla 17, 18. See previous page.

L. Volcatus Tullus called a meeting of some of the leading senators to consider the question of Catiline's candidature. The upshot of the matter was that the new candidate was barred on the grounds that he was under indictment and that his name had not been handed in early enough. Catiline consequently withdrew and the senatorial candidates were elected.^{1.}

Here then was the nucleus for the conspiracy which was formed in the latter part of 66 B.C., two ex-consules designateⁱ impoverished by their canvass, deprived of a political prize which they had already regarded as safe, politically disgraced and disqualified by their trial, and an ex-governor, galled at being shut out by his opponents through a technicality and under indictment for provincial extortion. It seems probably that Autronius was the actual ringleader,^{2.} and that Catiline was admitted as an accomplice after the plot was under way. It also seems probable that Sulla was involved although he may not have taken as active a part.^{3.} Cn. Piso another daring and needy malcontent was also an associate, but there is no more reason for regarding him as one of the prime movers, than for Catiline.

Beside these actual participants in the plot there

1. Sallust 18. Asconius p 80. A candidate had to be able to declare himself free from accusation, seventeen days (trinundium spatium) before the election.
2. Suetonius ("Julius", 9) mentions Autronius and Sulla as leaders but does not speak of Catiline at all in this connection. Sallust's narrative of this affair seems to be colored throughout by his knowledge of the plot of 63. Since the aim was to secure the consulship for Autronius and Sulla it seems reasonable to suppose that they headed the conspirators.
3. Cicero's defense of Sulla seems to indicate the consciousness of guilt. pro Sulla 13, 36 et seq., 24, 67 et seq.

is a very persistent rumor that Crassus and Caesar were the real instigators.^{1.} This is supported by the arguments of probability. They were both looking for means to arouse opposition to the Senate and to advance their own schemes, but they were not yet in a position to stand forth in open hostility and they were too wary to publicly compromise themselves with wild schemes of revolution. We may very well conclude then that they were fomenting the disturbance among these political malcontents, but without taking active part. They seem to have been very desirous of securing a pair of democratic consuls as a preliminary step to some of their schemes.^{2.} It is not improbable that they backed Autronius and Sulla in the election of 66 and were continuing to direct them in their plan to usurp the chief magistracies.

According to the stories which have come down to us, the plan of the conspirators was to murder the consuls-elect on January 1, 65, the day of their inauguration and seize the consulship. The Senate, however, getting wind of the scheme frustrated it by giving the consuls a guard.^{3.} The execution of the plot was then postponed until Feb. 5, and it was planned to massacre some of the leading senators, but the whole thing failed because the preconcerted signal

1. Suetonius bases his statements in regard to Caesar on contemporary writers, Tanusius Geminus, Bibulus, C. Curio the Elder, M. Aetorius Naso, and Cicero. It is true that Bibulus and Curio were hostile to Caesar, but the letter of Cicero to Axius, "referens Caesarem in consulatu confirmasse regnum, de quo aedilis cogitaret," comes from a sufficiently impartial source to credit the suspicion, ("Julius", 9) in consideration of the statements of the others.

According to Sallust, Crassus was intriguing at the time in favor of Piso, a conspirator, although this author does not involve either Crassus or Caesar in this conspiracy. Suetonius, however, makes Crassus the chief beneficiary. The suspicion of his complicity is as well founded on probability as that of Caesar. "According to Asconius (p 74) who

1. was given prematurely. Here then we have the plan of a coterie of dissatisfied politicians to obtain office and avenge themselves upon their opponents by a coup d'etat. To regard this as a movement generally supported by the people seems hardly credible. That it was backed by the

1. Sallust, 18; Suetonius "Julius" 9; Dio 37, 44.

①. (Previous page)

apparently is quoting from the *Ἀνέκδοτα*, Cicero made this accusation in so many words." (H. C. Nutting p 51). See also Plutarch, "Crassus", 13, Dio 39, 10, and Sallust, 48.

②. Ferrero thinks that the Egyptian plan was still the goal of Crassus's ambition. It hardly seems possible, however, to say definitely what was the actual aim of all these intrigues. Perhaps it was a dictatorship, Suetonius says so, and a disturbance in the city might be a pretext, for this a friendly consul, would be desirable. Suffice that Crassus and Caesar were struggling for power of some sort with a view of counterbalancing Pompey, and they seem to have been trying one expedient after another. (See previous page)

③. Dio adds "that a decree would have been pronounced against them, had not one of the tribunes opposed it:"
(καὶ δόγμα ἔκρινε καὶ ἀντιβῆναι ἐπέβη, εἰ μὴ δῆμαρχος ἦν ἰσχυρότερος)
37. 44.

two men who were regarded as the leaders of the Populares party by no means indicates popular support. They were using any means which offered to annoy the aristocrats and make political capital for themselves. However it is interesting to note that on the last day of December, 66 there was a tumult which prevented the trial of the ex-tribune Manilius and Catiline appears to have been present in arms.^{1.} We may therefore wonder if the consul's guard was intended solely against the conspirators.

The fact that the Senate, although supposedly knowing of the conspiracy did nothing, makes us question just how much the senators really knew. Probably there were rumors of intended agitation, possibly a sequel of the riot at the trial of Manilius, which caused the Senate to take precautionary measures. As to the second failure of the conspiracy it seems probable that Catiline, although not one of the chiefs, was the one delegated to give the sign but that he did so before the conspirators were assembled in sufficient numbers to effect their purpose.^{2.} Another version of the story ascribes this to Caesar but on the statement of his enemies. Furthermore such a failure is more in accord with the recklessness and impetuosity of Catiline rather than the cautiousness of Caesar.^{3.} The only

1. This seems to be the incident alluded to by Cicero in I. in *Catilinam* 6;— "Qui nesciat te pridē Kalendas Jan. Lepido et Tullo consulibus stetisse in comitio cum telo?" See also Dio, 37, 44, and Plutarch, "Cicero", 9.

2. Suetonius, "Julius", 9

3. Sallust (18) says that Catiline gave the signal. Cicero seems to allude to the occurrence in I in *Cat.* 61.

member of the conspiracy who seems to have profited was Piso who was shortly appointed to a governorship in Spain through the efforts of Crassus. What was the plan in connection with this move can only be surmised since Piso was assassinated shortly afterward. ¹ Thus the year 65 B.C. had opened unpropitiously with a democratic failure, but even this repulse had indicated the weakness and timidity of the government since being cognizant of a conspiracy it dared do nothing. Crassus was still bent on winning popular favor and securing power and prestige with which to oppose Pompey. Politically influential in the Senate and possessed of an enormous fortune he must have appeared to be the foremost man of Rome. Secretly leagued with him was Caesar, at the time scarcely more than a successful ward ² politician, hated and feared by his senatorial opponents. It has been a common custom to ascribe to Caesar phenomenal foresight and credit him as aedile with planning the far-reaching reforms which he accomplished as dictator. This seems hardly conceivable; he had political ambition in common with every other normal Roman aristocrat, but to suppose that he was deliberately aiming at supreme power is incredible. It is this combination then, which kept the political waters in a state of turmoil for the next three

1. Sallust, 19. It may be that Piso was intended to build up an anti-Pompeian power in Spain.. Both parties would readily accede to this. There were rumors rife that the assassination was instigated by Pompey or his supporters. Asconius, p 83.

2. Sihler, 61.

years. Caesar was personally popular and could count on the support of the voters to elect him to any of the regular magistracies, but more permanent and extraordinary power was needed to establish a strong democratic power. Crassus was anxious to imitate Pompey and since he was financing the combination, he appears as the prime mover, but it seems likely that the keener and more brilliant mind of Caesar directed the party policy.

In 65 B.C. Crassus was elected censor, an imperium in the exercise of which he might easily have hoped to accomplish some of his democratic projects. Unfortunately his colleague was Catulus the leader of the extreme Optimates. The first point at issue seems to clearly indicate the promptings of Caesar. This was the scheme to extend the franchise to the Transpadanes. Caesar had been an early advocate for the extension of Roman citizenship,^{1.} actuated probably both by a real appreciation of its advantage to the state and by the realization of the political support which the advocate of such a program would gain outside of Rome. At this time he was the patron of the Transpadanes and was consequently active in their interest.^{2.} The measure was democratic and a natural^{3.} continuance of the enfranchisement of Italy but we can

1. Suetonius "Julius" c.8.

2. Long, III: 267

3. Ferrero, I: 219.

hardly believe that it was popular and the Optimates were sure to be hostile to it. Catulus opposed it so vigorously that the matter was dropped. The affair was somewhat to the advantage of the oligarchy and was followed by a general expulsion of aliens from Rome.^{1.}

A more extraordinary attempt to excite popular interest was the scheme to annex Egypt. Caesar had paved the way for himself by the magnificent shows which he had exhibited during his aedileship, which had increased his popularity and his indebtedness. The plan was to have "Egypt assigned to (Caesar) as a province, by an act of the people."^{2.} The real object was to get an army into democratic hands, and occupy a post of vantage ahead of Pompey. In addition the administration of so rich a country as Egypt doubtless offered to Caesar an opportunity to recoup his shattered fortune and pay his enormous debts.^{3.} It hardly seems likely that this measure would be any more popular than the Transpadane scheme. An attack on Pompey's prestige could hardly count on the support of the people, while the Senate was sure to oppose a command for Caesar,^{4.} although it might be very ready to hold Pompey in check. Catulus attacked this scheme also and there is reason to suppose that Cicero spoke against it.^{5.} The time for bringing

1. Dio 37. 39.

2. Suetonius C. 11.

3. Merivale, I: 100

4. Heitland III: 73.

Mommsen, IV:209; Ferrero's theory that Crassus wanted to control the corn supply as a means of winning popularity is ingenious rather than convincing.

5. Strachan-Davidson, 90

forward such a project had not been well chosen. Financial stringency made ingenious plans for imperial expansion inopportune. The anti-Pompeian motive was too self-evident. The bill never came to a vote but was withdrawn by its authors because of the active opposition. Crassus's schemes had only resulted in strife between the censors and they resigned without having performed the duties of their office¹

In the law courts, however, where there seems to have been continual political skirmishing the Populares had distinctly the best of it. The tribune Cornelius who had brought forward the electoral law of 67 B.C. was impeached on the charge of "majestas" at the close of his term of office for having proposed a measure giving the people the sole authority for granting legal exemption. The case became a purely political contest, Cicero defended the accused and the democratic leader was acquitted.² A greater stir was caused by the prosecutions of the Sullan assassins, which was started by Cato in his zeal to administer the treasury with profit.³ The Democrats, however, saw in this a means of attacking the power of the Senate to pass laws of exemption. Caesar who was acting as deputy-praetor that year was president of the murder court and pushed the prosecutions so that the credit redounded to

1. Dio, 37, §9; Ferrero, I: 220-222; Heitland, III: 73-4
 2. Forsyth, 85
 3. Plutarch, "Cato Minor".

the Populares rather than to Cato. He especially pushed the case of the man who by Sulla's own order had murdered Lucretius Ofella and succeeded in condemning him.^{1.} The Optimates, however, retorted in kind by accusing Catiline whose participation in the proscription was notorious, but Caesar had political plans just then which included Catiline and he was acquitted without difficulty to the surprise of the people.^{2.}

Sometime in the fall of 65 Catiline was brought to trial for extortion. The charge was brought by P. Clodius, then a young man, but by bribing his accuser to let him choose his own jury and then by bribing them Catiline was able to obtain an acquittal. Although his guilt seems to have been glaring and although Catiline had been implicated in a plot to kill the consuls, nevertheless Torquatus appeared as his advocate, "improbo homini, at supplicii, fortasse audaci, at aliquando amico. Cui quum adfuit post delatam ad ² eum primam illam conjurationem, indicavit se audisse aliquid, non credisse."^{3.} The significance of the trial was that it prevented Catiline from being a candidate in 65, and its costs impoverished him so that he redoubled his efforts to secure a magistracy as a means of retrieving himself financially. An interesting incident in connection

1. Dio, 37. 10-11

2. Heitland, III: 76, 82-83; Sihler, 65-66. This took place after the election of 64. Asconius p 81.

3. Cicero, "pro Sulla" 29.

with this is Cicero's contemplated defense of Catiline. Whether he actually defended him or not is immaterial, but the evidence seems to show that he did not.^{1.} However Cicero was unquestionably willing to defend Catiline as his letter to Atticus of July 65 shows.^{2.} He was making a strong effort to obtain the consulship in the election of the following year and he was quite willing to undertake Catiline's case as a means of winning cooperation and support. We may perhaps infer that Catiline had already become attached to the interests of Crassus and Caesar, that his alliance with Antonius was accomplished but not made public, and that he consequently did not feel the need of the support of a "novus homo."

During this same year the two arch-intriguers of the Populares seem to have refrained from taking an active interest in the election and L. Julius Caesar and C. Marcus Figulus, two aristocrats, were elected consuls. However the reports from the East which showed Pompey's return to be more and more imminent stirred them to make one more attempt to get control of the consulship.^{3.} Catiline was a convenient tool ready at hand. He was poor and desperate but with the prestige of a patrician name and was apparently a leader among the fast young men of the city.^{4.} The

appearance in the field of a democratic candidate properly

1. Fenestella, a historian who flourished under Augustus, affirms that Cicero did defend Catiline, but Asconius doubts it. Asconius p 76.
 2. Cicero writes, - "Hoc tempore Catilinam, competitorem nostrum, defendere cogitamus. Iudices habemus, quos volumus summa accusatoris voluntate. Spero, si absolutus erit, coniunctiorem illum nobis fore in ratione petitionis." That this refers unquestionably to the trial for extortion and not the trial of Catiline for his part in the proscription, from the statement of Asconius, "Post effecta enim comitia consularia (64 B.C) et Catilina repulsam fecit eum reum inter sicarios L. Luceius paratus eruditusque." Asconius, p 81. For discussion of the date of the letter to Atticus see Forsyth 87-89 Long II 201 note

backed could fairly count on the support of all the many discontented elements.¹ Add to this the liberal use of money which Crassus could supply and the chances for success seemed excellent. C. Antonius Hybrida was selected for Catiline's running mate, doubtless because he was also impoverished and promised to be an even more pliable tool in the hands of his backers. Asconius says that hostility to Cicero was also one of the causes influencing Crassus and Caesar to support Catiline and Antonius actively.

"Ei enim acerrimi ac potentissimi fuerunt Ciceronis refragatores cum petiit consulatum, quod eius in dies civilem crescere dignitatem animadvertabant: et hoc ipse Cicero in expositione consiliorum suorum significat."² It may very well be that they were unwilling to see a political interloper becoming so popular and influential and that they would gladly have eliminated him if possible. We know that Crassus was not friendly to Cicero³ but it hardly seems likely that this personal hostility would become a primary political issue. However Cicero became the only formidable candidate in the field when the election day approached.

During the months of the canvass for the election of 64, Cicero had been forced to play the part of an independent candidate. Catiline and Antonius were backed

1. Sallust, 16

2. Asconius p 74.

3. Plutarch "Crassus", 13: Dio, 39, 10: Sallust, 48

③ For evidence of this backing see Asconius, 74; Sallust 17 (See previous page for this note.)

④ Sallust 17 (See previous page for this note.)

by the democrats, while the nobility gave their support to two of their own order Pub. Sulpicius Galba and C. Licinius Sacerdos. The other two candidates Q. Cornificius and L. Cassius Longinus were out of the running. We have already seen how the Populares leaders were hostile to Cicero and it is hardly likely that the nobility were any better disposed. Cicero had exposed the corruption of their provincial government by publishing his Verrine orations, while his active support of Pompey had been in defiance of the Senate.¹ He was moreover a "novus Homo", a mere Eques, and a non-Roman, facts which would tend to prejudice conservative voters. To counterbalance these unfavorable conditions he had his brilliant rhetoric, which had aroused the enthusiasm of many of the young men. He was befriended by the Equestrian order, the publicani and the moneyed interests generally. The municipalities were devoted to him, and his years of effort in the law courts had put many people under obligation to him and made him popular with the masses. It is evident, however, that he thoroughly appreciated the jealous watch which the aristocrats kept over the consulship and the chief aim of his canvass, if we may judge from the tone of the "De Petitione Consulatus", was to propitiate the Optimates. He aimed to

1. Sihler, p 64.

win the good will of the nobility, especially the consulars. He was urged to convince the Optimates that he had never been a demagogue and that his former leanings towards extreme democracy were for the purpose of gaining the support of Pompey.¹ Nevertheless he had no intention of sacrificing any of his popularity with the masses so his advances to the aristocrats were not made with sufficient openness to jeopardize the opinion that he was still on the popular side²

The consulship had been the goal of Cicero's ambition for some time. At the close of his praetorship in 67 B.C. he had declined to take a provincial promagistracy so as to be better able to increase his standing at Rome. On July 17, 65 he formally announced his candidature at the tribunician elections but refrained from soliciting votes. He rather ridiculed his competitor Galba for making a premature canvass and rejoiced in the fact that he was meeting "with a good old fashioned refusal without reserve or disguise", (Sine fuco ac fallaciis, more majorum, negatur).³ Meanwhile he busied himself in cultivating men of political influence and using every legal means of increasing his popularity and prestige.⁴ We have not the same abundant evidence concerning the activities of Catiline and Antonius, but it stands to reason that Crassus and Caesar were keeping

1. Q. Cicero, "De Pet. Con." 1-4.

2. Ibid, 13. These facts seem rather to justify the unfriendly comment of Dio, "Κατέπευθε δὲ τὸν τε σοφιστὰν ἀγρῶν ἡγεῖον καὶ ἐρεθιστὸν καὶ τὸ μῆδεν καὶ τοῖς δυνάστοις, ὅτι ὀνομαστὴς αὐτῶν ἠποδοῖναι, πᾶσι δὲ τοῖς ἐναντιοῦσι, ἐπιπολεῖσθαι τὸ γὰρ, καὶ πᾶσι μὲν τὰ λόγια, ἑστὶ δὲ ὅτι καὶ τὰ ἐκείνων, ἢ ὅτι ἀποπέπευθε πᾶσι δὲ, ἐπαλλῆν;" 36.43.

3. Cicero "ad Att", I:1

4. See the incident of Caecilius. Ibid.

up a vigorous campaign for votes, and that their methods were by no means as legal as Cicero's.

The likelihood of a Populares victory did not seem to have become apparent until a short time before the election. Then it was reported to the Senate that Catiline and Antonius were buying support. This resulted in an attempt to increase the penalties for bribery under the Calpurnian law as a means of hampering the democratic candidates. The Senate was by no means in favor of Cicero, but his election would be infinitely more endurable than Catiline's. The proposed law was vetoed by the tribune Q. Marcius Orestinus, acting supposedly in Catiline's interest. Here was an opportunity for Cicero to bid for senatorial support by espousing this measure and showing the Optimates that their enemies were his. In the debate on the veto he expostulated with Orestinus, reminding him of his personal obligations, for Cicero had defended him in the criminal court, but without success. It was when his arguments had failed that he delivered the violent invective against his competitors known as "Oratio in Toga Candida"¹. In a campaign where personality was one of the determining factors Cicero had a great advantage over his competitors and he made the most of it. Even from the fragments of this

1. Asconius, 74-75.

speech which remain we can see how he accuses Catiline of murder, profligacy, plundering the allies, violating the laws and corrupting the courts, while he twits Antonius with his expulsion from the Senate and the ruined state of his fortune. Both of these men were present and made insulting replies but could find no counter-charges to bring against Cicero except his "noxitas."¹ Other incidents occurred which warned the nobility that their opponents were unscrupulous and desperate. Antonius openly boasted that he could redress himself by force if defeated, while Catiline was busy collecting gladiators "for a friend".² We may imagine that at almost the last minute there was a stampede of Optimates in favor of Cicero resulting in his election at the head of the poll. The vigorous opposition of the nobility was not started soon enough to entirely defeat the democrats and Antonius was also elected receiving the votes of a few more centuries than did Catiline.³

The defeat of their principal candidate seems to have spurred the democratic leaders to make more vigorous attacks upon the government and the year of Cicero's consulship is marked by a series of radical measures which caused the government considerable annoyance although none of them were passed. They must, however, be regarded as

1. Cicero "In Toga Candida"; Asconius, 75-84.

2. Heitland, III:79

3. Asconius, 84.

something more than the mere attempts of disgruntled politicians to trouble their successful rivals. Caesar who is credited with being the instigator of these propositions, was too keen a politician not to appreciate the large amount of discontent which prevailed throughout the state. However much we may credit Caesar with political philanthropy we can not regard him as a doctrinaire, and it seems very likely that the radical measures which he was backing in 63 were both expressions of discontent and deliberate bids for popular support. Caesar was aiming to build his political future on a foundation of popularity with the masses and these were some of the means. He had the feeble cooperation of the consul Antonius to second the activities of his agents the tribunes. Measures were brought forward for restoring the franchise to the children¹ of those who had been proscribed by Sulla, for removing the disabilities from Autronius and Sulla and for cancelling debts, all of which the activity of Cicero succeeded in bringing to naught.²

A much more serious move on the part of the Populares was the Agrarian Law of the tribune Servilius Rullus. The rhetoric of Cicero branded this as a pernicious measure from the start and it probably was intended to

1. According to Plutarch these appear to have been vigorous agitators in their own behalf and an active element of discontent. "Τοιό μιν γὰρ οἱ Κελευθόμενοι κατὰ τοὺς Σύλλα νόμους ἄρχον, οὐτ' ὄντο, μετρίους ἀρχὰς ἐδυνατείον, ὅττι τὰς Σύλλα ὑπερρίθους ἀγνῶν μιν καὶ δίκαια καλῶσθεοῦντες."

"Cicero", 13.

2. Dio, 37. 25.

give the opportunity for the establishment of a democratic power in Italy. We may perhaps wonder whether any of the statesmen of 63 B.C. realized the unworkableness of the republican constitution and appreciated that a scramble for supreme power was sure to come sooner or later. They had the example of Sulla in whose footsteps Pompey was expected to follow and whom Crassus was ambitious to imitate. I hardly think it justifiable, ^{however,} to credit even Caesar at this stage of his career with this extraordinary fore-sight. Consequently the Agrarian law appears only as another effort to establish a basis of power by catering to the multitude and proposing the popular measure of a distribution of lands in order to secure the creation of a powerful Decemvirate.^{1.} Cicero was very active in his opposition and in order to keep his colleague Antonius from supporting the law actively, he traded provinces with him, giving up the desirable province of Macedonia for Cisalpine Gaul.^{2.} The efforts of Cicero and the anti-Pompeian features of the law aroused so much hostility that it was withdrawn. One thing, however, had been accomplished, namely that Cicero could no longer pose as a democrat but was now unreservedly committed to the Optimates. In this same connection we find the financial classes whom Cicero politically repre-

1. The law provided for a board of ten elected for five years by seventeen tribes chosen by lot, to found colonies in Italy. In order to do this the decemvirs were empowered to sell all that state property acquired since 88 B.C. They were further given a very extensive imperium for executing the law. Plutarch "Cicero", 12; Mommsen, IV:210;212
 2. Although this is based only on the statement of Plutarch ("Cicero", 12) nevertheless it seems much more likely than that Cicero made this move to keep Antonius from conspiring with Catiline. Plutarch wrote late enough to be free of the atmosphere of intrigue which Sallust breathed.

sented drawing towards the Senate to form a party the aim of which was to maintain an orderly status quo. This in turn tended to draw more sharply the distinction between the dominant Rich and the oppressed Poor.^{1.}

The failure of the law of Rullus frustrated Caesar again but by no means curbed his activities. Through his position as deputy-praetor he attacked the power of the Senate to pass a last decree, and laws of exemption by bringing to trial C. Rabirius for the murder of Saturninus thirty-seven years before. Cicero defended the case and although Caesar passed sentence of condemnation the matter was allowed to drop on being appealed to the people.^{2.} The restoration of the trophies of Marius the year before had shown how large the numbers of the old Marian party still were and impressed on the Senate its own importance before the popular demagogue.^{3.} Indeed the more Caesar cultivated the favor of the people the more the Optimates feared and hated him.^{4.} The general conception of Caesar in modern times is so colored by the admiration of the statesmanship of his later years that it is hard to realize that he was probably looked upon as a most undesirable and dangerous "ward politician" by the party which regarded itself as the representative of respectability and order.^{5.}

1. Heitland III: 81-82.

2. Dio, 37. 26-27

3. Plutarch, "Caesar", 6.

4. Suetonius "Julius", 10.

5. For a summary of Caesar's methods see Oman, 298.

The first real result of Caesar's efforts was manifested in 63 when the position of Pontifex Maximus was conferred on him by the vote of the people. He had paved the way for this by securing the passage of a bill reversing the arrangement of Sulla and making the pontificate elective. The real triumph, however, lay in the fact that the election was won over such rivals as Servilius Isauricus and Catulus the chief of the Optimates. The latter had vainly tried to bribe Caesar to withdraw, a fact^{1.} which made his defeat doubly bitter apparently for from now on Catulus showed a strong personal as well as a political hostility towards his successful competitor. However, the headship of the state religion had given Caesar the established foundation for his ambition for which he had been striving. He now had something with which to balance Pompey, and although he continued to annoy the government whenever he could, he was no longer forced to advance ingenious laws or back desperate coups d'etat, but could trust to the natural course of events and his own ability to secure the successful culmination of his ambitions.

Before considering the events leading up to the election of 63 B. C. and the subsequent conspiracy^{it} of will be well to take a look at the personality of Cicero and

1. Plutarch, "Caesar", 7.

form an estimate of his psychology since it is from him that almost all the facts about the events of the last half of this year come down to us. Cicero was not primarily a politician at all but a literary man in politics. He was a successful lawyer but an advocate at Rome did not mean one learned in the law so much as a clever pleader and a good rhetorician, and Cicero's political success had been the direct result of his oratory. In accepting his public statements it must be always remembered that they are made by a man who habitually spoke in hyperbole and there is good reason to believe that in the Catilinarian orations ~~that~~ gross exaggeration was a deliberate policy.¹ A corollary, almost, of Cicero's oratory is his love of the dramatic, a characteristic which shows itself on several important occasions during his dealings with Catiline. Behind these two, however, is the temperamental timidity of the scholar, a timidity which raises dangers to an importance in his eyes proportionate to his fears in regard to them. The idea of a democratic rising and a massacre of citizens by bands of desperate men, although we may discount it somewhat on the side of rhetoric, still seems to have been a fear which Cicero entertained before any of Catiline's schemes had come to

1. Cicero very naively described his habit in this respect when he comments on a speech of Crassus on the subject of the conspiracy:- "Quid Multa? totum hunc locum, quem ego varie meo orationibus-- soleo pingere, de flamma, de ferro, (nosti illas *intuitus*) valde graviter pertexuit," (ad Att. I, 14). "Our task therefore is to try to scrape off some of this Ciceronean "paint" and look at the truth underneath.

1. a head. That Cicero is to be credited with great courage for the action which he took in spite of his fears is not to be denied, but there seems little doubt that he has exaggerated the plans of the Catilinarians merely because having heard terrifying rumors of their extent he was frightened by the imminence of a vague and unknown danger.

One other characteristic, and perhaps the paramount one, stands out in Cicero and must be taken into consideration in judging his story of his own consulship. This was his desire for glory and adulation, not only from his contemporaries but also from future generations.^{2.} He seems to have even made himself the proclaimer of his own achievements and to have even made himself somewhat obnoxious on that very account.^{3.} There is also reason to believe that, aside from the populace, Cicero was not thought to have performed so great a service to the state as he would have had his contemporaries and us believe.^{4.} Nevertheless I am convinced that Cicero believed thoroughly in his own greatness and merit, and that in a large measure the picture which he gives of the conspiracy was what he regarded as true. Whether or not he was used by the Optimate leaders as a means for discrediting their opponents I am not prepared to say. It seems possible but we cannot know, and

1. See Cicero I in Rullus, 30, II in Rullus, 41.
2. See "ad Fam." V: 7 and 12; XV, 4; "ad Att." II: 5.
3. Plutarch, "Cicero", 24; Dio, 37, 42
4. "ad Fam." V:7; "ad Att." X: 1

doubtless Cicero himself did not know, how far Catulus, Piso and the others played upon Cicero's fears and egged him on to make a bloody revolution out of a city conspiracy. We do know that Cicero balked when they tried to push their advantage too far and involve their worst enemy Caesar, but we are in doubt even there as to just what his motive was.

As soon as the election was decided in 64, Catiline set himself to preparing for the election of the following year by despatching agents supplied with money throughout Italy to obtain the support of the elements of discontent.^{1.} It is a little hard to estimate Catiline's standing at Rome at this time and his real ability as a politician. The classic accounts which dwell upon his personality are all ~~too~~^{so} evidently colored by the Ciceronian or Sallustian biases that we must discount much that they tell us. That he was a man of some personality seems likely from the following which he succeeded in collecting, and there is no question as to his physical abilities, but he shows little indication of the acuteness and ability which both Cicero and Sallust imply.^{2.} His viciousness is also an admitted fact although we need not believe all the prurient stories which his enemies tell about him. However he lived

1. Sallust, 24, 27.

2. Cicero, "III in Cat.", 7; Sallust, 5.

at a time when moral corruption was becoming more and more prevalent in the Roman world, and he seems to have had a natural tendency which held him to associate with and become^{1.} the leader of a dissolute part of society. He was apparently not lacking in a certain audacious vigor but it was not supported by any inherent ability as the whole conduct of the conspiracy shows. He is indeed a man who, had he reached the consulship, would doubtless be as comparatively unknown today as the majority of the men who held that office, provided he had not been made the tool of more able men. It was only his repeated failures and his financial ruin which forced him into revolt. The consulship would have assured him of an important provincial command and that was the recognized means of setting a bankrupt on his feet again.^{2.} Doubtless the campaign of 64 had shown Catiline where to turn for support and with what classes his Socialistic appeals would have the most weight. In Rome property had become unevenly distributed so that the differentiation between Rich and Poor was very marked, and in the latter class were members of noble families whose patrimonies had passed into hands of persons of mean birth, who were sure to be more actively discontented than those who had become^{3.} accustomed to poverty. This class would probably drift into

1. Asconius, 82; Sallust, 15.

2. Cicero "in Piso", 6.

3. Plutarch "Cicero", 10.

Catiline's following since he was practically one of them himself and he could feel certain of the support of the lower classes who sympathized with his program. According to Sallust he seems to have solicited the support of the young men, a practice which Cicero had been strongly urged to do and which is still common among politicians,¹ by pandering to their lowest passions. We may be unwilling to accept the details which Sallust gives us, but if we are to believe him at all the young men seem to have had a natural craving for the dissipation which Catiline is said to have procured for them. Doubtless the latter would carry on his canvass according to his own vicious propensities. However it seems likely that his efforts would be most active in securing suburban support among the colonists whose grievances would cause them to support his candidature unpaid. We have already noted how he sent agents into Etruria, Camerinum, Picenum and Apulia, and it seems to have been in Etruria where he solicited the most. Indeed he is described as being surrounded in his canvass² by colonists from Arretium and Faesulae, and it seems likely that this extra-urban vote was one of his principal assets.

The nature of Catiline's appeal sounds strangely

-
1. Q. Cicero, "De Pet Consulat.", 1.
 2. Cicero, "pro Mur.", 24.

like that of a modern Socialist. The government has fallen into the hands of a few he asserts, who lord it over the empire while we who pay the taxes, however, brave and worthy are treated like a mob. If the state were in a sound condition we would be the dominant element and the aristocracy would be subject to us. They monopolize the wealth and power while we suffer from poverty, prosecution and debt. Why submit? Our condition cannot be worse so let us make a glorious attempt to recover our "liberties". This election offers the opportunity. I, Catiline, hope to effect these things if I am elected consul.^{1.} In support of these anti-Rich tirades, Catiline brought forward a more definite program which included a cancellation of debts and a redistribution of lands,^{2.} both of which propositions were sure of a considerable amount of popular favor.

It is practically impossible to form any definite idea as to whether Catiline really sympathized with the lower classes or whether he was a mere opportunist looking for an issue which would insure him a following. His enemies have painted him so black that one hesitates to even hint at the possibility of political philanthropy entering into Catiline's plans. It seems probable, however,

1. Sallust, 20. It is true that Sallust probably made up the speech which appears in his "Catilina", but it seems likely that it was based on his personal recollections of the campaign of 63 B.C. He was about twenty-three years old at the time and may easily have taken the usual youthful interest in an election.

2. Sallust, 20; Dio, 37, 30.

that such a propoganda emanating from a man, himself reduced in circumstances would carry much greater weight with the oppressed classes than a radical proposal backed by the Millionaire. We saw that the Land Bill of Rullus failed to elicit popular support, although it was scarcely less revolutionary than Catiline's proposals. Still the latter's project was a simple definite program which appealed directly to the oppressed land-holders and they appear to have responded heartily.

It is to be supposed that Catiline's finances were shattered by the expenses which were necessary to secure his acquittal for extortion but he seems to have had something left. The expenses of the campaign of 64 had undoubtedly been borne in large measure by Crassus but in 63 he seems to have been depending on his own resources. The necessary election expenditures appear to have been made with money borrowed on Catiline's own security and that of his friends. In his letter to Catulus in November Catiline avers that his own property and that of his wife would be sufficient to reimburse his creditors. This may have been true, but if so it must have completely exhausted his finances for already his bankruptcy had become publicly known.^{1.} However I am of the opinion that he was depending

1. "Praetermitto ruinas fortunarum tuarum, quas omnis impendere tibi proximis Idibus senties." I in Cat. 6.

more on his direct appeal to the social^{and} economic malcontents for support than on the bribery which characterized the customary canvass of a candidate.

The question naturally comes up as to whether Crassus and Caesar backed Catiline in his second attempt to be elected consul. Some scholars think that there may have been an attempt at first of co-operation but that a satisfactory agreement could not be reached.^{1.} This may be so; it is at least quite certain that Catiline was running in 63 independent of the Populares leaders. They seem to have no longer felt that the possession of the consulship was essential to their plans. Furthermore the failure of 64 had been due to the apprehension which Catiline's candidature had excited and it does not seem likely that these two astute intriguers would make a second attempt with such a candidate especially if he had indicated the radical program which he wished to advance. Catiline on the other hand was more in need of success than ever, after the drains upon his resources of a year of electioneering. The methods of 64 had not been sufficient and something further must be attempted. We may infer then that the extreme radicalism of the campaign of 63 emanated from Catiline and that it may easily have been the cause of the withdrawal

1. Heitland III: 90; Ferrero I: 243.

Caesar's acquittal of Catiline in the latter part of 64,

when the latter was tried for his part in the Sullan proscription may indicate that he still regarded him as a political asset.

of active support on the part of Caesar and Crassus. The richest man in Rome who was creditor to most of the Senate was hardly the one to support a cancellation of debts. Caesar might have seen in it a means of relieving his own embarrassments but he was sufficiently well established politically and had enough fore-sight to appreciate that an existing alliance with Crassus despite his indebtedness was much more to his advantage than co-operation with Catiline in a venture of doubtful success in an attempt to gain "novas tabullas." The rumored speech of Catiline in his "contio domestica" implies that he felt that he had been deserted by his former backers when he said "that it was impossible for any faithful defender of the miserable citizens to be found, except a man who was himself miserable; that men in an embarrassed and desperate condition ought not to trust the promises of men of a flourishing and fortunate estate."^{1.}

With the progress of the campaign the discontented flocked to Catiline's support, glad to find a champion who regarded himself as one of them and openly advocated the redress of their grievances. "The whole common people", says Sallust, "favored the projects of Catiline", because "they (were) discontented with their own circumstances and

1. Cicero "p Mur.", 25:- "in contione domestica dicebat^{ur}, cum miserorum fidelem defensorem negasset inveniri posse, nisi eum, qui ipse miser esset: integrorum, et fortunatorum promissio saucios, et miseros credere non oportere:"

desire^d a general alteration.^{1.} Besides the general acceptance of his program their was the ever present - envy of the rich by the poor and the hatred of the nobility which raised up adherents for him. All the dregs of the Roman slums, those who went to make up the proletariat, the impoverished noble and the dissolute young man, all that substratum of society which had lost out in the economic struggle and were normally hostile to the existing order of things saw in Catiline a leader whose interests and desires coincided with theirs. Added to these were the political malcontents of the city, sons of the proscribed unjustly disenfranchised, disgruntled politicians who had failed of election, and all the many city interests which were opposed to the Senate.

Besides this considerable urban following we have the very considerable support of the colonies and municipalities and it is from these that Catiline got his greatest strength. To them the radical Socialism of Catiline had a real meaning. Their condition was desperate and the abolition of debts and redistribution of lands offered them another chance. It is true that the debtor class in Rome itself was large and it was enthusiastic for Catiline, but the back-bone of his support was the Sullan veterans from

1. Sallust, 37.

Etruria who flocked to Rome to vote for him. The common conception of these men is that being tired of a quiet rural life they were impatient to revive the disorder of the civil wars from which they had reaped so much advantage. That this consideration was present cannot be denied but it seems more likely that their burden of debt was the primary cause of their restlessness. Cicero dwells on both these aspects but seems to emphasize the fact that they were so burdened with debt that they were desperate.^{1.} We, therefore, can hardly differentiate the Sullan colonists from the rest of Catiline's adherents. They probably were conspicuous in his following, excited the apprehension of his opponents and were used as bugaboos by the latter to frighten the people into an expectation of renewed proscription, but they were in fact only an element in the army of debtors which rallied around Catiline. "No one", says Cicero, "not only in Rome, but in every corner of Italy, was overwhelmed with debt whom he did not enlist in this incredible association of wickedness."^{2.} Indeed throughout Cicero's whole arraignment of Catiline he upbraids him as a leader of bankrupts.^{3.} With this debtor class which felt that it had a wrong to redress, added to a restless proletariat and led by a little group of un-

1. Cicero, "II in Cat.", 9

2. Cicero, "II in Cat.", 4.

3. See Cicero, "II in Cat.", 3, 8, 9, 10.

scrupulous politicians whose grievance was that they felt themselves cheated by their opponents, of their rightful enjoyment of office,^{1.} we may not be surprised that the aristocrats saw themselves in serious danger and did everything in their power to discredit and defeat Catiline.

Opposed to Catiline in this contest were three other candidates. Servius Sulpicius Rufus, L. Licinius Murena and D. Junius Silanus. Sulpicius was the son of an Eques^{2.} and had been a successful advocate whose oratory was second only to Cicero's. He may have had hopes of the backing of the moneyed interests and of repeating Cicero's triumph of the year before. Murena had been one of the lieutenants of Lucullus and had come home rich from the East ready to use his wealth in obtaining the consulship. Silanus belonged to one of the great plebian gentes and to a family which had early taken its place in the new nobility. He was making his second attempt to be elected consul, having been rejected in 64. Murena and Silanus were the candidates of the Senate and they also appear to have had some friendly connection with Crassus and Caesar. At least we know that Crassus acted as one of Murena's advocates in the latter's trial for ambitus, while Silanus^{3.} was the husband of Caesar's mistress Servilia. Whether

1. Sallust gives a list of those who were supposed to have been present at Catiline's "Contio Domestica", and we may safely conclude that they were associated with Catiline's canvass. Pub. Lentulus Sura had been ejected from the Senate for his infamous life, (Dio 37. 30). Autronius and Sulla were the disqualified consuls of 65 B.C. L. Cassius Longinus had been rejected in the election of 64.

2. Cicero "pro Mur.", 7.

3. Duran, III, Pt. 1, p 21; Ferrero, 246. We have no mention of an active part in the campaign by Crassus and Caesar. To imagine that they joined forces on personal grounds with the Optimates seems unlikely.

they were actively supported by the democrats^{ic} "Duumvirate" does not appear. I do not think it probable, the question of who was consul was no longer a vital one for the present, and their caution and interest might very well have advised them to hold aloof from the consular struggle and confine their efforts to Caesar's campaign for the praetorship. We may safely infer then that the Optimates were left to oppose Catiline and the Socialists by themselves.

The same financial conditions which increased the number of Catiline's supporters by enlarging the debtor class, had increased the traditional conservatism of the capitalists. The continued agitation of the democrats in support of socialistic schemes had badly unsettled business. Money was very tight and bankruptcies were becoming more and more frequent.^{1.} The exportation of precious metals was forbidden and the principal ports were placed under surveillance.^{2.} We may well imagine therefore that Catiline's radical program and the great success with which it seemed about to be crowned would arouse considerable anxiety in business circles. The Equites had supported Cicero in the election of 64 and in following his lead had drawn into closer touch with the Optimates. Business conditions had changed since Sulla's day and union between the Senators

1. Val. Max., IV: 8, 3.

2. Mommsen, IV: 212-3.

and the Knights had become the logical thing as the result of Caesar's activities. It only needed the fear of Catiline's election to cement the two orders together into one party standing for the defence of law and property. Every effort must be made to defeat the Socialists and business came to a standstill as the election approached.

During the course of the campaign Sulpicius had induced the Senate to pass more stringent laws against corrupt practices at election. The use of paid escorts and the treating of the populace en masse were declared contrary to the Calpurnian Law, severer penalties were to be imposed upon the people in cases of bribery, and senators were to be exiled if convicted. Another innovation was to have the votes counted irrespective of centuries.^{1.} These laws were passed without difficulty although, if we can believe Cicero, they aroused some ill-will.^{2.} This bill, however, could hardly have been aimed at Catiline as the one of the year before had been, because we know that he was low in funds, and we feel sure that being without backing he was relying on his own popularity and the "merits" of his platform.

Sulpicius, the author of the electoral laws seems to have been the only one who took them seriously. But

1. Cicero "pro Mur.", 23.

2. "If Crassus and Caesar had still been deeply interested in Catiline's behalf and had seriously objected to the new law, surely the efforts of Sulpicius would have been foiled at some stage." Heitland, III: 92.

penurious tactics were not likely to serve well with the Roman electorate in the face of "safe and sane" candidates who were disposed to be lavish. The result was that Servius received so cold a reception that he withdrew from the campaign and declared his intention of bringing charges against Murena for illegal practices. There is no doubt that there were very good grounds for the indictment of Murena but the move was very ill-timed from a senatorial point of view. Probably the charges were not actually preferred against Murena until after the election, but even then the imminence of a trial for an offense of which he was undoubtedly guilty profited nobody but Catiline. The accusations of Sulpicius would hurt Murena's moral prestige and the possibility of his disqualification was entirely in Catiline's favor. The latter seems to have appreciated this at once and his confidence and elation caused the Optimates considerable anxiety and led to several attempts to compromise him.

There seem to have been very persistent rumors that Catiline was planning violence in connection with the election. It seems impossible to come to any conclusion on this point. That Catiline had considered the contingency of defeat seems most likely. If rejected again he knew that

1. "Catilinam interea alacrem atque laetum (videbant)---- Vultus erat ipius plenus furoris, oculi scelerio, sermo arrogantiae, sic ut ei jam exploratus et domi conditus consulatus videretur:--" "pro Mur.", 24.

his case would be desperate and it seems very possible to think that he contemplated a coup d'état as a last resort. Sallust says that after his defeat in 64 that he sent arms and money throughout Italy.^{1.} On the other hand we must remember not only that all our knowledge comes from his enemies, but that it was to the advantage of his opponents to circulate rumors of violence and revolution in order to frighten people into voting against him. The character of the latter's following made such rumors all the more credible and Catiline himself was not too over confident to refrain from incendiary expressions. A few days before the day set for the election Cato threatened Catiline in the Senate with a prosecution for "vis". The demagogue, however, was not to be frightened and boldly replied, "Si quod esset in suas fortunas incendium excitatum, id se non aqua sed ruina restructurum."^{2.} Such audacious expressions coupled with persistent rumors might easily frighten the Optimates who had been regarding the mobilization of all the forces of discontent with apprehension, but they are hardly sufficient to convince us that a conspiracy was already formed.

The first attempt to "bluff" Catiline having failed, time was needed in which to try again to force him

1. Sallust, 24.

2. Cicero, "pro Mur.", 25.

1.
 into some action which might lay him open to indictment. It is very probable that all sorts of rumors were abroad about the plans of Catiline and his supporters, none of them sufficiently definite to be implicitly believed but all of them too persistent to be discredited. A few days after Catiline's defiance of Cato, Cicero moved in the Senate that the election which was scheduled for the next day should be postponed a week in order to discuss the situation more fully. On the following day the consul in a full meeting of the Senate, turned to Catiline and urged him to explain some of the Socialistic utterances which he was reported to have made. The latter boldly admitted that he was standing as the champion of the miserable and desperate and made his famous assertion, "Duo corpora esse rei publicae, unum debile, infirmo capite; alterum firmum, sine capite: huic, si ita de se meritum esset, caput se vivo non defuturum."² If Cicero had hoped to elicit some treasonable expressions from Catiline he had failed. The latter's attitude was bold and self-confident, expectant of success, but even the hostile Senate could not read an illegal meaning into Catiline's words, although they fully appreciated their sinister import. Probably the fears of the senators were thoroughly aroused, apprehensive of what the

1. The fact that at the very time when the Senate most desired to compromise Catiline, they were unable to do so, seems good proof that there was no conspiracy yet.
 2. Cicero, "pro Mur.", 25.

leader of the desperate proletariat would do when elected. However they passed resolutions against him, which Cicero described as "neque tamen satis severe."

In the latter part of July the postponed election took place.^{1.} There seems to have been an insistant rumor^{2.} that Catiline intended to kill Cicero at the comitia.

1. Until recently it was supposed that this election took place in October, this was based on passages in the "pro Murena" and the Catilinarians. It was thought that the meeting of Oct. 21 which Cicero mentions in "I in Catilinam", when he predicted the rising of Mallius, was the same as the meeting in which Catiline made his bold reply, which was held on the day originally set for the election. Consequently the attempted "massacre" of Oct. 28 which Cicero also mentions occurred at the election. If, however we compare these two orations with the other writers, we find that Sallust (26.5 and 29.2), Plutarch ("Cicero", 14-15), and Dio (37. 30-31) all put the "last decree" after the election. It seems hardly likely that this is the decree mentioned in the "pro Murena" 25 as "non satis severe", when he describes it in the Catilinarian as "vehemens at grave." The plan to murder Cicero at the election and to massacre the Optimates on Oct. 28 do not seem to be the same occurrences. If Cicero knew that Catiline had set Oct. 28 for his uprising would he have had the election held on that day? The regular time for the consular election was in July. (John, "Die Entstehungsgeschichte der Catilinarischen Verschwörung: ein Beitrag zur Kritik des Sallustius," 749 n.) We conclude then that there were four meetings of the Senate:- one on the day before the original date for the comitia, one on the following day when Catiline defied Cicero, one on the Election day itself, and one on Oct. 21. (Cook- "Sallust-Catiline," XVII-XIX).

2. All the authors have this, Sallust, 26; Dio, 37/ 29; Plutarch, "Cicero", 14, Cicero, "pro Mur.", 26. Dio says that Cicero openly accused Catiline before the Senate but that the senators did not believe him but thought that he was moved by personal enmity. Plutarch says, "Αἱ δ' εἰς ἐξέτασιν αὐτῶν ἀνδραγαθῶν μνηστῆς ἀγνοῦσιν περὶ τῶν ὄντων δ' εἰς ἐξέτασιν ἀνοχῶν κατ' ἀνδρῶν ἐνδόξων καὶ δυνάμεων μὲν τῶν Καταλινῶν."

We may conclude that the report of Catiline's intention was widespread but that it was sceptically received in many circles and that the rumor was never proved true but was conceded after the actual attempt on Cicero's life in November.

I am rather inclined to doubt the story than to believe it. The enmity of Catiline against Cicero had not become so bitter as it was in November. Catiline was confident of success in the regular course of the election. If he really contemplated such a scheme it would have been to his advantage to have accomplished it before the election so that Antonius who was supposed to be favorably disposed towards him would have presided at the comitia. On the other hand it was wholly in the interests of the Optimates to spread such a story, enlarge upon it and make it appear that the state was in danger. If they could frighten the timid voters into rejecting Catiline they would have accomplished their purpose. That the Socialists contemplated violence is not impossible. Election riots were not unknown in Rome. They might easily and with reason have suspected that the machinery of the government would be used against their candidate and Catiline's followers were of a class to support him with swords and clubs as well as with votes. The demonstration, however, which Cicero made was more as a means of influencing the voting than for his own protection.^{1.} Surrounded by the Senate and a body-guard of young nobles Cicero proceeded to the Campus Martius, ostentatiously displaying the armor which he wore in order

1. He himself says, "Descendi in campum cum firmissimo praesidio fortissimorum virorum, et cum lata insignique lorica, non quae me tegeret, --- verum ut omnes boni animadverterent, et quum in metu et periculo consulem viderent, id quod est factum, ad opem praesidiumque concurrent:--" "pro Mur.", 26.

to arouse the fears of the people.^{1.} We may fairly imagine that both sides mustered all their available voters. One side was fighting for its own rehabilitation and confident of success, the other was struggling to retain its control of the state in the face of a social revolution. The strength of each was about equal so that the decision lay with the "independent voters". It was these whom Cicero's display was intended to influence and apparently it was successful. There appears to have been a sudden change on the part of the voters in favor of Murena,^{2.} who was elected with Silanus as his colleague.

This second defeat left Catiline in desperate straits. He had risked everything on this attempt and lost. It is not improbable that he felt that he had a grievance. He had been barred from running in the elections of 66 and 65 as the result of what he might have regarded as an intrigue of his opponents. His defeat in 64 had been by such a narrow margin that knowing the general standard of political ethics, he could easily have ascribed^{it} to manipulation of the votes. He could at least be certain that extraordinary efforts had been necessary to elect Cicero instead of himself. He might reasonably claim that intimidation had lost him the election of 63, and that the

1. Plutarch, "Cicero", 14.

2. "Magna est autem comitiis consularibus repentina voluntatum inclinatio, praesertim quum incubuit ad virum bonum." Cicero, "pro Mur.", 26.

personal efforts of Cicero had resulted in his rejection. Whether his complaints were well grounded or not is immaterial. An unscrupulous man who finds himself thwarted is not likely to weigh the fine points of justice. He regarded himself as wronged and Catiline doubtless found many among his followers who being in equally straitened circumstances were able to sympathize with him and foster his sense of grievance. He had tried every legitimate means to obtain office and recoup his shattered fortune, he had represented the Populares party, acted as the tool of intriguing politicians, run on an independent ticket and posed as the champion of the down trodden and had always failed. His resources and patience were equally exhausted. His position could hardly be worse. He had a following who were as badly off and as discontented as himself. It was on this basis, therefore, that the real conspiracy of 63 B. C. was built.

It seems safe to conclude that the conspiracy was formed among the men who had acted as Catiline's political lieutenants in his canvass.¹ The chief among them was Pub. Cornelius Lentulus "Sura", one of the praetors. A man of bad character even for those times, but a superstitious dreamer, wholly incompetent to act as the ring-

1. Sallust (17) gives us the names of those who were present at Catiline's "Contio Domestica" before the election of 63. Many of these men we know from other sources were leading conspirators. That Sallust made up this list from his knowledge of the conspiracy is not impossible, but even then it seems probable that the nucleus of the conspiracy would be composed of Catiline's political adherents.

leader of a desperate enterprise. His consular rank seems to have obtained him the second place among the conspirators. Autronius and Sulla appear to have been involved in this plot also, but the latter does not seem to have taken active part and Autronius played a subordinate role.^{1.} Two other members of the conspiracy of 66-65 were present, C. Cornelius Cethegus^{2.} and L. Vargunteius,^{3.} both senators. The former^{4.} of these had shown his profligacy from early youth but was bold, and enterprising even to rashness and was probably the most capable of the conspirators next to Catiline. Another senator was L. Cassius Longinus, who having been defeated for the consulship by Cicero had joined the extremists and it was at his house that the conspiracy was formed.^{5.} Q. Curius had also been disappointed in the election of 64 and had later been ejected from the Senate for his bad character and notorious gambling.^{6.} The colonies were represented by P. Furius, a Sullan veteran from Faesulae^{7.} and M. Coeparius of Tarracina in Latium, but of the others both senators and knights we know nothing beyond their connection with the conspiracy.

The actual plot was probably confined to this little clique of bankrupts while Mallius kept together the colonists in Etruria who had supported Catiline at the

1. Cicero, "pro Sulla", 5, 19.
2. Sallust, 52
3. Cicero, "pro Sulla", 24.
4. Cicero, "pro Sulla", 25.
5. Ibid, 13.
6. Smith vide, "Curius".
7. Cicero, "III in Cat.", 6; Sallust, 50.

election. We must not, however, regard these as actual parts of the conspiracy. They represent an entirely different element in the state, the ruined land-owners who had lost their all and were seeking redress. The urban conspirators were a very different class. "Desire for money to gratify their passions was their one bond of union. They had also the common fact of being failures in the past."^{1.} Catiline was the connecting link between these two widely divergent elements. The difference lay in this that while Catiline and the conspirators were striving to secure the consulship by fair means or foul, the colonists and needy land-holders of Etruria were trying to alleviate their economic distress. They had supported the socialistic program of Catiline and considered him as their leader for want of another. With them, however, the obtaining of the consulship for Catiline was a means only and not an absolute essential either, with Catiline and his fellow conspirators it was an end.^{2.}

From July until October appears to have been a period of preparation on the part of Catiline and the conspirators. Just what they were doing is not very clear. This also is the time when Cicero kept track of Catiline by means of spies. The whole question of Cicero's watch-

1. Heitland, III: 95

2. The idea that Catiline was, Sulla-like, aiming at the supreme rule of the state seems absurd. He was without military backing and the return of Pompey was imminent. He was not a statesman but a debauchee seeking means to gratify his passions.

fulness is a little confused,^{1.} just when the consul began to watch Catiline and just what he learned is hard to determine. The story goes that Q. Curius, one of the conspirators, by his boastful and overbearing behavior aroused the curiosity of his mistress Fulvia. She, when she learned of his relations with Catiline and the great things which he expected from the latter's success revealed her discoveries to the consul.^{2.} The question is, when did this incident occur? However we can safely aver that after the election Cicero kept considerable watch upon Catiline although he does not appear to have discovered very much. Catiline appears to have been busy stirring up the discontented in Italy in order to have an army as a basis for his coup d'etat. Cicero probably was aware of the general plan of Catiline but had little definite knowledge. Rumors of threatened outbreak were rife and the consul sent agents^{3.} to the disaffected parts of Italy to watch. In Rome also^{4.} he maintained secret agents and conducted investigations but there are no indications of any actual discoveries. Cicero himself was probably convinced that something was impending but in the absence of facts he seems to have met^{5.} with considerable incredulity in influential circles.

In October matters came to a head. At midnight on

1. Sullust's chronology as to this is hopelessly confused. He puts the incident of Fulvia in the summer of 64 B.C. and ascribes the election of Cicero to her revelations. (23) This is absurd on the face of it. He then tells us that from the very beginning of his consulship Cicero employed Curius and Fulvia as spies. (26) If this is true it only goes to show how little there was to learn at least until the election and probably not before October.

2. Sallust, 23.

3. Appian, "Bell. Civ.", Bk II, C. 1, Par. 3.

4. Plutarch, "Cicero", 18.

5. Cicero, "II in Cat.", 2.

the twentieth Crassus, M. Marcellus and Scipio Metellus came to Cicero's house and insisted on seeing the consul. On being admitted Crassus told the story of how an unknown man had left a package of letters addressed to leading senators at his house. One of them being addressed to himself, Crassus opened it and found that it was an anonymous note warning him that Catiline was about to cause bloodshed and advising him to withdraw from Rome. Horrorstruck at the idea of Catiline's massacre Crassus had hastened to lay the matter before Cicero.¹ It has been suggested that this anonymous note really came from Cicero or some other leader of the oligarchy. Cicero's character, it seems to me clears him of any implication, he delighted in the dramatic but it does not seem likely that he would descend to a subterfuge of this kind. It may, however, have been a scheme of one of the other Optimate leaders.

The usual tendency in regard to this period is to accept Cicero's estimate of himself and regard him as the chief of the senatorial party, and the prime mover in the struggle with Catiline. This seems a little improbable, when we consider that Cicero was a "novus homo", thrust upon an unwilling aristocracy by a combination of circumstances. His popularity, his oratory and his position as

1. Plutarch, "Cicero", 15.

consul made him a ready means whereby the Optimates could carry on their war against Catiline whom they both hated and feared. Furthermore the opprobrium which would result from an attack upon a man with a following like Catiline's would fall upon the active consul and not upon the influential party leader. The proceedings against Catiline have a premeditated tinge which seems more characteristic of an astute politician working in conjunction and influencing the plans of the consul, who was himself primarily a literary man.¹ Who this party leader may have been we cannot say, Catilus seems the most probable person.

On Oct. 21, Cicero convened the Senate to consider the state of affairs. The activities of Mallius in Etruria had already been a topic of popular talk for some time, coupled with this were rumors of treason in the city.² The letters which Crassus had received brought matters to a head. When they were distributed in the Senate to those to whom they were addressed and were read aloud they were all found to be identical with the one which Crassus had opened. If this was a deliberate plan to frighten the incredulous Senate into taking action it was certainly carried out impressively. In the same meeting Q. Arrius, one of the praetorian senators told how Mallius was collect-

1. For a characterization of Cicero as the literary man in politics see Boissac, "Cicero and His Friends," p 33 et seq.
2. Sallust, 29.

ing bands of soldiers in Etruria and waiting for news from Rome.^{1.} Cicero who seems to have been well informed, added to this statement a prediction that the insurgents would be in arms by the twenty-seventh.^{2.} This aggregation of evidence convinced the Senate that extreme measures were necessary to meet the disorders in the state and the "last decree" was passed. "(Decrevit) ut darent operam consulibus nequid res publica detrimenti caperet."^{3.} Guards were stationed throughout the city, the consul went surrounded by a large bodyguard and steps were taken to oppose the expected insurrection but when nothing happened Cicero was charged with sycophancy until the news from Etruria confirmed his predictions.^{4.} A few days later L. Saenius read to the Senate some letters which he had received from Faesulae in which it was stated that Mallius had been in arms on Oct. 27th. This revelation resulted in prompt action on the part of the government. Q. Marcius Rex and Q. Metellus Creticus who were encamped near the city waiting to be permitted to celebrate their triumphs were sent against the insurgents,^{5.} one against Mallius the other into Apulia. This was a situation with which the Senate knew how to deal and its ability to handle an armed insurrection appears at once.

Affairs in the city, however, were less easy to cope

1. Plutarch, "Cicero", 15.
2. Cicero, "I in Cat.", 3.
3. Sallust, 29
4. Plutarch, "Cicero", 16; Dio, 37. 31.
5. Sallust, 30.

with because of the difficulty in knowing when and where the conspirators would strike. According to Cicero, Catiline had planned his coup d'etat for Oct. 28th but was thwarted by the demonstrations of force which the government made. This seems reasonable to believe, at least that Catiline intended to act very soon. The idea of a city uprising and an Italian revolt simultaneously is perfectly credible, although we might suppose that Catiline would want the army of Mallius nearer to Rome than Faesulae in order to give him immediate support in his attempt to seize office. At any rate we may conclude that civil strife in the city was generally expected at an early date. Many of the senators left Rome in order to escape.^{1.} The unanswerable question is why Cicero refrained from seizing Catiline and nipping the conspiracy in the bud if he knew as much as he claimed to know. He did not hesitate to arrest the other conspirators as soon as he had evidence against them, so that the argument that he feared the people is not entirely convincing. A possible explanation is that between Oct. 21st and Dec. 3rd, Cicero brought about a revulsion of popular feeling by his tales of massacre and incendiarism. This is in part true, and it is also true that Lentulus and Cethegus did not have the personal popularity which Catiline had. That all

1. Cicero, "II in Cat.", 3.

these considerations were factors in the events of October is probably true, but it also seems likely that in connection with the intended coup of Oct. 28th, Cicero was not as well informed as he makes himself out to be. The city was full of rumors of intended uprising and knowing of the revolt of Mallius it was not unlikely that Cicero anticipated some action on the part of Catiline and made preparations against it. There is no record of any disorder, Cicero merely remarks that Catiline was so surrounded by the consuls guards that he was unable to move.^{1.} About this same time the Senate offered rewards for information in regard to the conspiracy, to a slave his freedom and a hundred thousand sestertii, to a free man pardon if implicated and two hundred thousand sestertii,^{2.} but despite these offers no one appeared to give information.^{3.} This seems to indicate two things, first that the Senate had little if any real information about the conspiracy, and second that the number of conspirators was small. It is not probable that Catiline would admit many accomplices to his scheme for murdering Cicero because it was not necessary. As to stirring up a commotion in the city on the approach of the insurgent army that, too, was probably only known to the leaders among Catiline's adherents.

1. Cicero, "I in Cat.", 3.

2. Sallust, 30.

3. Sallust, 26.

Despite the activities of the Senate against him Catiline appeared insolent¹ in public as though to dare his enemies to attack him. At this juncture L. Aemilius Paulus, a young noble probably at the instigation of Cicero or some other senatorial leader, brought an indictment for "Vis" ^{1.} under the Lex Plautia against him as an exciter of sedition. Catiline seized the opportunity to arouse popular sympathy by an appearance of ostentatious innocence. As though willing to have every movement observed he first offered to give himself into the custody of Marcus Lepidus the father of his accuser. On being refused here he even had the impudence to ask Cicero to keep him confined in his house, but the consul replied that he could not feel safe as long as Catiline was in the city. Q. Metellus the praetor likewise declined to have anything to do with Catiline, but finally ^{2.} M. Metellus received him and Cicero ridicules the idea of his keeping much of a watch upon Catiline. ^{3.} Very likely Catiline had no desire to place himself under the surveillance of his leading opponents, but being conscious of their fear of him he felt perfectly safe in making the proposal which was sure to help him with the people. Having accomplished his end he actually gave himself into the custody of a friend who would not hamper his movements. However, he

1. Sallust, 31.

2. There is doubt whether this man's name was Metellus or Marcellus but both C.F.W. Mueller and Geo. Long read Metellus in their texts of Cicero.

3. Cicero, "I in Cat.", 8.

continued to pose, and began to prepare his defence,^{1.} for he not only needed to arouse popular sympathy but he had to gain time in which to devise means of getting out of the difficulties which the activities of Cicero had raised. The efforts of the consul seem to have been directed towards alienating the popular favor from Catiline and in convincing an incredulous people that a conspiracy existed.^{2.} The issuance of the "last decree", the nightly guards on the Palatine, the watches throughout the city, the meeting of the Senate in fortified places,^{3.} all served to arouse the anxiety which pervaded the city and Catiline needed every subterfuge^{4.} which he could think of, in order to make the popular fears appear groundless.

By the first week in November Catiline had become convinced that further delay would be disastrous. It is perhaps open to question whether his preparations were as thoroughly completed as he had intended, the attempt to surprise Praeneste on Nov. 1st had failed,^{5.} and he probably desired to prosecute a more vigorous campaign if possible in person. Furthermore his position in the city was desperate and he had little choice but to depart. This seems to have been his plan and the only thing which he wished to accomplish was the murder of Cicero. Many in the Senate were

1. Dio, 37. 31-32.

2. "Quod exspectavi jam sum assectus, ut vos omnes factam esse aperte conjurationem contra rem publicam videretis."

"II in Cat.", 4.

3. Cicero, "I in Cat.", 1-2.

4. Sallust, 31.

5. Cicero, "I in Cat.", 3.

credulous, even favorable to Catiline, and with Cicero out of the way the only watchful and suspicious eye, as he supposed, would be closed. On the night of Nov. 6th, he convened his confederates at the house of M. Porcius Laeca and made preparations for stirring up revolt in different parts of Italy. Then at Catiline's instigation L. Vargunteius, a senator and C. Cornelius, a knight, agreed to go to Cicero's house early the next day, on the pretence of making the usual morning call, and kill Cicero. This plan Curius, who had turned traitor,^{1.} conveyed to Cicero through Fulvia, and when the would-be assassins arrived on the morning of Nov. 7th they were denied admittance.^{2.}

Waiting a day so that the rumor of the attempted murder might get abroad, and the increased guards in the city might excite greater apprehension than ever, Cicero convened the Senate in the temple of Jupiter Stator, which he had surrounded with armed men as an added precaution.^{3.} Previously the consul had summoned some of the chief men and related the circumstances to them so that his audience in the Senate was acquainted with the facts before he began to speak. Indeed I am of the opinion that the incidents attendant on the delivery of the "First Catilinarian" were arranged before hand for the express purpose of cowing

1. How long Curius had been in Cicero's employ we cannot say. If as Sallust says, since the beginning of 63, we must infer either that, not being one of the ringleaders, he did not share directly in the plans of Catiline, and so could give the consul only vague information, or that previous to this there had been no planning of treasonable designs which could be definitely charged against the "conspirators."

2. Sallust, 27-28

3. Cicero, "I in Cat.", 8.

Catiline and forcing him into some desperate attempt which would unmask his schemes. Both Cato and Cicero had formerly tried to "bluff" him in the Senate only to be met with impudent effrontery. This third attempt was to be more elaborate, and as a sample of political theatricals it is without parallel. How it must have delighted Cicero's dramatic sense. At last he had some actual facts with which to threaten Catiline but in order to be successful the bold conspirator must be made to believe that much more was known than was actually the case. The first move and one which seems unquestionably to be preconcerted, took place when Catiline entered the Senate and advanced to his place among the praetorians. All the senators shrank from him and left the benches in his neighborhood vacant. This would at once arouse his apprehension, and we may imagine his growing uneasiness as Cicero began his speech as though everything had been revealed. However when we come down to the actual accusations we find that aside from the things which had taken place at Laeca's, there is nothing charged against Catiline which was not already a matter of general knowledge. With these facts as an introduction Cicero's whole speech is a masterly piece of insinuation backed by invective and concluding with an exhortation to Catiline to depart. Apparently

1. How Cicero triumphs in the facts which he possesses and flaunts them in Catiline's face: "Num negare audes? Quid taces? Convincam, si negas."--- "I in Cat.", 4.

during the progress of the speech, while Cicero was urging him to go into exile, Catiline interrupted and urged the consul to make a motion for a decree of banishment, and offered to obey the Senate, but Cicero had no intention of giving his opponent an opportunity of posing as an injured citizen, and refused to follow the suggestion.^{1.} When the consul had finished even the audacity of Catiline was overcome, and the arch-conspirator hurried to his own house without daring to attempt a reply.^{2.} That night he left Rome with a few attendants leaving word to his fellow-conspirators that he would soon advance on the city at the head of a large army.^{3.}

That the "First Catilinarian" accomplished its purpose is a little doubtful. It hastened Catiline's departure from Rome, but he had apparently been contemplating such a move already and had sent armed men ahead to conduct him to the camp of Mallius.^{4.} But if the Optimates had hoped that all the conspirators would flee they were disappointed. However the whole affair created a general stir of which Cicero was quick to take advantage. The support of the seditious multitude had probably been the factor which restrained the Senate, conscious of its unpopularity, from taking vigorous measures against Catiline and his accomplices.

1. Cicero, "I in Cat.", 8
 2. Sallust gives us a speech with which Catiline was supposed to have replied to Cicero, but it seems too doubtful to be admitted. In the first place it concludes with a remark which Cicero, who is of course much better authority, mentions as having been made to Cato a few days before the election ("pro Mur.", 25). Plutarch says that Catiline tried to speak before Cicero but was cried down, ("Cicero", 16) but this and other incidents in Plutarch look like the additions of a century and a half of unscientific history. Cicero himself gives the idea that Catiline made no reply: "II in Cat" 6; "Orator", 37.

This Cicero had deliberately set out to undermine and the events of October and November offered a not-to-be-neglected opportunity. The whole tone of the "Second Catilinarian" which Cicero delivered to the people on Nov. 9, was to the effect that the city had been saved from the fire and sword with which Catiline threatened it, but that the danger was by no means past so each citizen must take every precaution while the government struggled with Catiline and his army. The other conspirators were urged to follow their leader since all their machinations were known and provided for in advance. Although there was doubtless a desire to influence popular opinion against Catiline, I am inclined to believe that Cicero entertained grave apprehensions himself and was not brazenly trying to scare the populace. The attempts on his life had increased his natural timidity, "suo--- metu pericula metiri."^{1.} Catiline's adherents tried to counteract the consul's influence by spreading abroad the story that Catiline had been driven unto exile by the false charges of his enemies, and that he had gone to Massilia in order to prevent an uprising in his behalf.^{2.} Catiline himself wrote letters of the same import to most of the consulares.^{3.}

The fugitive conspirator had meanwhile fled into

1. Sallust, 31.
2. Cicero, "II in Cat.", 7.
3. Sallust, 34.
- ③ Sallust, 32 (See previous page.)
- ④ Cicero, "I in Cat.", 4. (See previous page.)

Etruria. He had waited a few days at Arretium, possibly to see if his departure had been the occasion for a demonstration in his favor at Rome, but when nothing happened he assumed the fasces and other emblems of consular authority and marched northward to join Mallius. As he advanced he found the country already ripe for revolt so he distributed arms and levied troops along the way.^{1.} The Senate promptly declared both Catiline and Mallius public enemies. Issued a pardon to all insurgents who would lay down their arms before a certain date, and ordered the consuls to make a military levy. Antonius was ordered in pursuit of Catiline and Cicero was to protect the city. The fact that there were no deserters in response to the decree of the Senate indicated the desperation of the insurgents.^{2.} At the same time Catiline explained his motives for revolt in a letter to Catullus. "Iniuriis contumeliisque concitatus, quod fructu laboris industriaeque meae privatus statum dignitatis non optinebam, publicam miserorum causam pro mea consuetudine suscepi.--- sed quod non dignos homines honore honestatos videbam meque falsa suspicione alienatum esse sentiebam. hoc nomine satis honestas pro meo casu spes reliquae dignitatis conservandae sum secutus."^{3.} The fact that Catiline was now in the field at the head of a des-

1. Sallust, 36; Appian, Bk II, Chap. 1, Par. 3.

2. Sallust, 36.

3. Ibid, 35.

perate revolt had a deciding influence on the trial of Murena which occurred at this time. It was absolutely necessary from an Optimate point of view, that there be two consuls on the first of January, to carry on the anti-socialistic policy of the government. Consequently the case was decided on the expediency of the moment rather than on its merits and Murena was acquitted. This relieved the Senate of the possible danger of a special election in case Murena had been convicted and shattered the last hopes of the Catilinarians of another chance at the consulship.

With the departure of Catiline the chief place among the conspirators fell to Lentulus. According to Sallust the execution of the plot was to be inaugurated as soon as Catiline reached Faesulae by L. Bestia, who in his capacity of tribune would assemble the people and deliver an invective against Cicero, blaming him with having started the war. The popular mind having been worked up to the proper pitch, a tumult was to be started, the city was to be fired in twelve places, and in the confusion Cicero and other prominent men were to be killed. Having thus paralyzed the government, the conspirators would sally forth to meet Catiline. There are in this

1. Sallust, 43. Appian had confused this account with the attempt to kill Cicero on Nov. 7. Plutarch has exaggerated the whole story absurdly.

account of the plans of the conspirators several inconsistencies which make us wonder whether Sallust was very well informed. In the first place why should the scheme be carried out as soon as Catiline reached Faesulae? The events of November show us that this was not done, and even from a logical point of view we would suppose that Catiline and his army would have to be in the immediate vicinity of Rome instead of two hundred miles away in order to insure the success of the conspiracy.^{1.} Under such circumstances the confusion in the city and the murder of the officers of government would enable Catiline at once to seize the chief magistracy which he coveted. Another part of the scheme which seems to imply that Catiline was expected to be in the neighborhood was the plan to sally forth to meet him. Unless he was in the vicinity such a move would be absurd, but if he were at hand it would be equivalent to throwing open the gates to him. It has been customary to condemn the conspirators on account of their dilatory movements but with these considerations in mind we can in part understand why they were inactive during November, 63. Furthermore the first act of the plot was the summoning of a popular assembly by L. Bestia the tribune. Such a move would have been politic as a means for stirring up the

1. This idea is confirmed by Lentulus verbal message to Catiline, "in urbe parata esse quae iusserit. ne cunctetur ipse (Catilina) propius adcedere."-- Sallust, 44. See also the testimony of Vulturcius. Cicero, "III in Cat.", 4.

people, and the fact that it was done by a tribune would give a democratic character consistent with Catiline's position. An invective against Cicero as the instigator of the war would have much greater force if delivered at a time when a hostile army was threatening the city. This too would add to the explanation of the delay, for Bestia^{1.} was only tribune designatus and would not be inducted into office until Dec. 10, 63 and would consequently not have any authority to assemble the people until after that date.

~~In the meanwhile~~ Lentulus had planned to execute the plot on the Saturnalia (about Dec. 17) but Cethegus^{2.} thought this too late, so we may conclude that the matter had not been fully decided. *P* Lentulus and his colleagues, *meanwhile* were joining as many interests in their cause as possible, and M. Coeparius had been detailed to go to Apulia to stir up the shepherds. It was this desire to form alliances with every possible element of discontent which probably led the conspirators to approach the Allobroges. Ambassadors of this people were at Rome complaining of the rapacity of the Roman officials and seeking to obtain some relief from the Senate. Pub. Umbrenus, one of the conspirators, a freedman who had been a trader in Gaul and was acquainted with the chief men of the Allobroges approached

1. Pauly "Real-Encyclopaedie", III, 1367.

2. Cicero, "III in Cat.", 4.

the ambassadors and offered to help them out of their difficulties. When they gladly accepted his offer, he conducted them to the house of Dec. Brutus who was absent from Rome, but whose wife Sempronia was favorable to Catiline.^{1.} When Gabinius had been sent for to give added weight to their statements, the two conspirators explained Catiline's schemes and solicited the co-operation of the Gauls. In order to inspire their confidence the personnel of the conspiracy was told to them and many names were added of perfectly innocent people in order to reassure any possible doubts which they might entertain.^{2.} The negotiations between the Gauls and the conspirators do not seem to have been concluded at a single meeting,^{3.} but the conspirators seem to have rushed into the alliance with the boldness of fools. In their eagerness to gain adherents they gave themselves away on the first opportunity. The idea that the Gauls would provide cavalry to the rebel army may have seemed plausible enough to the imaginative Lentulus but to suppose that promises would win their lasting adherence to an attempt which had met only with failure and the success of which was so desperate marks the conspirators as failures even in intrigue. The folly was not so much in approaching the Gauls as in admitting them into the

1. Sallust, 25.

2. Sallust, 40.

3. Cicero also accuses Pub. Furius and Q. Manlius Chilo of tampering with the Allobroges, ("III in Cat.", 6) and quotes a conversation which the Gauls had with L. Cassius, ("pro Sulla", 13).

secrets of the plot while they were still in Rome.

The Allobroges, naturally fickle, soon began to doubt whether it was to their advantage to join the conspirators. Their interest in the political struggles at Rome was slight, and the question for them was whether they would gain more by supporting Catiline or by revealing the plot and gaining the gratitude of the government. In their perplexity they revealed the state of affairs to Q. Fabius Sanga, the patron of their nation. He promptly communicated the story to Cicero. The consul, who despite all his spyings seems to have been pretty much in the dark, directed the Gauls to go into the conspiracy with apparent eagerness and get some damning evidence. By the beginning of December the ambassadors having completed their business at Rome, and we may believe that Cicero had hurried matters, were ready to return to Gaul. At the direction of the consul they requested letters from the conspirators to their nation. This proposition seems to have been readily conceded to by Lentulus and his friends. However they took the precaution of wording their missives ambiguously so that in the letters themselves there was nothing which was in any way incriminating. Besides this Vulturcius one of the conspirators was sent as a companion to the Gauls

and to him Lentulus committed a letter and a verbal message for Catiline urging him to enlist slaves and to hasten his approach to the city.^{1.}

Being apprised of the course of events Cicero sent the two praetors L. Flaccus and C. Pomtinus with some of his own body-guard to the Milvian bridge to intercept the Allobroges as they left the city. Early in the morning of Dec. 3rd, the cavalcade approached and was attacked by the men at the bridge. The Gauls promptly surrendered themselves but Vulturcius resisted and had to be overpowered. The letters with their seals unbroken were given up to the praetors and brought with the prisoners to Cicero. The rumor of the arrest quickly spread through the city and Cicero's friends hastened to come to his house. At their advice he opened and read the letters preparatory to summoning the Senate. He was still doubtful as to how far he could proceed against the nobles who were implicated, nevertheless he summoned Lentulus, Cethegus, Statilius, Gabinius and Coeparius from three of whom the Gauls had received letters. All but Coeparius came unsuspecting but he having already heard of the arrest of the ambassadors had fled from the city. He was pursued and arrested^{2.} later in the day.

1. Cicero, "III in Cat.", 5; Sallust, 44.

2. Cicero, "III in Cat.", 2-3; Sallust, 45-46; Appian, Bk. II, C. 1, Par. 4.

When the Senate met, the consul recounted the events which had taken place and brought forward his prisoners as witnesses. Vulturcius was first brought in alone and cross-examined. He at first proved stubborn and professed ignorance of any conspiracy but on being promised immunity he turned state's evidence and told all that he knew. The story of the messages for Catiline was corroborated by the letters which he carried, but when Cicero tells us that he gave evidence concerning the burning of the city and a wholesale massacre we wonder whether he is not giving us some rhetorical paint out of his " *invidious* " ^{1.}

In cross-examining a man who has turned state's evidence, before a prejudiced body like the Senate it would be possible to make him say most anything. Be that as it may ² the general outlines of the plot seem to have been revealed. However being only a recent acquisition to the plot he was only able to name a few whom he had heard were connected, ^{3.} this list included Autronius, Ser. Sulla, and Vargunteius.

After Vulturcius had given his testimony the Gauls were brought in and put under oath. They corroborated the facts already given, told how letters had been given them by Lentulus, Cethegus and Statilius and how Cassius had urged them to send cavalry into Italy. They further added

1. Cicero, "ad Att.", I: 14.
2. Cicero, "III in Cat.", 4
3. Sallust, 47.

that Lentulus had told them that the ⁱSibylline books had predicted that he was to be the third Cornelius to rule over Rome and that the time was now at hand.^{1.} The letters were then produced and identified by Lentulus and Cethegus who were present as senators, Statilius was also brought and identified his. When the contents were read aloud they were found to be all alike and not of a compromising nature in themselves except as they confirmed the statements of the Gauls.^{2.} An attempt was made to elicit some testimony from Gabinus but without success.^{3.} The most conclusive evidence, however, of the whole sitting was the letter of Lentulus to Catiline,^{4.} although rather vague in its wording when interpreted by the verbal message which he had given his messenger, it not only convicted him of aiding a public enemy who was in arms, but also of trying to incite a servile war, a thing always a terror to the Romans. As though the testimony before them was not sufficient two of the chiefs of the senatorial party, Piso and Silanus said that somebody had overheard Cethegus say that three consuls^{5.} and four praetorians were to be killed. At the suggestion of the Gauls the house of Cethegus was searched^{6.} and a quantity of arms was discovered.

The action of the conspirators during the course of

1. Cicero, "III in Cat.", 4.
2. "erat scriptum ipsius manu Allobrogum senatui et populo, sese quae eorum legatis confirmasset facturum esse; Orare ut item illi facerent quae sibi eorum legati recepissent." "III in Cat.", 5.
3. Ibid, 5.
4. "Quis sim scies ex eo quem ad te misi. Cura ut vir sis, et cogita quem in locum sis progressus; vide et quid tibi jam sit necesse, et cura ut omnium tibi auxilia adjungas etiam infimorum." Ibid.
5. Plutarch, "Cicero", 19. Rather modest proportions for the wholesale massacre which Cicero tells us about.
6. Cicero, "III in Cat.", 3.

these proceedings was itself damning testimony against them. They seem to have been taken entirely off their guard and were stunned by the hopelessness of their position. "Sic enim obstupuerant, sic terram intuebantur, sic furtim nonnumquam inter sese aspiciebant, ut non jam ab aliis^{1.} indicari sed indicare se ipsi viderentur." They were completely nonplussed. Who had told? How much was known? Could they rely on one another? They knew that they were all entangled in the same coils, but they probably felt that each of their fellows would be willing to sacrifice the whole crew in order to save his own skin. No one of them except Lentulus was able to attempt a defense. He, indeed, when first confronted with the incriminating letters, declined to speak, but at the end of the examination he tried to free himself from any connection with the witnesses by inveighing against them. But when they replied and questioned him about the Sibylline prophecy, his overweening conceit got the better of him and he admitted his belief in his destiny to the astonishment of the senators.^{2.} Cethegus, however, was entirely dumb-founded and could only furnish^{3.} a very lame excuse for the presence of arms in his house. It is little wonder that they were taken aback, caught as they were when they least suspected it after months of

1. Ibid, 5.

2. Cicero, "III in Cat.", 5.

3. Ibid, 3.

plotting, when doubtless their chances of success looked best. Being men of small ability they were unequal to a crisis and were silenced by the consciousness of their own guilt.

The Optimates in the Senate were now triumphant, doubters were silenced, secret sympathizers cowed. Lentulus was forced to resign his magistracy on the grounds that he had lost not only his rights as a praetor but also as a citizen.¹ A decree was passed after vigorous expressions of opinion supposedly against the conspirators. A vote of thanks was passed in favor of Cicero, while his colleague and subordinates were praised for their share in the recent events. Nine of the conspirators, the ones implicated in the affair of the Allobroges were ordered under arrest and a "supplicatio" was decreed in Cicero's name, "because he had delivered the city from conflagration, the citizens from massacre, and Italy from civil war."² Five of those who had been condemned were placed in the custody of different senators, but the other four had already made good their escape.³ It has been suggested that the entrusting of Statilius and Gabinius to Caesar and Crassus was done with the intent of compromising them with the multitude, but this seems improbable when we consider that part of Cicero's

1. Cicero, "III in Cat.", 6; "IV in Cat.", 3; Sallust, 47; Dio, 37. 34; Appian, Bk II, C. 1, Par. 5.

2. Cicero, "III in Cat.", 6.

3. Sallust, 47.

deliberate policy was to excite the people against the conspirators.

If there had been a tendency on the part of the populace to make a momentary hero of Catiline, and regard him as a friend of the people hounded by the aristocrats it seems to have been dispelled by the exposure of the conspiracy. Cicero had been painting in vivid colors the plans of massacre and incendi^carism^{1.} which were threatening the city and had at last succeeded in molding public opinion so that it accepted his views as fact. The events of Dec. 3rd had aroused considerable alarm and excitement and a great crowd had assembled around the Senate-house.^{2.} Cicero took this occasion to deliver his "Third Catilinarian", wherein by describing the incident of the Allobroges and the other discoveries he was able not only to arouse a horror of civil war but also the old dread of a Gallic invasion and the ever present fear of a slave revolt. To make the influence of the revelations more widespread he had stenographic reports made of the information given in the Senate and copies of these were spread broadcast among the people.^{3.} The effect seems to have been instantaneous, Cicero's continually harping on the massacre and conflagration and ruin prepared for the republic had had its effect. He was the

1. The whole tone of the Catilinarians is of this sort. See also "pro Mur.", 39.

2. Appian, Bk. II, C. 1., Par. 5

3. I am of the opinion that Sallust based his account to some extent on one of these. Similar records were taken of the meeting of Dec. 5, 63. (Plutarch, "Cato Minor".)

hero of the hour, the saviour of his country.^{1.} Everyone who had anything to lose rallied to the support of the government and during the rest of the commotion, business men assembled in arms to preserve order and protect the Senate.

When we stop to consider, however, that only nine men were actually implicated and that one of these was a freedman, we cannot but wonder whether the conspiracy was of such terrifying proportions as Cicero believed. The real danger lay in the existence of disaffection in the city ready to co-operate with Catiline and his army. If this really was as widespread as was supposed now was the time to stamp it out while the conspiracy was momentarily paralyzed by the arrest of its chiefs and Catiline was still at a distance. I am strongly of the opinion that not many more were connected with the actual conspiracy than those who were apprehended. This little clique was sufficient to stir up a tumult by means of their slaves and clients, when the proper time arrived. They then counted on the support of the proletariat, but it seems doubtful that very many people had actually been admitted to the plot. Consequently with Lentulus and Cethegus in custody, the plot disappeared.

On the following day the Senate again met and voted ample rewards to the Gauls and to Vulturcius.^{2.} At this same

1. Sallust, 48.

2. Cicero, "IV in Cat.", 3.

session occurred an incident which, while characterizing the practices of the times, baffles satisfactory explanation. L. Tarquinius, who was said to have been arrested as he was about to set out to join Catiline, was brought before the Senate and volunteered to give information if guaranteed the protection of the state. When this was given he repeated the testimony of Vulturcius in regard to conflagration, massacre and invasion and added that Crassus had sent him to Catiline to encourage him and urge him to hasten to Rome. When these statements were made the senators cried out that it was false and ordered the man imprisoned until he should reveal his instigator.¹ According to Dio, the general consensus of opinion was in favor of Crassus. Some thought that Crassus was above suspicion, others that the conspirators were trying to involve him with themselves in order to interest him in their cause. Even those who were willing to credit the statements of Tarquinius thought it inopportune to attack so powerful a man at such a crisis.² It has been thought that this was a deliberate trick on the part of the Optimates to tie Crassus's hands and prevent his trying to clear the prisoners. That the testimony was false seems to be generally conceded and with reason. Since the election of 63 B. C., Crassus had apparently been

1. Sallust, 48

2. Dio, 37. 35

drawing into temporary alliance with the governmental party. There is reason to believe that he had backed one of the aristocratic candidates, he had appeared as one of the advocates for Murena in the latter's trial, and had been the first one to give public information as to the conspiracy by revealing his anonymous letter to Cicero on Oct. 20th. To alienate so powerful an ally in a time of danger, even if he was not trusted would have been decidedly impolitic and the Senate appreciated the fact. What the interests behind Tarquinius had in mind in instigating his testimony can only be surmised, and even then we know too little of the incident to attempt a conclusion.

Meanwhile the clients and freedmen of Lentulus and Cethegus were trying to stir up a sedition among the proletariat and the slaves and effect the rescue of the prisoners. Agents went about among the poor attempting to excite a tumult, by bribing the leaders of the mob but without success.¹ Lentulus and his coadjutors lacked the popularity which Catiline had and could not hope to rely on the popular defense of their persons. Furthermore Cicero had influenced public opinion against them and the mob regarded them as patricides and incendiaries. When rumors of the agitation in favor of the prisoners reached

1. Appian says that an assault was made on the houses where the prisoners were confined, but none of the other writers mention anything of the kind so we may conclude that this statement is one of the additions which stories of this kind accrue in the course of time. Bk. II, C. 1, Par. 5.

the consul, he stationed guards throughout the city, made preparations for a military levy and convened the Senate.^{1.} If there was any danger of a sedition on their account the prisoners must be disposed of at once. They had already been declared traitors by the Senate and it only remained^{2.} to be determined how they should be removed from Rome.

The question before the Senate was a delicate one between expediency and legality. Full power had been given to the consuls by the passage of the "last decree", but Cicero was afraid to extend the interpretation of that power to cover the case in hand. It is true the Senate had no more right to decide the question than the consul, it was not a court of justice, and it could not by its decree override one of the fundamental rights of the constitution, namely that a Roman citizen could not be put to death without a trial and an appeal to the people. Cicero was not even willing to commit himself on the subject but tried to throw the entire responsibility on the Senate. In his "Fourth Catilinarian", he merely agrees to execute the decision of the senators and refrains from arguing one way or the other. However the dominant party in the Senate was frightened by the discovery of what was supposed to be a mammoth conspiracy. They were not free from the suspicion

1. Sallust, 50; Cicero, "ad Att.", II, 1; "II in Phil.", 16; Dio, 37.35.

2. Plutarch tells a story of how the rites of the Bona Dea were being celebrated at Cicero's house so that he went to the house of a friend and was there deliberating whether the prisoners should be put to death or not. Hither his wife came and told that after the fire on the altar had gone out, it suddenly rekindled and flamed up again. The Vestals who were present immediately sent her to Cicero to tell him that the omen meant that he was to do what he was contemplating. Both his wife and friends then incited him against the conspirators. ("Cicero", 19-20) The anecdotal character of this incident and the absence of any mention of it by the other authorities has led me to regard it as

that their political enemies were implicated, and being for the moment triumphant they were disposed to show no leniency. The democratic minority, however, saw one of the popular bulwarcks assailed. It was not a question of the life of Lentulus and Cethegus, but whether a precedent should be established. Roman citizens had been outlawed and put to death before, but always in some extra legal manner, in a riot or by private assassins, but never before had they been deliberately arrested and summarily executed. There might be no fear that Cicero would use these methods against his enemies, but once let the precedent be established and a less scrupulous consul could push it to an extreme.

When the Senate met on Dec. 5, there was a full representation of Optimates, but many of the Populares senators and among them Crassus,^{1.} absented themselves lest they be involved in an undemocratic decision which they dared not oppose for fear of being accused as accomplices.^{2.} No time was lost in approaching the question in hand and according to custom the senior consul designatus, Silanus spoke first. He advocated execution in no equivocal terms both on the grounds of desert and precedent, not only for the five prisoners but for the other four conspirators who had been condemned.^{3.} This opinion was pretty

apocryphal. We find Cicero's friends in the Senate advocating leniency lest he incur the odium of having put citizens to death without a trial. (Ibid, 21.)

1. Cicero, "ad Att.", XII, 21.

2. Ibid, "IV in Cat.", 5.

3. Ibid, 4.

generally accepted until Tib. Nero was called on to speak, whereupon, he advocated that the prisoners be carefully guarded and that final decision be postponed until Catiline should be defeated and more evidence secured.¹ The absence of debate seems a little remarkable. Either the Senate had practically made up its mind to put the conspirators to death, or as is more likely the senators were at loss just what policy should be pursued, but were willing to follow the leaders in what seemed the safest course.

The only dissenting voice was Caesar praetor designatus, and he vigorously opposed the proposition of Silanus. Although admitting the guilt of the prisoners he argued against their execution as impolitic. To put them to death illegally would not only excite popular sympathy but would establish a dangerous precedent. He therefore proposed that they be confined in the municipal towns, that their property be confiscated and that a revival of their case be forbidden.² That these proposals offered a questionable solution of the difficulty may be admitted. To confiscate the goods of bankrupts meant little. The right of the Senate to imprison citizens was as questionable as its right to put them to death, and to imprison them in the Italian towns was to impose an unprecedented hardship on the

1. Sallust, 50; Appian Bk. II, C. 1, Par. 5.

2. "sed ita censes, publicandas eorum pecunias, ipsos in vinculis habendos per municipia, quae maxime opibus valent, neu quis de eis postea ad senatum referat neve cum populo agat: qui aliter fecerit, senatum existumare eum contra rem publicam et salutem omnium facturum." Sallust, 51; see also Cicero, "IV in Cat.", 4. Plutarch and Appian appear to have confused Caesar's motion with that of Nero, Dio and Suetonius give it in the same form as Sallust.

municipia. As for prohibiting a revival of their case, that was an impossibility. However to argue that Caesar was an accomplice of Catiline because he advocated these propositions seems extreme. It seems likely that the conspiracy did not appear to him in the exaggerated form which it did to Cicero. Here was another means of annoying his opponents the Optimates and if the conspirators were kept as prisoners they might afford means for future democratic agitation.^{1.}

Here then were two propositions for the wavering Senate to decide between and for the moment many senators embraced Caesar's motion as a means of escape from an unconstitutional act. Even Q. Cicero and the friends of the consul supported this proposition as the safest one for Cicero.^{2.} Even Silanus modified his motion and acceded to the opinion of Nero.^{3.} But Catulus, the princeps senatus, the chief of the extreme aristocrats was the first to revive the idea of inflicting the extreme penalty, and he was followed by Cato who delivered a speech in favor of the first motion.^{4.} The tenor of his harangue was that the execution of the prisoners was necessary to intimidate the elements of disorder and maintain the government. He reproached Silanus for having changed his opinion and accused

1. Heitland, III; 104-5

2. Plutarch, "Cicero", 21. Yet not all of them apparently for Sextus Peducaeus, who seems to have been a praetorian and would so speak after Caesar replied to Cicero's question with a quotation from Homer. (Il.XXII,304) which, though vague, meant that he favored execution. Cicero, "ad Att.", X, 1.

3. Sallust, 50; Suetonius, "Julius", 14.

4. Plutarch, "Cicero", 21.

Caesar of participation in Catiline's designs, saying that he might think himself fortunate that he was not on trial along with Lentulus.^{1.} This speech decided the Senate. The consulares the bulwarks of the aristocracy vigorously applauded Cato and a majority of the others followed their example. Cicero had also spoken during the course of the debate, painting in vivid colors his usual picture of fire, rapine and murder. He tactfully reminds the Senate of the crowd of his supporters and the armed guard which surrounded the place of meeting.^{2.} Indeed the leading Optimates had probably determined that the conspirators should be put to death in order to terrorize any other malcontents, and they would have put the measure through the Senate easily except for the opposition of Caesar which gave the waverers an alternative.

In accordance with Cato's motion the Senate proceeded to draw up a decree and condemned the prisoners, but Caesar continued his obstructionist tactics. He objected to the confiscation of the property of the conspirators and appealed to the tribunes to support him. Other senators endeavored to persuade him to yield but without success.^{3.} Catulus and Piso tried to persuade Cicero to have Caesar accused, either by the Allobroges or by other witnesses and

1. Ibid, "Cato Minor", Sallust, 53.

2. Cicero, "IV in Cat.", 7; Appian, Bk II, C. 1, Par. 6.

3. Plutarch, "Cicero", 21.

when the consul refused they spread the report that they had heard things against him from Vulturcius and the Gauls.^{1.}

Caesar, however, continued in his opposition and finally succeeded in having the proposed confiscation withdrawn.^{2.}

However the rumors of his enemies and his action in the Senate had aroused the resentment of Cicero's guard of Equites, and when he came out of the Senate house they rushed upon him with drawn swords. A word from Cicero

would have cost Caesar his life but he refused to give his

assent to such an act, φοβηθεὶς τὸν δῆμον ἢ τὸν πόρον ὅπως ἄδικον καὶ παράνομον ἵσχυμένους. ---

Cicero was afterwards upbraided for neglecting such an opportunity to get rid of a dangerous opponent.^{3.}

As soon as the decree was passed preparations were begun to carry it into execution. Cicero and the praetors personally conducted the condemned from the houses where they were confined to the prison. Here they were let down one by one into the Tullian dungeon and strangled. Cicero waited outside until they were dead and then announced to the crowd, "Vixerant". This termination of the conspiracy aroused great popular enthusiasm, Cicero was hailed as the saviour of the republic and was conducted in triumph to his home by the populace and the chief men of the state.^{4.} That

1. Sallust, 49.

2. Plutarch, "Cicero", 21.

3. Plutarch, "Caesar", 8; Sallust, 49; Suetonius, "Julius", 14.

4. Sallust, 55; Plutarch, "Cicero", 22.

he crushed the conspiracy is perfectly true and he probably saved the city from a serious disorder, but whether the state was in danger or not we cannot be so certain. Cicero is entitled to all credit for fighting against a force of malcontents which he supposed to be vastly stronger than it was. But the ease with which he suppressed a common conspiracy of a few mediocre plotters never seemed to show him that he had exaggerated the danger to the proportion of his fears.

Perhaps the most mooted question connected with the Catilinarian episode is whether or not Caesar was an accomplice of the conspirators. Cicero was certainly suspicious of his ambition and all of the Optimates hated and feared him as a dangerous rival who had more than once attacked their monopoly of the government. As an avowed representative of the democracy he represented to the aristocracy an ever growing menace. The only direct accusations against Caesar came from Catulus and Piso^{2.} who were not only the leaders of the extreme Optimates but were also personal enemies of Caesar. One had been defeated in the election for Pontifex Maximus by this disreputable spendthrift after the added humiliation of an unsuccessful attempt to bribe him. The other had been prosecuted by Caesar for unjustly

1. Plutarch, "Cicero", 21.

2. The statements of Cato against Caesar were only suspicious and were made in the heat of a debate partly with the purpose, no doubt, of discrediting the latter's proposals.

executing a Transpadane Gaul. To the Optimates the conspiracy and Caesar's opposition to the death penalty seemed to offer an opportunity for getting rid of him. Sallust has been accused of shielding Caesar when he implies that the accusations of Catulus and Piso were mere political moves without basis of fact and it is quite possible. Still none of the other ancient writers speak of anything more than a suspicion and Sallust tells us that Caesar's two enemies took pains to circulate rumors against Caesar, and that these stories enflamed the men of Cicero's body-guard against him. The general indication of party feeling is that Cicero was urged by the aristocrats to take this opportunity to get rid of an enemy, and was blamed for failing to avail himself of the chance.¹ Whether Cicero was convinced of Caesar's guilt or innocence is hard to say. The accusations which he makes in his memoirs after the death of Caesar must be discounted to a large extent when we consider the events which had taken place, and recall the tendency of a suspicion to be regarded as a fact when its principle had been confirmed. However the motive which restrained Cicero was not conviction but fear of the demagogue's influence, his connections and his popularity.³

Indeed when Caesar a few days after the execution stood up

1. Plutarch, "Caesar", 8.

2. Ibid "Crassus", 13; Cicero seems to be making an allusion to Caesar's complicity in his letter "ad Att.", X, 8.8, but it is the only one which appears in a long correspondence in which Caesar is one of the main topics.

3. Plutarch, "Cicero", 21.

in the Senate to clear himself he was received with loud reproaches from the senators but the clamor of the populace in his behalf prevented any action against him.^{1.} As for the accusations against Caesar which Suetonius mentions I regard them as attempts which his enemies made against him after failing to persuade Cicero to attack him. The best we can say^{is} that Caesar was suspected by his political opponents and private foes, but that they were afraid to arraign him on a charge of conspiracy.^{3.} It does not seem likely that Cicero knew any more than the rest but that he also concurred in the suspicions of the Optimates.

As for Crassus the case is clearer inasmuch as the suspicion against him was based principally on the incident of Traquinius which we have already concluded was a pre-arranged bit of theatricals and which was regarded as false even at the time. Crassus himself blamed Cicero for the fact that his name was connected with the conspiracy even momentarily.^{4.} His reputation, none too good at the best, suffered by the incident and his political prestige fell so that for a time he seriously intended leaving Rome. However, no one seems to have thought of raising the question of his complicity with Catiline, although there may have been a feeling that he knew more about it than he

1. Ibid, "Caesar", 8.
2. Suetonius "Julius", 17. See page 94
3. Appian Bk II, C. 1, Par. 6.
4. Sallust, 48.

should. Crassus, although not popular, was too powerful a man and too many of the senators were under financial obligations to him to make it politic to attack him.^{1.} Furthermore,^a temporary entente seems to have been formed between Crassus and the Optimates during the year 63 so that there was none of that bitter hostility which was felt towards Caesar.^{2.}

When we consider the probability of their connection it simmers down to a possible cognizance that Catiline was planning a coup d'etat. They might be very well satisfied to let such a disturbance come to a head in order to annoy the oligarchy. They were both opportunists who might easily feel that while risking nothing they were in a position to profit by what might happen. It has been argued that they were desirous of having a democratic consul. This may be so, but having failed once with Catiline it seems more likely that they would put forward some less objectionable candidate. Furthermore I am of the opinion that after Caesar became supreme Pontiff, the possession of the consulship was no longer so all important. With Catiline, however, election to office was a question of prosperity or ruin, hence his desperation which gave rise to the conspiracy. To argue that Caesar would favor

1. Sallust, 48.

2. See also Dio, 37. 35 and Plutarch, "Crassus", 13; the latter says that Cicero in ^{his} oration accused both Caesar and Crassus of being Catilinarians but that it was not published until they were both dead. An accusation of one's enemies in a rhetorical composition, published twenty years after the event, is worth how much? Why should we credit Cicero with knowing anything more about it than Catulus or Piso? As far as his speeches show the only two events of which he had definite knowledge through his spies were the meeting at Laeca's and ~~of~~ the affair with the Allobroges.

Catiline for the sake of escaping the payment of his debts is to accuse him of an ungrateful attitude towards Crassus, his principal creditor which the character of the man as shown in his subsequent career does not warrant. Although we may hesitate to consider matters of sentiment of much historical bearing we certainly must credit Caesar with a normal sense of honor. Furthermore he had enough foresight and belief in himself to feel that an existing political alliance with Crassus, a man of wealth and influence, was vastly preferable to one with a desperate profligate. Similarly we can hardly imagine the Millionaire and money-lender to all Rome backing a candidate, the chief plank in whose platform was abolition of debts. The activities of the conspirators themselves seems to indicate great independence of action even among the ringleaders, while the whole scheme, highly colored as we see it, seems to be the creation of small-minded desperadoes rather than the plan of experienced politicians.

In considering the revolt in Etruria we have to do with a movement of an entirely different character. While the conspiracy at Rome merely indicates a diseased state of society the insurrection in Etruria represents economic and social discontent. Catiline had allied himself with

this in his attempt to be elected consul and when defeated had fallen back upon it as the back-bone of his proposed coup d'etat. Certain elements appear to have been eager for revolt, dispossessed Marians who had lost everything during the rule of Sulla had nothing more to lose and everything to gain. We have already seen how the debtor class flocked to Rome to support Catiline at the polls, and when they returned to their homes their sense of injury would only be intensified by the recollection of their defeat. It was with these poverty stricken Marians and Sul-
lan veterans burdened with debt that Mallius formed the
nucleus of his army.^{1.}

Other agents of Catiline were in other parts of Italy enlisting malcontents, but it was only in Etruria that any serious outbreak occurred. The majority of the Italians, while glad to be relieved of economic burdens by democratic legislation had too vivid a recollection of the civil war to be willing to join vigorously in a revolt and only the most desperate responded, but that those who did enlist were in earnest as long as there were any prospects of success is shown by the fact that there was not a single deserter in response to the decree of the Senate.^{2.} The character of the uprising is shown very plainly in the

1. Sallust, 28.
2. Ibid.

complaint which the insurgents laid before Q. Marcius Rex. Defense against the oppression of their usurious creditors and the inhumanity of the praetors who illegally imprisoned them for debt was the cause of the revolt. "at nos non imperium neque divitias petimus, quarum rerum causa bella atque certamina omnia inter mortalis sunt, sed libertatem, quam nemo bonus nisi cum anima simul amittit."^{1.} The reply of the proconsul was equivalent to a refusal and assured the continuance of a revolt which although a natural outcome of social conditions, was doomed to failure from the start because it lacked the backing of a large class of the Italians and because of the incompetence of its leaders.

We have already noted how the Senate took prompt action against the insurgents, sending two proconsuls into Etruria as soon as Mallius raised the standard of revolt. Emissaries were sent to other parts of Italy to suppress any disaffection which might appear and precautions were taken against a revolt of the slaves and gladiators. The prompt isolation of the rising in Etruria gave the Senate time to bring all the forces of government into action to crush the rebels. After the flight of Catiline a general levy was made and the consul Antonius put in a command of the newly recruited legions. Catiline made vigorous efforts

1. Sallust, 33.

to form an army out of the material which was available but he probably never had more than twelve thousand men at the very most and of these only one in four was properly armed. Although urged to do so he refused flatly to enlist slaves knowing that such a move would be sure to make the whole Roman people his enemy. The discovery of the plot and the arrest and execution of the conspirators at Rome was the death blow to the success of the revolt. Catiline's army melted away and only the hopelessly desperate who had nothing to lose but life remained to continue the struggle the termination of which was only a matter of time.

Catiline tried to escape into Gaul and rally to his standard the discontented Celtic tribes but he¹ was cut off by Q. Metellus Celer. Driven into the mountains he at last turned at bay near Pistoria in January 62. His plan was to bring on a battle with the army of Antonius, which had been pursuing him northward, in the hope that his one-time election colleague would be willing to allow himself to be beaten. The consul, however, turned the command over to Petreius one of his lieutenants on the plea of lameness and so refrained from fighting his former associate. Catiline's army which now numbered about three thousand men, prepared to stake everything on one desperate charge. The

1. Dio, 37, 39.

horses were sent away to prevent confusion by an early flight of the cavalry, and the most experienced ^{men} were placed in the front rank. Petreius, however, foreseeing the probability of such tactics made a vigorous counter attack with his praetorian guard which broke through Catiline's center and decided the battle. There were no survivors among the insurgents, it was a question of victory or death to them. Catiline and his lieutenants fell fighting and those of their followers who were not killed in the battle committed suicide rather than fall into the hands of the legionaries. Catiline's head was cut off and sent to Rome to show that the arch conspirator was really dead.¹ Although there were a few scattered disturbances in the Gauls, in Picenum, Bruttium and Apulia they were none of them formidable and the local magistrates were able to suppress them.² They only go to show that social and economic discontent was prevalent throughout Italy only waiting for a chance to agitate, but needing a competent organizer to succeed.

Meanwhile in Rome, Caesar undaunted by the attempts of the aristocrats to brand him with a charge of treason, and secure in his own popularity, had renewed his attacks upon the oligarchy. The execution of the conspirators laid

1. Sallust, 56-61; Dio, 37. 39-40.

2. Sallust, 62; Dio, 37. 41; Plutarch "Cicero", 10.

Cicero open to attack and his enemies immediately availed themselves of the opportunity. On the last day of the year the tribune Q. Caecilius Metellus Nepos,^{1.} backed by Caesar and aided by Bestia, himself a conspirator but inviolate by reason of ^{his} ~~his~~ tribuneship, forbade Cicero to deliver the customary address on quitting office and forcibly prevented his mounting the rostrum. Cicero felt the slight very keenly but contented himself with swearing that he had saved the republic, instead of the usual oath that he had maintained the laws. Popular sympathy seems to have been with Cicero and the whole people repeated the oath after him to indicate their assent. The alleged ground for this opposition was that Cicero had put citizens to death without trial.^{2.} There is also ground to believe that Metellus attacked Cicero in the Senate as being the cause of the war.^{3.} However Cicero was still the popular hero and the Democrats refrained from pushing their charge at this time. Instead Metellus Nepos brought forward a proposition to immediately recall Pompey "to protect the lives of citizens" supposedly from Catiline, who was still in the field, but really to act as a check on the Optimates. Caesar supported this proposal also, but the Senate vigorously opposed it. Scenes of violence resulted and Caesar and Metellus were

1. He was the brother of Metellus Celer who commanded one of the armies operating against Catiline. "ad Fam.", V, 2.
 2. Cicero, "ad Fam.", V: 2; Plutarch, "Cicero", 23
 3. Cicero writes, "nam in senatu Kal. Ian. sic cum eo (Metellus) de re publica disputavi."- "ad Fam.", V:2. We know that the conspiracy was to have been opened by an invective against Cicero by one of the tribunes, charging him with bringing on the war.

suspended from office by the Senate. The tribune fled to Pompey, but the popular demonstration in favor of Caesar caused the Senate to reinstate him. He seems then to have temporarily made his peace with the nobles by abandoning his proposal to call Catulus to account respecting the repairing of the Capitol and making Pompey curator.¹ The whole series of events goes to show that the oligarchy had failed to brand the Populares, and even Caesar sufficiently with the stigma of the conspiracy, as to effect their prestige or curb their active opposition.

The death of Catiline marked the end of the actual conspiracy but a series of supplementary investigations occurred at Rome in an attempt to implicate others in the plot.² The Optimates seem to have taken this occasion to renew their attack on Caesar which they had made the month before and tried to implicate him. L. Vettius, a professional informer, and Q. Curius, Cicero's spy who had now turned states' evidence, accused Caesar before the quaestor Novius Niger and in the Senate of being an accomplice. There is no statement of fact in this regard, but it seems most probable that these were instigated against Caesar by his political rivals, just as before they had tried to persuade Cicero to have him implicated by Vulturcius or the Gauls.

1. Suetonius, "Julius", 15-16; Plutarch, "Cicero", 14.
 2. Dio, 37, 36.

Neither of the witnesses are reliable, Curius being a bankrupt debauchee who was ready for any means to fill his pocket, while Vettius was already becoming suspected of bearing false witness against supposed conspirators.^{1.} The former told the Senate that his information concerning Caesar had come to him from Catiline, while the latter agreed to produce writings of Caesar to Catiline. Nothing, however, came of the charges, even Cicero bearing witness for Caesar and the aristocrats did not press the matter. They even abandoned their tools to Caesar's vengeance and he threw Vettius and Niger into prison, the latter because he had permitted a charge against a superior magistrate to be laid before him.^{2.}

One thing only remains; to sum up the results of Cicero's consulship. The great orator, himself, was the first to suffer from the deed on which he most prided himself. He thought that he had suppressed a great anarchical faction whereas he had only apprehended a treasonable clique. He regarded himself as the savior of the state and for a time he persuaded the people that he was, but their enthusiasm soon cooled and Cicero began to make himself obnoxious^{3.} by constantly dwelling on his great services to the republic. The leading men of affairs refused to accept him at his own

1. Dio, 37. 41.

2. Suetonius, "Julius", 17.

3. Dio, 37. 42; Plutarch, "Cicero", 24.

rating and he later complains of the jealousy and hostility which his fame had aroused.^{1.} Even the people recovered in time from the spell of the Catilinarian orations and by the end of 62 B. C. his "discoveries" seem to have become the subject of malignant chaff.^{2.}

The most important result of the year politically was the alliance which had been formed between the conservative party of the government and the financial classes.^{3.} This was the direct outcome of the activities of Catiline, for the nobility had joined the business interests in order to elect Cicero in 64, and the union thus formed had been cemented by the common danger of 63 when all the classes who desired the maintenance of the status quo united to oppose the socialistic schemes of Catiline and later to protect the city against his machinations. It was this too, which had weakened the Populares, who had been struggling for three years without getting anywhere. Caesar, however, had gained a permanent footing in the pontificate and could count on the popular support. Crassus was only temporarily under a cloud and the delay of the return of his rival from the East enabled him to revive his prestige. The three years struggle had only succeeded in stagnating business and leaving the political parties exhausted, supinely awaiting

1. Cicero, "ad Att.", I: 19; X:1; "ad Fam." V:7.
2. Cicero, "ad Att.". O:14; "Fam.", V:5.
3. Ibid "ad Q fr.", I, l. 1 and 9.

the triumphant home-coming of Pompey.

CHRONOLOGY OF THE CATILINARIAN CONSPIRACY.Year B.C.

- 70 Cn. Pompey, M. Licinius Crassus cos.
Overthrow of the Sullan constitution.
- 68 Catiline praetor at Rome
- 67 Propraetor in Africa
Gabinian law gives Pompey command against the pirates.
- 66 M. Aemilius Lepidus, L. Volcatius Tullus, cos.
Manilian law gives Pompey command against Mithradates.
Autronius and Sulla elected consuls, but condemned for bribery and disqualified.
Catiline barred from the special consular election.
Formation of the "First Conspiracy."
Dec. 31 riot at the trial of Manilius.
- 65 L. Aurelius Cotta, L. Manlius Torquatus cos.
Jan. 1, plot to murder the consuls thwarted.
Feb. 2, second failure of the conspiracy.
Piso sent to Spain where he is assassinated.
Censorship of Crassus and Catulus.
Failure of the proposal to enfranchise the Transpadanes.
Failure of the Egyptian scheme.
Catiline tried for extortion and acquitted.
- 64 L. Julius Caesar, C. Marcius Figulus cos.
The Sullan executioners brought to trial.
July, Catiline defeated for the consulship; Cicero and Antonius elected.
Catiline indicted by Luceius for his part in the Sullan proscription -- acquitted.
- 63 M. Tullius Cicero, C. Antonius Hybrida cos.
Agrarian law of Servilius Rullus.
Cicero trades provinces with Antonius.
Trial of C. Rabirius.
Caesar elected Pontifex Maximus.
July- Sulpicius inaugurates stringent election law.
Catiline advances radical program. This causes Cicero on the day before the Comitia to propose a postponement of the election. The next day he "bluffs" Catiline who declares his intention to lead the people. At the election a few days later, Catiline is again defeated.

Three months of preparation on Catiline's part, watchfulness on Cicero's. Formation of the conspiracy.

Oct. 20, Crassus and his warning letters.

Oct. 21, Senate passess the "last decree".

Oct. 27, open revolt of Mallius

Oct. 28, Cicero thwarts Catiline's coup d'etat in the city.

In the last of Oct. the Senate hears of the revolt in Etruria despatches troops, offers rewards for information.

Catiline indicted on charge of "vis".

Nov. 6-7 (night) meeting of the conspirators at Laeca's.

Nov. 7, attempted murder of Cicero.

Nov. 8, "Oratio I in Catilinam", flight of Catiline.

Nov. 9, "Oratio II in Catilinam"; a few days later it is learned that Catiline has joined Mallius. They are both outlawed. Antonius sent against them with an army. Sometime during this month Murena is tried for bribery and acquitted, ("Oratio pro Murena".)

The conspirators tamper with the Allobroges who reveal the plot to Cicero.

Dec. 2-3 (night)- arrest of the Allobroges.

Dec. 3- arrest of the conspirators-- examination of the Allobroges by the Senate. "Oratio III in Catilinam" to the people.

Dec. 4,- incident of Tarquinius in the Senate.- rumors of intended rescue of the conspirators.

Dec. 5,- debate in the Senate on the fate of the conspirators, "Oratio IV in Catilinam". Attempt to implicate Caesar. Execution of the conspirators.

62. D. Junius Silanus, L. Licinius Murena cos.

Jan. Caesar and the tribunes continue to annoy the government.

Battle of Pistoria, death of Catiline.

Supplementary investigations- ("Oratio pro Sulla".) second attack on Caesar.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.Ancient Authorities.

- Appian of Alexandria
 "Roman History", 2 vols; Vol. I, "Foreign Wars";
 Vol. II, "Civil Wars": trans. by Horace White.
 N. Y. 1899. Bohn's Classical Library.
- Asconius.
 "Q. Asconii Pediani, Orationum Ciceronis quinque
 enarratio", rec. A. C. Clark Oxford, 1907
 Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca
 Oxoniensis.
- Cicero, Marcus Tullius.
 "Scripta quae manserunt omnia"; rec. C.F.W. Mueller
 ed. 4 pt in 10 vols. Lipsiae, 1893-1904.
 Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teub-
 neriana.
 "Correspondence, arranged according to its chrono-
 logical order, with a revision of the text, a
 commentary, and introductory essays", by
 R. Y. Tyrrell and L. C. Purser. 6 vols.
 Dublin, 1879-1901.
 Dublin University Press Series.
 "Letters; the whole extant correspondence in
 chronological order"; trans. by E. S. Shuck-
 burgh. 4 vols. London, 1899-1904.
 Bohn's Classical Library.
 "Orationes"; with commentary by Geo. Long.
 4 vols. London 1855-1862.
 Bibliotheca Classica.
- Cicero, Quintus Tullius.
 "De Petitione Consulatus":- "Cicero's Letters",
 trans. by E. S. Shuckburgh, Vol. I App. A q. v.
- Dio Cassius Cocceianus.
 "Historiarum Romanarum quae supersunt. Graeca ex
 codicibus mss. aliisque subsidiis supplevit et
 emendavit, Xiphilini Epitomen librorum Dionis
 Casii aequae emendatam addidit, Latina versis ut
 Graecis verbis magis responderet operam dedit,
 fragmenta et indicem Graecum valde auxit, anno-

tationes ex editione Reimariana omnes repetiit multasque tam Joh. Jac. Reiskii et aliorum quam suas notas adiecit Fridericus Guilielmus Sturzius." 9 vols. in 8 Lipsiae, 1824-1825.

"Dio's Rome; an historical narrative originally composed in Greek during the reigns of Septimius Severus, Geta and Caracalla, Macrinus, Elagabalus and Alexander Severus;" and now presented in English form by Herbert Baldwin Foster.
6 vols. Troy, N. Y. 1905-1906.

Plutarch.

"Vitae parallelae"; rec. C. Sintenis.
5 vols. Lipsiae, 1889-1902.

Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana
"Lives"; trans by A. Stewart, and Geo. Long.
4 vols. London, 1906 Bohn's Classical Library.

Sallustius Crispus, C.

"C. Sallustii Crispi Bellum Catilinae"; A.M. Cook ed.
London, 1888.

"Sallust, Florus and Velleius Paterculus"; literally trans. by John S. Watson. London, 1902.
Bohn's Classical Library.

Suetonius Tranquillus, C.

"The Lives of the Twelve Caesars"; trans. by Alexander Thomson, rev. by T. Forester.
London, 1906.

Bohn's Classical Library.

Modern Works.

Boissier, Gaston.

"Cicero and his friends, a study in Roman society in the time of Caesar." trans. by A. D. Jones.
Second ed. N. Y. 1903.

"La conjuration de Catilina" Second ed. Paris, 1908.

Durny, Victor.

"History of Rome and the Roman People."
6 vols. in 12. London 1884.

- Ferrero, ^G Guglielmo.
 "The Greatness and Decline of Rome". trans by
 A. E. Zimmern. 5 vols. N.Y., 1907-1909.
- Forsyth, William.
 "Life of Marcus Tullius Cicero."
 Third ed. London, 1869
- Fowler, William Warde.
 "Julius Caesar and the foundation of the Roman
 imperial system." London, 1895.
 Heroes of the Nation's series; ed. E. Abbott.
- Heitland, William Emerton.
 "The Roman Republic."
 3 vols. Cambridge, 1909.
- Long, George.
 "The Decline of the Roman Republic."
 5 vols. London, 1864-1874.
- Merivale, Charles.
 "History of the Romans under the Empire."
 New ed. 8 vols. London, 1875.
- Mommsen, Christian Matthias Theodor.
 "History of Rome", trans by Dickson from the fourth
 German ed. 4 vols. N.Y., 1871.
- Nutting, H. C.
 "The Conspiracy at Rome in 66-65 B. C."
 Berkeley, 1910.
 University of California Publications in
 Classical Philology Vol. II.
- Oman, Charles W. C.
 "Seven Roman Statesmen; The Gracchi, Sulla, Crassus,
 Cato, Pompey, Caesar." London 1902.
- Pauly, August Freidrich von.
 "Pauly's real-encyclopädie der classischen altertums-
 wissenschaft;" neue bearbeitung unter mitwirkung
 zahlreicher fachgenossen hrsg. von G. Wissowa.
 6 vols. Stuttgart, 1894-1909.

Sihler, E. G.

"The annals of Caesar."
N. Y. 1911.

Smith, William.

"Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and
Mythology."
3 vols. London, 1869-1870.

Strachen-Davidson, James L.

"Cicero and the fall of the Roman Republic."
N. Y. 1894.

Heroes of the Nations series, ed. E. Abbott.