CHAPTER XXX

Nox rei publicae?

Catiline's and Cicero's Nocturnal Activities in the *Catilinarians*

Christoph Pieper

1 Introduction[1]

Nightly activities undertaken by Catiline are notoriously present in Cicero's first *Catilinarian* speech. Already in the powerful *exordium* he makes it clear that all senators know how Catiline spends his nights: 'What you did last night, what on the night before that, . . . —who of us, do you think, does not know about it?' (*quid proxima, quid*

[1] The ancient texts are quoted according to the following editions: Caes. *Civ*. Damon 2015; Cic. *Brut*. Malcovati 1965, *Catil*. Dyck 2008, *Flac*. Fruechtel 1933, *Har*. Maslowski 1981, *Agr*. Manuwald 2018, *Man*. Reis 1933, *Phil*. 1 Ramsey 2003, *S. Rosc*. Dyck 2010, *Sul*. Berry 1996, *Tog. Cand*. Crawford 1994; Quint. *Inst*. Winterbottom 1970; Sall. *Cat*. Reynolds 1991; Victorinus, *De definitionibus*: Stangl 1888. All translations are my own. I am grateful to the participants of the Penn-Leiden Colloquium for their remarks and questions. Special thanks are due to Cynthia Damon, Joseph Farrell, and Wesley Hanson for useful discussion and criticism during coffee breaks, to Yannick Zanetti for having given me access to his impressive collection of Ciceronian metaphors, to the reviewer of this volume for many helpful suggestions for improvement of my argument, to Antje Wessels and James Ker for their editorial guidance (and to James Ker for carefully correcting my English), and to my Ciceronian colleagues at Leiden, Leanne Jansen and Bram van der Velden. Thanks also to Jikke Koning for her editorial help. Research for this chapter has been made possible by a VIDI grant of the *Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research* (NWO), funding no. 276-30-013.

superiore nocte egeris, . . . quem nostrum ignorare arbitraris?, Cic. *Catil.* 1.1). Then, in the *narratio*, he describes the details of the secret meeting in the house of Marcus Laeca at nighttime (*Catil.* 1.8):

> Reconsider with me, if you will, that night before last night; . . . I declare that you came, the night before last, to the street of the scythe-makers, into the house of Marcus Laeca—I will speak openly with you!—and that many companions in the same insane crime gathered there.
>
> *recognosce mecum tandem noctem illam superiorem; . . . dico te priore nocte venisse inter falcarios—non agam obscure—in M. Laecae domum; convenisse eodem complures eiusdem amentiae scelerisque socios.*

It is obvious what kind of association Cicero wants to convey with this focus on the night as the setting of Catiline's conspiracy: it is a time which is dangerous and strange, and nightly meetings are aimed at secret plans, which are not meant to be brought into clear daylight. In an inspiring article, Thomas Habinek convincingly argued that the passages help Cicero to frame Catiline as a bandit, someone who can and should be excluded "from the place of reasoned debate," someone whose major dwelling was considered to be outside of the city and whose actions were undertaken at nighttime.[2] The association seems to fit rather nicely with what we can surmise about Cicero's rhetorical strategy in the *Catilinarians*: Cicero leaves no space for nuances, but sketches Catiline as supremely evil and egoistic, whereas he himself is the ultimate patriot and

[2] Habinek 1998, 71.

unselfish savior of the state. Habinek's article, however, is not interested in re-stressing this dichotomy, but rather suggests that the boundaries between Catiline's and Cicero's images are not based on the actual character of their deeds, but on the rhetorical framing of Cicero's evaluative rhetoric. At the end of his article, based on a comparison of Cicero and Romulus in the third *Catilinarian*, Habinek suggests that we can see in Cicero and Catiline a similar twin-pair like Romulus and Remus—the one being the hero, the other the villain—and the final triumph of Cicero being "a victory over the bloody legacy of Rome."[3]

This chapter will argue along similar lines while focusing on the metaphorical and associative use of night in the *Catilinarians*. That images of light and darkness are dear to Cicero in his political rhetoric, has been demonstrated by Kathryn Welch; her findings can be summarized with the following quotation: " . . . the city of Rome holds the *lux*, the source of light, which illuminates in a better way than any others the deeds of those who have rightly won praise."[4] Welch shows that Cicero associates light metaphors especially with the institutions of the functioning state and with the charismatic politicians guaranteeing this functioning. As an example of the first, she refers to Cicero's speech before the people from the very first days of his consulship: in the second speech against the agrarian law proposed by the tribune of the people, Rullus, he enumerates the advantages of living in the city (abstract concepts such as liberty and dignity, as well as such concrete things as the forum and the *ludi* on

[3] Habinek 1998, 87.

[4] Welch 2005, 315 (with reference to *Fam*. 2.12.2).

holidays), summarizing them with the term *lux rei publicae* (*Agr*. 2.71).[5] This light is contrasted with the darkness in which Rullus operates, but also with the recent past of Sulla's dictatorship, the *tenebrae rei publicae*, during which Rullus' father in law is said to have enriched himself shamelessly.[6] An example of the light metaphor being used with reference to people can be found in his first speech about Rullus' law, delivered in front of the senate on the first day of his consulship: there Cicero refers to his own consular voice and public renown as a beam of light that brings relief to the troubled state (*populo Romano . . . vox et auctoritas consulis repente in tantis tenebris illuxerit*, *Agr*. 1.24). Even if, as Welch has argued, Cicero is applying the light metaphor not to himself, but to his public office, the passage might have reminded the senators of the praise of Pompey Cicero had uttered few years before in his *De imperio Cn. Pompei* (*Pro lege Manilia*). In this encomiastic speech, Pompey was regularly hailed as light, for example at *Man*. 33: 'the incredible and divine virtue of one single man could in such a short period of time bring such a light to the state' (*tantamne unius hominis incredibilis ac divina virtus tam brevi tempore lucem adferre rei publicae potuit*).[7]

---

[5] Cf. Welch 2005, 317–318. Manuwald 2018, 343 *ad loc*. thinks that it stands for Rome itself ('the outstanding position of Rome within the Roman republic'), but I think it might similarly well refer to the mentioned infrastructure and institutions of the city.

[6] *Agr*. 2.69: 'He has a father-in-law, an outstanding man, who in this darkness of the state occupied as much land as he wished' (*habet socerum, virum optimum. qui tantum agri in illis rei publicae tenebris occupavit quantum concupivit*); this passage is not discussed in Welch. Manuwald 2018, 338 *ad loc*. refers to Cic*. S. Rosc.* 91 (quoted below) and *Red. Sen*. 5 for similar metaphorical use of *tenebrae* as "applied to political circumstances"; cf. also Fantham 1972, 125 and 134 (on *tenebrae* used metaphorically of Cicero's adversaries in the *Pro Sestio*).

[7] In my assessment of *Agr*. 1.24, I partly differ from Welch 2005, 317 and 323–325, who thinks that Cicero employed the metaphor with reference to his own person only in the years after his consulship. See her p.

2 The Metaphor *nox rei publicae*

If the light metaphor applied to the state is thus deeply rooted in Cicero's works, the idea of describing political instability with a metaphorical 'night of the republic' does not seem far-fetched—especially in an author such as Cicero, whose abundant use of metaphors more generally has been thoroughly shown already.[8] But surprisingly the formulation *nox rei publicae* (or similar genitives referring to the state) does not seem to be a common metaphor in the Latin literature of antiquity. This is confirmed both by a search in the *Library of Latin Texts* and by the late antique rhetorician and philosopher Marius Victorinus. In his short treatise *De definitionibus* he proposes fifteen categories of definitions, of which the seventh is the *definitio κατὰ μεταφοράν, id est per translationem*.[9] He warns that excessively artificial metaphorical definitions should be avoided, and among the examples he adduces, there is a passage from Cicero's speech *Pro Sexto Roscio Amerino* (Marius Victorinus, *De definitionibus* 22, 15—23, 2 Stangl):[10]

> In this category, one has to guard against the metaphor being either far-fetched or ugly.[11] Far-fetched would be the following sentence: "the agitation of the state

320 on the *Pro lege Manilia* in general; for the quoted sentence from this speech, cf. Gildenhard and Hodgson 2014, 144 *ad loc.*: the phrase *lumen afferre* is very rare in Cicero.

[8] Cf. Fantham 1972, 115–136 for an analysis of the speeches stemming from the years 57 and 56 BCE.

[9] For an overview of the treatise and its sources, see Pronay 1997, 15–41.

[10] Thomas Riesenweber is working on a new edition of the text that will replace Stangl's nineteenth-century edition; see Riesenweber (forthcoming).

[11] For Roman criticism of daring metaphors, cf. Riesenweber 2007, 18–19, and see, e.g., Quint. *Inst.* 8.6.17 ('harsh, because taken from a simile that is too far-fetched,' *durae, id est a longinqua similitudine ductae*);

is a chaos of the laws." Cicero tempered this in his speech for Sextus Roscius when he said "as if there was . . . an eternal night." Even if he says *quasi* as if it were a comparison, we still can regard this as a *definition*, defanged by a particle of comparison.

in quo genere tamen illud cavendum est ne aut longe sit petita translatio aut turpis. longe petita ut 'turba rei publicae chaos est legum,' quod Tullius pro Sexto Roscio temperavit qui 'quasi . . . sempiterna nox esset' inquit: in quo etiam si sit 'quasi,' ut per similitudinem sit, tamen definitio accipi potest temperamentum accipiens ex particula similitudinis.

Victorinus alludes to Cicero's *Pro Sexto Roscio Amerino* 91, a speech in which Cicero defends Sextus Roscius against the accusation of having murdered his father. In the context of paragraph 91, he has just embarked on the counterattack against two relatives of Sextus, the Titi Roscii, who have used the Sullan proscriptions to plot together with Sulla's freedman Chrysogonus in order to enrich themselves. But, as Cicero explains, they were not the only ones to profit from the chaotic situation and of a Sulla who was not in full control of the situation (Cic. *S. Rosc.* 91; annotations mine):

While he who was in charge of the state [i.e., Sulla] was occupied with other things, there were others who healed their wounds [i.e., who profited from the proscriptions]; who, as if eternal night had fallen upon the state, ran around in the darknees and confused everything.

Cicero himself in *de Orat.* 3.162–167 warns against misuse of the *similitudo* (if it is too harsh, he suggest, like Victorinus, to soften it by adding a relativizing particle or sentence, cf. 3.165).

> *dum is in aliis rebus erat occupatus qui summam rerum administrabat, erant interea qui suis vulneribus mederentur; qui, tamquam si offusa rei publicae sempiterna nox esset, ita ruebant in tenebris omniaque miscebant.*

Victorinus' reference does not do justice to Cicero's sentence structure—in Cicero, *rei publicae* is indirect object with *offusa*, whereas in the abbreviated quotation in Victorinus it looks like a genitive within a nominal phrase—and thus makes the expression harsher than in Cicero's original. Even so, Cicero obviously had a metaphor like *nox rei publicae* in mind.[12] But the *iunctura* itself was still daring to Victorinus' ears, and indeed there are not more than two passages in classical Latin literature where the phrase *nox rei publicae* (with *rei publicae* as a genitive) is used,[13] and both are by Cicero. One stems from his speech *De haruspicum responso* 11 in the year 56: 'In this thunderstorm and night of the republic, my enemy, although he had dipped his pen in the dirty audacity of Sextus Cloelius and had written down all kinds of [alleged] crimes [of mine], did not even touch with one letter on the sanctity of my house' (*quam [sc. meam domum] primum inimicus ipse in illa tempestate ac nocte rei publicae, cum cetera scelera stilo illo impuro Sex. Cloeli ore tincto conscripsisset, ne una quidem attigit littera religionis*). The second is from the end of the *Brutus* (for which see the conclusion below). It is interesting that Victorinus does not quote these two more

[12] On metaphors as referring to both verbal and contextual *ornatus*, see the excellent introduction in Riesenweber 2007 (with a sound summary of ancient on modern theories). On p. 25, he quotes Weinrich 1967, 5: "Wort und Kontext machen zusammen die Metapher."

[13] I have not been able to find another instance in Cicero of the combination *nox* + [genitive of any noun] in a metaphorical sense that could serve as a parallel.

obvious examples. Perhaps he chose the formulation in the early speech because it allowed him to exculpate Cicero as much as he could and to drive home his argument best, namely that the formulation is too daring. (The addition of the relativizing particle *quasi/tamquam si* helps him here.) The three passages stem from very different political contexts: the Sullan regime of 80 BCE; Cicero's fight against Clodius after his return from exile; and the time of Caesar's dictatorship.[14] They show that even if the *iunctura* is rare and perhaps too daring in the ears of many ancient readers, the metaphor itself must have been present in Cicero's mind throughout his life.

In the following I will argue that in the case of the *Catilinarians*, the metaphor is not only present, but even functions as one of the unifying metaphors that help Cicero to construct coherence in his four speeches against Catiline.[15] According to Thomas Riesenweber, ancient theories of the metaphor saw it mainly as *ornatus*, but not as a means to change the meaning of the passage in question.[16] Elaine Fantham, on the other hand, has argued that it was only in the *De oratore* that Cicero would put into practice two more structural ways of using metaphors: "the thematic" and "the architectonic use" (the latter one being defined as, among others, "to link a speech with the preceding speech which it answers").[17] My argument will be that Cicero's use of the night as metaphor in the *Catilinarians* is so persistent as to be seen as one of the structuring

[14] Additionally, in *Flac*. 102 Cicero solemnly invokes the danger of an eternal night for the city of Rome which was conjured by Catiline; soon afterwards (103), he contrasts this night to the next day which brought salvation to the city. On these passages see below.

[15] Another one, the metaphor of illness and pestilence, has been analyzed in depth by Walters 2011, 64–77.

[16] Riesenweber 2007, 17 ("sie verändert die tiefere Bedeutung einer Stelle nicht").

[17] Fantham 1972, 139–140.

metaphors of the corpus and that it adds an additional layer of meaning to the speeches, as well.[18] But unlike the *lux/tenebrae* or *pestis* imagery, it will turn out to be not as clearly allotted to Catiline and his friends alone, but to show some ambiguities.

3 Catiline at Night

The historicity of the events which encouraged Cicero to pronounce his first speech against Catiline is not at stake in this chapter. But it is still worth stressing that even in passages that have been taken at face value by all historians since Sallust and up to our days, Cicero is not speaking (or writing)[19] as an objective chronicler, but as an orator who uses the narrative of the events for his own rhetorical aims. A good example of this is the passage I quoted at the beginning of the article. For it is very probable that the nocturnal meeting at Laeca's house indeed took place, but similarly important is that Cicero makes use of an intertextual link in order to transform the description of a singular event into something that becomes typical behavior for Catiline. The passage is very reminiscent of a fragment of Cicero's speech *In toga candida*, delivered 'as a candidate' in 64 BCE, 'just a few days before the consular elections' (*ante dies comitiorum paucos*, Asc. *Tog*. 82C). Fragments of the speech have been conserved for us in Asconius Pedianus' first-century CE commentary. The fact that Asconius could

[18] See for a similar qualification of Fantham's argument, Cape 1991, 179, and Walters 2011, 66, n. 23.

[19] The question of how strongly the *Catilinarians* which we have, and which go back to Cicero's re-circulation of the consular speeches in 60 BCE, differ from the version he delivered in 63, has been object of fierce debates. Cf. Dyck 2008, 11 for a concise overview of the major arguments *pro/contra* heavy changes. I agree with Stroh 1975, 54: even if the agreement of oral and written speech might be partly fictitious, a rhetorical interpretation cannot but take this fiction as reality ("dann haben wir—so paradox es klingen mag—diese Fiktion als Wirklichkeit zu nehmen").

comment on the speech more than 100 years after its delivery proves that it must have been circulating in written form, and this means that it must have been published by Cicero himself, most probably (as was usual for him) not too long after the delivery, i.e., early during his consulate, which in turn makes it at least very probable that it could have been remembered by the audience of the first *Catilinarian*. In the "mostly invective" speech,[20] Cicero obviously referred to a secret meeting of his rivals Antonius and Catiline. The first transmitted fragment of the speech is very similar to the quotation from the first *Catilinarian* (Cic. *Tog. Cand*. fr. 1 Crawford = Asc. *Tog.* 83c):

> I declare, conscript fathers, that the night before last Catiline and Antony together with their followers gathered in the house of a certain nobleman who is very well known in this whole affair of bribery.
>
> *dico, patres conscripti, superiore nocte cuiusdam hominis nobilis et valde in hoc largitionis quaestu noti et cogniti domum Catilinam et Antonium cum sequestribus suis convenisse.*

For easier comparison, here is again the text of the *Catilinarian speech* (*Catil.* 1.8):

[20] This characterization comes from Crawford 1994, 159; her introduction to the context of the speech 159–175 is very useful in general.

recognosce mecum tandem noctem illam superiorem; . . . dico te priore nocte venisse inter falcarios—non agam obscure[21]*—in M. Laecae domum; convenisse eodem complures eiusdem amentiae scelerisque socios.*

The verbal allusions are obvious, as is the general impression that emerges: Catiline's way of making politics is via clandestine meetings at night, during which he plots against the constitution of Rome.[22] The night is part of a consciously constructed setting of the Ciceronian narrative within the *Catilinarian* speeches: the darkness and creepiness of night is introduced as the opposite of bright daylight, which in its turn represents political stability and order.[23] As Wilfried Nippel has shown, nightly gatherings are a constitutive element of conspiracy narratives and are furthermore

[21] An anonymous referee hinted at the possibility that Cicero might use this term playfully within this passage: whereas Catiline's nightly activities (namely his plan to murder Cicero) should not be known to non-insiders, Cicero's counter-action is open and visible to all.

[22] Cf. Lewis 2006, 291–292: "The language is well chosen to convey an atmosphere of secret intrigue an electoral malpractice, carefully declining to name the master mind." Cf. Dyck 2008, 81 *ad Catil.* 1.8: on "night as Catiline's favored time of action."

[23] Cf. Welch 2005 (see above). Cf. also *Sul.* 52, a passage from a speech delivered in 62, in which Cicero refers to the night at Laeca's house, as well, and stresses the importance of the nocturnal setting by a triple repetition of the word *nox*: 'what did he say about that famous *night*, when, summoned by Catiline, he joined the meeting of that *night* (the one following the 6th of November during my consulship) in the house of Laeca in the scythemakers' street? This *night* was the most dangerous and the most troublesome of all moments of the conspiracy.' (*quid tandem de illa nocte dicit, cum inter falcarios ad M. Laecam nocte ea, quae consecuta est posterum diem nonarum Novembrium me consule Catilinae denuntiatione convenit? quae nox omnium temporum coniurationis acerrima fuit atque acerbissima.*)

associated with political instability raised by pro-plebeian politicians.[24] On an intertextual level, the motif connects Catiline with his 'role models' Spurius Maelius or Manlius Capitolinus.

Therefore it cannot be surprising that in Cicero's narratives of the Catilinarian conspiracy, the element of night appears continuously and consistently. To give just a small selection: In *Catil.* 1.8, Catiline's *nocturnus impetus* in Praeneste is mentioned. In *Catil.* 1.9 Cicero does not only re-affirm the meeting at Laeca's house with Catiline's detailed plans including a redistribution of Italian land and the burning of Rome, but also announces the attempted murder of himself by a companion of Catiline. Also this deed was planned to be executed 'in that very same night, shortly before dawn' (*illa ipsa nocte paulo ante lucem,* 1.9). In a similar vein we find passages in which Cicero declares that Catiline's clandestine nightly actions are no longer a secret, but that the new day has made them visible. In other words, the night as time of danger and horror is contrasted with the day as symbol of the future safety and stability of the state once Catiline's conspiracy is eradicated. For example, in *Catil.* 1.6 Cicero urges Catiline to give up his plans, given the fact that 'neither *the night* with its darkness can obscure your heinous attempts, nor can a private house with its walls restrain the voices of the conspiracy, if everything is *illuminated* and breaks out' (*neque nox tenebris obscurare coeptus nefarios nec privata domus parietibus continere voces coniurationis potest, si illustrantur, si erumpunt omnia*). In the second speech, the same idea returns: '[Catiline's allies] perceive that all their plans of the other *night* have been reported to

[24] Nippel 1984, 24. He concludes that *coetus nocturni* were "considered as the nucleus of the independent organization of the plebs in the Early Republic." See also Ker 2004, 219. Also Marc Antony in the *Philippics* is represented as a master of crime (*princeps latronum*) who seeks shelter in the night (*nocte tectus*, *Phil.* 14.27), who is his ally (*nocte socia*, *Phil.* 2.45).

me; I uncovered them in the senate yester*day*' (*omnia superioris noctis consilia ad me perlata esse sentiunt; patefeci in senatu hesterno die, Catil.* 2.6). The quotations seem to confirm what Welch (above) programmatically put as the first sentence of her article: "Roman politics had to happen in the daylight."[25]

A slightly different context, which however merits mention here, is to be found in the long fragment of Cicero's poem *De consulatu suo* transmitted in the first book of *De divinatione*. Here, the night is mentioned as a moment when divine signs of divination are visible for men, and as such, night is a more productive concept here. The fragment is very close to the third *Catilinarian* speech in general, where partly the same *omina* are mentioned as signs of Catiline's planned deeds of horror and as symbols of the divine aid against those plans, which has manifested itself by now.[26] The poem stresses even more than the speech that the nightly aspect of the visions increases the foreshadowing of wars and uproar: 'And already various dreadful apparitions at the time of the night foreboded war and civil commotion' (*iam vero variae nocturno tempore visae / terribiles formae bellum motusque monebant*, Cic. *Div*. 1.18.26–27 = *Carm.* fr. 6 Büchner-Blänsdorf = 10 Courtney = 11 Morel). It is noteworthy that the words *nocturno tempore* and *bellum motusque* occupy the same metrical *sedes*, thus

[25] Welch 2005, 313.

[26] This latter aspect is highlighted from the very beginning of the passage; see *Catil.* 3.18: *[di] ita praesentes his temporibus opem et auxilium nobis tulerunt ut eos paene oculis videre possemus* ('in this time [the gods] have brought us assistance and help in such a way that we could almost see them with our eyes'). Dyck 2008, 192 comments (my emphasis): "These sections lay greater emphasis on the rôle of the gods in the *protection* of the *res publica* than is found elsewhere in Ciceronian oratory." See also Kurczyk 2006, 93–100 for a comparison of the two passages.

strengthening the connection between the signs at night and the symbolic value of the night as such, which we have met so often in the *Catilinarians*.

4 The Imagery Shifts

So far, we have seen the obvious metaphorical function of the night: the night is associated with Catiline's crimes, the day with Cicero's heroic defense of Rome. The imagery indeed seems omnipresent, once one looks for it. For example, when Cicero in the second *Catilinarian* declares that Catiline's allies should leave the city immediately, he suggests they could still reach their fleeing master *ad vesperam*, i.e., just before sunset (*si accelerare volent, ad vesperam consequentur, Catil.* 2.6)—and thus just in time for another nocturnal malicious reunion.

This, however, is only one part of the story. During (real and metaphorical) nights not only the enemies of the state wake in order to harm it; also its defenders (among whom Cicero is the foremost example) are awake.[27] Does that mean that the clear-cut black-and-white scheme which one often finds in the *Catilinarians* (Catiline = supremely bad; Cicero—supremely heroic) is at least partly blurred? Thomas Habinek thinks that it is indeed. In his chapter on the speeches, in which he wants to show that being a bandit and being a politician are not ontologically different, but a matter of framing, he shows the close parallels between Cicero's and Catiline's actions and comes to the following conclusion: "Bandits meet at night: so does the senate . . . Bandits have an energetic leader, one who works day and night to advance the interests of the group and receives the highest honor and greatest loyalty as a result: so does the senate, in the

[27] This ambivalence might be connected to ideas of the night as a time when otherwise accepted categories and ascriptions collapse; see Marie-Charlotte von Lehsten in this volume, p. xxx, with reference to E. *Rh.* 69: 'in the darkness a runaway is very mighty' (ἐν ὄρφνῃ δραπέτης μέγα σθένει).

person of its consul Cicero."[28] This rather absolute claim might be questionable (e.g., it seems hard to find evidence for Habinek's assertion that the senate's meeting during which the first *Catilinarian* was delivered took place at night). But nonetheless, it seems worthwhile pursuing the possibility of permeable boundaries between Cicero and Catiline.

In the first *Catilinarian,* Cicero, when he invites Catiline to reconsider the prior night at Laeca's house, explicitly says that he uses the night more effectively to save the state than Catiline does to destroy it (*Catil.* 1.8):

> Reconsider with me, if you will, that night before last night, and you will easily understand that I am awake and keep watch (*vigilare*) more energetically for the sake of the state, than you are doing for its doom.
>
> *recognosce tandem mecum noctem illam superiorem; iam intelleges multo me vigilare acrius ad salutem quam te ad perniciem rei publicae.*

Two alternatives for what the night can symbolize are offered: either *salus* or *pernicies*.[29] The most detailed reference to this very opposition does not stem from the *Catilinarians*, but from a passage in the *Pro Flacco* that refers back to the Catilinarian conspiracy. Towards the end of the speech in defense of Lucius Valerius Flaccus, the *praetor urbanus* of 63, who is accused of extortion, Cicero makes use of the recent past in order to show Flaccus' ethical excellence. As Cicero's ally he had fought bravely against Catiline. The famous Allobroges-affair of the night between the 2nd and 3rd of

[28] Habinek 1998, 82.

[29] See Ker 2004 on the ambiguous conceptualization of the night in Imperial culture.

December, during which Cicero intercepted the letters of the conspirators, is recalled as proof of that. First, the night is introduced with its well-known symbolism of eternal darkness (Cic. *Flac*. 102):

> O famous night, you that almost brought eternal darkness to this city, when the Gauls were called to war, Catiline to this city and his allies to sword and fire; when I, crying, called heaven and night to witness and beseeched you, Flaccus, who were crying as well; when I entrusted the well-being of the city and the citizens to your excellent and well proved faithfulness.
>
> *o nox illa quae paene aeternas huic urbi tenebras attulisti, cum Galli ad bellum, Catilina ad urbem, coniurati ad ferrum et flammam vocabantur, cum ego te Flacce caelum noctemque contestans flens flentem obtestabar, cum tuae fidei optimae et spectatissimae salutem urbis et civium commendabam!*

Luigi Bessone connects the passage with a moment in the *Pro Sulla* (delivered three years earlier), in which Cicero had used a similarly 'melodramatic' tone with reference to the night in Laeca's house;[30] obviously, Cicero in retrospect was keen on stressing that both pairs of *Catilinarians*, those from early November and those from early December, were reactions to moments of extreme political crisis.[31] But then the tone changes, and Cicero reminds the jury of the glorious actions Flaccus undertook for the

[30] Cf. Bessone 2006, 75, with reference to *Sul*. 52 (*nox omnium temporum coniurationis acerrima fuit atque acerbissima*), see above n. 23 for the full quotation.

[31] On the *Pro Flacco* passage within Cicero's strategy to predefine his own *memoria* in the years following his consulship see Pieper 2014, 44–45.

sake of the city. This memory also brings him to re-conceptualize the night, which is no longer seen as eternal, but as alternating with a following day (Cic. *Flac*. 103):[32]

> O 5th of December in the year of my consulship! This day I can call the actual birthday of this city, or at least its salutary day. O famous night that was followed by that day; a fortunate night for the city, but—unhappy me!—destructive for me, I fear!
>
> *o Nonae illae Decembres quae me consule fuistis! quem ego diem vere natalem huius urbis aut certe salutarem appellare possum. o nox illa quam iste est dies consecutus fausta huic urbi, miserum me, metuo ne funesta nobis!*

This is no longer the night-day dichotomy we saw above. Instead, while Cicero celebrates the day on which he disclosed the conspiracy as a new, foundational moment for the city, he also labels the previous night *fausta* for the city. Thus, within just one paragraph, he has attributed to the same night two very diverse characteristics: it menaces with eternal darkness and at the same turns out to be most beneficial. The difference between the two lies in the attitude of Flaccus and his friends (among whom Cicero of course is the most important). They have changed the symbolism of the night with their nocturnal actions. Of course, the passage is Cicero's reinterpretation almost four years after the conspiracy. But even if such an explicit passage cannot be found in the *Catilinarians*, the metaphorical shift is observable already there, as well.

[32] Cf. Ker 2004, 219 for two alternative concepts of the night: 1. 'enhancement and extension of the day' (and thus connoted positively), 2. 'inversion of day' (and thus negatively framed).

5 *Vigiliae*

Above, we have seen that Cicero claims not only that Catiline is active at night, but also that Cicero is awake and takes precautions. One of the terms he uses for this is the verb *vigilare* and the related noun *vigiliae*. This noun alone occurs 46 times in the works of Cicero, and from the very beginning it can carry both positive and negative evaluations. In the *Verrines*, Cicero's *vigiliae* refer to the tireless efforts Cicero undertook to collect as much evidence in Sicily as possible (*Ver*. 1.6), and the concept returns in the *peroratio* of the last speech of the *actio secunda* (*Ver.* 2.5.188). At the same time, Verres also is active at night. His *vigiliae*, however, are concerned with binges (2.1.33) and sexual depravation (2.4.144).[33] Thus, *vigiliae*, in principle a *vox media*, can be turned into one of the many words in a linguistic competition in which the stake is to define the public discourse at the costs of one's opponents, a "word of war", as William Batstone has labeled them.[34]

[33] Similarly, in the affair around his house in the 50s, Cicero attributes *vigiliae* both to himself (the reference is to his *vigiliae consulatus* with the aim of a *res publica restituta*, *Dom*. 144–145) and to Clodius (whose disgraceful *vigiliae* lead to the end of all proper jurisdiction, *Har*. 55). And when Cicero recasts himself in the old role of consular authority in the *Philippics*, he immediately refers to the *vigilia* which seems to be connected to it: 'Because I hoped that once the state would be called back to your [*sc.* the senators'] guidance and authority, I decided that I should stay, so to speak, on a consular and senatorial sentinel at night' (*ego cum sperarem aliquando ad vestrum consilium auctoritatemque rem publicam esse revocatam, manendum mihi statuebam quasi in vigilia quadam consulari ac senatoria*, *Phil*. 1.1).

[34] Cf. Batstone 2010, who mainly analyses how the word 'war' itself is defined very differently in the first century BCE. In labeling *vigiliae* a *vox media*, I differ from Hellegouarc'h 1963, 250–251, who speaks of *vigilantia* as "le symbole même de l'activité politique."

Also in the *Catilinarians*, as we saw, both Cicero and his enemies are awake at night. At the beginning of the third speech, about four weeks after Catiline has left the city, Cicero assures his fellow citizens that he has been awake since then in order to keep things under control (Cic. *Catil.* 3.3):

> Firstly, because Catiline, when he fled from the city some days ago, had left the companions of his crime and the most energetic leaders of this nefarious war in Rome, I was always watchful and made plans, fellow citizens, as to how we could be safe in such a multitude of hidden ambushes.
>
> *principio, ut Catilina paucis ante diebus erupit ex urbe, cum sceleris sui socios, huiusce nefarii belli acerrimos duces, Romae reliquisset, semper vigilavi et providi, Quirites, quem ad modum in tantis et tam absconditis insidiis salvi esse possemus.*

Note that Cicero especially stresses that his nightly watches are still necessary due to the ambushes of his opponents (their *insidiae*) that also take place at night. As Andrew Dyck has remarked, *insidiae* are typical for Catiline's behaviour.[35] In Roman historiography, nightly ambushes are mostly attributed to the enemies of the narrative. In Caesar's *De bello civili*, for example, there is a moment in book 3 when Quintus Caecilius Metellus Pius Cornelianus Scipio Nasica, who is fighting on Pompey's side and represented as a truly negative character in Caesar's narrative,[36] sets a nightly ambush.

[35] Cf. Dyck 2008, 120 *ad Catil.* 1.31.

[36] See for a good overview of his "selfishness" and "failure to comprehend the nature and purpose of military command" Batstone and Damon 2006, 109–113.

Caesar makes it very clear that Scipio does so only because of cowardice (Caes. *Civ.* 3.37.4–6):

> When Scipio had learned of our soldiers' desire and eagerness to fight, he suspected that tomorrow he would be forced to fight against his will or would remain in his camp, which would bring utmost disgrace to him who had come with the highest expectations; after having rushed forwards inconsiderately, his end was shameful: at night, without even giving the sign for departure, he crossed the river and returned to where he had come from; there, next to the river, on a natural mound, he made camp. Some days later, he laid an ambush of the cavalry at night, at a spot where during the last days our troops were accustomed to coming to forage; when according to daily routine Quintus Varus, Domitius' master of the cavalry, had arrived; the enemy all of a sudden rose from the ambush. But our men bravely sustained their attack; everyone quickly returned to his own formation, and all together they launched a counterattack against the enemy.

quorum [sc. nostrorum] studium alacritatemque pugnandi cum cognovisset Scipio, suspicatus fore ut postero die aut invitus dimicare cogeretur aut magna cum infamia castris se contineret qui magna exspectatione venisset temere progressus turpem habuit exitum. et <u>noctu</u> neque conclamatis quidem vasis flumen transiit atque in eandem partem ex qua venerat rediit ibique prope flumen edito natura loco castra posuit. paucis diebus interpositis <u>noctu</u> <u>insidias</u> equitum conlocavit quo in loco superioribus fere diebus <u>nostri</u> pabulari consuerant, et cum cotidiana consuetudine Q. Varus, praefectus equitum Domiti,

venisset, subito illi ex insidiis consurrexerunt. sed nostri fortiter impetum eorum tulerunt, celeriterque ad suos quisque ordines rediit, atque ultro universi in hostes impetum fecerunt.

The passage is a classical ambush scene. In our context, it is important to note that through the repetition of the words *noctu* and *insidiae*, Caesar stresses that an ambush is a nightly activity against his own party (*nostri*, also twice). The answer of Caesar's troops in the last sentence is completely contrary to Scipio's previous actions: they fight bravely, according to military order and collectively against the ambush, which on the contrary is presented as Scipio's individual and cowardly plan.[37]

The narrative structure of the third *Catilinarian* speech is decisively different. True, the first ambush is set up by Catiline. But immediately after it has been mentioned, there follows the account of the nocturnal events at Pons Mulvius where the pro-Ciceronian praetors Flaccus and Pomptinus detain the ambassadors of the Allobroges and intercept the letters containing the names of the conspirators. This episode is also narrated as an ambush scene: the praetors' action is clandestine (cf. *occulte*, Cic. *Catil.* 3.5)[38] and not meant to be noticed by anyone (*sine cuiusquam suspicione*, 3.5); the

[37] Another famous example is in Livy's book 22, where Hannibal, the master of *insidiae*, previous to the battle of Cannae, also sets up a nightly ambush, to which the Romans are not able to find an adequate answer; cf. Liv. 22.41.6: 'Therefore he thought that place and time were fitting for an ambush; in the next night he left the camp and left behind all public and private possessions—the soldiers carrying nothing but their weapons' (*itaque locum et tempus insidiis aptum se habere ratus, nocte proxima nihil praeter arma ferente secum milite castra plena omnis fortunae publicae privataeque relinquit*). Cf. Pausch 2019 for a fascinating narratological analysis of the ambush-motif in Livy 22.

[38] Dyck 2008, 174 *ad loc.* connects this passage *en passant* to "the *conspirators'* general preference for nocturnal operations" (my emphasis).

attack (*impetus*, 3.6) comes out of the blue. In other words, Cicero is countering the *insidiae* of his opponents not with open military fighting, but with Catiline's own weapons.[39] It is therefore no surprise that Cicero also stresses the nocturnal setting of the little scene: the execution of the plan starts when dusk arrives (*cum advesperasceret*, 3.5) and ends when the morning light reappears (*cum iam dilucesceret*, 3.6);[40] the attack on the Allobroges is staged when the third watch of the night is over, i.e., long after midnight: 'in the meantime, when the third watch was completed and when the envoys of the Allobroges with a huge escort and together with Volturcius already started to walk on the Mulvian bridge, they were attacked' (*interim tertia fere vigilia exacta cum iam pontem Mulvium magno comitatu legati Allobrogum ingredi inciperent unaque Volturcius, fit in eos impetus*, 3.6). And the next morning, when all is resolved and Cicero summons the main conspirators to his house, he pesters one of them, Lentulus, by saying that Lentulus normally sleeps at night and only by chance had been awake last night—in order to write letters: 'Very late, however, Lentulus arrived—I think because he had been awake last night against his custom and had written letters' (*tardissime autem Lentulus venit, credo quod in litteris dandis*

[39] Sallust's version of the scene makes this more explicit by using the word 'ambush' explicitly with respect to the scene 'Cicero gave order that [the praetors] catch the escort of the Allobroges on the Mulvian bridge with an ambush' (*imperat ut in ponte Mulvio per insidias Allobrogum comitatus deprehendant*, *Cat.* 45.1). Cf. Pagán 2004, 48 ("counter-conspiracy"). This ambush at night might at least partly explain his much debated characteristic in Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae* as a consul possessing *dolus* and *astutiae* (Sall. *Cat.* 26.2). See for different evaluation of the terms, see Vretska 1976, vol. 2, 360 *ad loc*. (positive and realistic with regard to Cicero), McGushin 1977, 166 *ad loc*. (not negative, but also not enthusiastic about Cicero), and Ramsey 2007, 135 *ad loc*. (normally negative terms "which tend . . . to undercut the apparent compliment to Cicero").

[40] For these two temporal markers as frame of the scene, cf. Dyck 2008, 175 *ad loc*.

praeter consuetudinem proxima nocte vigilarat, 3.6). Lentulus' inactivity and naivety (he had obviously not foreseen Cicero's ambush) contrasts strongly with Cicero's own regular *vigiliae*.[41] The subtext is clear: Lentulus is no adequate opponent of Cicero.

But Catiline of course is different. He has enormous talent for waking and acting maliciously at night, as the third *Catilinarian* makes clear.[42] The passage, which Sallust obviously had in mind when writing his famous characterization of Catiline at the beginning of his monograph, is packed with words that make it clear that Catiline is the most talented of all conspirators, the only worthy enemy of the wakeful consul Cicero (*Catil.* 3.16–17):

> He had an apt mental determination for crime; neither tongue nor hands were lacking to it. He already had chosen and instructed certain men to fulfill his plans. But he did not trust that his orders were enough to get what he wanted: there was nothing he would not undergo, for which he would not wake at night and work hard: he could endure thirst, nights without sleep, and hunger.[43] If I had

[41] Cf. Dyck 2008, 176 *ad loc.*: "Lentulus' usual behavior contrasts with C.'s own alertness."

[42] In the *Bellum Catilinae*, the same attribution of *vigiliae* to Catiline and the defenders of the Roman state is to be found, but in a very interesting distinction: in the first half of the text, only Catiline is associated with *vigiliae* on several occasions: after the characterization as *patiens . . . vigiliae* in 5.3, Sallust mentions Catiline's *vigiliae* in 15.4 as a sign of his restless character and in 27.2 when the conspiracy actually starts, after his loss during the elections; in the second half of the text, then, only the countermeasures of the state are described as *vigiliae*: in 30.6, 32.1, 52.29 (Cato's speech, linked to action and opposed to *supplicia muliebria*), and 54.4.

[43] Cf. the similarities in Sallusts's list at *Cat.* 5.3–4 (I have highlighted characteristics that Cicero mentions as well here): 'His body could endure hunger, cold and nights without sleep in an unbelievable way. His mind was rash, cunning, inconstant; he pretended this and hided the other, aspired to the possessions of

not forced that man—energetic, audacious, well prepared, and astute, always wakeful for the sake of his crimes, so carefully plotting wretched things—if I had not forced him to stop with his ambushes in the city and to go to his camp of freebooters (I shall say what I think, citizens), then I would not have dispelled so easily such a huge burden of evil from your necks.

erat ei consilium ad facinus aptum, consilio autem neque lingua neque manus deerat. iam ad certas res conficiendas certos homines delectos et descriptos habebat. neque vero, cum aliquid mandarat, confectum putabat: nihil erat quod non ipse obiret, occurreret, vigilaret, laboraret; frigus, sitim, famem ferre poterat. hunc ego hominem tam acrem, tam audacem, tam paratum, tam callidum, tam in scelere vigilantem, tam in perditis rebus diligentem nisi ex domesticis insidiis in castrense latrocinium compulissem (dicam id quod sentio, Quirites) non facile hanc tantam molem mali a cervicibus vestris depulissem.

The capacity to be wakeful at night obviously is central to this portrayal, as it is repeated twice in the passage. Moreover, it takes up similar passages of the first two *Catilinarians*.[44] The reference to Catiline's ability to endure thirst, hunger, and lack of sleep recalls especially a passage in the second *Catilinarian*, where Cicero however still rebuts the general appraisal with a counterattack on his uncontrolled lusts (*Catil.* 2.9):

---

others, but was generous with his own; his passion was tinderlike, his eloquence very good, while his wisdom was less developed.' (*corpus patiens inediae algoris vigiliae supra quam quoiquam credibile est. animus audax, subdolus, varius, quoius rei lubet simulator ac dissimulator, alieni adpetens sui profusus, ardens in cupiditatibus; satis eloquentiae, sapientiae parum.*)

[44] *Catil.* 1.26 (with Dyck 2008, 112), 2.9, 2.10, 2.22.

> And acquainted to his exercises of rapes and crimes, his fellow conspirators considered him strong due to his ability to endure cold, hunger, thirst, and lack of sleep, although he used his assiduity and his natural talent for virtuous behaviour only for his lust and presumption.
>
> *atque idem tamen stuprorum et scelerum exercitatione assuefactus frigore et fame et siti et vigiliis perferendis fortis ab istis praedicabatur, cum industriae subsidia atque instrumenta virtutis in libidine audaciaque consumeret.*

In the third speech, Cicero acknowledges the *instrumenta virtutis* without such moral qualification. Obviously, Cicero enlarges the picture of Catiline at the moment he has finally defeated his conspiracy in order to make his victory even greater. The virtues he celebrates here are connected to a military realm, nicely fitting his own self-fashioning as a *dux togatus*. It shows that Cicero was well aware that only to win against a worthy, and that means, a potentially equal enemy gives enough glory to the winner.[45]

The military *instrumenta virtutis* are famously alluded to by Sallust at the beginning of his *Bellum Catilinae* (*corpus patiens inediae, algoris, vigiliae*, see above n. 43).[46] In Sallust, Catiline is presented as an excellent soldier and a potential hero whose talents have been misled by the circumstances and by general weaknesses in his

[45] Cf. Dyck 2008, 82 ad *Catil.* 1.8: Cicero portrays Catiline as the master of wakefulness and then, in a second step, competes with him in his own field of excellence. Cf. also Riggsby 2010, 95 on Cicero's choice "to play up both the magnitude of the threat and the magnitude of his control over it."

[46] Cf. Vretska 1976, vol. 1, 128 *ad loc.*: the characteristics "gehören dem römischen Soldatenideal an."

character and have thus become ruinous for himself.[47] The fact that Sallust does not paint Catiline as a purely dark figure creates potential overlap between Catiline and his opponents on the one hand, and the moral stance of the narrator on the other, in terms of both the characterization and the terminology Sallust adopts. This has often been interpreted as the historian's reflection on the crisis of the state he describes, a crisis that manifests itself in the implosion of moral compasses.[48] Also in Cicero, Catiline's portrayal, negative as it is, has some aspects that hint towards the opponent and the narrator of the events: Cicero himself. The focus on the night, which this chapter has adopted, helps us to understand that at the end Cicero and Catiline are not so different at all.[49] They are both similarly able to work day and night for their plans. But Cicero had, in his own eyes, the advantage that he had chosen the right path. The division between him and his great opponent is not one of nature, but of ethics.

6 Conclusion

In all the passages discussed in this chapter, the term 'night' refers to actual nocturnal affairs, but should be understood at the same time as connected to the metaphor circling around the absent formulation of a *rei publicae nox*. (Even if it does not appear often in Cicero's works, the references cover all periods of his public career, so that we can

[47] Catiline's positive potential shows itself most clearly in the final battle and in his brave death, according to Vretska 1976, vol. 2, 689 *ad* 61.4: "ein Bild, würdig eines gefallenen römischen Feldherrn." McGushin 1977, 288 *ad loc*. compares the scene to the deaths of Decius Mus the Elder and the Younger (two uncontested Roman heroes and exemplary figures) in Livy 8.10.10 and 10.29.19.

[48] See recently Feldherr 2013, 65. Batstone 2010, 50–51.

[49] In this, I agree with Habinek 1998, 81, who stresses that Cicero's rhetoric of division at the end reminds us "of the essential similarity" between Cicero's and Catiline's supporters.

assume that the concept actively remained in his rhetorical repertoire most of his life.) However, the night turns out to be a rather ambiguous concept, one that withdraws itself from clear black-and-white attributions. Therefore I tentatively propose to read it as a productive concept, a time of testing when Romans must show openly on whose side they stand.[50] Read as such, it also makes sense on more than a literal level that at the end of the third *Catilinarian* Cicero connects the moment of relief he has brought to Rome with the night (*Catil.* 3.29):

> You, citizens, because it is night, worship Jove, the guardian of this city and of you; go off to your houses, and even if the danger is put down, defend them nevertheless with the same sentinels and *vigiliae* as last night.
>
> *vos, Quirites, quoniam iam est nox, venerati Iovem illum, custodem huius urbis ac vestrum, in vestra tecta discedite et ea, quamquam iam est periculum depulsum, tamen aeque ac priore nocte custodiis vigiliisque defendite.*

The war, and therefore the time of testing, is not over yet. The Roman citizens should therefore go to venerate Jove, who has shown himself especially propitious towards

[50] This is even more fascinating if one considers that at least at the beginning of the affair, when delivering his first *Catilinarian* speech, Cicero did not know who was on his side in the senate. Cf. on this well-known aspect the by now classical interpretation of Batstone 1994, who argues that the first *Catilinarian* is "finally about Cicero" and the construction of his ethos; cf. also Steel 2007, who identifies Cicero's strategy to give advice instead of orders as a clever response to his weak position; Price 1998, instead, interprets the speech as a failure (but if his interpretation was correct, it is highly implausible that Cicero would have published his speech and made it part of the representative consular orations).

Cicero; thus, by worshipping Jove, they also line up with Cicero and should keep nocturnal watch as he will continue to do. Even more explicitly, we find the link between the night and a choice on whose side you stand in the fourth *Catilinarian*. The senators are invited to make their decision on whose side they stand before the next night approaches: 'Be that as it may, you have to take a decision, before the night, regarding in what direction your minds and decisions are inclined.' (*nunc quicquid est, quocumque vestrae mentes inclinant atque sententiae, statuendum vobis ante noctem est*, *Catil.* 4.6).[51] Like this, so I am inclined to assume, they can fulfill their duties as righteous citizens also between dusk and dawn. The meeting of the senate will stop at sunset, but this does not mean that Roman politics only happened during daytime.[52]

Even the mentioning of the *rei publicae nox* in the more pessimistic context of the *Brutus* is not free of ambiguity. By way of a ring composition, at the end of the *Brutus* Cicero returns to the idea expressed in the preface: his colleague and rival Hortensius is lucky that he was allowed to die before the outburst of the civil war in 49 BCE. At the end, Cicero himself would wish for the same fate, but has to live on in the deepest darkness of the *rei publicae nox* (*Brut*. 330):

> I for myself am sad that I started the path, so to speak, of my life so late that I fell into this night of the republic before the path was finished; but one comfort

[51] Dyck 2008, 207 *ad loc*. refers to the fact that senatorial decisions had to be taken at daytime.

[52] *Pace* Welch 2007. Cf. for a late parallel the third *Philippic*, in which Cicero in the *peroratio* promises that, given the dangerous situation, he will not leave any time unused for thinking how he can serve the freedom of Rome: *nullum tempus, patres conscripti, dimittam, neque diurnum neque nocturnum* (*Phil*. 3.33); shortly afterwards (3.36) he points out that the crisis has one advantage: the choice concerning which political idea to follow is clear-cut and manifest by now.

keeps me going (a comfort you gave to me in your extremely sweet letter in which you urged me to be brave): you wrote that I have accomplished deeds that will speak of me even if I am silent, and that I will live even when I am dead.

equidem etsi doleo me in vitam paulo serius tamquam in viam ingressum, priusquam confectum iter sit, in hanc rei publicae noctem incidisse, tamen ea consolatione sustentor quam tu mihi, Brute, adhibuisti tuis suavissimis litteris, quibus me forti animo esse oportere censebas, quod ea gessissem, quae de me etiam me tacente ipsa loquerentur viverentque mortuo.

But there still is a bit of solace. His brave actions can at least guarantee his everlasting *memoria*. In the sentence which immediately follows, Cicero comments a on his deeds: 'my actions would testify my attitude towards the state through its salvation, if things were fair, or through its destruction, if they are not fair' (*quae, si recte esset, salute rei publicae, sin secus, interitu ipso testimonium meorum de re publica consiliorum darent*). The ultimate testimony, of course, is provided by his carefully constructed writing—in his own words, *meae vigiliae meaeque litterae*—, which, so he says, will serve the younger generation as a model and will bring fame to the Roman people (*et iuventuti utilitatis et nomini Romano laudis aliquid afferrent*, *Phil*. 2.20). Even if under Caesar's dictatorship the night is no longer a time to fight with the political weapons he used to have in hand, still Cicero would not be himself if he would simply go to bed. He only takes up different arms for his nightly mission: his writing pen.[53]

[53] Butler 2002 is a fascinating study about the possibility of using the written word as public *signum* in the first century BCE; on Cicero's treatises of the 40s as " 'substitutes' for political activity and public discourse", cf. p. 111. Ultimately, despite his bitter despair in some of the letters, Cicero does not seem to

Bibliography

Batstone, W. (1994). Cicero's Construction of Consular Ethos in the First Catilinarian. *TAPA,* 125, pp. 211–266.

Batstone, W. (2010), Word at War. The Prequel. In: B. Breed, C. Damon, and A. Rossi, eds. *Citizens of Discord. Rome and its Civil Wars*. Oxford, pp. 45–71.

Batstone, W. and C. Damon (2006). *Caesar's Civil War*. Oxford.

Berry, B., ed. (1996). *Cicero, Pro P. Sulla Oratio. Edited with Introduction and Commentary.* Cambridge.

Bessone, L. (2006). Le lunghe notti del 63. *Acta classica Universitatis Scientiarum Debreceniensis,* 42, pp. 57–79.

Butler, S. (2002). *The Hand of Cicero*. London.

Cape, R., Jr. (1991). *On Reading Cicero's Catilinarian Orations*. Diss. University of California Los Angeles.

Crawford, J., ed. (1994). *M. Tullius Cicero, The Fragmentary Speeches. An Edition with Commentary*. 2nd ed. Atlanta.

Damon, C., ed. (2004). *C. Iuli Caesaris Commentariorum libri III de bello civili*. Oxford.

Dyck, A., ed. (2008). *Cicero, Catilinarians*. Cambridge.

Dyck, A., ed. (2010). *Cicero, Pro Sexto Roscio Amerino*. Cambridge.

Fantham, E. (1972). *Comparative Studies in Republican Latin Imagery*. Toronto/Buffalo.

Feldherr, A. (2013). Free Spirits. Sallust and the Citation of Catiline. *AJP* 134, pp. 49–66.

---

frame night as the eternal darkness, but as a night that will at least potentially be followed by a new day, i.e., by new hope (for these two possibilities, see above n. 32). Thanks to Cynthia Damon for having suggested this thought to me.

Fruechtel, L., ed. (1933). *M. Tulli Ciceronis Oratio Pro L. Flacco*. Leipzig.

Gildenhard, I. and L. Hodgson (2014). *Cicero, On Pompey's Command (De imperio) 27–49. Latin Text, Study Aids, Commentary, and Translation*. Online-source: https://www.openbookpublishers.com/reader.php/284?284#page/1/mode/2up

Habinek, T. (1998). Cicero and the Bandits. In: *The Politics of Latin Literature. Writing, Identity, and Empire in Ancient Rome*. Princeton, pp. 69–87.

Hellegouarc'h, J. (1963). *Le vocabulaire latin des relations et des parts politiques sous la république*. Paris.

Ker, J. (2004). Nocturnal Writers in Imperial Rome. The Culture of *Lucubratio*', *CP,* 99, pp. 209–242.

Kurczyk, S. (2006). *Cicero und die Inszenierung der eigenen Vergangenheit. Autobiographisches Schreiben in der späten römischen Republik*. Cologne/Weimar/Vienna.

Lewis, R., ed. (2006). *Asconius, Commentaries on Speeches of Cicero*. Rev. by J. Harries, J. Richardson, C. Smith, and C. Steel, with Latin text ed. by A. Clark. Oxford.

McGushin, P., ed. (1977). *C. Sallustius Crispus, Bellum Catilinae. A Commentary*. Leiden.

Malcovati, E., ed. (1965). *Cicero, Brutus*. Leipzig.

Manuwald. G., (2018). *Cicero, Agrarian Speeches. Introduction, Text, Translation, and Commentary*. Oxford.

Maslowski, T., ed. (1981). *Cicero, Orationes cum senatui gratias egit, cum populo gratias egit, de domo sua, de haruspicum responsis*. Leipzig.

Nippel, W. (1984). Policing Rome. *JRS,* 74, pp. 20–29.

Pagán, V. (2004). *Conspiracy Narratives in Roman History*. Austin, TX.

Pausch, D. (2019). Who Knows What Will Happen Next? Livy's *fraus Punica* from a Literary Point of View. In: L. van Gils, I. de Jong, and C. Kroon, eds., *Textual Strategies in Ancient War Narrative. Thermopylae, Cannae and Beyond*. Leiden/Boston, pp. 234–252.

Pieper, C. (2014). *Memoria saeptus*. Cicero and the Mastery of Memory in his (Post-) Consular Speeches. *Symbolae Osloenses,* 88, pp. 42–69.

Price, J. (1998). The Failure of Cicero's First Catilinarian. In: C. Deroux, ed., *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History,* 9, pp. 106–128.

Pronay, A., ed. (1997). *C. Marius Victorinus, Liber de definitionibus. Eine spätantike Theorie der Definition und des Definierens. Mit Einleitung, Übersetzung und Kommentar*. Frankfurt.

Ramsey, J., ed. (2007). *Sallust's Bellum Catilinae. Edited, with Introduction and Commentary*. 2nd edition. New York.

Ramsey, J., ed. (2003). *Cicero, Philippics I–II.* Cambridge.

Reis, P., ed. (1933). *Cicero, Oratio De imperio Cn. Pompei*. Leipzig.

Reynolds, L., ed. (1991). *C. Sallusti Crispi Catilina. Iugurtha. Historiarum fragmenta selecta. Appendix Sallustiana*. Oxford.

Riesenweber, T. (2007). *Uneigentliches Sprechen und Bildermischung in den Elegien des Properz*. Berlin/New York.

Riesenweber, T. (forthcoming). Towards a New Critical Edition of Marius Victorinus, *De definitionibus*. In: T. Dorandi and L. Ferroni, eds., *Tempus quaerendi. Nouvelles expériences philologiques dans le domaine de la pensée de l'Antiquité tardive*. Naples, pp. xxx–xxx.

Riggsby, A. (2010). Form as Global Strategy in Cicero's Second *Catilinarian*. In: D. Berry and A. Erskine, eds., *Form and Function in Roman Oratory*. Cambridge, pp. 92–104.

Stangl, T. (1888). *Tulliana et Mario-Victoriniana. Programm des Kgl. Luitpold-Gymnasiums*, Munich.

Steel, C. (2007). Consul and *consilium.* Suppressing the Catilinarian Conspiracy. In: D. Spencer and E. Theodorakopoulos, eds., *Advice and its Rhetoric in Greece and Rome*. Bari, pp. 63–78.

Stroh, W. (1975). *Taxis und Taktik. Die advokatische Dispositionskunst in Ciceros Gerichtsreden*. Stuttgart.

Vretska, K., ed. (1976). *C. Sallustius Crispus, De Catilinae coniuratione, kommentiert von K.V.*, 2 vols. Heidelberg.

Walters, B. (2011). *Metaphor, Violence, and the Death of the Roman Republic*. Diss. University of California Los Angeles.

Weinrich, H. (1967). Semantik der Metapher. *Folia linguistica*, 1, pp. 3–17.

Welch, K. (2005). *Lux* and *lumina* in Cicero's Rome. A Metaphor for the *res publica* and her Leaders. In: K. Welch and T. Hillard, eds., *Roman Crossings. Theory and Practice in the Roman Republic*. Swansea, pp. 313–337.

Winterbottom, M., ed. (1970). *M. Fabi Quintiliani Institutionis oratoriae libri duodecim*. Oxford.