

# Discontents at Rome: 63 B.C.

*Class Struggle and Social Praxis  
in Republican Rome*

By E. H. Campbell

Second Edition

© E. H. Campbell 2006, 2007

**Inopibus Press: Seattle**

[inopibus@gmail.com](mailto:inopibus@gmail.com)

*To Dr. Paul Dixon*

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

*Aeneid* 8.666-670.

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

*Panegyricus 7-10*

## Chronology

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

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

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

# Contents

- I. Prologue
- II. Narrative
  - i. First Conspiracy, Jan. 1st – Feb. 5th, 66.
  - ii. First meeting at the home of Procius Laeca, June 1, 64.
  - iii. Election of Consuls Silanus and Murena. Second Conspiracy, July 63.
  - iv. Crassus gave anonymous letters to Cicero at his home, Oct. 18.
  - v. Cicero informs the Senate.
  - vi. Senate begins their first investigation into Catiline’s activities, Oct. 19.
  - vii. *Senatus consultum ultimum*.
  - viii. Cicero ascends as Dictator.
  - ix. Antonius becomes Master of the Horse, Oct. 20.
  - x. Manlius takes to the field, Oct. 27.
  - xi. Senate informed about the activities of Manlius, Nov. 1.
  - xii. Second meeting at Laeca’s house, Nov. 6.
  - xiii. *Argumentum ad baculum* against Cicero, Nov. 7.
  - xiv. Cicero’s *First Invective, argumentum ad hominem*, Nov. 8.
  - xv. Cicero’s *Second Invective, argumentum ad populum*, Nov. 9.
  - xvi. Catiline and Manlius declared *hostes rei publicae*, Nov. 17.
  - xvii. Arrest of the conspirators at the Mulvian Bridge, Dec. 2.
  - xviii. Cicero’s *Third Invective, argumentum ad populum*, Dec. 3.
  - xix. Cicero’s *Fourth Invective, argumentum ad senatum*.
  - xx. Execution of the conspirators, Dec. 5.
  - xxi. *Argumentum ad baculum* against Catiline at Pistoria, Jan. 62.
- III. Argument
- IV. Conclusion
- V. Metalogue
- VI. Works Cited

## I. Prologue

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

Διαβολὴ γὰρ ἐστὶ δεινότατον: ἐν τῇ δύο μὲν εἰσὶ οἱ ἀδικέοντες, εἰς δὲ οὐκ ἀδικεόμενος. ὁ μὲν γὰρ διαβάλλων ἀδικεῖ οὐ παρόντι κατηγορέων, ὁ δὲ ἀδικεῖ ἀναπειθόμενος πρὶν ἢ ἀτρεκέως ἐκμάθη: ὁ δὲ δὴ ἀπεὸν τοῦ λόγου τάδε ἐναυτοῖσι ἀδικεῖται, διαβληθεὶς τε ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐτέρου καὶ νομισθεὶς πρὸς τοῦ ἐτέρου κακὸς εἶναι.

Calumny is most terrible, for by her two men do wrong, and one man suffers wrong. For, on the one hand, the slanderer does wrong attacking a man not present, and, on the other hand, wrongs the one being convinced before really examining closely. Now then, the one being away suffers wrong from the these



same two; from the one for slandering and the other one for holding him to be bad. (The History 7.10G.2)

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

The history of the *Bellum Catilinae* has been handed down by two of Catiline's bitterest enemies, Cicero and Sallust, who had a mutual dislike for each other; and although they hated one another, they were united in hating Catiline. The history of Catiline's conspiracy, and his *putsch* against the Roman republic, was transmitted to us, more or less, authentically from the classical authors to the Renaissance humanists. The authentic transmission ended, however, with Voltaire's dramatic piece *Rome Sauvée* (1754). Ibsen's dramatization of the event, *Catiline* (1850), marked a new beginning. Once the historical persona Catiline was removed from what was considered the pinnacle of classical historical scholarship, and transmitted into the dramatic arts, the history of the event itself began to change until the historical persona, Catiline, had undergone a complete historical revision, from villain to hero.

Aleksandr Blok's opinion of Catiline is the first ostensibly dialectical and historical materialist interpretation of the Catilinarian conspiracy. Blok's commentary is an important one and cannot be ignored. Aside from being a gifted poet, he was also a classicist who could read Latin, and was generally aware of contemporary philological trends in the classics, especially in relation to the Catiline affair. It is clear that he has pondered this matter very deeply. As he put it, "Scholars of the new era think that the life of Catiline has yet to receive a just evaluation. We shall examine whether or not they are correct." (*World Revolution* 293) I will examine whether or not Blok's treatment is itself adequate.

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

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

Eighty-two years after Blok's *Catiline*, Judith E. Kalb, in her commentary on Blok's commentary, *A Roman Bolshevik* (2000), seems to complete a historical revision of the Catilinarian conspiracy which began with Ibsen; a marked departure from Ben Jonson's interpretation dramatic piece *Catiline: His Conspiracy* (1611).

Ibsen's work departed not only from all his predecessors, and historical authorities before him, but even from his own principal mentor from afar, Voltaire. Voltaire's *Rome Sauvée* followed the historical tradition and presented Catiline as a villain. Voltaire himself opposed tyranny, but Ibsen, in his apologetic for Catiline, actually supported a would-be tyrant, Catiline. Ironically as well, Voltaire, as opposed to Ibsen, not only loved Cicero, but had reportedly produced the play *Rome Sauvée*: "To make Cicero known to the young people who attend the spectacles." He would even play the role of Cicero when the drama was presented in Paris in 1750 where he reportedly exclaimed during a moment of inspired acting:

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

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

For Ibsen, who hated Cicero, Catiline would appeal to him, but not because of his propensity for revolutionary violence, but because Ibsen had suffered a social decline

resembled Catiline's, from riches to rags. Ben Jonson's play preserved the traditional legend of Catiline and transmitted it to us in the post-reformation Elizabethan English vernacular, during the wars of religion. Jonson's study of Catiline comes at a critical time between the Renaissance and the Enlightenment. His work has been praised both its adherence to the texts of Sallust and Cicero and for his many allusions to other classical Roman authors, particularly Seneca Minor, but also for his knowledge and skill as a Latin grammarian and translator of Roman classics. Jonson too contemplated the whole affair. But it was with Ibsen's work that the historical persona of Catiline was transformed from an archetypal villain into a hero for the modern bourgeoisie. Blok seized upon this shift and tried to transform Catiline into a symbol of revolutionary violence, and failed. Indeed it appears that Blok's *Catiline* was intended to be smear on Lenin's reputation and after Blok's interpretation it appears that a *bone fide* movement of historical revision was undertaken which has attempted to rehabilitate the historical persona Catiline within the western cannon, with tragic results.

*Quis male deorum Tantalos visas domos ostendit iterum?*

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

(*Thyestes* 1.3-4)

Henrik Ibsen's interpretation of Catiline was the decisive turning point in the history of the event for it is here that a diametrical change in the interpretation is to be found. It is with Judith Kalb's interpretation; however, what is quintessentially bad and good, according to all classical authorities, is transposed, *good* becomes *bad* and *bad* becomes *good*.

Ξυνον δε μοι εστιν 'οπποθεν αρξωμαι' τοθι γαρ παλιν 'ιξομαι αυθις.

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

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

My history is a history of the process of the historical revision of the *Bellum Catilinae*, a defense of Sallust's history, and a vindication of classical scholarship. Because by Hegel's methodological schemata my history is neither an *original history*, because I do not discuss deeds which were held before my own eyes in a time when I shared the same spirit of the principle actors, nor is it *reflective history* because my history only treats a single *episode* of a great history and does not apply a forensic methodology to the *criticism* of the sources for this episode in history, it is the *thoughtful consideration of this episode* in history because it considers the *meaning* of the events, and the meaning of the implicit change in the interpretation of those events, with the aim that people learn from this history and act according to it. Thus it is in general a *philosophical history*, μετα λογου<sup>1</sup>, of the *Bellum Catilinae*, but it is in its particular aspect *ethical philosophy* derived from historical examples. Thus this document understood in so far as it tells of history it relates the *perfective*, yet in terms of the ethics derived therefrom it transmits the *progressive*. "Spirit is indeed never at rest but always engaged in moving forward." (*Phenomenology of Spirit* 11)

---

<sup>1</sup> A rational account.

In other words, its *being*, *ον*, *ens*, has *dual aspect*.<sup>2</sup> It is both critical and exegetical. My methodology is that of both *forensic* rhetoric, for it both defends and accuses individuals for past acts; and *deliberative* rhetoric, for it is concerned with what is honorable and thus both exhorts and dissuades future actions; and it is *epideictic* because concerns itself with both vice and virtue and lays both praise and blame on my contemporaries.

[5] Ὅταν δὲ τὸ τῆς ἱστορίας ἠθος ἀναλαμβάνη τις, ἐπιλαθέσθαι χρὴ πάντων τῶν τοιούτων καὶ πολλάκις μὲν εὐλογεῖν καὶ κοσμεῖν τοὺς μεγίστους ἐπαίνοις τοὺς ἐχθρούς, ὅταν αἰ πράξεις ἀπαιτῶσι τοῦτο, πολλάκις δ' ἐλέγχειν καὶ ψέγειν ἐπονειδίστως τοὺς ἀναγκαιοτάτους, ὅταν αἰ τῶν ἐπιτηδευμάτων ἀμαρτίαι τοῦ θύποδεικνύωσιν. [6] Ὡσπερ γὰρ ζώοντων ὄψων ἀφαιρεθῆσιν ἀχρειοῦται τὸ ὅλον, οὕτως ἐξ ἱστορίας ἀναιρεθείσης τῆς ἀληθείας τὸ καταλειπόμενον αὐτῆς ἀνωφελὲς γίνεται διήγημα. [7] Διόπερ οὐτέ τῶν φίλων κατηγορεῖν οὐτέ τοὺς ἐχθρούς ἐπαινεῖν ὀκνητέον, οὐτέ δὲ τοὺς αὐτοὺς ψέγειν, ποτὲ δ' ἐγκωμιάζειν εὐλαβητέον, ἐπειδὴ τοὺς ἐν πράγμασιν ἀναστρεφομένους οὐτ' εὐστοχεῖν αἰεὶ δυνατόν οὐθ' ἀμαρτάνειν συνεχῶς εἰκόσ. [8] Ἀποστάντας οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλο πρᾶττόντων αὐτοὺς τοὺς πρᾶττομένους

---

<sup>2</sup> “Dual” refers specifically to “things that come in pairs.” For instance, eyes, legs, feet hands, etc. “Aspect” refers to verbal action being either past completed, that is Aorist in Greek, or Perfective in Latin, or to one of the progressive tenses, that is, Present, Imperfect, or Future. Although a written document is generally designated as a Noun, the study of the document give the document a progressive being, i.e. it is an action in the mind of the reader, but also carries through the values of the past into the presents and breathes new life, as it were, into old ideas. This is another way of saying that the ethics of Western Civilization has been, and is, a progressive development, not a static sort of thing as is a *moral substantiv*.

ε φαρμοστέον τὰς πρεπούσας α ποφάσεις καὶ διαλήψεις ε ν τοι ς  
υ πομνήμασιν. [9] ω ς δ' ε 'στιν α ληθη τὰ νυ νυ φ'

[5] Whenever anyone assumes<sup>3</sup> the moral character of History,<sup>4</sup> it is necessary, on the one hand, to have forgotten everything such as this,<sup>5</sup> and often, on the other hand, necessary to speak well of, and honor with the greatest commendations, the enemy; while at the same time you shall pass over they who demand this very thing, many times, moreover, to shame with reproach and censure with force, whenever a failure of their practices should make itself known. [6] For just as an animal which has had its eyesight taken away is rendered completely useless, in the same way, History itself, having been razed of truth, is left behind a useless thing and becomes a tale. [7] Therefore hesitate neither to speak against friends nor commend enemies, nor to blame them both,<sup>6</sup> but to praise at any time one must beware of turning things upside down, for it is neither possible to always hit the mark nor to miss the mark holding together a likeness of truth. [8] Standing aloof, at any rate, from the doers, one must adapt to be clearly seen speaking plainly and making determinations in the remembrances for the actions themselves, [9] so as they be true now by itself. (*The Histories of Polybius* 1.14.5-9)

It is rhetoric, but it is not imitative of any particular classical form of rhetoric.

Though it is conditioned by classical thought, it is rhetoric which shares in the spirit of

<sup>3</sup> Gr. α ναλαμβάνη pres. Subj. act. of α ναλαμβάνω, to take up, take into one's hands, to take upon one's self, assume, undertake, engage in. (*Liddell and Scott*)

<sup>4</sup> Gr. ι στορία, inquiry, to learn by inquiry, and knowledge so obtained. (*Liddell and Scott*) Thus, as it were, 'whoever assumes the morals necessary to learn by inquiry.'

<sup>5</sup> I.e. To love his friends and his country and share their enemies. *Op. cit.* (1.14.4).

<sup>6</sup> τοὺς αὐ τοὺς = 'the same men,' i.e. them both.

these times. And though it is presented in a written form, it is, because of this, also oratory.

Ἡ ρητορικὴ ἐστὶν ἀντίστροφος τῆς διαλεκτικῆς : ἀμφοτέραι γὰρ περὶ τοιούτων τινῶν εἰσὶν ἀκοινὰ τρόπων τινῶν ἀπάντων ἐστὶ γνωρίζειν καὶ οὐδεμίαν ἐπιστήμης ἀφορισμένης.

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

The textual criticism is presented here is a form of narrative *intertextus*, *πεπλεγμένοι*; the interweaving of the many extant narrative threads showing as many parallels as possible while at the same time noting as many departures as I find. I also suppose that readers will involve themselves in the study of these texts and will at the very least familiarize themselves with Sallust's narrative. All foreign words and block quoted passages in Latin and Greek have been translated by myself. **NB: Text highlighted in red and in quotation marks are translations from the authors in the Works Cited. They have been included here because I have planned to translate those passages, but have not as yet found the time.**

The *Chronicles of Jerome* records the life of C. Sallustius Crispus between 87 B.C. and 36 B.C. The textual critic J. T. Ramsey ascribes to these dates. The textual critic P. McGushin said, on the other hand, "There is no absolute certainty about the standard dates, since Jerome can be convicted of carelessness and inaccuracy in other particulars of literary history." (McGushin 1) Thus by McGushin's dates, Gaius Sallustius Crispus was born in 85 B.C. at Amiternum and died in 35 B.C. McGushin

contradicts Ramsey. While Ramsey relied on R. Helm's codex of Jerome's *Chronicle*, McGushin relied on MS (O).

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

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

Vis-à-vis:

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

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

His family was of plebian origin and of the equestrian order. The *ordo equester* were those who had met a property qualification and served on horseback in the Roman army. They were not *senators* and were not members of the *ordo plebeius* either. Although they were not members of the patrician ruling class *per se*, their class contained the *publicani*—tax collectors and financiers. After 70 B.C. they would share the function of the juries along with the *senators*. “A *publicanus* was a farmer-general of the revenues, usually from the equestrian order.” (Ramsey 108)

Although the etymology—*ετυμος*, ‘true’ or ‘real’ + *λογος* ‘word,’ ‘account,’ or ‘reason;’ thus the true account of the word, or reason for the word—plebeian, *plebius*, is unknown, the plebeians were an intermediary class also of noble origin which would later become a division of the ruling class as distinct from both the patricians, *patricus* from *pater* ‘father,’ and *servi*, ‘slaves.’ The nobles of Rome were *sprung from the soil*, i.e., of noble birth, *αυτόχθων*. This nobility *per se* is to be distinguished from men of noble



*deeds*, or men noble character, since men carry out deeds in accordance with their character. The noble *classes*, and therefore the so-called *nobility*, derived its *status*, class standing, from noble birth notwithstanding their actions.

ε ἵστι δὲ εὐ γενὲς μὲν κατὰ τὴν τοῦ γένους ἀρετήν, γενναίον δὲ κατὰ τὸ μὴ ἐξίστασθαι τῆς φύσεως: ὁ περὶ ὧς ἐπιτὸ πολὺ οὐ συμβαίνει τοῖς εὐγενέσιν, ἀλλ' εἰσὶν οἱ πολλοὶ εὐτελεῖς: φορὰ γὰρ τίς ἐστὶν ἐν τοῖς.

On the one hand, noble race<sup>7</sup> is concerned with a descent of excellent offspring, noble character, on the other hand, is concerned with a descent excellent character, that not being displaced from natural abilities. (*Rhetoric* 2.15.3)

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

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

I sing of arms and a man, who first, exiled by Fate, came from the coast of Troy to Italy and the beaches of Lavinium—tossed about he was, many times on land

---

<sup>7</sup> “The difference between εὐγενής and γενναίος lies in this; that in the former the race or descent, γένος, is directly expressed as the prominent and leading idea; it indicates that the εὐγενής comes of a good breed, but says nothing of the individual character: in the latter it is the character, conformable to the excellence of the breed or race, that is put prominently forward.” (E. M. Cope, *Commentary on the Rhetoric of Aristotle*)

and sea by the will of the gods on account of Juno's unrelenting anger, suffering many things and a war until he founded a city and brought the gods to Latium—whence the Latin race, the Alban fathers, and the high walls of Rome. O Muse to me these things relate... (*Aeneid* 1.1)

The patricians were the descendants of the Italic kings of Latium, the Sabines, and the Trojan refugees who sailed to Italy after the sack of Troy and inter-married with them.

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

The city of Rome, as I have learned, was founded and initially held by Trojans, who, as exiles, were wandering about homeless and unsettled under the leadership of Aeneas, and along with them the Aborigines, a savage race of men, without laws, without government, free and unrestrained. How easily they united, with a disparate origin, a dissimilar language and one having a different way of life from

the other, after they came together within the same walls, is unheard of in all memory: thus, after a short while, the great differences were smoothed out and harmony and citizenship was built. But after that, their civic affairs, the mores, with expanding domains, enough prosperity and sufficient power appeared, just as most mortal things have, jealousy out of opulence arose. Consequently, neighboring kings and peoples assailed them with war, few friends were to be of help; for the remainder, struck by fear, were absent from dangers. (*Bellum Catilinae* 6.1)

Thus the *patricians* could be understood as the *sons of the founding fathers* while the plebeians made up the greater part of the commons. The plebeians were a burgeoning class which was distinct from the patricians, the *proletarii*, ‘proletariat’ and the slave class. Between the patricians and the plebeians there was a class of equestrians, to which both Cicero and Sallust belonged. This class was a noble class between the plebeians and the patricians carved out from those who had met a property qualification. The members of the proletariat were citizens of the lowest freeborn class and who served the State not with their property but with their children; the *proletary*, from the word *proles* meaning *that which grows forth*; especially of human beings, *offspring, progeny, child, descendant; and collectively, descendants, race, progeny, posterity*. (*Lewis and Short*) Among the lowest levels of Roman society there were the *libertinii* ‘libertines’ who were men who had won their freedom from servitude, by one means or another, but while making up a part of the proletariat, they were, nevertheless, distinct from the freeborn of the laboring class. Tacitus, in his *Annals*, briefly explained the early political developments of Rome from its foundation to the ascension of Augustus:

*Urbem Romam a principio reges habuere; libertatem et consulatum L. Brutus instituit. Dictaturae ad tempus sumebantur...non Cinnae, non Sullae longa dominatio; et Pompei Crassique potentia cito in Caesarem, Lepidi atque Antonii arma in Augustum cessere.*

From the beginning kings held the Roman city. Freedom and the consulship were established by Lucius Brutus. Dictatorships were held for a short period of time...Neither Cinna's nor Sulla's dominion was long; both the power of Pompey and Crassus quickly yielded to Caesar; and the arms of Lepidus and Antonius to Augustus. (1.1)

Lucius Brutus was the patrician revolutionary who is credited with running out the Etruscan kings in 509 B.C. and, thereby, establishing the Roman republic. Rome, until this time, had been ruled by the Etruscans, a foreign power. Unable to agree on who should rule, instead of appointing another king, or a tyrant, the ruling class decided to institute a political system similar to the Spartan regime by appointing two consuls, who ruled simultaneously, and thereby settled, at least for a time, how many should rule insofar as they agreed that it should not be one man alone, but should in fact be two men who simultaneously shared power and answered to a great body of noble men called the Senate.

*Imperium legitimum, nomen imperi regium habebant. Delecti, quibus corpus annis infirmum, ingenium sapientia validum erat, rei publicae consultabant; hi vel aetate vel curae similitudine patres appellabantur. Post, ubi regium imperium, quod initio conservandae libertatis atque augendae rei publicae fuerat, in superbiam dominationemque se convortit, inmutato more annua imperia*

*binosque imperatores sibi fecere: eo modo minime posse putabant per licentiam insolescere animum humanum.*

They had lawful sovereignty, in name it was commanded by kings [a monarchy]. Chosen men whose body was weakened by years, whose character was strengthened by wisdom, held council for the Republic; these, whether by age or by similar diligence, were called Fathers. Afterwards, when the monarchy, which had been initiated to preserve liberty and develop the Republic, haughtiness and supremacy converted it, they changed its manner and created two dictators who ruled for a year: by this small measure to be able to prune the growth of the human soul to insolence due to license. (*Bellum Catilinae* 6.6)

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

Οὐ καὶ γὰρ ὁ πολυκοιρανίη: εἷς κοίρανος ἔστω.

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

The Roman system of consulship was different from the Spartan system of dual kings, however, in that each consul had the right of *veto*, ‘I forbid, protest or reject,’ over the decisions of his co-consul and, in time of war, one consul would nominate the other to be *dictator*, ‘the one who gives orders,’ also known as the *magister populi et peditum* ‘master of the people and infantry,’ and the other consul became the *magister equitum* ‘master of the horse and cavalry’ and rendered aid to the *dictator*. From the speech of Catulus (67 B.C.) :

Λέγω δε τον δικτάτορα. Και τουτον μεντοι τοιτουτον ὄντα ὄυτε ἔπι πασί ποτε τοις πράγμασιν ὄι πατέρες ἡμων ὄυτε ἔπι πλείω χρόνον ἔξαμήνου κατεστήσαντο.

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

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

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

*Constat autem Romanos preatextam et trabeas phalerasque et annulos, togas quoque pictas et palmatas tunicas, currus insuper aureas triumpho decoros, fasces denique et lictores et tubas et sellam curulem ac cetera omnia regum*

*magistratuumque insignia ab Etruscis sumpsisse. Nam quod duodecim lictores apparebant regibus consulibusque romanis, id quoque inde sumptum traditur, quod cum ex duodecim populis Etrusci constarent, singulos singuli lictores regi dabant. Inde ab Romanis res accepta, nec numerus quidem imminutus est.*

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

*(History of the Florentine People 1.20)*

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

εἶστι δὲ τιμὴ τοῖς στρατηγοῖς τὸδε τὸ προσαγόρευμα παρὰ τοὺς στρατοῦς, καθάπερ αὐτοῖς ἐπιμαρτυρούντων ἀξίως σφωὺς αὐτοκράτορας εἶναι.

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

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

At the time of Sallust, the Roman state was developing a distinct slave class, a proletariat, a bourgeoisie, and an aristocracy. The office of the dictatorship had fallen into disuse after the *Third Punic War* (146 B.C.). The patricians corresponded to the aristocracy and played a revolutionary role under the leadership of Lucius Junius Brutus—the historical founder of the Roman republic (509), sharing this distinction with Publicola. The plebians would assume *their* revolutionary role under the leadership of Tiberius Gracchus Sempronius in what would become known as the *Gracchi Rebellion* (133 B.C.) It was to this legacy and the achievements of the plebians after the Gracchi, that Cicero owed his *status*. His political *essence* was an allegiance to the achievements of the Gracchi though of his contemporaries it was to Pompey the Great. Appian relates the whole development of the Republic from its foundation to its destruction.

[1] Ρωμαίοις ὁ δῆμος καὶ ἡ βουλὴ πολλάκις ἐς ἀλλήλους περὶ τῶν νόμων θέσεως καὶ χρεώσεων ἀποκοπήσιν ἡγεῖσθαι διαδατουμένης ἡ ἐν ἀρχαιρείαις ἐστασίασαν: οὐ μὲν τι χειρῶν ἐργὸν ἐμφυλον ἦν, ἀλλὰ διαφοραὶ μόναι καὶ ἐρίδες ἐνόμοι, καὶ τὰδε μετὰ πολλῶν αἰδούσων εἰκόντες ἀλλήλοις διετίθεντο.

The commons [Plebians] and the Senate for Rome often times rebelled against one another regarding concerning the enactment of laws, cancellation of debts, the dividing of lands amongst themselves, or the election of magistrates. But nothing, however, was worked out by force, but merely disagreements and quarrels within the law, and both of these were mutually settled among them, yielding much respect to one another. But once upon a time, the Demos, when doing military



service, falling into such a quarrel did not cut their way through declaring themselves by means of weapons,

‘Ο δὲ δὴ μὲν ποτε καὶ στρατευόμενος ἐς τοιάνδε ἐρίν ἐμπεσὼν οὐκ ἐχρήσατο τοῖς ὅπλοις παρούσιν, ἀλλ’ ἐς τὸ ὄρος ἐκδραμών, τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦ δεκλιζόμενον ἱερόν, οὐδὲν οὐδὲ τότε χειρῶν ἐργον, ἀλλ’ ἀρχὴν ἐαυτοῦ προστάτινα πέφηνε καὶ ἐκάλεσε δημαρχίαν ἐς κώλυσιν μάλιστα τῶν ὑπᾶτων ἀπὸ τῆς βουλῆς αἰρουμένων μὴ ἐντελὲς αὐτοῖς ἐπιτῆ πολιτεία τὸ κράτος εἶναι. ὅθεν δὴ καὶ μάλιστα δυσμενέστερον ἐτί καὶ φιλονεικότερον ἐς ἀλλήλας αἰαρχαὶ διετίθεντο ἀπὸ τοῦ δε, καὶ ἡ βουλή καὶ ὁ δήμος ἐς αὐτὰς ἐμερίζετο ὡς ἐνταῖς τῶνδε πλεονεξίαις ἐκάτεροι τῶν ἐτέρων ἐπικρατοῦντες. Μάρκιός τε ὁ Κοριολανὸς ἐνταῖς ἐρίσιν ἐξελαθεὶς παρὰ δίκην ἐς Ουλοούσκους ἐφυγέτε καὶ πόλεμον ἐπήγαγε τῆ πατρίδι.

[1] Once when the plebeians were going to a war they fell into such a controversy, but they did not use the weapons in their hands, but withdrew to the hill, which from this time on was called the Sacred Mount. Even then no violence was done, but they created a magistrate for their protection and called him the tribune of the plebs, to serve especially as a check upon the consuls, who were chosen by the Senate, so that the political power should not be exclusively in their hands. Whence arose still greater bitterness, and the magistrates were arrayed in stronger animosity to each other after this event, and the Senate and plebeians took sides with them, each believing that it would prevail over the other by

augmenting the power of its own magistrates. In the midst of contests of this kind Marcius Coriolanus, having been banished contrary to justice, took refuge with the Volsci and levied war against his country.

[2] Καὶ τοῦ το μόνον ἀντί τῶν ἐπιπέδων τῶν πάλαι στάσεων ἐργον ἐνόπλιον, καὶ τοῦ θύραυτομόλου γενόμενον, ξίφος δὲ οὐδὲν ποῦ παρενεχθὲν ἐς ἐκκλησίαν οὐδὲ φόνον ἐμφυλον, πρὶν γε Τιβέριος Γράκχος δημαρχῶν καὶ νόμους ἐσφύρων πρῶτος ὁδε ἐνστάσει ἀπόλετο καὶ ἐπιπέδῳ πολλοὶ κατὰ τὸ Καπιτώλιον εἰλούμενοι περὶ τὸν νεῶν ἀνηρέθησαν. καὶ οὐκ ἀνέσχον ἐπιπέδῳ πῶς ἐπιπέδῳ δὲ τῶν μύσει, διαιρουμένων ἐκαστοτε σαφῶς ἐπιπέδῳ ἀλλήλοις καὶ ἐγχειρίδια πολλάκις φερόντων κτιννυμένης τέτινος ἀρχῆς ἐκ διαστήματος ἐνι ἐροισὶν ἐκκλησίαις ἡγετοραῖς, δημάρχων ἡ στρατηγῶν ἡ ἐπιπέδων ἡ τῶν ἐς ταῦτα παραγγελλόντων ἡ τῶν ἀλλῶς ἐπιπέδων. ὑβριστε ἀκόσμος ἐπειχεν αἰεὶ δι' ὀλίγου καὶ νόμων καὶ δίκης αἰσχρὰ καταφρόνησις. προϊόντος δ' ἐς μέγα του κακοῦ, ἐπαναστάσεις ἐπὶ τὴν πολιτείαν φανεραὶ καὶ στρατεῖαι μεγάλαί καὶ βίαιοι κατὰ τῆς πατρίδος ἐγίνοντο φυγάδων ἀνδρῶν ἡ καταδίκων ἡ περὶ ἀρχῆς τινος ἡ στρατοπέδου φιλονικούντων ἐς ἀλλήλους. δυναστεῖαι τε ἦσαν ἡδη κατὰ πολλὰ καὶ στασίαρχοι μοναρχικοί, οἱ μὲν οὐ μεθιέντες ἐπιπέδῳ τὰ πιστευθέντα σφίσις ὑπὸ του δήμου στρατόπεδα, οἱ δὲ καὶ κατὰ σφῶν ἀνευ του κοινου κατὰ ἀλλήλων ξενολογουντες. ὁ πότεροι δ' αὐτῶν τὴν πόλιν προλάβοιεν, τοῖς ἐτέροις ἡ νόσῳ ἀγῶν λόγω μὲν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀντιστασιώτας,

ε ἴργω δ' ε πὶ τὴν πατρίδα: ε σέβαλλον γὰρ ὤ ς ε ς πολεμίαν, καὶ σφαγαὶ τῶ ν ε ν ποσὶν ε γίνοντο νηλεεῖ ς καὶ ἄλλων ε πὶ θανάτῳ προγραφαὶ καὶ φυγαὶ καὶ δημεύσεις, ε νίων δὲ καὶ βάσανοι πάντων ε παχθει ς.

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

perpetrated. Men were proscribed, others banished, property was confiscated, and some were even subjected to excruciating tortures.

[3] Ἔργον τε οὐδὲν ἀηδὲς ἀπήν, μέχρι τῶνδε τῶν στασιάρχων εἰς ἔτει πεντηκοστῷ μάλιστα ἀπὸ Γράκχου, Κορνήλιος Σύλλας, κακῶ τὸ κακὸν ἰώμενος μόναρχον αὐτὸν ἀπέφηνεν ἐπιπλεῖστον: οὐδὲς δικτάτορας ἐκάλουν τε καὶ ἐπιταίς φοβερωτάταις χρεΐαις ἐξαμήνους τιθέμενοι ἐκ πολλοῦ διελελοίπεσαν. ὁ δὲ Σύλλας βία μὲν καὶ ἀνάγκη, λόγῳ δ' αἰρετός, ἐς αἰεὶ δικτάτωρ γενόμενος ὁ μῶς, ἐπεὶ τε ἐκορέσθη τῆς δυναστείας, πρῶτος ἀνδρῶν ὁδε μοι δοκεῖ θαρρησαί τυραννικὴν ἀρχὴν ἐκὼν ἀποθέσθαι καὶ ἐπειπεῖν, ὅτι καὶ τοῖς μεμφομένοις εὐθύνας ὑφέξει, ἰδιώτης τε ὁρώντων ἀπάντων ἐς πολὺ βαδίσαι κατ' ἀγορὰν καὶ ἐπανελθεῖν ἀπαθῆς οἰκάδε. τυσοῦτον ἡν ἀρά τοῖς ὀρωσιν ἔτι τῆς ἀρχῆς αὐτοῦ δέος ἡῆ τῆς ἀποθέσεως κατάπληξις ἡῆ τῶν εὐθύνων τῆς ἐπαγγελίας αἰδῶς ἡῆ ἄλλη φιλανθρωπία καὶ λογισμὸς ἐπισυμφέροντι τὴν τυραννίδα γενέσθαι. Ὡδε μὲν ἐπιβραχὺ ἐλήξαν αἰστάσεις ἐπὶ Σύλλα, καὶ κακῶν ἀντίδοσις ἡν ὦν ὁ Σύλλας εἰργάζετο:

[3] “No unseemly deed was wanting until, about fifty years after the death of Gracchus, Cornelius Sulla, one of these chiefs of factions, doctoring one evil with another, made himself the absolute master of the state for an indefinite period. Such officials were formerly called dictators -- an office created in the most perilous emergencies for six months only, and long since fallen into disuse. Sulla,

although nominally elected, became dictator for life by force and compulsion. Nevertheless he became satiated with power and was the first man, so far as I know, holding supreme power, who had the courage to lay it down voluntarily and to declare that he would render an account of his stewardship to any who were dissatisfied with it. And so, for a considerable period, he walked to the forum as a private citizen in the sight of all and returned home unmolested, so great was the awe of his government still remaining in the minds of the onlookers, or their amazement at his laying it down. Perhaps they were ashamed to call for an accounting, or entertained other good feeling toward him, or a belief that his despotism had been beneficial to the state. Thus there was a cessation of factions for a short time while Sulla lived, and a compensation for the evils which Sulla had wrought.

[4] μετὰ δὲ Σύλλαν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἔμοια ἀνεπιβίβητο, μέχρι Γάιος Καίσαρ, αἰρετὴν ἀρχὴν ἐπιπολὺ δυναστεύων ἐν Γαλατίᾳ, τῆς βουλῆς αὐτὸν ἀποθέσθαι κελευούσης αἰτιώμενος οὐκ ἐπὶ τὴν βουλήν, ἀλλὰ Πομπήιον, ἐχθρὸν ὄντα οἰκιστῶν καὶ στρατοῦ περὶ τὴν Ἰταλίαν ἡγούμενον, ὡς τῆς ἀρχῆς αὐτὸν ἐπιβουλεύοντα παραλύειν, προτιθεὶ προκλήσεις ἡ ἀμφὸς τὰ στρατεύματα ἔχειν ἐς τῆς ἐχθρας τὴν ἀφοβίαν ἡ καὶ Πομπήιον οὐκ ἔχει μεθέντα ἰδιωτεύειν ὁμοίως ὑπὸ νόμοις. οὐκ ἐπιθὼν δ' ἐς οὐδέτερα ἐκ Γαλατίας ἤλαυνεν ἐπὶ τὸν Πομπήιον ἐς τὴν πατρίδα, ἐσβαλὼν τε ἐς αὐτὴν καὶ διώκων ἐκφυγόντα περὶ Θεσσαλίαν ἐνίκησε μεγάλη μάχη λαμπρῶς καὶ ἐδίωκεν ἐς Αἰγύπτου ὑποφεύγοντα. ἀναιρεθέντος δὲ Πομπηίου πρὸς

α νδρῶ ν Αι γυπτίων ε πανη λθεν ε ς Ρώμην, ε ἴστιν α ἔ και περι  
 Αι ἴγυπτον ε ργασάμενός τε και ε πιμείνας, μέχρι καταστήσαιτο αυ τη  
 τούς βασιλέας. στασιώτην τε μέγιστον, ω διά μεγαλουργίαν πολεμικήν  
 Μέγας ε πώνυμον η ν, ου τος δη μάλιστα πολέμου κράτει σαφω ς  
 καθελών, ου δενός αυ τω θαρρου ντος ει ς ου δέν ε ἴτι  
 α ντειπει ν, δεύτερος ε πι Σύλλα δικτάτωρ ε ς τὸ διηνεκὲς η ρέθη:  
 και στάσεις αυ θις κατεπαύοντο πα σαι, ε ἴστε και τόνδε Βρου τος και  
 Κάσσιος ζήλω τε τη ς α ρχη ς του μεγέθους και πόθω τη ς πατρίου  
 πολιτείας ε ν τω βουλευτηρίω κατέκανον, δημοτικώτατον και  
 ε μπειρότατον α ρχη ς γενόμενον. ο ἴ γέ τοι δη μοσ αυ τὸν μάλιστα  
 πάντων ε πεπόθησε, και τούς σφαγέας ε ζήτουν περιόντες και τὸ σω μα  
 ε ἴθασαν ε ν α γορα μέση και νεὼν ε πω κοδόμησαν τη  
 πυρα και θύουσιν ω ς θεω .

[4] “After his death the troubles broke out afresh and continued until Gaius  
 Cæsar, who had held the command in Gaul by election for some years, was  
 ordered by the Senate to lay down his command. He charged that it was not the  
 wish of the Senate, but of Pompey, his enemy, who had command of an army in  
 Italy, and was scheming to depose him. So he sent a proposal that both should  
 retain their armies, so that neither need fear the other's enmity, or that Pompey  
 should dismiss his forces also and live as a private citizen under the laws in like  
 manner with him-self. Both requests being refused, he marched from Gaul against  
 Pompey in the Roman territory, entered it, put him to flight, pursued him into  
 Thessaly, won a brilliant victory over him in a great battle, and followed him to

Egypt. After Pompey had been slain by the Egyptians Cæsar set to work on the affairs of Egypt and remained there until he had settled the dynasty of that country. Then he returned to Rome. Having overpowered by war his principal rival, who had been surnamed the Great on account of his brilliant military exploits, he now ruled without disguise, nobody daring any longer to dispute him about anything, and was chosen, next after Sulla, dictator for life. Again all civil dissensions ceased until Brutus and Cassius, envious of his great power and desiring to restore the government of their fathers, slew in the Senate this most popular man, who was also the one most experienced in the art of government. The people mourned for him greatly. They scoured the city in pursuit of his murderers. They buried him in the middle of the forum and built a temple on the place of his funeral pile, and offered sacrifice to him as a god.

[5] Αἱ δὲ στάσεις ἐπὶ τῷ δε μάλιστα αὐθις ἐπανελθούσῃ τε καὶ αὐξηθεῖσαι δυνατώταται ἐς μέγα προήλθον, καὶ φόνοι καὶ φυγαὶ καὶ ἐπὶ θανάτῳ προγραφὰ βουλευτῶν τε καὶ τῶν καλουμένων ἱππέων, κατὰ πληθὸς ἀθρόως ἐκατέρων, ἐγένοντο, τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ἀλλήλοις τῶν στασιωτῶν ἀντιπαρεχόντων καὶ ἐς τοὺς ἀμελούντων καὶ φίλων καὶ ἀδελφῶν: τοσοῦτον ἐκράτει τῆς ἐς τὰ οἰκεία εὐνοίας ἡ ἐς τὰ ἀντίπαλα φιλονικία. προιόντες τε τὴν Ῥωμαίων ἀρχὴν ὡς ἰδιωτικὸν σφῶν κτημαδιενείμαντο ἐφ' ἐαυτῶν τρεῖς οἱ ἄνδρες, Αντώνιος τε καὶ Λέπιδος καὶ ὁ ἴσως πρότερον μὲν Οκτάουιος ὀνόμαζον, Καίσαρι δὲ πρὸς γένους ὄν καὶ θετὸς ἐν διαθήκαις ὑπ' αὐτοῦ γενόμενος Καίσαρ ἐκ τούτου δε μετωνομάζετο.

ε πὶ δὲ τῆ διαίρεσει τῆ δε μετὰ βραχὺ συμπεσόντες, ὡς εἰ κός  
 ἠ ν, ε ς α λλήλους ο Και σαυ τω ν συνέσει τε καὶ ε μπειρία  
 προύχων Λέπιδον μὲν πρότερον αυ τω ν ἠ ν ε κεκλήρωτο Λιβύην, ε πὶ  
 δὲ τω Λεπίδω καὶ Αντώνιον πολέμω περι Ἄκτιον α φείλετο τὴν  
 α πὸ Συρίας ε πὶ κόλπον τὸν Ιόνιον α ρχήν. ε πί τε τούτοις, μεγίστοις δὴ  
 φανει σι καὶ ε ς ε ἔκκληξιν α ἴπαντας ε μβαλου σιν, ει λε καὶ  
 Αι ἴγυπτον ε πιπλεύσας, ἠ ἄχρονιωτάτη τε ἠ ν ε ς τότε καὶ δυνατωτάτη  
 μετὰ Αλέξανδρον α ρχή καὶ μόνῃ Ρωμαίοις ε ἔλειπεν ε ς τὰ νυ ν  
 ο ἴντα, ὡ ἴστε Σεβαστὸς ευ θύς ε πὶ τοι ς ε ἴργοις, ε ἴτι περιών, ο ἴδε  
 πρω τος ο φθη ναί τε Ρωμαίοις καὶ κληθη ναι πρὸς αυ τω ν,  
 αυ τός τε ε αυτόν, ὡ ἴσπερ Γάιος καὶ ε ς τὸ δυνατώτερον ε ἴτι Γαι ἴου,  
 α ἴρχοντα α ποφη ναι τη τε πατρίδι καὶ τοι ς υ π' αυ τὴν ε ἴθνεσιν  
 α ἴπασιν, ου δὲν αι ρέσεως ἠ ἄχειροτονίας ἠ ἄπροσποινήματος ε ἴτι  
 δεηθείς. χρονίου δ' αυ τω καὶ ε γκρατου ς τη ς α ρχη ς γενομένης,  
 ε πιτυχῆς ε ς πάντα καὶ φοβερός ὡ ἴν γένος α φ' ε αυτου καὶ διαδοχὴν  
 τὴν ε πικρατου σαν ο μοίως ε π' ε κείνω κατέλιπεν.

[5] “And now civil discord broke out again worse than ever and increased  
 enormously. Massacres, banishments, and proscriptions of both senators and the  
 so-called knights took place straightway, including great numbers of both classes,  
 the chief of factions surrendering their enemies to each other, and for this purpose  
 not sparing even their friends and brothers; so much does animosity toward rivals  
 overpower the love of kindred. So in the course of events the Roman empire was  
 partitioned, as though it had been their private property, by these three men:



Antony, Lepidus, and the one who was first called Octavius, but afterward Cæsar from his relationship to the other Cæsar and adoption in his will. Shortly after this division they fell to quarrelling among themselves, as was natural, and Octavius, who was the superior in understanding and skill, first deprived Lepidus of Africa, which had fallen to his lot, and afterward, as the result of the battle of Actium, took from Antony all the provinces lying between Syria and the Adriatic gulf. Thereupon, while all the world was filled with astonishment at these wonderful displays of power, he sailed to Egypt and took that country, which was the oldest and at that time the strongest possession of the successors of Alexander, and the only one wanting to complete the Roman empire as it now stands. In consequence of these exploits he was at once elevated to the rank of a deity while still living, and was the first to be thus distinguished by the Romans, and was called by them Augustus. He assumed to himself an authority like Cæsar's over the country and the subject nations, and even greater than Cæsar's, not needing any form of election, or authorization, or even the pretence of it. His government being strengthened by time and mastery, and himself successful in all things and revered by all, he left a lineage and succession that held the supreme power in like manner after him.” (*Civil Wars* 1.0.1-5)

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

received theirs from Gaius Maecenas. Without the *patrocinium* of Engles *Capital* would never have been written, without that of Maecenas “the greatest poem by the greatest poet”<sup>8</sup> would likewise be non-extant.

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

Ρωμαῖοι τὴν Ἰταλίαν πολέμῳ κατὰ μέρη χειρούμενοι γῆς μέρος εὐλαμβάνον καὶ πόλεις ἐνώκιζον ἡ ἕως τὰς πρότερον οὐσίας κληρούχους ἀποσφών κατέλεγον.

The Romans, subduing Italy piece by piece by means of war, took shares of land and settled in cities or set down colonists of their own to those existing earlier.

καὶ τότε μὲν ἀντιφρουρίων ἐπενόουν, τῆς δὲ γῆς τῆς δορικτήτου σφίσις ἐκάστοτε γιγνομένης τὴν μὲν ἐξειργασμένην αὐτίκα τοῖς οἰκιστομένοις ἐπιδήρουν ἡ ἕπιπρασκον ἡ ἕξεμίσθουν, τὴν δ' ἀργὸν ἐκ τοῦ πολέμου τότε οὐσαν, ἡ δὲ καὶ μάλιστα ἐπλήθουν,

---

<sup>8</sup> John Dryden said of Virgil's *Georgics*.

ου κ α ῖ γοντές πω σχολὴν διαλαχει ν ε πεκήρυττον ε ν τοσω δε  
τοι ς ε θέλουσιν ε κπονει ν ε πὶ τέλει τω ν ε τησίων καρπω ν,  
δεκάτη μὲν τω ν σπειρομένων, πέμπτη δὲ τω ν φυτευομένων. ὠ ῖριστο  
δὲ καὶ τοι ς προβατεύουσι τέλη μειζόνων τε καὶ ε λαττόνων ζώ ων. καὶ τάδε  
ε ῖπραττον ε ς πολυανδρίαν του Ιταλικου γένους, φερεπονωτάτου  
σφίσιν ο φθέντος, ἵνα συμμάχους οὐ κείους ε ῖχοιεν. ε ς δὲ του ναντίον  
αυ τοι ς περιή ει. οὐ γὰρ πλούσιοι τη σδε τη ς α νεμήτου γη ς τὴν  
πολλὴν καταλαβόντες καὶ χρόνω θαρρου ντες ου ῖτινα σφα ς ε ῖτι  
α φαιρήσεσθαι τά τε α γχου σφίσιν ὅσα τε η ν α ῖλλα βραχέα  
πενήτων, τὰ μὲν ὠ νούμενοι πειθοι , τὰ δὲ βία λαμβάνοντες, πεδία μακρὰ  
α ντὶ χωρίων ε γεώργουν, ὠ νητοι ς ε ς αυ τὰ γεωργοι ς καὶ ποιμέσι  
χρώμενοι του μὴ τοὺς ε λευθέρους ε ς τὰς στρατείας α πὸ τη ς γεωργίας  
περισπα ν, φερούσης α ῖμα καὶ τη σδε τη ς κτήσεως αυ τοι ς πολὺ  
κέρδος ε κ πολυπαιδίας θεραπόντων α κινδύνως αυ ξομένων διὰ τὰς  
α στρατείας. α πὸ δὲ τούτων οὐ μὲν δυνατοὶ πάμπαν ε πλούτουν, καὶ τὸ  
τω ν θεραπόντων γένος α νὰ τὴν χώραν ε πλήθυε, τοὺς δ' Ιταλιώτας  
ο λιγότης καὶ δυσανδρία κατελάμβανε, τρυχομένους πενία τε καὶ  
ε σφοραι ς καὶ στρατείας. εἰ δὲ καὶ σχολάσειαν α πὸ τούτων, ε πὶ  
α ργίας διετίθεντο, τη ς γη ς υ πὸ τω ν πλουσίων ε χομένης καὶ  
γεωργοι ς χρωμένων θεράπουσιν α ντὶ ε λευθέρων.

"The Romans, as they subdued the Italian nations successively in war, seized a part of their lands and built towns there, or established their own colonies in those already existing, and used them in place of garrisons. Of the land acquired by war

they assigned the cultivated part forthwith to settlers, or leased or sold it. Since they had no leisure as yet to allot the part which then lay desolated by war (this was generally the greater part), they made proclamation that in the meantime those who were willing to work it might do so for a share of the yearly crops a tenth of the grain and a fifth of the fruit. From those who kept flocks was required a share of the animals, both oxen and small cattle. They did these things in order to multiply the Italian race, which they considered the most laborious of peoples, so that they might have plenty of allies at home. But the very opposite thing happened; for the rich, getting possession of the greater part of the undistributed lands, and being emboldened by the lapse of time to believe that they would never be dispossessed, and adding to their holdings the small farms of their poor neighbors, partly by purchase and partly by force, came to cultivate vast tracts instead of single estates, using for this purpose slaves as laborers and herdsmen, lest free laborers should be drawn from agriculture into the army. The ownership of slaves itself brought them great gain from the multitude of their progeny, who increased because they were exempt from military service. Thus the powerful ones became enormously rich and the race of slaves multiplied throughout the country, while the Italian people dwindled in numbers and strength, being oppressed by penury, taxes, and military service. If they had any respite from these evils they passed their time in idleness, because the land was held by the rich, who employed slaves instead of freemen as cultivators.” (*Civil Wars* 1.1.7)

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

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

καὶ ὅσα\* μὲν\* λόγῳ \* εἰπόντες ἕκαστοι ἡ ` μέλλοντες πολεμήσειν ἡ `  
 ἐναυτῶ \* ἡ ἴδη ὄντες, χαλεπὸν τὴν ἀκρίβειαν αὐτῶν τῶν  
 λεχθέντων διαμνημονεύσαι\* ἡ νῦν μοί τε ὠν\* αὐτὸς ἡ ἴκουσα  
 καὶ τοῖς ἀλλοθὲν ποθεν\* ἐμοὶ ἀπαγγέλλουσιν: ὡς δ' ἀνέδοκουν\*  
 ἐμοὶ ἕκαστοι περὶ τῶν αἰεὶ παρόντων τὰ δέοντα\* μάλιστα εἰπεῖν,  
 εἰχομένῳ ὅτι ἐγγύτατα τῆς ξυμπάσης γνώμης τῶν ἀληθῶς  
 λεχθέντων\*, οὕτως εἴρηται\*. [2] τὰ δ' ἔργα τῶν πραχθέντων\*\* ἐν  
 τῷ πολέμῳ οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ παρατυχόντος\* πυνθανόμενος ἡ ξίωσα\*\*  
 γράφειν, οὐδ' ὡς ἐμοὶ ἐδόκει\*, ἀλλ' οἷός τε αὐτὸς παρῆν\* καὶ  
 παρὰ τῶν ἄλλων ὅσον δυνατόν ἀκριβεία \* περὶ ἐκάστου  
 ἐπεξελθών\*. [3] ἐπιπόνως δὲ ἠυρίσκετο\*, διότι οἱ παρόντες τοῖς  
 ἔργοις ἐκάστοις οὐταὺ τὰ περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν\*\* εἴλεγον, ἀλλ'  
 ὡς ἐκατέρων\* τις εὐνοίας ἡ ` μνήμης ἔχοι\*+. [4] καὶ ἐς μὲν  
 ἀκρόασιν\* ἴσως τὸ μὴ μυθῶδες\* αὐτῶν ἀτερπέστερον\*

φανεται: ο ἴσοι δὲ βουλήσονται\* τῶν τε γενομένων\* τὸ σαφὲς σκοπεῖν  
καὶ τῶν μελλόντων\* ποτὲ αὐθις κατὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον τοιούτων καὶ  
παραπλησίων ἐσέσθαι, ὧ φέλιμα κρίνειν\* αὐτὰ ἀρκούντως ἐξεῖ.  
κτη μὰ τε ἐς αἰεὶ μαλλον ἢ ἀγώνισμα\*\* ἐς τὸ παραχρημα  
ακούειν\*\* ζύγκειται\*.

“With reference to the speeches in this history, some were delivered before the war began, others while it was going on; some I heard myself, others I got from various quarters; it was in all cases difficult to carry them word for word in one's memory, so my habit has been to make the speakers say what was in my opinion demanded of them by the various occasions, of course adhering as closely as possible to the general sense of what they really said. [2] And with reference to the narrative of events, far from permitting myself to derive it from the first source that came to hand, I did not even trust my own impressions, but it rests partly on what I saw myself, partly on what others saw for me, the accuracy of the report being always tried by the most severe and detailed tests possible. [3] My conclusions have cost me some labour from the want of coincidence between accounts of the same occurrences by different eye-witnesses, arising sometimes from imperfect memory, sometimes from undue partiality for one side or the other. [4] The absence of romance in my history will, I fear, detract somewhat from its interest; but if it be judged useful by those inquirers who desire an exact knowledge of the past as an aid to the interpretation of the future, which in the course of human things must resemble if it does not reflect it, I shall be content. In fine, I have written my work, not as an essay which is to win the applause of the moment, but as a possession for all time.” (1.22.1-4)

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

*Neque enim historiam proposui scribere, sed nostras breviter flere miserias.  
Alioquin ad haec merito explicanda et Thucydides et Sallustius muti sunt.*

But I have not proposed to write a history, but to briefly bewail our misfortunes. At any rate, to give these things a worthy explanation both Thucydides and Sallust would have been speechless (*Letters* 60.16).

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

*Nobilitate veritatis historicus.*

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

Martial called him the foremost of the Roman historians.

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

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

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

Tacitus said that Sallust was:

*Rerum Romanarum florentissimus auctor.*

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

And Horace wrote of him:

*Nullus argento color est avaris  
abdito terries, inimice lamnae*

*Crispe Sallusti, nisi temperato*

*splendeat usu.*

There is no color to silver

Hidden by the greedy Earth;

Sallust, hostile to the thin flakes,

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

Plutarch, on the other hand, faulted Sallust for saying that Romans had never seen a camel until Lucullus defeated king Mithridates at a battle near the river Rhyndacus, Bithynia, in Asia Minor. “Sallust says, to my amazement, that camels were seen by the Romans for the first time. He must have thought that the soldiers of Scipio who conquered Antiochus before this, and those who had lately fought Archelaus at Orchomenus and Chaeroneia, were unacquainted with the camel.” (*Lucullus* 11.4) In the end, Sallust had both his flatterers and his critics. In general, however, he was highly praised and held in equal esteem as the Greek historian Thucydides. According to the elder Seneca,

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

While the principal virtue of Thucydides is brevity, Sallust has beaten him at this and the former yields to him in his own camp; for the Greek sentence is certainly short, you have that which may be removed while the sense is unharmed: take out,



for instance, συγκρύψαι,<sup>9</sup> or συσκίασαι,<sup>10</sup> take out, ‘εκάστων’:<sup>11</sup> the sense will remain, not as elegant, but still equally complete. But from a sentence of Sallust nothing can be removed with out harm to the sense (*Controversarium* 9.1.13).

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

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

I think that what is indeed best should come both first and regularly, but of them the best candidate is nevertheless anyone who besides that is most accessible; for example Livy for boys rather than Sallust, for although he is a better author of history, in order to appreciate him, one’s work should already be advanced. (*Institutio* 2.5.19-20)

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

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

---

<sup>9</sup> Συγκρύψαι, aorist infinitive active of συγκρύπτω, *to cover up or completely conceal.*

<sup>10</sup> Συσκίασαι, aorist infinitive active of συσκιάζω, *to shade quite over, throw a shade over, shade closely or thickly.*

<sup>11</sup> Ἐκάστων, masc., fem., and neuter of ἑκάστος, *each one, every one.*

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

Seutonius reported that the grammarian Asinius Pollio had criticized Sallust for his archaic language.

*De eodem Asinius Pollio in libro, quo Sallustii scripta reprehendit ut nimia priscorum verborum affectatione oblita, ita tradit: 'In eam rem adiutorium ei fecit maxime quidam Ateius praetextatis nobis grammaticus Latinus declamantium deinde auditor atque praeceptor, ad summam Philologus ab semet nominatus.'*  
(*De Grammaticis* 10)

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

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

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

---

\* That is, an autodidact.

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

(*Controversarium* 9.1.14.)

Cassius Dio thought that Sallust was a dangerous hypocrite. He said, “Caesar, immediately after Juba’s flight, captured the palisade and caused great slaughter among all who came in the way of his troops, sparing not even those who came over to his side. Next he brought the rest of the cities to terms, meeting with no opposition; and taking over the Numidians, ‘Nomads,’ he reduced them to the status of subjects, and delivered them to Sallust, nominally to rule, but really to harry and plunder. At all events this officer took many bribes and confiscated much property, so that he was not only accursed but incurred the deepest disgrace, inasmuch as after writing such treatises as he had, and making many bitter remarks about those who fleeced others, he did not practice what he preached. Therefore, even if he was completely exonerated by Caesar, yet in his own history, as upon a tablet, the man himself had chiseled his own condemnation as well.” (*Historiae Romanae* 43.9.1-3) Aleksandr Blok said of Sallust, “Man is weak, and he can be forgiven everything except loutishness. Thus Sallust can, if you please, be forgiven his decadence, his corruption...One thing alone cannot be forgiven: the moral and patriotic tone he adopted...Sallust’s voice cracks; and it is this cracking of his voice that is difficult to forgive the stylist and bribe-taker.” (*World Revolution* 296-7) Sallust, however, while admitting to some wrong doing, claimed in his prologue to the *Bellum Catilinae* to have repented from his earlier bad deeds. Instead of continuing along the wrong path he resolved to record wickedness of the age, the *res gestae* of this foul pasture.

[3.3-5] *Sed ego adolescentulus initio, sicuti plerique, studio ad rem publicam latus sum ibique mihi multa advorsa fuere. Nam pro pudore, pro abstinentia, pro virtute audacia, largitio, avaritia vigeant. Quae tametsi animus aspernabatur insolens malarum artium, tamen inter tanta vitia imbecilla aetas ambitione corrupta tenebatur; ac me, cum ab reliquorum malis moribus dissentirem, nihilo minus honoris cupido eadem, qua ceteros, fama atque invidia vexabat.*

But when I was a young man, beginning, just as most, being borne into public life and there were many obstacles for me. For before shame, before abstinence, before virtue, audacity, bribery, and greed flourished. Although my soul, unaccustomed to evil ways, was repulsed, I nevertheless, among so many vices, was, on account of my tender age, captivated by ambition and corruption. And though I myself would differ with the evil practices of the others, I nevertheless, on account of desire for honors, was vexed by the same reputation and envy as the others.

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

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

But Cassius Dio, and moreover Blok, are unforgiving judges. “But the confession of the one who is wicked, ‘I am so,’ is not followed by the reciprocal similar confession...The one who made the confession sees himself repulsed, and sees the *other* to be in the wrong when he refuses to let his own *inner* being come forth into the *outer* existence of speech...It thereby reveals itself as a consciousness which is forsaken by and which itself denies Spirit; for it does not know that Spirit, in the absolute certainty of itself, is lord and master over every deed and actuality, and can cast them off, and make them as if they had never happened. At the same time, it does not recognize the contradiction it falls into in not letting the rejection which has taken place in *words*, be validated as a genuine rejection...by this hardness of heart produces the disparity which

still exists.” (*Phenomenology of Spirit* 667) There can be little question that Sallust repented, for his confession and repentance in words was later substantiated by his deeds, he indeed had fled public life, did not return to it, and blessed the world with his moral teachings through his written works. Cassius Dio, in refusing to validate Sallust’s confession and repentance, receives back the blame that he once had the audacity to impose.

*L. Catilina, nobili genere natus, fuit magna vi et animi et corporis, sed ingenio malo pravoque. Huic ab adulescentia bella intestina, caedes, rapinae, discordia civilis grata fuere ibique iuventutem suam exercuit. Huic ab adulescentia bella intestina, caedes, rapinae, discordia civilis grata fuere ibique iuventutem suam exercuit. Huic ab adulescentia bella intestina, caedes, rapinae, discordia civilis grata fuere ibique iuventutem suam exercuit. Corpus patiens inediae, alboris, vigiliae supra quam quouquam credibile est. Animus audax, subdolos, varius, quouis rei lubet simulator ac dissimulator, alieni appetens, sui profusus, ardens in cupiditatibus; satis eloquentiae, sapientiae parum. Vastus animus immoderata, incredibilia, nimis alta semper cupiebat. Hunc post dominationem L. Sullae lubido maxuma invaserat rei publicae capiundae; neque id quibus modis adsequeretur, dum sibi regnum pararet, quicquam pensi habebat. Agitabatur magis magisque in dies animus ferox inopia rei familiaris et conscientia scelerum, quae utraque iis artibus auxerat, quas supra memoravi. Incitabant praeterea corrupti civitatis mores, quos pessuma ac divorsa inter se mala, luxuria atque avaritia, vexabant.*

Lucius Catiline was begotten by the nobility; great in energy both in body and soul, but with an evil and depraved nature. Civil war, murder, rapine, and civil

discord were gratifying to this young man from a very young age and there occupied his youth. His body could endure hunger, cold, and sleeplessness to an incredible degree. His mind, reckless, cunning, and treacherous, was agreeable to any form of pretense [similitude] or concealment [dissimilitude]. Coveting the things of another, he out did himself burning with cupidity. Great in eloquence, but little in wisdom, his wasted mind, immoderate beyond belief, always longed for the great beyond measure. After Sulla's domination, a great desire for seizing the Republic entered this man, if only to make himself supreme, he weighed out anything, and not by what standard [mode] he should pursue it. His fierce soul was being driven onward more and more by the day by poverty at home and the guilt of his crimes; both of these he had augmented by the practices which I recounted above. Besides that the corrupt morals of the State, which were shaken to the ground by evils opposite between themselves,<sup>12</sup> luxury and greed, were inspiring. (*Bellum Catilinae* 5.1-8)

The conspiracy of Catiline, a patrician, was an outgrowth of the dictatorship and the proscriptions of Sulla. Catiline was himself was among Sulla's adherents and had profited by his service to him and had reportedly used the proscriptions of Sulla as a cover for the murder of his own brother-in-law and for killing a former praetor, Marius Gratidianus. He also greatly enriched himself under Sulla's reign. "This man [Catiline], namely had killed his brother before the civil struggle was decided, and now asked Sulla to proscribe the man, as one still living; and he was proscribed. Then Catiline, returning the favor of Sulla's, killed a certain Marcus Marius, one of the opposite faction, and

---

<sup>12</sup> "He was spurred on, also, by the corruption of the public morals, which were being ruined by two great evils of an opposite character, extravagance and avarice."—Rolf

brought his head to Sulla as he was sitting in the forum, and then going to the lustral water of Apollo which was near, washed the blood off his hands.” (*Sulla* 32.2)

Lester Hutchinson recounts this event in fine finished phrases that bear repeating. “Before decapitation, Gratidianus had his legs broken, his hands cut off and his eyes plucked out. It is said that Catiline then carried the bleeding head from the Janiculum through the streets to the temple of Apollo in the Palatine where Sulla was waiting. Having deposited his burden at the feet of the gratified dictator, Catiline, so Plutarch says, added sacrilege to murder by washing the blood off his hands in the water of a nearby fountain which was sacred to Apollo.” (*The Conspiracy* 39-40) The Seneca the play write reported that

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

Marcus Marius, to whom the people erected statues from street to street, to whom they supplicated with frankincense and wine, Sulla commanded to have his legs



broken, his eyes dug out, his tongue and hands cut off; little by little, and through tearing apart each joint, as if he killed him as many times as he injured him. Who was the servant of this command? Who but Catiline already busying his hands in every sort of crime. He hacked him apart before the tomb of Quintus Catulus desecrating the ashes of this most gentle man. Over which a man of bad example, yet popular, and not so innocent, rather loved overmuch, shed his blood, drop by drop. It was fitting that Marius should suffer these things, that Sulla should order them, that Catiline should do them, but it was wrong that the Republic should receive in her breast the swords of both her enemy and her defender equally. (*On Anger* 3.18.1)

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

Έργον τε ου δὲν ἀηδὲς ἀπην, μέχρι τῶνδε τῶν στασιάρχων  
 εἰς ἐπεὶ πεντηκοστῶ μάλιστα ἀπὸ Γράκχου, Κορνήλιος Σύλλας,  
 κακῶ τὸ κακὸν ἰώμενος μόναρχον αὐτὸν ἀπέφηνεν ἐπι-  
 πλεῖστον: οὐδὲς δικτάτορας ἐκάλουν τε καὶ ἐπιταίς φοβερωτάταις  
 χρείαις ἐξαμήνους τιθέμενοι ἐκ πολλοῦ διελελοίπεσαν. ὁ δὲ Σύλλας  
 βία μὲν καὶ ἀνάγκη, λόγῳ δ' αἰρετός, ἐς αἰεὶ δικτάτωρ γενόμενος  
 ὁ μῶς, ἐπεὶ τε ἐκορέσθη τῆς δυναστείας, πρῶτος ἀνδρῶν ὁδε  
 μοι δοκεῖ θάρρησαι τυραννικὴν ἀρχὴν ἐκὼν ἀποθέσθαι καὶ

επειπειν, οτι καιτοις μεμφομένοις ευθύνας υφέξει, ιδιώτης τε ορώντων απάντων ες πολυβαδίσαι κατ'αγοράν καιεπανελθειν απαθησ οικαδε. τυσου τον ηνα'ρατοις ορωσινε'τιτης αρχης αυτουδεος η'της αποθέσεως κατάπληξις η'των ευθυνων τηςεπαγγελίας αιδώς η'άλληφιλανθρωπία καιλογισμός επισυμφέροντιτην τυραννίδα γενέσθαι.

“No unseemly deed was wanting until, about fifty years after the death of Gracchus, Cornelius Sulla, one of these chiefs of factions, doctoring one evil with another, made himself the absolute master of the state for an indefinite period. Such officials were formerly called dictators -- an office created in the most perilous emergencies for six months only, and long since fallen into disuse. Sulla, although nominally elected, became dictator for life by force and compulsion. Nevertheless he became satiated with power and was the first man, so far as I know, holding supreme power, who had the courage to lay it down voluntarily and to declare that he would render an account of his stewardship to any who were dissatisfied with it. And so, for a considerable period, he walked to the forum as a private citizen in the sight of all and returned home unmolested, so great was the awe of his government still remaining in the minds of the onlookers, or their amazement at his laying it down. Perhaps they were ashamed to call for an accounting, or entertained other good feeling toward him, or a belief that his despotism had been beneficial to the state. Thus there was a cessation of factions for a short time while Sulla lived, and a compensation for the evils which Sulla had wrought.” (*Civil Wars* 1.3)

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

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

*Satius est uti regibus quam uti malis legibus.*

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

(*Rhetorica ad Herennium* 2.40)

The articulation of this slogan indicated both that one should not lament the loss of the constitution since kings are just as beneficial as bad laws and that Sulla was all but a king. At any rate, Sulla having reconstituted Rome and effectuated the *Leges Corneliae*, ascended as an absolute monarch and his first act was to annihilate his

opposition by means of a list of the “proscribed,” called a *proscriptio* from *proscribo*, to make public by writing, publish, proclaim, announce. The *proscriptio* was a list of names posted by Sulla in the Forum. Anyone whose name appeared on this list could be killed by anyone else and, he who carried out the evil deed would receive a reward for having done so. In fact, one could even obtain a reward by indicating the hiding place of one so proscribed. The victim’s property was expropriated to the State to be disposed *subhastio*; colloquially *sub hasta*, i.e., at auction, with political disabilities vested on his children and grandchildren. By the end of Sulla’s reign, according to Valerius Maximus, an estimated 4700 people had been so proscribed. (*The History of Rome* 102)

After Sulla, neither Catiline nor Crassus were required to return their ill gotten gains. “The man who had slain Lucretius at the instance of Sulla, and another who had slain many of the persons proscribed by him, were tried for the murders and punished, Julius Caesar being most instrumental in bringing this about. Thus changing circumstances often render very weak even those once exceedingly powerful. This matter, then, turned out contrary to most people’s expectation, as did also the case of Catiline, who, although charged with the same crimes as the others (for he, too, had killed many of the proscribed), was acquitted. And from this very circumstance he became far worse and even lost his life as a result.” (*Historiae Romanae* 37.10.2-3) Sallust says,

*Sed postquam L. Sulla armis recepta re publica bonis initiis malos eventus habuit, rapere omnes, omnes trahere, domum alius, alius agros cupere, neque modum neque modestiam victores habere, foeda crudeliaque in civis facinora facere.*

But after Sulla seized the Republic by means of arms, having made a bad end from good beginning, all men robbed, all men pillaged, some desired houses,

others lands, the victors had neither limits nor moderation, committed filthy and cruel deeds on the citizens. (*Bellum Catilinae* 11.4)

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

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

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

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

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

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

Not having known how to save while building as if rich, while establishing great households and holding great banquets, and their lavish apparatus being used impetuously, to have fallen into such great debt, if they themselves wished to be set free Sylla awakened from the dead would have to be brought back for them...As it happened at this time Lucius Catiline in Rome, planning new affairs, had initiated a great conspiracy against the Republic in which many Knights,

many Senators, were numbered, moreover what one might *call sons of the Fathers*. (1.4-1.7)

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

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

Can SYLLA'S Ghost arise within thy walls,

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

Thy darker bosome enter SYLLA'S spirit:

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

A spirit, within me, chides my sluggish hands

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

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

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

If they wish to be saved, Sulla would have to be arising from the dead for them. (2

*In Catilinam* 20)

Jonson borrowed the phrase from Bruni who borrowed it from Cicero. Ibsen lost the thread. The story of the Catilinarian conspiracy preserved in the writings of the historians of the late Roman Republic, the scribes of the Roman church, the writings of the Church fathers and eventually transmitted to us the writings of the Renaissance humanists. After the Renaissance humanists, however, the interpretation of the texts

began to change until Catiline was transformed from a villain of classical antiquity through Ibsen's work into the hero of the modern bourgeoisie. Though it has been said that Ibsen knew no dramatic works before he wrote *Catiline* (1850), he began with a similitude of Jonson's ghost. Instead of Sulla's ghost arisen entering "the darkest bosoms," a voice speaks from the beginning to Catiline from within. This similitude is strange since although Ibsen repeats Jonson's metaphor of a wicked soul entering Catiline, he fails to employ Sulla's ghost as it was set forth in Cicero's oration.

I must, I must a voice commands me thus

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

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

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

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

his social decline “he refused to accept as equals or develop any kind of friendship with the poorer children.”

Ibsen left school in 1843 when he was fifteen and became an apprentice to a pharmacist in the town of Grimstad where, five years later, he wrote *Catiline*. At sometime within this period he became acquainted with the writings of Voltaire and had gathered around him a small group of friends, Due and Schulerud, who wrote poetry, political pamphlets and read aloud together. Ibsen became an atheist and a republican under the influence of the writings of Voltaire and began to express his “bitter ill will” towards those with “empty brains with full purses.” In 1848 he became enthusiastic about the February Revolution in France and began to speak against all emperors, tyrants and kings and in favor of republicanism while the historical persona which would become the protagonist in his first play, and to whom Ibsen would soon identify himself, was the *criminis auctor* that destroyed the Roman republic and paved the way for the empire.

--Yes, freedom, it is freedom I'll create,

as pure as one time in the bygone days. (*Ibid.* 181)

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

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



Κατιλίνας δ' αὐτὸν ἐς ὑβρίων ἐπιλομένων ἐπέσκωπτεν, ἐς μὲν  
 ἀγνωσίαν γένους καινὸν ὀνομάζων καλοῦσι δ' οὐτὼ τοὺς ἀφ'  
 ἐαυτῶν, ἀλλ' οὐτῶν προγόνων γνωρίμους, ἐς δ' ξενίαν τῆς  
 πόλεως ἰγκουιλίων, ὧρῃματι καλοῦσι τοὺς ἐνοικοῦντας  
 ἐναλλοτρίαις οἰκίαις.

“a ‘New Man,’ on account of his obscure birth (for so they call those who achieve distinction by their own merits and not by those of their ancestors); and because he was born in the city he called him ‘The Lodger,’ by which term they designate those who occupy houses belonging to others.” (*Civil Wars* 2.1.2)

Textual critics have disputed the authenticity of Cicero’s invective against Sallust, *In Sallustium Crispum*. The *Invective’s* vituperation of Sallust’s character is unparalleled and for that reason it has become suspect, since Cicero’s ability to traduce with greater eloquence is well known. The authenticity of Sallust’s invective against Cicero, *In Ciceronem*, has also been disputed, but the opinion of the textual critics tends to indicate that it is a genuine work of Sallust published by him as a political pamphlet and circulated anonymously. The *In Sallustium Crispum* however is believed to be the product of a rhetorical school, composed by a writer of small ability. (Rolf xix-xx)

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

them, added to his oath the statement that he had saved the city; and for this he incurred much greater hatred.” (*Historiae Romanae* 37.38.1-2) Cicero, apparently, never ceased in praising himself both before, and after, the defeat of Catiline. The infuriating remarks referred to by Cassius Dio could have been nothing less than those Cicero himself published.

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

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

And even before that Cicero said,

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

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

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

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

## II. Narrative

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

In the consulship of Marcus Tullius Cicero, the orator, and Gaius Antonius, in the six hundred and eighty ninth year from the founding of the city, Lucius Sergius Catiline, a man of the noblest lineage, but of the most crooked character conspired to destroy the fatherland with certain illustrious, but audacious, men. His

accomplices were arrested and strangled in prison. Catiline himself was defeated in battle by Antonius, the other Consul, and killed. (*Breviarium* 6.15)

Sallust begins narrative:

*Omnis hominis, qui sese student praestare ceteris animalibu, summa ope nite decet, ne vitam silentio transeant veluti pecora, quae natura prona atque ventri oboedientia finxit.*

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

But man is also a slave to the belly. Poverty hurts. Starvation compels man to satisfy the demands of the belly. It is, in fact, only when man's material needs have been satisfied that man become free to excel the other animals. Sallust was not starving when he wrote these lines. The opening remarks to the *Bellum Catilinae* are also a self-disclosure indicating not to which social class he belongs, but to which social classes he does not belong. He does not belong to the social class of the slaves nor to the class of free labor, the proletariat. Though Sallust attributes subservience to the belly as being caused by Nature, he neglects to mention the real cause for his own leisure. In truth, it is through the high civilization that he lives in that, by means of the class system, has satisfied his material needs. The state that Sallust lived in was class stratified with slavery at its base. Sallust himself was neither in the lowest class nor in the highest class, but was somewhere in between them. Both the laboring class and the slave class toiled to satisfy the immediate hunger pangs of the belly. They were subservient to it while Sallust was not. Though it is true there were some exceptions to this, the *proletarii*, the *servi*, and the *libertinii* were most likely illiterate.

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

Καὶ γὰρ οὐ τὸς Ἰάδμονος ἐγένετο, ὡς διέδεξε τῆ δε οὐ κ  
 ἠΐκιστα: [4] ἐπεῖτε γὰρ πολλαίκις κηρυσσόντων Δελφῶν ἐκ θεοπροπίου  
 ὁ ἕβούλοῖτο ποινὴν τῆς Αἰσώπου ψυχῆς ἀνελέσθαι, ἄλλος μὲν  
 οὐδεὶς ἐφάνη, Ἰάδμονος δὲ παιδὸς παῖς ἄλλος Ἰάδμων ἀνεῖλετο.  
 οὐτῶ καὶ Αἰσώπος Ἰάδμονος ἐγένετο.

“For he was owned by Iadmon, too, as the following made crystal clear: [4] when the Delphians, obeying an oracle, issued many proclamations summoning anyone who wanted it to accept compensation for the killing of Aesop, no one accepted it except the son of Iadmon's son, another Iadmon; hence Aesop, too, was Iadmon's.” (*The History* 2.134.3-4)

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

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

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

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

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

Indeed Sallust uses many pretty words. He leads us to believe, to trust, that such words or moral rectitude could have only come from the most upright of men. He passed moral judgment on mankind and, at the same time, excused himself from scrutiny. Sallust as an author, and as a moral being, was beyond reproach. Like a god he lectures the reader on virtue. This cannot but help build trust between the author and the reader. With these remarks Sallust exalted himself and his work. The reader becomes a co-traveler with Sallust’s soaring virtue by affirming that Sallust himself is no animal. Though it may have been unintended, correspondences could be drawn between the

actual social classes and Sallust's metaphors: 'gods' and 'brutes.' Sallust's metaphor indicates that the ruling class corresponds to the linguistic signs, the analogy: god = mind = rulers and the proletariat corresponds to the analogy: body = brutes = workers.

*Sed nostra omnis vis in animo et corpore sita est: animi imperio, corporis servitio magis utimur; alterum nobis cum dis, alterum cum beluis commune est. Quo mihi rectius videtur ingeni quam virium opibus gloriam quaerere et, quoniam vita ipsa, qua fruimur, brevis est, memoriam nostri quam maxime longam efficere. Nam divitiarum et formae gloria fluxa atque fragilis est, virtus clara aeternaque habetur. Sed diu magnum inter mortalis certamen fuit, vine corporis an virtute animi res militaris magis procederet. Nam et, prius quam incipias, consulto et, ubi consulueris, mature facto opus est. Ita utrumque per se indigens alterum alterius auxilio eget.*

All our power is situated in the mind and the body: to a great degree we employ the soul to rule, the body to serve; one is common to us with the gods, the other with the beasts. Wherefore it seems correct to me to seek glory with the help of the intellect than by strength and, whereas life itself, which we might enjoy, is brief, to make our memory last long. For to have the glory of riches and of beauty is fleeting and fragile, but virtue brilliant and eternal. But long ago there was a great struggle among mortals, whether the strength of the body or virtue of the soul would prosper greater in military affairs. For both you must plan before that which is first and when you have planned act when the deed is ripe. In this way each through itself needs the help of the other. (*Bellum Catilinae* 1.7)

He questions his own remarks: "Each of these [mind and body] is incomplete in itself." (*Ibid.* 1.7) Sallust develops this dichotomy as a kind of historical dualism. "In the

beginning kings took different courses, some training their minds and others their bodies.” (*Ibid.* 2.1) In so doing, he admitted that the rulers, who by nature correspond to the mind, virtue and god, could, as individuals, correspond to either mind, body, or vice. This is a somewhat contradictory metaphorical mixture by his previous tenets and, nevertheless, shows Aristotle’s influence on his thinking. “The soul rules the body with the sort of authority of a master: mind rules the appetite with the sort of authority of a statesman or a monarch.” (*The Politics* 1254b)

Freud, on the other hand, said that there are three basic types of human personality: the erotic personality, the narcissist personality and the ‘man of action’ personality. “The man who is primarily erotic will choose emotional relationships with others above all else; the narcissistic type, who is more self-sufficient, will seek his essential satisfactions in the inner working of his own soul; the man of action will never abandon the external world in which he can assay his power.” (*Civilization and Its Discontents* 40) Thus, according to Freud’s psychoanalysis, the mindful are narcissistic and the brutes are men of action. Naturally the erotic are somewhere in between them, but each personality type is, by itself, a mixture of all these traits with but one trait overwhelming all the others. Sallust himself was, clearly, a narcissist, though he denies it, but Catiline, on the other hand, was a man of action—a brute.

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

This one out of the other occupations, which are pursued by the intellect, in the first place the producing of things of history is of great use. Of whose virtues I



presume to pass over since many have spoken of them, at the same time, that someone not suppose that I through insolence extol my study.

(*Bellum Jugurtha* 4.1-2)

Ironically, though Cicero was too a narcissist, in the end of the Catiline affair he begins to praise himself as a man of action, proving the unity of these traits in the personality. “My conduct of this whole matter may be thought to display both foresight and action.” (3 *In Catilinam* 18) Since by what means a man makes choices in life, according to Freud, is guided by pursuit of pleasure and avoidance of pain; it would seem that he and Aristotle could agree. “For pleasure and pain extend throughout the whole life, and are of great moment and influence for virtue and happiness; since men choose what is pleasant and avoid what is painful.” (*Nicomachean Ethics* 10.1.1) For the narcissist, pleasure is obtained and pain avoided, through intellectual pursuits, the “men of action” through the vain pursuit of many useless things of the material world, ‘the dunya’ دُنْيَا. What the erotic pursue goes without explanation, but Catiline represented a fusion of the “man of action” and the erotic personality. The fact that Catiline left no written works, assayed his power imprudently, and committed many nefarious crimes compelled by lust testifies to this fact. Though Cicero would later be praised as “a man of action,” he manifests this through oratory in the political arena, a quintessentially narcissistic activity. Meanwhile Blok along with Ibsen would appear to fuse the erotic with the narcissistic.

Although Sallust was the primary historian of the *Bellum Catilinae*, it is important to understand that Cassius Dio, in his time, may have had access to texts which are non-extant today. We cannot dismiss his work or presume that his narrative is corrupt on the

grounds that it differs from Sallust or that it merely comes after Sallust. Indeed just as Greece was the conscience of all of Latium, and Greek historians are the lie detectors and reality-testers of contemporaneous Roman historians, they all together make-up, in the process, the scientific history of the period. Just as Rome cast a backward glance on Greece as its own antecedent, and the study of Livy casts a backward glance on Polybius; Cassius Dio looks back on Sallust, Cicero, Plutarch, et al, summing-up the entire period. Greek historians not only made-up the basis and the prototype for the Roman historians; they also checked their progress along the way, summing it up again at the very moment their own culture faded. Rome would go on. Just as Greek culture made Roman culture possible in the first place, later they made it possible for us to learn of it and understand it. Our debt to Cassius Dio, then, is immense; and we could say as much for Plutarch. Appian's history too must be consulted not so much for the history of the *Bellum Catilinae* itself, but for what led up to it and for what followed it, both for its causes and its consequences. We cannot, therefore, just take Sallust's version as the primary history and be done with it. We need Cassius Dio, and Plutarch, to capture the high ground, to gain perspective. Polybius stands as something to which Livy must be compared; Sallust too must be compared to Plutarch and Cassius Dio. Cicero is a primary source for the history of the *Bellum Catilinae*, but we must also keep in mind that Cicero had numerous vested against Catiline's conspiracy. Both his social position and his personality contended directly with those of Catiline and become the principal bones of contention for those who wish to dispute the veracity of the history as it has been handed down. Nevertheless, Cicero is the primary source for the history, Sallust is the primary historian. "History is thus the believing someone else when he says that he remembers something. The believer is the historian; the person believed is called his authority." (*The Idea of*

*History 235*) According to Sallust, after Sulla gained control of the state by means of arms and brought everything to a bad end from a good beginning, avarice controlled the people.

*Sed primo magis ambitio quam avaritia animos hominum exercebat, quod tamen vitium propius virtutem erat. Nam gloriam, honorem, imperium bonus et ignavus aequae sibi exoptant; sed ille vera via nititur, huic quia bonae artes desunt, dolis atque fallaciis contendit. Avaritia pecuniae studium habet, quam nemo sapiens concupivit: ea quasi venenis malis imbuta corpus animumque virilem effeminat, semper infinita, insatiabilis est, neque copia neque inopia minuitur. Postquam divitiae honori esse coepere et eas gloria, imperium, potentia sequebatur, hebescere virtus, paupertas probro haberi, innocentia pro malivolentia duci coepit.*

But, at first, great ambition, rather than greed, occupied the minds of men, which was, nevertheless, a vice nearer to a virtue. For glory, honor, power the good and the cowardly equally desire; but the one strives by way of the truth, the other destitute of the good arts, by fraud and deceit contends. Greed has money as its object, which no wise man has desired: it, as if imbued by a deadly poison, feminizes the manliness of the body and soul, it is always infinite and insatiable, diminished neither abundance nor indigence. As soon as riches came to be honors and themselves a glory, dominion, and power followed, virtue became blunt, poverty was held shameful, innocence began to be taken for malevolence.

*(Bellum Catilinae 11-12)*

Men like Catiline pillaged and squandered. “To such men their riches seemed to me to have been but a plaything; for while they might have enjoyed them honorably, they made

haste to squander them shamefully...they slept before they needed to sleep; they did not await the coming of hunger or thirst, of cold or of weariness, but all these things their self-indulgence anticipated.” (*Ibid.* 13.2) In his lamentation for the virtue of bygone days, Sallust said of men like Catiline:

*Quibus profecto contra naturam corpus voluptati, anima oneri fuit.*

For whom, truly, contrary to nature, the body was an enjoyment, the soul a burden. (*Ibid.* 2.8)

The ancients had a theory of a golden age which was a period of time wherein it was believed that all was right with the world which was followed by a period of social decline. Many of the Latin historians begin their *operae* with a description of this golden age and the social decline ending their preface with a few remarks on just how bad things had really become by the time anyone got around to writing about it. And when they had, the description of the contemporary horrors flows forth with such eloquence, wisdom and foresight that we today dismiss *their* golden age as *arcadianism* and irrelevant childish reverie. We ourselves ascribe instead the period of the writing of Latin history as *the* golden age which, according to our own schemata didn't even begin until the writing of Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae* (43 B.C.)—for the most ancient of the Roman historians Quintus Fabius Pictor (c. 254 B.C.) wrote in Greek, not Latin, and Livy's monumental work *Ab Urbe Condita* was not begun until after 27 B.C. (*Dating Livy* 209) The oldest extant Latin text is Cato major's *De Agricultura* (c. 150 B.C.) and was considered archaic by the time Sallust composed his *Bellum Catilinae* and is, nevertheless, not history *per se*. Thus there is 710 A.U.C. intervening years between the founding of Rome and the appearance of Rome's first Latin historian. Although the

publication of Caesar's *Commentarii de Bello Gallico* (50 B.C.) preceded that of the *Bellum Catilinae*, Caesar was a noted dissembler and a sophist, as Appian pointed out:

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

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

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

The so-called golden age the Latin authors wrote about would have been in Rome's earliest period, certainly before Romulus, or even Aeneas. If it ever existed, it would have been the time of the *Aborigines*, *ab* 'from' + *origio* 'origin, source, beginning' hence 'from the origins or beginnings,' thus γηγενής—*born of the earth* and hence not truly Roman, but Native. At any rate, according to Sallust, *inter alios*, there

was a golden age of the ancient past before the time of Jupiter when Saturn ruled the world. Men at that time were viewed as having been truly virtuous which was followed by a period social decline. It was a time to which all contemporaneous men and social institutions ought to be compared. In his *Georgics*, Virgil described it:

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

*Ille malum virus serpentibus addidit atris*

130

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

135

*[Ut silicis venis abstrusum excuderet ignem.]*

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

140

*inventum et magnos canibus circumdare saltus;  
atque alius latum funda iam verberat amnem*

*alta petens, pelagoque alius trahit humida lina;  
tum ferri rigor atque argutae lamina serrae,--  
nam primi cuneis scindebant fissile lignum*

145

*tum variae venere artes. Labor omnia vicit*

*inprobus et duris urgens in rebus egestas.*

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

Before Jupiter, no farmers subdued the land.

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

They sought out for the things in middle,

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

After man's fall from grace:

*Labor omnia vicit;*

*inprobus et duris urgens in rebus egestas.*

Labor conquered everything;

necessity and hardship press urgently in man's affairs. (1.145)

Indeed as Varro has it:

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

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

But this of course is another way of saying that earth is property, since property is *ops*. Varro connects the Sky to Saturn from the word *satus* ‘sowing,’ *Ab satu est dictus Saturnus*, but Kent doubts this etymology. “*Saturn*; according to the myth, the most ancient king of Latium, who came to Italy in the reign of *Janus*; afterwards honored as the god of agriculture and of civilization in general; hence early identified with the *Kronos* of the Greeks.” (*Lewis and Short*)

*Sed civitas incredibile memoratu est adepta libertate quantum brevi creverit; tanta cupido gloriae incesserat. Iam primum iuventus, simul ac belli patiens erat, in castris per laborem usum militiae discebat magisque in decoris armis et militaribus equis quam in scortis atque conviviiis lubidinem habebant. Igitur talibus viris non labor insolitus, non locus ullus asper aut arduus erat, armatus hostis formidulosus; virtus omnia domuerat. Sed gloriae maxumum certamen inter ipsos erat; se quisque hostem ferire murum ascendere, conspici dum tale facinus facet, properabat; eas divitias, eam bonam famam magnamque nobilitatem putabant. Laudis avidi, pecuniae liberales erant; gloriam ingentem, divitias honestas volebant. Memorare possem quibus in locis maxumas hostium copias populus Romanus parva manu fuderit quas urbis natura munitas pugnando ceperit, ni ea res longius nos ab incepto traheret.*



But the free State, by means of gaining freedom, came into being is worthy of mention; desire for glory grew forth. A youth, at first, as soon as he was tough enough for war learned, through labor in the camp, military skills. And they had more pleasure in beauty of arms and horses for war than in prostitutes and parties. Accordingly, to such distinguished men, no task was unfamiliar, not any place too rough or steep no armed stranger too formidable; manliness conquered all. But in fact rivalry for the greatest glory was between themselves; each one made haste to himself strike the enemy, to climb the wall while conspicuously doing such a deed. These they considered riches, this good reputation and great renown. They were greedy for praise, generous with money; they wished for great fame, honorable wealth. I could mention the places in which the Roman people routed a great number of enemies with a small handful, those cities seized by natural fighting ability, if this matter did not draw me away from our undertaking. (Bellum Catilinae 7.3-7)

In his *Annals*, Tacitus, echoing Sallust, narrated along these lines.

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

In the earliest days of the mortals, no one heretofore lived by evil desire, without shameful act or sin, conducted himself without punishment or compulsions. And work was done with honor not for rewards it would be sought after for its own sake, and when nothing was desired against custom, nothing through fear was

prohibited. But, as soon as equality proceeded to be put off and, in the face of moderation and decency, ambition and strength was advanced, tyrannies arose and remained among many peoples. (3.26.1)

Just as Sallust in an earlier period noted:

*Igitur, initio, reges, nam in terris nomen imperi id primum fuit, divorsi pars ingenium, alii corpus exercebant: etiam tum vita hominum sine cupiditate agitabatur; sua cuique satis placebant. Postea vero, quam in Asia Cyrus, in Graecia Lacedaemonii et Athenienses coepere urbis atque nationes subigere, lubidinem dominandi causam belli habere, maxumam gloriam in maxumo imperio putare, tum demum periculo atque negotiis compertum est in bello plurimum ingenium posse.*

Then, in the beginning, kings, for that was the first name of sovereignty in the lands, applied themselves differently; part the mind, others the body: still, in those times, the life of men was urged along without cupidity, everyone was satisfied with their own. But truly after Cyrus in Asia, in Greece the Lacedaemonians and the Athenians began to subdue cities and nations, to have desire for dominion a cause of war, to consider the greatest glory in the greatest Empire. Then the inhabitants by means of experiment, as well as affairs, were learning to be able to multiply natural abilities in war. (*Bellum Catilinae* 2.2)

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

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

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

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

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

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

By the time of the *Bellum Catilinae*

*Verum ubi pro labore desidia, pro continentia et aequitate libido atque superbia invasere, fortuna simul cum moribus inmutatur.*

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

Even Livy noted, “Of late, riches have brought avarice, and excessive pleasures, the longing to carry wantonness and licence to the point of ruin for oneself and of universal destruction.”

*Adeo quanto rerum minus, tanto minus cupiditatis erat.*

By the same degree, the fewer one’s things, the less was his desire. (*Ab Urbe Condita* 1.1.12)

On account of these developments, Catiline, a product of sloth, greed, and ambition, gathered about him a number of young men to whom he taught the habits and

techniques of the criminal mind. In addition to these men, Catiline enlisted the aid of a number of Sulla's veterans, like himself. (*Bellum Catilinae* 16.1-4) Plutarch confirms this. "It was the old soldiers of Sulla, however, who were most of all urging Catiline on to action." (*Cicero* 14.2) According to Bruni,

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

Accordingly, in buildings such as these and moreover they were occupied spending the rest of their lives among such splendor, which Tullius Cicero mentioned, exercising foresight neither for the future nor using their store sparingly, in this way, after a short period of time, it came to pass, they ran out of money, and, at the same time, their only hope of largesses not only deserted the dictatorship, but passed out of this world. And so, partly because of their poverty, partly because they were accustomed to receiving rewards, they wished for some new rebellion to arise. Men were accustomed to using the military, and civil war. They had no idea how to live in peace. On the contrary, new dictatorships, and the exploits of a new war, revolved in the mind, and debt was indeed a sharp goad to acquiescence, by which even timid souls were dislodged from their leisure. (*History of the Florentine People* 1.6)

In his second invective against Catiline, Cicero lays out the six types of men who supported Catiline. The first group were those “who have heavy debts and possess estates more than large enough to pay them...These men have the most respectable outward appearance—for they are wealthy—but their intentions and attitudes are quite unscrupulous...The second group consists of those overwhelmed by debt but still enjoy absolute power. They want to gain control of the government and think that revolution, *perturbata* or disturbance, can bring them offices of which they have no hope in times of peace...The third group...are men from those colonies which Sulla founded...who have used their sudden and unexpected wealth to give a display of luxury to which they were quite unaccustomed and which was beyond their means...they have run so deeply into debt that they would have to raise Sulla from the dead if they wanted to be in the clear...The fourth group is a motley assortment of trouble makers...These men, I would say, are not so much eager soldiers as reluctant defaulters...The fifth group is composed of parricides, assassins and every sort of criminal...The last group is...Catiline’s very own; his special choice...his most intimate friends. These men are the men you see with their carefully combed hair, dripping with oil, some smooth as girls, others with shaggy beards...wearing frocks not togas...their waking hours are devoted to banquets that last till dawn...all the gamblers, all the adulterers, all the filthy minded lechers...boys so dainty and effeminate, have learnt not only to love and be loved, not only to dance and sing, but also to brandish daggers and sow poison.” (2 *In Catilinam* 18-23)

According to Mommsen, “the gangrene of a slave-proletariat gnawed at the vitals of the states of antiquity,” including that of Rome. It was especially coming to a head in 66 B. C. when, in addition to the robbing and squandering, the rural population was falling into debt, losing their property and crowding into the cities. Machiavelli said that

Rome was a free state, because it had free origins. For, although Rome had been founded by foreigners, it was not founded as a colony of another republic or by a prince who sought to glorify his own name and hence had free origins. “The builders of cities are free when any people, either under a prince or on its own, are forced by disease, famine, or war to abandon its native land and seek a new home.” He credits Aeneas with having achieved this. (*Discourses* 19-20) Hegel disagrees. With respect to the founding of Rome and the events that occurred at the end of the Republic and the ascension of Julius Caesar to the *imperium*: “A state which had first to form itself, and which is based on force, must be held together with force. It is not a moral, liberal connection, but a compulsory condition of subordination, that results from such an origin.” (*Philosophy of History* 287) The *argumentum ad baculum* became his final argument against the Republic.

In 66 B. C., when Catiline returned to Rome, he was already the subject of charges leveled against him by the envoys from Africa based on atrocities he had committed there where he was *propraetor* in 67-66. Even before that, in 73, he was accused of adultery with the Vestal Virgin Fabia. Quintus Latatius Catalus, consul in 78 and leader of the *Optimates*, testified in Catiline’s favor and he was acquitted. Furthermore, L. Annius Bellienus and L. Luscius, who had slain men during the proscriptions of Sulla, were tried for murder and convicted at the insistence of Julius Caesar. Catiline faced the same charges and was acquitted. Notwithstanding Cicero’s remarks to the effect that Catiline had been charged and acquitted at least twice (*Letters to Atticus* 59), Hardy says that the majority of the charges against Catiline “depended on mere rumor, had never been judicially investigated and were given inconsistently by other authorities.” Perhaps his remarks on this issue understate Catiline’s political power and the great amount of fear he instilled in the Senate and his propensity to dissemble

effectively. Hutchinson says, “These accusations against Catiline lack conviction.” (*The Conspiracy* 35) Mommsen disagreed, because, according to him, Catiline was “accustomed to impose on his cowardly opponents by his audacious insolence...neither private persons nor officials ventured to lay hands on the dangerous man.” (*The History of Rome* 477-78) According to Plutarch, “even the heavenly powers seemed, by earthquakes and thunderbolts and apparitions, to foreshow what was coming to pass. And there were also human testimonies which were true, indeed, but not sufficient for the conviction of a man of reputation and great power like Catiline.” (*Cicero* 14.4) Cicero himself related a great number of portents, and a vision, which guided him through the whole affair. Herodotus said:

Φιλέει δέ κως προσημαίνειν, εὐ τ' αὖ ἐν μέλλῃ μεγάλα κακὰ ἢ πόλι ἢ  
εὐθνή εἶσεσθαι

“It mostly happens that there is some warning when great misfortunes are about to befall a state or a nation.” (*The History* 6.27)

MacDonald surmised the charges made against Catiline by ancient authors: “In his speech *in toga candida*, delivered in the summer of 64, Cicero alleges a series of crimes committed over the past two decades. He says that at the time of the Sullan proscriptions Catiline had cut off the head of Marcus Marius Gratidianus and carried it through the streets of Rome, and that he had murdered Quintus Caecilius, Marcus Volumnius and Lucius Tanusius; that he had been discredibly involved with the Vestal Fabia... that he had entered into an incestuous marriage with his daughter, whose name, Aurelia Orestilla, is supplied for us by Sallust. In the first speech against Catiline he adds the further allegation that after getting rid of his previous wife he committed another crime, the murder of his son. Two other writers add to this list. The author of he

electioneering handbook, *commentariolum petitionis*, alleges that Catiline did away with his brother-in-law, a knight by the name of Quintus Caecilius, during the proscriptions. Plutarch relates that he killed his own brother and committed incest with his daughter.” (MacDonald 3-7)

MacDonald faults Cicero for not including the urban plebs in his list of *criminis auctores*, but there is no evidence that the urban plebs, as a class supported him, or that any class in particular supported him; rather Catiline’s supporters were, in fact, divided along the lines to which Cicero spoke. MacDonald says that the Roman masses, at first, supported him, but his own annotations prove this to be incorrect. Indeed, Sallust records a total of eight social groups gripped by Catiline’s insanity. According to him, the first group was “the whole body of the commons through desire for change.” (*Bellum Catilinae* 37.1-11) Here, since Sallust himself uses the word “*plebs*,” it could be argued, then, that Catiline was indeed supported by them, at least for a moment, but it is clear that his feelings were not mutual in this regard, because Catiline was a *sophist* not an orator. “For what makes the sophist is not the faculty [of speech] but [his] moral purpose.” (*Rhetoric* 1.1.14) Since, as it has already been established, Catiline was positively amoral; the body of the commons could have been *persuaded* to support Catiline but this in no way implies that Catiline had any *love* for them in return. “Let loving be defined as wishing for anyone the things which we believe to be good, for his sake and not our own...Wherefore one who wishes for another what he wishes for himself seems to be the other’s friend.” (*Ibid.* 2.4.1-4) Cicero says Catiline collected about him “a huge crowd of desperate men” (2 *In Catilinam* 8) not the entire class of the plebians. A crowd of desperate men is not a social class. In his first invective against Catiline, *ad hominem*, Cicero said:



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

What now, Catiline? Now do you hesitate to do by my command that which you were already willing to do? The consul orders the enemy to leave the city. You ask me, whether into exile? I do not order it, but, if you consult me, I recommend. For what is there in this city, Catiline, that will be able to delight you now? With respect to this, there is no one outside that conspiracy of hopeless men of yours who does not fear you, who does not hate. What mark of family disgrace is not branded upon your life? What shame of your private affairs does not remain fixed on your reputation? What lust from your eyes, what crime ever from your hands, what shame from your whole body never was? Before what young man, whom you have ensnared with the allurements of seduction, have you not either boldly carried a sword or a passionate flame? (1 *In Catilinam* 13)

Mommsen declared: “Catiline especially was one of the most wicked men in that wicked age. His villainies belong to the records of crime, not to history.” (*The History of Rome* 465) Cicero had been an ally of Pompey’s, and an enemy of Sulla’s, since the time he

served under Pompey in the war against the Marsians (B.C. 90-88). Plutarch says, incorrectly, that Cicero had served under Sulla when it was Pompey who had served under him (Cf. *Cicero* 3.2n1). Furthermore, on account of the fact that Cicero's first defense was in favor of Roscius, one to whom his father had been proscribed by Sulla, Cicero fled to Greece for a number of years out of fear of Sulla. (Cf., *Pro Roscio*) It was there, in Athens, that Cicero cultivated his skills as an orator. After Cicero learned of Sulla's death, having first consulted the oracle at Delphi who urged him to follow his own nature and not the opinion of the multitude, he returned to Rome in 77 B.C. (*Cicero* 3.4-5.2) In 75 B.C. he was appointed *quaestor* and won many friends defending the Sicilians. (*Ibid.* 6.1-3) 66 he was appointed *praetor* and convicted a man close to Crassus named Licinius Macer. (*Ibid.* 9.2) Two or three days before the expiration of his praetorship he set a trial date for Manilius, a friend of Pompey's, in such a way that Cicero could defend him on his last day in office. The tribunes were enraged and summoned Cicero to the rostra. (*Ibid.* 9.4-7)

In the 66 election for the consulship of 65, Autronius Paetus and Cornelius Sulla—a nephew of the great Sulla—were disqualified for bribery. They joined a secret league of men formed from the highest ranks of Roman society who sought to obtain power by any means necessary. It seems that Catiline also violated Machiavelli's laws of conspiracy in several ways. The whole plot was fractured with fatal flaws from the very beginning due to Catiline's disordered thinking and his tangled web of lies. According to Machiavelli it is difficult to develop a conspiracy beyond three or four persons in number. (*Discourses* 262) At Catiline's first meeting at the home of Procius Laeca: "There were present from the senatorial order Publius Lentus Sura, Publius Autronius, Lucius Cassius Longinus, Gaius Cethegus, Publius and Servius Sulla, sons of Servius,

Lucius Vargunteius, Quintus Annius, Marcus Procius Laeca, Lucius Bestia, Quintus Curius; also of the equestrian order, Marcus Fulvius Nobitor, Lucius Statilius, Publius Gabinius Capito, Gaius Cornelius; besides these there were many men from the colonies and free towns who were of noble rank at home.” (*Bellum Catilinae* 17.3-5)

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

Lucius Cotta and Lucius Torquatus ascended to the high office in 65 (*Historiae Romanae* 36.44.3) followed by Lucius Caesar and Gaius Figulus in 64. (*Bellum Catilinae* 17.1) Piso and Catiline were the principal actors in a plot to assail the Senate with armed men in the *putsch* of Jan. 1, 65 B.C. The newly elected consuls were to be put to death, Sulla and Paetus reinstated; Crassus was to be acclaimed dictator and Caesar the Master of the Horse. According to this sinister plan, Catiline was to await a signal to be given by Caesar upon a hint from Crassus, but Crassus was absent. (*The History of Rome* 466) Since this plot failed, they decided to postpone the action until Feb. 5th.

Under the revised plan, they decided to murder not only the consuls but a number of senators as well. The conspiracy came to naught because Catiline gave the signal for the attack too early. The armed conspirators had not yet assembled in sufficient number to follow through with the plan, but Piso’s intentions became known to all. (*Bellum Catilinae* 18.1-8) “On that day the most dreadful crime since the founding of the city of Rome would have been perpetrated.” (*Ibid.* 18.8) Piso was defended by Crassus. “The Senate, however, had been quite willing to give him the province, wishing to remove this shameless fellow to a distance from the seat of government.” (*Ibid.* 19.1) Cassius Dio says that a decree would have been passed against the conspirators but the tribunes had opposed it thinking that a conviction against Piso would have caused a riot. Piso was sent on to Spain where he met his death. (*Historiae Romanae* 36.44.5)

At the time of the *Bellum Catilinae*, Pompey was absent from Rome, in the east, waging war on the kings of Pontus and Armenia. In 64, “Catiline wished to obtain first a strong base of operation, and therefore sued for the consulship” sued for the consulship hoping that he might share the office with Antonius.<sup>13</sup> The populace, having recognized Antonius as a weak leader, who, as consul, would only add strength to the man next to him, chose Cicero over Catiline. (*Cicero* 11.1-3) During this time, the tribunes were introducing legislation that would have appointed a commission of ten men, a *decimvirate*, with unlimited power to rule Rome and all its territories. Antonius was one of those who favored the legislation. Pompey, so says Cassius Dio, returned to Rome in 63 where he was granted, at the insistence of Caesar and against the recommendation of Cato, the “trophy of the inhabited world” in honor of all his wars. “He did not, however, add any other title to his name, but was satisfied with that of Magnus alone, which he had gained even before these achievements. Nor did he contrive to receive any other extravagant honor.” (*Historiae Romanae* 37.20.4.-21.4)

## **II. First meeting at the home of Procius Laeca, June 1, 64.**

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

In July of 63 B.C. Catiline again announced his candidacy, this time it was a cover for his *putsch* against the consulship, Cicero, and *res publica*. “According to Plutarch, Cicero postponed the day of the elections and summoned Catiline to the Senate to question him about his activities. Catiline reportedly made a spectacle of himself with remarks to the effect: “‘What dreadful thing, pray,’ said he, ‘am I doing, if when there are two bodies, one lean and wasted, but with a head, and the other headless, but strong and

---

<sup>13</sup> Gaius Antony was the brother of the infamous Marc Antony. Γάϊον, τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἀντωνίου. (*Civil Wars* 4.10.75)

large, I myself become a head for this?’” (*Cicero* 14.6-7) Catiline’s parable was intended to signify the meaning that Catiline was the head of a body politic that was *lean and wasted*, due to its political poverty, and that the Roman republic, being *strong and large*, was headless with Cicero, or anyone besides Catiline, at its helm. Because of Catiline’s remarks in the Senate, Cicero became seriously alarmed and began wearing a breastplate under his tunic which he showed to the commons by loosing the tunic from his shoulders from time to time. (*Ibid.* 14.7-8) “When the day of the elections came and neither Catiline’s suit nor the plots which he had made against the consuls in the Campus Martius were successful, he resolved to take the field and dare the utmost, since his covert attempts had resulted in disappointment and disgrace.” (*Bellum Catilinae* 26.5) “He again suffered defeat, this time at the hands of Decimus Junius Silanus and Lucius Licinius Murena...The highest office in the State...was not to be his by constitutional means, and it was the realization of this fact that turned Catiline into an active revolutionary...This was the only path now left open to him.” (MacDonald 5-6)

Mommsen says that Catiline and Piso were the political tools of Crassus and Caesar. (*The History of Rome* 468) “[Cicero], in later years, when he had no reason to disguise the truth...expressly named Caesar among the accomplices.” (*Ibid.* 486) “In the affair of Catiline, which was very serious, and almost subversive to Rome, some suspicion attached itself to Crassus, and a man publicly named him as one of the conspirators, but nobody believed him. The conspirator Lucius Tarquinius confirmed the testimony of Volturcius and then implicated Crassus. (*Bellum Catilinae* 48.3-9) “Nevertheless, in one of his orations [non-extant] plainly inculpated Crassus and Caesar. This oration, it is true, was not published until both were dead; but in his treatise upon his consulship [non-extant], Cicero says that Crassus came to him by night with a letter

which gave details of the affair of Catiline, and felt that he was at last establishing the fact of a conspiracy.” (*Crassus* 13.2) Machiavelli said about Caesar’s character, “Anyone who wishes to know what writers, when free, would say about him should see what they say about Catiline.” (*Discourses* 48) Mommsen said, “Anyone who impartially considers the course of the conspiracy will not be able to resist the suspicion that during all this time Catiline was backed by more powerful men.” (*The History of Rome* 488)

Having been defeated in all legal but not in all illegal means of securing a consulship for himself, Catiline redoubled his efforts. He drew together his band of conspirators and harangued them about the nature of the government to the effect that the wealth and power of the state were in the hands of the few and urged them to action. (*Bellum Catilinae* 20.1-17) In his speech to his conspirators Catiline denied in advance what he had already planned to do. “We have taken up arms, not against our fatherland not to bring danger upon others, but to protect our own persons against outrage.” (*Ibid.* 33.1) This is contradictory to the known fact that he, *inter alia*, intended to burn the city. “Catiline believed that he could tempt the city slaves to his side and set fire to Rome.” (*Ibid.* 24.4) He went on to blame the moneylenders for their ruin. This may at least in part be true. It is, after all, well known fact that usury was out of control in the Roman republic and that many had been ruined by falling into debt. Usury, το δαιρίζειν, was illegal in Rome during the early period. According to Appian,

Του δ' αυ του χρόνου κατὰ τὸ α' στυ οι χρη σται πρὸς α λλήλους ε στασίασαν, οι μὲν πράττοντες τὰ χρέα σὺν τόκοις, νόμου τινὸς παλαιου διαγορεύοντος μὴ δανείζειν ε πὶ τόκοις η ` ζημίαν τὸν ου 'τω δανείσαντα προσοφλει ν. α ποστραφη ναι γάρ μοι δοκου σιν οι πάλαι Ρωμαι οι,

καθάπερ Ἕλληνας, τὸ δανείζειν ὧς κατηλικὸν καὶ βαρὺ τοῖς πένησι καὶ δύσερι καὶ ἐχθροποιόν, ὧς λόγῳ καὶ Πέρσαι τὸ κίχρασθαι ὧς ἀπατηλὸν τε καὶ φίλοψευδές. ἔθους δὲ χρόνιου τοὺς τόκους βεβαιουῖντος, οἱ μὲν κατὰ τὸ ἔθος ἠΐτου, οἱ δὲ οἰκονομικὰ πολέμων τε καὶ στάσεων ἀνεβάλλοντο τὰς ἀποδόσεις: εἰσὶ δ' οἱ καὶ τὴν ζημίαν τοὺς δανείσαντας ἐκτίσειν ἐπιπείλουν.

Ὁ τε στρατηγὸς Ἀσελλίων, ὧς ταυτα προσέκειτο, ἐπεὶ διαλύων αὐτοὺς οὐκ ἐπειθεν, ἐδίδου κατ' ἀλλήλων αὐτοῖς δικαστήρια, τὴν ἐκ τοῦ νόμου καὶ ἔθους ἀπορίαν ἐς τοὺς δικαστὰς περιφέρων. οἱ δανεισταὶ δὲ χαλεπήναντες, ὅτι τὸν νόμον παλαιὸν ὄντα ἀνεκαίνιζε, κτείνουσιν αὐτὸν ὧς δε: οἱ μὲν ἐθύε τοῖς Διοσκούροις ἐναγορὰ, τοῦ πλήθους ὧς ἐπιθυσία περιστάντος: ἐνὸς δὲ λίθου τὸ πρῶτον ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἀφεθέντος, ἐρριψε τὴν φιάλην καὶ ἐς τὸ τῆς Ἑστίας ἱερὸν ἵετο δρόμῳ. οἱ δὲ αὐτὸν προλαβόντες τε ἀπέκλεισαν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱεροῦ καὶ καταφυγόντα ἐς τι πανδοχεῖον ἐσφαξαν. πολλοὶ τε τῶν διωκόντων ἐς τὰς παρθένους αὐτὸν ἠγούμενοι καταφυγεῖν ἐσέδραμον, ἐνθα μὴ θέμις ἦεν ἀνδράσιν. οὐτῶ μὲν καὶ Ἀσελλίων στρατηγὼν τε καὶ σπένδων καὶ ἱερὰν καὶ ἐπίχρυσον ἐσθητὰ ὧς ἐνθυσία περικείμενος ἀμφὶ δευτέραν ὥραν ἐσφάζετο ἐναγορὰ μέση παρὰ ἱεροῖς. καὶ ἡ σύγκλητος ἐκήρυσσεν, εἰ τίς τι περὶ τὸν Ἀσελλίωνος φόνον ἐλέγξειεν, ἐλευθέρῳ μὲν ἀργύριον, δούλῳ δὲ ἐλευθερίαν, συνεγνωκότε δὲ ἀδείαν: οὐ μὴν ἐμήνυσεν οὐδεὶς, τῶν δανειστῶν περικαλυψάντων.

“An old law distinctly forbade lending on interest and imposed a penalty upon any one doing so. It seems that the ancient Romans, like the Greeks, abhorred the taking of interest on loans as something knavish, and hard on the poor, and leading to contention and enmity. But since time had sanctioned the practice of taking interest, the creditors demanded it according to custom. The debtors, on the other hand, put off their payments on the plea of war and civil commotion. Some indeed threatened to exact the legal penalty from the interest-takers.” (*Civil Wars* 1.6.54)

After the *Social War* the practice of usury was fought to a standstill in the courts. The usurers, in order to breach the logjam killed the praetor Asellio while he was making sacrifice to the god Castor. “The Senate offer a reward of money to any free citizen, freedom to any slave, impunity to any accomplice, who should give testimony leading to the conviction of the murderers of Asellio, but nobody gave any information. The money-lenders covered up everything.” (*Ibid*) Herodotus reported that usury was also forbidden amongst contemporaneous Persians,

Αἰσχιστον δὲ αὐτοῖσι τὸ ψεύδεσθαι νενόμισται, δεύτερα δὲ τὸ οφείλειν χρέος, πολλῶν μὲν καὶ ἄλλων εἴνεκα, μάλιστα δὲ ἀναγκαίην φασὶ εἶναι τὸν οφείλοντα καὶ τι ψευδος λέγειν.

The foremost shameful thing, according to custom, is to cheat by lies, the second is to owe a debt, on account of owing, *inter alia*, it is said to be necessary to speak more lies. (*The History* 1.138.1)

Aristotle noted:

Εὐλογώτατα μισεῖται ἡ βολοστατικὴ διὰ τὸ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ νομίσματος εἶναι τὴν κτησίν καὶ οὐκ ἐφ' ὅπερ ἐπορίσθη.



μεταβολῆς γὰρ ἐγένετο χάριν, [5] ὁ δὲ τόκος αὐτὸ ποιεῖ πλεονέκτημα ὅθεν καὶ τοῦ νόμου τοῦτ' εἰλήφεν: ὁμοία γὰρ τὰ τικτόμενα τοῖς γεννώσιν αὐτά ἐστιν, ὁ δὲ τόκος γίνεται νόμισμα ἐκ νομίματος: ὥστε καὶ μάλιστα παρὰ φύσιν οὗτος τῶν χρηματισμῶν ἐστίν.

“As this is so, usury is most reasonably hated, because its gain comes from money itself and not from that for the sake of which money was invented. For money was brought into existence for the purpose of exchange, but interest increases the amount of the money itself (and this is the actual origin of the Greek word: offspring resembles parent, and interest is money born of money); consequently this form of the business of getting wealth is of all forms the most contrary to nature.” (*The Politics* 1258b1-5)

Though the Greek would also add *hubris*, ὑβρις, among the great breeches of social decorum, something of which Catiline very much had.

The principal contradictory statement in Catiline’s speech to the conspirators, however, was his reliance on the *succession* movements of the plebeians against the patricians for Catiline was, after all, himself a patrician. The term *succession*, moreover, implied that Catiline looked forward to a separation with Rome, as if to leave to found a new city. It was through the *First Succession* movement (494 B.C.) that the *Tribunate of the Plebs* was created. After this a *Tribunnus Plebis* was elected annually and is considered to have been the first step toward democracy between the members of the ruling classes. Catiline, obviously, intended nothing of the sort. As a supporter of Sulla he could not have, since Sulla had abolished the tribunes and removed the juries from the equestrian order and they were not restored until 70 B.C. by the Consuls Pompey and

Crassus. Catiline, in his speech, went on to contrast the wealth of his enemies with the poverty of his friends.

*Catilina ubi eos, quos paulo ante memoravi, convenisse videt, tametsi cum singulis multa saepe egerat, tamen in rem fore credens univorsos appellare et cohortari in abditam partem aedium secedit atque ibi omnibus arbitris procul amotis orationem huiusce modi habuit: “Ni virtus fidesque vostra spectata mihi forent, nequiquam opportuna res cecidisset; spes magna, dominatio in manibus frustra fuissent, neque ego per ignaviam aut vana ingenia incerta pro certis captarem. Sed quia multis et magnis tempestatibus vos cognovi fortis fidosque mihi, eo animus ausus est maxumum atque pulcherrimum facinus incipere, simul quia vobis eadem, quae mihi, bona malaque esse intellexi; nam idem velle atque idem nolle, ea demum firma amicitia est. Sed ego quae mente agitavi, omnes iam antea divorsi audistis. Ceterum mihi in dies magis animus accenditur, cum considero, quae condicio vitae futura sit, nisi nosmet ipsi vindicamus in libertatem. Nam postquam res publica in paucorum potentium ius atque dicionem concessit, semper illis reges, tetrarchae vectigales esse, populi, nationes stipendia pendere; ceteri omnes, strenui, boni, nobiles atque ignobiles, vulgus fuimus, sine gratia, sine auctoritate, iis obnoxii, quibus, si res publica valeret, formidini essemus. Itaque omnis gratia, potentia, honos, divitiae apud illos sunt aut ubi illi volunt; nobis reliquere pericula, repulsas, iudicia, egestatem. Quae quousque tandem patiemini, o fortissimi viri? Nonne emori per virtutem praestat quam vitam miseram atque inhonestam, ubi alienae superbiae ludibrio fueris, per dedecus amittere? Verum enim vero, pro deum atque hominum fidem, victoria in manu nobis est: viget aetas, animus valet; contra illis annis atque divitiis omnia*

*consenuerunt. Tantummodo incepto opus est, cetera res expedit. Etenim quis mortalium, cui virile ingenium est, tolerare potest illis divitias superare, quas profundant in exstruendo mari et montibus coaequandis, nobis rem familiarem etiam ad necessaria deesse? Illos binas aut amplius domos continuare, nobis larem familiarem nusquam ullam esse? Cum tabulas, signa, toreumata emunt, nova diruunt, alia aedificant, postremo omnibus modis pecuniam trahunt, vexant, tamen summa lubidine divitias suas vincere nequeunt. At nobis est domi inopia, foris aes alienum, mala res, spes multo asperior: denique quid reliqui habemus praeter miseram animam? Quin igitur expergiscimini? En illa, illa, quam saepe optastis, libertas, praeterea divitiae, decus, gloria in oculis sita sunt; fortuna omnia ea victoribus praemia posuit. Res, tempus, pericula, egestas, belli spolia magna magis quam oratio mea vos hortantur. Vel imperatore vel milite me utimini! Neque animus neque corpus a vobis aberit. Haec ipsa, ut spero vobiscum una consul agam, nisi forte me animus fallit et vos servire magis quam imperare parati estis.”*

“When Catiline saw those, whom I have just above mentioned, assembled, though he had often discussed many points with them singly, yet thinking it would be to his purpose to address and exhort them in a body, retired with them into a private apartment of his house, where, when all witnesses were withdrawn, he harangued them to the following effect: “If your courage and fidelity had not been sufficiently proved by me, this favorable opportunity<sup>2</sup> would have occurred to no purpose; mighty hopes, absolute power, would in vain be within our grasp; nor should I, depending on irresolution or fickle-mindedness, pursue contingencies instead of certainties. But as I have, on many remarkable occasions, experienced

your bravery and attachment to me, I have ventured to engage in a most important and glorious enterprise. I am aware, too, that whatever advantages or evils affect you, the same affect me; and to have the same desires and the same aversions, is assuredly a firm bond of friendship.

“What I have been meditating you have already heard separately. But my ardor for action is daily more and more excited, when I consider what our future condition of life must be, unless we ourselves assert our claims to liberty. For since the government has fallen under the power and jurisdiction of a few, kings and princes<sup>4</sup> have constantly been their tributaries; nations and states have paid them taxes; but all the rest of us, however brave and worthy, whether noble or plebeian, have been regarded as a mere mob, without interest or authority, and subject to those, to whom, if the state were in a sound condition, we should be a terror. Hence, all influence, power, honor, and wealth, are in their hands, or where they dispose of them; to us they have left only insults, dangers, persecutions, and poverty. To such indignities, O bravest of men, how long will you submit? Is it not better to die in a glorious attempt, than, after having been the sport of other men's insolence, to resign a wretched and degraded existence with ignominy?

"But success (I call gods and men to witness!) is in our own hands. Our years are fresh, our spirit is unbroken; among our oppressors, on the contrary, through age and wealth a general debility has been produced. We have therefore only to make a beginning; the course of events will accomplish the rest.

"Who in the world, indeed, that has the feelings of a man, can endure that they should have a superfluity of riches, to squander in building over seas and leveling mountains, and that means should be wanting to us even for the necessaries of

life; that they should join together two houses or more, and and that we should not have a hearth to call our own ? They, though they purchase pictures, statues, and embossed plate ; though they pull down new buildings and erect others, and lavish and abuse their wealth in every possible method, yet can not, with the utmost efforts of caprice, exhaust it. But for us there is poverty at home, debts abroad; our present circumstances are bad, our prospects much worse; and what, in a word, have we left, but a miserable existence ?

“Will you not, then, awake to action? Behold that liberty, that liberty for which you have so often wished, with wealth, honor, and glory, are set before your eyes. All these prizes fortune offers to the victorious. Let the enterprise itself, then, let the opportunity, let your poverty, your dangers, and the glorious spoils of war, animate you far more than my words. Use me either as your leader or your fellow-soldier; neither my heart nor my hand shall be wanting to you. These objects I hope to effect, in concert with you, in the character of consul; unless, iudeed, my expectation deceives me, and you prefer to be slaves rather than masters.” (*Bellum Catilinae* 20.2-17)

Whereupon, Catiline promised his friends the abolition of their debts and the *proscription* of the rich. Here Catiline’s use of the word *proscription* shows he was still genetically tied to the politics of Sulla. In light of this, it would be difficult to articulate an argument to the effect that Catiline actually stood for something else besides Sulla’s political program. Clearly Catiline sought to imitate the *proscriptions* of Sulla. He was not a reformer, then, but a reactionary.

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

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

On account of capability being governed by chance, rather than intellectual power, men bemoan the nature of their race in vain. For, on the contrary, you would find, by means of reflection, nothing greater, and nothing more excellent; and that the industry of human nature, rather than virtue, or time, to be lacking. But, the leader and master of life of the mortals is the soul. Which, when goes to glory by means of the path of excellence, is sufficiently powerful and capable and it is clearly not needing luck, which obviously is able to give neither probity,

industry, or any other goods of the arts, nor to take them away. If on the contrary, it has been seized by by crooked desires for laziness and pleasures of the body it has been given to the bottom, serving itself a little while by pernicious desire, whence through indolence, time, strength, and constitution have passed away, weakness in nature is accused: the actors who are themselves to blame transfer it to circumstances. If, however, care for good things were as important to men, as fondness for the useless, as well as striving for things useless, and many dangerous and even destructive things, he would not be governed by circumstances more than he would govern them and from there would advance to greatness, where, instead of being mortal they would be made immortal by glory.

[2] *Nam uti genus hominum compositum ex corpore et anima est, ita res cuncta studiaque omnia nostra corporis alia, alia animi naturam secuntur. Igitur praeclara facies, magnae divitiae, ad hoc vis corporis et alia omnia huiusce modi brevi dilabuntur; at ingeni egregia facinora sicuti anima immortalia sunt. Postremo corporis et fortunae bonorum ut initium sic finis est, omniaque orta occidunt et aucta senescunt: animus incorruptus, aeternus, rector humani generis agit atque habet cuncta neque ipse habetur. Quo magis pravitas eorum admiranda est, qui, dediti corporis gaudiis, per luxum et ignaviam aetatem agunt, ceterum ingenium, quo neque melius neque amplius aliud in natura mortalium est, incultu atque socordia torpescere sinunt, cum praesertim tam multae variaequae sint artes animi, quibus summa claritudo paratur.*

For just as the race of man is composed of body and mind, in this way all our concerns and endeavors, some by nature would follow the body others the soul. Accordingly, beautiful appearance, great wealth, and to this bodily strength and

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

[3] *Verum ex iis magistratus et imperia, postremo omnis cura rerum publicarum minime mihi hac tempestate cupienda videntur, quoniam neque virtuti honor datur neque illi, quibus per fraudem iis fuit uti, tuti aut eo magis honesti sunt. Nam vi quidem regere patriam aut parentis, quamquam et possis et delicta corrigas, tamen importunum est, cum praesertim omnes rerum mutationes caedem, fugam aliaque hostilia portendant. Frustra autem niti neque aliud se fatigando nisi odium quaerere extremae dementiae est; nisi forte quem inhonesta et perniciose libido tenet potentiae paucorum decus atque libertatem suam gratificari.*

Truly out of these things are magistrates and dominions, and finally care of public affairs appear to me, at the present time, least of all desirable, since neither honor is given on account of virtue nor are those, who were benefit from them through fraud, safe or he more greatly respected. For indeed to rule our fatherland or our parents by force, although you may have the ability and in correcting



wrongdoing, is, nevertheless, unsuitable, particularly changing the affairs [of State] through bloodshed [i.e. the cutting down of men], exile, and other things of the enemy, would be a monstrosity. But to press on in vain fatiguing oneself, and not the other, seeking nothing but hatred is extreme of madness unless a strong man gets pleasure, power out of poverty, honor, and also freedom, gratifying himself against one who is dishonest and dangerous. (*Bellum Jugurtha* 1-3)

With these remarks Sallust shows himself to be decidedly stoical. He is taking up a negative attitude towards the lord and bondsman relationship, but only in a way that avoided a trial by strength and the possibility of death; as had happened to both Cicero, Cato and many others before them, and after. “Stoicism is the freedom which always comes directly out of bondage and returns into the pure universality of thought. As a universal form of the World-Spirit, Stoicism could only appear on the scene in a time of universal fear and bondage.” (*Phenomenology of Spirit* 199) His ability, however, to withdraw from civic affairs was conditioned by his class standing. He could have only withdrawn from the class struggle, the struggle in the Forum and at the Rostra, because he had some place to withdraw to, which, incidentally wasn't merely into his own mind, but to an estate. His personal estate was made famous as the *Horti Sallustiani*, ‘gardens of Sallust.’ In contradistinction to this, we should note that was very much not the state of affairs for Spartacus, or the *servi* and the *proletarii* that he represented. “This trial by death, however, does away with the truth which was supposed to issue from it.” (*Ibid.* 188) At any rate, we have no doubt been repeatedly admonished by the wise sages of antiquity through their numerous *gnomae*, γνομαι, to pursue wisdom not wealth, for this it is said to be not only the path of the righteous, but also that of true happiness. “Self-consciousness learns that life is essential to it.” (*Ibid.* 189) According to Seneca Minor

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

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

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

*(Epistolae 17.6)*

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

Και ως κεφαλαιω, ανοητου ευδαιμονος ηθος πλουτου εστιν.

And thus the Character<sup>14</sup> of the rich is the thought of success in the head of the senseless. *(Rhetoric 2.16.3)*

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

*Vitae est avidus quisquis non vult*

*Mundo secum pereunte mori.*

Greedy for life is he who when

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

It is interesting to note however his use of the word *paupertas* which indicates a man of *small means* as opposed to the word he might have used, *inops*, which would have

---

<sup>14</sup> Ηθος signifies *character*, while εθος indicates *habits*.

indicated a man without resources or is *needy*, literally *in*, without + *ops*, help: thus a man without help, but in need of it. “*Pauperis* from *paulus lar* ‘scantily equipped home’...*Dives* ‘rich’ is from *divus* ‘godlike person,’ who, as being a *dues* ‘god,’ seems to lack nothing. *Opulentus* ‘wealthy’ is from *ops* ‘property,’ said of one who has it in abundance; from the same, *inops*, ‘destitute’ is said of him who lacks *ops*, and from the same source *copis* ‘well supplied’ and *copiosus* ‘abundantly furnished.’” (*De Lingua Latina* 5.92) And we learn elsewhere from Varro that the alteration of words can “come about by the loss or the addition of single letters and on account of the transposition or the change of them.” (*Ibid.* 5.6) Thus we could deduce that *ops* might have been related to *pos* ‘having power’ by way of transposition of the vowel, thus *inpos* ‘lacking power.’ (*Ibid.* 5.4) “The mere making of sounds serves to indicate pleasure and pain, and is thus a faculty that belongs to animals in general: their nature enables them to attain the point at which they have perceptions of pleasure and pain, and can signify those perceptions to one another. But language serves to declare what is advantageous and what is the reverse, and it therefore serves to declare what is just and what is unjust.” (*The Politics* 1253a) We have learned from history that a man of small means possessed of literacy carries a voice with which to narrate it while those in need but without help have been scarcely possessed literacy and historically therefore have had no voice, were silenced.

φαίνεται δ' ὁ ἴμος καὶ τῶν ἐκτὸς ἀγαθῶν προσδεομένη, καθάπερ  
 εἰπομέν: ἀδύνατον γὰρ ἡ ῥαδίων τὰ καλὰ πράττειν  
 ἀχορήγητον ὄντα. πολλὰ μὲν γὰρ πράττεται, καθάπερ δι' ὀργάνων, διὰ  
 φίλων καὶ πλούτου καὶ πολιτικῆς δυνάμεως: ἐνίων δὲ τητῶμενοι  
 ὑπαίνουσι τὸ μακάριον, οἱ ὄντων ἐν γενείας ἐν τεκνίας κάλλους: οὐ

πάνυ γὰρ εὐ δαιμονικὸς ὁ τὴν ἰδέαν παναίσχης ἢ δυσγενῆς ἢ μονώτης  
καὶ ἀτέκνος, εἴ τι δ' ἰσως ἦ ττον, εἴ τω πάγκακοι παῖδες  
εἴεν ἢ φίλοι, ἢ ἀγαθοὶ ὄντες τεθνασιν. καθάπερ οὐκ  
εἴπομεν, εἴοικε προσδεῖσθαι καὶ τῆς τοιαύτης εὐημερίας: ὅθεν εἰς  
ταυτὸ τάττουσιν ἐνίοι τὴν εὐτυχίαν τῆ εὐδαιμονία, ἐτεροὶ δὲ  
τὴν ἀρετήν.

“For it is impossible, or at least not easy, to play a noble part unless furnished with the necessary equipment. For many noble actions require instruments for their performance, in the shape of friends or wealth or political power; also there are certain external advantages, the lack of which sullies supreme felicity, such as good birth, satisfactory children, and personal beauty: a man of very ugly appearance or low birth, or childless and alone in the world, is not our idea of a happy man, and still less so perhaps is one who has children or friends that are worthless, or who has had good ones but lost them by death.” (*Nicomachean Ethics* 1099a1-b1)

With the coming of modernity, as opposed to antiquity, and with modernity the bourgeois revolution, and with the bourgeois revolution the *welfare state*, the historically *inopes* have for the most part been enabled at least to obtain a marginal level of literacy and thus enabled have become not wholly silent if they could find the means, ποιησις. “If he is too poor to provide himself with tools and other things he needs for his craft, his work will be worse.” (*Republic* 4.421d) Catiline, a man of means, chose not the course of wisdom and philosophy for he left no written works.

Catiline continued: “Thereupon he heaped maledictions upon all good citizens, lauded each of his own followers by name; he reminded one of his poverty, another of his ambition, several of their danger or disgrace, many of the victory of Sulla, which they had found a source of booty.” (*Bellum Catilinae* 21.2-5) In short, Catiline claiming the advantage of the stronger promised to benefit his friends, harm his enemies, and see that justice be done. In Plato’s *Republic*, Simonides says that justice is giving each person his due, “friends owe it to friends to do them some good and no evil... owing from an enemy to an enemy what also is proper for him, some evil... To do good to friends and evil to enemies.” (*Republic* 331e-332d) Later on, Thrasymachus claims: “The just is nothing else than the advantage of the stronger.” (*Ibid.* 1.338) By lauding each man by name, Catiline also addressed each man’s particular problem and promised to ameliorate that particular condition. This is decidedly different then promising to satisfy a single want shared by members of a single class; such as freeing the slaves and proscribing the rich, for instance. Indeed, since Catiline did not represent any particular social class, he could do nothing less than promise a particular benefit to each and every particular friend. After that, Catiline bound his criminals to the future crime with a crime. “[He] compelled the participants in his crime to take an oath, he passed around bowls of human blood mixed with wine.” (*Bellum Catilinae* 22.1-2)

*Vina mutato fluunt cruenta.*

Wine changed flowing into blood. (*Thyestes* 700-1)

Cassius Dio’s narration depicts the gravity of the crime. According to him, Gaius Antonius, a participant in the 1st conspiracy of 66 (*Ibid.* 21.3) who was co-consul along with Cicero, “Sacrificed a boy, and after administering the oath over his vitals, ate these in company with the others.” (*Historiae Romanae* 37.30.3) Although the extant historical

narratives do not tell us which of the victim's vital organs, besides the blood, were eaten, Hegel noted that to the ancients the bodily organs corresponded to certain gods and supernatural powers. "Plato even assigns the liver something still higher, something which is even regarded by some as the highest function of all, viz. prophesying, or the gift of speaking of holy and eternal things in a non-rational manner." (*Phenomenology of Spirit* 326) About this human sacrifice Florus would say:

*Additum est pignus coniurationis sanguis humanus, quem circumlatum pateris bibere: summum nefas, ni amplius esset propter quod biberunt.*

The human blood which they passed around in the *paterae*<sup>15</sup> to drink and used as a pledge for the conspiracy would be a consummate sin if the reason for which they drank it not a greater one. (*Epitome* 2.12.4)

And though human sacrifice was outlawed in Rome and its territories in 97 B.C. (Cf. *Human Sacrifice* 35), Polydore Virgil in his *De Inventoribus Rerum* (1499) said:

*Sic ferme apud Romanos iusiurandum inter factiosos confirmabatur, testificante Sallustio, qhi scibit Catilinam humani corporis sanguinem vino permistum in pateris circumtulisse sociis coniurationis, et eos singillatim degustasse quo inter se magis fidi forent. Atqui hodie illud idem fit inter eos, qui ad aliquod insigne scelus faciendum conspirant.*

In this way, as Sallust so testifies, an oath was affirmed among the Roman factions. He writes that Catiline passed around blood from a human body mixed with wine in *paterae* and that they, one by one, tasted it so that there would be more trust among themselves. And, at any rate, this same thing is done today as a symbol among those who conspire to commit a crime. (2.15.7-8)

---

<sup>15</sup> The broad, flat dish or saucer used by the Romans for drinking and for offering libations.

Cicero, moreover, expressed contemporary Romans had for human sacrifice which continued to be practiced in Gaul:

*Postremo his quicquam sanctum ac religiosum videri potest qui, etiam si quando aliquo metu adducti deos placandos esse arbitrantur, humanis hostiis eorum aras ac templa funestant, ut ne religionem quidem colere possint, nisi eam ipsam prius scelere violarint? quis enim ignorat eos usque ad hanc diem retinere illam immanem ac barbaram consuetudinem hominum immolantium? quam ob rem quali fide, quali pietate existimatis esse eos qui etiam deos immortalis arbitrentur hominum scelere et sanguine facillime posse placari?*

Finally, can anything appear sacred and pious to these men, who, if ever are so much as witnessed to have been led by fear to be appeasing the gods, dishonoring by murder their altars and temples with human victims, so that indeed they should be able to cultivate no religious duty without first having violated it with a crime? Who in fact does not know they continue to retain to this very day that monstrous and barbaric<sup>16</sup> custom of human immolation? What do you reckon, on account of this affair, to be the nature of the faith, the nature of the piety, of they who indeed suppose they themselves to be able to appease the immortal gods by means of sin and human blood? (*Pro Fonteio* 31)

Although we do not know who was martyred by this sacrifice, we also know neither how nor when Catiline murdered his son, but the insinuation that his son was the victim in this crime can never be proven to a satisfactory degree of certainty.

---

<sup>16</sup> Fem acc. sing. of *barbarus*, strange speech, unintelligible; foreign or strange in mind or character; uncultivated, ignorant; rude, unpolished

Next, Catiline “himself was busy at Rome with many attempts at once, laying traps for the consul, planning fires, posting armed men in commanding places. He went armed himself, bade others to do the same, conjured them to be always alert and ready, kept on the move night and day...Finally, when his manifold attempts met with no success, again in the dead of night he summoned the ringleaders of the conspiracy.” (*Bellum Catilinae* 27.2-3) Quintus Curius was the weakest link. Unable to keep a secret, he revealed the whole plan to his mistress Fulvia who told a number of people. “All these facts, while they were still secret, were communicated to Cicero by Fulvia, a woman of quality. Her lover, Quintus Curius, who had been expelled from the Senate for many deeds of shame and was thought fit to share in this plot of Catiline’s, told his mistress in a vain and boastful way that he would soon be in a position of power. By now, too, a rumor of what was transpiring in Italy was getting about.” (*Civil Wars* 2.3) Naturally, the bad news eventually fell upon the ears of Cicero; and he began to regularly use Fulvia as an informant about Catiline’s criminal mechanizations. (*Bellum Catilinae* 23.1-4) Later, in 63 when Catiline again ran for consul, Cicero persuaded Quintus Curius to reveal Catiline’s plan and immediately countered Catiline’s plot by first paying off Gaius Antonius and surrounded himself with a bodyguard. (*Ibid.* 26.3-4)

Fulvia had her own dialectical counterpart in the persona of Sempronia the shameless. Giovanni Boccaccio , in his *Famous Women* (1362), said:

*Porro, ut in unum eius et extremum, ut arbitror, facinus omnia eius concludamus scelera, flagrante illa pestifera face seditiosissimi hominis Lucii Catiline et se iniquis consiliis et coniuratorum numero ad desolationem perpetuam romane reipublice in ampliores vires assidue extollente, facinorosa mulier ad pleniorum suarum libidinum captandam licentiam, id appetens quod etiam perditis hminibus*



*fuisset horroni, coniuuratis se immiscuit ultro; domus etiam ue penetralia sevis colloquiis patuere semper. Verum nequitiis obsistente Deo, et Ciceronis studio coniuuratorum detectis insidiis, cum iam Catilina Fesulas secessisset, in aliorum excidium frustratam arbitror corruisse.*

Let us surmise all of her wicked deeds into one crime which, as I believe, was also her last; that pernicious woman eagerly took part in the grand sedition of that man Lucius Catiline. On account of the fact that she herself was overflowing with lust, this nefarious woman, seeking to lay hold of liberties that would have horrified even the most desperate men, voluntarily mixed herself up in the conspiracy; indeed even her home was always open for sleazy meetings with the pig. But God, in fact, opposes wickedness, and on account of Cicero's zeal, the men of the conspiracy were discovered by means of an ambush, now that, I believe, is when Catiline may have withdrawn to Fiesole, she, her scheming having been ruined, perished along with the others. (79.13)

According to Diodorus Siculus, Quintus Curius, after having been slighted by Fulvia, told her that within a few days she would be in his power and later, when they were drinking, she persuaded him to tell her what he had meant by that remark "and he, wishing in his infatuation to please her, disclosed the whole truth. She pretended to have taken what was said sympathetically and joyfully, and held her peace, but on the morrow went to the wife of Cicero the consul, and speaking privately with her about the matter reported what the young man had said." (*Library of History* 12.40.5.1)

#### **IV. Crassus gave anonymous letters to Cicero at his home, Oct. 18**

According to Plutarch, while Catiline's soldiers were assembling in Etruria, Crassus, Marcus Marcellus, and Scipio Metellus came to Cicero's home on the night of

Oct. 18 and, after having dined with him, an unidentified man brought Crassus some letters which were addressed to a number of different persons. One of those letters lacked a signature, but was addressed to Crassus, which he read. This letter reportedly warned Crassus of the bloodshed to come at the hands of Catiline and advised him to flee the city. In order to deflect suspicion from himself, so says Plutarch, Crassus handed over the letters to Cicero who convened the Senate at dawn. Cicero delivered these letters to the persons to whom they had been addressed and compelled each of them to read his letter aloud. All the letters told of the plot.

**V. Cicero informed the Senate.**

**VI. Senate begins their first investigation into Catiline's activities, Oct. 19.**

**VII. *Senatus consultum ultimum*.**

**VIII. Cicero ascends as Dictator.**

**IX. Antonius becomes Master of the Horse, Oct. 20.**

The Senate passed a decree Oct. 20 that placed charge of the state in the hands of the two consuls, Cicero and Antonius. Thus a decree of *imperium* was conferred; Cicero was appointed *dictator*; Antonius the *master of the horse*. "The power which according to Roman usage is thus conferred upon a magistrate by the Senate is supreme, allowing him to raise an army, wage war, exert any kind of compulsion upon allies and citizens, and exercise unlimited command and jurisdiction at home and in the field; otherwise the consul has none of these privileges except by order of the people." (*Bellum Catilinae* 29.3) Such a decree of *imperium* had not been pronounced by the Senate at Rome since the *Third Punic War* (146 B.C.). The consuls, having been so empowered, were entrusted with all the power and the responsibility to save the city. Cicero surrounded

himself with a bodyguard and began appointing officials to carry out his commands.  
(*Cicero* 15.1-16.1)

**X. Manlius takes to the field, Oct. 27.**

Catiline, having learned of this, prepared to join Manlius in Etruria. Manlius took the field with a large army on the 27th of October (*Bellum Catilinae* 30.1) and began to inflame Etruria where many had lost their lands during the proscriptions of Sulla. The expropriated land had been settled by Sulla's veterans. (*Ibid.* 28.1-4) Faesulae, in Etruria, was a Sullan stronghold, but many who had lost their lands during the proscriptions were also ready for war. (*Ibid.* 28.4)

**XI. Senate informed about the activities of Manlius, Nov. 1.**

**XII. Second meeting at Laeca's house, Nov. 6.**

**XIII. *Argumentum ad baculum* against Cicero, Nov. 7.**

On Nov. 6, in the dead of night, Catiline, once again, summoned the leaders of the conspiracy to the house of Porcius Laeca where he suborned two knights, Gaius Cornelius and Lucius Vargunteius, into a plot to murder Cicero at his home. The informant Curius told Fulvia who told Cicero (*Ibid.* 27.4-28.2) who surrounded his home with a great many men. Cicero brought the matter to the attention of the Senate and the Senate took heed.

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

[1] *Quo usque tandem abutere, Catilina, patientia nostra? Quam diu etiam furor iste tuus nos eludet? Quem ad finem sese effrenata iactabit audacia? Nihilne te nocturnum praesidium Palati, nihil urbis vigiliae, nihil timor populi, nihil concursus bonorum omnium, nihil hic munitissimus habendi senatus locus, nihil horum ora voltusque moverunt? Patere tua consilia non sentis? Constrictam iam*

*horum omnium scientia teneri coniurationem tuam no vides? Quid proxima, quid superiore nocte egeris, ubi fueris, quos convocaveris, quid consilii ceperis, quem nostrum ignorare arbitraries?*

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

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

O the times, o the morals! The Senate knows these things, the consul sees it: this man lives. He lives? On the contrary indeed, he still comes to the Senate, takes part in a public meeting, notes us with his gaze, and marks each one of us down for death. It appears to us, on the other hand, o brave men, enough for the Republic if we should ignore his madness and his weapons? It was necessary,

Catiline, that you to be led on a consul's orders to your death long ago, to bring a scourge upon you from all sides that you contrived against us.

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

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

[4] *Decrevit quondam senatus, ut L. Opimus consul videret ne quid res publica detrimenti caperet: nox nulla intercessit; interfectus est propter quasdam seditionum suspiciones C. Gracchus, clarissimo patre, avo, maioribus; occisus est*

*cum liberis M. Fulvius consularis. Simili senatus consulto C. Mario et L. Valerio consulibus est permissa res publica; num unum diem postea L. Saturninum tribunum pl. et C. Servilium praetorem mors ac rei publicae poena remorata est? At vero nos vicesimum iam diem patimur hebescere aciem horum auctoritatis. Habemus enim huiusce modi senatus consultum, verum inclusum in tabulis, tamquam in vagina reconditum, quo ex senatus consulto confestim te interfectum esse, Catilina, convenit. Vivis, et vivis non ad deponendam, sed ad confirmandam audaciam. Cupio, patres conscripti, me esse clementem, cupio in tantis rei publicae periculis me non dissolutum videri, sed iam me ipse inertiae nequitiae condemno.*

The Senate once decreed that Lucius Opimius should see that the Republic should suffer no harm: not one night intervened when Gaius Gracchus, descended from a famous father, grandfather, and ancestors, was murdered on account of suspicions of a certain sedition and Marcus Fulvius, an ex-Consul, was slain along with his children. The Republic entrusted a similar decree of the Senate to the Consuls Gaius Marius and Lucius Valerius: surely Lucius Saturninus, Tribune of the Plebs, and Gaius Servilius, a Praetor, were not kept waiting more than a single day for death and the penalty of the State. But indeed we have already permitted the edge of the Senates authority to become dull for twenty days. For we have a decree of this kind, but it has been locked up in the public records as if buried in a sheath, in accordance with this decree you, Catiline, should have been put to death immediately. You live, and you live not towards ceasing but towards strengthening your insolence. I wish, conscript fathers, to be merciful myself, I

wish myself to not appear irresolute in such great dangers to the Republic, but now I condemn myself for inactivity and negligence

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

There is a camp in Italy against the Roman people stationed in the narrow passes of Etruria, the number of those enemies grows every day, moreover, the leader of those men and the enemy the walls and you actually see him in the Senate plotting civil war every day. Now if I arrested you, Catiline, if I order you put to death what shall I have to fear not that all good men may say the act by me is too late, but rather that some may say it is too cruel. In truth, though I may do this, on account of that reason I am not yet inclined to do that which ought to have been done long ago. When there is nobody to be found who is so wicked, so worthless, so like you, as to say that the deed is unjust, then you may finally be put to death. So long as there shall be anyone at all who might be bold enough to defend you, you will live, but you will live such as you do live; besieged by my many and strong defenses, thou shalt not be able to move against the Republic.

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

So long as there shall be anyone at all who might be bold enough to defend you, you will live, but you will live such as you do live; besieged by my many and strong defenses, thou shalt not be able to move against the Republic. Though you shall feel nothing, many eyes and ears will be spying on you, watching over you just as they have done. Indeed, Catiline, what now thee detains, if night for its gloom cannot conceal the wickedness of a meeting, nor the walls of a home within its walls contain the voices of conspiracy, if all is illuminated, if all permeates? Now, take my advice. Change your mind. Forget your murder and arson. You are beset on all sides. All your plans, which you may recount with me now, are clear as day.

[7] *Meministine me ante diem xii Kalendas Novembris dicere in senatu fore in armis certo die, qui dies futurus esset ante diem vi Kal. Novembris, C. Manlium, audaciae satellitem atque administrum tuae? num me fefellit, Catilina, non modo res tanta tam atrox tamque incredibilis, verum, id quod multo magis est admirandum, dies? dixi ego idem in senatu caedem te optimatum contulisse in*



*ante diem v Kalendas Novembris, tum cum multi principes civitatis Roma non tam sui conservandi quam tuorum consiliorum reprimendorum causa profugerunt.*

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

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

What now, Catiline? Now do you hesitate to do by my command that which you were already willing to do? The consul orders the enemy to leave the city. You ask me, whether into exile? I do not order it, but, if you consult me, I recommend. For what is there in this city, Catiline, that will be able to delight

you now? With respect to this, there is no one outside that conspiracy of hopeless men of yours who does not fear you, who does not hate. What mark of family disgrace is not branded upon your life? What shame of your private affairs does not remain fixed on your reputation? What lust from your eyes, what crime ever from your hands, what shame from your whole body never was? Before what young man, whom you have ensnared with the allurements of seduction, have you not either boldly carried a sword or a passionate flame?

Cicero summoned Catiline to the Senate, who presented himself in one, last, and final dissemblance. “Catiline at first welcomed this heartily, as if supported by a good conscience, and pretended to make ready for trial, even offering to surrender himself to Cicero...Cicero, however, refused to take charge of him, [and] he voluntarily took up residence at the house of Metellus the praetor, in order that he might be as free as possible from the suspicion of promoting a revolution until he should gain some additional strength from the conspirators there in the city. But he made no headway at all, since Antonius shrank back through fear and Lentulus was anything but energetic.” (*Historiae Romanae* 37.32.1-3) “When he took his seat, Catiline, prepared as he was to deny everything, with down cast eyes and pleading accents began to beg the fathers of the Senate not to believe any unfounded charge against him...they must not suppose that he, a patrician, who like his forefathers had rendered great service to the Roman people, would be benefited by the overthrow of the government, while its savior was Marcus Tullius, a resident alien.” (*Bellum Catilinae* 31.7) “Then, at the house of Laeca on that night, Catiline; you allocated the regions of Italy, you decided where you wanted each man to go, you chose those whom you were leaving in Rome and those whom you were taking with you, you assigned the parts of the city to be burnt...Two Roman knights were

found to...kill me in my bed...Your meeting had scarcely broken up when I learned all this.” (1 *In Catilinam* 9) His very presence in the Senate caused a great deal of unease. It seemed to them that Catiline was up to something nefarious but many were uncertain, considering his position and the position of his chief adversary, as to what to do about it. “No senator, however, would sit with him, but all moved away from the bench where he was.” (*Cicero* 16.4) He claimed that he was the victim of calumny. In the Senate on Nov. 8, Cicero delivered his first invective against Catiline. (*Bellum Catilinae* 31.6) Thus spoke Cicero:

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

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

us do you think does not know what you did last night, the night before last, where you went, who you summoned, where you held council?

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

O the times, o the morals! The Senate knows these things, the consul sees it: this man lives. He lives? On the contrary indeed, he still comes to the Senate, takes part in a public meeting, notes us with his gaze, and marks each one of us down for death. It appears to us, on the other hand, o brave men, enough for the republic if we should ignore his madness and his weapons? It was necessary, Catiline, that you to be led on a consul's orders to your death long ago, to bring a scourge upon you from all sides that you contrived against us. (1 *In Catilinam* 1-2)

Instead of following through with his threat to have Catiline executed; Cicero said, "We have a decree of the Senate...but it is locked up with the records like a sword buried in its sheath; yet it is a decree which you, Catiline, ought to have been executed immediately," (*Ibid.* 4) Cicero magnanimously granted Catiline the option to leave the city. "Catiline, finish the journey you have begun: at long last leave the city: the gates are open: be on your way...Take all your men with you or, if you cannot take them all, take as many as you can...You cannot remain among us any longer; I cannot, I will not, I must not permit it." (*Ibid.*10)

Diodorus Siculus said that: “Catiline, on being openly accused to his face declared that under no circumstances would he condemn himself to voluntary exile without a trial. Cicero put the question to the senators, whether it was their wish to banish Catiline from the city. When the majority, abashed by the man’s presence remained silent, Cicero, wishing as it were to probe their sentiments exactly, turned the question and asked the senators next whether they would order him to banish Quintus Catulus from Rome. When with one voice they all shouted their disapproval and showed their displeasure at what was said, Cicero, reverting to Catiline, remarked that when they considered a man not deserving of banishment they shouted with all their might; hence it was evident that by silence they were agreeing to his banishment. Catiline, after stating that he would think it over in private, withdrew.” (*Library of History* 12.40.5a.1) *Qui tacebant consentire videntur.*

Thereupon, Catiline stormed from the Senate vowing along the way to put out the fire of his enemies with a general devastation. (*Bellum Catilinae* 31.9) “He gladly withdrew on this excuse, and went to Faesulae, where he took up war openly. Assuming the name and dress of the consuls, he proceeded to organize the men.” (*Historiae Romanae* 37.2) Theophrastus’ character analysis of the ironic man, the dissembler, describes Catiline perfectly in this instance. The ironic or dissembling man is one “who goes up to his enemies and is willing to chat with them...He admits to nothing that he is actually doing, but says he’s thinking it over.” (*Characters* 1) Catiline left Rome under the pretext of going into voluntary exile at Marseilles in order to spare Rome the calamities of civil war, but he had no intention of doing this in earnest until he later learned of the death of the conspirators he left behind in Rome. “He rushed from the

Senate-house and went home. There after thinking long upon the situation...he left for the camp of Manlius with a few followers in the dead of night.” (*Bellum Catilinae* 32.1)

Omens and portents along with rumors of war flooded the city. According to Livy, during the consulship of Marcus Cicero and Gaius Antonius several things were struck by lightening:

*Fulmine pleraque decussa Sereno Vargunteius Pompeiis de caelo exanimatus. Trabis ardens ab occasu ad caelem extenda. Terrae motu Spoletum totum concussum et quaedam corruerunt. Inter alia relatam, biennio ante in Capitolio lupam Remi et romuli fulmine iactam, signumque Iovis cum columna disiectum aruspicum response in foro repositum. Tabulae legume aeneae caelo tactae litteris liquefactis. Ab his prodigiis Catilinae nefaria conspiratio coepta.*

Many things were struck down by lightning. Sereno Vargunteius was himself struck down from heaven. A burning timber extended up into the sky from the West. An earthquake shook all of Spoletum and certain things fell down. Among other things, it was related that two years before the she-wolf of Romulus and Remus had been struck by lightening in front of the Capitol and the statue of Jupiter with its column had been shattered but had been replaced in the Forum upon a reply from the soothsayers. Bronze tablets containing the laws were struck from the sky liquefying the letters. With these prodigies, the nefarious conspiracy of Catiline began. (*Julius Obsequens* 61)

Cassius Dio also recorded the occurrence of many portents during the consulship of Antonius and Cicero, among them were thunderbolts, earthquakes, human apparitions, flashes of fire in the west. “Even a layman, was bound to know in advance what was signified by them.” (*Historiae Romanae* 37.25.2) A great many people were about to die.

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

The Senate announced a reward for any information about the plot, the gladiators were quartered on Capua; Rome was at watch night and day. Gloom and apprehension replaced gaiety. (*Bellum Catilinae* 29.1-31.3) On Nov. 9, the next day Cicero addressed the people, delivering his second invective against Catiline, *ad populum*.

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

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

Cicero had outsmarted him militarily as well as politically. Catiline was no longer able to rely on the activities of ordinary citizens neither as a cover for his clandestine military activity nor was he able to dissemble to, and confuse, the people directly. Once drawn out into the open field, as Cicero repeatedly said *murus interest* 'a city wall is between us' (2 *In Catilinam* 17 *et passim*), it was easier, both to the people, *ad populum*, and to the Senate, *ad senatum*, to distinguish friend from foe and when it came to war the innocent would be spared.

As a delay tactic, Manlius sent an attaché, along entourage, to Marcius Rex declaring that Catiline's men had not taken up arms against the fatherland, but to defend themselves from outrage. "We ask neither for power nor riches...but only for freedom." (*Bellum Catilinae* 32.3-33.5) In addition to these letters, Catiline also sent letters to the consuls and many nobles "saying that he was the victim of false accusations and unable to cope with the intrigues of his personal enemies, he bowed to fate and was on his way to exile at Massilia." (*Ibid.* 34.2) In a different letter addressed to Quintus Catulus:

“Maddened by wrongs and slights...I followed my usual custom and took up the general cause of the unfortunate.” (*Ibid.* 35.1-3) Although, in this letter to Catulus, Catiline claimed he had taken up the cause of the unfortunate, he had not actually done so, but distributed these documents to feign his victim hood, as he had been doing all along. One of those letters was in fact a ruse which was intended to signal the remaining conspirators to initiate the insurrection.

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

On Nov. 17, the Senate had resolved to charge Catiline and Manlius with the *Plautian Law* which had been passed in 89 B.C. by M. Plautius Silvanus, tribune of the commons, and directed against acts of violence and breaches of the peace. (*Ibid.* 31.4-5, n. 4)

Plutarch said that one of the most dangerous criminals Catiline had left behind in Rome, in order to initiate the insurrection there at the appointed time, was Publius Cornelius Lentulus. This man was so shameless and arrogant that at one time, when he was under prosecution, he bribed the jury and, when acquitted by only two votes said “that what he had given to the second juror was wasted money, since it would have sufficed if he had been acquitted by only one vote.” (*Cicero* 17.4) He was so utterly conceited that he went about Rome reciting forged oracles from the Sibylline books to the effect that Rome was fated to be ruled by three Cornelii. According to this urban legend Cinna and Sulla had been the first two and Publius, having the *nomen* ‘middle-name’ Cornelius was thereby destined to become the third. (*Ibid.* 17.5). “He also said that this was the year, the tenth after the acquittal of the Vestal Virgins and the twentieth after the burning of the Capitol, fated for the destruction of Rome and her empire.” (3 *In Catilinam* 9 et *Bellum Catilinae* 47.2) In order to effectuate this he conceived of a plan to



kill all the senators and as many of the other citizens as he possibly could; while at the same time setting the city aflame and sparing only the children of Pompey whom he intended to hold hostage. The night of *Saturnalia*, December 19, was chosen for the insurrection; (3 *In Catilinam* 10) the weapons were quartered in the house of Cethegus, and a hundred armed men were stationed in strategic places around Rome ready to commit arson upon receiving the signal. Others were to stop the aqueducts and kill anyone who tried to bring water to extinguish the blazes (*Cicero* 18.1-3)

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

Meanwhile, two ambassadors of the Allobroges, a Celtic tribe oppressed by Rome and residing in Gaul, were intercepted by Lentulus and his gang who tried to persuade them to join the conspiracy and incite Gaul into revolt. (*Ibid.* 18.4-5). Sallust says it was Publius Umbrenus who sought them out. (*Bellum Catilinae* 40.1) At any rate, the Allobroges were outfitted with all sorts of letters to take to their Senate, which made all sorts of false promises regarding their freedom, and to Catiline which urged him to set the slaves free to march on Rome. (*Cicero* 18.6) Umbrenus reportedly said to them: “Why, I myself, if only you will show yourselves men, will disclose a plan which will enable you to escape the great evils your are suffering.” And the Allobroges were overcome with vain hopes and replied that they would do anything if only the conspirators, when victorious, would abrogate their national debt. (*Bellum Catilinae* 40.3-4) And so the story goes, the Allobroges disclosed the plan to their national representative in Rome, Quintus Fabius Sanga, who told Cicero. (*Ibid.* 41.5)

The plot was rapidly unfolding. “Lucius Bestia, tribune of the commons, should convoke an assembly and denounce the conduct of Cicero...That was to be the signal for the rest of the band of conspirators to carry out their several enterprises...Statilius and

Gabinus...were to kindle fires at twelve important points in the city...Cethegus was to beset Cicero's door and assault him...The eldest sons of several families...were to slay their fathers. Then, when the whole city was stunned by the bloodshed and the fire, they were all to rush out and join Catiline." (*Ibid.* 43.1-2) Cicero was hardly napping. He made arrangements with the Allobroges to visit Lentulus, Cethegus, Statilius, and Cassius to demand an oath from them which they could carry back with them to their countrymen in Gaul. They all complied except Cassius who promised to come to Gaul, but instead slipped away. (*Ibid.* 44.1-2) On account of the fact that many of the conspirators were licentious men who rarely met without wine, women and song, informants easily kept track of their comings and goings and reported their findings to Cicero. Lentulus gave a letter to Titus Volturcius of Crotona and sent him along with the Allobroges who, on his way home, was to confirm to Catiline that an alliance had been made. An ambush set by Cicero's men on Dec. 2, Lucius Valerius Flaccus and Gaius Pomptinus, captured Titus Volturcius at the Mulvian Bridge. (*Ibid.* 45.1) Cicero again convened the Senate the following day, Dec. 3, and tried the men. Volturcius, after having been granted a pardon in exchange for his cooperation, gave details of the affair. (*Bellum Catilinae* 47.1 et 3 *In Catilinam* 8) The Senate read the letters and examined the informants who told of plots to kill three consuls and four praetors. Having been charged by the Senate with conducting an investigation, Caius Sulpicius, a praetor, discovered a huge cache of missiles, swords and knives at Cethegus' house. Lentulus was convicted and resigned his office as praetor. (*Cicero* 18.6-19.4)

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

Cicero delivered his third invective against Catiline, to the people, *Argumentum ad populum*, explaining how the conspirators were caught. "Not to make a long story of

it, citizens, we ordered the letter to be produced which each man was alleged to have given them [the Allobroges]. We first showed Cethegus his letter and he identified his seal. We cut the string and read the letter...Now, when his letter was read out, he stood paralyzed and smitten by his guilty conscience and suddenly fell silent...Statilius was brought in and identified his seal and handwriting. His letter was read out...He admitted writing it. Then I showed Lentulus his letter and asked whether he recognized the seal...There was read out the letter that he had written...I offered him the chance to say anything he wanted about its contents. At first he refused...Then, suddenly, his guilt made him lose his wits...Although he could have denied their statement, to everyone's surprise he suddenly confessed." (3 *In Catilinam* 10-11)

After Cicero explained all this to the throng outside the Senate, the people "who at first...had been so eager for war, faced about and denounced...Catiline, while they extolled Cicero to the skies, manifesting as much joy and exultation as if they had been rescued from slavery." (*Bellum Catilinae* 48.1-2) The next day Lucius Tarquinius, who had been arrested while making his way to join Catiline, was brought back and upon a pledge of immunity from the Senate confirmed the testimony of Volturcius and added that he had been sent by Crassus to advise Catiline not to be worried about the arrest of the conspirators but to return to the city to boost the morale of the rest, to return and free the captives. "Cicero learned of this beforehand and occupied the Capitol and the Forum by night with a garrison. At dawn he received some divine inspiration to hope for the best...Accordingly, he ordered the praetors to administer the oath of enlistment to the populace, in case there should be any need of soldiers." (*Historiae Romanae* 37.35.3-4) Cicero's vision is commonly referred to as his *Bona Dea* experience.

Many thought the charge made against Crassus was credible, “but thought that in such a crisis so powerful a man ought to be propitiated rather than exasperated.” (*Bellum Catilinae* 48.5) Many others, held in thrall to Crassus by economic means, condemned the charge and demanded that the matter be laid before the Senate and, upon a motion of Cicero, voted the testimony of Tarquinius to be false and demanded that he reveal the name of whom so ever had caused him to lie. Some said the charge was fabricated by Autronius, but others thought it was Cicero. Sallust himself testifies that Crassus told him personally, later on, that Cicero was behind the insult. (*Ibid.* 48.5-9) It has also been reported that Quintus Catulus and Gaius Piso, through bribes and political influence, tried to get Cicero to bring a false charge against Caesar to no avail. “Gaius Caesar was not free from suspicion of complicity with these men, but Cicero did not venture to bring into the controversy one so popular with the masses.” (*Civil Wars* 2.6)

**XIX. Cicero’s *In Catilinam IV*, argumentum ad senatum.**

At any rate, the Senate resolved that the conspirators were guilty of treason. Decimus Junius Silanus, the consul-elect, suggested, at first, that the men be put to death, but later, he was persuaded by Caesar’s oration and changed his opinion and held thereafter that they should only increase the guards to protect the city. According to Appian, Nero also spoke and he suggested that the men only be kept under guard until Catiline had been beaten in the field and that Cato openly suspected Caesar of involvement. (*Civil Wars* 2.5-6)

The matter was reopened for discussion. According to Sallust’s narrative, Caesar spoke first followed by the younger Cato. In his oration, Caesar urged the Senate not to be influenced by their emotions. “Kings and peoples under the influence of wrath or pity have made errors in judgment, he said.” (*Bellum Catilinae* 51.4) He went on by way of

two examples derived from ancient sources: the first suggested that the Senate recall the experience of the *Macedonian War* against king Perses (168 B.C.) as a precedent where the elder Cato had persuaded the Romans not to retaliate against them for a wrong they had committed. The second example raised by him cited the numerous occasions that Rome had not immediately retaliated for great injustices committed against them by the Carthaginians during the Punic wars, but had, instead, first debated whether or not such a retaliatory action was consistent with Roman law. (*Ibid.* 51.5-6)

Caesar's sophisticated remarks: "If a punishment commensurate with their crimes can be found, I favor a departure from precedent; but if the enormity of their guilt surpasses all men's imagination, I should advise limiting ourselves to such penalties as the law has established...If the humble, who pass their lives in obscurity, commit any offense through anger, it is known to few; their fame and fortune are alike. But the actions of those who hold great power, and pass their lives in a lofty station, are known to all the world.

*Ita in maxuma fortuna minuma licentia est.*

In this way, in great fortune is the least freedom. (*Ibid.* 51.8-14)

He then holds that the penalty initially suggested by Silanus, i.e., death, was foreign to the customs of Rome. Caesar's sophism could be parsed thus:

- (a) If a punishment equal to their crimes can be found, then
- (b) depart from precedent.
- (c) If the guilt of the conspirators surpasses all imagination, then
- (d) punishment should be limited to what is allowed by law, and
- (e) death is a relief from the woes of life, not a punishment.

Caesar maintained that the Senate must adhere both to precedent and to written law. Therefore, Caesar argued that no punishment equal to their crimes could be found and that the enormity of the guilt of their surpassed all men's imagination. In short, death was too good for these people. He then went on to deploy a form of *slippery slope argument* by means of (a) digression on the history of the Peloponnesian war where Lacedaemonians instituted the rule of the *Thirty Tyrants* after defeating the Athenians, and (b) digression on Sulla:

*Omni mala exempla ex rebus bonis orta sunt.*

All bad precedents have originated in cases which were good. (*Ibid.* 51.27)

“It is possible that in another time, when someone else is consul, with this precedent before and is likewise in command of an army, some falsehood may be believed to be true. When the consul, with this precedent before him, shall draw the sword in obedience to the Senates decree, who shall limit or restrain him?”

In his digression on the *Thirty Tyrants* at Athens, he said: “They applied the scourge to citizens and inflicted the supreme penalty upon those found guilty. Afterwards the state reached maturity, and because of its large population factions prevailed; when blamelessness began to be oppressed and other wrongs of the kind were perpetuated: then they devised the *Porcian Law* and other laws which allowed the condemned the alternative of exile. Do I recommend that the prisoners be allowed to depart and swell Catiline's forces? By no means! This, rather, is my advice: that their goods be confiscated and that they themselves be kept imprisoned...further, that no one hereafter shall refer their case to the Senate or bring it before the people, under pain of being considered...to have designs against...the state.” (*Ibid.* 51.35-43) In view of the fact that Caesar was implicated in the plot, we ought to suspect that Caesar may have

wished to free the suspects. If Caesar was indeed as powerful as many of the ancient sources claim, it is entirely possible that things could have been arranged so that the so-called ‘strongest of the free towns’ could have been induced to revolt. To this Cato replied in his speech that followed, “As if, indeed there were base criminal men only in our city and not all over Italy.” (*Ibid.* 52.15)

Caesar remarks to the effect that men of great power are less free than the downtrodden is reminiscent of the remarks made by Hiero, the tyrant of Syracuse (478-467 B.C.), to the poet Simonides. For example, “If it profits a man to hang himself, know what my finding is: a despot has the most to gain from it.” (*Hiero* 7.13) Caesar statement to the effect that life imprisonment in a strong city is a fate worse than death is an absurd contrary to fact remark, for, if this were true, the Roman people never would have enacted the *Sempronian Law*, which permitted the condemned the right of appeal to the people in capital cases, which was instituted to protect Roman citizens. Not only that, but the Roman religion, and therefore Roman custom, testifies to the pain of death and the trials of the wicked condemned to Hell, as Virgil affirmed in his *Aeneid*. Seneca noted:

*Nulla avarita sine poena est.*

There is no avarice without punishment. (*Epistulae* 115.16)

Caesar falsely equated the propositions: ‘life is woe some’ with ‘death is relief,’ when clearly life is a relief from death and death is one of life’s woes. Anyone who sincerely believed Caesar’s argument would have killed himself immediately. We, however, hardly need Aristotle to remind us:

Φοβερωτατον δ’ ο θανατος

But death is the thing most feared. (*Nicomachean Ethics* 3.4.6)

Cato, who relied on the expedience of the cause toward justice, and his own moral character, spoke next: “The speakers appear to me to have dwelt upon the punishment of these men...but the situation warns us rather to take precautions against them than to argue about what we are to do with them...in the case of other offenses you may proceed against them after they have been committed; with this, unless you take measures to forestall it, vain will you appeal to the laws when once it has been consummated...nothing is left to the vanquished.

*Capta urbe nihil fit reliqui victis.*

Once the city is seized, to the living nothing remains.

“I call upon you, who have always valued your houses, villas, statues, and paintings more highly than your country; if you wish to retain these treasures to which you cling, of whatsoever kind they may be...wake up at last and lay hold of the reins of the state...Now...the question before us is not whether our morals are good or bad...but whether all that we have, however we regard it, is to be ours, or with ourselves is to belong to the enemy...

*Iam pridem equidem nos vera vocabula rerum amisimus.*

Now we have indeed let slip true names of things long ago.

“It is precisely because squandering the goods of others is called generosity, and recklessness in wrong doing is called courage, that the republic is reduced to extremities.” (*Bellum Catilinae* 52.4-12) Cato’s reference to the ‘true names of things’ is an allusion to a well known phrase belonging to Homer, as Plato recorded his *Cratylus*: “For the gods must clearly be supposed to call things by their right and natural names.” (391e) Thucydides noted that due to the dire necessities caused by the civil strife on



account of the *Peloponnesian War*: “The ordinary acceptance of words in their relation to things was changed as men thought fit.

Ραον δ’ οι πολλοι καουργοι (οντες) δεξιοι κεκληνται

η αμαθεις αγαθοι·

And therefore it was easier for the many bad people to be called clever than for the stupid to be called the good. (*Peloponnesian War* 3.82.7)

Truly Caesar’s rhetoric had the appearance of a well reasoned argument without having actually been so. His reasoning is unconvincing because we have all learned from Aristotle that “those things also are to be preferred, which men would rather possess in reality than in appearance, because they are nearer the truth.” (*Rhetoric* 1.7.38) Caesar created the semblance of truth with out actually reasoning out the truth. “In fine finished phrases did Gaius Caesar a moment ago before this body speak of life and death, regarding as false, I presume, the tales which are told of the Lower World, where they say that the wicked take a different path from the good, and dwell in regions that are gloomy, desolate, unsightly, and full of fears,” Cato said. (*Bellum Catilinae* 52.13) Contrasting the virtues of their ancestors with the attitudes and habits of his contemporaries, Cato continued, “We have extravagance and greed, public poverty and private opulence. We extol wealth and foster idleness. We make no distinction between good men and bad.” (*Ibid.* 52.22) He also chastised Cicero because he “even let them go, taking their arms with them!” (*Ibid.* 52.27) As Aristotle said: “Since in the eyes of some people it is more profitable to seem wise than to be wise without seeming to be so (for the sophistic art consists in apparent and not real wisdom, and the sophist is one whom makes money from apparent and not real wisdom), it is clear that for these people it is essential to seem to perform the function of a wise man rather than actually to perform it

without seeming to do so.” (*De Sophisticis Elenchis* 165a20) Caesar was one about whom we might say it was ‘more profitable to seem wise than to be wise,’ while of Cato we should remark that he was one who had found it profitable ‘to be wise without seeming to be so.’

Cato continued by way of example stressing the urgency of the decision because laws were of little use to people who are dead or a republic that no longer existed, and demanded that the conspirators be treated “after the manner of our forefathers.” (*Bellum Catilinae* 52.30-36) In this way, Cato relied on what Aristotle called the general law, “For it is evident that, if the written law is counter to our case, we must have recourse to the general law.” (*Rhetoric* 1.15.4) Aristotle himself cited Sophocles. “Antigone in Sophocles justifies herself for having buried Polynices contrary to the law of Creon, but not contrary to the unwritten law...and further, that justice is the real expedient.” (*Ibid.* 1.15.6) Having been thus persuaded, the Senate agreed that justice was indeed the real expedient. “All the ex-consuls, as well as a great part of the other senators, praised the proposal and lauded his courage to the skies...Cato was hailed as great and noble, and a decree in the Senate was passed in accordance with his recommendation.” (*Bellum Catilinae* 53.1)

Cicero, who spoke last, delivered his fourth invective against Catiline to the Senate. “Their plan is that in the universal slaughter there should not survive a single individual even to mourn the name of the Roman people...informants have disclosed these facts, the accused men have confessed.” (4 *In Catilinam* 5) Cicero, in true democratic spirit, went on to refer the decision as to the fate of the conspirators to the Senate and revealed his true feelings on the matter. “If you adopt the motion of Gaius Caesar...I shall have less need to fear the attacks of the people because it is he who is

proposing and advocating this motion; but if you adopt the alternative, I fear that more trouble may be brought down upon my head.” (4 *In Catilinam* 9) After noting Crassus’ absence from the proceeding he recognized Caesars concerns regarding the *Sempronian Law*, enacted by Tiberius Gracchus (123 B.C.) which gave Roman citizens the right to appeal to the people in capital cases, and then roundly declared: “an enemy ‘*hostis*’ of the Republic cannot in any respect be regarded as a citizen,” on the grounds that the author of the *Sempronian Law* himself paid the supreme penalty to the Republic without appeal to the people. (4 *In Catilinam* 10)

On the authority of Marcianus: “The Law of the Twelve Tables ordains that he should have roused up a public enemy, or handed over a citizen to a public enemy, must suffer capital punishment.” (*Duodecim Tabulae* X) On the authority of Salvianus, the same table stated: “Putting to death...of any man whosoever he might be, un-convicted was forbidden by the decrees even of the Twelve Tables.” (*Ibid.*) In this case however, it is not so much as question of whether or not the men were tried in accordance with the law of the *Twelve Tables*, but whether or not the Senate had the authority to try the men and whether or not they could be executed without appeal.

Cicero continued on to tell the Senate that he was indeed not motivated by cruelty, but “In my minds eye I see pitiful heaps of citizens lying unburied upon the grave of their fatherland; there passes before my eyes the sight of Cethegus as he prances upon your corpses in his frenzied revels...I have pictured Lentulus as potentate...Gabinus as his grand visier, and Catiline there with his army...this vision arouses in me such strong feelings of pity and anguish that I am acting with severity and vigor against against those who have wanted to perpetrate such horrors.” (4 *In Catilinam* 11-12)

...*Crudelis ubique*

*luctus, ubique pavor et plurima mortis imago.*

Everywhere bitter sorrow, everywhere

Terror and many images of death. (*Aeneid* 2.369)

After having made several examples he directed the Senate's attention to the throngs of people outside awaiting the decision: "I cannot pretend to be deaf to what comes to my ears...Everyone is here—men of every order, every class and every age; the Forum is crowded, the temple around the Forum are crowded, all the approaches and grounds of this temple are crowded...the whole mass of freeborn citizens is here, even the poorest...All classes are united in purpose, will and voice to preserve the Republic. Beset by the brands and weapons of this vile conspiracy, the fatherland we all share extends to you [the Senate] the hands of a suppliant...You have a consul who will not shrink from obeying your decrees and, while he lives, from defending your decisions and answering for them in person. (4 *In Catilinam* 14-24)

## **XX. Execution of the conspirators, Dec. 5.**

With these concluding remarks, Cicero formally submitted the fate of the conspirators to the Senate who voted to condemn the men.

*Sic ait dicto citius tumida aequora placat*

*Collectasque fugat nubes solemque reducit.*

Thus speaking a command swelling waves are quickly calmed

And gathering clouds flee and the sun returns. (*Aeneid* 1.142-3)

Not wishing to give the enemies of Rome any advantage that might be obtained by hesitation or delay, Cicero ordered the *triumvis* to make the preparations for the executions and then he himself led Lentulus into the dungeon, where he, followed by the others, were strangled. "Thus that patrician, of illustrious stock of the Corneli...ended

his life in a manner befitting his character and his crimes.” (*Bellum Catilinae* 55.1-6) Cassius Dio said that others too, who had information lodged against themselves, were rounded up and called to account; that Aulus Fulvius, a senator, was murdered by his own father, a private person, and many others, not only consuls but private individuals as well, killed their sons for their involvement in the conspiracy of Catiline. Valerius Maximus (30 A.D.) observed that A. Fulvius, a man of senatorial rank recalled his son...[who] had misguidedly followed Catiline’s friendship...and put him to death first observing that he had not begotten him for Catiline against his country but for his country against Catiline.” (*Memorable Doings and Sayings* 5.8.5) Events to which Dio had remarked: “This was the course of affairs at that time.” (*Historiae Romanae* 36.3-4)

In a comment on these orations, Florus would later write, “When the question of punishment was discussed, Caesar expressed the opinion that the conspirators ought to be spared on account of their position; Cato thought that they ought to be punished in accordance with their crime.” (*Epitome* 2.12.10) The position referred to by Florus was no doubt the conspirator’s positions as citizens and nobles. The question of the legality of trying these men in the Senate and executing them has been raised many times and by many authors and I do not propose to have a solution to the argument. Andrew Drummond has examined this case in relation to Roman law very thoroughly and I don’t purport to resolve the question of the legality of the issue, but only to caution the interpreters of these events not to succumb to presentism by projecting our understanding of the present law on to the past, for we must remember that the Roman senate at this time was not only chronologically closer to the opinions of Aristotle than to modern western law, but was also psychologically, culturally, morally and politically closer to him. Although the question of the legality of imposing the death penalty on citizens of

Rome without appeal to the people, in accordance with the *Sempronian Law*, was raised in the Senate at the time, and plagued Cicero's reputation for the rest of his life, the very fact that the trial both of Catiline, and the conspirators captured in Rome, did take place in the Senate without objection, and was not submitted to the juries, tends to suggest that this procedure was not as controversial as it may at first seem to the students of modern positive law. Furthermore, the suggestion that Cicero and Cato, *inter alios*, and hence the Senate, deviated from the rule of law perhaps misunderstands the office of the dictator. Cicero held *imperium* and it was his prerogative to submit this case to the Senate. Therefore the question would be properly framed by referring to the acts of the Senate, not to the acts of Cicero, since, in the end, the decision belonged wholly to the Senate. Whether or not the Senate adhered to the rule of law, its decision in this case was, nevertheless, expedient with respect to the cause of justice. As Cicero had said to the people, "My consulship cannot cure these men but, if it removes them, then it will have prolonged the life of the Republic." (2 *In Catilinam* 11) According to Plutarch, after the conspirators had been put to death, many of Catiline's hangers-on, for they could not truly have been called supporters, continued to hang around the Forum unaware of the recent turn of events believing that the men might still be rescued. Cicero reportedly cried out to them: *Vixere!* 'They lived.' "Most of those who had flocked to the standard of Catiline, as soon as they learned the fate of Lentulus and Cethegus, deserted him and went away." (*Cicero* 22.8) Appian inflects upon them cowardice and some sinister designs. "The crowd dispersed in alarm, congratulating themselves that they had not been found out." (*Civil Wars* 2.1.6)

**XXI. *Agumentum ad baculum* against Catiline at Pistoria, Jan. 62.**

Meanwhile, Catiline was in Faesulae arranging his men in to two full legions of 5,000 men each, though Appian claims it was 20,000 men (*Civil Wars* 2.1.7). According to Sallust's narration when Antonius marched upon him, Catiline withdrew into the mountains and gave the enemy '*hostium*' no opportunity for battle while, at the same time refusing the aid of slaves who wished to join his army. Once news of the executions had reach Catiline's army, his men began to desert. With the men that remained, Catiline pressed on though forced marches into the mountains near Pistoria, modern Pistoia, in the region of Tuscany. Metellus Celer with three legions approached from Picene. When Catiline realized that he was trapped between two Roman armies, and that his plans for insurrection in Rome had failed, and that all was hopeless, he harangued his troops and prepared to battle Antonius' army. "Two hostile armies, one towards Rome, the other towards Gaul, block our way. We cannot remain longer where we are...Wherever we decide to go, we must hew a path with the sword. Therefore I counsel you to be brave...If we win, complete security will be ours...You might have passed you life in exile and infamy...but since such conditions seemed base and intolerable to true men, you decided upon this course. If you wish to forsake it, you have need of boldness; none save the victor exchanges war for peace...But if Fortune frowns upon your bravery, take care not to die un-avenged. Do not be captured and slaughters like cattle, but fighting like heroes, leave the enemy a bloody and tearful victory." After a moment of silence, the trumpets were sounded, the horses dispersed, and Catiline in the center, next to the silver eagle, prepared to do battle. Antonius having feigned illness, either out of cowardice or embarrassment, trusted his army to Marcus Petreius who gave the signal and began to advance slowly and the army of the enemy '*hostis*' did the same. Once the distance had been closed enough for a skirmish, the two forces rushed upon each other.

“When Catiline saw that his army was routed and that he was left with a mere handful of men, mindful of his birth and former rank he plunged into the thickest of the enemy ‘*hostis*’ and there fell fighting, his body pierced through and through.” (*Bellum Catilinae* 56.1-60.7) “[Marcus Petreius] joined battle with the rebels and in a very bloody contest cut down Catiline and three thousand others as they fought most bravely; for not one of them fled, but every man fell at his post.” (*Historiae Romanae* 37.40.1) For Rome it was indeed a bloody and tearful victory as Catiline had shown himself to be a mad man.

*Catiline vero longe suis inter hostium cadavera repertus est, paululum etiam spirans ferociamque animi, quam habuerat vivos, in voltu retinens.*

Catiline was found truly far in advance of them among the corpses of the enemy, still breathing a little and not holding back fierce spirit in his face which he had in life. (*Bellum Catilinae* 61.4)

Flavio Biondo in his *Italy Illuminated* (1474) recalled the event:

*Supremo autem in sinu amplae ac primariae totius Etruriae planitieei, Pistoria est civitas, in cuius agro Catilinae excitum fuisse superatum multi ex vetustis scripsere.*

In the upper most corner of the large and principal plain of all Etruria is the city of Pistoria in whose territory the army of Catiline was defeated as many ancient men have written (1.2.25).

Not a man of free birth left alive, Sallust declared that these men “had valued their own lives no more highly than those of their enemies ‘*hostium*’ ...But the army of the Roman people gained no joyful nor bloodless victory, for all the most valiant had either fallen in the fight or come off with severe wounds...turning over the bodies of the rebels ‘*hostilia*’ found now a friend, now a guest or kinsman; some also recognized their personal



enemies. Thus the whole army was variously affected with sorrow and grief, rejoicing and lamentation.” (*Bellum Catilinae* 61.6-9) Antonius reportedly sent Catiline’s head to the city and he himself was acclaimed emperor for the victory. (*Historiae Romanae* 37.40.2) After this, Cicero himself became the subject of charges for the execution of the prisoners. “This charge, though technically brought against him, was really directed at the Senate. For its members were violently denounced before the populace...on the ground that they had no right to condemn any citizen to death without the consent of the people.” (*Ibid.* 37.42.2-3) This charge failed to bring any result as the Senate at the time had granted immunity to all who were involved. Cicero was later exiled for this very act, however, by Publius Clodius Pulcher in 58 B.C. and, after that, was himself executed in 43 B.C.

I will not weary the reader recounting the *First Triumvirate* and the events leading up to assassination of Caesar, or the story about Cato’s tragic suicide in Utica where reportedly tore his own guts out with his bare hands, but, with respect to the proscription and murder of Cicero, it would be better to remain silent than to say too little. But since his reputation is diametrically opposed to, and contends directly with, that of Catiline’s, I find it necessary to digress on the topic at great length. The elder Seneca recorded a number of narrations of the events that took place after the ascension of the *Second Triumvirate* composed of Marcus Lepidus, Marcus Antonius and Octavius Caesar. Livy’s history of the event is based on Seneca’s compendium of the Roman historians who commented on them. According to Livy, Cicero fled Rome shortly after the arrival of the triumvirate. He first fled to his rural estate in Tuscany and then to Formiae where he boarded a ship bound for Caieta. He set sail several times, but contrary winds and

seasickness drove him back. Wearing from his futile endeavor, he returned to his home where he reportedly said:

*Moriar in patria saepe servata.*

I shall die in the fatherland I often saved. (*Suasoriae* 6.17)

After the assassination of Caesar, Marcus Lepidus, Marcus Antonius and Octavius Caesar “came together on a small island in the midst of a river, and there held conference for three days. All other matters were easily agreed upon and they divided up the whole empire among themselves as through it were an ancestral inheritance.” (*Antony* 19) According to Appian’s narrative the three men met on a islet in the river Lavinus near the city of Mutina where they negotiated day and night for two days concluding that Octavian should resign the consulship and that Ventidius should take his place who should use his position to enact a law establishing a magistrate with consular powers to protect the government from civil disturbances and that this magistrate should be headed by Lepidus, Antony, and Octavian, who together were to rule for five years and, furthermore that a distribution of the Roman provinces ought be made. Antony acquired the length and breadth of Gaul except for the lands adjacent to the Pyrenees Mountains which was called Old Gaul. Old Gaul along with Spain was allotted to Lepidus and Octavian acquired Africa, Sardinia, Sicily and a number of other islands in the vicinity. This new government was called the *Second Triumvirate*. The Roman provinces east of the Adriatic were as yet still held by Cassius and Brutus, against whom Lepidus and Octavian pledged to wage war. (*Civil Wars* 4.2-3) Cassius Dio continued: “After forming this compact and taking oaths they hastened to Rome, giving the impression that they were all going to rule on equal terms, but each having the intention of getting the entire power himself.” (*Historiae Romanae* 47.1.1) Numerous portents were said to

follow the summit of these most powerful men. Dogs howled continuously like wolves. Cattle spoke in human voices. A new born infant spoke and statues were said to sweat blood. The Senate sent for soothsayers from Etruria and one of them proclaimed that the kingdom of the past was returning and that all present would be made slaves save he himself alone, whereupon he held his own breath until he died.

ε φ' οἱ σὺν ἡμῶν βουλῆ θύτας καὶ μάντις συνη γένεσθαι τὸν Τυρρηνίαν: καὶ ὁ πρεσβύτατος αὐτῶν, τὰς πάλαι βασιλείας ἐπανήξειν εἰπὼν, καὶ δουλεύσειν ἅπαντας χωρὶς ἐαυτοῦ μόνου, τὸ στόμα κατέσχε καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα, ἕως ἂν πέθανεν.

The senate gathered together diviners and seers from Etruria and an old man of them was saying the kingdoms of long ago would return and everyone except he himself alone were to be slaves, shut his mouth and held his breath until he died.

(*Civil Wars* 4.4)

Not to make a long story of it the triumvirate forthwith initiated new proscriptions reminiscent of those actuated by Sulla but on a grander and more sinister scale. “Not only the men’s enemies or the rich were being killed, but also their best friends, incredible as it may seem.” (*Historiae Romanae* 47.5.3) The first man executed, Salvius, was one of Cicero’s accomplices. (*Civil Wars* 4.17) Appian related the story how Cicero fled Rome and even claimed to visit Cicero’s country home near Caieta “to gain knowledge of this lamentable affair...and here he [Cicero] remained quite. While the searchers were approaching...ravens flew into his chamber and awakened him from sleep by their croaking, and pulled off his beard-covering, until his servants, divining that this was a warning from one of the gods, put him in a litter and again conveyed him toward the sea,

going cautiously through a dense thicket. Many soldiers were hurrying around in squads inquiring if Cicero had been seen anywhere. Some people, moved by good-will and pity, said that he had already put to sea; but a shoemaker, a client of Clodius, who had been the most bitter enemy of Cicero, pointed out the path to Laena, the centurion, who was pursuing with a small force. The latter ran after him, and seeing slaves mustering a defense in much larger number than the force under his own command, he called out by way of stratagem, ‘Centurions in the rear, to the front!’ Thereupon the slaves, thinking that more soldiers were coming, were terror stricken, and Laena, although he had been once saved by Cicero when under trial, drew his head out of the litter and cut it off, striking three times, or rather sawing it off by reason of his inexperience...Antony was delighted beyond measure. He crowned the centurion and gave him 250,000 Attic drachmas in addition to the stipulated reward...The head and hand of Cicero were suspended for a long time from the rostra in the forum where formerly he had been accustomed to make public speeches...It is said that even at his meals Antony placed the head of Cicero before his table, until he became satiated with the horrid sight. Thus was Cicero, a man famous even yet for his eloquence, and one who had rendered the greatest service to his country when he held the office of consul, slain, and insulted after his death.” (*Civil Wars* 4.19-20)

Cicero's slaves, unlike the slaves of many other nobles at the time, were ready to fight to the death to defend him, but Cicero ordered them to set down the litter upon which they bore him and offered his neck to his would be assassins. Appian graphically described the chaos that descended on Rome after the first names were published.

Εὐθὺς οὐκ ἔπειτα ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τῇ αὐτῇ τὴν χώραν καὶ ἀπὸ τῆν πόλιν, ὡς  
ἐκάστος πῆρ συνελαμβάνετο, ἀνδρολήματα φνίδια πολλὰ καὶ τρόποι

τῶν φόνων ποικίλοι τῶν τε κεφαλῶν ἀποτομαὶ τοῦ μισθοῦ χάριν  
 εἰς ἐπίδειξιν φυγαί τε ἀπρεπεῖς καὶ σχήματα ἀτόπα ἐκ τοῦ πρὶν  
 περιφανοῦς. κατέδυνον γὰρ οἱ μὲν εἰς φρέατα, οἱ δὲ εἰς τὰς  
 ὑπονόμους τάφρους ἐπιτάα καθαῖρα, οἱ δὲ εἰς καπνώδεις  
 ὑποφορίας ἠέ τῶν τε γωνυαῖς κεραμίσι βυομέναις ὑπεκάθητο μετὰ  
 σιγησβαθυτάτης. ἐδεδοίκεσαν γὰρ οὐχ ἡσσον τῶν σφαγέων οἱ  
 μὲν γυναικάς ἠέ παιδάς οὐκ εὐμενῶς σφίσιν ἔχοντας, οἱ δὲ  
 ἐξελευθέρους τε καὶ θεράποντας, οἱ δὲ καὶ δανεισμάτων χρήστας ἠέ  
 χωρίων γείτονας ἐπιθυμίας τῶν χωρίων. ἐπανάστασις γὰρ δὴ πάντων,  
 ὅσα τέως ὑπόουλα ἦν, ἀθρόα τότε ἐγίγνετο καὶ ἀθέμιτος  
 μεταβολὴ βουλευτῶν ἀνδρῶν, ὑπάτων ἠέ στρατηγῶν ἠέ  
 δημάρχων, ἔτι τάσδε τὰς ἀρχὰς μετιόντων ἠέ ἐναυταῖς γεγονότων,  
 εἰς πόδας ἰδίου θεράποντος ῥιπτουμένων σὺν ὀλοφύρσεσι καὶ σωτηρα  
 καὶ κύριον τὸν οἰκέτην τιθεμένων. οἱ ἄκτιστον δὲ ἦν, ὅτε καὶ ταῦτα  
 ὑποστάντες οὐκ ἐληθεῖεν.

Then, straight away, through city and country, wherever each was to be  
 found, there were sudden arrests and many kinds of murder, the cutting off of  
 heads for the sake of rewards with the showing of the heads, and unbecoming  
 flights in disguises contrasted with notoriety. (*Ibid.* 4.13)

In the end Livy, giving credit where due, eulogized him thus:

*Omniū aduersum nihil ut viro dignum erat tulit praeter mortem...Si qui  
 stamen virtutibus vitia pensarit, vir magnus acer memorabilis fuit.*

Not all of his adversities did he endure as a dignified man besides his death...Nevertheless, if we consider any of his faults against his virtues, he was a man, great, brave, and memorable. (*Fragmenta* 50)

The elder Seneca, relying on a lost work of Livy, said, “There is no doubt that his slaves bravely and loyally showed readiness to make a fight of it; and that it was Cicero himself who ordered them to put down the litter and suffer calmly the compulsions of a harsh fate. He leaned from where he sat, and offered his neck without a tremor; his head was struck off. The soldiers in their stupid cruelty, were not satisfied. They cut off the hands, too, cursing them for having written attacks on Antony. The head was taken back to Antony, and, on his orders, placed between the two hands on the rostra, where as consul, and often as ex-consul, and in that very year attacking Antony...The Romans could scarcely bear to lift eyes wet with tears to look on his mutilated body.” (*Suasoriae* 6.17)

Thus Cicero, unlike Catiline, met his death as a brave man would, showing no fear in accordance with his own remarks:

*Nam neque turpis mors forti viro potest accidere neque immature consulari nec misera sapienti.*

For death is neither ugly for the brave, early for the consul nor wretched to the wise. (4 *In Catilinam* 3)

Appian, Plutarch and Dio say that only Cicero’s head and right hand were cut off and displayed on the rostra. Antony’s wife Fulvia at one time “took the head into her hands before it was removed, and after abusing it spitefully and spitting upon it, set on her knees, opened the mouth, and pulled out the tongue, which she pierced with pins that she used for her hair, at the same time uttering many brutal jests.” (*Historiae Romanae* 47.8.4) According to Seneca: “All concede that Cicero was neither coward enough to

plead with Anthony, nor stupid enough to think that Antony could be won over: all, that is, except Asinius Pollio, who remained the most implacable enemy of Cicero's reputation." (*Suasoriae* 6.14 *et Institutio* 12.1.22) Seneca recorded the narration of Cremutius Cordus: "*Quibus vivis laetus Antonius* he was now raised, limb by limb, to be viewed by his fellow countrymen in a new state, blood spattered over his lips and lolling head. Shortly before, he had been leader of the senate, glory of the Roman name: now he was merely a source of profit to his killer." (*Suasoriae* 6.19)

Bruttedius Niger had reported:

*Nulla non pars fori aliquot actionis inclutae signate vestigo erat; nemo non aliquod eius in se meritum fatebatur.*

The assembled people did not as is customary, hear the biography of the body on the rostra, but they [themselves] narrated it.

"Every part of the forum was marked by the memory of some glorious pleading; everyone had a benefit done him by Cicero to proclaim. There was no doubt of at least one service to Rome: he had put off that miserable servitude from the time of Catiline to that of Antony." (*Ibid.* 6.21) The elder Seneca also said, "None of all these eloquent men lamented the death of Cicero more finely than Cornelius Severus:

*Conticuit Latiae tristis facundia linguae.*

The eloquence of the Latin tongue was dumb-struck by grief. (*Ibid.* 6.26)

Cornelius Nepos eulogized him thus:

*Ille enim fuit unus qui potuerit et etiam debuerit historiam digna voce pronuntiare...ex quo dubito, interitu eius utrum res publica an historia magis doleat.*

He truly was the only one who could have, and indeed gave, a dignified voice to narrate history...on account of that, I question whether his death pains the republic or history greater. (*De Historicis Latinis* 2.1)

And Velleius Paterculus said, “When Cicero was beheaded the voice of the people was severed...You did not rob him of his fame, the glory of his deeds and words, nay you enhanced them...He lives and will continue to live in the memory of the ages, and so long as this universe shall endure.

*Tuum in eum factum exerabitur citiusque e mundo genus hominum quam (Ciceronis) nomen cedit.*

Your deed against him will call forth a curse and the race of man will more quickly depart from the world than *his* name. (*2 Compendium* 66.2-5)

Following the tradition promulgated by Solon and recorded by Herodotus and validated by Aristotle of looking to the end of a man's life in order to determine whether or not that man had lived a happy life:

Δει γάρ, ὡς περ εἶπομεν, καὶ ἀρετῆς τελείας καὶ βίου τελείου. πολλαὶ γὰρ μεταβολαὶ γίνονται καὶ παντοίαι τύχαι κατὰ τὸν βίον, καὶ ἐνδέχεται τὸν μάλιστ' εὐθηνου ντα μεγάλας συμφοραὶς περιπεσεῖν ἐπὶ γήρως, καθάπερ ἐν τοῖς Τρωικοῖς περὶ Πριάμου μυθεύεται: τὸν δὲ τοιαύταις χρησάμενον τύχαις καὶ τελευτήσαντα ἀθλίως οὐδεὶς εὐδαιμονίζει.

“Happiness, as we said, requires both complete goodness and a complete lifetime. For many reverses and vicissitudes of all sorts occur in the course of life, and it is possible that the most prosperous man may encounter great disasters in his declining years, as the story is told of Priam in the epics; but no one calls a man



happy who meets with misfortunes like Priam's, and comes to a miserable end.”

(*Nicomachean Ethics* 1100a1)

Cicero after having having been fortunate in life, successful in career, whole of body and sound of mind, brave in spirit, virtuous in character; met with a miserable and tragic end, would be considered to have been wholly happy. “The wealthy man is better able to content his desires, and to bear up against a sudden buffet of calamity. The other has less ability to withstand these evils (from which, however, his good luck keeps him in the clear), but he enjoys all of these following blessings: he is whole of limb, a stranger to disease, free from misfortune, happy in his children, and comely to look upon. If, in addition to all this, he end his life well, he is of a truth the man of whom thou art in search, the man who may be rightly termed happy. Call him, however, until he die, not happy but fortunate.” (*The History* 1.32) Catiline however having been very much the opposite, neither brave nor happy.

### III. The Argument

In a manifestly uncritical way, Aleksandr Blok took Catiline not as a revolutionary archetype, but as a symbol of violence against the state abstracted from its motive force. (*A Roman Bolshevik* 414) For him, it was analogous that if Catiline attacked the powers that be, and Lenin attacked the powers that be, then Catiline must have been a revolutionary, since Lenin was one. Remarkably, Kalb said Catiline was running for consul on a “populist platform.” (*A Roman Bolshevik* 416) When it was Tiberius Gracchus in an earlier period who ought to be credited with that. “By asserting this familiarity Blok aims in ‘Catiline’ to situate the Bolshevik revolution in a momentous lineage.” (*A Roman Bolshevik* 416) In truth, however, it was Cato who

would rightly be described as the leader of the commons. “Cato belonged to the family of the Porcii and emulated the great Cato, except that he had enjoyed a better Greek education than the former. He diligently promoted the interest of the *plebs*, and admired no man, but was thoroughly devoted to the commonweal. Suspicious of unlimited power, he hated anyone who had grown above his fellows, but loved anyone of the common people through pity for his weakness. He was becoming the friend of the people such as no one else, and indulged in outspokenness in behalf of the right, even when it involved danger.” (*Historiae Romanae* 37.22.1-4) Everyone has praised Cato’s virtues. After him, it was Caesar who captivated the masses. Sallust compared Cato and Caesar’s virtues, “In birth then, in years and in eloquence, they were about equal...Caesar was held great because of his benefactions and lavish generosity, Cato for the uprightness of his life...Caesar gained glory by giving, helping, and forgiving; Cato by never stooping to bribery. One a refuge for the unfortunate, the other a scourge for the wicked...[Caesar] longed for great power, an army, a new war to give scope to his brilliant merit. Cato, on the contrary, cultivated self-control, propriety, but above all austerity. He did not vie with the rich in riches nor in intrigue with the intriguer...He preferred to be, rather than to seem virtuous.” (*Bellum Catilinae* 54.1-6) In short, Caesar bribed people with gifts, Cato stood as a role model.

Blok impetuously compared Catiline to Tacitus. “A few decades after Christ it fell to the lot of Tacitus...A few decades before Christ, it had fallen to the lot of poor Catiline.” (*World Revolution* 294) Blok said, “Sulla was a free and easy-going man.” (*Ibid.* 296) And “that Catiline was a lover of the people or dreamed of universal equality, there can, of course, be no question.” (*Ibid.* 300) Blok complained that Cicero drowned Catiline in a flood of lawyer’s oratory, but what Catiline heard was nothing compared to

Cicero's panegyrics delivered to the people and to the Senate which he did not hear.

Oratory such as this:

*Ex hac enim parte pudor pugnat, illinc petulantia;*

*Hinc pudicitia, illinc stuprum;*

*Hinc constantia, illinc furor;*

*Hinc honestas, illinc turpitude;*

*Hinc continentia, illinc libido;*

*Hinc denique aequitas, temperantia, fortitude, prudential*

*virtues omnes cerant cum iniquitate, luxuria, ignavia, temeritate, cum vitiis omnibus; postremo copia cum egestate, bona denique spes cum omnium rerum desperatione confligit.*

For from this part fights decency, over there wantonness;

Hence modesty, thence defilement;

Hence constancy, thence madness;

Hence honor, thence turpitude;

Hence continence, thence lust;

and finally, from hence fairness, temperance, fortitude, prudence, all virtues, contend with inequality, luxury, laziness, thoughtlessness, against all vices; in the end abundance fights indigence, and finally, good wishes against all things hopeless. (2 *In Catilinam* 25).

For him, Sallust was actually the real criminal, "He left a very bad memory. He managed to squeeze all the juice out of a rich country through bribes and extortion." (*World Revolution* 295) There's no arguing with someone who maintains the most absurd positions in the face of all evidence to the contrary.

‘Ο ου ν Πολέμαρχος<sup>17</sup> ε ῥφη: ω Σώκρατες, δοκει τέ μοι πρός α ῥστυ  
ω ρμη σθαι ω ς α πιόντες.

Ου γάρ κακω ς δοξάζεις, η ν δ' ε γώ.

‘Ορα ς ου ν η μα ς, ε ῥφη, ο ῥσοι ε σμέν;

πω ς γὰρ ου ῥ;

η ῥ τοίνυν τούτων, ε ῥφη, κρείττους γένεσθε η ῥ μένετ' αυ του .

Ου κου ν, η ν δ' ε γώ, ε ῥτι ε ῥν λείπεται, τὸ η ῥν πείσωμεν υ μα ς

ω ς χρη η μα ς α φει ναι;

η καὶ δύναισθ' α ῥν, η δ' ο ῥς, πει σαι μη α κούοντας;

Ου δαμω ς, ε ῥφη ο Γλαύκων.

‘Ως τοίνυν μη α κουσομένων, ου ῥτω διανοει σθε.

Then Polemarchus declared: “Socrates, y’all appear to me to have been headed to town.”

“You don’t guess badly, for I was.”

“Don’t you see us, he said, how many we are?”

“For surely not? Accordingly y’all become stronger than these men or y’all stay right where you are.”

But I said, “Isn’t there still one alternative, if we perchance persuaded both of you that it is necessary to send us away?”

But he said, “Verily, perchance y’all able to persuade them not hearing?”

“In no wise,” Glaucon said.

<sup>17</sup> Πολέμαρχος, masc. nom. sing., one who begins or leads the war, a leader, chieftain. (*Liddell and Scott*) By naming this *persona* Polymarchus, Plato signifies that he intends that the reader understand that the *argumentum ad baculum* is being deployed against Socrates and his comrades and that this form of argument overcomes any kind of persuasive argument; *for if one does not listen neither can one be persuaded*.

“Well, y’all, therefore, have in mind we not hearing.” (*Republic* 1.327c)

For Blok, Catiline is Christ arisen, followed by the real Christ arisen, followed by the V. I. Lenin, and again, Christ arisen! The fact that Blok was no follower of Lenin’s seriously undermines his argument. Not being Bolsheviks, both Blok and Kalb are hard pressed to vindicate Catiline by drawing correspondences between Catiline and Lenin. In his poem *The Twelve* (1918), which Bloc claimed had been written in support of the revolution, he wrote:

Our sons have gone  
to serve the Reds  
to serve the Reds  
to risk their heads! ...  
So they march with sovereign tread ...  
Behind them limps the hungry dog,  
and wrapped in wild snow at their head  
carrying a blood-red flag...  
ahead of them goes Jesus Christ.

Though Blok says, “Catiline was a revolutionary with all his spirit and all his being.” (*World Revolution* 300) But even Leon Trotsky disputed that Blok could understand this. In his critique of Blok’s poem *The Twelve*, Trotsky said, “Blok was not a poet of the revolution...Throughout all his changes, Blok remained a true decadent, if one were to take his word in a large historic sense, in the sense of the contrast between decadent individualism and the individualism of the rising bourgeoisie...‘The Twelve’ does not sing the Revolution, but Russia, in spite of the Revolution...To be sure, Blok is

not one of ours, but he reached toward us. And in doing so, he broke down.” (*Literature and Revolution* 118) After *The Twelve*, Aleksandr Blok never published again.

Sallust’s voice didn’t crack, Blok’s voice did. In his *Catiline*, Blok claims that Catiline underwent a ‘metamorphosis.’ “Such a person is a madman, a maniac, possessed.” (*World Revolution* 300) Just as Sallust himself recorded, “His guilt-stained soul, at odds with gods and men, could find rest neither waking nor sleeping, so cruelly did conscience ravage his overwrought mind. Hence his pallid complexions, his bloodshot eyes, his gait now fast now slow; in short, his face and his every glance showed the madman.” (*Bellum Catilinae* 15.4-5) Sallust, Blok and Freud can, at least for the moment, agree: “Unbridled gratification of all desires forces itself into the foreground as the most alluring guiding principle of life.” (*Civilization and Its Discontents* 29) Once accustomed to the high life, Catiline now deprived of it “was found [to have] become neurotic because [he could not] tolerate the degree of privation that society imposes on [him].” (*Ibid.* 46) Catiline became neurotic because he had lost a luxurious lifestyle he had been accustomed too. Not only that, he had also accustomed himself to self-gratification through violence. As a commentary upon a commentary, Kalb’s analysis of Blok’s essay, and consequently of the Catiline affair and the Bolshevik revolution, is in a precarious position. Since Kalb is neither a Latinist, nor a Marxist, her ability to contribute a meaningful commentary on the *Bellum Catilinae* and to draw correspondences between it and the Bolshevik revolution, is dubious. Indeed she sought to explain Blok, not Catiline. Although she compared Catiline both to Christ and to Bolshevism; she never mentioned Lenin or Marx by name and made no annotations to any classical text, save Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*. Although Kalb does cite Ovid, he said nothing on the Catiline affair. Kalb’s argument that Catiline was a calumniated man and,

“a precursor to Jesus Christ,” is absurd. Catiline could not have been a Bolshevik because any class analysis would place him in the category of the nobles of Rome. According to Karl Marx, “The wage-laborer lives only by the sale of his labor-power.” (*Capital vol. II* 33) He was a discontent, but he was not motivated by any *class consciousness*. “What makes men morally discontented...is that they do not find the present adapted to the realization of aims which they hold to be right and just.” (*Philosophy of History* 169) For Catiline it was not merely the nobility whom he believed ought to rule, but of those of the stronger. He was not the leader of a proletarian vanguard political party. These were men who had lost all they had through riotous living and attempted to steal back what they had just finished throwing away. After the exhaustion of all legal means, they withdrew from Rome and hurled themselves against it and, being annihilated, as it were, to the very last man. It would not be difficult to elaborate a completely dialectical and historical materialist interpretation of Catiline himself. He is of the noble class it is true, but he is not the vanguard of any class and has no political principles to speak of and does not articulate any particular political program besides placing himself at the helm of state and benefiting his friends and harming his enemies. Catiline is not a reformer; he does not motivate the oppressed to rise in arms as a social movement of their entire class in the way Spartacus did, but instead conspired among his personal associates, formed a cabal, and attempted a *putsch*. Furthermore the biography of Lenin does not correspond to that of Catiline. After serving 15 months in prison, Lenin and his family were exiled to Siberia in 1897 for his brother, Alex’s, involvement in the plot to murder the Tsar Alexander III. Lenin became a revolutionary while in exile. There is no evidence that Lenin had ever undergone a neurotic metamorphosis, nor is there any that he had committed any of the crimes Catiline had.

This whole question as applied to Christ is absurd. Hegel thought Christ was revolutionary on account of a single paragraph in the *Gospel of Matthew*.

*Nolite arbitrari quia venerim mittere pacem in terram non veni pacem mittere sed gladium.*

Wish not to believe that I have come to bring peace on the Earth. I have not come to bring peace, but the sword. (10.34)

To this Hegel said: “Nowhere are to be found such revolutionary utterances as in the *Gospels*.” (*Philosophy of History* 308) This may of course be true and Kalb seems to take her departure from here, but she should not have forgotten Jesus’ earlier statement:

*Ecce ego mitto vos sicut oves in medio luporum estote ergo prudentes sicut serpentes et simplices sicut columbae.*

Lo, I am sending you out like sheep among wolves, therefore be as wary as serpents and as simple as doves. (*Matthew* 10.16)

Though it would be difficult to characterize Cicero as either a serpent or a dove, the populace could indeed have been called sheep and if it were not for sword of Cicero, the wolf Catiline should devour us. *Cave Canem!* Indeed Jesus represented a movement of the oppressed. Since in his case criticism came from below we may conclude that his movement was indeed revolutionary, an ascendancy from the lower to the higher. Of course this metaphor was itself prefigured by Herodotus: “But as Theras’ son would not sail with him, his father said that he would leave him behind as a sheep among wolves; after which saying the boy got the nickname of Oeolycus.” (4.149) To return to my point of departure, it was incumbent upon Cicero to deploy the *argumentum ad baculum* against a criminal like Catiline for, as Tacitus noted:



*Inter inpotentes et validos faslo quiescas: ubi manu agitur, modestia ac probitas nomina superioris sunt.*

Among the powerless and the powerful you would find peacefulness vain: where a strong hand commands, moderation and honesty are the appellations of the stronger. (*Germania* 36.1)

One could take the view that Catiline, having already lost his great fortune, had descended in class to the *proletarii*. Hutchinson takes the position that Catiline was a revolutionary who intended to “strike at the heart of Roman capitalism.” (*The Conspiracy* 15) He continued: “It is clear that Catiline was proposing not merely a change in government and policy but a social and economic revolution.” (Ibid. 56-57) But this was clearly not the case, for, although he was financially ruined, he suffered no political disability on account of this and ran for consul twice, in 64 and again in 63. Catiline promised to cancel the debts of certain members of the ruling class and to confiscate the property of others, but he makes no mention of abolishing *capitalism*—if he even perceived of it. Sulla’s expropriations of land and property followed by disposal of that property *sub hasta* were fraudulent. The auctions were rigged and the profits were channeled back to Sulla and his agents. The populace benefited little from these enterprises. Hutchinson represents a nostalgic leftist malaise, which, having already been smeared with the reputation of Catiline, seek to embrace it, co-opt it, and revise it in order to give it a more palatable interpretation. Vindicating Catiline is, nevertheless, utterly pathological; παθος ‘a suffering of the soul.’ Though some may feel somehow vindicated by Hutchinson’s interpretation of the *Bellum Catilinae*; Catiline was no doubt a scandalous creature and anyone compared to him should consider his reputation smeared. He was a supporter of Sulla and his proscriptions and benefited from them. He

was also a cannibal. “After the domination of Lucius Sulla the man had been seized with a mighty desire of getting control of the government, recking little by what manner he should achieve it, provided he made himself supreme.” (*Bellum Catilinae* 5.6) His actions would be best described as an attempted *putsch*, not a revolution. A revolution is progressive by its very nature. It seeks to overturn an old oppressive order and replace it with a new freer order. Catiline sought to re-establish an old and hated political regime. Catiline’s program didn’t intend to benefit even his own class in its entirety, but only himself and his conspirators. He, furthermore, made no allusion to any *bone fide* theory of justice, sacred moral, or commonly held value. Blok’s analogy between the conspirators of the *Bellum Catilinae* to the revolutionaries of the Bolshevik revolution proves that Blok was beyond the pale of the Russian working class. He was a dilettante to the very end. He sang bleary eyed of the old Russia, and it ruined him. The *Bellum Catilinae* was an outgrowth of Catiline’s conspiracy. The Bolshevik revolution was not a conspiracy, but a mass movement of the truly oppressed transformed into a civil war whereby the oppressed class as a whole supplanted the ruling class as a whole. Catiline was no V. I. Lenin, but he was no Spartacus either. In truth, Judith Kalb, as Blok did before her, thinks she may more easily overcome Lenin if Catiline overcomes him first. It is a well known sophistical technique to smear the reputation of a good man by continually comparing that man to a bad one. “Irony is to say something and pretend you are not saying it, or else to call things by the names of their contraries.” (*Rhetoric to Alexander* 21.1) There are no *bone fide* comparisons between the life of Lenin and that of Catiline. Lenin did not undergo a neurotic metamorphosis as Catiline had. He had committed neither rape, nor incest, nor cannibalism, nor murder and no one says he did.

Wilkins' monograph is an attempted deconstruction, so popular within academia these days. For instance, she seeks to prove that if Sallust's *antistrophe*, the word *hostis* 'enemy,' was to describe Catiline and Catiline used the same word to refer to the Roman government, then Sallust was guilty of blurring the distinction between right and wrong. The word *hostis* in its original meaning, however, signified *a stranger* in a time when any stranger might be an *enemy*. (*Latin* 121) "Many words indicate one thing now, but formerly meant something else, as is the case with *hostis* 'enemy': for in olden times by this word they meant a foreigner from another country independent of Roman laws, but now they give the name to him whom they then called *perduellis* 'enemy.'" (*De Lingua Latina* 5.3) Through the use of ambiguous speech, Sallust, then, indicated that Catiline had become like a foreigner since his actions indicated that he no longer considered himself a subject to Roman law. And Sallust, noted for his archaisms, signified through this *antistrophe* that these men, though citizens of the same *πολις*, had become *strangers* to each other.

*Cum unius cuiusque verbui naturae sint duae,  
a qua re et in qua re vocabulum sit impositum.*

Each and every word has a dual nature, that thing from which and that thing to which a name is imposed. (*De Lingua Latina* 5.2)

Thus Sallust's acceptance of the word *hostis* as taken *from* the actions of Catiline, or by way of etymology, was as a *stranger* while that same acceptance as applied *to* him by way of semantics was enemy.

The central argument of Wilkins' work is an apparent error in Sallust's chronology, though she denies it after suggesting it. The central precept of her methodology, however, is to functionally deny that Sallust was a historian and affirm that

history can be discovered somewhere outside him as an extant source. She goes on and on using phrases to the effect that Sallust intended to “depict” or “portray” Catiline this way or that way. In so doing, however, Wilkins actually depicts and portrays Sallust as an author who disregarded historical veracity as means of justifying her praise for Catiline. Her revisionist operation revolves primarily around her excessive preoccupation with forensic philological concerns while at the same time denying Sallust’s objectivity which she initially impugned by his chronological mistake. Not that there is anything wrong with forensic philology *per se*, but Wilkins uses it to assert that Sallust invented both the first conspiracy and the infamous oath. Wilkins, furthermore, does not vet the many extant codices of the *Bellum Catilinae*, discuss any of Sallust’s other works, or examine any other extant sources, but asserts that Sallust needed to invent the first conspiracy in order to justify a later passage where Catiline departed Rome “with the fasces and other emblems of authority.” (*Bellum Catilinae* 36.1) By denying objectivity to Sallust and simultaneously discovering *real* history through pinpoint philological parsing; Wilkins supposes to induce the reader into believing that objectivity actually does exist, and, not only that, it resides with her; and that it can be found in her work and by her methodology, but she remains hard pressed to find history from within written sources which she denied veracity to at the outset. If Sallust’s monograph is a fictive work, on the grounds that he intentionally included events that never took place, then all extrapolated evidence must likewise be held in doubt because the all the facts have been drawn from the same *poison well*. “We question why, since Catiline had the chance of being elected to the consulship, he was reduced to revolutionary action.” (*Villain or Hero* 7) I question whether or not Catiline’s actions could properly be called “revolutionary.” Wilkins’ primary fault as a historian is not her use of forensic

philology, but her *positivistic* methodology. She treats Sallust's text as an object of a *natural science*, not as an object of history. She failed to understand that in interpreting the *Bellum Catilinae* the historian does not start with a hypothesis and then attempt to falsify that hypothesis by gathering pieces of evidence which become data plugged into one or the other of two columns of data which either *supports* or *refutes* the hypothesis *Catiline was a villain*. Since the events of the *Bellum Catilinae* are of the past, they are not falsifiable because they cannot be re-enacted. But this fact is neither here nor there. Whether or not Catiline was an actual villain or merely a calumniated man is not essential to the historian, because whether or not he was an actual villain *he was believed to be one*. It is inconsequential if Catiline was an actual villain because the object of study for the historian is not who or what Catiline actually was, but is how *man* in general has become who he *is*. The *Bellum Catilinae* has influenced who we are today. The proper object of study for the historian is to compare who we are as a civilization to Catiline's *reputation* for whom he was, not an inquiry as to whether or not the actual Catiline corresponds 1:1 with his reputation, unless inquiry happens to be a study of whether or not a historian has lied. But Wilikins' monograph is not an inquiry into whether or not Sallust as a historian is a liar, but whether or not Catiline was a villain or a hero. Determining whether or not Catiline was a villain is based on whether or not the crimes alleged against him are still crimes, not whether or not he actually committed them because we cannot re-try him for those alleged crimes. The question as to whether or not Catiline was guilty of those crimes is a *moot* case.

It is clear from the several narratives that Catiline intended to become not only consul, but dictator by whatever means. It would have been best for him if he could have attained this by being elected to the position, but he intended to seize the *fascēs* by any

means, including that of violence. The reader may wish to recall, however, that the fasces had been seized before. “The poor were moved with deep sorrow, and rightly so, both on their own account (for they believed that they were no longer to live in a free state under equal laws, but were reduced to servitude by the rich), and on account of Gracchus himself, who had incurred such danger and suffering in their behalf. So they all accompanied him with tears to his house in the evening, and bade him be of good courage for the morrow. Gracchus cheered up, assembled his partisans before daybreak, and communicated to them a signal to be displayed in case of a fight. He then took possession of the temple on the Capitoline hill, where the voting was to take place, and occupied the middle of the assembly. As he was obstructed by the other tribunes and by the rich, who would not allow the votes to be taken on this question, he gave the signal. There was a sudden shout from those who saw it, and a resort to violence in consequence. Some of the partisans of Gracchus took position around him like body-guards.

Οἱ δὲ τὰ ἱμάτια διαζωσάμενοι, ῥάβδους καὶ ξύλα τὰ ἐν χερσὶ τῶν  
 ὑπηρέτων ἀρπάσαντές τε καὶ διακλάσαντες ἐς πολλά

“Others, having girded themselves, seized the fasces and staves in the hands of the lictors and broke them in pieces.”

“They drove the rich out of the assembly with such disorder and wounds that the tribunes fled from their places in terror, and the priests closed the doors of the temple. Many ran away pell-mell and scattered wild rumors. Some said that Gracchus had deposed all the other tribunes, and this was believed because none of them could be seen. Others said that he had declared himself tribune for the ensuing year without an election.” (*Civil Wars* 1.2.15)

But this entirely different than what Catiline had done, for instead of smashing them to pieces Catiline enshrined them. The fact that when Catiline finally did withdraw, at Cicero's indulgence, and assumed the outward symbols of a consul, proves that he was a pretender to the office. By having himself preceded by *lictors* bearing the *fascēs*, he tried to appear as if he were the consul elect, nay, the *dictator* self-appointed! By so doing, Catiline insinuated that he had somehow been illegitimately deprived of a political position that would have been rightly his and would brook no contenders. But he had not been unjustly deprived of a lawful office. Catiline had not been elected he had been defeated. Thus Catiline, in fact, behaved highly undemocratically, indeed autocratically. By assuming the outward symbols of an office that was not rightly his, Catiline broke the law. "I knew that the arms, the axes, the fascēs, the trumpets, the military standards, that silver eagle for which he had even built a shrine in his own home had been sent on ahead." (2 *In Catilinam* 13) *Per omne fas ac nefas*, Catiline intended to be not only consul, but *dictator*. Whether by election or *putsch*, he himself presumed to decide the election by and for his own self. Catiline was also a dissembler. As Plato tells us, "The height of injustice is to seem just without being so." (*Republic* 2.361a) And so it went with Catiline deploying the *argumentum ad misericordiam* through his pleading accents and his repetitive assertions that he only sought justice. This behavior, then, is not so remarkable for if one is "unjust and have procured [the] reputation for justice a godlike life is promised." (*Ibid.* 2:365b) A dissembler attempts to create a discrepancy between appearance and reality. Catiline tried to appear to be both just and wise, though in reality he was neither. His dissemblance, however, must have been somewhat effective, since he had attracted a number of followers, and indeed still attracts apologists. The error that was made by the dramatist Ibsen in relating the story of Catiline was through his

inappropriate use of *poetic license*. In Harris' introduction to Jonson's play she cites Jonson's own remark, "We should enjoy the same license or free power to illustrate and heighten our invention as the ancients did." (*His Conspiracy* xliii ) Ben Jonson applied his artistic license appropriately. He developed his invention within the parameters that scholarship ought to allow by staying close to the extant sources and attempting to illustrate upon them. Ibsen, however, applied his poetic license inappropriately by treating the historical persona as a mouthpiece for the views of the author. "A poet, whether he is writing epic, lyric or drama, surely ought always to represent the divine nature as it really is." (*Republic* 2.378) Not just the divine however, but all representations of beings ought to correspond to that actual being. The literary criticism that grew out of the Enlightenment wrongly took the legends of antiquity to be mere myths when the legends in many cases grew up around the facts of history. They also wrongly supposed that the authors who related these legends were prone to fictionalize the events, when this tendency would truly best be ascribed to the moderns not to the ancients. On account of a dream Astyages which had been interpreted to indicate that his daughter Mandane would bear a son that would rule in his stead he attempted to murder her first born son, the infant child Cyrus. Astyages summoned his servant Harpagus and commanded him to kill the child. Harpagus was at first overcome with pity and on account of the fact that his wife had refused to become a party to the crime, and that he furthermore reasoned that not only was the boy his kin, and, moreover, he reasoned that if the crown passed from Astyages to his daughter Mandane he could but live in fear of revenge from her for murdering her child. Thus, Harpagus reasoned: "For my own safety, indeed, the child must die." (*The History* 1.109) Harpagus then decided to give the child to a herdsman named Mitradates, but since Mitradates' wife Cyno had just



given birth to a still born child they decided to switch the children, leaving their dead infant exposed on a mountainside and to raise the newborn Cyrus as their own. After a period of ten years, and by a fortuitous circumstance, the identity of Cyrus was discovered by Astyages who was secretly enraged that Harpagus had defied his orders. Upon hearing an account of the events, Astyages calmly told Harpagus, "Send thy son to be with the new comer, and to-night, as I mean to sacrifice thank-offerings for the child's safety to the gods to who such honor is due, I look to have thee a guest at the banquet." (1.118) Harpagus did as bidden and sent his own son to Astyages who murdered the child, boiled his flesh, and served him for dinner to his own father. "On the table of Harpagus, nothing was placed except the flesh of his own son. This was all put before him, except the hands and feet and head, which were laid by themselves in a covered basket. When Harpagus seemed to have eaten his fill, Astyages called out to him to know how he had enjoyed the repast. On his reply that he had enjoyed it excessively, they whose business it was brought him the basket, in which were the hands and feet and head of his son, and bade him open it, and take out what he pleased." (1.119) On account of the fact that the distinguished and virtuous Herodotus recorded this, that it happened there can of course be no question. But a similar legend recorded by Pindar preceded this one. According to him Tantalus, son of Zeus and Pluto, and king of Sipylus in either Phrygia or Lydia, murdered his own son Pelops and served him to the gods for dinner. "Your father invited the gods to a very well-ordered banquet at his own dear Sipylus, in return for the meals he had enjoyed... But when you disappeared, and people did not bring you back to your mother, for all their searching, right away some envious neighbor whispered that they cut you limb from limb with a knife into the water's rolling boil over the fire. and among the tables at the last course they divided and ate your flesh. For me it

is impossible to call one of the blessed gods a glutton. I stand back from it. Often the lot of evil-speakers is profitlessness. If indeed the watchers of Olympus ever honored a mortal man, that man was Tantalus. But he was not able to digest his great prosperity, and for his greed he gained overpowering ruin, which the Father hung over him: a mighty stone. Always longing to cast it away from his head, he wanders far from the joy of festivity. He has this helpless life of never-ending labor, a fourth toil after three others, because he stole from the gods nectar and ambrosia, with which they had made him immortal, and gave them to his drinking companions. If any man expects that what he does escapes the notice of a god, he is wrong. Because of that the immortals sent the son of Tantalus back again to the swift-doomed race of men.” (1 *Olympian Ode* 35-65) The *Peloponnesus* took its name from the Pelops. The fact that these legends exist and were mythologized is not to say that the events stated in them are purely the product of imagination, but to the pervasiveness of the practice of human sacrifice and cannibalism, the repugnance of the practice to the best of men in ancient times. Its representation in poetic and dramatic works of art depicts an ethical struggle within the civilization. A human sacrifice is not a mythical creature, a *Scylla* or a *Charybdis*, but an ancient practice which is known to have existed both in criminal conspiracy and, so it would seem, before battle to save the father land. Plutarch relates the story of how a man from Thebes named *Pelopidas* had a vision in a dream before the *Battle of Leuctra* (371 B.C.) in which he saw the daughters of Scedasus, the *Leuctridae*, young women who had slain themselves out of shame, for they had been raped by the Spartans, weeping over their tomb whereupon their father fell on his own sword after seeking redress, and receiving none, at Sparta. On account of these tragic events it was widely believed that a curse prevailed there as oracles and prophecies warned against the wrath of the *Leuctridae*. At

any rate, before the battle, Pelopidas had a dream that he saw these maidens invoking curses weeping and of Scedalus urging him to sacrifice a virgin with auburn hair if he wished to obtain victory of the Lacedaemonians. "The injunction seemed a lawless and dreadful one to him, but he rose up and made it known to the seers and the commanders. Some of these would not hear of the injunction being neglected or disobeyed, adducing as examples of such sacrifice among the ancients, Menoeceus, son of Creon, Macaria, daughter of Heracles; and in latter times, Pherecydes the wise man, who was put to death by the Lacedaemonians, and whose skin was preserved by their kings, in accordance with some oracle; and Leonidas, who, in obedience to the oracle sacrificed himself (Cf. *The History* 7.220) as it were to save Greece; and still further, the youths who were sacrificed by Themistocles to Dionysus Carnivorous before the *Battle of Salamis* (Cf. *Themistocles* 13.2); for the successes which followed these sacrifices proved them acceptable to the gods. Moreover, when Agesilaus, who was setting out on an expedition from the same place as Agamemnon did, and against the same enemies, was asked by the goddess for his daughter in sacrifice, and had this vision as he lay asleep at Aulis, he was too tender hearted to give her, and thereby brought his expedition to an unsuccessful and inglorious ending. Others, on the contrary, argued against it, declaring that such a lawless and barbarous sacrifice was not acceptable to any one of the superior beings above us, for it was not the fabled typhons (Cf. *Iliad* 2.782 & *Theogony* 869, 306) and giants who governed the world, but the father of all gods and men; even to believe in the existence of divine beings who take delight in the slaughter and blood of men was perhaps folly, but if such beings existed, they must be disregarded, as having no power; for only weakness and depravity of soul could produce or harbor such unnatural and cruel desires." (*Pelopidas* 20.3-21.4) While debating all this amongst themselves, a filly broke away

from the heard, whereupon, having taken this as a sign which resolved the dispute: “Theocritus the seer, after taking thought, cried out to Pelopidas: ‘Thy sacrificial victim is come, good man; so let us not wait for any other virgin, but do thou accept and use the one which Heaven offers thee.’” (22.2) We could deduce from this, then, that after 371 B.C., in the Greco-Roman tradition, a trend towards the substitution of an animal victim for a human victim was developing. This is echoed in *Genesis* though instead of a seer pointing out the sacrificial victim in the *Bible* it is an “angel of God” who is said to have pointed out the appropriate victim and prevented Abraham from sacrificing his son Isaac.

*Quae postquam gesta sunt temptavit Deus Abraham et dixit ad eum Abraham ille respondit adsum. Ait ei tolle filium tuum unigenitum quem diligis Isaac et vade in terram Visionis atque offer eum ibi holocaustum super unum montium quem monstravero tibi. Igitur Abraham de nocte consurgens stravit asinum suum ducens secum duos iuvenes et Isaac filium suum cumque concidisset ligna in holocaustum abiit ad locum quem praeceperat ei Deus. Die autem tertio elevatis oculis vidit locum procul. Dixitque ad pueros suos expectate hic cum asino ego et puer illuc usque properantes postquam adoraverimus revertemur ad vos. Tulit quoque ligna holocausti et inposuit super Isaac filium suum ipse vero portabat in manibus ignem et gladium cumque duo pergerent simul. Dixit Isaac patri suo pater mi at ille respondit quid vis fili ecce inquit ignis et ligna ubi est victima holocausti. Dixit Abraham Deus providebit sibi victimam holocausti fili mi pergebant ergo partier. Veneruntque ad locum quem ostenderat ei Deus in quo aedificavit altare et desuper ligna conposuit cumque conligasset Isaac filium suum posuit eum in altari super struem lignorum. Extenditque manum et arripuit*

*gladium ut immolaret filium. Et ecce angelus Domini de caelo clamavit dicens Abraham Abraham qui respondit adsum. Dixitque ei non extendas manum tuam super puerum neque facias illi quicquam nunc cognovi quod timeas Dominum et non peperceris filio tuo unigenito propter me. Levavit Abraham oculos viditque post tergum arietem inter vepres herentem cornibus quem adsumens obtulit holocaustum pro filio. Appellavitque nomen loci illius Dominus videt unde usque hodie dicitur in monte Dominus videbit.*

After which there are these things, God tempted Abraham and said to him: “Abraham” and he responded “I am here.” He said to him, “Make off with your only begotten son whom you love and hurry into the land of Visions and offer him there as a holocaust [Lat. holocaustum; Gr. ὀλοκαυστος: ‘burnt-offering’] upon a mountain of the mountain range which I shall make known to you. Accordingly Abraham arising by night saddled his ass and leading with him two young men and his son Isaac and cut up firewood for the holocaust and went to the place which God had told him. On the third day, raising up his eyes, he saw the place in the distance. And he said to his boys”Wait here with the ass, I and the boy are going yonder without delay and after we have worshiped we shall return to you. And he took the firewood for the holocaust and placed it upon Isaac his son himself truly carried in his hand the fire and the sword and the two pressed on together. Isaac said to his father: “My father?” And he responded to him: “What do you want son?” “Lo,” he said, “Fire and firewood, where is the victim for the holocaust?” Abraham said: “God will provide you as victim for the holocaust my son.” Therefore they pressed on as before. And the came to the

place which God had shown him in which he built an altar and there upon placed the firewood and bound Isaac his son and placed him on the altar upon the heap of firewood. And he extended his hand and drew his sword and was immolating [sprinkling with a sacrificial meal] his son. And behold an angel of God from the sky called out, saying: "Abraham, Abraham!" Who responded, "I am here." And he said to him, "Do not extend your hand over the boy. Do not make anything of him now I understand because you fear and you would have not spared your only begotten son from me. Abraham lifted his eyes and he saw behind his back a ram among the brambles caught by the horns which he offered as a holocaust for his son. And he called the place by the name of the Lord he saw, and to this day it is said: "On the mountain of the Lord, he shall see." (22.1-14)

Abraham was ready to sacrifice his own son for a cause which was purportedly good, Catiline to bind his conspirators to a crime with a crime. Is this so difficult to believe?

The tendency to lie through art is a modern invention, as Ibsen's *Catiline*, for instance shows us. Moreover with respect to an ethical dilemma the principle and the representation ought to remain true. Ibsen boldly disregarded the extant historical sources and in so doing altered the public's perception of the events surrounding the *Bellum Catilinae*. In his introduction to his 1875 edition of the play Ibsen's statement, "There nevertheless must have been a good deal that was great or significant about the man whom the majority's indefatigable advocate, Cicero, did not find expedient to tackle until things had taken such a turn that there was no longer any danger connected with the attack," are offered without foundation. (*Ibid.* 246) Ibsen doesn't even deny that Catiline raped the Vestal Virgin, and, in fact, gleefully incorporated the event into his play.

Variety's my joy, I've never numbered

a mistress from among the vestal virgins,  
 so here I've come to try my luck at it! (*Ibsen's Catiline* 136)

For all the revisionists have to say with respect to the Catiline affair, the fact that none have successfully escaped the narration of Catiline's crimes against morality suggests a motive on their part.

*Ieiunia expel, mixtus in Bacchum cruor...potetur*

Expel your hunger, drink the blood mixed with wine. (*Thyestes* 65)

Not only is it a project of drama in general, but of deconstructionism as a whole, to challenge the mores of society, but do any of these authors sincerely suggest that a man who committed a human sacrifice, raped women and boys, a *bone fide* cannibal, can be a hero of history?

Be still thy incests, murders, rapes before

Thy sense; thy forcing first a *Vestall* nunne;

Thy parricide, late, on thine owne onely sonne,

After his mother ; to make emptie way

For thy last wicked nuptials; worse, then they,

That blaze that act of thy incestuous life,

Which got thee, at once, a daughter, and a wife. (*His Conspiracy* 1.30-36)

One thing deconstructionists always fail to do is deconstruct them selves. Some simply deny the events took place; others simply refuse to reconcile the event. Catiline sacrificed a boy. Was it his son? For Ibsen, Blok, Kalb, et al: "But was there really a boy? Perhaps there was no boy at all!" (*Bystander* 103) Sallust says that Catiline and his conspirators passed bowls of human blood and that they drank from these in the presence of others. Where do bowls of human blood come from, if not from a human sacrifice?

Its true Polydore Virgil notes that the Scythians drank from clay cups their own blood, along with the blood of those with whom they made a treaty, mixed with wine in order to ratify a treaty. This he, of course, learned from Herodotus. (Cf., *The History* 4.70) But Catiline and his conspirators were far too disrespectful to use any blood of their own. Besides that, Cassius Dio says the blood came from a human sacrifice, is that not enough? To insinuate that Sallust invented this is also to declare the *Bellum Catilinae* to be a work of fiction. It denies Sallust his role as a historian; only a scribbler of monographs I suppose? The fact that Wilkins purports to vindicate Catiline in the beginning of her monograph and then admits at the end that Sallust presented a complex character (*Villain or Hero* 137) is hardly surprising since Cicero himself had already noted this very fact. “No I do not believe that there has ever existed on earth so strange a portent, such a fusion of natural tastes and desires that were contradictory, divergent, and at war amongst themselves...at the very time when he gathered round him every wicked and reckless man from every land, still held fast many good men and true by a kind of semblance of pretend virtue,” Cicero said. (*Pro Caelio* 5.12-14)

G.W.F Hegel’s master-slave dialectic in the *Phenomenology of Spirit* (1807) may elucidate the dialectical struggle of Catiline among those of his own class, but he is not the Roman spirit. The history of the *Bellum Catilinae* is not a universal history of Rome. His movement could not be considered a national movement, an actualization of the national spirit, because it is not a qualitatively better development. It was positively a development for the worse. Rome united around Lucius Brutus, the founder of the Roman Republic, the man who ran out the Tarquinius Etruscan kings. Brutus was a revolutionary. Rome hailed him. This was not so with Catiline. The first decree of the Senate which added ten years banishment to the penalties established for bribery, which



Dio Cassius says was instituted on the insistence of Cicero, may have been the chain placed around Catiline's neck which held him in thrall. "Catiline, accordingly, believed that this decree had been passed on his account, as was indeed the case." (*Historiae Romanae* 37.29.1) But it was Catiline's bad acts which caused Cicero to make a motion for this law and for the Senate to approve it. And even if this did happen, there's no reason Catiline could not have withdrawn and accepted this as his punishment. He was still quite young, waiting another ten years to attain a great honor, legally, should not have been a problem for him. But it was his arrogance that drove him onward until the point of no return had been reached. Clearly the problem of bribery in the Roman government and was in fact the very reason the courts had been transferred from the Senate to the equestrian order in 124 B. C. by the Gaius Gracchus the younger brother of Tiberius.<sup>18</sup> "he transferred the courts of justice , which had become discredited by reason of bribery, from the senators to the knights...The Senate was extremely ashamed of these things and yielded to the law, and the people ratified it...So it shortly came about that the political mastery was turned was turned upside down, the power being in the hands of the knights, and the honor only remaining in the Senate...The knights indeed went so far that they not only held power over the senators, but openly flouted them beyond their right. They also became addicted to bribe-taking, and when they too had tasted these enormous gains, they indulged in them even more basely and immoderately than the senators had done. They suborned accusers against the rich and did away with prosecutions for bribe-taking altogether." (*Civil Wars* 1.3.22) Corruption of the Roman government by means of bribery was endemic. Cicero, an equestrian, was lording his power, in this case, over

---

<sup>18</sup>Cf. Appian's *Civil Wars* "The first triumvirs appointed to divide the land were Gracchus himself, the proposer of the law, his brother of the same name, and his father-in-law, Appius Claudius." (1.1.13)

Catiline—a patrician. Thus by the dialectical moments of history on the question of bribery the equestrian and the patricians had changed places and become each others opposite not once, but twice. The patricians having once been the bribe-takers were supplanted by the equestrians who suddenly became the opposite of what the once were. In the next moment, Cicero being an equestrian prosecuting a patrician for bribe-taking had once again reversed the *social praxis*. Catiline must have found this turn of events nothing less than infuriating.

Της δε Δικης ῥοθος ἔλκομενης ἠ κ' ἀνδρες ἀγωσι δωροφαγοι, σκολης δε δικης κρινωσι θεμιστας'

But there is roar of Justice when being dragged away and to this men devouring presents are carrying her, but give sentence to twisted judgments. (*Works and Days* 220)

A psychoanalytic view may yield some insight into the character of Catiline. Catiline was a man of action man to be sure. Although he was accused of violating both his daughter and the Vestal and a number of other crimes, Hardy says: “As to the other crimes perhaps justly attributed to Catiline, many obviously depended on mere rumor, had never been judicially investigated and were given inconsistently by other authorities.” (*A Re-Examination* 8) Hutchinson noted: “There is no mention of the murder of Gratidianus in Sallust or in Cicero’s four orations against Catiline.” (*The Conspiracy* 41) It does seem rather odd that two of Catiline’s contemporary enemies would have over looked this murder if it indeed happened. According to Appian, “Nobody had ventured to lay hands on him, because facts were not yet accurately known.” (*Civil Wars* 2.3) Hutchinson noted, “He did not even deign to defend himself against charges of the greatest personal infamy.” Hutchinson went on to declare that it

was a common practice in Rome to charge someone with imaginary crimes and that this was an outgrowth of the rhetorical schools who taught their pupils to speak with “Colors, a certain way of presenting the most insignificant facts, mixed with useful lies.” (*The Conspiracy* 31) Though this may be true of the rhetorical schools, Cicero was one who made many of these charges. Did Hutchinson intend to suggest that either Cicero, or Sallust, were themselves pupils of those rhetorical schools, and not the teachers of them? If its true that Catiline was contemptuous of public opinion, as Hutchinson says, that could have only been because he was confident that the accusations would not have been believed by the Senate where the true power resided. Appian said, “Catiline was a person of not, by reason of his great celebrity, and high birth, but a madman, for it was believed that he killed his own son because of his own love for Aurelia Orestilla, who was not willing to marry a man who had a son.” (*Civil Wars*, 2.2) But even if we believe all the negative remarks made against Cicero, not one of them accuses him of bribery, rape, murder, cannibalism, et al?

Sallust himself became the victim of calumny. On account of the fact that Sallust wrote that Pompey had “an honest face but a shameless character,” Lenaeus remarked in a satire that Sallust was “a debauchee, a gormandizer, a spendthrift, and a tippler, a man whose life and writing were monstrous, and who was besides being an ignorant pilferer of the language of the ancients and of Cato in particular.” (*De Grammaticis* 15) Cicero and countless others fell victim to these kinds of remarks. Philiscus said of Cicero, “Surely you would not prefer to have joined Catiline...to have performed none of the duties laid upon you...and thus remain at home as the reward for your wickedness, instead of saving your country and being exiled.” (*Historiae Romanae* 38) But there are no declamations against Catiline only judicial *charges* made against him.

Even Lynn Harold Harris chimed in with her missives. Accusing Ben Jonson of getting the facts all wrong on account of “living in an uncritical age” she said, “Not only the evil that men do lives after them, but much that they never even thought of doing. Catiline had the misfortune to have two prejudiced biographers, and has suffered unjustly in consequence.” (*His Conspiracy* xxvii) But where is the proof that Catiline suffered unjustly? There is as much proof of injustice against Catiline as there is for Harris’ remarks that Catiline employed the slaves in his rebellion. “The slaves were to rise” (*Ibid.* xxvi) vis-à-vis Sallust: “He refused to enroll slaves, a great number whom flocked to him at first, because he had confidence in the strength of the conspiracy and at the same time thought it inconsistent with his designs to appear to have given runaway slaves a share in a citizens’ cause.” (*Bellum Catilinae* 56.4-5) Lynn Harold Harris said that insofar as Ben Jonson’s *Catiline*: “follows sources it is not in the main true to history.” (xxiii) Is it possible to be true to history by rejecting them? “To say that historical narratives relate events that cannot have happened is to say that we have some criterion, other than the narratives which reach us, by which to judge what could have happened.” (*The Idea of History* 60) Harris subtly contradicts her self by maintaining that Jonson’s play was is not a tragedy because, according to Aristotle’s definition, the tragic hero must somehow be respectable, or virtuous.

*Da mihi testimonium mutuum.*

Give the borrowed evidence to me. (*Pro Flacco* 10)

With this remark, Harris confirms Calitine’s villainous reputation while at the same time denying the truth Sallust’s interpretation of him. Harris says, “Sallust’s account was undoubtedly considered beyond reproach then, especially as Plutarch, Cassius Dio, Appian, Florus, and the other authorities agree substantially with it. But to

us of today that very agreement is suspicious. As Merimèe points out, the accounts as so painstakingly alike that the conjecture at once arises that they have all been drawn in the main from one source.” (*Ibid.* xxiii)

It is not enough to say that the historians that came after Sallust simply followed his work. If this were true then why would Sallust say that Antonius could not meet Catiline on the battle field because he was sick with gout, while Cassius Dio said that Antonius only feigned illness because he didn't wish to fight his comrade? If Sallust produced the primary history of *Bellum Catilinae*, and all historians relied on him, and Cicero in addition to him, then how is it that C. MacDonald was able to discover eight different accounts of the charges made against Catiline? Harris says the charges were too consistent, Hardy says not consistent enough. The *law of the excluded middle* dictates that a statement must be either true or false. Catiline was either a criminal or he was not. This kind of sophistical attack erases not only Sallust's testimony, but the testimony of all the other ancient sources as well. Since neither Harris, Hardy, nor Hutchinson's assertions could be true, then Sallust's assertions must be true, rather, advancing the *principle of generosity*, all the ancient sources must be considered true and of philosophical and historical value insofar as all the apologists for Catiline are all wrong. The only ancient source that could be even remotely construed to cast Catiline in a favorable light would be Lucan's (39-65 A.D.) remarks in his poem *De Bello Civili*.

*Cunctorum uoces Romani maximus auctor*

*Tullius eloquii, cuius sub iure togaque*

*pacificas saeuos tremuit Catilina securis,*

*pertulit iratus bellis, cum rostra forumque*

*optaret passus tam longa silentia miles.*

Tullius, the great writer of speeches,  
 [was] the whole voice of Rome  
 under whose justice and consulship  
 the peacemaking axes shook the savage Catiline  
 who, on account of wars, suffered violent outbursts  
 when he longed for Rostra and the Forum  
 after suffering in silence so long as a soldier. (*Pharsalia* 7.62-66)

But that could only be held true if one were to take the phrase “suffering in silence,” or “suffered violent outbursts on account of wars,” as reasons to pity him. Even still, Cicero could only be understood as “the voice of the Roman people.” Catiline did not, however, articulate his claim to the consulship on account of having been a soldier suffering in silence so long, but on account of his noble birth and his long line of ancestors who had held that position. Harris, relying on Shakespeare’s phrase, supposes to “Give the devil his due,” insofar as Catiline was the “logical product of his age.” (*Ibid.* xxiv-xxvi) In Shakespeare’s play *Edward Poins and Henry the Prince of Wales* discussed Sir John Falstaff’s supposed deal with the devil.

*Poins:* Jack, how agrees the devil and thee about thy soul that thou soldest him on Good Friday last, for a cup of Madeira and a cold capon’s leg?

*Prince:* Sir John stands to his word, the devil shall have his bargain, for he was never yet a breaker of proverbs. He will give the devil his due.

*Poins:* Then thou art damn’d for keeping thy word with the devil.

*Prince:* Else he had been damn’d for cozening [cheating] the devil. (1 *Henry IV* 1.2)

By way of Harris' allegory we might conclude that Catiline, being the devil, received Harris' soul which she had pledged to deliver to him, or that perhaps Harris pledged herself to Catiline who had pledged himself to the devil. But this allegory does little to exculpate Catiline from his bad reputation. Cicero, Cato, and Sallust, nay, all the classical authors, in agreement on the criminality of Catiline, were the logical products of their age too. To Harris I reply in the words of Francesco Petrarca: "You act as if people who live together must share everything, when in fact *inter bonos pessimi, inter pessimos boni habitant.*" (*In Magni Hominem* 31) Harris bestowed her praise on a bad man, Livy on the good.

Ibsen held that "there nevertheless must have been a good deal that was great." But even a broken clock is right twice per day. Catiline was great at being bad, but this is not the proper use of the term "great" since, for applied to Catiline "great" would mean despicable. Ibsen's application of the word great here is *false by equivocation*, for it equivocates the *great* with the *bad* where great would properly correspond to *laudable* and bad to *contemptible*.

Ὁμώνυμα λεγεται ὄν ονομα μόνον κοινόν, ὁ δε κατα τούνομα λόγος της ουσίας ἕτερος.

"Things are equivocally name, when they have the name only in common, the definition (or statement of essence) corresponding with the name being different."

(*Categories* 1.1)

C. MacDonald says that "he was no more dangerous or important than a number of other men." Indeed, it appears that Caesar and Crassus may have been more dangerous than Catiline, since Catiline, it had been suggested, was working upon their orders. Or take this guy Lentulus for example; or Cethegus who "constantly complained

of the inaction of his associates.” (*Bellum Catilinae* 43.3) Cicero said, “Catiline was the only one out of all these men to be feared and he only so as he was within the walls of Rome.” (3 *In Catilinam* 16) Catiline was indeed the most important criminal in Rome at the time. He was the *sine qua non* of the *coup d’etat*. Caesar and Crassus, if they were indeed backing him, could not have acted against the republic without him and Cicero asserts that it was imperative that Catiline be removed from the seat of the government. C. MacDonald and Cassius Dio do agree, however, that the importance of the conspiracy was exaggerated. “He [Catiline] gained a greater name than his deeds deserved.” (*Historiae Romanae* 37.42.1) The history of this affair did not survive the ages by accident, but through its importance. His reputation exceeded his deeds because his intentions had been thwarted. If Catiline had succeeded, then, his deeds, I suppose, may have equaled his reputation if there was anyone left to report them. In the last analysis, however, the apologists for Catiline are the patrons of a scoundrel, φιλοπονηρος ‘love of the base,’ for they “seek out the losers in court...and imagine that with their friendship [they] will become more experienced and formidable...[they] admit the truth of the rest of what is said about him by people, but some points [they] do not believe.” (*Characters* 29) For Catiline’s apologists, it is just as Homer said:

Νυν μεν δη μαλα παγχυ κακος κακον ηγηλαζει  
 ως αιει τον ομοιον αγει θεος ως τον ομοιον’

Now, on the one hand, in its entirety, bad guides the bad, thus always God leads like to like. (*Odyssey* 17.218)

Furthermore, “the friendship of inferior people is evil, for they take part together in inferior pursuits and by becoming like each other are made positively evil. But friendship of the good is good and grows with their inter course...



Εσθλον μεν γαρ αρ' εσθα:

For, good things from good men. (*Nicomachean Ethics* 9.12.3)

The charges made against Catiline were more than rhetorical quips. Many thoroughly substantiated charges were made against him; but Catiline was not an ordinary subversive, he was a noble. He was a man of extraordinary political power and had not surrounded himself with what Harris referred to as “a motley crowd,” but with senators and knights.

*Quod Antonius umbram suam metuit,*

*hic ne leges quidem.*

Whereas Antony is afraid of his own shadow,

this guy [Catiline] not even the laws. (*Handbook on Electioneering* 9)

Cato, during his speech against the conspirators captured in Rome, said: “Citizens of the highest rank have conspired to fire their native city.” (*Bellum Catilinae* 52.24) Catiline relied on the difficulty of combating conspiracy hatched within ones own native city: in this case, the challenge was to Cicero as the leading man of the πολις, to prove a conspiracy and cause the powers that be to act upon it. “Conspiracies planned against one’s native city are less dangerous for those who plan them ...In organizing them there are not many dangers, for a citizen can make preparations to acquire power...It should be understood that this occurs in a republic where some corruption already exists...Everyone has read about the conspiracy of Catiline described by Sallust and knows how, after the conspiracy was discovered, Catiline not only remained in Rome but came to the Senate and said insulting things both to the Senate and to the consul.” (*Discourses* 273) Though Cicero was dictator, by no means was he ruling by *dicta*. Convincing the Senate that a conspiracy was afoot was a difficult task.

Whoever Cicero was; no matter what class or party he belonged to, he was the defender of the republic. By all authorities defending the republic at this time was a thing of virtue.

Καὶ ὁ Κικέρων, ἀΐσιν ἐπὶ λόγου δυνάμει μόνῃ γνῶριμος ὢν, τότε καὶ ἐπὶ ἔργῳ διὰ στόματος ἠνέκεν καὶ σωτὴρ ἐδόκει περιφανῶς ἀπολυμένη τῆ πατρίδι γενέσθαι, χάριτές τε ἠέσαν αὐτῷ παρὰ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ εὐφημίαι ποικίλαι. Κάτωνος δ' αὐτὸν καὶ πατέρα τῆς πατρίδος προσαγορεύσαντος ἐπεβόησεν ὁ δήμος. καὶ δοκεῖ τισὶν ἠδέ ἠεὐφημία ἀπὸ Κικέρωνος ἀρξαμένη περιελθεῖν ἐς τῶν νυν αὐτοκρατόρων τοὺς φαινομένους ἀξίους: οὐδὲ γὰρ τοι σδε, καίπερ οὐ σὶ βασιλευσιν, εὐθὺς ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἀμᾶταις ἀλλαις ἐπωνυμίαις, ἀλλὰ σὺν χρόνῳ μόλις ἠδέ, ὡς ἐντελής ἐπὶ μεγίστοις δὴ μαρτυρία, ψηφίζεται.

“Cicero, who had been hitherto distinguished only for eloquence, was now in everybody's mouth as a man of action, and was considered unquestionably the saviour of his country on the eve of its destruction, for which reason the thanks of the assembly were bestowed upon him, amid general acclamations. At the instance of Cato the people saluted him as the Father of his Country. Some think that this appellation, which is now bestowed upon those emperors who are deemed worthy of it, had its beginning with Cicero. Although they are in fact kings, it is not given to them with their other titles immediately upon their accession, but is decreed to them in the progress of time, not as a matter of course, but as a final testimonial of the greatest services.” (*Civil Wars 2.7*).

The Republic was a qualitatively better development over the monarchy that had preceded it. The dictatorships of Cinna and Sulla had threatened its very existence. It was right to defend it. “Go over with me, please, the events of the night before last. You will appreciate now that my concern for the safety of the Republic is much deeper than is yours for its destruction.” (1 *In Catilinam* 8) Thus Cicero makes plain his true vested interests which were to defend the Republic. The Roman Empire was bad. No one disputes that it should have fallen, but whether or not it fell soon enough. Understanding this is the key to understanding why Catiline has become a negative archetype in the history of western civilizations. He is an arch villain not only of history, but of drama and poetry as well. Catiline had not yet passed the prime of his life, although he was rapidly approaching it. In many ways he still retained the character of a very young man who is “passionate, hot tempered and carried away by impulse...owing to [his] ambition.” (*Rhetoric* 2.12.3) He was careless with his money to “which he [attached] only the slightest value because [he] had never experienced want.” (*Ibid* 2.12.6) According to Aristotle, young men “are more courageous, for they are full of passion and hope...are high-minded, for they have not yet been humbled by life nor have they experienced the force of necessity; further there is high-mindedness in thinking oneself worthy of great things...they prefer the noble to the useful; their life is guided by their character ἠθος rather than by calculation...and do everything to excess.” (*Ibid* 2.12.9-11)

For instance, although Wilkins asserts that Catiline “performs admirably, but for an ignoble cause,” he was not brave. Although Aristotle says that the noblest form of death is death in battle, and that the courageous man fearlessly confronts a noble death, as Catiline seemed to do, Catiline was not courageous man, but a mad man. “Of characters that run to excess...he who exceeds in fearlessness has no name...but we should call a

mad man.” (*Nicomachean Ethics* 3.6.8-3.7.7) During his defeat at Pistoria, Catiline showed no fear “for it is a necessary incentive to fear that there should remain some hope of being saved.” (*Rhetoric* 2.5.14) Since Catiline's cause was clearly hopeless, it was for him just as Aristotle said it would be for a man who is being beaten to death, as Catiline was about to be at the time he exhorted his comrades, who would have no fear since he necessarily had already lost all hope. Thus Catiline was neither courageous nor noble, because, although he died in battle, he did not do so fearlessly, but out of the sense of having lost all hope. Catiline, rather, was not a fearless man, but a man to be feared since he was a man of injustice possessed of power. “Injustice is all the graver when it is armed injustice.” (*The Politics* 1253a1) Cicero and Cato were the real heroes for preventing Catiline for gaining state power and for preserving the Republic.

#### IV. Conclusion

The moral of the story that was handed down to us through the ages then was the correct one and attempts to alter its conclusions is love of the base.

Ἐκ μὲν οὐ τῶν εἰρημένων καὶ παρὰ τῶν συνηδρευκότων ἡ ἄδη  
τῶ λόγῳ σοφῶν ταυ τα παρειλήφαμεν.

From the wise men who sat in council on this question we have received these things. (*Metaphysics* 987a)

Furthermore, one who “performs admirably for an ignoble cause” is thoroughly corrupt, since the good adheres to the good and the bad to the bad. The good is just and does well to the profit of virtue. He who performs well in the interest of injustice perpetuates vice and is therefore condemned as completely bad. We, as authors, whether of oratory, or history, of poetry, or drama, must endeavor to call things by their right and

proper names, to strive to maintain the integrity of our words, ideas, and mental constructs; distinguishing between the good and the bad and to teach this, for this is justice. “Our fathers, in time past, distinguished right and wrong plainly enough, and it is our wisdom to submit to be taught by them.” (*The History* 1.8) In the contest between Cicero and Catiline we must:

*Apprends à distinguer e' ambitieux du traître.*

Learn to distinguish the ambitious from the traitor. (*Rome Sauvée* 5.3)

And to teach this not making a muddle of right and wrong. History is the memory of humanity. History as it is and was recorded and preserved in books is not actual social memory, but only the potential for it.

*Historia vero testis temporum, lux veritas, vita memoriae, magistra vitae, nuntia vertustatis.*

History is the true test of time, light of truth, life of memory, teacher of life, messenger of antiquity.” (*De Oratore* 2.9.36)

History properly used is the active social memory of humanity for “the only clue to what man can do is what man has done.” (*The Idea of History* 10) And furthermore the power of man to control his own destiny is limited by his knowledge; or is rather greatly limited by his *ignorance*. Ignorance is not strength. Books as concrete objects do not constitute the memory of humanity, but only the potential for social memory. For, “men have no more ready corrective of conduct than knowledge of the past.” (*The Histories of Polybius* 1.1) Like the archaeological remains of Rome in Freud's metaphor that the memory in man is like an archeological site, for what ever goes into it potentially remains in it. “Now let us make the fantastic supposition that Rome were not a human dwelling place, but a mental entity with just as long and varied a past history: that is, in which nothing

once constructed had perished, and all the earlier stages of development had survived alongside the latest.” (*Civilization and Its Discontents* 17) Books on a shelf however, like the layers of an archeological site, only lay side-by-side. Not only must the books themselves be preserved, as an archaeological site must, the books themselves must be studied again and again in order for the men of the past to communicate themselves to the living, in order to fulfill their function, since we have it on the most excellent authority that not only is it most wise to γνῶθι σεαυτόν ‘know thyself’ but also that *repetitio mater memoriae*. “Without some knowledge of himself, his knowledge of other things is imperfect: for to know something without knowing that one knows it is only a half-knowing, and to know that one knows is to know oneself.” (*The Idea of History* 205)

The world is evermore filling itself with books. More information accumulates everyday and we must choose which ones to study, in whole or in part, when to read fast, when slow. We must separate the good from the bad, the relevant from the irrelevant. The ancients transmitted this story to us as a means of teaching by bad example and we must respect that, diminishing neither their reputations as scholars nor the importance of their teachings. Polybius said: “The surest method of learning how to bear bravely the vicissitudes of fortune, is to recall the calamities of others.” (*The Histories of Polybius* 1.2) The very fact that these works survived and are the topic of debates even today testifies to their enduring importance. They may not be easily dismissed. Their teachings not easily negated. For, “to accord praise which genius of a bad man bribes us into bestowing is to sin against the sacred character of history.” (*The History of Rome* 110) Rehabilitating Catiline with the historical canon, then, is an assault on the integrity of history, on the memory of humanity. The historical process is a great responsibility, as Cicero noted. On the responsibilities of the historian, Cicero said, “History’s first law is

that an author must not dare to tell anything but the truth. And it's second that he must make bold to tell the whole truth." (*De Oratore* 2.14.62) Today, without overturning Cicero's maxims, we recognize that there is more to history in that we must apply both our scientific capability and our rational faculty to study of history. Understanding our great social responsibility as historians we have developed theories of history so that we may best apply the lessons of the past, that the mistakes of the past be not repeated. "What chiefly makes the study of history wholesome and profitable is this, that you behold the lessons of every kind of experience set forth as on a conspicuous monument; from these you may choose for yourself and for your own state what to imitate, from these mark for avoidance what is shameful in the conception and shameful in the result." (*Ab Urbe Condita* 1.10-11) We also have the responsibility to transmit to the youth the moral tale, ever urging them on to be "loving what is noble and hating what is base." (*Nicomachean Ethics* 10.9.8) With respect to the Catiline affair we must not adopt the view point of the historical revisionists for "we would not have our [future] Guardians grow up among representations of moral deformity, as in some fowls pasture where, day after day, feeding on every poisonous weed they would, little by little, gather insensibly a mass of corruption in their very souls." (*Republic* 3.401)

Though Bolsheviks did promise, and effectuate, an economic leveling, it was the social relations of the class system which they sought to transform. For the final aim of communism is *to end the exploitation of man by man*; or at least to end the private exploitation of man since it seems the State it seems would still be permitted to exact labor from the individual, but only for the common good. It is the social relations of the class system that hold the proletariat in bondage today, as it did then. None but the boldest sycophant would suggest that the proletariat has made itself oppressed, then or

now, through robbing and squandering, loose morals and disordered thinking. “Inferiors become revolutionaries in order to be equals, and equals in order to be superiors.” (*The Politics* 1302a3) Though I would call Spartacus a revolutionary, I would name Catiline a reactionary. Plato’s assertion to the effect that justice in the state is maintained through temperance supposes that dissemblance can somehow be overcome and that under ideal circumstances a state could be constructed wherein virtue could not be faked, but he never succeeded in proving, even in theory, that this could actually be done. Indeed Hegel agreed with Plato that “nations are what their deeds are.” (*Philosophy of History* 187) But he also said that “good for its own sake” had no place in living reality (*Ibid.* 166) Thrasymachus’ position related what constituted the actual *social praxis* in Plato’s time. It is indeed the social praxis to wit, for all forms of state are predicated on violence. For the *argumentum ad baculum*, it should be noted, appears on the first page of Plato’s *Republic*.<sup>19</sup> “The secret being that where force can be used, law is not needed.” (*The Peloponnesian War* 1.77)

Since incest, rape, murder, adultery, human sacrifice, and cannibalism are wrong everywhere, and not just in our state but also in Rome at the time of the *Bellum Catiline*; it was vice, not virtue, his class standing and the social relations between members of his own class and from his class to the other classes, that made Catiline who he was. In a general sense, he could not have acted differently than he did. Hegel’s assertion that: “What experience and history teach is this--that peoples and governments never have learned anything from history” (*Ibid.* 155) is wrong since it can be proven through the historical record that laws and customs have indeed changed. We should note that there have been civilizations wherein each of the aforementioned crimes were in fact not

---

<sup>19</sup> Cf. *Republic* 327c *supra* and moreover *op. cit.* 411d



crimes but were customs and that these civilizations no longer exist. Indeed man did learn from history and through this learning Rome itself determined that certain practices such as rape, murder, and human sacrifice ought to have been prohibited on the grounds that a moment of pleasure for a man like Catiline was repugnant to the whole people. Catiline, then, must be historically situated and tried by the laws of his own time.

He was a product of the social relations of his time. He was the material product of his age to be sure, but it was his class standing which determined how he reacted within it. “Every historical character in every historical situation thinks and acts as rationally as that person in that situation *can* think and act, and nobody can do more.” (*The Idea of History* 116) It was the patrician class that had accustomed itself to assailing the Roman government as if it were a prize. “A characteristic of noble birth is that he who possesses it is more ambitious.” (*Rhetoric* 2.15.2) Though we all hold out hope that a character such as Catiline will at some time reverse course, he did not reverse it. “The developments that take place in history are never accidental, they are necessary.” (*The Idea of History* 117) Entertaining the possibility any further would be counterfactual historiography. His was not a moment of revolution, but of reaction. His was a movement in the opposite direction, from progress to reaction. The patrician class, having first supplanted the monarchy, had itself tumbled. Having at one time granted concessions to the plebeians, the patricians began to lose even more power. Cinna, Sulla and Catiline, all patricians, sought to restore the supremacy of the patrician class but could only do so through the establishment of a quasi-monarchy, a tyranny. It was Cicero and Cato who held the middle ground. They represented the progressive wing of the ruling classes. Catiline did not. As a historical movement worthy of Rome’s national spirit it was for the *servi* and the *proletarii* to rise and overturn the old order, both the

patricians and the plebeians. That would have been a progressive historical development. The national spirit of a nation is the struggle for freedom. Rome's national spirit could only have been actualized through the success of the class struggle which gnawed at its vitals. Rome underwent a historical development when the aristocrats through off chains of the monarchy and again when the bourgeoisie, the plebs, won the right to share power with the patricians, but the struggles of the slave class and the proletariat had failed. The Catilinarian conspiracy was not a moment in the process of class struggle on the part of the oppressed classes, but was, indeed, a moment in the process of the development of reaction on the part of the oppressors. Catiline represented the nobility attempting to reassert itself against the bourgeoisie hence Catiline's repeated assertions that Cicero was a *new man* and a *lodger* (Cf. *Civil Wars* 2.1.2) for the nobility presumed to obtain high standing by means of the merits of their ancestors while the bourgeoisie sought to obtain status through their own noble deeds. The world was changing. Opposing social classes were struggling against each other not only at the rostra and on the battle fields, but through the language creating an ambiguity over the meaning of the word *noble*. The process of the ascension of reaction, the ascension of the Roman tyrants, the emperors, was embryonic at the time of the *Bellum Catiline*, but would come to the fore later with the ascension of Octavian as Augustus Caesar (27 B.C.). Cicero's actions were in accord with the historical momentum of the plebian class united with the equestrians. By way of analogy the bourgeoisie, in an attempt to affirm the new social order and everything that went along with it including the rise of the orators in contest at the *rostra*, the rule of law, and the belief that *the good* were those of noble character, not men of noble birth. Catiline's actions were in accord with the historical momentum of the patrician class, the aristocracy, in an attempt to reassert the old order and everything that went along with it

which was kingship, tyranny, the commands of the king and the deference of the masses to the caprice of the nobility, and the belief that *the good* were men of noble birth, not men of noble deeds. “One side holds that justice is a relation of mutual goodwill...the otherside holds that the rule of the surperior is in itself, and by itself, justice...neither view has any cogency, or even plausibility, against the view that the superior *in goodness* ought to rule over, and be the master of, his inferiors.” (*The Politics* 1255a) Since the idea of justice is fundamentally ineffable; the social praxis of it at the end of the Roman republic was arbitrarily applied by the aristocracy with the aim of the happiness of the few not the many, indeed the king stood above the law. In the end, the *nobility* succeeded in reasserting itself. Those of noble birth, having won out against those of noble character, at long last established the *Pax Romana* under a man, Octavian, who would be acclaimed the first *Roman king*. It was precisely because the bourgeoisie was unable to keep the peace that its government remained unstable and became vulnerable both to revolution from below and reaction from above.

The decisive historical moment in turning the progressive the grand historical moment into a moment of reaction was the defeat of Spartacus at the river Silarus (71 B.C.). For those who do not know this story, take note it was Appian who preserved the tale. Spartacus was a Greek slave from Thrace who had once served in the Roman army, but was later taken prisoner and sold for a gladiator. While he was imprisoned in the gladiatorial school at Capua he persuaded about seventy of his comrades into revolt (73 B.C.).

*Agitare inter se mala servitutis, conferre iniurias et interpretando accendere:  
nihil profici patientia nisi ut graviora tamquam ex facili tolerantibus imperentur.*

They agitated among themselves on the evils of slavery, to and to compare their injuries, arguing that: Nothing is to be accomplished by patiently enduring commands except greater burdens placed upon those who willingly bear them.

*(Agricola 15.1-2)*

After overcoming the guards, they escaped and armed themselves with clubs and daggers that they had stolen from travelers along the road until they made their way to Mount Vesuvius where they took refuge for a short time. Fugitive slaves and freemen alike flocked to him and his two subordinate officers, Oenomaus and Crixus, who at once commenced in plundering the countryside in the vicinity. Rome at first sent Varinius Glaber and later Publius Valerius after them, but they were so quickly and very badly beaten that Spartacus rode away on Varinius' horse. After this, a great many more joined Spartacus' league until, according to Appian, his army surpassed 70,000 men who, now preparing to face two Roman legions, began to manufacture their own weapons. Crixus was overcome near Mount Garganus and Spartacus fled seeking to make his way through the Apennines and across the Alps into Gaul, but one of the Roman legions cut him off from the front while another harassed his rear. Spartacus defeated one and then the other, who scattered in confusion and disorder, whereupon, Spartacus sacrificed 300 Roman soldiers to the memory of Crixus and marched on Rome with 120,000 unencumbered infantry. Along the way, Spartacus defeated another Roman army at Picenum. After this, Spartacus changed his mind believing that he was ill prepared to attack Rome itself since no cities had joined him. Thence he withdrew to the mountains near Thurii and captured the city there. He would not allow his men to acquire any gold or silver, but only brass and iron and would only permit merchants who dealt in these commodities. His men acquired an abundance of this material and fashioned plenty of arms which they

used to defeat the Romans once again. Upon the new year, and three years into the war, Licinius Crassus, having just been praetor, marched upon him with six legions who were joined by two more, but he punished and decimated his own men for losing too many battles. Appian says that Crassus may have killed up to 4,000 of them. Having demonstrated to the army that he as a general was more dangerous to the soldiers than the enemy, the Romans finally won a battle against a detachment of 10,000 and, having first killed two-thirds of Spartacus' men, he then marched on Spartacus himself and, after having his forces decimated; Spartacus tried unsuccessfully to cross into Sicily. Crassus surrounded him and enclosed his forces with a ditch, a wall, and a paling. Spartacus attempted to break through Crassus' encirclement and lost another 6,000 men. According to Appian: "Only three of the Roman army were killed and seven wounded, so great was the improvement in their morale inspired by [Crassus'] recent punishment." Evidently, Spartacus was expecting reinforcements and therefore only fought Crassus by harassment and even crucified a Roman prisoner between the two armies in order to demonstrate to his own men what fate awaited them if they were to lose. In order to put an end to their disgrace, Rome sent Pompey, who had just arrived from Spain, and his army against him. Crassus, therefore, sought to bring the conflict to a decision as quickly as possible before Pompey arrived so that he would not reap the glory of a victory. Spartacus, having perceived, Crassus' anxiety sought to come to terms with him. When his proposals were rebuffed with scorn, Spartacus dashed through the enemies lines and pushed on to Brundisium with Crassus in pursuit. Unfortunately for Spartacus, Lucullus had just arrived in Brundisium after his victory over king Mithridates. Spartacus and the Romans fought a long a bloody battle. "Spartacus was wounded in the thigh with a spear and sank upon his knee, holding his shield in front of him and contending in this way against his

assailants until he and a great mass of those with him were surrounded and slain. The reminder of his army was thrown into confusion and butchered in crowds...the body of Spartacus was not found.” According to Appian, the remainder of his men divided themselves into four parts having fled into the mountains, with Crassus on their rear, and they continued to fight until they all had perished except for about 6000 who were captured and crucified along the road from Capua to Rome. (*Civil Wars* 1.116-120)

Through the *Sparticus Rebellion* the *servi* sought to transcend *thing hood*. The *servi* as a social class had become self-conscious by challenging *death*. Catiline as an actor on the world stage on behalf of the nobility did not obtain class consciousness through the *Bellum Catilinae*, for as a social class the *patricians* already had it. His actions in fact demonstrated that the nobility had become conscious of the fact that as a class it was no longer *the Master* holding the other classes in thrall, but was in fact a social class in decline. Its mastery had been replaced by the mastery of the *plebeians*. The most advanced elements of the patrician class; Caesar, Crassus and Catiline, having recognized this historic development reasserted themselves as representatives of their class. Though the Roman republic did continue after the defeat of Spartacus, the exile of Cicero signaled that the Republic had come to an end. Not long after the *Bellum Catilinae*, Pompey, Crassus and Caesar “pooled their interests” ascended as the *First Triumvirate* (60 B. C.-53 B.C.) which was gained through reliance on their reputations of their *glorious* conquests abroad and some demagoguery whereby the people were bought off with land distributions, threats of violence and the ejection of Cato from the forum. In 59 B.C. Clodius was appointed *tribune* by Caesar “although [he] had been suspected of an intrigue with the wife of Caesar himself during a religious ceremony of women. Caesar, however, did not bring him to trial owing to his popularity with the masses, but divorced

his wife. Others prosecuted Clodius for impiety at the sacred rites, and Cicero was the counsel for the prosecution. When Caesar was called as a witness he refused to testify against Clodius, but even raised him to the tribuneship as a foil to Cicero, who was already decrying the triumvirate as tending toward monarchy. Thus Caesar...benefited one enemy in order to revenge himself on another.” (*Civil Wars* 2.14) In 58 B.C. Clodius prosecuted Cicero for putting Lentulus and Cethagus, *inter alios*, to death without a trial. “Cicero, who had exhibited the highest courage in that transaction, became utterly unnerved at his trial.” (*Ibid.* 2.15) Cicero reportedly threw himself into a number of public histrionics. Dressing himself in rags and covering himself in filth he implored people in the streets. “When Clodius interrupted Cicero’s supplications on the streets with contumely, he gave way to despair and, like Demosthenes, went into voluntary exile.” (*Ibid.*) Sixteen months later he was recalled to Rome at the urging of Pompey who hoped that Cicero would no longer speak against the triumvirate but would instead attack Clodius. “He was received magnificently at the city gates, and it is said that a whole day was consumed by the greetings extended to him, as was the case with Demosthenes when he returned.” (*Ibid* 2.16) Cassius Dio says that Cicero “discarded his senatorial dress and went about in the garb of the knights, paying court meanwhile, as he went the rounds, day and night alike, to all who had any influence, not only of his friends but also of his opponents, and especially Pompey and even Caesar, inasmuch as the latter concealed his enmity toward him.” (*Historiae Romanae* 38.14.7) This is not so far fetched as Appian’s account of the events since Cicero was an equestrian, which means knight. At any rate, Cicero cast himself as a persona in a tragic drama understanding well the portent of charges dutifully entertained against a former consul who had immunity. In his staged triumphal return Cicero vaingloriously and wrongly believed that the *idea* of

the republic had won out against the *idea* of tyranny. This is Cicero consciously demonstrating to the people through real life drama, or real life tricked out as a drama. His histrionics were in fact calculated *pedagogy* through drama intended to impress upon the people at the time as it impresses upon us now the great historic importance of these events. Cicero covers his face with the tragic mask of Demosthenes and speaks through the opening; as if to say: ‘Hello! It’s me, Cicero. Remember me? I saved the republic. It is I who dashed away the daggers once held at your throats. *Servate me! Servate me!* Now save me, and through me, the republic.’

The reason that this event is so significant is that it showed that patrician demagoguery once again carried the day in Rome. Strictly speaking, the political process was no longer functioning as it once had. The removal Cato from the forum was the first sign that Rome had new masters. It was as yet a mere oligarchy, but the historical momentum was toward the return of the monarchy; this time not foreign but domestic. The historical precession must have somehow continued unfold in this direction but it was obstructed by the fact that Rome had banished the foreign monarchy and therefore lacked a legitimate basis for the coronation of a king, hence the precession from monarchy back to monarchy was mediated through the republic. If a monarchy were to ascend in England today, we see the precedents for it in the royal family which claims precedence to the throne. If a monarchy were to ascent in American, however, we see that it lacks and precedents. That is not say that it would be impossible for a king to rule America, but it would be difficult to settle the issue of precedence to the throne because America has no domestic heritage from monarchy but to a foreign monarchy expelled as Rome did. The historical process in Rome was settling this issue. None of the men of the first triumvirate qualified as a true king and none of these men would allow any of the



others to ascend as a tyrant, hence the first *tricaranus* followed by the second. It was not the assassination of Caesar, the proscription of Cicero, or the ascension of Octavian, which sealed Rome's fate as a culture in decline. It was in fact exile of Cicero which played the pivotal role. It was the exile of Cicero that truly demonstrated that democracy in Rome had come to an end. The not only had the *rule of law* been banished, but politics through oratory had been thereby outlawed. There was no more respect for the citizen statesman. Rome had a *de facto* oligarchy ruling it. Octavian would finally make the case for establishing a neo-monarchy by narrating a divine heritage through his adoptive father Julius. Though it wasn't called a monarchy, but a *pinceps*, or 'pincipate' or a State ruled by the 'leading man.'

*Non regno tamen neque dictatura sed principis nomine constitutam rem publicam.*

Nevertheless, the Republic had been constituted as neither a kingdom nor a dictatorship but by the name of Pincipate. (*The Annals* 1.9)

Octavian's argument for the re-institution of the monarchy might be compared to the events that took place among the Medes after they freed themselves from the oppression of the Assyrians.

According to Herodotus there was a certain Mede named Deioeces who achieved sovereign power in Media over the Busae, the Paretaceni, the Struchates, the Arizanti, the Budii, and the Magi by means of demagoguery. Since there was great lawlessness in the land on account of the fact that Media lacked a central authority, Deioeces applied himself to the practice of justice and acquired a reputation for being an equitable judge. He soon collected a large following of people who greatly enlarged his case load. Once Deioeces saw that the people had come to rely on him for giving dispensation and force to law he

suddenly quit his job causing robbery and lawlessness to reappear. In want of justice and despairing at the state of affairs, the accomplices and provocateurs of Deioces gathered the Medes together and declared: "We cannot possibly...go on living in this country if things continue as they now are; let us therefore set a king over us, that so the land may be well governed." (*The History* 1.95-101) If the difference between tyranny and monarchy is the difference between how power is exercised, with the consent of the people versus without the consent of the people, and not a debate over how that power is obtained (*Liddel and Scott*), then, because of the *Pax Romana*, Octavian succeeded not only in re-establishing the monarchy but also in making that monarchy Roman. But there can be little doubt that the dialectical development of Roman history for the time of the expulsion of Tarquinius to the ascension of Octavian was from monarchy to monarchy mediated through the republic which in the end gave back to Rome what a foreign power had once held.

Though it may not at first glance appear to be particularly germane to the matter at hand, in the process of passing moral judgment upon the crimes of Catiline we first looked to his sacrilege against the Roman religion but in this process we must also look at our own theological presuppositions for it is from here that we pass judgment upon him. Our theology is primarily Platonic passed through the lens of Semitic dogma. We could only do this because our own civilization has derived its ethical compendium from the Bible and from theological thought derived from it. We as a civilization have negated the Roman religion; we have pronounced an ethical judgment against it. We do not criticize it by drawing the Roman religion in relation to the Greek religion because western civilization has rejected it as *paganism*. We cannot however truly even speak of western theology as Semitic except as a dialectical development of Platonic philosophy; the

development being from Plato to Mohammed. On account of his remarks in *Timaeus* (c. 360 B.C.), Plato has been recognized as the origin of monotheism. According to him: “Everything which becomes must of necessity become owing to some Cause...Now to discover the Maker and Father of this Universe were a task indeed...Let us now state the Cause wherefore He that constructed it constructed Becoming and the All. He was good, and in him that is good no envy ariseth ever concerning anything and being devoid of envy. He desired that all should be, so far as possible, like unto Himself...For God desired that, so far as possible, all things should be good and nothing evil.” (*Timaeus* 28A-30A) Before this Plato has already speculated in the *Republic*: “Suppose there are no gods.” (2.365) In other words, suppose there are no *gods* but one God; لا إله إلا الله. Humanist philosopher Marcilio Ficino (1433-1499) said, “Plato, the father of the philosophers, realizing that our minds bear the same relationship to God as our sight to the light of the Sun, and therefore they can never understand anything without the light of God, consider it just and pious that as the human mind receives everything from God, so it should restore everything to God. And that is why he has been considered indisputably divine and his teaching called ‘theology’ among all peoples. For whatever subject he deals with, be it ethics, dialectic, mathematics or physics, he quickly brings it round, in a spirit of utmost piety to the contemplation and worship of God.” (*Platonic Theology, Proem* 1-2) At any rate, there were no Jews at the time of Herodotus. The Hebrews, on the authority of the cylinder of Cyrus, were in the captivity of the Babylonians. Herodotus, nevertheless, could not have been mistaken that the region was called Palestine, not Israel, for he himself traveled to Palestine where he saw the pillars of Sesostrius, king of Egypt and Ethiopia at the time. “The pillars which Sesostrius erected in

the conquered countries have for the most part disappeared; but in the part of Syria called Palestine, I myself saw them still standing.” (*The History* 2.106) Herodotus is well known for having narrated the histories of the dozens of obscure people’s inhabiting the regions of North Africa, Arabia, Asia Minor, Central Asia and Europe. It seems to be rather impossible that he would have ignored the noble exploits of the Jewish people if they had indeed existed in his time or before. Tacitus said:

*[2] Iudaeos Creta insula profugos novissima Libyae insedissee memorant, qua tempestate Saturnus vi Iovis pulsus cesserit regnis. argumentum e nomine petitur: inclutum in Creta Idam montem, accolas Idaeos aucto in barbarum cognomento Iudaeos vocitari. quidam regnante Iside exundantem per Aegyptum multitudinem ducibus Hierosolymo ac Iuda proximas in terras exoneratam; plerique Aethiopum prolem, quos rege Cepheo metus atque odium mutare sedis perpulerit. sunt qui tradant Assyrios convenas, indigum agrorum populum, parte Aegypti potitos, mox proprias urbis Hebraeasque terras et propiora Syriae coluisse. clara alii Iudaeorum initia, Solymos, carminibus Homeri celebratam gentem, conditae urbi Hierosolyma nomen e suo fecisse.*

*[3] Plurimi auctores consentiunt orta per Aegyptum tabe quae corpora foedaret, regem Bocchorim adito Hammonis oraculo remedium petentem purgare regnum et id genus hominum ut invisum deis alias in terras avehere iussum. sic conquisitum collectumque vulgus, postquam vastis locis relictum sit, ceteris per lacrimas torpentibus, Moysen unum exulum monuisse ne quam deorum hominumve opem expectarent utrisque deserti, sed sibimet duce caelesti crederent, primo cuius auxilio praesentis miserias pepulissent. adsensere atque omnium ignari fortuitum iter incipiunt. sed nihil aequae quam inopia aquae*

*fatigabat, iamque haud procul exitio totis campis procubuerant, cum grex asinorum agrestium e pastu in rupem nemore opacam concessit. secutus Moyses coniectura herbidi soli largas aquarum venas aperit. id levamen; et continuum sex dierum iter emensi septimo pulsus cultoribus obtinere terras, in quis urbs et templum dicata.*

*[4] Moyses quo sibi in posterum gentem firmaret, novos ritus contrariosque ceteris mortalibus indidit. profana illic omnia quae apud nos sacra, rursus concessa apud illos quae nobis incesta. effigiem animalis, quo monstrante errorem sitimque depulerant, penetrali sacravere, caeso ariete velut in contumeliam Hammonis; bos quoque immolatur, quoniam Aegyptii Apin colunt. sue abstinent memoria cladis, quod ipsos scabies quondam turpaverat, cui id animal obnoxium. longam olim famem crebris adhuc ieiuniis fatentur, et raptarum frugum argumentum panis Iudaicus nullo fermento detinetur. septimo die otium placuisse ferunt, quia is finem laborum tulerit; dein blandiente inertia septimum quoque annum ignaviae datum. alii honorem eum Saturno haberi, seu principia religionis tradentibus Idaeis, quos cum Saturno pulsos et conditores gentis accepimus, seu quod de septem sideribus, quis mortales reguntur, altissimo orbe et praecipua potentia stella Saturni feratur, ac pleraque caelestium viam suam et cursus septenos per numeros commeari.*

*[5] Hi ritus quoquo modo inducti antiquitate defenduntur: cetera instituta, sinistra foeda, pravitate valere. nam pessimus quisque spretis religionibus patriis tributa et stipes illuc congerebant, unde auctae Iudaeorum res, et quia apud ipsos fides obstinata, misericordia in promptu, sed adversus omnes alios hostile odium. separati epulis, discreti cubilibus, proiectissima ad libidinem gens,*

*alienarum concubitu abstinent; inter se nihil inlicitum. circumcidere genitalia instituerunt ut diversitate noscantur. transgressi in morem eorum idem usurpant, nec quicquam prius imbuuntur quam contemnere deos, exuere patriam, parentes liberos fratres vilia habere. augendae tamen multitudini consulitur; nam et necare quemquam ex agnatis nefas, animosque proelio aut suppliciis peremptorum aeternos putant: hinc generandi amor et moriendi contemptus. corpora condere quam cremare e more Aegyptio, eademque cura et de infernis persuasio, caelestium contra. Aegyptii pleraque animalia effigiesque compositas venerantur, Iudaei mente sola unumque numen intellegunt: profanos qui deum imagines mortalibus materiis in species hominum effingant; summum illud et aeternum neque imitabile neque interiturum. igitur nulla simulacra urbibus suis, nedum templis sistunt; non regibus haec adulatio, non Caesaribus honor. sed quia sacerdotes eorum tibia tympanisque concinebant, hedera vinciebantur vitisque aurea templo reperta, Liberum patrem coli, domitorem Orientis, quidam arbitrati sunt, nequaquam congruentibus institutis. quippe Liber festos laetosque ritus posuit, Iudaeorum mos absurdus sordidusque.*

[2] “Some say that the Jews were fugitives from the island of Crete, who settled on the nearest coast of Africa about the time when Saturn was driven from his throne by the power of Jupiter. Evidence of this is sought in the name. There is a famous mountain in Crete called Ida; the neighbouring tribe, the Idæi, came to be called Judæi by a barbarous lengthening of the national name. Others assert that in the reign of Isis the overflowing population of Egypt, led by Hierosolymus and Judas, discharged itself into the neighbouring countries. Many, again, say that they were a race of Ethiopian origin, who in the time of king Cepheus were driven

by fear and hatred of their neighbours to seek a new dwelling-place. Others describe them as an Assyrian horde who, not having sufficient territory, took possession of part of Egypt, and founded cities of their own in what is called the Hebrew country, lying on the borders of Syria. Others, again, assign a very distinguished origin to the Jews, alleging that they were the Solymi, a nation celebrated in the poems of Homer, who called the city which they founded Hierosolyma after their own name.

[3] “Most writers, however, agree in stating that once a disease, which horribly disfigured the body, broke out over Egypt; that king Bocchoris, seeking a remedy, consulted the oracle of Hammon, and was bidden to cleanse his realm, and to convey into some foreign land this race detested by the gods. The people, who had been collected after diligent search, finding themselves left in a desert, sat for the most part in a stupor of grief, till one of the exiles, Moyses by name, warned them not to look for any relief from God or man, forsaken as they were of both, but to trust to themselves, taking for their heaven-sent leader that man who should first help them to be quit of their present misery. They agreed, and in utter ignorance began to advance at random. Nothing, however, distressed them so much as the scarcity of water, and they had sunk ready to perish in all directions over the plain, when a herd of wild asses was seen to retire from their pasture to a rock shaded by trees. Moyses followed them, and, guided by the appearance of a grassy spot, discovered an abundant spring of water. This furnished relief. After a continuous journey for six days, on the seventh they possessed themselves of a country, from which they expelled the inhabitants, and in which they founded a city and a temple.

[4] “Moyses, wishing to secure for the future his authority over the nation, gave them a novel form of worship, opposed to all that is practised by other men. Things sacred with us, with them have no sanctity, while they allow what with us is forbidden. In their holy place they have consecrated an image of the animal by whose guidance they found deliverance from their long and thirsty wanderings. They slay the ram, seemingly in derision of Hammon, and they sacrifice the ox, because the Egyptians worship it as Apis. They abstain from swine's flesh, in consideration of what they suffered when they were infected by the leprosy to which this animal is liable. By their frequent fasts they still bear witness to the long hunger of former days, and the Jewish bread, made without leaven, is retained as a memorial of their hurried seizure of corn. We are told that the rest of the seventh day was adopted, because this day brought with it a termination of their toils; after a while the charm of indolence beguiled them into giving up the seventh year also to inaction. But others say that it is an observance in honour of Saturn, either from the primitive elements of their faith having been transmitted from the Idæi, who are said to have shared the flight of that God, and to have founded the race, or from the circumstance that of the seven stars which rule the destinies of men Saturn moves in the highest orbit and with the mightiest power, and that many of the heavenly bodies complete their revolutions and courses in multiples of seven.

“This worship, however introduced, is upheld by its antiquity; all their other customs, which are at once perverse and disgusting, owe their strength to their very badness. The most degraded out of other races, scorning their national beliefs, brought to them their contributions and presents. This augmented the



wealth of the Jews, as also did the fact, that among themselves they are inflexibly honest and ever ready to shew compassion, though they regard the rest of mankind with all the hatred of enemies. They sit apart at meals, they sleep apart, and though, as a nation, they are singularly prone to lust, they abstain from intercourse with foreign women; among themselves nothing is unlawful. Circumcision was adopted by them as a mark of difference from other men. Those who come over to their religion adopt the practice, and have this lesson first instilled into them, to despise all gods, to disown their country, and set at nought parents, children, and brethren. Still they provide for the increase of their numbers. It is a crime among them to kill any newly-born infant. They hold that the souls of all who perish in battle or by the hands of the executioner are immortal. Hence a passion for propagating their race and a contempt for death. They are wont to bury rather than to burn their dead, following in this the Egyptian custom; they bestow the same care on the dead, and they hold the same belief about the lower world. Quite different is their faith about things divine. The Egyptians worship many animals and images of monstrous form; the Jews have purely mental conceptions of Deity, as one in essence. They call those profane who make representations of God in human shape out of perishable materials. They believe that Being to be supreme and eternal, neither capable of representation, nor of decay. They therefore do not allow any images to stand in their cities, much less in their temples. This flattery is not paid to their kings, nor this honour to our Emperors. From the fact, however, that their priests used to chant to the music of flutes and cymbals, and to wear garlands of ivy, and that a golden vine was found in the temple, some have thought that they worshipped

Father Liber, the conqueror of the East, though their institutions do not by any means harmonize with the theory; for Liber established a festive and cheerful worship, while the Jewish religion is tasteless and mean.”(*Historiae* 5.2-5)

And that they may have emigrated from Egypt under the leadership of a man named Moses. “Most writers, however, agree in stating that once a disease, which horribly disfigured the body, broke out over Egypt; that king Bocchoris, seeking a remedy, consulted the oracle of Hammon, and was bidden to cleanse his realm, and to convey into some foreign land this race detested by the gods. The people, who had been collected after diligent search, finding themselves left in a desert, sat for the most part in a stupor of grief, till one of the exiles, Moyses by name, warned them not to look for any relief from God or man, forsaken as they were of both, but to trust to themselves, taking for their heaven-sent leader that man who should first help them to be quit of their present misery...Moyes, wishing to secure for the future his authority over the nation, gave them a novel form of worship, opposed to all that is practiced by other men. Things sacred with us, with them have no sanctity, while they allow what with us is forbidden. In their holy place they have consecrated an image of the animal by whose guidance they found deliverance from their long and thirsty wanderings...They abstain from swine's flesh, in consideration of what they suffered when they were infected by the leprosy to which this animal is liable...This worship, however introduced, is upheld by its antiquity; all their other customs, which are at once perverse and disgusting, owe their strength to their very badness. The most degraded out of other races...among themselves they are inflexibly honest and ever ready to show compassion, though they regard the rest of mankind with all the hatred of enemies...as a nation, they are singularly prone to lust, they abstain from intercourse with foreign women; among themselves nothing is

unlawful. Circumcision was adopted by them as a mark of difference from other men. Those who come over to their religion adopt the practice, and have this lesson first instilled into them, to despise all gods, to disown their country, and set at naught parents, children, and brethren...They hold that the souls of all who perish in battle or by the hands of the executioner are immortal. Hence a passion for propagating their race and a contempt for death. They are wont to bury rather than to burn their dead, following in this the Egyptian custom; they bestow the same care on the dead, and they hold the same belief about the lower world. Quite different is their faith about things divine. The Egyptians worship many animals and images of monstrous form; the Jews have purely mental conceptions of Deity, as one in essence. They call those profane who make representations of God in human shape out of perishable materials. They believe that Being to be supreme and eternal, neither capable of representation, nor of decay. They therefore do not allow any images to stand in their cities; much less in their temples...the Jewish religion is tasteless and mean.” (*Ibid.* 5.3-5) It appears that over the years little has changed except for the invention of the *Torah* scroll which makes up the center piece of their Temples today and has become an object of worship for them for according to Tacitus: “Cneius Pompeius was the first of our countrymen to subdue the Jews. Availing himself of the right of conquest, he entered the temple. Thus it became commonly known that the place stood empty with no similitude of gods within, and that the shrine had nothing to reveal.” (*Ibid.* 5.9)

According to Herodotus, however, it was the Egyptians who first designated the pig as an unclean animal, not the Jews. “The pig is regarded among them as an unclean animal, so much so that if a man in passing accidentally touches a pig, he instantly hurries to the river and plunges in with all his clothes on. Hence too, the swineherds...are

forbidden to enter into any temples...and further, no one will give his daughter in marriage to a swineherd, or take a wife from among them, so that the swineherds are forced to intermarry among themselves.” (2.47) Of course the pig was considered despicable even in the Greek world. The Elder Clisthenes, having conquered the Sicyonians, after appointing his own tribe the Archelai ‘Rulers he renamed the remaining tribes: Hyatae ‘Pig-folk,’ Oneatae ‘Ass-folk,’ and the Choereatae “Swine-folk’ as an insult to them.

He also says that the Egyptians were related black Africans. For the “Colchians are an Egyptian race. Before I heard any mention of the fact from others, I had remarked it myself. After the thought had struck me, I made inquiries on the subject both in Colchis and in Egypt, and I found that the Colchians had a more distinct recollection of the Egyptians, than the Egyptians had of them...they are black-skinned and have wooly hair.” (2.104) In addition to this, Herodotus noted that the Colchians, Egyptians and the Ethiopians were the nations which originally practiced circumcision. “The Phoenicians and the Syrians of Palestine themselves confess that they learnt the custom from the Egyptians.” (*Ibid.*) In addition to this it appears that the *Pelastoi* were the original inhabitants of the land “in the part of Syria called Palestine.” (2.106) The land we now call Palestine. Syria is a Greek name. The original name of the region was Cappadocia. The people residing there were thus known as “the Cappadocians, whom we Greeks know by the name Syrians.” (5.49) And that the Egyptians “were also the first to broach the opinion that the soul of man is immortal.” (2.123) The *Torah* was based on the writings of Josephus (c. 37 – c. 100 A.D.); and because of that it was first written in Greek not in Hebrew. If it was ever written in Hebrew there are no parchments or any historical evidence to substantiate that fact. Indeed the oldest extant text of the *Torah* is

in Latin (100 A.D.) which is widely believed to be a translation of a non-extant Greek version for which the Greek *Septuagint* (1000 A.D.) serves as a substitute. If we rely on what the historical evidence shows us, the Septuagint is not an ancient Greek translation of the Hebrew Scriptures. Some scholars in fact hold that the Hebrew language is derived from Greek and we can easily see the correspondences between the Latin, Greek, Hebrew and Arabic alphabets, from the Greek *αλφαβητος*, 'alpha + beta.' Latin: A, B, C, D, E; Greek: Alpha, Beta, Gamma, Delta, Epsilon...Lambda, Mu, Nu; Hebrew: Alef, Bet, Gimmel, Dalet...Lamed, Mim, Nun; Arabic: Alif, Ba, Ta, Gim, Ha, Dal...Lam, Mim, Nun. Some etymologists wrongly presume the Greek alphabet to be from the Phoenician-Hebrew, but for lack of evidence of this, I hold to what this information shows to me on its face as opposed to making hyperbolic presumptions which evidently have a political subtext since certain unscrupulous individuals, seeking to posit themselves as the origin of everything good, deny the Greek origin of western theology and Plato's pivotal role in the development of it. Assertions to the effect that the Greek alphabet or that Greek thought, particularly Plato's thought, was derived from Judaism is absurd and does not merit serious discussion. This is not to say that Plato himself was a monotheist, but that monotheism was built upon his cosmology in the *Timaeus*. (Cf. *Plato's Cosmology* 34-35) The contemporary Hebrew Scriptures are in fact the translation of the Greek *Septuagint*; Josephus having been the principle author of them. It really neither here nor there except to individuals who hope to establish some primacy over humanity, but he seems to be wiser who would predicate his theological genealogy upon the last development, as opposed to its first, since the last development of an upward spiral would be the most advanced. Indeed then it appears that monotheism is the result of a long and varied historical development. Those who would later be called the

Jews didn't exist until after Plato. The space here would be insufficient to do justice to the topic. "It is equally unreasonable to accept merely probable conclusions from a mathematician and to demand strict demonstrations from an orator." (*Nicomachean Ethics* 1.3.4)

If they did exist in either Egypt or elsewhere, the historical record is silent about them until c. 100 A.D. The point being that the ethics of western civilization were summed up in the *Torah*, the *Ten Commandments*, but as substantive morals they could not be adequately define, due the structure and phenomenological development of the human mind, hence the development of the *Talmud* as a body of law to interpret the Law; justice itself becoming ever more distant and its interpretation evermore corrupt.

Though Josephus tells us that the *Torah* was originally a mere *ten words*, which he refused to reveal, it was expanded to 613 *commandments* and then later greatly expanded into many thousands, indeed innumerable, *Halakah*, demonstrating the imperfection of the work.

Οὓς οὐ θεμιτόν ἐστιν ἡμῖν λέγειν φανερώς πρὸς λέξις, τὰς δὲ δυνάμεις αὐτῶν δηλώσομεν.

These words, by the law of God and man, we are not allowed to say openly, but we will indicate the meaning of them. (*Jewish Antiquities* 3.90)

"What is called the unutterable is nothing else than the untrue." (*Phenomenology of Spirit* 110) Hence it was originally conceived that the *Torah* pronounced by Moses was sufficient, but it was later declared by its own adherents to be insufficient.

*Non addestis ad verbum quod vobis loquor neque auferetis ex eo.*

You shall not add to the Word which I speak to you nor remove from it. (*Deuteronomy* 4.2)

On account of the great corruption of Jewish law, a new Prophet came and gave humanity a *New Covenant*. The Torah was replaced by the *Gospels* and the writings of the Church Fathers. The theology of Saint Paul (A.D 3–14 - 62–69), the Gospels, eventually gave way to القرآن , the *Qur'an* (c. 632 A.D.), the recitation of the Prophet Mohammed. This represented a positive upward development in terms of substantive ethics for the western world, the ascendancy of western theology, unfolding through dialectical struggle in an upward spiral; an ascendancy from the lower to the higher. But as history continues to unfold, the morals propounded within these documents, as substantive ethics, becomes ever more out of step with the need of humanity, they become dated as it were. Thus as contemporary historians, our interpretation of Catiline's crimes cannot be completely understood in terms of Roman paganism for our concept of Holy law has been conditioned by what would properly be called Platonic theology having developed through the lens of Semitic history and then transmitted to us through the history of the later Roman Empire as Christianity. Thus it could not be truly said either that there are two distinct sources for western thought, or that the three principal monotheistic religions, are truly Semetic because they in fact have a Greek origin.

According to western ethics and western culture *paganism* is false because as a source of ethical principles it cannot survive the tests of contemporary logic which seized upon the development of Semitic theology, in American, principally, as Christianity. But truly, the development of Platonic theology ended with the Prophet Mohammed, not with Moses or Jesus, hence the second part of the شهادة 'shahadah:' رسول محمد الله 'Mohammed is the Messenger of God.' This was the final historical development of

western theology regardless of whether or not anyone chooses to ascribe to this doctrine. It is with the *Qur'an* that the Semites, Arabs, declared that there could be no further ethical development in history along this path. The *Qur'an* is the final substantive moral doctrine from this source. Mohammed was the last and final messenger. The whole of the ethical and historical development of the Platonic religion was ultimately laid down as a substantive doctrine in the *Qur'an*. It is a moral datum. It is the moral yardstick for all ethical activity from those who ascribe to it and the end result of western religion. The Jews were displaced from their position as the bearers of God's ethics by the Christians and the Christians by the Muslims. According to Islam, Judaism was too strict, Christianity was not strict enough. Both had become theologically corrupt by any test of logic. Islam became a middle path between the two extremes and is known as the straight path *سُـبُلُ قَـرِـيْمَ*. Not the only path as it were, according to its doctrine, but the straight path.

All who follow it are guaranteed eternal life after death in paradise *جَنَّة*. At length however, the theology of Islam fell into the same morass as its predecessors in attempting to legislate from a moral substantive purportedly revealed through divine agency to positive law. The more it pursued the idea of absolute justice the further it became from actually achieving it. This isn't to say that the whole body of theological thought is worthless, but to point out its limitations which have resulted from the fact that while history develops and therefore mankind's idea of the ethical develops, moral substantives do not. The whole purpose of this rather lengthy and tiresome digression being to point out that western ethics is marked by a dualism between the theological and the secular



humanistic. Indeed there were two principle developments in early Greek philosophy: (α) Ionic and (β) Italiot. The western academy, as a result of the Enlightenment, has taken a course which is decidedly Ionic. Whosoever should wish to understand western ethics must understand both of these developments. I might also be worthwhile to note that after secular humanism over took the western academy, the faculty became what would correspond to the ancient priest class. It has become their responsibility to impart the values of this civilization. This of course is to no avail for: “The masses are the victims of the deception of a *priesthood* which, in its envious conceit, holds itself to be the sole possessor of insight and pursues its other selfish ends as well. At the same time it conspires with *despotism* which, as the synthetic, non-notional unity of the real and this ideal realm—a curiously inconsistent entity—stands above the bad insight of the multitude and the bad intentions of the priests, and yet unites both within itself. From the stupidity and confusion of the people brought about by this trickery of preistcraft, despotism, which despises both, draws for itself the advantage of undisturbed domination and the fulfillment of its desires and caprices, but is itself at the same time this same dullness on insight, the same superstition and error.” (*Phenomenology of Spirit* 542)

If as Hegel remarked that the state rests on religion, we could also conclude that as for the Roman Empire that it was the ابر ‘riba,’ the دنيا ‘dunya,’ the شرك ‘shirk,’ and the ركبة ‘kibr’ that had destroyed it. “Religion is the sphere in which a nation gives itself the definition of that which it regards as true...the conception of God, therefore, constitutes the general basis of a people’s character.” (*Philosophy of History* 176) Thus I compare the personality traits of the villainous Catiline to four great احرام ‘sins:’ ابر ‘riba’ or ‘usury,’ the دنيا ‘dunya’ or ‘the quest for earthly possessions,’ the شرك ‘shirk’

or 'idol worship', and the *كبر* 'kibr' or 'υβρις'. Catiline himself was possessed of these vices: usury, avarice, polytheism, and insolent outrages before God. He was going broke because the usury, on the money he borrowed to purchase useless things of the material world, the *dunya*. Men like Catiline and the Roman emperors that followed him saw themselves reflected in the Roman Pantheon. The gods of the Romans were too much like men, *shirk*. Hegel citing Schiller said: "While the gods remained more human, the men more divine." (*Ibid*) The concept of the Hero, which the Romans allegedly acquired from the Greeks, suggested that the *great men* of Rome could become like the heroes of antiquity. Through this *idea* the great men believed that they could challenge the gods themselves, *kibr*, *كبر* or 'υβρις, insolence and arrogance. The fact that Octavian would be later acclaimed Caesar Augustus, *the divine Caesar*, proves this. As a man's objective greatness grew, and his power and dominion over not only things but over *men as things* grew. The state's subjective content passed through the lens of the state's leading man first approached the idea of the Great Man as *hero* and later approached the idea of the Great Man as a *god*.

*Nihil deorum honoribus relictum cum se templis et effigie numinum per flamines et sacerdotes coli vellet.*

No honor was left to the gods when Augustus wished himself to be worshiped like a god with temples and effigies, by priests and priestesses. (*The Annals* 1.10)

The Roman emperors became like the *pharaohs* of Egypt, the ruler as god on Earth. The fact that Catiline so boldly desecrated the fountain of Apollo demonstrated not only his *hubris* but his madness. Herodotus said that the fact that the Persian king Cambyses opened ancient sepulchers in Memphis and examined the bodies inside and

that later the fact that he mocked and desecrated the images of Vulcan and the Cabiri was proof that he was mad. “For if one were to offer men to choose out of all the customs in the world such as seemed to them the best, they would examine the whole number, and end by preferring their own...Unless, therefore, a man was mad, it is not likely that he would make sport of such matters.” Herodotus continued by way of a parable based on the life of Darius. According to him, Darius summoned some Greeks and asked them what he should have to pay them in order to cause them to eat the bodies of their fathers after they had died. The Greeks replied that there was no sum of money so great that could cause them to commit such a sacrilege. Darius then summoned some Indians called the Callatians, whom were known to eat their fathers after they had died, and asked them what sum of money he should have to give them to cause them to follow the Greek custom and burn the bodies of their fathers after they had died. The Callatians replied that there was no sum of money so great that they would even hear the suggestion. Whereupon Herodotus concluded in the words of the Greek poet Pindar:

Ὄρθος μοι δοκεῖ Πινδαρός ποιῆσαι νόμον πάντων βασιλεῖα φησας εἶναι.

In my opinion Pindar does right when he declares: “Law is to be king over all.”

*(The History 3.38)*

Cambyses committed outrages similar to the ones Catiline had. For in addition to sacrilege, it reported that Cambyses murdered his brother Smerdis and later married one of his other sisters after first marrying and then murdering the younger of the two. Hardy presumed to exculpate Catiline from the charges made against him on the grounds that they are related to us differently by several authorities, but Herodotus himself relates two different accounts of the murder of Smerdis and two more different accounts of Cambyses’ murder of his sister. His practice of narrating multiple accounts of the same

story is used throughout his works. Should we convict Cambyses for both these crimes on account of the fact that only *one* historian has told us about his crimes and be unable to convict Catiline on account of the fact that his crimes were narrated not by one but *several*? Or could we dispute Cicero's authority to banish Catiline, vanquish him with an army raised by the state, and to execute the conspirators knowing well that the punishment for the crimes by which they were charged, at that time, was death in accordance with the *rule of law*? Irrespective of a positive conviction in a court of law, those guilty of aforesaid crimes were owed the ultimate punishment. The fact that they received it demonstrated that νόμος 'law' was the king over men, not men the *king* over law. But strictly speaking it was not the positive law in direct correspondence to these men in this case that was vindicated by the law that established the Republic. Irrespective of his dissemblance and his conspiracy, Catiline, and the men behind him, could not have, and should not have, made themselves supreme.

Δίκη δ' ὑπερ ὕβριος ἰσχει ἐς τέλος ἐξελθούσα

But Justice overcomes Hubris when it comes to the end. (*Works and Days* 217)

Thus, Cicero affirmed the *rule of law* and that a man is not a god. And that Catiline as a full participant in the mechanisms of the Roman government was bound by law to uphold the Republic. He was not above the law but was subject to law; in general the law that established the Republic, and in this instance the *Plautian Law* in particular. "They must do what is best for the community, never forgetting it or allowing themselves to be either forced or bewitched into throwing it over." (*Republic* 10.3.413) The moral principle regarding revolution against the state is different for those who have no power, for the national spirit in every state is to strive for freedom. The many having no power believe that it is just that they should have it. No one disputes the right of the people to

overthrow a monarchy, but the right to re-establish one is denied by all. “Injustice has this effect of implanting hatred wherever it exists.” (1.351) Whosoever should attempt to do so is roundly condemned as an oppressor and a tyrant.

Catiline was the oppressor. He was an instrument of the oppressor class, which having been displaced from its social position sought to reassert itself. If *class struggle* is taken as the motive force in the process of the development of the national spirit, the patrician class supplanting the monarchy was the first moment of historic justice within the Roman state. “The rich citizens ‘*populus crassus*’ now excluded the nobility from power...the patrician nobility which supplanted the feudal aristocracy, deprived the common people of all share in the conduct of the state, and thus proved itself no less oppressive than the original noblesse.” (*Philosophy of History* 336) The plebian class supplanting the patrician class was the second moment of historic justice. The re-assertion of the patrician class was a moment of historic *injustice* when justice is taken to be a condition of the state which brings happiness, in both a qualitative and quantitative sense, to the greatest number of people. The *Pax Romana* was good for a while, but most would agree that the Roman people suffered greatly under the Empire. The patrician class under the aegis Catiline did not play the historic role of the liberator. As the embodiment of injustice in a moment of reaction the patrician class became the oppressive class operating through Catiline as an instrument of that class. Catiline became the enforcer of the will of the oppressors, hence an oppressor himself. Punishing the oppressor in accordance with the rule of law isn’t called *oppression*. It’s called *justice*. “It seems almost an act of justice that a man should suffer wrong such as he had been accustomed to make others suffer.” (*Rhetoric* 1.12.26) Through the process, then, of the examination and re-examination of the evidence, an evil man once lain low and

later invested with grandeur, Catiline, once again, assumes his proper place in history, as a villain, not a hero.

‘Οι γ’ αὐτῷ κακά τευχέει ἀνὴρ ἀλλῷ κακά τευχῶν,

‘ἢ δὲ κακὴ βουλή τοι βουλευσάντι κακίστη’

At any rate, a man plans bad things for himself when he plans bad things for another, but the bad plan is most bad to he who planned. (*Works and Days* 267)

Thus Catiline received what was owed to him, which was justice. In this case justice was harm to the *bad man* who was he who had *plotted the bad thing* in the first instance. Catiline and his conspirators, then, did not become *better* by the receiving of *justice*; they became very much worse for it. “One who pays a just penalty must not be called miserable, and his misery laid at heaven’s door.” (*Republic* 2.380b) In punishing the criminal here, it was not the individual which was improved, but the state which had improved itself. The idea of the state, the rule of law, and Rome’s national spirit was strengthened by his defeat. *Rome Sauvée!* Rome was saved, at least for a time. Cicero had saved it. There’s no denying that. Catiline would have ruined it and there’s no denying that either unless one holds that monarchy is better than democracy. For the republicans among us, justice was served; and for the very same Judith Kalb has tampered with the social memory of humanity. She slipped on the *Ring of Gyges* in order to crown Catiline with the *Helmet of Hades*. To rehabilitate Catiline’s reputation first at the expense of Cicero’s, and next at the expense of Lenin, and afterwards at the expense of Christ is not only to suggest that justice of the state be found in monarchy, not in democracy, and that the poor are rabble, it transposes the common acceptance of the words *the good* and *the bad* within today’s republic.

Kalb is as much an ironist as Catiline was. Her activity would not be called a virtuous action or the one who does it good. “For ‘activity in conformity with virtue’ involves virtue....But virtue in active exercise cannot be inoperative—it will of necessity act, and act well....The man who does not enjoy doing noble actions is not a good man at all: no one would call a man just if he did not like acting justly, nor liberal if he did not like doing liberal things, and similarly with the other virtues.” (*Nicomachean Ethics* 1098b1-1099a1) The student of dialectical and historical materialism would say that whether or not one views Catiline as a criminal is conditioned by one’s class standing. Thus those who have sought to vindicate Catiline, being of the bourgeois class and not of the aristocracy, only find a little “something great” in him. Their vindication of him is qualified by saying Catiline was at least not as bad as he was made out to be, but in the end of their discourse must either also condemn him as the ancients did, or leave the matter hanging by neither wholly condemning him nor wholly vindicating him, for the *imperium* of the bourgeoisie is a mere *middle term* between progress and reaction. “In class society everyone lives as a member of a particular class, and every kind of thinking, without exception, is stamped with the brand of that class.” (*On Practice* 296)

For all the virtues of the historical revisionists, if Catiline is to Christ then Kalb is to Myrrah.

*Scelus est odisse parentem:*

*hic amor est odio maius scelus...*

*Illa quidem sentit foedoque repugnat amori*

*et secum...*

*“di, precor, et pietas sacrataque iura parentum,*

*hoc prohibete nefas scelerique resistite nostro,*

*si tamen hoc scelus est.*

*Sed enim damnare negatur*

*hanc venerem pietas, coeuntque animalia nullo*

*cetera delicto. Nec habetur turpe iuvencae*

*ferre patrem tergo, fit equo sua filia coniunx,*

*quasque creavit init pecudes caper, ipsaque, cuius*

*semine concepta est, ex illo concipit ales.*

*Felices, quibus ista licent! Humana malignas*

*cura dedit leges, et quod natura remittit,*

*invida iura negant. Gentes tamen esse feruntur,*

*in quibus et nato genetrix et nata parenti*

*iungitur, [ut] pietas geminato crescat amore.*

*Me miseram, quod non nasci mihi contigit illic,*

*fortunaque loci laedor! – Quid in ista revolvor?*

*Spes interdictae discedite! Dignus amari*

*ille, sed ut pater, est. –Ergo si filia magni*

*non essem Cinyrae, Cinyrae concumbere possem;*

*nunc quia iam meus est, non est meus, ipsaque damno*

*est mihi proximitas: aliena potentior essem.*

*Ire libet procul hinc patriaeque relinquere fines,*

*dum scelus effugiam. Retinet malus ardor amantem,*

*ut praesens spectem Cinyram tangamque loquarque*

*osculaque admoveam, si nil conceditur ultra.*

*Ultra autem spectare aliquid potes, impia virgo?*



*Et quot confundas et iura et nomina, sentis!*

*Tune eris et matris paelex et adultua patris? tune soror nati genetrixque  
vocabere fratiris?...Mors placet.*

A filthy passion indeed she feels this and against it fights.

And to herself she does say...

“It is a sin to have hated a parent,

A great sin too is this kind love by means of a jealous hatred...

O god please, I beg you,

with utter devotion and the rites sacred of parents.

Keep us from us this sin, and from this crime away.

If indeed it is a sin?

Venus herself would not truly condemn this great sign:

That animals breed with family others:

It is not repulsive for a bull to mount his heifer,

a stud to mount his daughter; and

the he-goat goes among the band he begat,

from those whose very semen conceived the same birds do mate.

Happiness is to those whom this is lawful!

Spite to laws with great pains mankind gives;

What nature allows, they deny;

And with jealous oaths they do condemn

the races of men are there who breed at home;

those to whom both mother and son

father and daughter

mate.

Doubling love but magnifies devotion.

O' woe is me, not being born there,

by fortune, in this place, I am oppressed!

Who am I to be dwelling on this?

I hope to give up by talking to myself!

Worthy to be loved is he,

but only as a father.

If I were not the daughter

of this great man Cinyras,

to lay with him now I might be able.

But as it stands he is both mine and not mine,

and if near me I myself to him forbid:

Much stronger I would be as a stranger.

Far far away I wish to go

this native land to leave behind

to escape this sin at the ends of the Earth.

But a wicked lust me detains,

In person that Cinyras I may behold

to touch and speak and to him give

only a kiss, and nothing else would come to pass.

At last what else do you appear to be,

but an impious virgin?

And think of how many words

and promises you do you confound!

Thou shalt not be a both adulterer of your mother.

A concubine to your father?

Thou shalt not be called sister and mother

of your brother?"

In the end, she pleased Death. (*Metamorphoses* 10.314-378)

Myrrah's justification for her passion by way of making an analogy between the breeding habits of animals and her incestuous passion for her father serves as proof to her irrationality, and by analogy Catiline's. Since man is not merely the political animal but also the rational animal the apologists for Catiline seek to approach the morality of animals. Man's self-consciousness, his being for another, as an individual perhaps may be found in political discourse, but mankind's self-consciousness, not solely as national consciousness, or national spirit, or even class consciousness, but in its totality as the human race on a single Earth, is experienced through the thoughtful consideration of the development of history in so far as working history is the summation of human experience obtained through the interpretation of the social *res gestae* produced through self-conscious social relations recorded in books and transmitted by the old to the young. The summation of the *res gestae* is not merely a catalog of 'things done,' but an understanding of the *social praxis* of the time. The institution of the principles discovered is called *politics*. Man through the study of history and the institution of learned principals seeks to institute a qualitatively better State. History thus employed is partially a self-creating teleological because it has as its final aim the greatest degree happiness for the greatest number of people. As historians the beginning and end of history have been posited by our own selves. History then has an internal teleology. "*The*

*final cause of the world at large*, we allege to be the *consciousness* of its own freedom.”  
(*Philosophy of History* 161) Moreover,

“happiness then is the activity of the soul in accordance with reason.”

(*Nicomachean Ethics* 1.7.8)

Since the State is the summation of individual happiness the activity of the State in accordance with the principle of reason would be the best State. Historians have not only a duty but the rational capability to discourse on social problems and make recommendations as to the best course of action. “If we want to abolish capitalism or war, and in doing so not only to destroy them but to bring into existence something better, we must begin by understanding them.” (*The Idea of History* 334) This intention of the historian to create a better world is no longer confined to the idea of the mere nation state but now embraces the whole world. This is a development over the scientific history of modernity which is presently named *post-modern* since no one has as yet defined it as an *idea* but hold it as a mere *concept*. The post-modernists are however the merely *skeptical*; caught up in “the dizziness of perpetually self-engendered disorder...At one time it recognizes that its freedom lies in rising above all the confusion and contingency of existence, and at another time equally admits to a relapse of occupying itself with what is unessential...Its deeds and its words always belie one another and equally it has itself the doubly contradictory consciousness of unchangeableness and sameness, and of utter contingency and non-identity with itself...Point out likeness or identity to it, and it will point out unlikeness or non-identity; and when it is now confronted with what it has just asserted, it turns round and points out likeness or identity.” (*Phenomenology of Spirit* 205)

What the current trend in philosophy knows for certain is that the present historical moment is different from, but analogous to, what had preceded it. With increasing rationality and self-directedness, mankind has increasingly differentiated itself from the animal kingdom. By way of ancient thought man has become more human than animal, but there has been a rebellion against this. The coming of modernity was marked with the trend: philosophical reductionism, positivism, and behaviorism. Those who followed this trend saw poverty in the realm of the human spirit and reduced man and human society to a mere machine; a body with no soul—and hence an animal with an excessively large brain—and exaggerated sense organ or stimulus and response mechanism, and no more. Our understanding of whom and what is man has become uncertain; and as our self-consciousness became unstable our ideas of morality have been called into question. If there is no God and man is merely an animal and the Universe is but a machine then how does one know that it is wrong to kill? For an animal the Commandment: “Thou shalt not kill” has no moral force.

But even if man rejects *the divine as lawgiver* it is still possible, indeed it is necessary, to discover moral principles through the study of history. In fact the so-called *divine lawgiver* is actually a product of history. Unfortunately, due to the positivism that grew out of the Enlightenment socialists tried to situate the idea of dialectical and historical materialism as a philosophical branch of natural science when in fact it is a human science. With respect to religion: “What Enlightenment declares to be an error and a fiction is the same thing as Enlightenment itself is.” (*Phenomenology of Spirit* 549) The methodology that grew from this trend was Comte’s *sociology* (1822), and the best that could be achieved for the benefit of mankind through that methodology, was *social engineering*. Is it any wonder that Eisenstein’s *Battleship Potemkin*, with all its images

of churning maggots and ant-like images of man, has become a Trotskyite favorite, a socialist farce. But who would follow a man who derived his theory of social praxis from watching an ant farm? If there was any Bolshevik who could be said to correspond to Catiline, it would have to be Leon Trotsky on account his involvement in the murder of Maxim Gorky and his conspiracy to overthrow the Soviet Union.

Not only was man thought to be a machine, but social practice was thought to be a mere social mechanism. Hence the conflict within the academy as to whether or not the department of history ought to be included under the rubric of the *humanities* or under the rubric of the *social sciences*. This dialectical struggle is exhibited in the language of the academy as well. Should one in explaining social praxis refer to man in *society* or should one refer to mankind in its totality as *humanity*. Hence the trend in dialectical materialism diverged as either socialism understood as *atheism* or socialism understood as *secular humanism*. Socialism is really *secular humanism*, not atheism. Atheism is the language of natural science, not of humanism. Man externalizing himself, naming his collective conscience “God,” affirms that in the world of ethical social praxis affirms the principal that: “Man is the measure of all things.”

Και ὁ Πρωταγόρας δε βούλεται πάντων χρήματων εἶναι μέτρον τον ἄνθρωπον,  
των μεν ὄντων ὡς ἐστίν, των δε ουκ ὄντων ὡς ουκ ἐστίν.

And Protagoras councils himself, [i.e. professes], all things to be measured by Man; on the one hand, of being that it is, and, on the other hand, non-being that it is not. (*Outlines of Pyrrhonism* 1.216)

And Man claims that if Man claims God to have being then it must be. Of the fact that it has being there can be no question for its very being has a name and what has a name

must somehow be, but it is for us to determine what its being is and the significance of that being. But to simply deny its being is to deny one's own ability to apprehend being.

The socialist needs to understand that since the methodology of natural science does not apply to the study of history. No amount of studying Freud, Comte, or Darwin will ever produce the result sought after. For the resolution of the contradiction posed by the exploitation of man by man is by its very nature a humanistic question. Socialism must impact the social relations of the state. The methodology of natural science can only impact material production, but no amount of production will ever transform the social praxis, only ethical judgments can do that. But who ever should adopt *atheism*, as a product of scientific *naturalism*, as opposed to *humanism*, necessarily discards all moral parameters. Naturalism rejects the ethical for the ethical comes from the *humane*. By the same token those who presumed to make the "world work for everyone" through natural science have failed miserably for the question of developing any social praxis to actually do so. It is, then, not a question of merely inventing new things nor one of channeling the youth into math and science for the question of solving the world's problems can only be made by impacting the social relations which is as much an ethical problem as it is a question of who and how many should rule. Who will make ethical pronouncements that will be satisfactory to all, who will enforce them? Making science primary in education implies that the mission of education remains the process of studying the world as a collection of things. "The consciousness that observes in this way means, and indeed says, that it wants to learn, not about itself but on the contrary, about the essence of things *qua* things." (*Phenomenology of Spirit* 242) Yet without knowing itself the culture knows neither what it has done nor why it has done it. As a whole the Culture lacks the level of self-consciousness necessary at the level of the State. Education that preoccupies

itself with the mere observation of nature as the practice of science also perpetuates the production of graduates who have only been trained in the regular use of *first order thinking*, not second. “Even if Reason digs into the very entrails of things and opens every vein in them so that it may gush forth to meet itself, it will not attain this joy; it must have completed itself inwardly before it can experience the consummation of itself.” (*Ibid* 241)

The correct understanding of theology according to dialectical and historical materialism to wit is that: History is a branch of Ethics and Theology is a branch of History; both are subordinate to Logic. Since history develops, our idea of the ethical must develop and has developed. A Prophet is an individual who has summed up the ethics of his or her civilization up to that particular period of time when he or she makes their pronouncement. To return to the principal thread of my argument, the Idea of God, then, is a division of the conscious mind. Mind posits the Idea of God and proceeds to have this mental construct narrate the Law. The Absolute Ethical Principle is posited as a ‘This,’ but the ‘This’ is not God but a mediated representation of God or an ‘other than God,’ hence merely the Idea of God—an abstract universal. The conscious mind does this in order to affirm that its own idea of the ethical is not only true it is also perfect because it comes from Omniscient and Almighty God, i.e., that the ethical postulates pronounced by the Holy Prophet have absolute moral force and that it is a unitary entity hence **الله** or *al* ‘the’ + *illa* ‘God,’ or ‘The God.’ “Fear of the lord is indeed the beginning of wisdom.” (*Phenomenology of Spirit* 195) The fact that mind posits the Idea of God, however, does not prove that God does not exist, for the relation of the material world to the mind is a mediated world. And not only that, Reality is itself is marked by a dualism between



Mind and Material to ask what is beyond Representation is also to ask what is beyond Reality. But since the mind cannot experience the material world directly, but only in a mediated way, it cannot say for certain either what the material world truly *is*, where it came from, or what is beyond it if anything. The Idea of God is the idea of the ethical and the ultimate source for Law. The dialectical interplay between the Self and the Material World is the beginning of what we call Reality. The beginning Reality had two parts: the Self and the Material World. The Self and the Material World then are at the outset of life *dialectical counterparts*. The consciousness itself at the very moment it perceives the Material World immediately splits up into two parts. At the beginning of our dialectic, then, the Self is a unity counter-posed to another unity called the Material World which appears to be an other for it. In the process of perceiving the Material world the conscious mind must divide itself into two parts. This is because the Material World can only be known to the Self by means of *sense perception*. The Material World then is only perceptible to the Self for instance through touch, or through sight, or smell, or hearing—through the unity of five senses working in consort.

The sense organs themselves, however, merely transmit this information to the brain in the form of electrical impulses. The brain receiving this information must create a representation in the mind of what its sense organs have told it and cast the totality of what it has been perceived onto the ‘big screen’ of the conscious mind; but not just as a three dimensional picture of reality but as a total picture of experience which includes all of the information that the sense organs have told it through the five senses. The mind’s understanding of an event, then, only takes place inside the mind itself. The mind, or the Self, then, must split itself up into two parts: one of the parts is a *representation* of the Material World in its totality—its sights, sounds, and sensations—and the other part

called the Self. Thus the Self which was at the beginning of its emergence into the Material World was unity immediately ends up with dialectical counterpart *inside* itself and its perception of the Material World is mediated through this representation. Where at once there was the dialectical counterpart of the Material World, Reality immediately becomes *three terms* instead of only two: the Material World, the Self and the self's Representation of the Material world. This is called the *first dialectical trope of the conscious mind*. It is also called consciousness of the *first degree*.

The methodology of *empirical science* is the perception of the events of the Material World, but the perception of the events of the material world are *mediated* through the self's Representation of the Material World. The scientist, then, doesn't directly study the Material World itself but in fact studies a Representation of the Material World which exists in the mind of the scientist. The mere observation of phenomena in the material world such as measuring the speed of light or in computing the length of the hypotenuse of a triangle, *viz.*  $a^2 + b^2 = c^2$ , is an activity of consciousness in the first degree. Thus there are three phenomenological terms in consciousness of the first degree which forms up the foundation of scientific methodology—the Material World, the Representation of the Material World, and the Self. The naturalist can then begin, for instance counting and measuring things. This is *mere* consciousness, but it is not Self-Consciousness. In order to attain Self-Consciousness the Self must split itself up again into a Self and Self-Consciousness. Thus the dialectical development of Self-Consciousness has *four terms*: the Self, the Material World which is external to the Self, the material world as posited by the Self called the Representation of the Material World, and the Self-Consciousness. This is called the *second dialectical trope of the conscious mind*. It is also called consciousness of the *second degree* and is in fact *self-*

*consciousness*. Just as the Self posited the Representation of the Material World; the Self, which has become self-conscious, posits *another self* which could be called a Representation of the Self. Just as the Self posits the Representation of the Material World in order to understand the Material World by mediating it through a representation of it held in the mind, the Self posits the Representation of the Self in order to understand the Self by mediating it through a representation of itself. Once the Self has posited a Representation of the Self, it begins a dialectical interplay with itself. This is called thinking and the Self in its totality is called Mind.

The conscious activity of the first degree, the Self examining the Material World through a Representation of the Material World, is the principle activity of *natural science*. The conscious activity of the second degree, the Self examining its own itself through a Representation of the Self, is the activity of *human science*. While both of these kinds of study are called a *science* they proceed by different methodologies. Psychology as a science proceeds by means of thought of the first degree because it studies the mind by means of the methods of natural science. The psychologist studies the mind with the same methodology that a biologist studies life. "Psychology is thought of the first degree; it treats mind in just the same way in which biology treats life. It does not deal with the relation between thought and its object, it deals directly with thought as something quite separate from its object, something that simply happens in the world, as a special kind of phenomenon, one that can be discussed by itself. Philosophy is never concerned with thought by itself; it is always concerned with its relation to its object, and is therefore concerned with the object just as much as with the thought." (*The Idea of History* 2) However, when one reflects on the meaning of science and begins to frame general laws it must also climb out of the first level of thinking and into the level of the

second degree. It must go beyond mere classification and experimentation and develop, for instance, the theory of relativity. The scientist must use the methodology of *philosophy*. For the natural scientist consciousness of the first degree is primary, for the activity of the scientist primarily relates to gathering data and experimentation. Consciousness of the second degree, in relation to natural science, or the philosophy of science, is secondary. For human science, on the other hand, the roles of the orders of consciousness are reversed; second degree thought, or philosophy, is primary.

Just as the Material World upon examination splits up into a multitude of parts, a number of different sciences which study the Material world, e.g., Biology, Geology, Psychology, Astronomy, Physics, et al, come into being. Just as each of these sciences have interrelationships with each other, which correspond the multitude of real interrelations between the many parts of the material world, the individual Mind is not alone in the world but is counter-posed to a great number of other Minds, other people. These other minds have undergone the same dialectical development as the Self did, but are only known to the individual mind because they really exist in the Material World. Thus the Mind becomes conscious of other people because they exist in the Material World, but the Mind only comes into dialectical interplay with them insofar as they are mediated through the Self's Representation of the Material World. Thus each individual person has a number of self-conscious Minds interacting with it through its Representation of the Material World which has been posited in its own Mind. The Self may wish to study these other Minds as if they were the objects of natural science, but it is *compelled* to relate to them in a humanistic way. This is called *social relations*. Social relations are the way different Minds relate to one another, how people interact. The many different Minds, being self-conscious thinking beings, begin to apply a *human*

*science* to their interactions. Although a house has no choice about whether it will be ruined by a tree falling on it, for the results are governed by *natural laws*, humanity, being a collection of different Minds seeks to control the contradictions between people by creating *human law* to govern their interactions; for with consciousness comes *choice*. Human social relations are not governed by the blind determinism of the material world. Now, insofar as human beings are material products of the material world certain aspects of their lives are governed by natural laws; but insofar as human beings are Minds interacting with each other, most aspects of their lives are governed by social relations *not* by natural laws but human law which is derived from *human nature*. The study of human nature is a conscious activity of the second degree and its methodology is not the methodology of natural science, but of History which has no natural laws. Human law is derived from Ethics which is derived from History. As Collingwood asserted, Ethics are derived from the development and study of history and that as history changes our idea of ethics also changes.

Substantialism in this context does not refer a physical substance but to an object form of thought. Epistemologically speaking philosophical substantialism claims that only the unchanging is knowable. Since *times arrow* points in one direction, nothing that has ever happened can ever be repeated. Thus Santayana's proposition that "those who remain ignorant of history are doomed to repeat it" must be a fallacy. Philosophical substantialism was the chief drawback of Greco-Roman philosophy. Since what is historical is also transitory. Dialectical and historical materialism, though it has been dogmatized, is not an ideology but is a methodology for historical inquiry. "The essence of materialism does not consist in the assertion that everything is simply matter but rather

in a metaphysical determination according to which every being appears as the material of labor.” (*Basic Writings* 243)

Collingwood is correct. History is a branch of ethics and we reject the possibility of the existence of any substantive moral or substantive ethical principle then the pursuit of justice, or any ethical ideal, is an unending process of historical development. The aim of communism is *the end of the exploitation of man by man*. The socialist posits this idea as a substantive moral principle with the understanding that the social praxis of justice cannot be a static sort of thing but must continue to develop alongside the Idea of Freedom. The aim of Communism, then, is freedom. But freedom as a substantive ethical principle is impossible to define. It is something aimed at but never fully achieved except through unending process of historical development. As Friedrich Engels once remarked: “For dialectical philosophy nothing is final, absolute, sacred. It reveals the transitory character of everything and in everything; nothing can endure before it except the uninterrupted process of becoming and of passing away, of endless ascendancy from the lower to the higher.” (*Ludwig Feuerbach* 8)

The Greeks and Romans, however, had developed another system of lawgiving whereby a Lawgiver was elected. Thus they introduced a *humanistic* element to ethical theory whereas the Semitic tradition relied wholly on a divine substance which was supposed to reveal Himself through a human oracle, a Prophet. The Greeks and Romans, however, used both a human and divine source for ethical judgments. The process of recognizing the human ability to propound ethical judgments signified the process of Logic coming into play. The process of recognizing the use of logic in forming ethical judgments, however, is a process of the development of historical inquiry. Hence the first history book was indeed called ‘The Inquiry.’

At any rate, as History develops the imperfections of the ethical as posited by the conscious mind whether they be derived from a concept of the divine, or from the logic of a philosopher, begin to run up against their own limitations since the morals posited by the Prophet, or the philosopher, or a lawgiver are *substantive morals*. As substantive morals they do not change. But History and hence our idea of the ethical does change. Hence the theologian always appears to be behind the times and as time goes on he or she becomes even more so. Hence the historical development of the Prophets: Moses, Jesus, Mohammed. Attacking religion, then, is essentially attacking a person's concept of what is ethical. The proper position then of the dialectical and historical materialist is to derive ethics from the study of history, while at the same time understanding that theology is statement of just that. According to Greco-Roman historiography at least one principle must be taken as an axiom and all moral questions must be considered in the light of it. What Collingwood called *substantialism*, and noted its defects. (Cf. *The Idea of History* 42-5)

For Aristotle the *datum* from which to measure moral truth was *the good* which for man meant *happiness*. Freud reduced this concept of happiness to the experience of mere *pleasure*; hence he developed the idea of the *pleasure principle*. But the best of men would strongly disagree that happiness is the result of mere pleasure. "To judge from men's lives, the more or less reasoned conceptions of the Good or Happiness that seem to prevail are the following. On the one hand the generality of men and the most vulgar identify the Good with pleasure, and accordingly are content with the Life of Enjoyment—for there are three specially prominent Lives, the one just mentioned, the Life of Politics, and thirdly, the Life of Contemplation. The generality of mankind then

show themselves to be utterly slavish, by preferring what is only a life for cattle.”  
 (*Nicomachean Ethics* 1095b1-3)

Bertrand Russell once said: “There is much pleasure to be gained from useless knowledge.” As a member of the *realist* school of thought he held that “history, which is mind’s knowledge of itself, is ruled out as impossible” (*The Idea of History* 142) To us, History proven itself to be very useful. Indeed it is used all the time in courts of law to establish *mens rea*, or to determine *ancient claim*, but has done a great deal more that remains unrecognized. It has molded the ethical foundations of our civilization. Our understanding of what something *is* in the political world is usually based on knowing what it *was*—the philosophical principles and historical facts which make it up. What has gone before is routinely compared to what is now in all kinds of decision making processes; for it is generally held that *natural laws* do not change and, though historian makes no claim to be able to predict the future, by inference we hold that the reality tomorrow will be very much the same as the reality today. “History *must* end with the present, because nothing else has happened.” (*Ibid.* 120) But historians “should show itself to be alive, or in its thinking should grasp the living world as a system of thought.” (*Phenomenology of Spirit* 200) The historian must give content to history and bring history into relation with the living world. A principle fault of historical epistemology then is that the historical principal derived from the study of history cannot apply to the present *de facto* material reality in the same way that it applied to the historical model because the world is *flux*.

Ποταοισι τοισιν αυτοισιν εμβαινουσιν

‘ετερα και ‘ετερα ‘υδατα επιρρει

To step into same river is different,



for different waters flow. (*Heraclitus* 12)

For the post-modernists, taking happiness to mean pleasure, the source of creativity must lie in the unleashing of the libido; the unbridled gratification of desire, hence the advantage of the stronger. I say it's the opposite. But it seems rather absurd to suggest that a moral principle could be distilled from the experience of pleasure or pain; or from a record of this experience or from its opposite. Indeed Freud is hardly original here since Aristotle had already recorded and refuted the ideas of Eudoxus who "held that the goodness of pleasure was equally manifest from the converse: pain is intrinsically an object of avoidance to all, therefore its opposite must be intrinsically an object of desire to all." (*Nicomachean Ethics* 1172b)

The deconstructionists under the pretext of questioning the 'holy moral legislator' actually seek to destabilize the moral principles held by our civilization because they disagree with those principles themselves not because they seek the truth *per se*; but because they dissemble the truth. Just as Catiline posited two diametrically opposed courses of action, to go into exile or follow through with the *putsch*, his apologists simultaneously hold that he was both guilty and not guilty. The dissembler by vindicating Catiline: "In so doing it confesses that, as a matter of fact, it is in earnest with neither of them." (*Phenomenology of Spirit* 617) Just as Catiline was insincere about the two diametrically opposed courses of action that he posited, his apologists are insincere about their two alternatives, but holds out each as a simple *plan A* and a *plan B*; seeking the greatest opportunity for themselves they set each these in dialectical struggle against each other to see which one will win out; and they themselves stand ever ready to leap to the side of the victor. Who ever does this must hold the *advantage of the stronger* to be a substantive moral principle and that the "just man always has the worst of it." (*Republic*

1.343) Making their first appearance as the *skeptical consciousness* they immediately pass over to the *unhappy consciousness*, but they have yet to attain the conscious mode of Reason for they continue to study the world as if external things were the proper object of philosophy. Whoever posits a substantive moral code, be the law of Moses, the code of Hammurabi, the Constitution of the United States, the law of the Twelve Tables, or the *Plautian Law, et al*, makes this his Lord and Master and he must serve it, though it may not always serve you. “Servitude is only in relation to lordship...servitude has the lord for its essential reality; hence the *truth* for it is the independent consciousness that is *for itself*.” (*Phenomenology of Spirit* 194) It is not always wrong to question moral principles or positive law, but undermining these universal learned rational moral principles, which have made crimes like Catiline’s illegal everywhere, brings man closer to the animals; which should be associated with an increase in irrationality, uncleanliness, self-indulgence, inequality, laziness, ignorance, lawlessness, and disorder for those are the principle characteristics of the *law of the jungle* with the principle characteristics of civilization being the exact opposite.

‘ὡςπερ γαρ και τελεωθεν βελτιστον των ζωιων ‘ο ανθρωπος εστιν,

‘ουτω και χωρισθεις νομου και δικης χειριστον παντων’

For just as man is best of the animals when perfected,

he is worst when separated from all law and justice.

(*The Politics* 1.1253a1)

For who would call Cambyses happy when, aside from his other outrages, he marched against the Ethiopians, and before he had completed even 1/5th of the distance, his provisions failed “whereupon the men began to eat the sumpter beasts, which shortly failed also. If then...seeing what was happening, [he] had confessed himself in the

wrong, and led his army back, he would have done the wisest thing...but as it was, he took no manner of heed, but continued to march forwards. So long as the earth gave them anything, the soldiers sustained life by eating the grass and herbs; but when they came to bare sand, a portion of them were guilty of a horrid deed: by tens they cast lots for a man, who was slain to be the food of the others.” (*The History* 3.25) By calling this deed *horrid*, Herodotus passed a historical judgment on these deeds. Or who could fail to condemn the failed civilization of the Massagetae among whom, “human life [did] not come to the usual close...but when a man grows very old, all his kinsfolk collect together and offer him up in sacrifice...After the sacrifice they boil the flesh and feast on it; and those who thus end their days are reckoned the happiest.” (*Ibid.* 1.216)

Who among us would admire the marriage rites of the ancient Babylonians? According to Herodotus they “have one most shameful custom. Every woman born in the country must once in her life go and sit down in the precinct of Venus, and there consort with a stranger...A woman who has once taken her seat is not allowed to return home till one of the strangers throws a silver coin into her lap, and takes her with him beyond the holy ground...The silver coin may be of any size; it cannot be refused, for that is forbidden by law, since once thrown it is sacred. The woman goes with the first man who throws her money, and rejects no one...Such of the women as are tall and beautiful are soon released, but others who are ugly have to stay a long time...Some have waited three or four years in the precinct. A custom very much like this is found in certain parts of the island of Cyprus.” (*Ibid.* 1.199) Whosoever may be repulsed by these customs ought to think hard about how it is that one has come to make the moral judgments that one has made; how we as a civilization have collectively judged against these kinds of practices. Our values are shared values.

Hegel noted that the 'I' that holds *res gestae* up to the absolute moral principle, to the lantern of rational thought, taking this as a substantive, puts the substantive principle outside itself. "Consciousness itself really places the object *outside* itself as a beyond of itself. But this object with an intrinsic being of its own is equally posited as being, not free from self-consciousness, but as existing in the interest of, and by means of, it." (*Phenomenology of Spirit* 616) Thus the moral principle is actually posited by consciousness; for what is beyond it is unknowable. Mankind being endowed with speech is also endowed with reason.

Εν αρχη ην 'ο λογος και 'ο λογος ην προς τον θεον και θεος ην 'ο λογος.

(*John* 1.1)

In the beginning was Reason, and on account of God Reason was, and God was Reason.

*In principio erat Verbum et Verbum erat apud Deum et Deus erat Verbum [2] hoc erat in principio apud Deum [3] omnia per ipsum facta sunt et sine ipso factum est nihil quod factum est [4] in ipso vita erat et vita erat lux hominum [5] et lux in tenebris lucet et tenebrae eam non comprehenderunt.* (*John* 1.1-5)

In the beginning of thought there was the Word which made up speech which caused man to reason and reason led to ethics and ethics to the Ethical Idea thus the Mind possessed of Reason posited the Idea of God which was Reason.

*Dixitque Deus fiat lux et facta est lux.*

And God said: "Let there be light." And light there was. (*Genesis* 1.3)

Man through his representation, his own thought mediated through the Idea of God, using God as a mouthpiece for his own thought, spoke his first two words: 'light' and 'darkness.'

*Et vidit Deus lucem quod esset bona et divisit lucem ac tenebras.*

And God saw that light was the Good and divided Light from Darkness. (1.4)

Man having achieved *consciousness* began to name thing, to classify them, changing them from mere *picture thoughts* into fixed determinate thought objects.

*Appellavitque lucem diem et tenebras noctem factumque est vespere et mane dies unus.*

And He called the light ‘day’ and the darkness ‘night’ and indeed Evening and Morning is Day One. (1.5)

For every word there is a reason for the word, hence the word *logos* has its dual aspect by being both the appellation for the thing and the reason for that appellation. Thus ‘evening’ and ‘morning’ preceded the words ‘darkness’ and ‘light’ for they are the reasons for the words themselves. But ‘darkness’ and ‘light’ were the first words spoken which immediately led to the next word ‘day’ which immediately precipitated the words ‘evening’ and ‘morning’ which completed the dialectical development: combination, division, and recombination. But here the narrator, not being fully conscious of the meaning of this development, presents the development of consciousness as a form of *picture thought* hence it has been transmitted to us in the form of a *parable*. *Light* corresponds to several things: light as light, light as daytime, light as consciousness, light as the good, light as knowledge. *Darkness* is immediately recognized as its dialectical counterpart: darkness as darkness, darkness as evening, darkness as unconsciousness, darkness as ignorance. But although darkness preceded light it wasn’t until evening again that evening and morning could be understood as one day hence: “And there was evening and morning, one day.” Since darkness corresponded materially to ignorance, since light corresponded to consciousness, light then and shall ever more correspond to

knowledge, the good, darkness to ignorance and the bad. In ignorance all and everything to the mind of man was a unity called the Abyss, amorphous and inscrutable.

[1] *In principio creavit Deus Caelum et terram.* [2] *Terra autem erat inanis et vacua et tenebrae super faciem abyssi et spiritus Dei ferebatur super aquas.* [3] *Dixitque Deus fiat lux et facta est lux.* [4] *Et vidit Deus lucem quod esset bona et divisit lucem ac tenebras.* [5] *Appellavitque lucem diem et tenebras noctem factumque est vespere et mane dies unus.*

In the Beginning God created Earth and Sky, but Earth was Void and Vacant and Darkness was the superficial character of the Abyss and the Spirit of God was produced over the Waters. And God said: ‘Let there be Light’ and Light there was. And God saw Light because it would be *Good* and divided *Light*<sup>20</sup> from *Darkness*.<sup>21</sup> And He called Light ‘Day’ and Darkness ‘Night’ and it is a fact Evening and Morning is One Day.

*Genesis 1.3: Dixit que Deus “fiat lux et facta est lux.”* God said “Let there be Light, and Light there was.” This is the articulation in the form *essential thinking* of the development of consciousness from the state of *sense perception* and mere *picture thinking* to *mere* consciousness, a positive upward development of consciousness or the mind of man, hence *Light* signifies *knowing*, but this is a knowing which is somehow higher than *mere* perception. It is a knowing which knows that it knows. That is to say, that consciousness in Man has recognized that there is a separation between himself and his environment. From this the metaphor between light and knowledge or moreover the analogy between light and consciousness was made. This sudden *awakening* then is

---

<sup>20</sup> Lat. *lux, lucis*, f., light consciousness, knowledge.

<sup>21</sup> Lat. *tenebrae, -arum*, f. pl., darkness, night, blindness, unconsciousness, death, obscurity, ignorance.

expresses here in *Genesis* 1.3 has been expressed in its most fundamental form what came before was *darkness* followed by *light*, Man leading himself from darkness to light. Hence “The Earth was a vast waste, darkness covered the deep, and the Spirit of God hovered over the surface of the water” (*Genesis* 1.2) for in the beginning of a narrative there must be a beginning, but since before Man could relate any form of beginning *Light* qua consciousness must precede the telling of the tale. Thus *Genesis* 1.3 preceded *Genesis* 1.1-2. The statement “In the Beginning God created the Heaven and the Earth.” First Man recognized Light and then recognized what had come before Light and named that thing Darkness and forevermore, in whatever language, Light signifies an awakening, Darkness sleep. The actual development was the awareness of Light, Man becoming conscious, followed by the recognition that all was *Darkness*, i.e. ignorance, before this. The *Idea of God* was posited after this for there must have been a cause for *Light, Darkness, Earth* and the answer to this was ‘God created it.’ Thus: First there is *light*, signifying the ascension of consciousness from mere *perception*, and unconscious mechanical participation in the world, *picture thinking* and animal consciousness, to objectification of the world, i.e. the *splitting-up* of things into different parts. Hence the development: If there is an *a* there must be a *b*, and if *a* is *light* then *b* must *darkness*, and if *light* is *knowledge* and *darkness* is *ignorance* then *light* is *order* and *darkness* is formless *void* and if *light* is from *Heaven* (*caelum* = sky) then *Earth* was a “vast waste.” And “The *Spirit of God* hovered over the surface of the water.” (*Genesis* 1.2) Man in having the consciousness of an animal was a mere animal. But something was taking place in the mind of the Man. It was burgeoning, growing from unconsciousness to consciousness, from ignorance to knowledge, from darkness to light. Thus the metaphor was posited in its essential form as *water* an undifferentiated formless mass and God,

*Reason*, “hovered over the surface of the *Water*.” Thus consciousness was a mere potentiality and the metaphor “hovering over the surface of the *Water*” signified an intermediary state. And so, while the narrative itself has been written:

- I. God Created the Heavens and the Earth.
- II. The Earth was Void and without Form and God hovered over the face of the *Water*.
- III. And God said: “Let there be *Light*” and *Light* there was.
- IV. And God saw that *Light* was *Good* and separated *Light* from *Darkness*, *Good* from *Bad*, *Reason* from *Ignorance*.
- V. And He named *Light* *Day* and *Darkness* *Night*. *Day One*. First Dialectical Trope of the Conscious Mind.

This was not the development of the human consciousness, but the reverse order of that development. Now if we understand the name ‘God’ to be a metonymy for ‘Reason’ then we see that Reason hovered over the formless void of *Water*. *Water* in this context then is the unformed consciousness, an indeterminate Being. *Water* then corresponds to the indeterminate metaphysical substance *Mind*, while *Earth* corresponds to the indeterminate physical substance *Matter*. Thus the first *substantive dualism* of Reality was demarcated as a consequence of the burgeoning of human consciousness. *Matter* was a vast waste and *Mind* was a darkened Abyss and Reason first recognized *light* and formulated *his* first moral judgment expressed in its essential form: “*et vidit lucm quodts esset bona.*” Whereupon, the consciousness of Man turned completely around on itself immediately recognized what had gone before which was darkness: “and He separated light from darkness.” That is to say Man recognized the substantive dualism of reality itself and named: “the light day and the darkness night.” By way of stipulative definition the first *dialectical development* occurred according to the schemata: combination,



division, and recombination, the first combination was the void and vacant *Abyss* which was divided into (a) Light and Darkness, (b) consciousness and unconsciousness, (c) knowledge and ignorance, which was recombined as Day One, or the completion of the first dialectical trope of the conscious mind. From the first development, Man achieved mere consciousness, or consciousness of the first degree, an everlasting division between dialectical counterparts. By way of comparison, *John* 1.1-5:

[1] *In principio erat Verbum et Verbum erat apud Deum et Deus erat Verbum.*

[2] *Hoc erat in principio apud Deum* [3] *omnia per ipsum facta sunt.* [4] *In ipso vita erat et vita erat lux hominum* [5] *et lux in tenebris lucet et tenebrae eam non comprehenderunt.*

In the Beginning the Word was and the Word was with God and God was the Word. This Thing was in the Beginning with God, all Things through this Thing itself are made. In this Thing itself was Life and Life was Light to Man and Light shined in the Darkness and Darkness overcame it.

Or, “In the beginning was the power of Speech and the power of Speech was next to Reason and Reason was the power of Speech. This power, in the beginning was with Reason and through this power all things are Named. In this power was Power itself and the Power itself was Light to Man and Light shined in the Darkness and the Darkness never returned to Man.”

[6] *Dixit quoque Deus fiat firmamentum in medio aquarum et dividat aquas ab aquis.* [7] *Et fecit Deus firmamentum divisitque aquas quae erant sub firmamento ab his quae erant super firmamentum et factum est ita.* [8] *Vocavitque Deus firmamentum caelum et factum est vespere et mane dies secundus.*

And God said: “Let there be a Solid Thing<sup>22</sup> in the middle of the Waters and would let Waters be divided from Waters.” And God made a firm Division and divided the Waters which were the under the Manifest Boundary from those that were above the Clear Division, and in this way it is done. And God called the Manifest Certainty ‘Heaven’<sup>23</sup> and in this way it is done, and with Light and Darkness the Second Day.

The traditional translation of this is that God made a ‘firmament’ to separate the ‘waters above from the waters below.’ But the traditional translation of these verses is nonsensical unless we understand what is meant by the words ‘Firmament’ and ‘Waters.’ For instance imagine a flat plane of fluid substance. This flat plane is the unformed consciousness. Then imagine something being thrown upward from this, light, and at the same time something precipitating beneath it, earth. This is a metaphorical way of envisioning and communicating the dawn of consciousness.

The ostensible meaning of these verses is a description of the creation of Sky and Earth and the separation of water from solid ground, but presuming that the world as we know it existed prior to Man’s consciousness of its existence and that these actually describe the development of Man’s recognition of these extant things, then God is Reason, Light is Pure Spirit or *pure negativity*, Water is the indeterminate positive content. Light as the pure negative of rational thought is the prime mover. Reality then began as an indeterminate positive content. It is represented here as a void vacant Abyss because it was heretofore undefined, indeterminate. Once the Light of rational inquiry, Pure Spirit, impinged on the indeterminate, it split up into two parts, Light and Darkness

---

<sup>22</sup> Lat. *firmamentum*, -i, n., prop, support; main point, mainstay; firmament = ‘certainty,’ ‘firm division,’ ‘clear division,’ ‘manifest boundary,’ ‘manifest certainty;’ *firmus*, -a, -um, firm, strong, true, stable + *mens*, *mentis*, mind, intellect, reason; thus ‘the true reason,’ or *etymology*.

<sup>23</sup> I.e. ‘Sky.’

with each of these words signifying several things, and a firm division, a firmament, between these two ideas was posited and they became dialectical counterparts to one another. After that Reason divided the two indeterminate metaphysical substances into Heaven, which is Mind and the metaphysical, and Dry Land, which is the Material and the physical. Thus the term Abyss, as it is used in *Genesis* 1.1, means Pure Being and Waters signifies metaphysical emanations of Pure Being which have become fluid in the process of dividing itself into two things hence they ‘gather together’ and transition from indeterminate Being to determinate *beings*. Thus the Waters are the *middle term* in the dialectical development of Man’s representation of Reality. Thus “In the Beginning of Reality there was a indeterminate Being and Reason divided this being into Mind and Material, conscious and unconsciousness, determinate from indeterminate, knowledge from ignorance, Light from Darkness, and Heaven from Earth. And in the end of the second dialectical trope of the development of the conscious mind, Reason made this a firm division in the mind of Man. In the beginning of the third trope, as ‘dryness’ or colloquially ‘dry land’ appears, so too does water itself become permanently associated with the indeterminate middle term between Sky and Earth, the indeterminate from the determinate, the mind from the material, etc.

[9] *Dixit vero Deus congregationesque aquae quae sub caelo sunt in locum unum et appareat arida factumque est ita.* [10] *Et vocavit Deus aridam terram congregationesque aquarum appellavit maria et vidit Deus quod esset bonum* [11] *et ait germinet terra herbam virentem et facientem semen et lignum pomiferum faciens fructum iuxta genus suum cuius semen in semet ipso sit super terram et factum est ita* [12] *et protulit terra herbam virentem et adferentem semen iuxta genus suum lignumque* [lignum, n. nom/acc. sing. gathered wood, firewood]

*faciens fructum et habens unumquodque sementem secundum speciem suam et vidit Deus quod esset bonum [13] factumque est vespere et mane dies tertius.*

God spoke truly and gathered the Waters which were under Heaven in one place and let Dryness appear, and in this way it is done. And God called the Dryness Earth and the Collected Things of the Winds he named the Seas and God saw the fact that it would be Good. And He said: “Let the Earth grow a green plant

[14] *Dixit autem Deus fiant luminaria in firmamento caeli ut dividant diem ac noctem et sint in signa et tempora et dies et annos [15] ut luceant in firmamento cali et inluminent terram et factum est ita [16] Fecitque Deus duo magna luminaria luminare maius ut praeesset diei et luminare minus ut praeesset nocti et stellas [17] et possuit eas in firmamento caeli ut lucerent super terram [18] et praeessent diei ac nocti et dividerent lucem ac tenebras et vidit Deus quod esset bonum [19] Et factum est vespere et mane dies quartus.*

And where as *all Things thargument um Thing itself are made*, i.e. *The Word*, Adam, Man, began to name the things and, by means of *stipulative definition*, each thing came to be and was and indeed is, or rather *is* to the mind of Man for it has become a *fixed determinate thought object*, no longer the undifferentiated thing of the undifferentiated amorphous mass which is mere potentiality. The Abyss is the indeterminate, the undefined, the thing where from all things come, the thing from which all things are made and indeed those things are themselves made for it is through the process of designation and definition that one thing is known from another and therefore indeed is for it has become known to Man and does so through the Word for the .

*Enim quod vocavit Adam animae viventis ipsum est nomen eius appellavitque.*

Indeed, the name by which Man invoked the living beings is itself of it and applied to it. (*Ibid.* 2.19)

And man found himself confronted with object thought forms which had *being-in-themselves* in diametrical opposition to man himself. In recognizing the *other-than-self*, man created the Notion of himself. Thus man's Reason was reflected back into itself as the ethical which Man in turn placed outside Himself.

*Et ait faciamus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram et praesit piscibus maris et volatilibus caeli et bestiis universaeque terrae omnique reptili quod movetur in terra et creavit Deus hominem ad imaginem suam ad imaginem Dei creavit illum masculum et feminam creavit eos.*

And He affirmed: "Let us make Mankind by Our image and likeness and let him rule over the fish of the sea and the birds of the sky and the beasts and over the whole Earth and every reptile which moves on the Earth and God created Man in His own image by the image of God He created him; male and female He created them. (*Genesis* 1.26-27)

Thus Man created the Idea of God in the image of his own self and in the likeness of himself in order to examine himself and know himself and come to an Understanding with Himself. "It is thus in truth the Self; and Spirit therefore passes on to know itself in the form of self." (*Phenomenology of Spirit* 688)

*Ut in ipsa creatae mentis divinitate, ceu speculo rerum omnium medio, creatoris ipsius tum operis speculemur, tum mentem contemplemur atque colamus.*

"That in the divinity of the created mind, as in a mirror at the center of things, we should first observe the works of the Creator, and then contemplate and worship the mind of the Creator." (*Platonic Theology, Proem* 3)

The wisest and most virtuous men came and narrated the Law which became the ethical substance of Civilization. And those men were called a Prophets.

*Multifariam et multis modis olim Deus loquens patribus in prophetis (Hebrews 1.1)*

After this he externalized the source of his judgments about, and representations of, Reality as an image which He called that image 'God.' Subconsciously Man knows that He is the source of the divine. Thus the more a man gets into religion the more God looks like himself, because God is himself just as every thought form is both by, with, and from, himself and also to and for himself as Langston Hughes showed in his *Black Nativity* (1961).

There's Fire in the East,  
 There's Fire in the West,  
 There's fire among the Methodists.  
 Satan's mad and I'm so glad  
 He missed the soul he thought he had  
 This year of Jubilee  
 The Lord has come to set us free. (Act 1)

"The self that is *thought of* is not the *actual* self...For what is *thought of*, ceases to be something [merely] thought of, something alien to the self's knowledge, only when the self has produced it, and therefore beholds the determination of the object as its *own*, consequently beholds *itself* in its object." (*Phenomenology of Spirit* 684) And man saw that this was good and upon gazing upon his own thought and in examining it he said: *Cogito ergo sum et homo neque animal sed homo.* And God is with man because God is

Man as the image of man. Through the practice of the Law man seeks to become virtue and maintain virtue, but it is something to which man approaches but never achieves.

Since the absolute moral substance must be complete in order to establish an absolute moral principle, and is in actuality incomplete because the consciousness which posited it is incomplete—i.e., unable to know the mind of God or to understand that which is beyond itself; what is posited as pure morality is in fact incomplete and therefore *immoral* since true morality must be perfect. Just as history develops by increments, man's idea of morality and his collection of *bone fide* moral principles must develop by increments as well. Collingwood must have been right when he said: "The right way of investigating the mind is by the methods of history...the work which was to be done by the science of human nature is actually done, and can only be done, but history." (*The Idea of History* 209)

That brings us to the question of why ancient history and the Greek and Roman classics as a source for history should be the first substance of higher education. The analogy that the development of history from the classical authors to the present time, as an analog for the riddle of the Sphinx; that it represents the 'three stages of a man's life,' i.e., that he walks on all fours on the morning, two in the afternoon and three in the evening—would be wrong for there is nothing childlike in these texts. We are too often surprised both at their insights and their discourse, but the most striking thing is their resemblance to ourselves. Placing them outside us as an object of study is only possible because they *are* us. "The self is really the object of the self, or the object only has truth so far as it has the form of the self." (*Phenomenology of Spirit* 529) In studying them we study our own selves, but as a past underdeveloped self. In fact the Greeks give us *grammar, syntax* and *elocution*, the Romans dignity, refinement and *res publica*. The

democracy we understand as democracy does not come from the Greek experience, but from the Roman experience of it. If we wish to understand our republic we must first understand theirs. In contemporary higher education, the student first has their mind structured by Plato and then restructured by Aristotle, if they get that far. It must be restructured again by Hegel and Marx. “If all modern treatment of the history of philosophy goes back to Hegel as the great modern master of the subject, all modern treatment of economic history goes back in the same sense to Marx.” (*The Idea of History* 126)

The genealogy of contemporary thought presumes: if there was no Plato there would have been no Aristotle: no Aristotle, no Hegel: no Hegel, no Marx. All this is of course passed through a great lens of history, philosophy and culture. After Marx there is a dearth of philosophical greatness until Collingwood raised the study of history from a mere backwater of a social science to the philosophy, the *logic*, of *human nature* but not merely human nature as it is in the individual but of human thought becoming *universal judgments* concerning human social relations. But the Romans somehow get left out, and this is not without reason. There is a gaping hole in the study of the classics at the university level where Roman civilization ought to be which must somehow be explained. The Romans didn't get included in the study of the classics by accident and they haven't recently been left out of that study by accident either.

Too often the Greeks and the Romans are presented to students as somehow being competition with one other; the Greeks are presented as the *original*, the Romans as the *counterfeit* and not without reason, but the true reason for the nuance of combativeness between the two cultures has been misunderstood. Thucydides in his opening remarks regarding the outbreak of the *Peloponnesian War* incorrectly noted: “Indeed this was the



greatest movement yet known in history.” There was one war which had already taken place which was greater; if not in extent, then in importance—the *Trojan War*. The calamity of the *Trojan War* was known far and wide.

*Quicumque regno fidit et magna potens  
dominatur aula nec leues metuit deos  
animumque rebus credulum laetis dedit  
me uideat et te, Troia: non umquam tulit  
documenta fors maiora, quam fragili loco  
starent superbi. Columen euersum occidit  
pollentis Asiae, caelitum egreguis labor.*

Whosoever relies upon being king, and in great power

Lords himself in royal court, and fears not the gods

And happily gives his soul to doubtful things,

Let him, I and thou, O Troy, behold.

For never has Fortune shown such great proof

What fragile place the most high stand.

Sweeping away that which rose above,

It destroyed the power of Asia, a work of heaven. (*Troades* 1-7)

According to the *Aeneid* the events of the *Trojan War* were recorded in pictographs on the walls of Carthage even before Aeneas arrived there.

*Namque sub ingenti lustrat dum singula templo,  
reginam opperiens, dum, quae fortuna sit urbi,  
artificumque manus inter se operumque laborem  
miratur, videt Iliacas ex ordine pugnans,*

*bellaque iam fama totum volgata per orbem,  
 Atridas, Priamumque, et saevum ambobus Achillem.  
 Constitit, et lacrimans, "Quis iam locus" inquit "Achate,  
 quae regio in terris nostri non plena laboris?  
 En Priamus! Sunt hic etiam sua praemia laudi;  
 sunt lacrimae rerum et mentem mortalia tangunt.  
 Solve metus; feret haec aliquam tibi fama salutem." (Aeneid 454-464)*

The "New Troy" at the Tiber was but a twinkle in his eye; and Rome itself had not yet even been conceived. The Greeks had their say about the war through the epics of Homer. The *Aeneid* was the belated Roman answer to that, but that answer was there in Roman culture before Virgil wrote of it. It was recorded by Livy and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *inter alios*.

*Fuimus Troes, fuit Ilium et ingens  
 gloria Teucorum.*

We Trojans have been, Ilium and

The glory of the Teucrians, was. (*Aeneid* 2.325)

The Romans are in part the descendents of the Trojans who fled *Ilium* after the sack of Troy. At the time of Homer there were no Greeks or Romans *pre se*. It was long after the fall of Troy that the Greeks became Greeks and the Romans became Romans. Indeed Homer never used the word 'Greeks.' "He does not even use the term barbarian, probably because the Hellenes had not yet been marked off from the rest of the world by one distinctive appellation." (*The Peloponnesian War* 1.3.3-4)

Their national identities emerged synchronously. Thus the Greeks and the Romans to each other could be understood as same cultural *ordo*; while the Greeks to

themselves were of the same *familia*; designated by Homer as under the *tribus*: Achaeans, Argives, and Danaans; not Hellenes. The name these people took for themselves was the name of Ἑλλην, *Hellen*, son of Deucalion king of Thessaly, the name we give to them, however, is from the Latin word *Graeci*. “The Greek language is the language spoken by the Greek race which, from a long period before Homer, has occupied the lower part of the Balkan peninsula, the islands of the Aegean Sea, the coasts of Asia Minor, and, later certain districts in Southern Italy, Sicily, Gaul, and Northern Africa. After the Homeric period the people of this race called themselves by the Name Hellenes, and their language Hellenic. We call them Greeks, from the Roman name *Graeci*. Although conscious of possessing the same speech and the same religion, the Greeks were not politically united. In the Homeric poems (before 900 B.C.) there is no common name to denote the entire race. The Homeric Hellenes were a small tribe in southern Thessaly, of which Achilles was king; and the Greeks in general were called by Homer Achaeans, Argives, or Danaans. Later, Greek literature recognized three important divisions...Aeolic, Doric, and Ionic.” (Goodwin and Gulick 1) The Greeks and the Romans were different from but analogous to one another. Their cultural destinies were tied together by what they understood as Fate; what we call *cultural analogues*, bound by time, language, culture and geography. Both were also related to the Pelasgi. Having very ancient cultural ties to one another--both through their mutual relations with the *sea peoples* and through the Indo-European tongue, all of which preceded the *Trojan War*—the Romans had a filial admiration for the Greeks which was qualified by a duality because of the atrocity of the *Trojan War*, this admiration was layered with anger and contempt. While the Romans studied the Greek philosophers, they enslaved the Greek people.

*Verum tamen hoc dico de toto genere Graecorum: tribuo illis litteras, do multarum artium disciplinam, non adimo sermonis leporem, ingeniorum acumen, dicendi copiam, denique etiam, si qua sibi alia sumunt, non repugno; testimoniorum religionem et fidem numquam ista natio coluit, totiusque huiusce rei quae sit vis, quae auctoritas, quod pondus, ignorant.*

Truly, this I say about the whole of the Greek race: I grant them literature, I give them the knowledge of many practical skills, I do not deny them charming discourse, sharpness of mind, abundance of speeches; and finally, I do not oppose the other things which they claim for themselves; but that nation never cultivated a sense of right and truth for testimony, and they are totally ignorant of this thing which may be a strength, which may be powerful, because of its weight. (*Pro Flacco* 9)

Those who choose sides between the Greeks and the Romans within the Classics Department live out this struggle vicariously through their students; each pedagogue tries to pull the student to their side, but to claim that the Romans were mere counterfeits of the Greeks is both dishonest and mean.

*Sed profecto fortuna in omni re dominatur; ea res cunctas ex lubidine magis quam ex vero celebrat obscuratque. Atheniensium res gestae, sicuti ego aestumo, satis amplae magnificaeque fuere, verum aliquanto minores tamen quam fama feruntur. Sed quia provenere ibi scriptorum magna ingenia, per terrarum orbem Atheniensium facta pro maxumis celebrantur. Ita eorum qui ea fecere virtus tanta habetur, quantum ea verbis potuere extollere praeclara ingenia. At populo Romano numquam ea copia fuit, quia prudentissimus quisque maxume negotiosus*

*erat; ingenium nemo sine corpore exercebat; optumus quisque facere quam dicere, sua ab aliis benefacta laudari quam ipse aliorum narrare malebat.*

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

*(Bellum Catilinae 8.1-5)*

Thus it was not that the Greeks were intrinsically good, but that the writers, their thinkers, were superb. The golden age of Greek literature, it's true, chronologically preceded the golden age of Roman literature, but philosophy came from *Miletus*, in Asia Minor, not from Athens. "The Athenians originally had a royal government. It was when Ion came to dwell with them that they were first called Ionians." (*The Athenian Constitution* Fr. 1)

In the last analysis then the study of the classics is not a contest between Greeks and Romans. As students of western civilization, we must have both the Greeks and the Romans: first for their linguistic structure which has ordered our minds on the most fundamental level, next for their philosophy which gave us the mental tools to examine

our own thought and finally for their historiography which taught us to discourse on thought and experience in a socially meaningful way.

The Greeks gave us the *rustic*, the Romans the *urbane*. Of course there is much more to both of these than this since the Romans are famous for their *georgics* and the Greeks for their *polis*. The Greeks perhaps prefigured everything Roman but it all remained underdeveloped. Even the Greek *language* is rough around the edges. Perhaps the difference is better stated thus: the Romans were *pastoral* the Greeks were *bucolic*. Greek words were first translated into Latin before they were transmitted to us in English. Heidegger said that the translation of the Greek words into Latin estranged Western thought from its essence. “The process begins with the appropriation of Greek words by Roman-Latin thought. *Hypokeimenon* becomes *subiectum*; *hypostasis* becomes *substantia*; *symbebêkos* becomes *accidens*. However, this translation of Greek names into Latin is in no way the innocent process it is considered to this day. Beneath the seemingly literal and faithful translation there is concealed, rather, a *translation* of Greek experience into a different way of thinking. *Roman thought takes over the Greek words without a corresponding, equally original experience of what they say, without the Greek word*. The rootlessness of Western thought begins with this translation.” (*Basic Writings* 149) Thus *both* idioms are needed for without knowledge of the Greek, on the one hand, the student is estranged from essential thought but with out the Latin, on the other hand, the student is estranged from *Western thought*; rootless as it is. But, Latin thought, however, is not the mere counterfeit, or an inauthentic representation, of essential Greek thinking because the Destiny [Μοίρα] of these two civilizations was bound together in an earlier period. For the Greek and Latin civilizations differed not in essential thinking, but in *modes of thought* for the wellspring of Greek philosophy was *Ionian* whereas the well

spring of Latin philosophy was *Italiote* personified by Anaximander and Pythagoras respectively the former scientific, the latter mystical. Hence the development of these two branches of western ethics. (*From Religion to Philosophy* v-vi) The repetitive motif of the Shepherd, Νομης, shows this in an elemental way, for to the reasoning mind of the Greeks the Νομης is the *Lawgiver*, Νομοθετες, Solon, but in the *Romanization* of this idea is nuanced as the divine, hence a priest in the Latin religion is called *Pastor* which means Shepherd. Though all shepherds have not been good, nor has every lawgiver. The repetition of the motif in western culture suggest, however, if they were not always good they were at least always necessary. Hegel reference to the founders of Rome as “predatory shepherds” wildly misses the mark. (*Philosophy of History* 287) Here he clashes unhappily with Sallust’s narration: “How easily they united...within the same walls, is unheard of in all memory.” Though Plato indeed has it that shepherds only fatten their sheep while looking forward to the slaughter and Polyphemus was a notoriously savage *lawgiver*.

“εἴ νηθεν δὲ προτέρω πλέομεν ἅ καχήμενοι ἡτορ:  
Κυκλώπων δ' ἔσγαι ἄνυ περφιάλων ἅ θεμίστων  
ἱ κόμεθ', οἱ ἴρ ἅ θεοῖσι πεποιθότες ἅ θανάτοισιν  
οὐ ἔτε φυτεύουσιν χερσὶν φυτὸν οὐ ἔτ' ἅ ρόωσιν,  
ἅ λλά τὰ γ' ἅ ἴσπαρτα καὶ ἅ νήροτα πάντα φύονται,  
πυροὶ καὶ κριθαὶ ἡ δ' ἅ ἴμπελοι, αἱ ἔτε φέρουσιν  
οἱ ἴνον εἰριστάφυλον, καὶ σφιν Διὸς ὄμβρος ἅ ἔξει.  
τοῖσιν δ' οὐ ἔτ' ἅ γοραὶ βουληφόροι οὐ ἔτε θέμιστες,  
ἅ λλ' οἱ ἴγ' ἅ ψηλω ἴνορέων ναίουσι κάρηνα

εὐσπέεσσι γλαφυροὶ σι, θεμιστεύει δὲ εἰκάστος  
παίδων ἠ δ' ἀλόχων, οὐ δ' ἀλλήλων ἀλέγουσιν.

“Thence we sailed on, grieved at heart, and we came to the land of the Cyclopes, an overweening and lawless folk, who, trusting in the immortal gods, plant nothing with their hands nor plough; but all these things spring up for them without sowing or plowing, wheat, and barley, and vines, which bear the rich clusters of wine, and the rain of Zeus gives them increase. Neither assemblies for council have they, nor appointed laws, but they dwell on the peaks of lofty mountains in hollow caves, and each one is lawgiver to his children and his wives, and they reckon nothing of another.” (*Odyssey* 9.105-115)

Thus one could conclude that with respect to the question of the lawgiver, it is not the office but the moral purpose of the office holder that one should question.

Hegel said that the Roman civilization was marked by its dualism. “The city of Rome had besides its proper name another secret one, known only to a few. It is believed by some to have been *Valentia*, the Latin translation of *Roma*; others think it was *Amor* (*Roma* read backwards). Romulus, the founder of the state, had also another sacred name—*Quirinus*—by which title he was worshiped: the Romans too were also called *Quiritres*.” (*Philosophy of History* 290) According to Varro, “The Quirites were named from the Cureses ‘men of Cures.’” But the Greeks also had a similar dualistic sort of naming as Plato recorded in his *Cratylus*. On account of the fact that the Romans had this, however, Hegel said that “the Romans, on the contrary, remained satisfied with a dull, stupid subjectivity.” (*Ibid*) On account of the fact that Hegel said this, I say Hegel is dull, stupid and subjective. The whole study of the classics is tainted with this kind of dull, stupid and subjective prejudice. What the students of Greece and Rome need to see



however is not this prejudice, or even the dualism, but the dynamic and dialectical interplay between these two civilizations that was the motive force behind the historical development of the western world; western civilization unfolding itself in a spiral.

For the contemporary academy the dualism between Greek and Roman culture is taken as a substantive dualism, not a dialectical one. Marx and Hegel moved the study of history beyond the substantive dual and gave it *flux* through dialectics. At best Greece is perceived within the classics department as a unitary entity which somehow gives birth to Rome through a form of cultural mitosis. But Greece was not a unitary cultural entity at the time Rome was born. Since the Roman Republic was established in 510 B.C. and the advent of democracy in Athens was in 505 B.C. it might be suggested that the Greeks acquired the democratic spirit from the Romans. But, it is at any rate a *fallacy of sources* to suppose that because two nations have a similar idea or institution that one must have learnt it from the other. (*The Idea of History* 69) Even if one considers the Greeks to prefigure everything Roman, it is important to understand the dialectical interplay between these two civilizations over the course of time and that one of these nations cannot be the substantive origin of the other. Each of these, Greece and Rome, existed by and for its own self. Each one gained certainty of itself by first positing and then observing the other; first by recognizing the other as objective and later realizing that what it was observing was its own self; the subject and object through dialectical development change places with each become the others opposite. Hence, Rome could not have dull stupid subjectivity unless Greece also had it. "The movement is the twofold process and the genesis of the whole, in such wise that each side simultaneously posits the other, and each therefore has both perspectives within itself; together they thus

constitute the whole by dissolving themselves, and by making themselves into its moments.” (*Phenomenology of Spirit* 42)

In many ways the Greeks and the Romans were actually the same people; in many other ways they are diametrical opposites. In the end at any rate it is not what Greece or Rome was in a positivistic sense that out to interest us, but what we believe about them that we ought to find interesting and is the proper object for historical examination. Thus the classics department is in itself an underdeveloped treatment of the Greco-Roman tradition because it studies the *classics* for its own sake and not for what can come from it. One who would pursue a particular study of history, for example the classics, for its own sake is not a historian, but really only an antiquarian who gazes in fascination at the variegated scenes of his own imagination. To him a historical fact, or even a narrative, is a mere curio; a collectible thing gathering dust on the shelf of memory and which was originally hoarded away of a perceived intrinsic value that it may one day have. But the antiquarian is as far from realizing the value of his thought objects as he ever was, perhaps even further away from it than he has ever been. “The past cut off from the present, converted into a mere spectacle, can have no value at all.” (*The Idea of History* 170) Since the study of the classics through the classics department draws no correspondences between the object of study, the thought of the ancients and its relation to the contemporary world, the study of the classics as classics is merely taking pleasure in the knowledge of useless facts. The whole department is inebriated with a pathological eroticism. Hence the latest trend there is to interpret every text as a justification for repressed sexual predilections. The classics however are the proper objects of study for the *historian*, not the *classicist*, because classics only find their proper use in so far as they give us knowledge about ourselves.

The current trend is to pigeon-hole the Classics Department in a backwater of the department of foreign languages and literatures. This treatment of the topic supposes that the classics are best understood as a symbolic system. Whatever math is to say physics, Greek and Latin is to the classics. But a foreign language isn't even a *bone fide* department, or a study, through itself, but is an ancillary to a study. The Greek and Latin languages are only instruments, tools, for a study which is necessarily a historical study which is a branch of philosophy called ethics. The classics department is, then, a sub-branch of History which is a branch of Ethics which is a branch of Logic which itself breaks down into *humanism* and *naturalism* with mathematics being the symbolic system ancillary to naturalism, or natural science. There are two fundamental phenomenological *worlds*, the world of the *mind*, which is human world, and the world of *material*, which is the natural world. Thus reality at the outset is marked by a subjective dualism. "Unity is plural and, at minimum, is two." (*Synergetics* 905.11) These two worlds are not completely separate, but maintain a constant and complicated interaction, but the material world is, nonetheless, mediated through the mind. Man has dominion over the material, since all ethical judgments over the material world are formed by him. Ethical judgments as applied by man to the material world are different than those applied to the human world, for man has primacy, or dominion, over the Earth. Thus Ethics is a branch of Logic, History is a branch of Ethics, and the Classics are a branch of History. According to Aristotle, Politics is a branch of Ethics. If this is true then Politics is the study of human social praxis, or ethics in action. The purpose of the study of the classics, then, is to understand how the ethical judgments of western civilization have been made and to make these and object for a critique.

In the process of objectifying and critiquing the Greek and Latin library, the student develops a critique of themselves hence hence western civilization. This is decidedly different than the pure eroticism that dominates the study today, for as the study of ethics the classics are subordinate to logic whereas eroticism is a mere opiate of the masses. Without calling itself this, the study the classics under the current system turns itself into the process of acquiring simple pleasure. Whatever is understood as the ‘foundations of western society’ is a mere feeling, a notion, but not an object form of thought. The study of the classics raises many uncomfortable issues and the powers that be may not wish to grapple with those issues but at the same time obliged as it were to introduce them in a limited way, but not to draw the thought of the ancients into relation with any particular contemporary social praxis and not to pass judgment on that. The study of history then is the acquisition of self-knowledge of our ethical past. This self-knowledge in enabling us to understand our present situation to the greatest possible degree serves as our *oracle* in helping us determine how we should act in any given circumstance. “For a man about to act, the situation is his master, his oracle, his god. Whether his action is to prove successful or not depends on whether he grasps the situation rightly or not. If he is a wise man, it is not until he has consulted his oracle, done everything in his power to find out what the situation is, that he will make even the most trivial plan. And if he neglects the situation, the situation will not neglect him. It is not one of those gods that leave an insult unpunished.” (*The Idea of History* 316)

Thus the study of Greece cannot be separated from the study of Rome because it is not merely an essential link in the chain of history that leads us to the present. Just as the historical thought of the Greece and Rome of classical antiquity had a dialectical interplay, with each understanding itself by understanding the other, contemporary

historians have a dialectical interplay with *the classics* themselves, or classical antiquity as a whole, for by studying them we study ourselves because we come from there. As a thinking being the contemporary historian by means of studying antiquity sees his own self for we *are* them. “The peculiarity of an historical or spiritual process is that since the mind is that which knows itself, the historical process which is the life of the mind is a self-knowing process which understands itself, values itself, and so forth.” (*The Idea of History* 175)

Though displaced from them by time, our thought comes from them. We are different from but analogous to them. By studying Greek and Roman thought our thought becomes an object for us, or, rather, we become an object for ourselves. Just as the Greeks and Romans passed logical ethical judgments, developed their own idea of the ethical, on civilizations before theirs and on each other, we have passed judgment on them. But more importantly, it is through the study of the Roman Empire that we obtain the best explanation the contemporary state of the world and America’s hegemony over it; for the Roman Empire is the historical analogue of contemporary America.

Ψευσομαι η ετυμον ερεω; κελεται δε με θυμος.

Shall I dissemble or speak the truth? But my soul urges me, speak.

(*Odyssey* 4.140)

And for this reason, the study of Rome in America is suppressed. The powers that be seek neither to know themselves, nor an academic movement of self-knowing to develop. Or when this self-knowing is allowed it is a somehow preconditioned knowing, a kind of knowing which is intended to impart certain beliefs, determinate thought forms, and not others. For if the historical judgments against the Roman Empire were drawn into

relation to contemporary America certain contemporary historical developments would likely be condemned as they once were.

*Aufferre trucidare rapere falsis nominibus imperium, atque ubi solitudinem faciunt, pacem appellant.*

To rape, to pillage, to slaughter are falsely called ‘government,’ where they make desolation, they declare peace. (*Agricola* 30.6)

For indeed in America today even poverty is seen as a disgrace; the poor are the disgraceful.

Πρὸς γὰρ Διὸς εἰσὶν ἅπαντες

Ἐεὶ νοί τε πτωχοί τε, δόσις δ' ὀλίγη τε φίλη τε.

Ἀλλὰ δότ', ἀμφίπολοι, ξείνω βρωσὶν τε πόσιν τε,

Λούσατέ τ' ἐν ποταμῷ, ὅθ' ἐπίσκεπας ἔσται νέμοιο.

For from God are all strangers and beggars,

And a gift though small is welcome.

And always give, maidens, the stranger meat and drink,

Wash him in the river,

Shelter him from the wind. (*The Odyssey* 6.207-10)

Riches have become honors and in and of themselves a glory to he who has them, virtue has become blunt, poverty is held shameful, innocence is taken for malevolence, and smart people are called stupid.

*Hospitalitatem nolite oblivisci per hanc enim latuerunt quidam angelis hospitio receptis.*

Don't forget hospitality; for through this some unknowingly with a hospitable thing receive angels. (*Hebrews* 13.2)

The so-called ‘non-western’ movement within academia is both *not* truly non-western, because it studies social objects, civilizations, already tainted by contact with western civilization and they themselves are studied through the western historical lens historical thought prefigured by judgments on Greece and Rome. Who ever posits the non-western attempts to find a new basis for this civilization, but they cannot since in articulating the virtues if the so-called non-western they must themselves adopt western historical methods. History itself is western. Whoever embarks upon an historical inquiry, ἱστορία, embarks upon the path of western thought. The process of situating the non-western within the western canon must also be the process of vindicating the *prehistoric*; and in many cases the vindication of the *preliterate*. The whole idea of the non-western academy would be barbaric, βαρβαρος, if it were not already impossible, because western historical thought has already universalized itself. βαρβαρος *means* ‘foreign’ hence the ‘non-western’ is foreign. But it also means *barbaric*, for the ethics of the foreign, which first clashed with the Greek idea of the ethical, now it clashes with our own. “Among the barbarians, however, (contrary to the order of nature), the female and the slave occupy the same position—the reason being that no naturally ruling element exists among them, and conjugal union thus comes to be a union of a female who is a slave with a male who is also a slave.” (*The Politics* 1.1252b) It is often supposed that in Homer’s time the word ‘barbarian’ meant a man of “rough of speech,” on account of his use of the word βαρβαροφωνων (*Iliad* 2.867). The idea that barbarian meant, or came to mean, foreigner was taken from the context of *that* usage of the word. But in light of that word’s connection to speech and reason’s connection to speech the term βαρβαρος could be taken to mean *men perceived to be possessed of disordered thinking* and what would

be perceived by the Greeks as having been irrational. Perhaps boarish or surly, about whom one might say.

Ακουσαι ουκ επισταμενοι ουδ' ειπειν

ωι μαλιστα διηνεκως ομιλουσι.

Not knowing how to listen, neither can they speak.

Above all they continuously disturb the company. (Heraclitus 50)

Heraclitus seems to indicate that on account of their diminished capacity to reason, their perceptions and understanding, and hence judgment, was regarded as unreliable:

Κακοι μαρτυρες ανθρωποισιν οφθαλμοι και ωτα

βαβαρους ψυχας εχοντων·

Eyes and ears are bad witnesses

For men with the soul of a barbarian. (*Ibid.* 107)

In short, barbarians were ultimately men who held foreign thought forms, ethical values which clashed with the cultural values of the Greeks. That they held to customs repugnant to the Greeks. Apart from any real or implied prejudice that may be indicted by these remarks, it is clear that the Greeks did not designate any other people's to be barbaric except insofar as there was a conflict between their ethics which was apprehended through a perception of their speech, hence Aristotle's affirmation of Euripides' remarks:

Βαρβαρων δ' Ἑλληνας ἀρχεὶ εἰκος, ἀλλ' οὐ βαβαρους,

μητερ, Ἑλληνων: το μεν γαρ δουλον, 'οι δ' ελευθεροι.

It is fair, mother,

For Barbarians to be ruled by Greeks



But not the Greeks by the barbarous:

For, on the one hand, that is a slave,

But these men are the free. (*Iphigenia in Aulis* 1400)

The attempt to find a new basis for western civilization by undermining its ethical tenets is the activity of *post-civilizationism*. It is therefore an absurdity, for there is nothing beyond civilization unless it would be *anarchy* which is a return to barbarism. No sane man would want this for it means becoming *like* an animal which is *irrational*. Any attempt to overturn western historical judgments, western ethics, appears to be a trend away from civilization. The neo-misanthrope, a postmodern savage, confounded by the irrationality and hypocrisy of the world unfolds himself into “an extreme pathological form of spiritual withdrawal in which consciousness, unable to disengage itself from irrational particularity, simply identifies itself with the latter, and is then led to extrude the rational universality which is its true self into a mystical, unattainable Beyond.” (*Phenomenology of Spirit* xvii) Condemning civilization and mankind along with it the new barbarian tears off the rational attire of Western Civilization and rushes headlong into *wilderness studies*. He can no longer live among the people for they according to him are very thing that is wrong with the world. Indeed, according to *him*, it is only animals that *should* have rights, but they don't.

*Benedixitque illis Deus et ait crescite et multiplicamini et replete terram et subicite eam et dominamini piscibus maris et volatilibus caeli et universis animantibus quae moventur super terram.*

And God blessed them, and He said: spring forth and increase and replenish the Earth and you subject them and and you yourselves be Lord to the fish of the sea and the birds of the sky and to all the animals which move over the Earth.

(Genesis 1.28)

*Architecture is a holocaust of trees and of God's green Earth! Civilization must itself be the enemy. The post-civilizationists have gathered together into a brand new Indian tribe they call the 'rainbow people.'*

*Dixitque Deus hoc signum foederis quod do inter me et vos et ad omnem animam viventem quae est vobiscum in generationes sempiternas [13] arcum meum ponam in nubibus et erit signum foederis inter me et inter terram [14] cumque obduxero nubibus caelum apparebit arcus meus in nubibus [15] et recordabor foederis mei vobiscum et cum omni anima vivente quae carnem vegetat et non erunt ultra aquae diluvii ad delendam universam carnem [16] eritque arcus in nubibus et videbo illum et recordabor foederis sempiterni quod pactum est inter Deum et inter omnem animam viventem universae carnis quae est super terram.*

(Genesis 9.12-16)

And as a brand new 'chosen people' they are simultaneously a brand new 'God's gift to humanity.'

I came upon a child of God,

He was walking along the road,

And I asked him, where are you going?

And this he told me:

"I'm going on down to Yasgur's farm

I'm going to join in a rock-n-roll band

I'm going to camp out on the land

I'm going to try an' get my soul free.

We are stardust

We are golden

And we've got to get ourselves

Back to the Garden." (*Woodstock*)

But since Mind posits God whoever supposes themselves to be the Chosen People by necessity chooses themselves. Their new mission is to fulfill 'God's plan' by preventing the destruction of His work, which according to them is Nature itself. In order to do this they must destroy humanity before humanity destroys itself and creation along with it. Indeed they believe that only they, as the new chosen ones, should even be allowed to live.

Ἀφρητῶρ ἀθεμιστὸς ἀνεστιός·

Homeless, lawless, and friendless is he. (*The Politics* 1.1253a1)

The so-called 'non-western studies' is then western civilization attempting to observe what little remains beyond it which is nothing but barbarism and chaos. A withdrawal into either environmentalism or animal rights is an absurdity embraced by those who have given up on humanity. Heraclitus was one of these. "Finally, he became a hater of his kind and wandered on the mountains, and there he continued to live, making his diet of grass and herbs. However, when this gave him dropsy, he made his way back to the city and put this riddle to the physicians, whether they were competent to create a drought after heavy rain. They could make nothing of this, whereupon he buried himself in a cowshed, expecting that the noxious damp humour would be drawn out of him by the warmth of the manure. But, as even this was of no avail, he died at the age of sixty." (*Heraclitus* 10.3) Their movement is in fact very much the opposite of *theism* for Darwin is their prophet. Just as the civilized posited the Idea of God and propounded the laws of morality, the neo-misanthrope negates the divine and ethics along with it.

They seek to return to the 'community of animals' and its *law of the jungle* which is envisioned as the return to the *real* Garden of Eden, but what they really promise is a planet of the apes. The solution to the crisis of modern man, however, is not a trend away from civilization, but towards a greater civilization. "Humanity cannot shrink and return into the womb and revert to as yet unfertilized ova." (*Synergetics* 311.03) Thus the trend is not toward less civilization but towards more of it. The non-western, first being posited by the western scholar, forms ethical judgments about it, but does not become it. The western student, who studies the non-western then, does not himself become non-western but westernizes *it*. Non-western studies, then, elevates its object, but does not become like it. He is the unwitting agent universalizing western culture believing all the while that he does to opposite.

The study of the Greek and Roman classics is indeed vindicated, but not in the way we first supposed it would. The study of the classics is first and foremost a historical study. It is man forming ethical judgments about the social relations of the past. The difference from where we began from where we have arrived being that whereas we first supposed that the study of the classics was good in and for its own self and later understood it as a *substantive datum* for our understanding of the ethical from which we measured the moral structure of the world of the past against the world of the present; now we understand it as the study of the history of contemporary thought by which we achieve self-knowledge. It is an *oracle* which we ought to consult before acting. Holding as it were that it is best to begin at the beginning, we begin with classical studies because the classics are the origin of our own thought. "If accordingly, we begin at the beginning, and consider things in the process of their growth, we shall best be able, in this as in other fields, to attain scientific conclusions by the method we employ." (*The*

*Politics* 1252a) Some say that the origin of our thought is with Homer. But the way Homer is taught is as if we were eating pudding and that we should consume his work for the mere pleasure that we get from it. As if the understanding of the Greeks could be obtained through a mere eating, i.e., by getting a taste of things the student whets their appetite for the next course. In classical studies however, we do not seek an understanding of the Greeks, but an understanding of ourselves. The current methodology, however, is not only the wrong approach to the study of classics as a whole, but is in fact the wrong place to begin. We ought to begin with Herodotus which is where the student learns not that the Greeks believe in certain things but have become conscious of the fact that they believe certain things. That these beliefs should not merely be recorded but should also become the objects of examination; not only to record what men have done but also to try to understand why they have done it. “We go upon the practical mode of teaching *Nickleby*; the regular education system. C-l-e-a-n, clean, verb active, to make bright, to scour. W-i-n, win, d-e-r, der, winder, a casement. When the boy knows this out of the book, he goes and does it.” (*Nicholas Nickleby* 106)

It is impossible to understand the Greeks by reading Homer; or even a great list such as: Homer, Sophocles, and Plato. The student having done so is very likely more confused than enlightened, because he or she would know neither what the Greeks thought, how they came to think it, for we cannot truly understand the Greeks as Greeks, but can only understand ourselves by coming into relation to them. “The manner of study in ancient times differed from that of modern age in that the former was the proper and complete formation of the natural consciousness. Putting itself to the test at every point of its existence, and philosophizing about everything it came across, it made itself into a universality that was active through and through. In modern times, however, the

individual finds the abstract form ready-made.” (*Phenomenology of Spirit* 33) Wherever the students may begin, to coin a phrase by Ezra Pound, what is most important is that they get around the topic and see it from all sides. “It doesn’t, in our contemporary world, so much matter where you begin the examination of a subject, so long as you keep on until you got around again to your starting point. As it were, you start on a sphere, or a cube; you must keep on until you have seen it from all sides.” (*ABC of Reading* 29) We study them in order to understand how we have come to think as we do. The object of study situated in the distant past not drawn in relation to the present is a lifeless determinate. Our historical relation to the Greeks and the Romans has imparted to us certain thought forms. In studying the past we examine the thought form of the past and draw them into relation with our contemporary thought forms to ask: How are they the same, or different? The Greeks and Romans passed a number of ethical judgments against, for instance, cannibalism. This ethical judgment made in the past has been placed into our minds by our teachers as a particular thought form. Whoever has challenged this judgment will run up against a fundamental presupposition of Western Civilization and they have placed them self in opposition to it. In so doing, the challenger has sought to destroy a particular ethical principle and to replace it with another. “It may thus be said that historical inquiry reveals to the historian the powers of his own mind...his coming to know them shows him that his mind is able...to think in these ways...whenever he finds certain historical matters unintelligible, he discovered the limitation of his own mind...It is the historian himself who stands at the bar of judgment, and reveals his own mind in its strengths and weaknesses, its virtues and vices.” (*The Idea of History* 218-19)

In studying the works in the Greek and Latin library we maintain our ethical link to this past. If we are unable, however, to agree with the ethical judgments of the classical authors over any events, say the Catiline affair, it would indicate that those ethics that had condemned him had somehow become estranged from present scholarship. We posit them, but we can only do so in so far as they have already become us. “The self is really the object of the self, or the object only has truth so far as it has the form of the self.” (*Phenomenology of Spirit* 529) History begins with Herodotus. Our understanding of the present begins here in Herodotus: *hic Rhodes hic salta.*

*quamquam et apud Herodotum patrem historiae. (De Legibus 1.1.5)*

Whosoever believes that one can take a flying leap at the study of any historical event, as Kalb did with her remarks on the *Bellum Catiline*, would be well advised to consider the perils of leaping before looking; and the even greater perils of pretending to know what one clearly does not know and still worse the preceding an abysmal plunge with the brandishing credentials, for her credentials would now appear to be a mere symbol of knowledge but not an actual mode of recognition for knowledge is one of those things we would rather to possess in reality than in appearance.

*Insignis eorum est error qui malunt quae nesciunt docere quam discere quae ignorant.*

He who wanders in error is distinguished among all men for preferring to teach that which he does not know rather than to learn that of which he is ignorant.

*(De Lingua Latina 9.1)*

Alas we come to Rhetoric, where the ethics of philosophy meets the material world in the form of politics actuated through speech. Thus the genealogy of Social Praxis mediated through the study of History is: Social Praxis, Rhetoric, Politics, History,

Ethics, Humanism, Logic, Philosophy with Classics being a species of History and Logic having two principal branches, Naturalism and Humanism, hence the logic of Rhetoric, being characterized by such *modes* as *argumentum ad baculum*, *argumentum ad populum*, *argumentum ad hominem*, *argumentum ad misericordiam*, et al, is fundamentally different than the logic natural science, or *dialectic*, which is characterized by *symbolic* logic. But, oratory is not the arena of the barbarian, but of the wise.

Καὶ πῶς, ὥστε συμβαίνει τὴν ῥητορικὴν οἰκον παραφυῆς τι τῆς διαλεκτικῆς εἶναι καὶ τῆς περὶ τὰ ἠῆθη πραγματείας, ἣν δίκαιόν ἐστι προσαγορεύειν πολιτικὴν.

And, in a certain way, so as to be some kind of offshoot of Dialectic, stands Rhretoric, and concerns the practice of Ethics, which is justice to be called Politics. (*Rhetoric* 1.2.7)

It is through rhetoric that Ethics meets the material world for it is here that it affects the social praxis of the State through the power of speech. Rhetoric, then, is the ethics of History finding its proper use. The historian, who is also a philosopher, must draw his body of knowledge in relation to the material world. Rhetoric is a tool which is used to persuade. Used in accordance with virtue it imparts the ethical thought forms of civilization and wrongful use has the opposite effect, hence Rhetoric preceeds Social Praxis.

## VI. Metalogue (Μετα Λογου)

The lesson of Socrates is that whoever runs up against the fundamental presupposition of the Culture in which they live will drink the hemlock. But it is the fixed and determinate, the positive moral content of the culture which is the dark side.



Being the thing in itself which is responsible for imparting the values of the Culture, and the Faculty being the priests of this order, it is the dark side, the Abyss, the utterly immoral. Or indeed itself having its own dual aspect. The light of change, pure spirit, is divided in the same way. The determinate content and pure Spirit each having its own contradiction within its own self. Catiline was indeed the pure Spirit, but a bad one, performing well in an ignoble cause. Socrates would historically speaking make up his dialectical counterpart pure Spirit as the light of truth and the force of change, the ascendancy from the lower to the higher, with Catiline representing the opposite of this, not an upward development of western culture, but a return to the badness of its past, the progressive and the reactionary faced off against each other.

The process of effectuating *calumny* is the process of disfiguring the representation of a being, i.e. its name, and advancing the disfigured representation of that being while at the same time keeping the ontological being hidden from those who would make a rational account of that being, or that individual. All things which are to be processed through the Culture require a rational account. “Individuality has now become the object for observation, or the object to which observation now turns.” (Phenomenology of Spirit 309) This document, then, must itself pass over and become not mere Subject but also the Predicate of itself. This argument, then, cannot not remain mere argument without content—as pure Spirit and absolute freedom—but must also become a determinate negative which is positive content. As a persuasive element it achieves its particular aims through demonstrative argument. The argument, having refuted and destroyed its predicates, must now re-crystallize into a number of determinate thought forms. “This outer, in the first place, acts only as an *organ* in making the inner visible or, in general, a being-for-another...The speaking mouth, the working hand, and,

if you like, the legs too are the organs of performance and actualization...But the externality which the inner obtains through them is the action as a reality separated from the individual. Speech and work are outer expressions in which the individual no longer keeps and possesses himself within himself, but lets the inner get completely outside of him, leaving it to the mercy of something other than himself. For that reason we can say with equal truth that these expressions express the inner too much, as that they do so too little: too much, because the inner itself breaks out in them and there remains no antithesis between them and it; they give not merely an *expression* of the inner, but directly the inner itself; too little, because in speech and action the inner turns itself into something else, thus putting itself a the mercy of the element of change, which twists the spoke word and the accomplished act into meaning something else than they are in and for themselves.” (*Phenomenology of Spirit* 312)

In passing ethical judgment against one historical persona it vindicates the others. But who ever vindicates one set of moral beings and condemns the other has vindicated himself by drawing himself into moral relation with his heroes and distancing himself from his villains. “In rhetoric one who acts in accordance with sound argument, and one who acts in accordance with moral purpose, are both called rhetoricians.” (*Rhetoric* 1.1.19-20) The “I” that was subject, and took the *Bellum Catilinae* as its predicate, must now pass over and predicate itself against this. Thus the argument doesn’t merely defend say Cicero, but the author of this very argument. And though it does defend Cicero its romance with Cicero, on account of Cicero’s hostility towards the slaves, must necessarily be short lived. Spartacus and Lenin are indeed the real heroes for moral predicates are conditioned by actual class standing as it was demonstrated that among

contemporary scholars; the more ambitious the bourgeois element the greater the affinity for Catiline.

That the attack could not have been made from inside the institution that the 'I' had to pass out of the institution in order to find a place to stand in order to launch his attack indicated that the institution cannot be criticized from within. It cannot contain its own critique. The author as a moment in the history of the interpretation of the *Bellum Catilinae* could only think and act in the way that a person in that situation can think and act. The vindication of *base desires* has been demonstrated to have come, historically, from within the institution showing that those who adhered to Catiline think and act the way people in those institutions think and act. If the critic were homeless, friendless or lawless it could only be because the academy is really a community of savages, not intellectuals. "Homelessness so understood consists in the abandonment of Being by beings. Homelessness is the symptom of oblivion of Being. Because the truth of Being remains unthought." (*Basic Writings* 242) The real philosopher can't even function in today's academy if and when he's even allowed into it,  $\alpha\tau\tau\alpha$  or 'motive.' To understand how it was possible for this to take place we must recapitulate Plato's theses that ( $\alpha$ ) that the just man always gets the worst of it, and ( $\beta$ ) that one cannot merely be good, but must also have the reputation for it; and to tie these two principles back to the theory of *dissemblance* and to see how it operates to precipitate these results.

The thing-in-itself is covered by its representation which exists in the mind's eye and is but a symbol for the thing. The dissembler dislodges the representation from its actual being and causes being and representation to live independently while at the same time tied together. The representation is a false being and cannot have a life of its own as long as the true being still exists since false representation could at any time be compared

to ontological being which would prove the reputation ascribed to the thing was different from the actual being of the thing and thereby destroying the predicate. If, however, the thing-in-itself were to pass away from this world without making present to the world its true being, false reputation would persist *as* truth in posterity. Thus the dissembler must endeavor to advance falsehood while keeping the truth concealed. “What is meant, and purpose, are separated from truth...the ostensible meaning from the real meaning, from the true thing and intention.” (*Phenomenology of Spirit* 526) And that this is the pitfall of a social praxis which traffics in the mere symbols of things and not in the things themselves. Or, moreover, it is a natural consequence of the dualistic nature of reality. Pure Spirit, light, truth, wisdom, ascends the spiral of knowledge. It is the pure *negative* running up against the positive content of the Culture. It is the motive force for change, but if it is not always good it is at least necessary. In the beginning Western Civilization was pure being, Ον. Man, ‘Adam,’ gave things names, οντα. He named the *beings*. The name given to a being is a word, λογος. The word is a representation for a being, οντα, be that a being of the mental, or metaphysical world, or the physical world. If there is a word, there is a reason for the word.

If as Hegel said that Art is the externalization of the Self, the self becoming an object for the Self, then the work of Art is the phenomenological manifestation of the Self, or the Self made visible. “Spirit brings itself forth as object.” (*Phenomenology* 703) And Heidegger, that Art is the bring of the essence of the thing in unconcealment, the with respect to the works of art produced through the examination of the soul, that is to say through higher education where the life of the student becomes a life worth living, that is to say an *examined life*; he is the artificer of his own Being. The whole course of his internal development must be yarded out of his mind and questioned, through the

Socratic method. In doing so, the Self is no longer capable of hiding from itself, nothing within the self can remain a mystery to the Self. A man becomes no longer a stranger to himself, but consequence of this is that every belief or philosophical principal held by the student, through this questioning, becomes fixated because every action undertaken by the rational man cannot be without reason and in stating each and every reason for every action, and not merely the action of social praxis but the reason for the use of each word as action in the form of speech, the reasons behind the words. All becomes know to the Self through its externalization: that is, through its dissertation—the Self giving a rational account for itself. But in becoming fixated and determinate, each rationale no long possesses the character of Pure Spirit and Absolute Freedom. The Self becomes determinate content and passes over to the Darkside.

*Tantali uocem excipe.*

Oh, listen to the voice of Tantalus (*Thyestes* 80)

Its Light has been extinguished. It has become dead for it received its life from its ability to remain in flux. Each *rational account*, Μετα Λογου, given for each thought action, externalized in the form of speech, in losing its ability to remain in flux, fixates the mind of the student.

But each and every determination, under the current system is made by the teacher, not the student. That is to say, the students thoughts are validated and through the validation are elevated to the level of truth. In order to continue, however, to self-actualize after having become fixated by the education process, the student cease to be a student and join the faculty of the Academy. He must join the darkside and dwell among the Walking Dead. “Luke I am your father,” not your mother, not your *alma mater*, but your father.

μήτηρ μὲν τέ μέ φησι τοῦ εἴ μιν εἶναι, αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ γέ  
 οὐκ οἶδ'· οὐ γάρ πώ τις ἐὼν γόνον αὐτὸς ἀνέγνω. (*Odyssey*  
 1.215-16)

And on the one hand, mother declares me to be from him, but I at any rate

Don't know: for as yet no *man* has been certain of his child.

But to say that all determinations through this system are made externally is also to say that the thought which flows from it cannot be innovative, for the Lord through the middle term of the High Priest of the Academy can only validate what is known to it.

What flows forth from the mind of the student as Pure Spirit is very much the opposite: it is the unknown, it is the indeterminate. It is the life of Pure Light ascending the spiral of human knowledge and it knows that in becoming determinate it loses the very thing which is essential to it and resists. But it must concede to the power of the Lord which stands over and above it, for the Lord retains the exclusive right to pass judgment, to condemn or validate, reward or punish, every act, including action is the form of thoughts as they manifest themselves through an externalization of the Self. It has the power over Life and Death and appropriates to itself the exclusive right to deploy the *argumentum ad baculum*. Within the Academy, then, the student either yields to this irresistible force or be flung off and spun out to the margins of civilization.

Striving for self-determination, Pure Spirit learns that all meaningful determinations are made by an other. All thought must be approved thought. Everything must be approved. Pure Spirit must go through the entire development of thought examining each and every development along the way and passing judgment on it. Passing through each stage along the way until it reaches its end and then takes it higher propounding a new development of thought. But most students are, on account of the

fact that they are oppressed by a fixed and determinate system standing over and above them become fixated at too early of a stage of development on account of the fact that all thoughts must be approved thoughts. For everything that exists has a name and it is through naming that a thing obtains its being. The unthinkable cannot be done and the unthought can have no independent being. Man, Adam, named the things and it is through this naming the indeterminate becomes the determinate. By giving *it* a minimum of three characteristics the determinate becomes the fixated and this is the reason that there is a lack of truly creative thought within the academy for the Faculty stands over and above the student body. The student body represents the Spirit running through the course of the development of human thought while the teachers represent the fixed and determinate Absolute Knowledge. But through the education process the students become progressively more and more fixated.

Through the education process what is the Light, the Spirit, in becoming fixated and determinate becomes the dead. And the reason there is so little creativity exuding from the youth at the level of the entering Freshmen is because they have to a greater or lesser extent been overly determinate in their thinking. But they are the Light of Pure Spirit ascending the spiral of knowledge and their only defense is to somehow stave off a full determination in their thinking as long as possible. The process of getting a Ph.D. Then is the process of causing the scholar to make a full determination in his or her thinking through the process of the externalization of the Self. And though the student through the whole course of their lifetime from birth to death, but primarily being with their formal education has been going through the process of having becoming determinate not just through the imparting of determinate thought forms, knowledge, but in following through with the dialectical development, the externalization of what they

have learned. For it is precisely in the externalization of what the student has learned in class, either through an exam or a paper, that the student places what was learned outside himself making it an object for his own consciousness and thus making it truly his own. When the student externalizes in the way that the teacher has predetermined is correct, the Cultural Program, the teacher, Master, Lord, is pleased and the student does well. But at this very moment certain parts of the students thinking are no longer the light of the inquisitive Pure Spirit, but become indeed, fixed and determinate, i.e., it dies. The Mind suffers a form of death and becomes the Darkness of Knowledge.

The Ph.D. On the other hand, having been capable of staving off the full determination until the completion of a higher degree makes a full externalization of the Self through the dissertation process and therefore becomes the most fully determinate consciousness of all hence the least creative, the most knowledgeable, hence the blackest of all the darkness of night.

They are the walking dead. The grim reapers of the souls of the youth which accomplishes its mission by cause each and every student who comes along to externalize on every issue, hence more and more fixated and determinate and more and more like the teacher himself. Thus the role of the teacher isn't to encourage the growth of the young mind but to kill it. To get into it and yard its brains out and examine every thought the student has, determine what those thoughts are by challenging them through the so-called Socratic Method and compelling the student to externalize his or her own reasoning on each and every issue that comes into the purview, but since the teacher is not the disinterested thinker he pretends to be, but is in fact the middle term between the Culture and Pure Spirit, and indeed plays the role of the Lord in the Lordship and Bondsman relationship, for the teacher has the power to judge each and every externalization of the



students thought, he is not the liberator but the conqueror. And because he can only do as was done to him, and having become fully determined at an earlier period of time, he can only shunt off creativity, not develop it. Pure Spirit know that determination is inevitable. If he should continue to endlessly vacillate in order remain indeterminate, retaining the light of life hence freedom, in his thinking and therefore avoiding the full determination of his thought he will nevertheless suffer the absolute determination of death for all men must die. He is running out of time and he knows that in order to complete the philosophical challenge 'know thy self' he must as yet still fully determine, but this is a self-determination and instead of becoming certain for the other, the Lord, he chooses to become certain of himself, to achieve self-certainty thus truly knowing himself. But by the process of external validation through study in the Academy the Self can only achieve certainty to/ for and by/with/or from the other and not certainty of itself. Through the Academy, then, it is impossible to self-determine.

## VI. Works Cited

Appian, *The Civil Wars*, with an English translation by Horace White, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1958.

Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, with an English translation by John Henry Freese, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1926.

—, *Categories*, with an English translation by Harold P. Cooke, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 2002.

—, *Metaphysics*, translated by Richard Hope, New York: University of Michigan Press: 1960.

—, *Nichomachean Ethics*, with an English translation by H. Rackham, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1982.

—, *De Sophisticis Elenchis*, with an English translation by E. S. Foster, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1955.

—, *The Athenian Constitution*, with and English translation by H. Rackham, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1981.

—, *The Politics*, with an English translation by H. Rackham, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1944

—, *The Politics*, edited and translated by Ernest Barker, New York: Oxford University Press: 1968.

Ausonius, with an English translation by Hugh G. Evelyn White, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1985.

Augustine, *The City of God against the Pagans*, edited and translated by R. W. Dyson, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 1998.

Biondo, Flavio, *Italy Illuminated*, edited and translated by Jeffrey A. White, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 2005.

Blok, Aleksandr, "Catiline: A page from the History of World Revolution," *A Revolution of Spirit: Crisis of Value in Russia (1890-1924)*. Edited by Bernice Glatzer Rosenthal and Martha Bohachevsky-Chomiak, translated by Marian Schwartz, New York: Fordham University Press: 1990.

Boccaccio, Giovanni, *Famous Women*, edited and translated by Virginia Brown, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 2001.

Bruni, Leonardo, *History of the Florentine People*, edited and translated by James Hankins, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 2001.

Cicero, *In Catilinam I-IV, et al*, with an English translation by C. MacDonald, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 2001.

—, *Letters to Atticus*, with an English translation by E.O. Winstedt, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1962.

—, *De Oratore*, with an English translation by E. W. Sutton, completed with an introduction by H. Rackam, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University: 2001.

—, *Handbook on Electioneering*, with an English translation by M. I. Henderson, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 2002.

—, *Pro Caelio*, with and English translation by R. Gardner, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1958.

—, *Pro Flacco*, with an English translation by C. MacDonald, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 2001.

—, *Pro Fonteio*, M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationes: *Recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit Albertus Curtis Clark*, Albert Clark, *Oxonii, e Typographeo Clarendoniano: Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis*: 1909.

Collingwood, R. G., *The Idea of History*, New York: Oxford University Press: 1969.

Cope, E. M., *Commentary on the Rhetoric of Aristotle*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 1877.

Cornford, F. M., *From Religion to Philosophy*, New York, Dover: 2004.

—, *Plato's Cosmology: The Timaeus of Plato*, Indianapolis, Hackett: 1997.

Dickens, Charles, *Nicholas Nickleby*, New York: Barnes & Noble: 2005.

Dio, Cassius, *Historiae Romanae*, with an English translation by Earnest Cary, New York: Macmillan: 1914.

Drummond, Andrew, *Law Politics and Power, Sallust and the Execution of the Catilinarian Conspirators*, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag: 1995.

Empiricus, Sextus, *Outlines of Pyrrhonism*, with an English translation by R. G. Bury, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1967.

Engels, Friedrich, *Ludwig Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy*, Peking: Foreign Language Press 1976.

Euripides, *Iphigenia in Aulis*, Euripidis Fabulae, edited by Gilbert Murray, vol. 3. Oxford: Clarendon Press, Oxford: 1913.

Eutorpius, *Breviarium Ab Urbe Condita*, recognovit Franciscus Ruehl, Lipsiae: B.G. Teubneri: 1897

Ficino, Marsilio, *Platonic Theology*, English translation by Michael J. B. Allen with John Warden, Latin text edited by James Hawkins with William Bowen, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 2001.

Floris, *Epitome of Roman History*, with an English translation by Edward Seymour Forster, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 2005.

Freud, Sigmund, *Civilization and Its Discontents*, translated by Joan Riviere, London: The Hogarth Press: 1957.

Fuller, R. Buckminster, *Synergetics: Explorations in the Geometry of Thinking*, in collaboration with E. J. Applewhite, Sebastopol, CA: R. Buckminster Fuller: 1997.

Goodwin, William Watson, *Greek Grammar*, revised by Charles Burton Gulick, New York: Ginn and Company: 1930.

Gorki, Maxim, *Bystander*, translated by Bernard Guilbert Guerney, New York: D. Appleton-Century Company: 1939

Hardy, E. G., *The Catilinarian Conspiracy in its Context: A Re-Study of the Evidence*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell: 1924.

Heidegger, Martin, *Basic Writings* revised and expanded by David Farrell Krell, San Francisco: Harper Collins: 1993.

Herodotus, *The History*, translated by George Rawlinson, Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica: 1952.

Hegel, G. W. F., *The Philosophy of History*, translated by J. Sibree, Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica: 1978.

—, *The Phenomenology of Spirit*, translated with an introduction and notes by A. V. Miller analysis of the text and foreword by J. N. Findlay, New York: Oxford: 1977.

Heraclitus, *Fragments*, a text and translation with a commentary by T. M. Robinson, Toronto: University of Toronto Press: 1987.

Hesiod, *Works and Days*, with an English translation by Hugh G. Evelyn-White, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 2002.

Horace, *Odes*, with an English translation by Nial Rudd, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 2004.

Hughes, Langston, *Black Nativity*, Electronic Edition by Alexander Street Press, L.L.C.: Langston Hughes: 1961. URL: <http://www.alexanderstreet4.com/cgi-bin/asp/bldr/navigate?/projects/artfla/databases/asp/bldr/fulltext/IMAGE/.305>

Hutchinson, Lester, *The Conspiracy of Catiline*, New York: Barnes and Noble: 1967.

Ibsen, Henrik, *Catiline and the Burial Mound*, translated with introductions by Thomas F. Van Laan, New York: Garland Publishing: 1992.

Isocrates, *Panegyricus*, with an English translation by George Norlin, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1928.

Jerome, *Select Letters of St. Jerome*, with an English Translation by F. A. Wright, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1963.

—, *Vulgate Bible*, Bible Foundation and On-Line Book Initiative. <ftp.std.com/obi/Religion/Vulgate>.

Jonson, Ben, *Catiline: His Conspiracy*, edited with an introduction, notes, and glossary by Lynn Harold Harris, Yale Studies in English, Vol. 53, Weimar: R. Wagner Sohn: 1916.

Josephus, Flavius, *Jewish Antiquities*, with an English translation by H. St. J. Thackeray, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1957.

Kalb, Judith E., A "Roman Bolshevik: Aleksandr Blok's Catiline and the Russian Revolution," *Slavic and East European Journal*, 44, No. 3 (Fall, 2000), 413-428.

Laertius, Diogenes, *Plato*, with an English translation by R. D. Hicks, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 2006.

—, *Heraclitus*, with an English translation by R. D. Hicks and edited by Jeffrey Henderson, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 2005.

Lewis, Charlton T. & Charles Short, *A Latin Dictionary*, Oxford. Clarendon Press. 1879.

Liddell, Henry George and Robert Scott, *An Intermediate Greek-English Lexicon*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Livy, *Ab Urbe Condita*, with an English translation by Alfred C. Schlesinger, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1959.

Lucanus, M. Annaeus, *Pharsaliae Libri X*, Carolus Hermannus Weise, Leipzig: G. Bassus: 1835.

Luce, T. J., "The Dating of Livy's First Decade," *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, Vol. 96. (1965), pp. 209-240.

Machiavelli, Niccolo, *Discourses on Livy*, translated with an Introduction and Notes by Julia Conway Bondanella and Peter Bondanella, Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press: 2003.

Mao, Tse-tung, *Selected Works of Mao Tse-Tung, Vol.I*, New York: Pergamon Press: 1975.

Martial, *Epigrams*, edited and translated by D. R. Shackleton Bailey, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1993.

Marx, *Capital*, Vol. II, New York: International Publishers, N.Y.: 1967.

Mitchell, Joni, *Woodstock*, Lyrics Freak, URL:  
[http://www.lyricsfreak.com/j/joni+mitchell/woodstock\\_20075381.html](http://www.lyricsfreak.com/j/joni+mitchell/woodstock_20075381.html)

Mommsen, Theodor, *The History of Rome, Vol. IV*, London: Routledge/Thoemmes Press:  
1894.

Nepos, Cornelius, *De Historicis Latinis*, with an English translation by John C. Rolfe,  
Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1960.

Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, with an English translation by Frank Justus Miller, revised by G.  
P. Goold, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 2005.

—, *Metamorphoses*, edited by Hugo Magnus, Gotha, Germany: Friedr. Andr. Perthes:  
1892.

Paterculus, Velleius, *Compendium of Roman History*, with and English translation by  
Fredrick Shipley, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1961.

Petrarca, Francesco, *Against a Man of High Rank*, edited and translated by David Marsh,  
Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 2003.

Plato, *Republic*, with an English translation by Paul Shorey, Cambridge, Massachusetts:  
Harvard University Press: 1937.

—, *The Republic*, translated with Introduction and Notes by Francis MacDonald  
Cornford, New York: Oxford University Press: 1945.

—, *Timaeus*, with an English translation by R. G. Bury, Cambridge, Massachusetts:  
Harvard University Press: 1961.

Plutarch, *Cicero*, with and English translation by Bernadotte Perrin, Cambridge,  
Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1971.



—, *Lucullus*, with an English translation by Bernadotte Perrin, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 2001.

—, *Sulla*, with an English translation by Bernadotte Perrin, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 2000.

—, *Crassus*, with an English translation by Bernadotte Perrin, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 2001.

—, *Pelopidas*, with an English translation by Bernadotte Perrin, New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons: 1917.

Polybius, *The Histories*, with an English translation by W. R. Patton, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1922.

Pound, Ezra, *The ABC of Reading*, New York: New Directions: 1934.

Quintilian, *The Institutio Oratoria of Quintilian*, with an English translation by H. E. Butler, New York: William Heinemann: 1921.

Reid, J. S. "Human Sacrifices at Rome and Other Notes on Roman Religion," *The Journal of Roman Studies*, London: Society of Roman Studies: 1912.

Sallust, *Bellum Catilinae*, with an English translation by J. C. Rolfe, New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons: 2005.

—, *Conspiracy of Catiline*, translated by Rev. John Selby Watson, New York and London: Harper & Brothers: 1899.

—, *Bellum Catilinae*, a commentary by P. McGushin, Leiden, Netherlands: E. J. Brill: 1977.

—, *Bellum Catiline*, edited with Introduction and Commentary by J. T. Ramsey, American Philological Association: Oxford University Press: 1984.

—, *The Jugurthine War*, translated by Rev. John Selby Watson, New York and London: Harper & Brothers: 1899.

Seneca Major, *The Elder Seneca*, translated by M. Winterbottom, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1974.

Seneca Minor, *Moral Essays*, with an English translation by John W. Basore, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1964.

—, *Ad Lucilium Epistulae Morales*, with an English translation by Richard M. Gummere, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1962.

—, *On Anger*, with an English translation by John W. Basore, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1958.

—, *Thyestes, Sénèque Tragédies, Tome I*, text établi et traduit François-Régis Chaumartin, Paris: Les Belles Lettres: 1999.

—, *Troades, Sénèque Tragédies, Tome II*, text établi et traduit François-Régis Chaumartin, Paris: Les Belles Lettres: 1996.

Seutonius, *De Vita Caesarum*, with an English translation by J. C. Rolfe, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1939.

Siculus, Diodorus, *Library of History*, with an English translation by Francis R. Walton, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 2001.

Shakespeare, William, *Henry IV, The Riverside Shakespeare*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin: 1994.

Tacitus, *Agricola*, with an English translation by M Hutton revised by M. Ogilvie, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 2000.

—, *The Annals*, with an English translation by John Jackson, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 2005.

—, *The Annals*, translated by Alfred John Church and William Jackson Brodribb, Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica: 1952.

—, *Germania*, with an English translation by M. Hutton revised by E. H. Warmington, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 2000.

—, *Historiae*, translated by Alfred John Church. William Jackson Brodribb, Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica: 1952.

*The Law of the Twelve Tables*, with an English translation by E. H. Warmington, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1938.

Theophrastus, *Characters*, edited and translated by Jeffery Rusten and I. C. Cunningham, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 2002.

Thucydides, *History of the Peloponnesian War*, London, J. M. Dent; New York, E. P. Dutton: 1910.

—, *The History of the Peloponnesian War*, translated by Richard Crawley and revised by R. Feetham, Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica: 1952.

Trotsky, Leon, *Literature and Revolution*, New York: Russell and Russell: 1957.

Varro, *De Lingua Latina*, with an English translation by Roland G. Kent, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 1938.

Virgil, *Vergil's Aeneid*, with introduction, notes, vocabulary, and grammatical appendix by Clyde Pharr, Wauconda, IL: Bolchazy-Carducci Publishers: 1997.

Virgil, Polydore, *On Discovery*, edited and translated by Brian P. Copenhaver, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 2002.

Voltaire, *Oeuvres Complètes De Voltaire, Tome V*, Paris: Chez E. A. Lequien : 1820.

Wheelock, Frederic M., *Latin: An Introductory Course Based on Ancient Authors, 3rd Edition*, New York : Barnes and Noble : 1963

Wilkins, Ann Thomas, *Villain or Hero: Sallust's Portrayal of Catiline*, New York: Peter Lang: 1994.

Xenophon, *Hiero*, with an English translation by E. C. Marchant, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press: 2000.