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It is the year when Marcus Tullius Cicero and Gaius Antonius Hybrida are consuls.
Will the Republic live to see another?

INTRODUCTION

Rome, 63 BCE: a tumultuous year of urban and rural unrest, economic instability, sensational trials, and electoral misconduct. You are a Roman senator. Can you save the Republic…and yourself?

At the center of the crisis stands Lucius Sergius Catilina or Catiline, a charismatic (and scandal-plagued) nobleman. Last year Catiline lost an election for the consulship, the highest office in Rome, to Marcus Tullius Cicero, a brilliant orator, canny politician, and “new man” (novus homo) — the first member of his family to reach the pinnacle of Roman politics. Now that Catiline has again failed in his quest for the consulship, rumors swirl that he and his followers plot assassinations and arson in Rome, while raising an army in the north. Are the rumors true — is Catiline conspiring to lead a revolution? Or have Catiline's enemies conspired to thwart desperately needed social and economic reforms by slandering Catiline and his followers?

Dissatisfaction with the current system has made Catiline popular among the urban and rural poor, as well as among many disaffected members of the nobility who have seen their careers thwarted by the wealthy and insular clique that dominates Roman politics. During the most recent campaign, Catiline proposed significant (some would say radical) reforms to address the hardships facing the poor Roman citizens, whose livelihoods had been undermined by the social and economic changes that accompanied Rome's emergence as a commercial and military superpower.

Fear of Catiline led the entrenched elites to swing their support to an unlikely champion: Cicero, the son of a well-off businessman from the small town of Arpinum, 60 miles southeast of Rome. Cicero and some of Rome's conservative leaders acknowledge that incremental reform is necessary but they also believe that Catiline’s reckless promises and rumored threats of violence pose a threat to public order. There are other senators who are unsure about whether Catiline or Cicero can be trusted to set a secure and prosperous course for Rome.

Severe economic turmoil contributed to the unstable conditions that threaten Rome in 63 BCE. But The Crisis of Catiline requires you to act to solve a political crisis. This game poses essential questions about political action and the relationship between the individual and the state. What constrains those in power or those seeking power? What can undermine the legitimacy of a state or, conversely, permit the state or a person acting on its behalf to curtail or even eliminate the traditional prerogatives and legal rights of a citizen or a group of citizens? Ultimately, the Crisis of Catiline asks whether the preservation of civil order justifies the use of force against threatening (but not yet violent) citizens, and who has the power to decide when that point of crisis has been reached.

The Crisis of Catiline begins on November 8th, 63 BCE.

The Roman senators who assembled in the fortified Temple of Jupiter Stator have just heard Cicero denounce Catiline in his First Oration Against Catiline (included in this booklet). Still Catiline sits in the Senate. Then he stands and delivers a blistering speech reminding the assembled senators of the achievements of his illustrious
family, while Cicero, his tormentor, is a mere novus homo, the first man of his family to hold the consulship. Who, Catiline asks, could believe that he, a true Roman of Rome, poses a threat to the city while Cicero, an immigrant, barely even a citizen, could be its savior? Catiline declares that Cicero will not drive him from Rome, his home, where he was born.

After Catiline sits, all eyes turn to Quintus Lutatius Catulus, the elderly “first man of the Senate,” the princeps senatus, who guards the traditions of the Roman Senate. Catulus is known to despise Catiline’s politics; but, like so many senators, he cannot help but like the man. When Catulus signals his support for continued debate, Cicero agrees to seek the Senate’s advice when they reconvene in the morning. And thus begins the contest over the fates of Catiline, Cicero — and perhaps the Roman Republic itself.

As a senator, your goal — whether you support Catiline, oppose him, or are undecided about which path to take (or even have your own agenda) — is to lead Rome out of this crisis by persuading the Senate to adopt a decree consistent with the goals of your character or faction. You will do this by persuading your fellow senators through a short speech that proposes a solution to the crisis that confronts Rome — or by supporting or condemning the proposal made by another senator. What course of action will Catiline and his supporters take? And what will other Romans do about (or to) Catiline and his supporters?

Crafting a persuasive speech will require you to reflect on how Rome came to this point of crisis. You will also have to consider the viewpoints of your friends and enemies, which you can discover by listening carefully to their speeches and speaking with them outside of the Senate. Some Romans will oppose your opinions to their dying breath — but others are persuadable by the right argument, if it is well-presented. The fate of Rome (and quite possibly your own life) is in your hands. Take care, Roman, that you prosper!

**The Necessity of Action**

If the Senate is unable to approve a new decree by the conclusion of this debate, then the confusion of the current political crisis will be compounded and events will spin out of control in unpredictable ways. In the absence of a new decree, Cicero may act on the existing decree at any moment. This state of affairs is untenable to the senators who support Catiline and to many other senators who fear unchecked senatorial power. Since failing to confirm the “Final Decree” could (further) delegitimize it in the eyes of many Romans and call into question the legality of any action taken under its auspices, Cicero and his supporters have every incentive to pass a decree that confirms their authority. In short, (almost) all senators have a vested interest that the Senate take some action.
ROME IN 63 BCE

1. Temple of Juno Moneta
2. Temple of Apollo Medicus
3. Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus
4. Ara Maxima
5. Temple of Ceres
6. Temple of Diana on the Aventine
7. Cuna Hostilia
8. Temple of Concord
9. Temple of Saturn
10. Mundus
11. Comitium
12. Shrine of Vulcan
13. Rostra
14. Tabernae
15. Regina
16. Temple of Castor & Pollux
17. Fountain of Juturna
18. Temple of Vesta
19. Domus Publica
A TENSE NIGHT IN ROME (HISTORICAL VIGNETTE)

Six days before the Ides of November, early evening

Gaius Sallustius Crispus shook his empty cup. A young Greek slave rushed over, refilled the cup with sweet Rhaetic wine from an ornate silver pitcher, and then retreated to the corner of the couch-lined dining room. Sallust had arrived late for dinner with scarcely an excuse. But you could overlook etiquette on a day like today.

“What do you think will happen, Sallust?”

Sallust grimaced. He had been born in the nearby Sabine countryside just over twenty years ago. But a few years of hard living in Rome made him seem older. Sallust showed such promise as a writer. He might still make a mark — if only he would abandon his current pastimes of dicing, drinking, and dancing girls. Sadly, he was not the first Roman to toss away a promising career and bring dishonor to his family. Not in times like these.

Sallust began, “History teaches us that the events of revolution are ‘many and terrible, such as have occurred and always will occur, as long as the nature of mankind remains the same.’ Slaughter is inevitable once a state has fallen into crisis, ‘a rough master that brings men’s characters to a level with their fortunes.’” Sallust, it seemed, was re-reading Thucydides’ History of the Peloponnesian War.

“... Murder and treachery and crime. The plots. The threats. Manlius is said to be raising an army in the north. Or at least that’s what Cicero claims. I don't know if I believe him. The north is often restless. Earlier today, while you were listening to Cicero’s speech against Catiline, I was in the Forum studying a letter by the tribune Tiberius Gracchus…”

Sallust always claimed to be “studying” — although one could never be sure whether his subject was a scroll, the bottom of a wine cup, or an actress.

“...when I spotted Marcus Antonius walking with a few friends. I see your disapproval. I know Antonius can be a rogue but, when he’s sober, he is terribly sharp and he knows everyone. Any man who can be friends with Populares like Crassus and Caesar, supporters of Catiline like Lentulus Sura, and Boni like Curio is a source worth cultivating.1 Cicero, you know, greatly esteemed Antonius’ grandfather, the famous orator. Did you know that when Antonius’ grandfather was about to be murdered by a supporter of the popular faction during the Terror...”

“Please, my dear Sallust, if you tell me everything, what will you have left for your history?”

“Of course...Marcus Antonius was on his way to the house of Gaius Scribonius Curio, the orator, to learn more about the day’s events from one of Cicero’s friends. Since Antonius would know the intentions of the popular faction and Curio would know Cicero’s mind, I joined him. As we walked across the Forum, Marcus Antonius voiced his concerns about the behavior of Cicero and Catiline:

My friends find themselves in a most uncomfortable situation. The Optimates who support the prerogatives of the Senate above

1 A glossary of Roman terms is provided in Appendix 1.
all else, are concerned that all *Populares* are conspiring with Catiline. But ever since Crassus
turned those letters over to Cicero, the friends of Catiline believe we value the few above the
welfare of the people. Personally, and I am not ashamed to say it, I think that Catiline makes
a great deal of sense. The *Optimates*, with their villas and their retinues of slaves, might not
realize it but Rome has changed. This is not a city of shepherds' huts and she-wolf lairs! We
rule the world and the world has come to our seven hills. But the city is dangerous for the
poor. Food is scarce; their apartments are ramshackle. Gaius, you said recently that a poor
person is more likely to die in a collapsing or burning apartment than of old age. Champions
of the People have long known that Rome can only be strong when her people are strong.

Yet earlier this year, when the tribune Publius Servilius Rullus proposed first the abolition of
debts and then real land reform, Cicero and the *Boni* aligned with the *Optimates* to thwart
reform. Debt relief is controversial. But how could anyone object to the land bill? Land
would have been purchased at a fair price using funds from Pompey's conquests in the East.
And public lands in Campania, all now unoccupied, would have been distributed to the
urban and rural poor. But Cicero spoke vigorously against it, citing its costs and claiming
that land would be no benefit to the poor. No benefit to the poor!? No wonder there is such
desperation here and throughout Italy, when a consul can speak such nonsense. Emotions
were raw. As a gesture of conciliation, the *Populares* thought, ‘surely we can at least allow
the sons of men proscribed under Sulla to run for office again.’ But no! Even this basic
recognition of the rights of Roman citizenship was blocked by Cicero and his supporters. No
wonder so many such men now support Catiline.

As if this insult to the People were not enough, Cicero then defended Gaius Rabirius, a man
who killed a fellow Roman without trial, all to prevent any challenge to the authority of their
precious *Consultum Ultimum*. Look, Cicero claims that the *Consultum Ultimum* is needed to
prevent the chaos of mob rule. Rabirius and the other murders climbed on the roof of the
Senate House, tore off the tiles, and stoned to death Saturninus and his followers, who had
surrendered to the consul and were awaiting lawful trial. Where was the imminent threat to
public order? Even if you grant the authority of the decree, as soon as the threat had passed,
surely the decree has run its course. Or, once, passed does the *Consultum Ultimum* allow
anyone to resort to violence with impunity whenever the mood strikes? *That* is mob rule!
Rabirius' conviction shows that the People believe that their tribunes should be protected and
that the rights of Roman citizens are inviolate. Cicero risks all by resting his ability to act on
the illegal and discredited authority of *Consultum Ultimum*. A mob in fine togas is still a mob.

But this business of Catiline raising an army? If it is true, then Catiline is less clever than I
suspected. What folly! First, the threat of insurrection gives a pretext to move against those
who seek reform. They have been itching for just such an excuse since Pompey and Crassus
restored the powers of the tribunes. We must preserve and strengthen the powers of the
tribunate. It is our best check on the abuse of the People by the powerful. But just as Cicero
should not act outside the law, neither should Catiline, no matter how compelling his
reforms. Don't misunderstand, I see the attraction. Many of my friends are on the Aventine
tonight, listening to Catiline and his associates rallying the people. But we know all too well
what might happened when one man's ambition grows too high.
Need I mention Catiline’s “service” to Sulla during his reign of terror? How many Knights met their fate because of Catiline? He even arranged for his own brother-in-law to be added to list of the proscribed, and tortured to death Marius’ nephew on the tomb of his friend Lutatius Catulus. Catiline says he is a friend of the People, and maybe now he is. But when he had the chance to stand against tyranny, he preferred to put citizens’ necks to the sword. I cannot shake the feeling that he cares more for the consulship of Catiline than the welfare of the People.

But no matter what happens we must attempt to overturn the Consultum Ultimum. Unless, of course, advantage seems to lie with strange bedfellows.’ ‘You would know about those, Marcus!’ shouted one of his friends. Antonius grinned, ‘There was this time in Baiae...’

Blessedly our arrival at the house of Gaius Scribonius Curio spared me the scandalous details of Antonius’ story. We were greeted by Curio’s wife — Curio had not yet returned from the meeting of the Senate — and shown into his study. Curio soon arrived, huffing and puffing in his heavy toga. He greeted Antonius warmly:

"Marcus Antonius, my good friend! And look, you’ve brought Sallustius Crispus. Excellent! I suppose, Sallust, that soon I will read about this conversation in your history. I guess posterity is my true audience tonight. Ha! As it should be, for these are moments when the world turns. Cicero just delivered a blistering indictment of Catiline in the Senate. There is no turning back now. It must now be one or the other.

I know you have soured on Cicero, Antonius. But he truly is the best hope we have to bring stability to Rome and to reunite all Romans — Senators, equestrians, the poor in Rome and the countryside — in pursuit of the common good. Antonius you must see that no good can come from antagonizing the Optimates. Subjecting poor, senile Rabirius to that irregular trial? Revenge will not bring Rome stability. Land reform? Distributing free grain? I know the poor suffer. I am not blind, Antonius. But we must also not be fools. Free grain would fill bellies, yes. But free citizens must be able to support themselves or else they will be become dependent on the giver. And dependent men cannot be free. Soon their rumbling bellies will tolerate and even call for a tyrant. Antonius, your family knows all to well what happens when a tyrant stalks Rome.

Antonius, we can only improve the lot of the poor and reduce corruption if we all work together to find a path that is agreeable to all the actors in this great play. Rome has been strong because for generations, as other cities careened from despot to despot and government to government, Rome was stable, secure, and prosperous. No foreign enemy ever made us doubt ourselves. Why should we do to ourselves what Pyrrhus or Hannibal or the Cimbri could not. We must preserve and reform the system: the Senate and People of Rome. Together. That is what Cicero, I, and the other Boni want.

Of course we can give no quarter to revolutionaries. I believe what Cicero has said about Catiline. Chaos will reign if he and his henchmen are not called to account for their actions. Attempting to kill the consuls? Overthrowing the election? Buring the city?! We must unit against this threat to our very existence. Only then can Rome address the real and dire problems that ail her."
“Antonius began to debate Curio on various points, but I think you already know where he stands. After a while Antonius gestured me over.”

“Sallust, I promised I would visit a friend on the Aventine. If you want to learn the true opinion of the people you should join me.”

“We soon arrived in a tavern on the Aventine Hill — quite near the very place where the Plebs first seceded from Rome, refusing to serve in the army until the wealthy acknowledged the rights of all citizens. It was just down that same street that, exactly 350 years later, the consul Opimius caved in the skull of the tribune Gaius Gracchus. History moves in cycles, as they say. As I was finishing my Massic wine (a foul vintage), a large group of men, many of them young, burst into the tavern. The Knights, Publius Gabinius Capito and Lucius Statilius, close friends of Catiline, led the group.”

“While the cheap wine flowed, Gabinius Capito began to rage against Catiline’s recent indictment. I took notes about the entire speech but I think a few remarks are especially noteworthy:

‘Is this all it takes to slander a Roman? Suddenly a noble Roman like Catiline — a man from an ancient family, a consular family — is declared a criminal? Declared a criminal! The infamy! No charge. No trial. No appeal. But condemned. Are we, Catiline’s friends, likewise to be condemned? Am I? Are you? Did I fall asleep and awake in the court of an eastern despot where the whim of a some perfumed eunuch trumps the laws of the People? Or is this still Rome and are we not Roman citizens? Am I no longer a Roman citizen because two weeks ago Crassus claims he received a letter warning him to leave the city? Can senators annul my rights whenever they vomit forth their precious “Final Decree,” the Consultum Ultimum?

Who has suffered more than Catiline has on your behalf? The Boni, the so-called “Good men” cannot abide a true noble who loves the People and whom the People love. That is why they tainted Catiline’s good name when he tried to run for the consulship three years ago. Why? Because of the baseless accusations that he abused his position as governor. An accusation that was not even levied by citizens. Do you see the pattern? There is a threat to Cicero’s ambition or vanity. An aggrieved provincial appears, like Jupiter from the mist, with some fool story about how Cicero’s opponents are lying, corrupt, and treacherous.

Tomorrow is an important day, my friends. Tomorrow you have a chance to expose the lie that is the “Good men.” You can convince the Senate that the “Good men” are not. You, the best men, can convince the Senate to be Better Men and to not allow rumor and innuendo to run riot over the Roman People! Or you can let those “Good men” trample on the ruins of our Republic. You can let them continue to extort and steal from the Roman People. We must be ready to do battle — with words, friends, with words (for now) — for Catiline and for Rome!

The crowd exploded in applause and shouts of approval. A few of them were glaring at me as I scribbled down the speech. I took my leave before the wine encouraged their enthusiasm and

---

2 The full text of Capito’s speech is included in the Appendix 4.
suspicion further. Having lost Marcus Antonius, I made my way down the Aventine on the Via Triumphalis. As the sun set, I spotted Quintus Caecilius Metellus rushing down from the Palatine...”

“Caecilius Metellus rushing?! Like a buffoonish slave in a comedy? Ha! How impossibly amusing!”

“Well not ‘rushing’ — he was walking in a brisk but dignified manner towards the Forum with a several attendants. Caecilius paused to greet me. His handshake was firm. But he looked anxious:

Walk with me, Gaius Sallustius Crispus. Even brave men like us ought not to grant these brigands an easy target, yes? Yes. I just left Tullius Cicero, who is consulting even now with other senators at his home about how best to approach the debate tomorrow. A momentous day. I confess I wish the ship of state were in the hands of a more experienced pilot from a more experienced family. But fate is what we are given, not what we choose, yes? Yes.

But I lose the thread of my thoughts. This all centers on Sergius Catiline. Enmeshed in vice and swimming in perversion, but dangerously clever. The man is a paradox. A slave to every urge, every unclean impulse, yet capable of enduring any physical discomfort they say. A hard man with a soft spirit. Nefarious, yes? Yes. But not an inconsequential man. No, not inconsequential. Too many of my colleagues underestimate him, thinking him just another rabble rouser. No one should doubt his charisma. And now he has the attention of the mob with his calls for land reform, free grain, and the forgiveness of debt. Land reform? A fancy word for theft. Free grain? Not free to those who will have to buy it! Forgiveness of debt? Novae tabulae! “Clean slates,” they shout — just an oratorical flourish to disguise another form of theft!

I had thought we were rid of Sergius Catiline three years ago, when he was banned from running for office because of his corruption. But no, the following year, there was Sergius Catiline again. Plots against the leading senators! What treachery! Yet many of the very senators that Catiline was conspiring to kill helped defend him against this round of charges. That is the greatness of soul, the magnanimity, that good Romans display towards even the least deserving among them. But having been given this second chance to be a lawful citizen, what did Sergius Catiline do? He plotted to assassinate the consuls! Have you ever heard of such an abomination? Thanks to the gods that some in the conspiracy let slip his plans. With their conspiracy revealed, the snakes slithered back into the muck of the Subura.

Just this year the good people of Rome again rejected Catiline — for a third time, mind you! Has any “people’s champion” ever been so hated by the people? Yet still he refuses to accept defeat, but begins to raise an army against the Senate and People of Rome. And again conspires to assassinate a consul! Vile, villainous treason! Tell me, Sallustius Crispus, what course of action should be barred to Cicero now that he must grapple with this hydra of villainy? Catiline is still in the Senate. His creatures prowl the streets, no doubt hoping to find good men like us and catch them unawares. Or, as Cicero says, do they plan to burn the city and undertake their vengeance against the Senate and People with one blow? What could be more apt for that viper than burning down the city that he hopes to lead, destroying the
property that he imagines he can claim, immolating a people that he claims to champion, yes? Yes! He would rather be king of ash and bone than the ex-praetor of Rome.'

It will all be settled tomorrow. You, Sallustius Crispus, are too young to attend the Senate. But know well that tomorrow either the good men will confirm the Consultum Ultimum against Catiline or the city will lie exposed to destruction, as surely as when Tarpeia opened the gates to Titus Tatius or when the Gauls were scaling the Capitoline. When Hannibal was at the gates, our ancestors showed what greatness true Romans possess. Threatened with torture Scaevola willingly thrust his hand in the fire — courageous testament to our relentless hostility to tyranny. May the gods nod on our undertakings tomorrow. Or else I fear that the Republic will not see another sunrise. Forgive me Sallustius Crispus, I must go see my nephew Caecilius Metellus Celer before sunset. I fear he is letting his personal animosity towards Cicero cloud his judgment about what course of action to take. Having principles is a fine and noble thing; letting the world burn in their service is the prerogative of a Greek philosopher and not a Roman senator, yes? Yes.

Take care that you be well, Sallustius Crispus. I do hope that, when this storm has passed, we can talk more about Crete. My military campaign. Riveting I assure you! Be well.

“And, with that, Metellus and his entourage headed towards his cousin’s house on the Esquiline Hill.” Sallust shook his wine cup to attract the attention of the serving boy.

“But, my dear Sallust, you said it was not quite dark when Metellus took his leave. Yet you arrived here so late. What detained you?”

“At the moment Metellus turned the corner, whom should I see but Marcus Antonius staggering down the street, singing loudly.”

Sallust! You survived the Aventine! Bravo! Join me at the house of Titus Atticus Pomponius, the philosopher. He’s holding a dinner for all who are tired of talking politics. I believe my good friend Cornelius Nepos will be there. You and Cornelius are both such... such... historians! (he laughed as though he’s made a hilarious joke) I’m sure Cornelius would appreciate seeing you.

We slowly climbed the Esquiline Hill to the house of Pomponius Atticus. When we were shown into the dining room, conversation had turned to Cornelius Nepos’ desire to write a history of the world. Posidonius, the Greek historian, and Nepos were debating some obscure point concerning the geography of Gaul. Licinius Macer Calvus and Valerius Catullus were there too, the poets. You surely know Catullus — “let us live, my Lesbia, and let us love...” — not my style, this modern poetry, I confess. Pomponius Atticus welcomed use into the dining room:

Marcus Antonius, welcome! And Sallustius Crispus! A surprise to see you — but of course not an unpleasant one. I am sorry to say that you just missed our friend Helvius Cinna. He wanted to rest before the important debate in the Senate tomorrow. Imagine! Cinna the poet taking an interest in faction, law, and politics. Not that such things much concern young poets and old philosophers like us, of course. I regret to say that before he left Cinna made it clear that he is no sure vote for my
dear friend Cicero. Cicero you remember had some pointed criticism for Cinna’s *Zymrna*, a learned and challenging poem. And Cinna, like all poets, can hold a grudge.

There are several senators who would just as soon rid themselves of Catiline and Cicero as see any one of them victorious. One of the many reasons why politics, as you know, holds no interest for me. But even a philosopher does not wish to see blood run in the streets. I was in Athens the year after Sulla’s siege, you know. There I heard in no uncertain terms that although one may ignore politics, politics does not always return the favor. It would be better if a solution could be found without the need for bloodshed. Well. These are not the topics for which my meals are famous, now are they? Let us turn to happier pursuits. Catullus, I believe you have a new poem about my dear friend Marcus Tullius, do you not?

Indeed I do, my dear Titus, one that bears directly on Tullius’ judgment:

O most learned of the descendants of Romulus,
As many as there are and were, Marcus Tullius,
And will be in later years.
Catullus gives great thanks to you,
Catullus the worst poet of all,
As he is the worst poet of all,
Just so you are the best patron of all.

Pomponius Atticus cheered in the Greek style — *'sophos, sophos, three times sophos!'* — thinking, of course, that a humble Catullus had praised Cicero’s support of his friends and the arts. But I noticed that Cornelius Nepos seemed confused about whether the poem was sincere. Marcus Antonius was about to burst out laughing at what he perceived as a riotous insult of Cicero when he realized that his interpretation differed from that of his host."

“Well, Sallust, Catullus has hit the mark, hasn’t he? What kind of man is Cicero? Does he have the interests of Rome foremost in this heart, as he claims, or is it ambition that drives him, and us, towards the rocks of civil strife. I think that tomorrow we will learn what is best and worst for us all. Now, dear Gaius, if you will indulge me, did Catullus recite any other poems…?”
How to React to the Past

Reacting to the Past is a series of historical role-playing games. Reacting to the Past places you and your classmates within a re-imagined moment of historical controversy and intellectual ferment, one in which decisive action is required and history could unfold in any number of ways. The class becomes a public body of some sort; students, in role, become particular persons from the period, often as members of a faction. Their purpose is to advance a policy agenda and achieve their victory objectives. To do so, they will undertake research and write speeches and position papers; and they will also give formal speeches, participate in informal debates and negotiations, and otherwise work to win the game. After a few preparatory lectures, the game begins and the players are in charge; the instructor serves as adviser or “gamemaster.” Outcomes sometimes differ from the actual history; a debriefing session at the end of the game sets the record straight.

The following is an outline of what you will encounter in the Reacting game and what you will be expected to do. While these elements are typical of every Reacting game, it is important to remember that every game has its own special features.

1. Game Set-up
Your instructor will spend some time before the beginning of the game helping you to understand the historical background. During the set-up period, you will read several different kinds of material:

- The game book (from which you are reading now), which includes historical information, rules and elements of the game, and essential documents; and
- Your role, which describes the historical person you will play in the game.

You may also be required to read primary and secondary sources outside the game book (perhaps including one or more accompanying books), which provide additional information and arguments for use during the game. Often you will be expected to conduct research to bolster your papers and speeches.

Read all of this contextual material and all of these documents and sources before the game begins. And just as important, go back and reread these materials throughout the game. A second reading while in role will deepen your understanding and alter your perspective: ideas take on a different aspect when seen through the eyes of a partisan actor.

Players who have carefully read the materials and who know the rules of the game will invariably do better than those who rely on general impressions and uncertain recollections.

2. Game Play
Once the game begins, certain players preside over the class sessions. These presiding officers may be elected or appointed. Your instructor then becomes the gamemaster (GM) and takes a seat in the back of the room. While not in control, the GM may do any of the following:

- Pass notes to spur players to action;
• Announce the effects of actions taken inside the game on outside parties (e.g., neighboring countries) or the effects of outside events on game actions (e.g., a declaration of war); and

• Redirect proceedings that have gone off track.

Presiding officers may act in a partisan fashion, speaking in support of particular interests, but they must observe basic standards of fairness. As a failsafe device, this game uses the “Podium Rule,” which allows a player who has not been recognized to approach the podium and wait for a chance to speak. Once at the podium, the player has the floor and must be heard.

In order to achieve your objectives, outlined in your role sheet, you must persuade others to support you. You must speak with others, because never will a role contain all that you need to know, and never will one faction have the strength to prevail without allies. Collaboration and coalition-building are at the heart of every game.

Most role descriptions contain secret information which you are expected to guard. Exercise caution when discussing your role with others. You may be a member of a faction, which gives you allies who are generally safe and reliable, but even they may not always be in total agreement with you.

In games where factions are tight-knit groups with fixed objectives, finding a persuadable ally can be difficult. Fortunately, every game includes roles that are undecided (or “indeterminate”) about certain issues. Everyone is predisposed on certain issues, but most players can be persuaded to support particular positions. Cultivating these players is in your interest. (By contrast, if you are assigned an "indeterminate" role, you will likely have considerable freedom to choose one or another side in the game; but often, too, indeterminates have special interests of their own.)

Cultivate friends and supporters. Before you speak at the podium, arrange to have at least one supporter second your proposal, come to your defense, or admonish those in the body not paying attention. Feel free to ask the presiding officer to assist you, but appeal to the GM only as a last resort.

In antiquity, orators practiced a kind of speech in which they impersonated a famous figure from the past. In Reacting you will be following in their footsteps, taking on the persona of a Roman senator. As a Roman senator you have a distinctive personality and set of ideas and convictions formed from a lifetime of experience. Your biggest challenge — and what will determine your success in the game — is arguing and listening from the perspective of this Roman persona. Whenever you are in class during the game (that is “in” the Senate), you must strive to the best of your abilities to act and think and speak like a Roman.

Immerse yourself in the game. Regard it as a way to escape imaginatively from your usual “self” — and your customary perspective as a college student in the 21st century. At first, this may cause discomfort because you may be advocating ideas that are incompatible with your own beliefs. You may also need to take actions which you would find reprehensible in real life. Remember that a Reacting game is only a game and that you and the other players are merely playing roles. When they offer criticisms, they are not criticizing you as a person. Similarly, you must never criticize another person in the game. But you will likely be obliged to criticize their persona. (For example, never say, “Sally’s argument is ridiculous.” But feel free to say, “Cinna’s argument is ridiculous” —
although you would do well to explain why! Always assume, when spoken to by a fellow player — whether in class or out of class — that that person is speaking to you in role.

Help to create this world by avoiding the colloquialisms and familiarities of today's college life. Never should the presiding officer, for example, open a session with the salutation, “Hi guys.” Similarly, remember that it is inappropriate to trade on out-of-class relationships when asking for support within the game. (“Hey, you can't vote against me. We're both on the tennis team!”)

Reacting to the Past seeks to approximate of the complexity of the past. Because some people in history were not who they seemed to be, so, too, some roles in Reacting may include elements of conspiracy or deceit. (For example, Brutus did not announce to the Roman Senate his plans to assassinate Caesar.) If you are assigned such a role, you must make it clear to everyone that you are merely playing a role. If, however, you find yourself in a situation where you find your role and actions to be stressful or uncomfortable, tell the GM.

3. GAME REQUIREMENTS

Your instructor will explain the specific requirements for your class. In general, a Reacting game will require you to perform several distinct but interrelated activities:

**Reading:** This standard academic work is carried on more purposefully in a Reacting course, since what you read is put to immediate use.

**Research and Writing:** The exact writing requirements depend on your instructor, but in most cases you will be writing to persuade others. Most of your writing will take the form of policy statements, but you might also write autobiographies, clandestine messages, newspapers, or after-game reflections. In most cases papers are posted on the class website for examination by others. Basic rules: Do not use big fonts or large margins. Do not simply repeat your position as outlined in your role sheets: You must base your arguments on historical facts as well as ideas drawn from assigned texts—and from independent research. (Your instructor will outline the requirements for footnoting and attribution.) Be sure to consider the weaknesses in your argument and address them; if you do not your opponents will.

**Public Speaking and Debate:** Most players are expected to deliver at least one formal speech from the podium (the length of the game and the size of the class will affect the number of speeches). Reading papers aloud is seldom effective. Some instructors may insist that students instead speak freely from notes. After a speech, a lively and even raucous debate will likely ensue. Often the debates will culminate in a vote…

**Strategizing:** Communication among students is a pervasive feature of Reacting games. You should find yourself writing emails, texting, and attending meetings on a fairly regular basis. If you do not, you are being outmaneuvered by your opponents.
4. Skill Development

A recent Associated Press article on education and employment made the following observations:

“The world’s top employers are pickier than ever. And they want to see more than high marks and the right degree. They want graduates with so-called soft skills — those who can work well in teams, write and speak with clarity, adapt quickly to changes in technology and business conditions, and interact with colleagues from different countries and cultures. . . . And companies are going to ever-greater lengths to identify the students who have the right mix of skills, by observing them in role-playing exercises to see how they handle pressure and get along with others . . . and [by] organizing contests that reveal how students solve problems and handle deadline pressure.”

Reacting to the Past, probably better than most elements of the curriculum, provides the opportunity for developing these “soft skills.” This is because you will be practicing persuasive writing, public speaking, critical thinking, problem-solving, and collaboration. You will also need to adapt to changing circumstances and work under pressure.
Your Speech

The game typically begins ante diem quartum Idus Novembres, also known as November 9th, the day immediately after Cicero delivered his “First Oration Against Catiline” (included in this book). Your instructor may suggest or require other readings and may begin the game at a different point in the crisis, but Cicero’s speech serves as the primary source for the game.

Remember that Cicero’s speech is not a sterile recitation of facts. It is passionate, clever, and biased testimony composed by a passionate partisan of one side of this debate. Read Cicero’s speech (and all other primary documents) from the perspective of your character. Depending on who you are, his speech may appear to be a powerful indictment of a malignant threat to the Senate and People of Rome, or it may seem a tissue of lies spun by a slanderous, megalomaniacal blowhard — or a little of both.

During the debate that follows Cicero’s speech you are required by the traditions of the Senate to state your opinion about the matter introduced by Cicero. You may make a counter-proposal for how to address the crisis that confronts Rome or comment on the wisdom or folly of a proposal that has already been made.

Legally, a senator may speak as long as they wish, but debate will be limited to a duration determined by your instructor (likely between 4 and 8 minutes, or the equivalent of 2-to-4-pages of typed text). The order of speakers will follow standard senatorial practice (see ORDER OF DEBATE in the “RULES & TRADITIONS OF THE ROMAN SENATE” below). With this in mind, you will be well served to discuss your ideas, concerns, fears, and/or plots with Romans who are likely to support (or oppose) your designs, especially if they will be speaking before you. Seek out allies, anticipate the arguments of enemies, and court those senators who can be persuaded.

Since your goal is to persuade your fellow senators by means of a persuasive speech in the Roman Senate, you will need to conform to the expectations of a Roman audience. With this in mind, your speech must:

1. **Be believable and consistent with the historical moment.** You must avoid anachronism and may not allude to events or works that have yet to happen (no mention of any events after the day the Senate is meeting). You must shun contemporary slang and allusions to pop or literary culture. During the game, you are a Roman: “to be or not to be” is just another antithesis (and a facile one at that); “I have a dream” has no historical-cultural significance for you.

2. **Argue like a Roman.** Romans rarely argued exclusively from fact. Rather they approached important decisions from the perspective of ethics and circumstance. Much more important than who did what when is the question of what kind of character would do what sort of thing in what kind of circumstance. That is, it matters less if
Catiline really did sleep with his sister or if Cicero would bribe a witness, than if they were the kind of people who would engage in such activities. Refer early and often to the “Roman Virtues,” (Appendix 3) Observe how your opponents lack them and the actions of you and your friends display them.

3. **Be consistent with the practice of Roman oratory.** Roman oratory is *performance*. You will persuade through entertainment (supported by facts and reality, if possible). A dry rehearsal of law or facts will not persuade anyone. Be flamboyant, be funny, be over the top; but…

4. **Be consistent with your persona.** Some of you are regal; some shady; some experienced; some young and excitable; some, frankly, a little crazy.

Since Roman rhetorical training emphasized memory and improvisation, a Roman would never dream of reading his speech. Since, however, you have not have the 20 years of rhetorical training and likely 20 or more years of practice at delivering speeches, **your instructor will let you know what, if any, supports you are allowed.** Please, however, do not read your speech *verbatim*. If you anticipate this being a problem, please approach your instructor to discuss the situation.

Your instructor will provide additional details about the expectations for your written speech.

### Fortune & Action Outside the Senate

At any point in the debate, events may overtake the deliberations of the Senate. That is, you should be prepared for the unexpected (a riot caused by a particularly offensive speech, a sign from the gods, word that a prominent Roman has returned to Italy, etc.).

Roman history shows that politics was not always settled by debate. There are a number of actions that specific characters can take outside of the meetings of the Senate. Some of these may be included in your Role sheet, but some are given out only on request. When you receive your role, consult with the GM about whether you are eligible for special actions.

### Victory

At the start of the game, no group has the advantage. The course of the debate will be determined by what proposals are made and how you support or assail them.

In a sense, everyone who participates in the transformative educational experience that is *The Crisis of Catiline* is a winner — but in another more accurate sense, some of you will be winners and others will be disgraced, exiled, or dead. Your instructor may assign a victory bonus for those of you who successfully navigate your way through this crisis.

*Nota bene:* You may pretend to support one position to mask a secret goal that you work for behind the scenes. If this is the case, be sure to confess your treacherous (but perhaps crafty) designs to your instructor; otherwise the position you support publicly will be assumed to be your actual position.
### Timeline for the Crises of the Late Republic

**134–133 BCE** Tiberius Gracchus proposes a controversial land reform program; he and his followers were murdered by senators and equites; riots grip Rome.

**129 BCE** Scipio Aemilianus, the conquerer of Carthage and opponent of the land reformers, dies under mysterious circumstances. The commissioners in charge of the land reforms are stripped of power.

**122–121 BCE** Gaius Gracchus passes a more radical land reform law and passes a law that would subsidize the purchase of grain by the urban poor. After the Senate passes a *Senatus Consultum Ultimum* empowering the consul to ensure the safety of the state, Gracchus is killed (or commits suicide). A flurry of treason trials grips Rome.

**107 BCE** Gaius Marius enrolls the poor in the army, who became increasingly dependent on and loyal to their generals, rather than the Roman state.

**105 BCE** Germanic tribes annihilate two consular armies at the Battle of Arausio, resulting the death of over 80,000 Romans (perhaps the most deadly single day of combat in history). In response, Romans elect Gaius Marius to an unprecedented four successive consulships. He eventual is able to eliminate the threat posed by the Germanic Tribes.

**103–99 BCE** Second Sicilian Slave Revolt begins when Romans briefly begin releasing slaves from allied countries, with the hope that these countries will support Roman operations against the Germanic Tribes.

**100 BCE** The tribune Lucius Appuleius Saturninus and the praetor Glaucia foments mob violence in an attempt to force passage of a radical legislative program. Saturninus is declared a public enemy by a *Senatus Consultum Ultimum*. Saturninus and Glaucia are lynched by Roman senators.

**95 BCE** Non-citizen Italians from Rome are expelled from Rome, causing significant resentment among Rome’s Italian Allies.

**91–90 BCE** Drusus passes a set of democratic reforms but fails to enfranchise the Italians. When Drusus is murdered, many of the Italian allies revolt from Rome in the so-called the Social War. The political crisis has now become a full-blown civil war.

**88 BCE** The tribune Publius Sulpicius Rufus is killed after he passes legislation diluting the power of the aristocracy over voting. Sulla marches on Rome, forcing Marius and his supporters to flee.

**86 BCE** Marius is consul for the seventh time; he dies in the same year. His followers undertake widespread suppression of the supporters of Sulla.

**83–82 BCE** Sulla lands in Italy and routs the Marian forces. Thousands of captured soldiers are executed without trial. Strife in Rome leads to the burning of the Capitoline Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus and the books of the Sibylline Oracle that were housed therein. Quintus Sertorius flees Italy and establishes a rebel kingdom in Spain.

**81–79 BCE** Sulla, as dictator, unleashes “proscriptions” opponents and wealthy Romans. Sulla reforms the Roman constitution to limit the power of tribunes and the power of ambitious politicians.

**77 BCE** The proconsul Marcus Aemilius Lepidus raised a revolt in Etruria and was marching on Rome from his province of Cisalpine Gaul, when the bulk of his army defects.

**72–71 BCE** Third and final slave revolt begins under Spartacus, who is Spartacus eventually defeated by Marcus Crassus (praetor). 20,000 slaves are crucified along Via Appia from Capua to Rome.

**70 BCE** Cicero, still a novice politician, prosecutes Gaius Verres for corruption during his service as governor of Sicily. So compelling was Cicero’s case that Verres fled into exile.
**64–63 BCE**  Crisis of Catiline

**64 BCE**  Catiline tried for abuse of power and exonerated with support of leading senators (including Torquatus and others that he was supposedly conspiring to kill). Catiline refuses Cicero's help during the trial.

Cicero elected consul with Antonius Hybrida over Catiline. Cicero is the first “new man” elected consul in 30 years.

**July**  Catiline runs again for the consulship on a radical platform that called for cancellation of debts (novae tabulae), the redistribution of wealth, and other popular measures.

Cicero requests that the Senate postpone the elections and provide him with a bodyguard. The Senate delays the election for a few days but refuses Cicero a bodyguard. During the vote, Cicero appears wearing a breastplate under his toga, protected by his own bodyguards. Catiline is defeated. Julius Caesar elected *pontifex maximus*.

Manlius encourages impoverished Sullan veterans to rise against propertied interests in Rome. Minor disturbances in other parts of Italy.

**October 18**  An anonymous letter warns Crassus and other members of the Senate to flee Rome before violence Oct. 27. Crassus and other nobles deliver these letters to Cicero.

**October 21**  The Senate passes its “Final Decree” (the *Senatus Consultum Ultimum*, see Appendix 2) authorizing the consuls to take whatever measures necessary to ensure the health of the state.

**October 27**  When the 27th passes without incident, suspicion grows that Cicero may have fabricated the plot and invented the crisis to strengthen his political position.

**October 28**  Cicero's prestige is restored when reports of Manlius’ actions arrive in Rome. Under the auspices of the *lex Plautia de vi*, Cicero orders the indictment of Catiline. Catiline offers to place himself in the custody of Cicero or Metullus Celer as a sign of his innocence. Both decline his offer.

**November 1**  Attempt by conspirators to seize Praeneste fails. Reports of slave revolts in Capua and Apulia. Military commanders dispatched to threatened areas. The Senate approves rewards for the betrayal of conspiratorial acts.

**November 6**  Meeting of Catilinarians at the house of Marcus Porcius Laeca. Catiline supposedly decides join army and march on Rome. Cornelius and Vargunteius agree to assassinate Cicero at his house the following morning, but Cicero refuses to see them.

**November 8**  Cicero delivers his *First Catilinarian*, denouncing Catiline, in the Temple of Jupiter Stator. Catiline responds to Cicero, calling for the senators to look at his ancestry and the absence of proof to support Cicero’s allegations.

**November 9**  The *Crisis of Catiline* begins.
HISTORICAL CONTEXT

The Crisis of Catiline plays out against the backdrop of transformative changes to Roman society. The most significant is the development of Rome — founded as a small settlement at a bend in the Tiber River in Italy — into the most powerful state in the ancient world, with subjects on three continents and spanning nearly the entire Mediterranean. By the time of the Crisis of Catiline no state posed a serious threat to Rome's continued survival or dominance. Local potentates or Germanic tribes might raid across Rome's borders, kill Roman citizens, or even defeat a Roman army, but the manpower and resources available to Rome all but guaranteed its eventual victory over such foes.

Instead, the threats to Roman society were internal: corruption, economic disruption, mob violence, popular uprising, and civil war. The foundation of Rome's military manpower had been the small family farm, which provided the resources for non-elite Romans to purchase arms and serve in the army. But by the late second century, deteriorating economic conditions in the countryside forced many farmers to immigrate to Rome, where they joined the swelling ranks of the urban poor. The economic distress led even those who remained on their land to fall into debt. Attempts to resolve these and other crises in the generations before the Crisis of Catiline led to a series of increasingly violent political conflicts within the Roman nobility and between the Roman nobility and the poor.

Competition among the Roman elites had always been ferocious. But beginning in 133 BCE, the wealth and power of Rome's expanding empire distorted a political system that had developed to balance the ambitions of local aristocrats in central Italy. By 63 BCE the system of Roman governance, which had evolved and endured for over 400 years, was breaking — if it was not already broken. Romans had become the greatest threat to Rome.

THE GROWTH OF ROME AND ITS EMPIRE

According to myth, Rome was founded on April 21, 753 BCE by Romulus and Remus, twin sons of Mars, the Roman god of war, and Rhea Silvia, a descendent of the Trojan hero Aeneas. Remus, however, was soon killed in a quarrel over the name the new settlement. Romulus became Rome's first king and opened his city as an asylum to foreign outcasts. After abducting women from the neighboring tribe of the Sabines, Romans and Sabines united and Rome began to prosper. Early Rome was ruled by kings. Although the king's power was great, a council of wealthy elders, called the Senate, eventually acquired the authority to advise the king. All male citizens capable of military service met in the Popular Assembly to ratify the decisions of the king. The Assembly, which represented the Roman people or the populus Romanus, theoretically possessed ultimate political authority. In time, the Roman people would demand that their theoretical power gain the force of law.

Exactly when and how Rome transitioned from a monarchy to a Republic is among the most disputed questions in Roman history. At the time of the transition, Rome was controlled by the Etruscans, a sophisticated culture based to the north of Rome. The popular story held that in 509 BCE an Etruscan prince raped a Roman noblewoman named Lucretia. When Lucretia committed suicide rather than endure the abuses of tyranny, she emboldened the Roman nobles to overthrow the monarchy and establish the Republic. Forever after, the word rex or king was cursed in Rome,
and there could be no greater charge against a Roman than the accusation that he was aiming to establish himself as king. Although Romans came to see the establishment of the Republic as a singular event, the overthrow of the Etruscan monarchy was in fact part of a trend throughout the region as towns reasserted their independence against an Etruscan state weakened by recurrent famine. The collapse of Etruscan hegemony in central Italy led to a prolonged struggle for supremacy among the various cities and tribes of the region. After nearly a century of conflict with its neighboring towns, Rome established its dominance in central Italy, setting the stage for its explosive expansion throughout Italy and the Mediterranean in the following centuries.

It was during this period of conflict with its neighbors that Rome developed its Republican political system that, with a few changes, was still largely in place during the Crisis of Catiline.

- The Senate benefited most from the abolition of the monarchy. Originally composed of 100 noblemen, the Senate grew in size, eventually reaching 600 men. Admittance became limited to those who had been elected to the post of quaestor (see below). The Senate’s ability to initiate legislation, control expenditures, oversee foreign policy, and supervise most aspects of public administration granted it practical control of the government. The Senate was the only public body in which public debate was permitted.

- All male Roman citizens of military age participated in one or more of the Assemblies. The Centuriate Assembly (comitia centuriata) elected consuls, praetors, and censors; declared war; and served as a court of appeal for citizens sentenced to death. Because it was organized by wealth, nobles controlled an effective majority of the voting groups. The Tribal Assembly (comitia tributa), which was originally organized by geography, elected all other magistrates and ratified laws. A subgroup of this assembly, the Plebeian Assembly elected those magistrates open only to plebeians (tribunes and plebeian aediles). Eventually its decrees were given the full force of law.

- The Consul developed into the most prestigious and powerful political office in Rome. Drawn from a slate of candidates proposed by the Senate, consuls were elected to one-year terms by the people of the comitia centuriata. When consuls were in Rome, they were responsible for the legal, political, and diplomatic apparatus of the Roman state; outside of Rome they served as supreme commanders of the Roman army. There were always two consuls, each with the power to block the decisions of the other, a effective check on the ability of a consul to leverage his considerable power into a tyranny. Consuls were accompanied by a bodyguard of 12 lictors, who carried the fasces, a double-headed axe in a bundle of rods that symbolized the consul’s imperium, or their “power to command” the obedience of Roman citizens in military operations and to punish malefactors. Throughout the history of the Republic, election to the consulship was dominated by a small group of noble families, although occasionally a talented “new man,” or novus homo, from non-consular family was able to win election to the office.

- In times of severe crisis, the consuls could empower a single leader to take control of the entire apparatus of the Roman state. This Dictator possessed superior imperium over all magistrates, but was limited to a single six-month term. Although quite common in the fourth and third centuries, the office of the dictator eventually fell into disuse.
Most of the king’s religious functions were transferred to the Pontifex Maximus (‘Chief Pontiff’), who oversaw public sacrifices, regulated the calendar, and supervised the priests who conducted public religious activities. It is important to note that the Romans, like the Greeks, did not have a hereditary class of religious officials. The offices of the priests were instead filled by lay citizens.

Other magistracies developed to administer Rome’s increasingly large and complex society.

In 443 BCE Censors began to compile the official lists of senators and equestrians (the next highest property class), to maintain the roll of citizens, to assess the tax liability of property, and to contract for major public projects. Unique among magistrates, censors were elected to five-year terms.

Praetors oversaw the foreign and citizen law courts and assumed the administrative duties of consuls when consuls were absent from Rome.

Aediles supervised public places, public games, and the grain supply in the city of Rome.

Quaestors assisted the consuls and kept public records.

Promagistrates administered overseas territories after they completed their year in their elected higher office.

Over time a standard sequence of political offices developed. Known as the cursus honorum (above), it began with election to the quaestorship around age thirty and progressed through the aedileship and praetorship to the distinguished consulship.

After serving in a magistracy, a Roman was usually required to wait at least two to three years before becoming eligible for higher office. Re-election was exceedingly rare, occurring only in time of great crisis. In this way, political power was spread among a larger segment of the Roman political elite, who were thus encouraged to maintain the stability of the system. This constant turnover, however, assured that most magistrates had little to no direct experience in their offices at the time of their elections. As a result, the advisory role of the Senate took on added significance. Because most magistrates were elected to single, annual terms, there was a tendency for magistrates to focus more on their own short-term advantage than the longer-term concerns of the Roman people.

Unlike the federal and state governments in the United States of America, Rome did not have a written constitution that provided the core political and legal framework for the state. Rather, Rome's political system developed over centuries through a combination of custom and legislation. As a result, precedent was an essential factor in determining whether political actions were acceptable. By the time of the Crisis of Catiline, however, generations of bad precedents had revealed
that there were few limitations for a politician who was cunning, daring, and shameless enough to seize the advantage.

Before the end of the monarchy, Roman society had become stratified into two distinct classes: the noble **Patricians** and the common **Plebeians**, also called the **Plebs**. Patricians belonged to a few ancient families that dominated the political and religious life of the city. The more numerous plebeians tended to be poor. But even in the early period there is evidence that some plebian families were wealthy. While both groups enjoyed basic civic rights, in the early years of the Republic, patricians came to possess almost exclusive claim to the Senate and religious offices. Eventually, the distinction was formalized and plebeians were prevented from holding many political offices and they were often subjected to harsh treatment by patrician magistrates. The unequal rights afforded to plebeian citizens led to the **Struggle of the Orders**, a centuries-long struggle by the plebeians for the restoration of their political and legal rights.
The main weapon of the plebeians in pressing for more equitable treatment was *secession*, a kind of civic strike in which the Plebs withdrew from civic participation until their demands were met. Because Rome was constantly at war during this period, secession posed a serious threat to the interests of the landowning political elite. In 494, the plebeians seceded to the “Sacred Mountain,” refusing to fight even while Rome was under attack by several neighboring tribes. As part of that settlement, the Plebs won the right to elect ten *Tribunes of the Plebs*. Tribunes were empowered to protect the life and property of all plebes against arbitrary abuses by patrician magistrates. The bodies of tribunes were declared sacrosanct, making it a religious offense to harm a tribune when they exercised their power of *intercessio*, or intercession, on behalf of a pleb. Plebeians took an oath to consider cursed anyone who violated the sacrosanctity of a tribune.

Because laws during this period were passed down orally and controlled by the patrician *Pontifex Maximus*, Plebs were often subjected to arbitrary justice, including enslavement for debt. In 451 BCE, another secession, this time to the Aventine Hill within Rome, forced the Senate to establish a commission of ten men to codify existing laws. In 449, they published the *Law of the Twelve Tables*, but only after a scandal led to the overthrow of the commission. When one of the commissioners, the cruel Appius Claudius, lusted after Verginia, her father killed her rather than see her abused by the power-crazed Appius. The Roman people, repulsed by Appius’ behavior, overthrew the commissioners after first compelling them to promulgate laws more favorable to the plebeians. The expansion of plebeian rights continued in 445 when they gained the ability to marry into patrician families. In 367 plebeians were permitted to seek election as consul. By 338 the Senate could no longer override votes by the Plebeian Council and plebeians could run for election to all magistracies. In 287 another plebeian succession gave the votes of the Assembly, or plebiscites, the full force of law. The peaceful resolution of the struggle for plebeian rights was recognized as the *Concord of the Orders*. The classes of patricians and plebeians continued to exist and remained socially, if no longer legally, important.

The internal dispute between patricians and plebeians played out against a period of Roman expansion in Italy. In 466 BCE, Rome conquered the nearby city of Veii after a protracted struggle. By the early third century BCE, Rome dominated central Italy. Following the second of three Punic Wars against Carthage (264–202 BCE), Roman power was unrivaled throughout the western Mediterranean. By 146, Carthage lay in ruins and Rome had conquered Greece. Rome was master of the Mediterranean, although independent kingdoms in Asian Minor and Egypt would only finally be conquered in the first century BCE. Its rapid expansion throughout the Mediterranean and contact with the ancient cultures of the East revolutionized the political, social, and economic lives of the Romans. Yet Rome’s success had sown the seeds of the Republic’s destruction and Rome’s eventual transformation into a dictatorship similar to the Hellenistic (or Greek) monarchies it had conquered.

The infusion of wealth from Rome’s victories transformed it into one of the most important commercial hubs of the Mediterranean. For those Romans who had earned their livelihood through small-scale farming and crafts, however, the “globalizing” economy and the almost constant military service caused great hardship. Participation in the Roman army was limited to those citizens who owned property. The vast majority of these farmers worked small plots of land ranging from 7 to 20 acres (an acre is about \( \frac{3}{4} \) the area of a...
football field). To supplement their meager harvests, many worked as day laborers on larger farms, gathered firewood, and grazed livestock on public land (the *ager publicus*, land that had been seized during Rome’s numerous wars of expansion). The almost continual warfare in Italy during the late third and early second centuries BCE took an enormous toll on these farmers, causing the number of Roman citizens to plummet from 285,000 before the First Punic War (264–241 BCE) to only 144,000 by 193 BCE. The numerous and lengthy foreign wars fought in the second century required these farmers to be abroad for years at a time, during which time their farms suffered from the lack of their labor and often fell into disrepair and debt. The decline in the number of landowners reduced the number of citizens eligible for military service. The burden of military service thus fell more heavily on the remaining citizen farmers, who in turn were compelled to spend more time away from their farms on campaign, leading more to fall in debt and lose their land. The military and strategic success of Rome, which garnered enormous wealth for the Roman elite, paradoxically undermined Rome’s traditional economy and the source of Roman military power.

Absentee landlords, often using the wealth generated by Rome’s wars of conquest, purchased the indebted farms and combined them into large farms known as *latifundia*. *Latifundia* often specialized in a single export crop and were worked by slaves. Small farmers were unable to compete with the efficient, export-oriented *latifundia*. As the size of these farms grew, many of the landowners began to rent additional plots of public land. Many of these large farms were soon renting more public land than was permissible under the law, further encroaching on what had been an important resource for the remaining small farmers. Moreover, the influx of slave labor further depressed the economic prospects of free citizens, who could no longer work as laborers on neighboring farms. Meanwhile, the concentration of brutalized slaves in massive farms resulted in a series of large-scale uprisings, known as the Servile Wars. The first two Servile Wars occurred in Sicily (135–132 and 104–100 BCE). The last, led by the gladiator Spartacus, would threaten the Roman heartland of Italy. As this agrarian crisis accelerated, many of the rural poor flocked to Rome in search of employment. High rents from the swelling urban population forced the poor into overcrowded, poorly constructed apartment buildings (*insulae* or ‘islands’) where they lived at continual risk of building collapse, disease, and fire.

**How Rome’s Empire Changed Rome**

Rome’s explosive conquest of the Mediterranean had exposed a critical weakness in the Roman political system. The Republican system was constructed to avoid the concentration of power by any one person or family. Magistrates were thus always limited to short terms in office, after which they could be held accountable for their actions while in office. The powers of a magistracy were also usually apportioned among several co-equal colleagues (e.g. the 2 consuls and 2 censors). When Rome’s population and territory were small and its wars were waged against relatively poor towns of tribes of Italy, no a single military command provide enough wealth to overwhelm the ability of the Roman nobility to check the accumulation of prestige by a victorious general. Nor could a reform could create enough clients to destabilize the balance of political power. But as the population of Rome grew and Rome fought wars against larger, wealthier, more distant foes, the prestige and
power attained by magistrates in successful wars of expansion and by politicians through passing
popular reforms threatened the balance of power within the senatorial aristocracy. A single
campaign against a wealthy power in the east could bring the victorious general massive wealth. A
popular reform could generate thousands or even tens of thousands of clients, loyal to the reformers
and ready to support them in subsequent elections.

Senators who were fearful (or jealous) of the growing authority of a politician, or family, or group worked to prevent the concentration of
power or any reforms that would diminish the traditional prerogatives and authority of the
senatorial aristocracy. Such conservative senators are often referred to as Optimates or “the best
men.” Because of their opposition, popular generals often returned from successful and lucrative
campaigns only to find themselves political pariahs at their moment of triumph; likewise, reformers
saw sensible and necessary legislation defeated by senators who feared destabilizing the balance of
power. Finding their ambitions thwarted by the Optimates, another group of Roman politicians began
to seek alternative sources of power among the Roman people and also the Italian allies. Because
they looked to the people as the source of their power, these Roman politicians are often called
Populares or “men of the people.”

It is important to note that Populares and Optimates were not permanent political parties in the
modern sense. Nor were its members drawn from a different social classes. Rather they are terms
that represent different approaches to the exercise of political power within the Roman elite. Populares wielded the power of the tribuneship to press for social, economic, and political reforms,
because these were the reforms that were most likely to garner the support of the poor. Optimates
sought to limit the power of the tribunes, to preserve the dominance of the aristocracy in the
political assemblies, and to maintain the balance of power within the political aristocracy. Although
certain families became associated with each approach, lineage was not a sure guarantee of how a
Roman would seek to wield political power. Cicero began his career by allying himself with Populares, attacking the corruption of the well-connected senator Verres and supporting Pompey’s
extraordinary commands in the East, before moving decisively towards the Optimates during the
Crisis of Catiline. Pompey himself began his career as an outsider who used appeals to the people
to further his political agenda, only to find himself, decades later in the 50s and 40s BCE, the champion
of the Senate against Caesar. Clodius was from one of the oldest and most decorated families in
Rome, yet renounced his patrician status in order to run for the tribunate. Most Populares and
Optimates believed they were working in the best interests Republic; both kinds of politicians engaged
in unscrupulous behavior, the manipulation of the system, and political violence. Although neither
actively sought its destruction, their exploitation of a failing political system hastened its collapse.

In 137 BCE a young Roman noble by the name of Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus travelled through northern Italy
where he observed firsthand the consequences of the agrarian crisis. His attempts to solve the impending crisis of manpower by reestablishing the small
family farm in Italy would provoke a violent crisis. Although this crisis occurred seventy years before the
Crisis of Catiline, it will be worthwhile to describe the reform attempts of Tiberius and his brother
Gaius in some detail because they grappled with many of the same social and economic problems
that enflamed the crisis in the time of Catiline and Cicero; they illustrate the political power
available to a politician who could muster the support of the urban and rural poor; and, in the reaction of the entrenched political elite to reform, they set a pattern for many of the subsequent political crises that would eventual wreck Rome's Republican system.

When Tiberius Gracchus was elected tribune in 133 BCE, he proposed a solution to the agrarian crisis: public land that had been illegally occupied by large landowners would be confiscated by a special commission that would redistribute it to the poor. The commission would also establish colonies of Roman citizens in recently conquered provinces outside of Italy. There was broad agreement among the Roman elite that land reform was needed. Indeed at first Tiberius could count on the support of many noble Romans. Tiberius himself was from a very noble family — his father had twice been consul and his mother was the daughter of Scipio Africanus, who had defeated Hannibal in the Second Punic War. The consul for 133 assisted in drafting the bill, and it had the support of the pontifex maximus and also the princeps senatus, who happened to be Tiberius’ father-in-law. Nevertheless, the needed reform was hampered by economic and political factors. The same senators who had to approve the agrarian reforms were in many cases the landowners whose land would be confiscated. To gain the support of these senatorial landowners, Tiberius proposed a comprise. Landowners who had illegally occupied public land would gain legal title, rent-free, to a substantial portion of the occupied land (plus an additional allotment for each child up to a total of four children). But the rest of the occupied land would have to be restored to the state for distribution to landless citizens, regardless of how long the landowner had used it or what improvements he had made. On its own, this reasonable and generous compromise might have had a chance at success. But any substantial reform also posed a political challenge to the nobility. It was recognized that the commissioners who enacted this program would gain the loyalty of many thousands of clients among the settlers. They would also have the unchecked power to survey the land and determine which land was public and which private, a power open to abuse. When Tiberius’ proposal met with vehement opposition in the Senate, Tiberius bypassed the Senate and took his bill directly to the Plebeian Council. Tiberius summarized the moral case for reform in an address to the Roman poor:

“Even the wild beasts that roam over Italy each have a cave or lair to settle down in; but the men who fight and die for Italy have only a share of air and sunlight — but nothing else. Homeless they wander about with their wives and children. Their generals lie to them and exhort them to defend tombs and shrines from the enemy. But not a one has a family altar. Not one of all these many Romans has an ancestral tomb. They fight and die to support others in wealth and luxury. Although they are styled masters of the world, they have not a single lump of earth to call their own.” — Plutarch, Life of Tiberius Gracchus 9

Tiberius’ maneuver in taking his bill directly to the people was not illegal, but it did violate the long-standing precedent that granted the Senate the right to advise on legislation. Provoked by this affront to the traditional prerogatives of the Senate, senatorial opposition to Tiberius’ bill hardened. When the tribune Octavius, encouraged by the senatorial opposition, vetoed the law, Tiberius took the unprecedented step of deposing Octavius, reasoning that Octavius was not acting in the interest of the Plebs but at the behest of the nobles whose power Octavius was duty-bound to check. Once Octavius was removed, the law was passed, establishing the Commission to distribute the public
land. Tiberius did nothing to lower the fears of the opposition when he had himself, his brother Gaius, and his father-in-law Appius Claudius appointed as commissioners.

The senatorial opposition, led by the new pontifex maximus, Scipio Nasica, refused to fund the Agrarian Commission, which was manned by members of Tiberius’ family. At his moment of impasse, news arrived that King Attalus III of Pergamon, a wealthy Hellenistic kingdom in Asia Minor, had died, bequeathing his land and wealth to the Roman people. Tiberius proposed that the Plebeian Council would oversee the distribution of the inheritance, part of which would be used to fund the Commission. This proposal provoked intense opposition by the Senate, which had traditionally directed Rome’s foreign policy and managed its finances. In the face of senatorial hostility, Tiberius decided to take an unprecedented step and stand for re-election, which would allow him to safeguard his legislation and prevent his enemies from prosecuting him for the removal of Octavius. Tiberius’ actions can be viewed from two opposing perspectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From the Perspective of Tiberius &amp; His Supporters</th>
<th>From the Perspective of the Senatorial Opposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tiberius was attempting to strengthen Rome by addressing a pressing economic and social problem. It would have been legal and ethical to confiscate the public land, which was illegally occupied by the large landowners, without any compensation. Tiberius’ proposal was generous to these illegal occupiers of public land. Concerning the tribune Octavius, since the tribune was bound by oath to defend the Roman people, any tribune that failed to do so had forfeited his standing as a tribune. Thus the deposition of Octavius was justified. His opponents among the Optimates did not really care about the prerogatives of the plebeian tribunes, and at any rate they could not trump the judgment of the Plebeian Assembly. Since these nobles were planning legal action against Tiberius, who had only sought to defend the integrity of the tribunate, he reasonably sought to remain in office. Reelection as tribune would also permit Tiberius to staff the Agrarian Commission and ensure the fair redistribution of land. If unusual steps had been taken, it was only because the crisis was so dire and the opposition so stubborn.</td>
<td>Tiberius was attempting to consolidate power for himself and his family. Tiberius’ failure to secure the approval of the Senate for his legislation revealed that he would overturn precedent to achieve his personal political goals, even if it risked undoing the Concord of the Orders. His removal of Octavius was a dangerous attack on the rights of the tribunes that threatened the system of checks and balances that defined Rome’s Republican constitution. If elections were no longer binding, then politics would devolve to the whim of the unchecked mob. Mob rule was antithetical to Rome’s constitutional order, and would inevitably result in the rise of a tyrant, when a charismatic figure realized he could take advantage of the unchecked power of the majority. Tiberius’ intention to run for consecutive re-election, which was traditionally granted only to essential leaders during times of crisis in war, was another attempt to avoid responsibility for his reckless behavior. Tiberius, therefore, had all the hallmarks of an aspiring tyrant: a noble who sought the support of the people to establish his power outside of the limitations imposed by tradition and law. Rome could not tolerate a king nor a tyrant. The balance of political power had to be restored.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the election, disagreement over the propriety of Tiberius’ candidacy turned violent. The Senate, fearful of revolution, condemned Tiberius as a tyrant and authorized the consul Publius Mucius Scaevola to safeguard the Republic. When Scaevola refused to resort to violence against Tiberius and his supporters, Scipio Nasica, although only a private citizen, proclaimed “let any who wish to save the Republic follow me,” the formal phrase spoken by consuls when they mobilized the people against an imminent threat to Rome. A group of senators led by Nasica marched to the
Capitoline hill, where the Plebeian Council was meeting. There, the senators clubbed to death Tiberius and hundreds of his supporters. That night their bodies were thrown into the Tiber. For the first time in centuries, violence had settled a political dispute among Romans. Nasica was quickly dispatched on a diplomatic mission to Asia, lest the people attempt to avenge Tiberius. The following year a special commission headed by the consul Popillius Laenas condemned to exile or death many Romans who were thought to have supported with Tiberius.

Although the Senate had mobilized to prevent Tiberius from gaining authority and prestige through the Agrarian Commission, once the political value of the Commission was neutralized, the Senate allowed it to proceed with the needed land reform. The Commission, however, encountered resistance from Italian landowners, who were required to return large tracts of public land, but who, as non-citizens, were ineligible for compensatory land grants. Partially in response to the growing resentment among the Italian allies, Fulvius Flaccus proposed a law in 125 that would grant citizenship to the allies. In the same year, the Latin town of Fregellae revolted. Although the revolt was quickly suppressed, this revolt by a long-term ally of Rome revealed the growing animosity of the Italians, who were shouldering an ever larger share of the burdens of military service, while reaping little of the rewards of empire. Unable to overcome resistance by both the Senate and the local elites throughout Italy, the Agrarian Commission failed to resolve the land crisis.

In 123, Tiberius' younger brother, Gaius, was elected tribune. Assembling a broad coalition of the discontented middle class, urban poor and small farmers, he sought to revive and expand Tiberius' program of reform. Among his first acts, Gaius passed the *lex Sempronia*, which banned extraordinary tribunals like the one that condemned the followers of Tiberius. In theory, a Roman citizen could no longer be declared an enemy of the state (*hostis*) and deprived of his legal rights without being first being convicted in a trial. To ease the plight of the urban poor, he proposed the establishment of numerous colonies, including the first outside of Italy. The urban poor also benefited from the first grain law, which provided for the sale of wheat at fixed low prices to Roman citizens. He also ordered the construction of large grain warehouses in the city to prevent shortages and price fluctuations. The minimum age for military service was set at 17 years old, and the basic equipment for Roman legionaries was to be provided by the state at no cost to the soldier, although they were still expected to own at least some land.

Gaius was re-elected tribune with the plan of tackling land reform. In the face of stiffening opposition, Gaius proposed to two significant reforms in an attempt to gain new sources of political support. First he cultivated the support of the *equites*, the Roman commercial class, who were wealthy but had little power in the political system. For some time provincial subjects had been entitled to sue a governor who extorted money during his term under the *quaestio de pecuniis repetundis* (‘an inquiry for recovering money’). But these extortion trials were judged by senators, who had close familial and political associations with the senatorial governors. Indeed, many senators no doubt hoped to profit by serving as a governor of a wealthy province themselves someday. As a result, although the law had been in effect for the nearly thirty years, not a single conviction had been won. Since *equites*, many of whom were involved with trade with the provinces,
would be more concerned about the long-term financial stability of the provinces, Gaius reasoned that they would be more diligent in prosecuting corruption by magistrates. Although the Senate viewed this change as a threat to its traditional prerogatives, it provided a more effective check on provincial corruption: nearly half of the extortion cases brought under the revised law resulted in a conviction. Two generations later, a trial under this law would launch Cicero's political career and and indictment under this law would nearly derail the career of Catiline.

Gaius also sought support outside of Rome by attempting to extend full citizenship to the Latin allies and granting additional rights to all of the peoples of Italy. The Latins were Rome’s oldest and closest allies and shared a language and many cultural institutions with the Romans. The Italians, meanwhile, were providing an ever-increasing share of Rome’s military power. Granting these allies some benefit from Rome’s lucrative overseas conquests would help solidify Rome’s military advantage while also binding the still diverse peoples of Italy to Rome. But this farsighted proposal proved too much for many Romans, in particular the poor Romans who feared that their hard-won rights would be diluted by the mob of new Italian citizens. Even when it became clear that Gaius lacked the support to pass this law, he persisted in attempting to force the law’s passage. Gaius’ support ebbed and many former supporters denounced his plan.

Even before Gaius’ citizenship law foundered, his position among the people was being actively undermined by the tribune Livius Drusus, who would present more generous versions of Gaius’ proposals. For example when Gaius proposed two small colonies in which settlers would pay a small rent, Drusus proposed 12 large colonies in which settlers could hold land for free. Drusus’ proposals were so generous that it seems likely that they were never intended to be put into effect, but only to undermine support for Gaius among the more gullible of the urban and rural poor. Drusus also assailed the character of Gaius’ ally, Fulvius Flaccus, even suggesting that Flaccus was inciting the Italian allies to revolt. Suspicion inevitably transferred from Flaccus to Gaius. Gaius’ plan to found a colony at the site of Carthage in Africa provided further fodder for his foes. When the ceremonies that accompanied the founding of the new colony were marked by bad omens (unnatural winds, failed sacrifices, boundary stones pulled out by wolves), Gaius’ opponents claimed that the gods opposed his plan to settle Romans on the land once occupied by Rome’s greatest enemy.

In 121, as Gaius’ popularity continued to deteriorate, his opponents moved against him. An assembly was called to repeal the bill that established the colony at Carthage. During the tense meeting, Quintus Antyllius, a client of the consul Lucius Opimius, pushed his way through a crowd of Gaius’ supporters. When he impugned their honesty and made an obscene gesture, Gaius’ supporters stabbed him to death with their pens. The next day Opimius paraded Antyllius’ corpse through the city, further stirring animosity against Gaius and his supporters. The Senate, fearful of mass demonstrations and riots, took the unprecedented step of issuing a Senatus Consultum Ultimum or “final decree of the Senate.” This decree authorized the magistrates to “take any measure necessary for the safety of the state.” Normally no Roman citizen could be put to death without trial and could appeal conviction to the people. The lex Sempronia had forbidden the Senate from voiding the rights of citizens without trial. Magistrates in turn were also limited in the powers they could exercise within the boundaries of Rome. The decree was, in effect, a declaration of a state of emergency in which normal civil rights were suspended. Supporters of the decree would argue that desperate times called for desperate measures; opponents would claim that no political body could
suspend the law or grant essentially unlimited powers to any magistrate. Gaius and his followers retreated to the Aventine Hill. Attempts to negotiate a resolution failed. Opimius led the senators, equites, and a force of Cretan archers to the Aventine and slaughtered Gaius and his followers after a short battle. Thousands more were arrested and executed without trial in the aftermath. A few months later Opimius was indicted under the lex Sempronia for killing Roman citizens without trial. Opimius defended himself by claiming that his actions were authorized by the Senate and that no action could be illegal if it was undertake to preserve the state. The acquittal of Opimius seemed to legitimize the decree as a legal response to an imminent crisis. But the decree would remain a highly contentious action whenever it was deployed.

Meanwhile a dynastic dispute in North Africa drew Rome into an unpopular war against Jugurtha, the king of Numidia. After corrupt and incompetent generals failed to defeat and capture Jugurtha, Quintus Marcellus at last put Jugurtha on the defensive in 109 but failed to capture him. Gaius Marius, a novus homo and Marcellus' client, exploited Marcellus' failure to win popular support for his election to the consulship.

The consul Marius solved the manpower crisis by abolishing the property requirement for serving in the army. On the one hand, this was a commonsense solution that recognized the reality of Roman military service. The property requirement for service had been progressively lowered to the point that even citizens with only the smallest amount of land could serve in the army. Moreover, during times of emergency, Rome often waived even this meager requirement. Nevertheless, the elimination of property qualifications had profound consequences for Roman politics and society. Soldiers became dependent on their general for their support in the army and their livelihood once they were discharged. The potential of thousands of loyal clients increased the value of military commands dramatically. To provide for their new solider-clients, generals had an incentive to seek new (and lucrative) conflicts. They were compelled to find land for their veteran-clients when the legions were demobilized. Although few at the time recognized how significant this small change would be, Marius had irrevocably changed the relationship between the Roman state, its generals, and its army.

Fresh from victory over Jugurtha in 104, Marius found Rome gripped with fear of invasion by the Teutons and Cimbri, Germanic tribes which had won a series of victories against Rome culminating the Battle of Arausio in which over 80,000 legionaries were killed. To deal with the “Cimbric Terror,” Marius was reelected to an unprecedented five consecutive consulships. Hailed as “another Camillus,” after the illustrious general who had defeated an earlier invasion of Gauls, Marius routed the tribes and preserved Rome from invasion. But his unrivaled prestige and status as a novus homo generated resentment among the aristocracy. With the military threat passed, Marius sought land for his triumphant veterans, many of whom were Latins and Italians. The Roman urban poor resented the prospect of non-Romans receiving land. When Marius’ ally, the tribune Saturninus, brought the measure to a vote, a group of poor Romans claimed that they heard thunder, a bad omen that required the vote to be postponed. Saturninus, however, was known for heavy-handed tactics and

“...the Roman people, in payment for their great ingratitude and treachery, might never be free from servitude” — Plutarch, Life of C. Gracchus 16

Reforms of Marius

The Fall of Saturninus
pressed ahead, leading the poor to attempt to dissolve the Assembly by force. Marius’ veterans, who were watching nearby, overpowered the mob and forced the passage of the bill, which included a provision that required all senators to swear allegiance to the bill within five days of its passage. The pledge was another affront to the Senate’s prestige and powers. Elected consul for the sixth time in 100 BCE, Marius now faced opposition by the Senate and the people. When Gaius Memmius, one of the candidates for the consulship, was beaten to death by Saturninus’ mob, the Senate issued an a Senatus Consultum Ultimum. Marius attempted to protect his supporters by locking them in the Senate house under his custody until they could face charges. A mob, which included many senators, scaled the Senate house, tore through the roof, and stoned Saturninus and his supporters with roofing tiles. A ruined Marius went into voluntary exile in the East. His land bill was never fully implemented, stoking further resentment among Rome’s Latin and Italian allies.

Animosity between the Romans and her allies continued to grow. In 95, Italians were expelled from Rome. In 91, Livius Drusus, the son of Gaius Gracchus’ opponent, sought to resolve the growing rift between Rome and Italy by incorporating the equites into the Senate and enfranchising the Italian Allies. His aim was to make Italians co-rulers of the Empire rather than its subjects. The bill faced stiff opposition by the conservative senators and the urban poor. When Drusus was assassinated, revolts broke out throughout Italy, leading to the Italian or Social War (90–88 BCE), after the Latin word for “ally”: socius. The war exacted a terrible human and economic toll, and Rome was forced to enfranchise all free persons south of the Po River. Although isolated pockets of resistance continued for several years, most Italian cities quickly accepted the peace and 500,000 Italians gained Roman citizenship. At terrible cost, Rome and Italy had been unified. In the crisis, Marius again displayed his talent for military operations, as did one of his former lieutenants, a noble named Lucius Cornelius Sulla.

Meanwhile, Rome’s position in the eastern Mediterranean was deteriorating. Roman preoccupation with the Cimbric and Social Wars, and discontent with corrupt Roman governors, allowed Mithridates VI of Pontus to occupy most of Asia Minor and Southern Greece. The command against Mithridates promised immense wealth and prestige to the victorious general. Violence erupted in 88 when the tribune Publius Sulpicius Rufus sought to grant the command to Marius instead of Sulla, who as proconsul was entitled to lead the campaign. Rufus’ bill was resisted by the Senate, who saw it as another attempt to usurp the Senate’s traditional authority over foreign policy. To block the passage of the bill, the consuls declared a iustitium, a suspension of official business. Rufus surrounded himself with a bodyguard and attempted to force the consuls to call a vote on the bill. When they refused, mob violence erupted throughout the city. In the ensuing chaos, Sulla sought refuge in the nearest house, which happened to the that of his former mentor and now bitter foe, Marius. Marius agreed to allow Sulla to leave the city into exile, provided that Rufus’ bill be passed. Sulla assented. He then fled to Campania, where six legions that had served him during the Social War were besieging the city of Capua. The soldiers enthusiastically endorsed Sulla’s right to campaign against Mithridates (a campaign that promised rich plunder for his soldiers). Sulla marched into the Rome and for the first time a Roman army led by a Roman general slaughtered Roman citizens in Rome. Facing fierce resistance from the Roman people, Sulla burned rebellious neighborhoods of Rome.
He defeated a hastily organized militia led by Marius and Sulpicius, who were declared *hostes* by the Senate. Marius fled to Africa, but Sulla massacred Sulpicius and his supporters, repealed his laws, and strengthened the authority of the Senate. Sulla then marched to the East to confront Mithridates.

In Sulla’s absence, Lucius Cornelius Cinna, consul of 87, attempted to repeal Sulla’s laws. The other consul, Gaius Octavius, drove Cinna from the city and declared him a *hostis*. Cinna rallied support of newly-minted Italian citizens, recalled Marius, and quickly starved Rome into submission. In Rome, Marius and his army ranged through the city slaughtering their noble adversaries and confiscating their property. In 86, Marius attained a seventh consulship but died soon after taking office. Cinna took control, appointed the consuls without elections in 85 and 84, and sought cooperation with opponents.

Meanwhile, Sulla, having learned of the situation in Rome, negotiated a generous peace with Mithridates and hastened back to Rome. Cinna’s poorly trained armies stood little chance against Sulla’s veteran force. In 82 Sulla decisively defeated one army; another defected to Sulla. Marcus Crassus and Gnaeus Pompey raised a private army in the north and marched towards Rome in support of Sulla. The combined army engaged and defeated a large force of recently-enfranchised Samnites outside of Rome’s Colline Gate. Sulla used the captured rebels to make a grim point about the new order in the city. While Sulla calmly presided over a meeting of the Senate on the day after the battle, 6,000 Samnites were tortured to death in the Circus Maximus — “only some criminals being punished,” he calmly remarked to the shocked and horrified senators. To finance the settlement of his veterans, Sulla posted lists of persons who were declared to be outlaws. These “proscribed” individuals could be hunted down and killed with impunity. Their killers received a share of their property, while the rest went to the state treasury. During the Sullan reign of terror, 90 senators and 2,600 *equites* lost their lives and property. Some cities received small fines while others were leveled. Farmers were driven from their land throughout Italy to make room for Sulla’s veterans. Etruria, the region to the north of Rome, was especially hard hit by the confiscations.

Now dictator, Sulla broke the power of the *Populares* by forbidding tribunes from holding higher offices and restricting the veto to the personal protection of plebeian citizens. To forestall the concentration of power among the nobility, he increased the number of magistracies and limited the term of provincial governors to one year. He expanded the size of the Senate to 600, filling its ranks with grateful *equites*. The prestige of the Senate was restored and juries were to be composed entirely of senators. He discouraged the concentration of the poor in Rome by eliminating the subsidy for wheat. He also forbade generals from leaving their province without the explicit permission of the Senate. In short, Sulla undid every popular reform of the past few generations, while also trying to prevent another general from exploiting the weaknesses of the system as he had done. Sulla retired to his country estate in 79, believing that he had restored balance the Roman state. His death the following year saved him from witnessing the quick demise of his reforms. Having failed to address the discontents of the populace that fueled the power of the *Populares* or the military system that tempted generals with unlimited power, Sulla's reforms and cruelty only laid the foundation for further civil trauma.
The power vacuum caused by the civil wars and the discontent fueled by Sulla’s vicious reprisals led to two rebellions: one in Spain by Quintus Sertorius and one in Italy by Marcus Aemilius Lepidus, an opponent of Sulla who had been assigned by Cinna to protect Spain. For nearly a decade he would lead a coalition of Roman and native forces that resisted the armies sent by the Senate. Lepidus was a member of the Roman aristocracy who as consul in 78 sought to undo a number of Sulla’s reforms, including the resumption of subsidized grain for the urban poor, the distribution of land for the dispossessed in Etruria, and the restoration of the powers of the tribunes. When a group of Italian farmers sought to force Sulla’s veterans off their land, the consuls were sent to quell the violence. Lepidus instead enlisted the discontented farmers in his private army and marched on Rome. The Senate issued a Senatus Consultum Ultimum authorizing the other consul, Quintus Lutatius Catulus, to preserve the Republic. Gnaeus Pompey, who was in his late twenties at the time, raised a private army to support Catulus, and defeated Lepidus at the Mulvian Bridge outside of Rome. After Lepidus died in Sardinia, his lieutenant, Perperna, took the remaining 20,000 men in Lepidus’ army and joined forces with Sertorius. Pompey, fresh from his defeat of Lepidus, then demanded the command against Sertorius. The Senate, however, feared the young, popular, and wealthy general, and rejected his request. But Pompey simply refused to disband his legions and reiterated his demand that he be allowed to campaign against Sertorius. With the bloody examples of Marius, Cinna, and Sulla fresh in their minds, the Senate acquiesced and dispatched Pompey to Spain. There, he and Quintus Caecilius Metellus Pius wore down the army of Sertorius. After Perperna assassinated Sertorius in 72 BCE, Pompey quickly dispatched the overmatched Perperna and returned to Rome. In Rome, Sulla’s reforms continued to unravel, as distribution of subsidized grain had resumed in the same year.

The year before, a small band of gladiators under the leadership of Spartacus escaped from their barracks in Capua. They defeated a small force of Romans and withdrew to Mount Vesuvius, where they raid the local countryside. After defeating a force of several thousand Roman troops, the numbers of the rebels swelled to over 70,000 men, women, and children. The next year the slaves rebounded from early losses to annihilate a large army. Rome, in panic, turned to to Marcus Licinius Crassus, who drove Spartacus' depleted forces to the toe of the Italian “boot.” Eventually Crassus first trapped and then destroyed Spartacus' army, while Pompey, returning from Spain, captured and executed the few slaves who had escaped, allowing him to claim a share of the honor — and Crassus' enmity. As a sign of his victory and a warning to other slaves, Crassus crucified 6,000 slaves along the Via Appia. The crosses stretched all the way from Rome to Capua, where the rebellion had begun. Pompey, although only 35 years old, was granted a triumph for his victory in Spain and, against all precedent, was elected consul with Crassus for 70 BCE.

The consulship of Pompey and Crassus was relatively uneventful. With no one able to rival their prestige, popularity among the people, or their support among the army, they moved to restore the powers of the tribune. The failure of Sulla’s attempt to restore the power of the Senate was now complete. Meanwhile throughout the Mediterranean, a crisis was coming to a head. By 67 BCE, with Rome too consumed by its civil turmoil to police the seas, piracy had become an endemic problem, one
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**Pompey’s Suppression of the Pirates and Departure to the East**
threatening to cripple Roman trade. Previous attempts to curtail piracy had proven ineffective. If a competent governor managed to drive the pirates from his province, they simply relocated and continued to capture ships and plunder the coast. As the crisis grew acute, the Tribune Aulus Gabinius proposed the *Lex Gabinia*, which granted Pompey authority over all territory within 50 miles of the sea, as well a massive force of 500 warships, 120,000 infantry and around 5,000 cavalry. In effect, Pompey was given extraordinary command over the entirety of Rome's empire. The law passed over vehement opposition from conservative senators, who feared the concentration of such power in the hands of a single magistrate. Although Pompey was allotted three years to resolve the problem, he resolve the crisis in months by resettling most of the pirates, and likely bribing others. In recognition of his success, Pompey was nominated to succeed Lucius Licinius Lucullus as commander against Mithridates. Pompey's command was supported by Caesar and defended by Cicero, although it was opposed by the conservative faction of the Senate. In 65 BCE he decisively defeated Mithridates in Pontus, which he converted into a Roman province. The following year, just as the political situation in Rome was descending into crisis, he marched into Syria, deposed its king, Antiochus XIII Asiaticus, and reconstituted this, too, as a Roman province. In 63 BCE, he moved south, and established Roman supremacy in Phoenicia and Coele-Syria, and then into Judea, where he supported the Pharisee faction against the Sadducees. Pompey had conquered the East, in the process gaining unprecedented power and prestige. He prepared to return to Rome in triumph. Meanwhile, the Roman state was teetering on the brink of chaos, as the *Crisis of Catiline* came to a head.

**A NOTE ON THE CRISIS OF 64-63 BCE**

In retrospect, it it tempting to see the events of the late second and early first centuries BCE as a single, continuous sequence of political unrest that eventually undid the Republican order of the Roman state. While the escalating stresses on the political system and the inadequacy of the reforms seem self-evident in hindsight, it is important to remember that Romans in 63 BCE did not realize that in less than a generation the Republic would be irrevocably lost. Despite the recent turmoil, few Romans, even in the midst of the *Crisis of Catiline*, doubted the long-term stability and durability of Rome’s government, which after all had survived in roughly the same form for over 400 years, and which to the Romans appeared to be the longest-lasting and most successful government the world had ever seen.

We might think that the evolution towards tyranny was the inevitable result of Rome’s territorial growth and the bureaucratic and military apparatus necessary to maintain that geo-strategic order. But “radicals” like Catiline were seeking to gain power within the existing system, even if they were seeking to do so through extra-constitutional means. Catiline sought to be consul, not king or a leader of a radical democracy. Indeed, faith in the system is one of the factors that eventually led to its fracturing, as the political elite failed to enact necessary reforms and hollowed out the traditions that made possible the consensual model of Roman politics.
ROLES & FACTIONS

At the beginning of the game, Roman senators are distributed among four groups:

I. **Populares**, many of whom support Catiline’s bid for power and his reform agenda.

II. **Boni**, who will try to restore stability through compromise, but do not support Catiline’s radical actions.

III. **Optimates**, who oppose all reform and support Cicero’s attempts to move against Catiline under the auspices of the *Senatus Consultum Ultimum* (with greater or lesser degrees of enthusiasm).

IV. **Indeterminates**, who are uncertain about which faction to support, perhaps because they detest Catiline or cannot support Cicero (or both), or because they fear the precedent that would be set by the indiscriminate use of the *Senatus Consultum Ultimum*.

---

**I. Populares**

Marginalized by the *Optimates*, the *Populares* or “men of the people” seek power by radical appeals to the disgruntled and disaffected Romans and Italians, especially the impoverished urban Plebs, indebted aristocrats and farmers, and veterans who had failed as farmers and fondly remembered the excitement (and profit) that accompanied military victory. To ameliorate the financial pressures on the many, some (but not all) *Populares* advocated a radical program of debt forgiveness, land reform (redistribution of property), the curtailing of the prerogatives of the Senate, the empowerment of popular assemblies, and the opening of magistracies and priesthoods to all regardless of wealth or status.

**II. Boni**

The *Boni* are sympathetic to the concerns of the people, but they fear significant and hasty reform in order to address those concerns. Whereas the *Populares* argue that the Senate should appease the people by adopting revolutionary policies like subsidizing grain, broadening the electorate, or increasing the power of the tribunes, and the *Optimates* try to address problems by adopting ever-more conservative positions and consolidating power within the Senate, the *Boni* are defenders of the status quo, preferring to make gradual reforms within the boundaries of the current system. Their goal is to appease the people, not by capitulating to their demands, but by utilizing the current senatorial system to ensure the well-being of all Romans and the stability of Rome.

**III. Optimates**

*Optimates* are united by their unanimous hostility towards Catiline, his supporters, and his political agenda. They are devoted to preserving the political prerogatives of the Senate and the power and privileges of the traditional nobility of Rome. They sought to limit the power of the popular assemblies and the Tribunes of the Plebs. In general, they favored the *nobiles* (noble families) and opposed the ascension of *novi homines* (“new men”, usually provincials) into Roman politics. But some “new men,” like Cicero, might support and seek the support of the *Optimates*. *Optimates* oppose the *furor* (‘destructive madness’) that they believe the *Populares*
threaten to unleash by stoking the ambitions and resentments of the people. In times of crisis, stability must be maintained, even at the cost of individual liberties.

4. INDETERMINATES

Some senators are uncertain about which faction they should support. They are persuadable by the proper argument. They may have strong opinions about Catiline or Cicero, but hesitate to join a particular faction because of personal grudges or motivations.

A NOTE ABOUT FACTIONS

It is important to recognize that, although the senators are divided into different factions, they are all drawn from the wealthiest stratum of Roman society. Optimates, Boni, and Populares, therefore, are not differentiated by economic class or coherent political platforms or modern conceptions of liberal and conservative. There are wealthy Populares (like Crassus) and more modestly-heeled Optimates (like Cato). Cicero began his career allied with Populares politicians and interests, but saw his allegiances shift as he rose through the ranks of the cursus honorum, the sequence of political offices leading to the consulship.

Keep in mind that most of the members of the Senate are from wealthy, aristocratic families, regardless of their political beliefs. They grew up with similar family histories, values, and customs. Most senators have family members who served as consuls, or as other high-ranking officials. Furthermore, although these factions exist, senators do not always vote with their factions. Some people disagree with their factions on specific issues. Others may choose to vote strategically. Some senators will even be convinced to switch factions as the Game proceeds.
Roles by Faction

In *The Crisis of Catiline*, there are four broad factions, although every person within those factions has their own specific political beliefs. The *Optimates* believe that putting power in the hands of the people will disrupt the stability of the Republic and thus work towards keeping power within the Senate. The *Boni* believe that the Senate should be more accountable to the people but will usually oppose significant reform if it threatens the traditional order. They are particularly concerned with preventing another dictatorship and reconciling the senatorial and commercial classes of Roman society. The *Populares* believe that it is the responsibility of the Senate to protect and serve the people, and therefore advocate for measures that help the common people and decrease the power of the Senate. The *Indeterminates* are those without strong political allegiances; they can be swayed in any direction.

Keep in mind that the following charts list the factions as they stand at the beginning of the game, but once the game begins, alliances and opinions can shift dramatically.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Optimates</th>
<th>Boni</th>
<th>Populares</th>
<th>Indeterminates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quintus Lutatius Catulus</td>
<td>Marcus Tullius Cicero</td>
<td>Marcus Licinius Crassus</td>
<td>Publius Cornelius Lentulus Sura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decimus Junius Silanus</td>
<td>Lucius Licinius Murena</td>
<td>Gaius Antonius Hybrida</td>
<td>Gaius Helvius Cinna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publius Servilius Vatia Isauricus</td>
<td>Lucius Aurelius Cotta</td>
<td>Gaius Julius Caesar</td>
<td>Publius Cornelius Lentulus Spinther</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quintus Caecilius Metellus Celer</td>
<td>Lucius Julius Caesar</td>
<td>Lucius Serguis Catilina</td>
<td>Publius Claudius Pulcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servius Sulpicius Rufus</td>
<td>T. Atius Labienus</td>
<td>Lucius Cassius Longinus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quintus Caecilius Metellus Nepos</td>
<td>Publius Vatinius</td>
<td>Servius Cornelius Sulla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcus Porcius Cato</td>
<td>Lucius Caecilius Rufus</td>
<td>Lucius Calpurnius Bestia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quintus Caecilius Metellus Pius Scipio Nasica</td>
<td></td>
<td>Marcus Porcius Laeca</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gaius Cornelius Cethegus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-Voting Roles

Non-voting roles may be assigned by the Instructor as an option for roles drawn from outside of the senatorial class. The non-voting roles are still strongly invested in the outcome of the crisis, and will be responsible for strategizing and otherwise participating outside of the Senate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Faction</th>
<th>Pedarii</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Marcus Tullius Cicero, <em>consul and presiding magistrate</em></td>
<td>Boni</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Quintus Lutatius Catulus, <em>princeps senatus</em></td>
<td>Optimates</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Decimus Junius Silanus, <em>consul designatus</em></td>
<td>Optimates</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Lucius Licinius Murena, <em>consul designatus</em></td>
<td>Boni</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Marcus Licinius Crassus</td>
<td>Populares</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Publius Servilius Vatia Isauricus</td>
<td>Optimates</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Gaius Antonius Hybrida, <em>consul</em></td>
<td>Populares</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Lucius Julius Caesar</td>
<td>Boni</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Gaius Julius Caesar, <em>pontifex maximus; praetor designatus</em></td>
<td>Populares</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Lucius Sergius Catilina</td>
<td>Populares</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Lucius Cassius Longinus</td>
<td>Populares</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Servius Sulpicius Rufus</td>
<td>Optimates</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Publius Cornelius Lentulus Sura, <em>praetor</em></td>
<td>Populares</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Quintus Caecilius Metellus Celer, <em>praetor</em></td>
<td>Optimates</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Quintus Caecilius Metellus Nepos, <em>tribune designatus</em></td>
<td>Optimates</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Lucius Calpurnius Bestia, <em>tribune designatus</em></td>
<td>Populares</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Marcus Porcius Cato, <em>tribune designatus</em></td>
<td>Optimates</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Titus Atius Labienus, <em>tribune</em></td>
<td>Boni</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Lucius Caecilius Rufus, <em>tribune</em></td>
<td>Boni</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Servius Cornelius Sulla</td>
<td>Populares</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Publius Vatinius</td>
<td>Boni</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Gaius Cornelius Cethegus</td>
<td>Populares</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Gaius Helvius Cinna</td>
<td>Indeterminates</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Marcus Porcius Laeca</td>
<td>Populares</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Quintus Caecilius Metellus Pius Scipio Nasica, <em>pontifex</em></td>
<td>Optimates</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Publius Claudius Pulcher</td>
<td>Indeterminates</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PUBLIC BIOGRAPHIES

MARCUS TULLIUS CICERO

_consul and presiding magistrate_

Cicero is a _novus homo_ ('new man'), the first man from his family to enter the Senate and rise to the consulship. As a young man, he was recognized as an unusually talented orator and poet. He studied philosophy and rhetoric in Athens, developing an innovative oratorical style that propelled his political career. Cicero won every election “in his year” or in his first year of eligibility. As quaestor he served in Sicily, where he compelled the farmers to supply grain needed at Rome. Yet the Sicilians eventually agreed that he was careful, just, and fair, and they honored him more than any governor before or since. It was at this point that he took a great risk: the prosecution of Verres, who was accused by the Sicilians of grotesque abuse of his office. Verres was supported by many of the most powerful men in Rome and defended by the great orator Hortensius. Yet Cicero won a resounding victory, forcing the corrupt man to flee into exile. More successes in the courts and elections followed, with Cicero often working in favor of popular reform. Recently, however, Cicero has turned toward the nobility, who have supported him in the recent consular elections. A few weeks ago, after evidence of the conspiracy was discovered, Cicero convinced the Senate to pass the _Senatus Consultum Ultimum_, which empowers the two consuls to take whatever action necessary to protect the Republic. Since the SCU was passed, he has focused all his efforts on finding evidence against Catiline.

QUINTUS LUTATIUS CATULUS

_princeps senatus_

Catulus' father was a close associate of war-hero and champion of the people Marius, who helped him gain a consulship. When Marius betrayed the elder Catulus and forced him to commit suicide, the younger Catulus fled. Since he returned with Sulla, he has been a voice of authority in the Senate. He is well respected for his fairness, prestige, and authority. A decade ago he led the opposition to reforming the tribunate too hastily. As a result of his patience, the Senate achieved consensus: the restoration of the tribunes' powers and the reform of the courts proceeded smoothly. As a pontifex, he oversaw the rebuilding Temple of Jupiter on the Capitoline that was destroyed during Sulla’s March on Rome. For this he earned the nickname, “Capitolinus.” Julius Caesar accused him of embezzling funds but few believe the charge and the case was dismissed. He stands firmly against demagogues and extraconstitutional actions. Although Gaius Julius Caesar just defeated him in the election for Pontifex Maximus, Catulus considers it his duty to uphold the _mos maiorum_.

DECIMUS JUNIUS SILANUS

_consul designatus_

Silanus is from a distinguished family, son of Marcius Junius Silanus, who was consul in 109 BCE. He is a traditionalist, and opposes reform, as he believes it will undermine the stability of the Republic. He recently won the election to the consulship for next year, and, with Murena, will take office on January 1st. His relationship with his wife Servilia is tense. Rumors that she is having an affair with Gaius Julius Caesar were recently confirmed when Cato demanded that Caesar read a note he received, which turned out to be a love note from Servilia.
**Lucius Licinius Murena**

*consul designatus* 43 years old

Murena was born in Rome to a plebeian family, but is descended from aristocrats, including Lucius Licinius Murena (the elder), consul in 151 BCE. Murena served in all three wars in the East against King Mithradates, and has quickly worked his way up the *cursus honorum* in the last ten years. He was elected to the consulship for 62 BCE, and will take office, with Silanus, in January 1st. After the election, he was accused of bribery by Servius Sulpicius Rufus, but was eventually acquitted, largely because Cicero gave persuasive testimony about his good character. He is known to be open to moderate reform.

**Marcus Licinius Crassus**

*ex-censor, ex-consul* 52 years old

Crassus is a savvy politician and businessman. He was a loyal supporter of Sulla, and helped Sulla return to Italy in 84 BCE. Throughout his career, he has constantly been in Pompey's shadow, and resents that Pompey gets the credit for assisting Sulla's return and for defeating the gladiator uprisings in the 70s. Crassus is incredibly wealthy, and uses his wealth to ensure that he and his allies continue to stay in the good graces of the Roman people. He and Cicero are often in conflict, although their disagreements have yet to come to a head. Several weeks ago, Crassus delivered letters of warning to Cicero, revealing the conspiracy.

**Lucius Aurelius Cotta**

*censor* 57 years old

Cotta was praetor in 70, consul in 65, and then censor last year. His family has a record of consular success: his grandfather, his father, and both of his brothers were consuls before him. A good friend of Sulla's, he is known to be concerned with the morality of the Roman people, and feels very strongly that senators must set a proper example for the people. Several years ago, he brought charges of bribery against consuls-elect Publius Cornelius Sulla and Publius Autronius Paetus. They were both convicted, and Cotta and his ally Lucius Manlius Torquatus were chosen as consuls instead. He earned praise as an able and even outstanding consul. As a censor, it is his responsibility to monitor the moral character of his fellow senators. He is respected as a figure of authority in the Senate.

**Publius Servilius Vatia Isauricus**

*ex-consul* 71 years old

Isauricus has spent his life as a champion of traditional values and the *mos maiorum*. In his lifetime he has been granted not one but two personal triumphs, the first for killing Saturninus and quelling the revolt that he caused, and the second for defeating the pirates in Cilicia. He brought a huge amount of wealth back to Rome from Cilicia, keeping none for himself, a noble and selfless act. He recently ran for *pontifex maximus* but lost the election to G. Julius Caesar.

**Gaius Antonius Hybrida**

*consul* 43 years old

Hybrida served in the Mithridatic Wars under Sulla, and was chosen to supervise Greece after the wars were over. During that time, he earned the name Hybrida (half-beast) because of rumored scandalous behavior. He has since begrudgingly embraced the name, and has become known by it in his rise to power in recent years. He is currently co-consul with Cicero, although he has been spending much of his time tending to his proconsular province, wealthy Macedonia, which promises to replenish his fortune. Everyone knows he cut a deal with Cicero: in return for Macedonia, he would defer to Cicero during their consulship. He ran for consul together with Catiline, and most Romans assume that he and Catiline remain close friends, although Catiline failed to win the election.
**Lucius Julius Caesar**

*ex-consul* 

Lucius Caesar was consul in 64 BCE, continuing the tradition of consulship in the Julii. He is in generally good standing with the Senate, and usually acts moderately. He has pledged himself as an *Optimate*, but just this year he joined with his cousin, Gaius, to prosecute Rabirius for executing a Roman citizen without trial. He is often called upon as a moderator, as he is known as a fair and just man, with the *auctoritas* to have his decisions carried out.

**Gaius Julius Caesar**

*pontifex maximus; praetor designatus* 

In a city of ambitious men, everyone agrees that Gaius Caesar is the most ambitious of them all. He is an up-and-coming politician with enough charm to keep the people on his side and enough political savvy to navigate the Senate with relative ease. He proved himself a capable leader as a quaestor, and aedile. Now *pontifex maximus* — a post he was elected to over many older and seeming more deserving men — he was recently elected praetor, and will take office on January 1st. He is an outspoken critic of the *Senatus Consultum Ultimum*, having led the recent prosecution of Rabirius. But his family gives be close ties to many of the *Optimates* and he seems to have distanced himself from Catiline recently.

**Lucius Sergius Catilina**

*ex-praetor* 

Catiline stands at the center of the crisis in the Senate. He is descended from an ancient Roman family, but one that had produced a consul in over 300 years. He served under Strabo in the Social War, and as a young man supported Sulla and the Optimates. Over time, he abandoned the *optimate* cause, championing the common people by pushing for debt and land reform. Throughout his life, he has been plagued by accusations of wrongdoing: in 73 BCE he was accused to committing adultery; in 66 BCE he was prevented from running for consul due to charges of corruption; in 65 BCE he was tried for the abuse of power; and was more recently tried for the murder of his brother-in-law Gratidianus, among others, during the Sullan proscriptions. He was acquitted of all these charges, but they have harmed his reputation. This year, he ran for consul, but lost to Cicero and Hybrida.

**Lucius Cassius Longinus**

*ex-praetor* 

Longinus’ family is well-respected, and has done much for the Roman people, although Longinus himself is yet to achieve political prominence. He ran for consul last year, but was unsuccessful, and holds a grudge against Cicero for beating him in the election and for his nasty campaign rhetoric, which made much sport of his weight. He is known to be a close associate of Catiline.

**Servius Sulpicius Rufus**

*ex-praetor* 

Sulpicius Rufus is known as good and just man, although he has not yet achieved significant military or political success. He is a well-known orator and rhetorician, and spends his time as a lawyer. He ran for consul in the last election, but was defeated by Murena. Following the election, he and Cato charged Murena with corruption, arguing that he won the election through bribery. Murena was eventually acquitted, but Rome now knows he is not to be challenged lightly.
Publius Cornelius Lentulus Sura
praetor; ex-consul 52 years old

Sura was a quaestor under Sulla, and quickly rose through the *cursus honorum*. He was elected consul in 71 BCE, but what he thought would be his great accomplishment, leading a command to defeat Spartacus’ troops, was given to Crassus instead. Soon afterwards, he fell out of favor and was even temporarily removed from the Senate (along with 63 others) on the charge of immorality. Although eventually forgiven and allowed to return to the Senate, he lost a great deal of influence.

Quintus Caecilius Metellus Celer
praetor 40 years old

As the praetor and propraetor *designatus* for Cisalpine Gaul, Metellus Celer holds a great deal of military power, and uses it to his advantage in the Senate. He has traditionally allied himself with the *Optimates*, and is extremely loyal to his family, the Metelli. The Metelli family is plagued by scandal, but unlike some of his relatives Metellus Celer seems to be a cool-headed senator who makes reasonable and rational decisions.

Publius Cornelius Lentulus Spinther
ex-quaestor 42 years old

Spinther comes from the same family as Publius Cornelius Lentulus Sura, but does not appear to share either his ambition or his talent for politics. He has close connections with the *Optimates* through his family, although in general it is unclear whether he agrees with them. He has a love for the theater and for public games, and will surely be in favor of providing more entertainment for the masses. His opinion on the Catilinarians is a mystery.

Quintus Caecilius Metellus Nepos
tribune designatus 37 years old

Metellus Nepos is a vehement defender of the *Optimates*. He was recently elected tribune with Bestia and Cato, and will take office on January 1st. He has numerous personal troubles, most of which are widely known as rumors, but are not confirmed. He has spoken out against Cicero, and continues to argue that a novus homo should not have such power as Cicero has accumulated.

Marcus Porcius Cato
tribune designatus 32 years old

Despite his youth, Cato has quickly become a prominent senator. He was recently elected to the tribunate for the upcoming year, with Bestia and Metellus Nepos, neither of whom he seems to get along with. He makes enemies easily, as he is often unwilling to compromise on issues, and has little regard for who is hurt on his quest to root out corruption and restore virtue and order to the Senate. Even so, he has earned the (grudging) respect of even those nobles he has targeted and the affection of the people, who view him as the only trustworthy man in the Senate (even as he often fights against their interests). This past year, he unsuccessfully charged Murena with corruption for bribery in the most recent elections.

Lucius Calpurnius Bestia
tribune designatus 27 years old

Bestia has recently been elected to the tribunate, along with Metellus Nepos and Cato. He will take office on January 1st. He is from the aristocratic Calpurnii family, but has some financial troubles. His political stances are not well-known, but he has spoken out recently in favor of land reform, amnesty, and debt cancellation.
**Titus Atius Labienus**

*tribune*  
37 years old

Labienus is a champion of the people, and has made his support of the *Populares* clear during his year as tribune. He showed his ambition by running for *pontifex maximus* last year but lost the position to Gaius Caesar. He seems to have taken the loss well, however, and instead of begrudging Caesar the position, has been working together with him to support and safeguard the interests of the people of Rome.

**Lucius Caecilius Rufus**

*tribune*  
35 years old

Caecilius Rufus has used his power as a tribune to fight back against demagogues and to crack down on bribery. He is a staunch supporter of the *Boni*, and although he is bound by his office to act on behalf of the people, he fears reform will lead to mob rule.

**Servius Cornelius Sulla**

*ex-quaestor*  
45 years old

Sulla, nephew of the dictator Sulla Felix, is well-known for the grudge he has against the Optimates for their actions against his family, including preventing his cousin Publius from taking the consulship that he was rightly elected to, and for disqualifying him from running for the consulship due to accusations of corruption and bribery. He is a staunch Catilinarian, and will take extreme measures to bring his family back from disgrace.

**Publius Vatinius**

*ex-quaestor*  
42 years old

Vatinius is a *novus homo* who has been steadily making a place for himself in a Senate that does not generally respect those without family connections. Naturally sympathetic to the *Populares* because of his humble background, he has thus far voted shown a moderate streak. Thus far, he has only achieved the rank of quaestor, but most of the senators who know him assume he has ambitions for the tribunate in the coming years.

**Gaius Cornelius Cethegus**

*ex-quaestor*  
42 years old

Cethegus is known as a rash and reckless man, and has therefore not achieved much political success. He comes from a well-respected family, but he and his family do not get along. Before now, he has supported Marius, Sulla, and Pompey in turn. He now has allied himself with the Catilinarians, but his true motives are unclear.

**Gaius Helvius Cinna**

*ex-quaestor*  
37 years old

Cinna, a well-known poet, has participated little in the Senate before now, but he appears to be compelled by a sense of civic obligation to attend Senate meetings at this tense time. He does not seem to hold any particular stances, beyond his love for the arts. Perhaps that will change as the crisis continues.
### Marcus Porcius Laeca

*ex-quaestor* 37 years old

Laeca is a steadfast member of the *Populares* and a close friend of Catiline’s. He is a talented speechwriter and orator, but he has not pursued a political career, choosing to bring his calls to action to the people rather than the Senate. Cicero has accused Laeca of offering his own home in Rome as a base for the Catilinarians.

### Quintus Caecilius Metellus Pius Scipio Nasica

*ex-quaestor* 36 years old

Scipio Nasica is just beginning his career, but he has the resources of the powerful Metelli family behind him. He recently lost the election for the tribunate to Cato, with whom he has a known rivalry. Thus far in his career, he has been rather conservative, favoring the *Optimates*, as any action that bolsters the power of the aristocracy protects his family, and therefore his interests.

### Publius Claudius Pulcher

*ex-quaestor* 30 years old

Pulcher, still a young man, has not yet held high office, but he has close connections to some of the most powerful men in Rome. One of his sisters is married to the praetor Quintus Metellus Celer, and the other was married to Lucius Licinius Lucullus, although he has since divorced her amidst scandalous rumors. He is the son-in-law of Murena, who has afforded him political protection on account of their familial bond. In 65 BCE, he attempted to prosecute Catiline for his felonies in Africa, but was unsuccessful. There is a rumor, possibly started by Cicero, that he was paid off by Catiline or one of his supporters.
RULES & TRADITIONS OF THE ROMAN SENATE

CONVENING THE SENATE

The presiding magistrate (Cicero) offers a sacrifice and take the auspices (look to the sky for ill- or favorably-omened birds) before he entered the Senate house. If the Senate was convening in a Temple, the senators might offer a small, bloodless sacrifice to the god at the altar (e.g. valuable spices). The presiding magistrate had the discretion to judge whether the meeting was sufficiently full for meaningful business to be done.

ENTRY AND DEPARTURE OF MAGISTRATES

When a magistrate (praetor, consult, or censor) enters or leaves the meeting, all in attendance should stand up. They might also stand up on the arrival or departure of any individual to whom they wished to show particular respect.

INTRODUCING THE MATTER FOR DISCUSSION (RELATIO)

The presiding magistrate does not propose a specific course of action, but merely outlines the topic for discussion (relatio) before the Senate. The relatio itself was always quite brief and in this form:

\[ Quod bonum faustum felix fortunatumque sit populo Romano Quiritium, referimus ad vos, patres conscripti... \]

“That which is good and favorable to the Roman people we refer to you, conscript fathers...

He then states succinctly the matter for discussion and conclude with these words:

\[ De ea re quid fieri placet? \]

“About this matter, what action is pleasing?”

DEBATE

Having introduced the relatio, the presiding magistrate ordinarily opens the matter for debate. This is customarily done by calling each member of the Senate to state his opinion on the matter. This invitation usually follows this simple formula:

\[ dic, Marce Tulli, (quid censes) \]

“Speak, Marcus Tullius, (what you recommend).”

DELIVERING AN OPINION (SENTENTIA)

When the presiding magistrate calls upon a senator by name, that senator is obliged to give some indication of his opinion, even if was simply agreeing with another's position.

\[ Gnaeo Pompio adsentior \]

“I agree with Gnaeus Pompeius.”

If a senator plans to deliver a speech of any length, he should stand. Once he was on his feet, a member of the Senate was entitled to speak for as long as he wished without being stopped (although the presiding magistrate or another magistrate may make a brief interruption to ask a question or challenge a point). The only requirement was that he must, usually at the end of his speech, either make a specific proposal of what should be done about the relatio or express his agreement with the proposal of a previous speaker.
RESPONDING TO A SENTENTIA

Speech will be greeted by cheers, heckles, or grumbles. Senators will react in some way to any notable speech.

Signaling agreement with your feet: If in agreement with a previous speaker, a member of the Senate might immediately move near that speaker. He may also move away from a speaker to indicate his disapproval of that speaker’s view. The conclusion of a speech might be followed by a quite extensive movement of people from one place to another.

ORDER OF DEBATE

Senators speak in the order they appear in the Album Senatorum, the list of senators maintained by the censors (see below). The most prestigious and experienced senators speak first; newly minted senators speak at the end of debate, after they have heard the opinions of their elders.

There are three important exceptions to this sequence of debate:

1. Current magistrates (i.e. praetors and consuls and censors) have an assigned position in the Album Senatorum but can deliver formal or informal speeches at any point in the debate.

   Magistrates who may speak at any time:
   - Marcus Tullius Cicero, consul, presiding magistrate
   - Lucius Aurelius Cotta, censor
   - Gaius Antonius Hybrida, consul
   - Publius Cornelius Lentulus Sura, praetor
   - Quintus Caecilius Metellus Celer, praetor

   The presiding magistrate can call on senators to speak earlier in the debate if the matter directly concerned them or as a mark of special esteem, but this was unusual, since it could be perceived as a sign of disrespect to those senators who had been displaced.

2. The presiding magistrate would normally allow senators who were mentioned by name in the speech of another senator the privilege of making a brief reply.

3. The presiding magistrate may call on senior members of the Senate to respond briefly to speeches made after they had delivered their formal speeches.

PROPOSING A CONSULTUM

Remember that senators are always debating specific proposals. To propose a consultum, a senator must read it to the senate as part of his sententia and submit a copy, in writing, to the presiding magistrate (who will deliver it to the GM at the end of the session).

To propose a consultum, the senator must say: “I propose the following be a senatus consultum…”

Any senator may offer an amendment to a consultum at any point before the vote occurs. The presiding magistrate will ask original proposer if he accepts or rejects the amendment. If the amendment is accepted, the proposal will be changed. If the amendment is rejected, the other senator may submit it as their own separate proposal.
**ENDING DEBATE AND VOTING**

Once the presiding magistrate has opened debate he is obliged to continue calling for opinions until he has called on every member present at the meeting. If there is not enough time for this in a single day then he is obliged to renew the meeting on a subsequent day to continue the debate.

If there are multiple proposals, the presiding magistrate has complete freedom in deciding how to handle competing proposals. He can put a proposal to a vote exactly as it had originally been suggested, or he can make changes to it, or he can refuse to put it to a vote at all. He can even create entirely new proposals which had not been discussed during the debate. That said, even senators who do not support a proposal may take offense if a proposal were not brought to a vote.

The magistrate also has freedom to decide in which order he would put proposals to a vote. The result of one vote may influence his decision about which, if any, proposal to put forward next. If the presiding magistrate attempts to push through an unpopular proposal by including it in a single vote with a number of more popular items, members might protest by shouting “divide!” (“split it up!”). The presiding magistrate was not obliged to do so, but he would often bow to pressure.

Voting was always by separation (discessio). Since senators must either support the proposal or not support it, abstentions were thus counted as votes against the proposal. The presiding magistrate reads the proposal and then say:

\[
\textit{Qui hoc censetis, illuc transite; qui alia omnia, in hanc partem.} \quad \text{“Whoever agrees with this, move over there, those who think anything else, move over here.”}
\]

At the same time he indicates where the first group should go, and where the second. Those supporting the proposal are normally told to move to the person who had made the proposal.

**VOTERS**

All members of the Senate participate in the vote, with the exception of the presiding magistrate. As a prominent Roman, you also control the vote of a certain bloc of pedarii, clients who are loyal to you and your family, and who will take their cue from your vote. This models the influence of the patron-client system in ancient Rome, which exerted a profound influence over Roman politics.

The *Album Senatorum* lists how many pedarii each player controls at the beginning of the game. But your auctoritas can be fleeting. Based on the strength (or weakness) of your speech and game play, you may gain (or lose) supporters — if you deliver a passionate, well-styled speech while someone else mutters incoherent nonsense, you may convince some additional pedarii to support you in the next debate.

**TALLYING THE VOTES**

When the vote takes place, the presiding magistrate marks down each person's vote, along with how many pedarii they have at the time of the vote. The magistrate calculates which group has a higher total number, and the majority will win the vote. He announces the vote by pointing to the side of the chamber with more votes and declaring:

\[
\textit{haec pars videtur maior.} \quad \text{“This side seems greater.”}
\]
**Special Actions and Gambits**

The most common special actions are listed below. Each of these gambits may be used by any player. Specific characters may be able to take additional special actions, listed on their role sheets. Consult with the GM if you are considering pursing one of these gambits. Beware: the risks of defeat are as high as the benefits of victory.

**Dictator Gambit**

In the storied past of the early Republic, dictators were elected for 6-month terms to address a particular crisis (internal or external) or civil need. At the time of the game, the dictatorship is stained by the recent example of Sulla’s terror. In the early Republic, however, the dictatorship was very frequently deployed, with more than a dozen in the 5th century and nearly fifty in the 4th century.

The appointment of a dictator requires three steps:

1) the Senate passes a *consultum*, authorizing one of the consuls (assuming they are alive) to nominate a dictator. The *consultum* must specify the *causa* (‘reason’) for the dictatorship: managing a particular crisis, quelling sedition, investigating something, holding elections, establishing a new festival (usually in response to a terrible omen), holding the Roman Games, driving a nail into the Temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus. These reasons might be combined.

2) The consuls nominate a dictator, if they cannot agree on a candidate they will draw lots for the responsibility.

3) The nomination is ratified by the Senate, which confers *imperium* on the dictator. Historically, the ratification was passed by the *Comitia Curiata*, but for the purposes of the game, the Senate will be in charge of the ratification (since the *Comitia* was controlled by the same group that dominated the Senate). A majority vote in the Senate will be enough for ratification.

A dictator will hold *imperium* for 6 months. He would usually appoint a lieutenant, a “master of the cavalry” (*magister equitum*). Within the bounds set out by the *causa*, the dictator's powers were nearly absolute. Other magistrates remain in office, with their rights and privileges intact. But they are subordinate to the dictator. Within the city of Rome, the judgement of a dictator was subject to the “right of appeal to the People” (*provocatio*).

**Ambassador of the Allobroges**

The Allobroges are one of the Celtic tribes of Gaul. The ambassador of the Allobroges is one of the non-voting roles that may be assigned by the Gamemaster, but players may appeal to the ambassador even if he is not a character in play. In that circumstance, the correspondence with the ambassador will occur through letters, and the GM will write on behalf of the ambassador.

The Allobroges have significant resources, as well as a powerful army. Players may try to persuade the ambassador that supporting their cause will be beneficial to the interests of the tribe. A successful attempt to persuade the ambassador may lead to more power (if a senator can say they have the support of a Gallic tribe, their arguments may be much more persuasive), more *pedarii* (Romans will want to follow such a charismatic patron), or an army (see "Marching on Rome"). A failed attempt may lead to a loss of *pedarii*, the Allobroges supporting one's opponents, or even an attack on Rome by the Gallic tribes. The GM will decide (with the Ambassador, if in play) what rewards or punishments should be dealt to a suppliant of the Allobroges.
MARCHING ON ROME

Any character with control of an army (such as the urban praetor or Catiline, if he declares there is a conspiracy) may use that army to march on Rome. Players may also attempt to raise legions or draw on legions posted to the provinces to march on Rome. Whether an attempt to march on Rome is approved is entirely at the discretion of the Gamemaster.

If players believe they can advance the interests of their faction or their own interests by marching on Rome, they may attempt to do so by following the steps below.

1. Inform the Gamemaster of your intent to march on Rome, in writing, on the “Marching on Rome” form. Fill out and submit the form at least 12 hours before the game session during which the march takes place.

2. Inform the Senate of your demands and your intent to march on Rome, in an oration, in writing (e.g., post to class blog), or through an oration delivered by another member of the Senate. This speech should be attached to the “Marching on Rome” form.

The “Marching on Rome” form must be submitted to the Gamemaster at least 12 hours before the session during which the march takes place.

If the plan to march on Rome is found out, another player may conduct a counter-march. The “Counter-March” form must be submitted before the start of the game session during which the march takes place. N.B. If a Counter-March form is filed and there is no March on Rome to defend against, the counter-marchers face a penalty. The primary leader of the counter-march will be exiled from Rome. The other leaders will lose ½ of their pedarii and supporters will lose ¼ of their pedarii.

The Gamemaster will determine the success or failure of the march with a die roll:

1 or less: Attempt fails, all leaders fall in battle, list of supporters is publicized.
2: Attempt fails, 2 leaders fall in battle and a list of supporters is publicized.
3: Attempt fails, 1 leader falls in battle and a list of supporters is publicized.
4: Stalemate, neither side is able to gain control and 1 leader is killed.
   If a counter-march is conducted, 1 leader of counter-march is killed.
5: Attempt succeeds, but one or more leaders fall in battle (determined by die roll).
   If a counter-march is conducted, one or more leaders fall in battle (determined by die roll).
6: Attempt succeeds, leader takes control of Rome.
7 or more: Attempt succeeds, leader takes control of Rome, opponents killed in battle.

Certain actions can add or subtract from the value of the roll. These actions include:

- Marching on Rome form has signatures of more than ⅓ of current players as either leaders or supporters (+1), OR:
- More than ½ of players declared as either leaders or supporters on Marching on Rome form (+2)
- Leader has submitted additional speeches or documents that significantly helps their cause, to be approved at the Gamemaster’s discretion (+1)
- Counter-March form submitted (-1)
- More than ⅓ of players declared as either leaders or supporters on Counter-March form (-2)
- Leader has control of more than one army (+2)
- Additional factors may be added at the Gamemaster’s discretion
ASSASSINATION

The Crisis of Catiline began with (rumored) attempts on the lives of the consuls. It would not be surprising if prominent politicians found the end of a blade during these chaotic times. If you believe you can advance your interests or those of your faction by removing an opponent from the Senate, you may wish to attempt an assassination.

Assassination attempts are permitted after the first game session and at the Gamemaster’s discretion.

To attempt an assassination, you must follow these steps.

1. Inform the Gamemaster, on the “Assassination” Form of (1) the identity of your intended victim; (2) why you are doing so, (3) how you plan to accomplish the deed; and (4) how such an action is consistent with your character’s personality and political and personal loyalties.

2. Deposit with the Gamemaster pledges, on the “Assassination” form, from any individuals (up to three) who support the assassination attempt. You can improve your odds of success by finding individuals to support the attempt. But be careful: those co-conspirators might reveal this information to others for their own purposes.

3. Submit to the Gamemaster, on the “Assassination” form, a written defense of your actions for public dissemination.

The Gamemaster will determine the success or failure of the attempt with a die roll.

- 2 or less: Attempt fails, assassins are killed.
- 3: Attempt fails, identity of the assassin(s) is known; some assassins are killed (die roll)
- 4: Attempt fails, identity of the assassin(s) is known.
- 5: Attempt fails, identity of the assassin(s) is known.
- 6: Attempt fails, identity of the assassin(s) is known.
- 7: Attempt succeeds, identity of the assassin(s) is known.
- 8 or more: Attempt succeeds, identity of the assassin(s) is unknown.

Whatever happens, you should be prepared to justify your actions to the Senate and to history. If your identity as an assassin becomes known (even if your attempt is successful), you must go into voluntary exile and remain in exile until you find a way to return to Rome, either through recall, amnesty, or a march on Rome.

The Gamemaster rolls one die, then adds or subtracts points based on the specified conditions. For example, if the die roll is 1 and their target is a tribune, the Gamemaster subtracts from the die roll, yielding –1. If the Gamemaster rolls a 6 and they have the support of three senators, the Gamemaster adds 3 to the roll, yielding 9.

Certain actions may increase or decrease your chances of a successful assassination.

- Pledges of support from allies (+1 each, up to 3). Note that allies are putting themselves at risk by pledging to help with the assassination attempt.
- If your intended victim is a Tribune of the Plebs, tribunes have sacrosanctitas (personal inviolability). (-2)
- If your intended victim has more than 10 pedarii. (-1)
- Additional factors may be added at the Gamemaster’s discretion
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**List of Primary Sources**

**Core Primary Text**

Cicero: *First Oration Against Catiline (In Catilinam I)*: available in this Gamebook

**Supplemental Primary Texts (Available from Instructor)**

Cicero, *Second Oration Against Catiline (In Catilinam II)*
Sallust, *The War With Catiline* §1–32, 36–37
Attributed to Sallust, *The Invective Against Cicero*
Selected Ancient Rhetoricians, *Advice on Delivering Effective Speeches in Character*
Cicero, *On His Consulship* (Selections)
Valerius Maximus, *Memorable Doings and Sayings* (Selections)

**Additional Primary Texts (Available from Instructor)**

Appian, *Civil Wars*, Book 2: In this passage, Appian discusses Catiline's character and opinion of Cicero. He describes how Catiline forms a conspiracy, Cicero finds out and has the conspirators arrested.
Asconius, *On the Candidate’s Toga*: ancient commentary on Cicero’s speech against Gaius Antonius and Lucius Catilina during the election of 64 BCE
Cassius Dio, Book 37: a later summary of the events of 63 BCE.
Cicero
   *In Defense of Rabirius on Trial for Treason* (delivered in 63 BCE): details Cicero’s opinion of the legality and expansive power of the *Senatus Consultum Ultimum*.
   *Third Oration Against Catiline* (delivered in 63 BCE): Cicero describes how he caught the conspirators and proved their guilt by having their letters intercepted. He has been praised by the Senate, and talks at length about his own good actions and virtues.
   *Fourth Oration Against Catiline* (delivered in 63 BCE): Cicero argues for the capital punishment of the conspirators for the safety of the entire Republic.
   *In Defense of Caelius* (Selections): Cicero says that Catiline made himself appealing to both good and bad men. Cicero himself even liked Catiline at one time.
   *In Defense of Murena* (Selections): Cicero comments on being a “new man” and calls Catiline worthless; Cicero praises his bold action in defense of the state. Catiline represents a negative example of goodness: whatever Catiline would do, a good man should not.
   *In Defense of Sulla* (Selections): Cicero discusses the conspirators and their closeness; the shocking nature of the conspiracy; past support of Catiline was not proof of his goodness.
Plutarch (Selections)

*Life of Caesar:* Plutarch writes that Catiline tried to destroy the entire Republic and wonders if Caesar tried to help them. Caesar urged the Senate not to kill the conspirators.

*Life of Cato the Younger:* Catiline tried to destroy the state and burn down Rome; Caesar's speech swayed many to show mercy to the conspirators.

*Life of Cicero:* Plutarch reviews Catiline's bad character, summarizes the events of the conspiracy, and says that Cicero made himself hated by exalting his role in ending the conspiracy.

*Life of Crassus:* Crassus was named as a conspirator and Cicero implicated him along with Caesar, but no one believed he was guilty.

*Life of Sulla:* Plutarch accuses Catiline of being involved in a murder organized by Sulla.

Quintilian, *Institutes of Oratory:* Quintilian says that Cicero's gift of oratory made him popular and destroyed Catiline.

Sallust

*The War with Catiline* §60–61: The noble death of Catiline.

Seneca the Elder

*Controversiae* 7.2.7: Seneca discusses Cicero's importance and the threat that Catiline posed to the city.

*Suasoriae* 6.26: Seneca quotes Cornelius Severus' lament of Cicero's death, which mentions the Catilinarian affair as a major accomplishment of Cicero, as well as suggesting that Cicero was greatly beloved.

Seneca the Younger (Selections)

*On Benefits:* Seneca writes about the ungratefulness that he believes motivated Catiline, and ingratitude's effect on Cicero after the conspiracy.

*Consolation for Marcia:* Seneca discusses how much happier Cicero might have been had he died right after defending the Republic from Catiline, and compares later ills of Rome to Catiline.

*On the Brevity of Life:* Seneca writes about the difficulties of Cicero's life.

Suetonius

*Life of Julius Caesar:* Caesar wanted to limit the punishment to conspirators and would have convinced people were it not for Cato. Suetonius says Cicero had gone over to Caesar's side.

Florus

*Epitome of Roman History:* a lurid description of the conspirators and the justice of Cicero's actions; yet he acknowledges Catiline's courage in fighting for the wrong cause.
Cicero — First Oration Against Catiline (In Catilinam I)

In this speech, delivered in the Senate, Cicero addresses Catiline, accusing him of aiming at the destruction of the whole Republic and being hated by the whole city and demanding that he and the other traitors separate themselves from good citizens.

Quo usque tandem abutere, Catilina, patientia nostra?…

[1] When, Catiline, will you stop abusing our patience? How much longer will your insanity mock us? Where is the limit of your unbridled arrogance? There is a night watch on the Palatine. There are guards throughout Rome. There is panic among people. Loyal citizens have come together. The Senate meets here in this fortified place. Look at the faces of these senators! Does none of this impress you? Don't you understand that your plans have been detected? Don't you see that our knowledge of your conspiracy has rendered it powerless? Do you think we don't know what you did last night or the night before, where you were, who attended your meeting, what you decided?

[2] Shame on this age! Shame on its character! The Senate knows everything you've done. The consul sees everything. Yet this man is alive. Alive? He even comes into the Senate! As he takes part in public debates, he watches us and uses his eyes to mark us all for slaughter! Meanwhile we, brave men that we are, think we've done our duty for the Republic by avoiding his frenzy and his daggers. Long ago, Catiline, you should have been executed on the command of the consul. The destruction you planned for us ought to have long ago crashed on your head!

[3] Wasn't Publius Scipio, a distinguished man and pontifex maximus, a private citizen when he killed Tiberius Gracchus? And Gracchus' threat to our constitution was minor! Shall we, the consuls, tolerate Catiline who seeks to put the entire world to fire and slaughter? I won't mention an older precedent — Gaius Servilius Ahala using his own hands to kill Spurius Maelius when he plotted a revolution. Once… once there was virtue in this Republic, when brave men would punish the traitorous citizen more ferociously than their most bitter foreign enemy. We have the senatus consultum against you, Catiline. This decree is powerful and authoritative. The Republic doesn't lack a decision by us. It is we — I'll say it plainly — we who are lacking.

[4] Once the Senate decreed that the consul Lucius Opimius should “see to it that the Republic suffer no harm.” Not a single night passed: Gaius Gracchus was executed on the mere suspicion of treason, despite the good reputation of this father, his grandfather, and his family going back generations. Marcus Fulvius, who had been consul, was executed along with his children. Another senatus consultum entrusted the Republic to the consuls, Gaius Marius and Lucius Valerius. Not a single day passed before the Republic exacted its punishment by executing Lucius Saturninus, a tribune of the people, and the praetor Gaius Servilius. But for twenty days we've let the Senate's authority grow dull. We have the same senatus consultum but it's tucked away in a drawer like a sword in a sheath. According to this decree, Catiline, you ought to have been executed immediately. Yet you live. And as you live you do not lay aside your arrogance but you strengthen it! I want, gentlemen, to be merciful. I want to not seem negligent during this crisis of the Republic. But now I condemn myself for my negligence and my failure to act.

[5] To the north in Italy an enemy base has been established against the Roman people. The number of the enemy increases every day. Yet you see the general of that base and the leader of those
enemies within the walls of Rome. Rome? Within these very walls, plotting every day an internal strike against the Senate. If now, Catiline, I order your arrest and execution, I don't fear that these good men will think I acted with too much cruelty. I will fear that they will think I acted too late. But I have a good reason for not yet doing what I ought to have done long ago: you will be executed only when there remains no one so wicked, so perverse, so like you to declare your death unjust.

[6] As long as a single man dares to defend you, you will live. You will live as you live now. Besieged by my loyal guards, you won't be able to make a move against the Republic. Many eyes will watch you and many ears will stand guard against you, even if you don't know they are there.

What, Catiline, are you waiting for, now that night no longer conceals your criminal meetings in its shadows and a private house no longer contains your conspiratorial voices within its walls. Everything is exposed to the light. Everything bursts into the open. Trust me: change your mind. Forget slaughter and arson. You are checked on every side. We see all your plans as clear as day. Let's review them together.

[7] Do you remember how on October 21st I told the Senate that Gaius Manlius, agent and lackey in your brazen scheme, would begin his insurrection on October 27th? Wasn't I right, Catiline, not only about the act, whose savagery and brazenness I can scarcely believe, but also about the date? What a coincidence! I also told the Senate that you set October 28th as the day when the city's leaders would be assassinated. Many of these men fled the city beforehand — not to save themselves but to thwart your plans. You cannot deny, can you, that on October 28th my guards and preparations hemmed you in and prevented you from moving against the Republic, even as you said that you would be pleased by the slaughter of those leaders who hadn't fled the city.

[8] What happened? You were confident that you would take the stronghold at Praeneste with a nighttime assault on November 1st. Were you aware that I had ordered that town defended by my guards, my garrison, and my watchmen? There is nothing you do, nothing you attempt, nothing you plan that I don't hear it, see it, and know it entirely.

Review with me now the events of the night before last. Then you will understand that my efforts to safeguard the health of the Republic surpass your attempts at its destruction. I say that on the night before last you came to the Street of the Scythe-makers — I'll not leave anything hidden — you came to the house of Marcus Laeca. Your accomplices in this criminal insanity joined you there. You don't deny it, do you? Then why are you silent? If you deny it, I will prove that it happened. In fact, I see some of your accomplices here in the Senate. For gods' sake! Where in the world are we? What constitution do we have? What city are we living in? Here, gentlemen, here among us in this, the most revered and important council in the world, there are men who plot our deaths and the destruction of the city and the world! I am the consul and I see these men. I call for their opinions about state business. These men, who ought to be executed by the sword, I don't even wound with my words!

You were, Catiline, at Laeca's house that night. It's true. You doled out the regions of Italy. You decided where each man should go. You chose men to stay at Rome. You chose men you would lead to your army. You assigned which neighborhoods in the city they should burn. You confirmed that you were about to leave the city. But you said that you delayed because I was still alive. Two Knights were found to free you from this anxiety. They promised they would kill me in my bed just before dawn that very night.
Of course, I learned everything as soon as your meeting broke up. I strengthened my guard, fortified my house. I barred my door to those whom you had sent to salute me in the morning. Yet those very same men came at exactly the time I said they would. You see, I had revealed all of this beforehand to many of city’s leaders.

Since this is the situation, Catiline, finish what you’ve begun. Leave the city. Its gates are open. Go on your way! For too long has Manlius’ base — your base — waited for its general. Take all your men with you — or at least as many as you can. Cleanse the city. You will free me of my great fear once the city wall stands between us. You cannot remain here with us any longer. I will not endure it, tolerate it, or allow it.

We owe a great debt to the immortal gods and to Jupiter Stator (gesturing to the statue), the most ancient guardian of this city. So many times we have already escaped this sickness so loathsome, so foul, so deadly to the Republic. But the health of the Republic cannot be put at risk by a single man again and again. You plotted against me, Catiline, when I was consul-elect. Then I defended myself with my personal alertness, not a public guard. When, as consul, I oversaw the recent election, you wanted to kill me and the other candidates in the Campus Martius. Even then I avoided public outcry and tried to thwart your wickedness by the protection and support of my own friends. Wherever you attacked me, I stood in your way, although I recognized that my death would be a great disaster for the Republic.

Now you openly attack the entire Republic. You summon the temples of the immortal gods, the buildings of the city, the lives of every citizen, all of Italy to destruction and ruin. Still, I won’t yet do what is best, what befits my authority and the example of our ancestors. Instead I shall act more leniently but with more benefit for the common good. If I order you to be killed, the rest of your gang of conspirators will remain in the Republic. But if, as I have long encouraged, you leave the city, the great and noxious sewage of your comrades will be drained from the Republic.

What is it, Catiline? Surely you don’t hesitate to do at my bidding what you were going to do of your own free will? The consul orders a public enemy to leave the city. You ask me, “you don’t mean exile do you?” I don't command it. But if you ask my opinion, that is my advice.

What is there, Catiline, that can now give you any pleasure in this city? Here, except from that gang of outcast conspirators, there is no one who does not fear you, no one who does not hate you. By what stain of domestic scandal has your life not been branded? What disgrace does not cling to the reports about your private affairs? From what lust have your eyes ever abstained? What outrage your hands? What atrocity your body? Is there a single young man who, after you snared him in your net of corruption, you have not offered a sword for his recklessness or a torch for his desire?

What is it? Just recently, when the wicked death of your wife created an opening for a new bride, didn’t you pile on another incredible wickedness? I pass this by and willingly allow it to remain in silence so that this monstrous crime not seem to have occurred in this city without being punished. I pass by the ruin of your fortune, which you understand looms on the next Ides. I pass by your domestic difficulties and disgrace. I arrive at matters pertaining to welfare of the Republic and the lives and health of us all.

Can the light here please you, Catiline? Can the air here please you, when you know that every one of these men knows that on the last day of December, when Lepidus and Tullus were still consuls, you stood in the Comitium armed with a weapon and readied your gang to kill the consuls
and the leaders of this city? Everyone knows that it wasn’t fear or a change of heart that stopped this
criminal insanity — it was the good luck of the Roman people. I won’t mention those other crimes —
they are well-known and you have committed many more since — how many times you tried to
kill me after I was elected consul, how many times once I was in office! How many of your blows,
which seemed destined to land, have I dodged with a slight bob or a weave. You achieve nothing. You gain nothing.

Yet you don’t stop trying and hoping. How often has your dagger been wrenched from your hands
[16] How often has some chance caused it to slip and fall from your hand? This dagger — I cannot
imagine the rites you used to consecrate it that you think that you must drive it into the body of a
consul. What life is left to you now? Now I will speak with you so that you will know I am not
moved by hatred — although I should be — but by pity that you do not deserve. A few minutes ago
you entered this meeting of the Senate. Did any of your friends and acquaintances greet you? No
senator in memory has ever experienced this. Are you waiting for them to voice their condemnation?
You have been convicted by the stern judgement of their silence. What do you think of this? At the
moment you arrived, all the seats around you were abandoned. The former consuls, whom you had
so often marked out for slaughter, left the seats around you bare and empty. How do you think this
should make you feel? Good god! If my slaves feared me as much as your countrymen fear your, I
would think that I had to leave my own home. Do you even consider that you should leave the city?
If I were so deeply loathed and suspected of wrongdoing by my countrymen — even if I didn’t
deserve it — I would rather avoid their sight than have their hostile eyes glare at me. But you,
although you acknowledge the guilt of your crimes and the justified hatred they cause, still hesitate
to avoid the gaze and presence of those whose hearts and minds you have wounded? If your parents
feared you and hated you and you were unable to reconcile with them, I think you would slink away
from their sight. Now your country, which it is mother of us all, hates and fears you and long ago
decided that you think of nothing but her murder. Won’t you respect her authority or bow to her
judgement or fear her power?

[18] She pleads with you, Catiline, and although silent she somehow speaks:

“For some years now, no crime has happened without your hand in it, no scandal without
your involvement in it. You alone have slaughtered citizens. You have tormented and
plundered my allies without punishment or consequence. Not only have you ignored my
laws and my courts, you have even corrupted and broken them. These earlier crimes —
although they were intolerable — I tolerated as best I could. But now I am in a state of
complete terror because of you alone. Whenever there is a thump in the night, I fear it’s
Catiline. There’s no plot hatched against me that lacks your complicity. This I cannot
tolerate. Therefore go! Free me from this terror. If what I fear is true, then I won’t be
destroyed. If it is false, at least I will no longer be afraid.”

[19] If, as I said, your country said these things to you, shouldn’t her request be honored, even if she
couldn’t force you to comply? What about the fact that you surrendered yourself into custody? To
avoid suspicion you said that you were willing to live in Lepidus’ house. When Lepidus rejected you,
you dared to come to me, asking that I guard you in my own home! You received the same answer
from me: if I couldn’t be safe when we lived together in the same city, how could we live together
under the same roof! So you approached Quintus Metellus, the praetor. When he rejected you, you
went to your buddy, a most excellent man, Marcus Marcellus. I guess you thought he would keep you under the most attentive guard, under the most clear-sighted suspicion, and the most vigorous punishment. Are you so very far from a trip to prison and chains if you deem yourself worth of being in custody?

[20] Since this is the situation, Catiline — and if you cannot face death calmly — why do you hesitate to depart for foreign lands? Do you hesitate to entrust your very life, snatched from just and numerous punishment, to exile and solitude? “Put the matter to the Senate,” you say. In fact, you demand this. You say that if this group votes for your exile you will will obey. I shall not put this to the Senate because it is contrary to my principles. Yet I will make sure that you understand what these men think about you. Leave the city, Catiline! Liberate the Republic from its fear! If you wait for these words: go into exile! What is it? What are you waiting for? Don't you notice the silence of these men? They allow it. They are silent. Why are you waiting for the verdict of their speech when you can see their desire expressed by their silence?

[21] Now if I had said this against this excellent young man, Publius Sestius, or that bravest man Marcus Marcellus, the Senate would have already turned violent against me — and justly too — even though I’m a consul and we are in a temple. But in your case, Catiline, their inaction signals their approval, their verdict, their silence their applause. I refer not only to these men, whose authority you evidently value so highly even as you deem their lives worthless. I refer also to the Roman Knights, those most honorable and excellent men, who surround the Senate, whose numbers you could see, whose desires you could sense, and whose voices you heard just a few minutes ago… whose hands and weapons I have barely been able to keep off you. I can easily persuade these same men to escort you as you leave the city gates, the gates which you have for so long been eager to destroy.

[22] But what am I saying? Would anything break your will? Would you ever change your ways? Would you ever consider flight or exile? If only the immortal gods had the power to plant that idea in your head. Even so I see what a storm of unpopularity looms for me if you are frightened by my speech and decide to go into exile. The memory of your crimes may keep the storm at bay for a time but in the future it will come. It will be worth it, as long as this disaster falls only on you and the Republic is kept free from danger. Could you abandon your vices, fear the punishment of law, and yield to the demands of the Republic? It’s too much to ask. No, Catiline, shame won’t turn you from scandal, nor fear from risk, nor reason from madness.

[23] Therefore, as I have often said, depart! If you wish to fan the flames of hatred against me, your enemy, as you have often said, go straight into exile. It would be hard for me to endure the rebukes of these men if you went. It would be hard for me to bear the burden of unpopularity if you went into exile on the order of the consul. If, however, you’d rather help my credit and reputation, leave with that savage gang of felons! Go to Manlius! Rally your outcasts! Separate yourself from virtuous men! Wage war against your country! Rejoice in your wicked banditry! Then it won't seem like I cast you out to strangers. It will seem like I invited you to join your own kind.

[24] But why am I encouraging you? I already know that you have sent men ahead to wait for you at Forum Aurelium. I know that you have agreed with Manlius on the day. I know that you have even sent ahead a silver eagle. You had a shrine set up for it in your home. I am confident that it will bring death and destruction to you and all your followers. Can you bear to be parted from your precious
eagle any longer? You used to worship it as you made your way to your crimes. Your hand often passed from its altar to the murder of your countrymen.

[25] At long last you will go where for along time your unbridled lust and madness has been leading you. This outcome doesn't seem to cause you grief but some unimaginable kind of pleasure. Nature bore you for this insanity. Your will trained you for it. Your luck preserved you for it. You never wanted peace. You didn't even want war unless it was despicable. You found your gang of evil men swept together from among the outcast souls who have lost their fortune and even hope.

[26] Such happiness you will enjoy with them, such joys will you delight in, in such pleasures will you debase yourself. When you are among your friends you will not hear or see a single decent man. Your physical training has prepared you for this kind of life. Lying on the ground? Not only to lie on the bare ground in wait for debauchery but even crime. Staying awake all night? Not only to ensnare husbands while they slept but even to steal the property of those you catch unawares. You have the opportunity to display your splendid endurance of hunger, cold, and total deprivation. Very soon you will realize that these talents will exhaust you.

[27] I accomplished this much when I drove you from the consulship: you could only attack the Republic as an exile rather than torment it as its consul; and this criminal act undertaken by you would be called banditry rather than war.

Now, gentlemen, I will reject and refute a complaint by our country that may seem justified. Please listen carefully to what I say and fix it firmly in your hearts and minds. If my county, which means more to me than my life, or all of Italy, or the entire Republic were to say this to me:

“What are you doing, Marcus Tullius? You've discovered that this man is a public enemy. You see that he will lead an army against me. You understand that the enemy base waits for him to be its general. He's the leader of this conspiracy, a recruiter of slaves and outcasts. Will you allow him to leave? It seems that you don't send him from the city but welcome him in! Will you not order this man to be led off in chains, taken away to his execution and to his ultimate punishment? What is stopping you? The practice of our ancestors? But in this Republic often even private citizens condemned dangerous citizens to death. Is it the laws that have been passed concerning the punishment of Roman citizens? But in this Republic those who rebel against the state never keep their rights as citizens. Do you fear you will be unpopular in the future? Splendid thanks indeed you give to the Roman people who have just in time raised you through the ranks of political office, even though you made your own name for yourself and had no backing from famous ancestors. Will unpopularity or fear of danger cause you to neglect the safety of your countrymen? [29] If you fear unpopularity, unpopularity caused by strictness and courage should be more fearful than unpopularity caused by inaction and negligence! Or, when Italy has been devastated by war, its cities cry in torment, its buildings aflame, will you then think that you will not be consumed by an inferno of unpopularity?”

I will respond briefly to these most holy words of the Republic and to the minds those who share its thoughts. If I thought it were the best course of action, gentlemen, to condemn Catiline to death, I would not have granted that wretched gladiator another hour of life. In fact, if our best and most illustrious citizens were not only not stained with the blood of Saturninus and the Gracchi and Flaccus and many others before them but even glorified by it, I certainly had no reason to dread that
a wave of unpopularity would crash over me because I had executed this murderer of citizens. If, however, this wave did loom over my head, I have always been of the opinion that unpopularity born from doing what is right in not unpopularity at all but glory.

[30] Nevertheless there are some in this group who either don’t see what threatens us — or they pretend they cannot. These men have fed Catiline’s hope by their feeble decisions. They strengthened the conspiracy when it was growing because they didn’t believe it existed. These men have influenced the wicked and the naive to say that I act cruelly or like a tyrant if I act against this man. Now, if Catiline arrives at his destination — Manlius’ base — I believe that no one will be so foolish or wicked as to deny that the conspiracy exists. If this man is executed, I believe that this disease in the Republic can be held in check for a time, but it cannot be suppressed forever. But if he banishes himself and marches away with his supporters and he gathers in one place all those castaways he’s rounded up, then this disease can be snuffed and with it the root and source of all our misfortunes.

[31] For a long time now, gentlemen, we have lived among the dangers and plots of this conspiracy. Somehow the moment of crisis for all these crimes and this ancient, reckless madness burst forth during my consulship. If that man alone is removed from that gang of thugs, we will seem — for a short time — to have released this Republic from its anxiety and fear. But the danger will remain, burrowed deep in the veins and vital organs of the Republic. Often men who are ill with a serious illness toss and turn with the heat of their fever. If they drink cool water, at first they seem to have some relief. But then their affliction strikes even more seriously and acutely. Just so if this illness which in the Republic is relieved by the punishment of just this one man, it will return and grow even more severe as long as the others remain alive.

[32] Therefore let these wicked men depart. Let them isolate themselves from loyal men. Let them gather in one place and, as I’ve often said, let a city wall stand between them and us. Let them stop ambushing the consul at his home. Let them stop surrounding the tribunal of the urban praetor. Let them stop besieging the Senate-house with swords. Let them stop preparing firebrands and torches to set fire to the city. Finally let it be written on the forehead of every man exactly what they think of the Republic. I promise you this, gentlemen, we consuls will show such diligence, you senators will display such authority, you Roman Knights such courage, all loyal citizens such unshakeable consensus that, when Catiline departs, you will see everything will be exposed, illuminated, crushed, and punished.

[33] With omens like these, Catiline, with the greatest salvation of the Republic and the disaster and ruin for yourself and destruction for all your supporters who have joined you in every crime and murder — depart to your wicked and despicable war. But you, Jupiter, whom Romulus established with the same good omens that established this city and whom we rightly call “The Foundation” of his city and empire, keep this man and his allies from your temple and the temples of the other gods, from the buildings of the city and its walls, from the lives and fortunes of all our countrymen. And these men, enemies of loyal citizens, enemies of their country, plunderers of Italy, these men who joined together in an alliance of the wicked and a brotherhood of crime, on them you will inflict with eternal punishment while they yet live and even after they have died.
Appendix 1: Glossary of Roman Terms

**Client**: Roman social relationships outside of the family were defined in part by the system of *patronage* or *clientela*, which established a complex set of interrelated obligations between a *patron* and his many *clients*. A patron was expected to protect, mentor, and support his clients. In return the client was expected to support the patron to the best of his abilities, often by voting for him and his friends. Powerful Romans typically had many clients in inferior classes, but more experienced nobles could also serve as the patrons of other nobles. The number of clients was one of the manifestations of the social authority or *dignitas* wielded by powerful Romans. The early development of the system of patronage in Rome may have contributed to the creation of the *patrician* and *plebeian* classes.

**Cursus honorum** (‘course of offices’): the sequence of elected Roman offices that began with the *quaestorship* and culminated in the *consulship*. After Sulla’s reforms in the early 70s BCE, each office had a minimum age requirement and candidates had to wait a minimum number of years after their last successful election. But these restrictions were often waived.

**Discessio** (‘separation, division’): the voting method used by the Roman Senate; see “Rules and Procedures.”

**Equites** (‘Knights’): in early Rome, members of the equestrian class served in the calvary, and so had to be wealthy enough to supply their own horses and armor. By the late Republic, *equites* were part of the Roman elite, along with the senators. Many *equites* were involved in business and trade class, and were often as, if not more, wealthy than members of the Senate.

**Imperium** (‘power to command’): the formal authority conveyed on a magistrate to act in the interests of the state within his jurisdiction. A curule magistrate carried a distinctive ivory baton topped by an eagle and was escorted by *lictors* who carried the *fasces*, or bundles of rods that symbolized the magistrate’s *imperium*. Outside of Rome, an axe was added to the *fasces* to indicate his power to authorize capital punishment.

**Intercessio** (‘interposition’): the right of a *tribune* to veto political action by interposing his sacrosanct body.

**Magistrate**: any of the powerful Roman political offices (praetor, consul, censor).

**Mos maiorum** (‘Custom of the Ancestors’): a general term used to refer to the established customs, behaviors, and traditions of the Roman people. Although it implied traditions of great antiquity, it could refer to any precedent, even those set quite recently.

**Novus homo** (‘a new man’): a designation given to the first man in a family to serve in the Roman Senate (and so be elected to the *quaestorship*). Also used to refer to the first man in a family to attain the consulship, and so the pinnacle of Roman political power.

**Optimates** (‘the best men’): entrenched aristocrats who sought to advance the political prerogatives of the senatorial aristocracy.

**Patricians**: families who trace their descent from senatorial families in the time of the kings. In the early Republic, they came to monopolize important magistracies and religious offices. Even in the late Republic, a limited set of offices and priesthoods could only be held by patricians.
**Perduellio** (‘high treason’): according to the *Law of the Twelve Tables*, a man is treasonous if he stirs up an enemy or betrayed a citizen to the enemy. By the late Republic it was an obsolete law, but it was revived by Julius Caesar for the prosecution of Rabirius in early 63 BCE.

**Plebeians**: all families that are not **Patrician**.

**Patron**: see “**Client**.”

**Princeps senatus** (‘chief of the Senate’): a position of enormous prestige in the Roman Senate, although by the late Republic most of its official powers had been transferred to other offices. Retained the right to speak early in debate. Selected for a renewable five year term by the censors, the princeps senatus was usually an elderly patrician senator who had served as consul, and often as censor.

**Populares** (‘favorsing the people’): Politicians who claimed to support democratic perogatives and the interests of “the people”, including land distribution, cancellation of debt, subsidized distribution of food, and expansion of the vote.

**Promagistrate**: a military or administrative post filled by a magistrate after their term in elected office is complete; e.g. propraetor, proconsul.

**Proscription**: the publication of a written notice. In Roman politics, proscription referred to the publication of a list of Roman citizens by the Senate. Citizens on this list were deprived of their citizen rights and any protection under the law and their property was subject to confiscation. Rewards were given to informers who contributed to the death of the proscribed. Anyone who killed a proscribed man was entitled to a share of his property, with the remainder going to the state. During the dictatorship of Sulla (82–81 BCE), hundreds and perhaps thousands of Romans were proscribed and executed. Decapitated heads of many of the proscribed were displayed in the Roman Forum. Men, especially those from the wealthy equestrian class, were dragged from their homes in the dead of night. This state-sanctioned terror left a deep scar on the Roman psyche.

**Relatio**: a matter presented for formal discussion before the Senate.

**Rex**: a king, monarch. A word hateful to the Romans.

**Senatus Consultum**: recommendation of the Senate to a magistrate.

**Senatus Consultum Ultimum**: the “ultimate decree of the Senate” (see Appendix 2).

**Sententia**: an opinion delivered in the Senate.

**Struggle of the Orders**: a centuries long process through which plebeians won the full rights of citizenship and access to Rome’s legal and political system.

**Triumph**: a civil ceremony of enormous spectacle that celebrated a great military success, especially the successful conclusion of a foreign war. Dressed like the statue of Jupiter Optimus Maximus, the Triumphator was paraded through the city in a chariot, followed by his soldiers, and captives and spoils of war. The festive atmosphere was often finished with a great feast for the inhabitants of the city and even neighboring towns, the celebration of athletic games, and other public entertainment.
Appendix 2: History of the Senatus Consultum Ultimum
(“The Final Decree of the Senate”)

During times of extreme crisis in the early Republic, Romans would routinely grant extraordinary powers to a dictator, who would serve as supreme political and military leader for a single term of six months. This office, however, fell into disuse after the conclusion of the Second Punic War in 202 BCE. In part, there was less need for the dictatorship, since Rome was experienced a period of political stability and rapid growth; but as Rome began to conduct most of its wars abroad, often against very wealthy enemies, the senators grew concerned about concentrating that much authority away from their watchful eyes.

In the late second and early first centuries BCE, however, renewed civil unrest often required swift and decisive action. Instead of creating a dictator during times of crisis, the Senate could issue the following decree or Consultum:

“Let the consuls see to it that the state suffer no harm.”

consules darent operam ne quid detrimenti res publica caperet (Sallust, The War with Catiline 19)

This simple decree empowered the consul to take whatever steps were necessary to preserve the Republic. Because these actions generally included extra-legal and unconstitutional acts that violated the traditional rights of Roman citizens, the legality of this ultimate decree, known as the Senatus Consultum Ultimum, was highly contested. Did a magistrate have the ability — or indeed the obligation — to protect the state from suffering irreparable harm by taking actions that would otherwise be illegal? It could be argued that once Roman citizens constituted themselves as a private army and attempted to overthrow the state, it was self-evident that they were no longer citizens (cives) but enemies of the state (hostes), and so no longer enjoyed the legal protections that forbade their execution without trial and granted them the right of appeal his verdict to the Roman people. Although Roman citizens had enjoyed protections against abusive magistrates since the time of the early Republic, in times of crisis an older law took precedence: “let the well-being of the people be the ultimate law” (salus populi suprema lex esto).

Opponents, such as Julius Caesar, who coined the term Senatus Consultum Ultimum as a rebuke of its dangerous power (Bellum Civile 1.5.3), argued that the decree simply enjoined the consul to act within the traditional legal and political framework provided by Rome’s constitution, not to violate the essential rights of Roman citizens. A magistrate, such opponents would argue, may take extraordinary action in stopping an insurrection or apprehending riotous citizens. But once the rebels were in custody and so no longer posing an immediate threat to the state or public order, they were again merely citizens and deserving of citizen rights, until such time as a trial determined their guilt or innocence.
## Uses of the Senatus Consultum Ultimum before the Crisis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>121 BCE</td>
<td>For the consul Lucius Opimius against the ex-tribune Gaius Sempronius Gracchus and the tribune Marcus Fulvius Flaccus (the only ex-consul to hold the tribuneship). Gracchus, out of office and so a private citizen, had assembled a personal body guard, which killed a servant of Opimius. Opimius then led a group of senators and <em>equites</em> against Gracchus and his supporters on the Aventine, resulting in the deaths of Gracchus, Flaccus, and around 3,000 other people. Opimius was tried by a tribune “among the people” (<em>apud populum</em>). He did not deny that he had violated the law against executing Roman citizens. But he claimed that doing so was justified because it was in accordance with the interests of the Senate and was necessary to protect the “well-being of the people” (<em>salus populi</em>). Opimius was acquitted. A precedent had been established that a magistrate could take extra-legal action to secure the continuance of the state when he was advised to do so by an official motion of the Senate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 BCE</td>
<td>For the consul Gaius Marius against the tribune Lucius Appuleius Saturninus and the praetor Gaius Servilius Glauca. Saturninus had fomented mob violence in an attempt to force passage of his legislative program. Gaius Rabirius was prosecuted for treason and convicted his role in killing Saturninus and Glauca in 63 BCE; Cicero speech in his defense, the <em>Pro Rabirio</em>, survives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77 BCE</td>
<td>For the consul Quintus Lutatius Catulus against the proconsul Marcus Aemilius Lepidus, who had raised a revolt in Etruria and was marching on Rome from his province of Cisalpine Gaul. When the bulk of his army defected to Pompey, Lepidus fled to Sardinia, where he died of natural causes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63 BCE</td>
<td>For Cicero against Catiline and his followers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX 3: ROMAN VIRTUES

How should a Roman behave? To what standards of conduct was he held? What was considered a good life?

Perhaps the most revealing and succinct source for the Roman conception of the “good life” were, ironically, the eulogies or *laudationes funebres* delivered at the funerals of aristocratic Romans. These eulogies praised the accomplishments of the deceased, often in the context of the notable achievements of the family’s most illustrious ancestors.

In a eulogy delivered in 221 BCE, Quintus Caecilius Metellus praises his father, Lucius Caecilius Metellus (twice consul and *pontifex maximus*), for accomplishing the “ten greatest and most excellent things.” According to Metellus, these were:

1) being a champion warrior
2) being the best orator
3) being the bravest general
4) holding command in the greatest undertakings
5) attaining the highest political office
6) being a leader in (public) wisdom
7) being considered a leading senator
8) gaining great wealth by honest methods
9) leaving many children
10) and being the most distinguished man of the state.

Here we find a concise vision of the best Roman life, distilled into 8 public and 2 private achievements: the ideal Roman was accomplished in the full range of manly pursuits, devoted to public service, and preeminent among his peers.

In the pursuit of these achievements, good Romans strived to be recognized for displaying a set of Roman virtues. One’s own behavior was paramount; but all of these virtues were thought to have a hereditary component as well. The degree to which a Roman attained these standards of virtue exerted enormous influence on his public worth (*virtus*), his image (*dignitas*), his influence (*auctoritas*), and his ability to forge lasting relationships with other Romans (*amicitia*). These “Master Concepts” are discussed below.

*Note:* each of the terms outlined below contains a complex bundle of meanings and implications; the simple English translation might be considered the best fit term, but be sure to read the description to get a better sense of the virtue and how it functioned in Roman society.
MASTER CONCEPTS

**AMICITIA — “FRIENDSHIP”**

*Amicitia* is generally translated as “friendship” but it is important to remember that it only gradually gained the sense that we associate with contemporary friendship. In the Republic, it primarily referred to the network of relationships and obligations that bound together families and personal relationships among people of like social status.

**VIRTUS — “EXCELLENCE”**

A Roman valued valor, manliness, courage, and character in the public sphere. A man might be thought to possess *virtus* if he displayed *prudentia, iustitia, temperantia, and fortitudo* in his public dealings. Note: the highest female virtue was *pudicitia*: “modesty” or “chastity”, although on rare occasions, women, children, and even non-Romans could demonstrate *virtus*.

**DIGNITAS — “WORTH”**

The sum of a Roman's personal clout and influence because of his personal reputation, visual impressiveness or distinction, dignity of style and gesture, rank, moral standing, and achievement. It also incorporates the obligations that flow from these. The basis of one's *auctoritas*.

**AUCTORITAS — “PRESTIGE”**

Auctoritas represented a Roman's ability to influence others and to direct the political process. The ability to put one's *dignitas* into action. One's auctoritas is the prestige that an individual had accumulated through the standing of his family, his personal experiences, material power, the strength of his *amicitia*, and the perception of this virtue. The great historian Theodor Mommsen describes the “force” of *auctoritas* as “more than advice and less than command, an advice which one may not safely ignore.”

**ROMAN VIRTUES**

**COMITAS — “APPROPRIATENESS”**

A Roman should display good taste, decorum, and courtesy at all times when interacting with someone of lower social status. It might be easier to understand by reference to its opposite: a Roman should never be boorish, crass, inconsiderate, or discourteous. His *comitas* is one of the aspects of Romanitas that distinguishes him from the bestial barbarian and the obsequious Greek. Some more traditional Romans believe that *comitas* is a dangerous modern disposition, and that social inferiors should be treated with *severitas*.

**CLEMENTIA — “MERCY”**

The prudential granting of tolerance, forbearance, and gentleness to the humbled weak. Its opposite is “savageness”, the indiscriminate application of violence and force on the undeserving.

**CONSTANTIA & FIRMITAS — “TENACITY”**

A Roman is confident in his positions. He abhors fickleness. He possesses the strength of character to maintain ones' convictions in the face of any challenge.

**FORTITUDO — “COURAGE”**

A Roman is courageous in confronting dangers to himself, his family, and to the state.
**Frugalitas — “Frugality”**
A Roman should have simple tastes, economical with his resources and embracing a simplicity of style; but was never miserly, which would be a violation of *comitas*. Many think virtue is needed more than ever if the crisis of the Republic is to be resolved.

**Gravitas — “Weight”**
The sense of responsibility, dignity, and earnestness that a Roman projects; his intellectual substance gained from years of experience and his depth of personality, austerity, and moral rectitude. The manifestation of a harmony between one’s actions and emotions. Closely related to *severitas*.

**Humanitas — “Grace”**
Like *comitas*, *humanitas* acquired importance only in the later stages of the Republic. It referred to the refined manners, tact, education, and style of an urbane Roman aristocrat in his dealings with other members of the same social rank. Whereas *comitas* regulated relationships between social unequals, *humanitas* described proper behavior within the bounds of *amicitia*.

**Industria — “Industriousness”**
A Roman should work hard for the betterment of the state and his family and friends. Even leisure should be productive, never slothful or lazy.

**Iustitia — “Fairness”**
A Roman should behave towards others in accordance with the principles of justice.

**Pietas — “Dutifulness”**
The moral purity attained by fulfilling one’s obligations. A Roman respects all the obligations that he has — to the gods, to the state, to his parents, and to other blood relations.

**Prudentia — “Discretion”**
A Roman avoids unnecessary risk through the judicious application of foresight and wisdom.

**Salubritas — “Wholesomeness”**
It is no surprise that a Roman coined the phrase “sound mind in a sound body” (*mens sana in corpore sano*). Physical and mental health permit the attainment of virtue and arise in turn from its cultivation.

**Severitas — “Sternness”**
A Roman disciplined himself and exercised self-control in all fields. This extended to the strict regulation of his household, which reflected his own virtue (or vice).

**Temperantia — “Moderation”**
The balance in life and character that comes when actions are guided by knowledge and wisdom. A Roman resists the easy temptation of sensual pleasure.

**Veritas — “Truthfulness”**
A Roman is as good as his word.
APPENDIX 4: SAMPLE SPEECH (CAPITO’S FULL SPEECH FROM “A TENSE NIGHT”)

Speech given by Publius Gabinius Capito, a member of the Populares and a dedicated follower of Catiline. Capito argues to rescind the senatus consultum ultimum and publicly declares that Cicero is overstepping his role in pursuit of personal gain. Capito makes particular use of recent events to drive home his points.

Is this new speech against Catiline all it takes to slander a Roman? Suddenly a noble Roman like Catiline — a man from an ancient family, a consular family — is declared a criminal? Declared a criminal! The infamy! No charge. No trial. No appeal. But condemned. Are we, Catiline’s friends, likewise to be condemned? Am I? Are you? Did I fall asleep and awake in the court of an eastern despot where the whim of a some perfumed eunuch trumps the laws of the People? Or is this still Rome and are we not Roman citizens? Am I no longer a Roman citizen because two weeks ago Crassus claims he received a letter warning him to leave the city? Can senators annul my rights whenever they vomit forth their precious “Final Decree,” the Consultum Ultimum?

They passed their “final” decree 18 days ago, giving that hypocrite Cicero the power to “see to it that the state suffer no harm.” I tell you, my fellow Romans, the only one who will harm the state is Cicero! Who hurls baseless accusations against good Romans? Cicero! Who slanders anyone who would support the legitimate grievances of the urban poor and the poor Italians and everyone who is disadvantaged by the rapacious property owners and moneylenders? Cicero! Who is so eager to lick the sandals of those decrepit, marauding hypocrites: the Boni, the so-called “Good men,” who nap in their fancy chairs in the useless Senate? Cicero! (the crowd roared the name) Who surrounds himself with private bodyguards, the surest sign of a would-be tyrant? Cicero! Who dared appear at a peaceful election wearing armor? Cicero! Who violates the ancient laws of the Roman People? Cicero! If there is a king among us, isn’t it likely to be that very same man, who already behaves like a tyrant? Not me. Not you. CICERO!

Capito attacked the evidence that Cicero used to persuade the senators to issue the Consultum Ultimum:

Crassus said he received letters warning of impending horrors. But when the supposed day of revolution came, I ask you what happened? There were no assassinations. There were no fires. There were no disturbances. Then, just as the People, whose interests we hold in our hearts, were about to realize what a treacherous dog Cicero is — BANG, like a bolt from Jupiter! — he unearths a some pig-herder to claim that an army is being raised up north in Etruria. How convenient! Then Cicero finds another oaf, Quintus Arrius, to support this lie about a phantom army. Is it any wonder? The senators, at Cicero’s goading, approved bribes for information about Cicero’s opponents. Not for the truth, mind you, but about “conspiratorial acts.” Now anyone who supports the People is at risk of condemnation. Cicero is right about one thing. A revolution is underway and the state is being threatened — but not by us; not by just men who seek only to protect the privileges that are due us as Romans. Not by us, who seek to check those “Good men” from abusing the law. What use is the law if a group of preening and paranoid plutocrats can declare that law suspended whenever it suits
them? Can they simply declare the law null whenever someone resists them, by standing up and fighting — with words — on behalf of the People?

_Capito condemned the senators who repeatedly resort to violence against their political opponents:_

When the election of Autronius Paetus and Cornelius Sulla was overturned two years ago, the “Good men” would not even allow Catiline to run for the consulship, despite the fact that Catiline had not been convicted of a single crime. We hear that Catiline was involved in the conspiracy to kill the consuls, Lucius Torquatus and Lucius Cotta. But just as in today’s so-called crisis, did anything happen? Were they killed? Was there ever any evidence that Catiline was involved, or any evidence of any conspiracy? Did not the consul Torquatus defend Catiline against charges of being involved in the conspiracy? The “Good men” must think Torquatus quite the fool if he would defend his own would-be assassin!

‘When the august tribunes of the People, Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus and his brother Gaius Sempronius Gracchus sought to give the people land — my apologies, I misspoke. When the tribunes sought to allow the people to use the public lands that were theirs by law, that had been appropriated illegally by the “Good men” without compensation, when they tried to restore to the poor what little they had, the “Good men” declared the law null and void and killed the tribunes and anyone who ever spoke well about them. When the tribune of the people Lucius Appuleius Saturninus and the praetor Gaius Servilius Glauca tried to provide land for Marius’ soldiers — Romans and Italians alike who had saved Rome from the barbarian hordes of the Teutons and the Cimbri — the sons of those same “Good men” killed Glauca in the street like a dog and stoned Saturninus and his supporters _after they were already in custody awaiting trial_. What could be the justification for such wickedness? What did these “Good men” fear? Why did these “Good men” break the law?

It was all to prevent the reduction of their bloated, slave-run farms by a few acres. The People asked for scraps from the table of these grandees. Scraps that had been stolen from the mouths of the People. And did the People receive any generosity? The tribune of the people Marcus Livius Drusus tried to clean up the mess that the “Good men” had caused. He tried to provide land to the veterans so that the heroes of the Republic would not have to live in poverty, and also to increase the size of the Senate, so that it would truly represent the will of the Roman people, and also to recognize that our Italian brothers, who fight and bleed alongside Romans, deserved the same protections against the “Good men” as the citizens of Rome. What did the “Good men” do? They didn't even resort to the fig-leaf of their illegal _Consultum Ultimum_. But lo and behold, Livius Drusus was assassinated. All because he put the interests of all the Roman People above those of a few “Good men.”

_According to Capito, it is the greedy and corrupt “Good men” who to blame for the current unrest:_

And now they have another _Consultum Ultimum_ and in Cicero, an ambitious coward to wield it. Why? Because Catiline has now twice been robbed of the consulship? Because he will expose the vicious nature of that corrupt clique of treacherous traitors? Because he supports giving all Romans a second chance, liberated from unjust debt? Because he champions the common Roman? Because he hopes that the people will have a voice that matters in the assembly? And can do so on a full stomach? The debt crisis is untenable. Many of you were once landowners. But the “Good men” occupied the public land that you needed for your livestock, firewood, or game. They imported thousands of slaves to do the work that you once did. You now had to buy what once was yours by
law — often you had to buy it from the “Good men” who had occupied the public land! To feed your family or plant your crop or pay your taxes you had to borrow money, often from the same “Good man” who stole your land. Soon the “Good man” owned the land that was once yours. But he rented it back to you! What generosity! What greatness of soul!

‘Now, having to pay rent, you fell further and further into debt to the same “Good man.” As more and more farmers could not pay this immoral burden, interest rates soared. I heard one “Good man” would charge his tenant-farmers 48% interest! Who can possibly live when pirates own our farms and write our laws? The rest of you are hard working shop owners, tradesman, tavern operators, and traders. One piece of bad luck, one fire or theft or illness, and you too found yourself in hock to a “Good man.” For years the “Good men” have played the urban poor against the rural poor, and poor Romans against poor Italians. But don’t you see that you all have one and the same problem? There is one source of wickedness for the men of Italy: “Good men”!

But, said Capito, the people would see to it that those who violated the law faced justice:

Their Consultum Ultimum is nothing more than lawless destruction of the concept of citizenship. The Roman People have always been sovereign, even in the time of kings. After King Tarquinius Superbus was driven from Rome, we first replaced one king with 300 — 300 senators, more oppressive of the people than one king ever was. Eventually the People were able to regain their power. But we must always be vigilant against the treacheries of the so-called “Good men.” The People have a long memory, and even if they kill our leaders or illegally violate our rights, we will, in the end, always regain our rightful status as Roman citizens.

Just this year, we finally avenged the massacre of the tribune Saturninus, who was killed 37 years ago by a mob of “Good men.” Titus Labienus convicted one of the murderers, Gaius Rabirius, of treason. Then Rabirius, a murderer of a Tribune of the People, had the audacity to appeal to the people for mercy! But as a citizen, he had the right. The people would have upheld his conviction if the praetor had not been bribed to lower the flag on the Janiculum Hill, signaling the end of the assembly. The People, however, had made its point: anyone who kills a Roman citizen without trial would eventually face justice at the hands of the people — Consultum Ultimum or no.

Capito denounces Cicero who lust for power and hatred of Catiline threaten the State:

But “desperate times require swift and decisive action,” they say. Even if we were to grant this to be true, how “swift” or “decisive” is an action that takes more than half a month to undertake? At least when the “Good men” killed Gaius Gracchus and Saturninus you could claim that they acted in the heat of the moment — not that panic is a good excuse for the enormity of their crimes, but at least it is an excuse. Now we are asked to believe that there is a threat to Rome so great, so imminent, that normal procedures cannot possibly be followed, that extraconstitutional action is the only remedy. Here it is eighteen days since the Senate gave Cicero leave to act. Yet he only slanders and gives speeches. Granted those are his strong suits, but if Catiline really were a threat, don't you think Cicero would have already moved against him? Or Catiline against Cicero? No, my friends, these eighteen days show that Catiline is no threat. Yet their Consultum Ultimum stands. What could be clearer proof that their “Final Decree” is not aimed at the safety of the state but the preservation of their pernicious power.

Many of you have no doubt read the pamphlet on electioneering written by Cicero’s brother Quintus. You can tell the rest how Quintus laid out Cicero’s plan for success in the election and
beyond. First, secure the support of the “Good men” and the Knights by posing as the champion of the Senate, the status quo, and public order. How better to appear as Rome’s savior than by creating a crisis which only he can resolve — what luck! Thus Cicero renders anyone who advocates commonsense and necessary reform a revolutionary. But that is not enough: Quintus advised Cicero to be sure to slander his adversaries and impugn their motives, even if doing so required spreading titillating (and false) rumors about his opponents. How vile it is for a man to hold himself out as a champion of order and justice while whispering falsehoods about better men? But it was not enough to whisper. Only days before the election he delivered a speech in which he slandered Catiline and Hybrida. How many times did he mention Catiline’s recent acquittal of bribery charges? Apparently being found innocent of a crime is a crime in Cicero’s Rome! Such poison worked on too many of the “Good men,” whose judgment was bought at the price of a lie.

Who has suffered more than Catiline has on your behalf? The “Good men” cannot abide a true noble who loves the People and whom the People love. That is why they tainted Catiline’s good name when he tried to run for the consulship three years ago. Why? Because of the baseless accusations that he abused his position as governor. An accusation that was not even levied by citizens. Do you see the pattern? There is a threat to Cicero’s ambition or vanity. An aggrieved provincial appears, like Jupiter from the mist, with some fool story about how Cicero’s opponents are lying, corrupt, and treacherous. It happened with Verres, when he prosecuted him for corruption. It happened when Catiline ran for the consulship. As it became clear that Catiline had the support of the People and would be elected consul, they manufactured another crisis. Cato threatened to indict him for bribery, raising the possibility of another contested election, more chaos. I was at his house when Catiline sought to rally his supporters by reminding them of how much he had suffered at the hands of the “Good men”:

“it is impossible for any faithful defender of the miserable citizens to be found, except a man who was himself miserable. Men in an embarrassed and desperate condition ought not to trust the promises of men of a flourishing and fortunate estate. And therefore that those who were desirous to replace what they had spent, and to recover what they had lost, had better consider what I owe, what I possess, and what I will dare to do. Any man ought to be very fearless and thoroughly overwhelmed by misfortune, who is the leader and standard-bearer of unfortunate men.”

Cicero, that sniveling coward, misunderstood Catiline’s wisdom as a threat and tried to postpone the election. The next day in the Senate, he called on Catiline to explain his words. Catiline, you’ll remember, replied:

“there are two bodies of the Republic — the one weak with a weak head, [that is the Senate] the other powerful without a head [that is the People]. As the latter body deserves my support, it will never want a head as long as I live.”

Tomorrow is an important day, my friends. Tomorrow you have a chance to expose the lie that is the “Good men.” You can convince the Senate that the “Good men” are not. You, the best men, can convince the Senate to be Better Men and to not allow rumor and innuendo to run riot over the Roman People! Or you can let the “Good men” trample on Roman citizens. You can let them continue to extort and steal from the Roman People. We must be ready to do battle — with words, friends, with words (for now) — for Catiline and for Rome!
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