

De Domo Sua	On His House
<p>M. Tullius Cicero. M. Tulli Ciceronis Orationes: Recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit Albertus Curtis Clark. Albert Clark. Oxonii. e Typographeo Clarendoniano. 1909. Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis.</p>	<p>M. Tullius Cicero. The Orations of Marcus Tullius Cicero, literally translated by C. D. Yonge, B. A. London. George Bell & Sons, York Street, Covent Garden. 1891.</p>
<p>1 Cum multa divinitus, pontifices, a maioribus nostris inventa atque instituta sunt, tum nihil praeclarius quam quod eosdem et religionibus deorum immortalium et summae rei publicae praeesse voluerunt, ut amplissimi et clarissimi cives rem publicam bene gerendo religiones, religiones sapienter interpretando rem publicam conservarent. Quod si ullo tempore magna causa in sacerdotum populi Romani iudicio ac potestate versata est, haec profecto tanta est ut omnis rei publicae dignitas, omnium civium salus, vita, libertas, arae, foci, di penates, bona, fortunae, domicilia vestrae sapientiae, fidei, potestati commissa creditaque esse videantur.</p>	<p>1 Many things, O priests, have been devised and established with divine wisdom by our ancestors; but no action of theirs was ever more wise than their determination that the same men should superintend both what relates to the religious worship due to the immortal gods, and also what concerns the highest interests of the state, so that they might preserve the republic as the most honourable and eminent of the citizens, by governing it well, and as priests by wisely interpreting the requirements of religion. But if there has ever been a time when an important cause has depended on the decision and power of the priests of the Roman people, this indeed is that cause; being such that the dignity of the whole republic, the safety of all the citizens, their lives, their liberties, their altars, their hearths, their household gods, their properties and condition as citizens, and their homes, all appear to be committed and entrusted to your wisdom integrity, and power.</p>
<p>2 Vobis hodierno die constituendum est utrum posthac amentis ac perditos magistratus improborum ac sceleratorum civium praesidio</p>	<p>2 You have got to decide this day whether you prefer for the future to deprive frantic and profligate magistrates of the protection of</p>

<p>nudare, an etiam deorum immortalium religione armare malitis. Nam si illa labes ac flamma rei publicae suum illum pestiferum et funestum tribunatum, quem aequitate humana tueri non potest, divina religione defenderit, aliae caerimoniae nobis erunt, alii antistites deorum immortalium, alii interpretes religionum requirendi; sin autem vestra auctoritate sapientiaque, pontifices, ea quae furore improborum in re publica ab aliis oppressa, ab aliis deserta, ab aliis prodita gesta sunt rescinduntur, erit causa cur consilium maiorum in amplissimis viris ad sacerdotia deligendis iure ac merito laudare possimus.</p>	<p>wicked and unprincipled citizens, or even to arm them with the cloak of religion and of the respect due to the immortal gods. For if that pest and conflagration of the republic succeeds in defending his own mischievous and fatal tribunate by appeals to divine religion, when he cannot maintain it by any considerations of human equity, then we must seek for other ceremonies, for other ministers of the immortal gods, for other interpreters of the requirements of religion. But if those things which were done by the madness of wicked men in the republic at a time when it was oppressed by one party, deserted by another, and betrayed by a third, are annulled by your authority and your wisdom, O priests, then we shall have cause rightly and deservedly to praise the wisdom of our ancestors in selecting the most honourable men of the state for the priesthood.</p>
<p>3 Sed quoniam ille demens, si ea quae per hos dies ego in senatu de re publica sensi vituperasset, aliquem se aditum ad aures vestras esse habiturum putavit, omittam ordinem dicendi meum: respondebo hominis furiosi non orationi, qua ille uti non potest, sed convicio, cuius exercitationem cum intolerabili petulantia tum etiam diuturna impunitate munivit.</p>	<p>3 But since that madman has thought that he should find a ready road to your attention by blaming the sentiments that I in the last few days have expressed in the senate concerning the republic, I will deviate from the natural arrangement of my speech, and I will make a reply to what I will not call the speech of that furious fellow, (for that is more than he is capable of,) but to his abuse, that being an employment which he has fortified himself in the practice of by his own intolerable bad temper, and by the length of time that he has been allowed to indulge it with impunity.</p>

<p>4 'Fuisti,' inquit, 'tum apud pontifices superior, sed iam, quoniam te ad populum contulisti, sis inferior necesse est.' Itane vero? quod in imperita multitudine est vitiosissimum, varietas et inconstantia et crebra tamquam tempestatum sic sententiarum commutatio, hoc tu ad hos transferas, quos ab inconstantia gravitas, a libidinosa sententia certum et definitum ius religionum, vetustas exemplorum, auctoritas litterarum monumentorumque deterret? 'Tune es ille,' inquit, 'quo senatus carere non potuit, quem boni luxerunt, quem res publica desideravit, quo restituto senatus auctoritatem restitutam putabamus quam primum adveniens prodidisti?' Nondum de mea sententia dico: impudentiae primum respondebo tuae.</p>	<p>4 "Oh," says he, "you had the advantage before the priests, but now you must inevitably get worst off since you have had recourse to the people." Is it so? Will you transfer that which is the greatest defect in the ignorant multitude,—namely, its fickleness and inconstancy, and change of opinion, as frequent as the changes of the weather, to these men, whose gravity protects them from inconsistency, while their fixed and definite principles of religion and the antiquity of precedents, and the authority of written records and monuments, effectually deters them from all capricious change of sentiment? "Are you," says he, "the man whom the senate was unable to do without? whom the good lamented? whom the republic regretted? by whose restoration we expected that the authority of the senate was restored? and who destroyed that authority the very first thing you did?" I am not at present speaking of my own matters; I will first of all reply to your impudence.</p>
<p>5 Hunc igitur, funesta rei publicae pestis, hunc tu civem ferro et armis et exercitus terrore et consulum scelere et audacissimorum hominum minis, servorum dilectu, obsessione templorum, occupatione fori, oppressione curiae domo et patria, ne cum improbis boni ferro dimicarent, cedere coegisti, quem a senatu, quem a bonis omnibus, quem a cuncta Italia desideratum, arcessitum, revocatum conservandae rei publicae causa confiteris? 'At enim in senatum venire in Capitolium turbulento illo die non debuisti.'</p>	<p>5 Did you then, O you deadly pest of the republic, by means of the sword and arms, by the terror of an armed force, by the wickedness of the consuls, and the threats of most audacious men,—by enlisting slaves, by besieging the temples, by occupying the forum, by oppressing the senate, contrive to compel the departure of that citizen from his home and from his country, in order to prevent actual battles between the virtuous and wicked citizens,—though you now confess that he was regretted and sent for back and recalled by the</p>

	<p>senate, by all good men, and by the whole of Italy, as the only means of preserving the republic? "But on that day of disturbance you ought not," says he, "to have come into the senate, you ought not to have entered the Capitol."</p>
<p>6 Ego vero neque veni et domo me tenui quam diu turbulentum tempus fuit, cum servos tuos, a te iam pridem ad bonorum caedem paratos, cum illa tua conscleratorum ac perditorum manu armatos in Capitolium tecum venisse constabat; quod cum mihi nuntiaretur, scito me domi mansisse et tibi et gladiatoribus tuis instaurandae caedis potestatem non fecisse. Postea quam mihi nuntiatum est populum Romanum in Capitolium propter metum atque inopiam rei frumentariae convenisse, ministros autem scelerum tuorum perterritos partim amissis gladiis, partim ereptis diffugisse, veni non solum sine ullis copiis ac manu, verum etiam cum paucis amicis.</p>	<p>6 But I did not come, and I kept in my own house as long as that disturbance lasted; while it was notorious that your slaves had come with you armed into the Capitol, ready for plunder and for the massacre of all good men, with all that band of wicked and profligate partisans of yours. And when this was reported to me, I know that I remained at home, and would not give you and your gladiators power of renewing the massacre. After news was brought to me that the Roman people had assembled at the Capitol, because of their fear for, and difficulty of procuring corn, and that the ministers of your crimes had been frightened and had fled, some having dropped their swords, and some having had them taken from them, I came forward not only without any armed band, but with only a very few friends.</p>
<p>7 An ego, cum P. Lentulus consul optime de me ac de re publica meritus, cum Q. Metellus, qui cum meus inimicus esset, frater tuus, et dissensionis nostrae et precibus tuis salutem ac dignitatem meam praetulisset, me arcesserent in senatum, cum tanta multitudo civium tam recenti officio suo me ad referendam gratiam nominatim vocaret, non venirem, cum praesertim te iam illinc cum tua fugitivorum</p>	<p>7 Should I, when Publius Lentulus the consul, who had conferred the greatest benefits on me and on the republic,—when Quintus Metellus, your brother, O Metellus, who, though he had been my enemy, had still preferred my safety and dignity to any desire to keep alive our quarrel, and to your entreaties that he would do so, sent for me to the senate,—when that great multitude of citizens, who had lately shown such</p>

<p>manu discessisse constaret? Hic tu me etiam, custodem defensoremque Capitoli templorumque omnium, 'hostem Capitolinum' appellare ausus es, quod, cum in Capitolio senatum duo consules haberent, eo venerim? Vtrum est tempus aliquod quo in senatum venisse turpe sit, an ea res erat illa de qua agebatur ut rem ipsam repudiare et eos qui agebant condemnare deberem?</p>	<p>zeal in my behalf, entreated me by name to show my gratitude to them,—should I, I say, have declined to come forward, especially when it was notorious that you with your band of runaway slaves had already left the place? Have you dared to call me—me, the guardian and defender of the Capitol and of every temple—the enemy of the Capitol, because, when the two consuls were holding the senate in the Capitol, I came thither? Is there any time at which it can be discreditable to have attended the senate? or was that business which was then being transacted of such a nature that I was bound to repudiate the affair itself, and to condemn those who were promoting it?</p>
<p>8. Primum dico senatoris esse boni semper in senatum venire, nec cum his sentio qui statuunt minus bonis temporibus in senatum ipsum non venire, non intellegentes hanc suam nimiam perseverantiam vehementer iis quorum animum offendere voluerint et gratam et iucundam fuisse. At enim non nulli propter timorem, quod se in senatu tuto non esse arbitrabantur, discesserunt. Non reprehendo, nec quaero fueritne aliquid pertimescendum: puto suo quemque arbitrato timere oportere. Cur ego non timuerim quaeris? quia te illinc abisse constabat. Cur, cum viri boni non nulli putarint tuto se in senatu esse non posse, ego non idem senserim? Cur, cum ego me existimassem tuto omnino in civitate esse non posse, illi remanserunt? An aliis licet, et recte licet, in meo metu sibi nihil timere: mihi uni</p>	<p>8. First, I say that it is the duty of a virtuous senator at all times to attend the senate; and I do not agree with those who determine that they themselves will not come to the senate at unfavourable seasons, and who do not understand that this excessive obstinacy of theirs is exceedingly pleasant and acceptable to those men whose wishes they intend to counteract. "But some departed out of fear, because they thought that they could not remain with safety in the senate." I do not name them, nor do I ask whether they had any real reason for fearing anything. I imagine that every one had a right to form his own opinion as to what grounds he had for fear. Do you ask why I was not afraid? Why, because it was known that you had gone away. Do you ask why, when some good men thought that they could not remain</p>

<p>necesse erit et meam et aliorum vicem pertimescere?</p>	<p>with safety in the senate, I did not think so too? or why, when I thought that it was impossible for me to remain in the city at all with safety, they did not think so too? Are then others to be allowed, and rightly enough, to have no fear for themselves at a time when I am in danger; and yet am I bound to be afraid not only when I am myself in peril, but when others are also?</p>
<p>9. An quia non condemnavi sententia mea duo consules, sum reprehendendus? Eos igitur ego potissimum damnare debui quorum lege perfectum est ne ego, indemnatus atque optime de re publica meritus, damnatorum poenam sustinerem? Quorum etiam delicta propter eorum egregiam in me conservando voluntatem non modo me sed omnis bonos ferre oporteret, eorum optimum consilium ego potissimum per eos in meam pristinam dignitatem restitutus meo consilio repudiarem? At quam sententiam dixi? Primum eam quam populi sermo in animis nostris iam ante defixerat, deinde eam quae erat superioribus diebus agitata in senatu, denique eam quam senatus frequens tum cum mihi est adsensus secutus est: ut neque adlata sit a me res inopinata ac recens, nec, si quod in sententia vitium est, maius sit eius qui dixerit quam omnium qui probarint.</p>	<p>9. Or am I to be blamed because I did not express an opinion condemnatory of both the consuls? Ought I then to condemn those men, of all men in the world, by whose law it was brought about that I, who had never been condemned and who had deserved well of the republic, should be saved from enduring the punishment of condemned criminals? Was I, of all men in the world, I who had been restored to my former dignity by their means, to denounce by my expressed opinion the admirable sentiments of those men, who, even if they had been in error, ought to have been borne with by me and by all good men, on account of their exceeding good-will displayed in ensuring my preservation? And what were the opinions which I delivered? In the first place, that one which the common conversation of the people had already previously fixed in our minds; in the second place, that one which had been discussed in the senate on the preceding days; and thirdly, that which the senate in a very full house adopted, expressing its agreement with me; so that so sudden or novel proposition was brought forward by me, and moreover, if there</p>

	<p>be any fault in the opinion, it is not more the fault of the individual who advanced it than of all those men who approved of it.</p>
<p>10. At enim liberum senatus iudicium propter metum non fuit. Si timuisse eos facis qui discesserunt, concede non timuisse eos qui remanserunt; sin autem sine iis qui tum afuerunt nihil decerni libere potuit, cum omnes adessent, coeptum est referri de inducendo senatus consulto; ab universo senatu reclamatum est. <i>Sed quaero in ipsa sententia, quoniam princeps ego sum eius atque auctor, quid reprehendatur. Vtrum causa novi consili capiendi non fuit, an meae partes in ea causa non praecipuae fuerunt, an alio potius confugiendum fuit nobis? Quae causa maior quam fames esse potuit, quam seditio, quam consilia tua tuorumque, qui facultate oblata ad imperitorum animos incitandos renovaturum te tua illis funesta latrocinia ob annonae causam putasti?</i></p>	<p>10. "But the decision of the senate was not free, because of the fear in which they were." If you make out that they who left it were in fear, at least grant that they who remained were not alarmed. But if no free decision could be come to without the presence of those men who were absent at that time, I say that the motion about framing a resolution of the senate began to be made when every one was present; it was carried by acclamation by the entire senate.</p>
<p>11. Frumentum provinciae frumentariae partim non habebant, partim in alias terras, credo, propter avaritiam venditorum miserant, partim, quo gratus esset tum cum in ipsa fame subvenissent, custodiis suis clausum continebant, ut subito novum mitterent. Res erat non in opinione dubia, sed in praesenti atque ante oculos proposito periculo, neque id coniectura prospiciebamus, sed iam experti videbamus. Nam cum ingravesceret annona, ut iam plane inopia ac fames non caritas timeretur, concursus est ad templum Concordiae factus,</p>	<p>11. As for corn, some of the countries which usually supply it had not got it; some had sent it into other countries, I imagine because of the great variety of sellers; and some were keeping it back, shut up in their stores, in order suddenly to send it, so that the supply might be more acceptable if they seemed to come to our aid when we were in a state of actual famine. The matter was not one of uncertain opinions, it was a case of actually existing danger, present to our eyes; it was not one which we were looking forward to in conjecture, but one which we were</p>

<p>senatum illuc vocante Metello consule. Qui si verus fuit ex dolore hominum et fame, certe consules causam suscipere, certe senatus aliquid consili capere potuit; sin causa fuit annona, seditionis quidem instimulator et concitator tu fuisti, nonne id agendum nobis omnibus fuit ut materiem subtraheremus furori tuo?</p>	<p>actually beholding by present experience. For when the scarcity was getting more severe, so that it was actually want and famine that was dreaded, and not mere dearness of price, there was a rush towards the Temple of Concord, when the consul Metellus summoned the senate to meet in that place. And if that was the genuine effect of the grief of men suffering under famine, certainly the consuls had good reason to undertake the affair, certainly the senate had good reason to adopt some determination or other. But if the scarcity was the pretext, and if you in reality were the exciter and kindler of sedition, ought we not all to have striven to take away all shadow of pretext for your madness?</p>
<p>12. Quid? si utrumque fuit, ut et fames stimulet homines et tu in hoc ulcere tamquam inguen exsisteres, nonne fuit eo maior adhibenda medicina quae et illud nativum et hoc inlatum malum sanare posset? Erat igitur et praesens caritas et futura fames; non est satis; facta lapidatio est. Si ex dolore plebei nullo incitante, magnum malum; si P. Clodi impulsu, usitatum hominis facinerosi scelus; si utrumque, ut et res esset ea quae sua sponte multitudinis animos incitaret, et parati atque armati seditionis duces, videturne ipsa res publica et consulis auxilium implorasse et senatus fidem? Atquin utrumque fuisse perspicuum est; difficultatem annonae summamque inopiam rei frumentariae, ut homines non iam diuturnam caritatem, sed ut famem plane timerent, nemo negat: hanc istum</p>	<p>12. What, if both these causes existed,—if there was both famine to excite men, and you too like a nail working into this ulcer? was there not all the more need to apply some remedy, which might put an end to both the evil caused by nature, and to the other mischief imported into the case? There was then both present dearness and impending famine; that is not enough; men were attacked with stones. If that arose from the indignation of the common people, without any one having stirred them up, it is a great misfortune; but if, it was caused by the instigation of Publius Clodius, it is only the habitual wickedness of a wicked man: if both these causes existed,—if there was both a fact sufficient of itself to excite the feelings of the multitude, and if there were leaders of sedition</p>

<p>oti et pacis hostem causam arrepturum fuisse ad incendia caedis rapinas nolo, pontifices, suspicemini, nisi videritis.</p>	<p>ready and forearmed; then, does it not seem natural for the republic to have had recourse to the protection of the consul and the loyalty of the senate? But it is quite plain that one of these causes did exist; that there was a difficulty of obtaining provisions, and an extreme scarcity of corn, so that men were afraid not only of a continuance of high prices, but of actual famine. No one denies it. But I do not wish you, O priests, to suspect that that enemy of all tranquillity and peace was likely to seize on this as a pretext for conflagration, and massacre, and rapine, unless you see it proved.</p>
<p>13. Qui sunt homines a Q. Metello, fratre tuo, consule in senatu palam nominati, a quibus ille se lapidibus adpetitum, etiam percussum esse dixit? L. Sergium et M. Lollium nominavit. Quis est iste Lollius? qui sine ferro ne nunc quidem tecum est, qui te tribuno plebis, nihil de me dicam, sed qui Cn. Pompeium interficiendum depoposcit. Quis est Sergius? armiger Catilinae, stipator tui corporis, signifer seditionis, concitator tabernariorum, damnatus iniuriarum, percussor, lapidator, fori depopulator, obsessor curiae. His atque eius modi ducibus cum tu in annonae caritate in consules, in senatum, in bona fortunasque locupletium per causam inopum atque imperitorum repentinos impetus comparares, cum tibi salus esse in otio nulla posset, cum desperatis ducibus decuriatos ac descriptos haberes exercitus perditorum, nonne providendum senatui fuit ne in hanc tantam</p>	<p>13. Who are the men who were openly named in the senate by Quintus Metellus,—your brother, O Metellus,—the consul, by whom he said that he had been attacked with stones and actually hit? He named Lucius Sergius and Marcus Lollius. Who is that Lollius? A man who is not even at this moment by your side without his sword; who, while you were tribune of the people, demanded (I will say nothing of his designs against myself) to have the murder of Cnaeus Pompeius entrusted to him. Who is Sergius? The armour-bearer of Catiline, your own body-guard, the standard-bearer of sedition, the exciter of the shopkeepers, a man who has been convicted of assault, an assassin, a stoner of men, a man who has depopulated the forum, and blockaded the senate-house. With these leaders and others like them, when you, at the time when provisions were dear, under pretence of</p>

<p>materiem seditionis ista funesta fax adhaeresceret?</p>	<p>espousing the cause of the poor and ignorant, were preparing for sudden attacks on the consuls, on the senate, on the property and fortunes of the, rich; when it was impossible for you to find safety if affairs remained in a tranquil state; when, the leaders being all desperate men, you had your bands of profligates regularly enrolled and distributed into decuries,—did it not behoove the senate to take good care that that fatal firebrand did not fall upon these vast materials for sedition?</p>
<p>14. Fuit igitur causa capiendi novi consili: videte nunc fuerintne partes meae paene praecipuae. Quem tum Sergius ille tuus, quem Lollius, quem ceterae pestes in lapidatione illa nominabant? quem annonam praestare oportere dicebant? nonne me? Quid? operarum illa concursatio nocturna non a te ipso instituta me frumentum flagitabat? quasi vero ego aut rei frumentariae praefuissem, aut compressum aliquod frumentum tenerem, aut in isto genere omnino quicquam aut curatione aut potestate valuissem. Sed homo ad caedem imminens meum nomen operis ediderat, imperitis iniecerat. Cum de mea dignitate in templo Iovis Optimi Maximi senatus frequentissimus uno isto dissentiente decrevisset, subito illo ipso die carissimam annonam necopinata vilitas consecuta est.</p>	<p>14. There was, therefore, good cause for adopting an unusual determination. See now whether or not I was the person who had the principal share in it. Who was it whom that friend of yours, Sergius, whom Lollius, whom the other rascals named when they were throwing the stones? who was it that they said ought to provide them with corn? was it not I? What was it that that nocturnal mob of boys which had been trained by you kept demanding? They were demanding corn of me; as if I superintended the corn-market; or as if I were keeping back any corn in store; or as if, in fact, I had any management of, or influence whatever in, any affairs of that class at all. But the fellow who was thirsting for slaughter had published my name to the artisans, and to the ignorant mob. When the senate, in a very full house assembled in the temple of the all-good and all-powerful Jupiter, had passed a decree touching my dignity with only one dissenting voice, on a sudden, on that very day, a most</p>

	unexpected cheapness followed a time when corn had been excessively dear.
<p>15. Erant qui deos immortalis--id quod ego sentio--numine suo reditum meum dicerent comprobasse; non nulli autem illam rem ad illam rationem coniecturamque revocabant, qui, quod in meo reditu spes oti et concordiae sita videbatur, in discessu autem cotidianus seditionis timor, iam paene belli depulso metu commutatam annonam esse dicebant; quae quia rursus in meo reditu facta erat durior, a me, cuius adventu fore vilitatem boni viri dictitabant, annona flagitabatur.</p>	<p>15. Some said, (and I myself am of that opinion,) that the immortal gods had shown their approbation of my return by this exercise of their power. But some traced that fact back, connecting it with this argument and opinion,—that, as all hopes of tranquillity and concord appeared to depend on my return, and as there was an incessant dread of sedition connected with my absence, so now that all fear of contest was almost at an end, they thought that the state of the corn-market was altered; and, because it again had become more unmanageable after my return, then corn was demanded of me, on whose arrival virtuous men were in the habit of saying that there would be cheapness.</p>
<p>16 Veni exspectatus; multis iam sententiis dictis rogatus sum sententiam; dixi rei publicae saluberrimam, mihi necessariam. Petebatur a me frumenti copia, annonae vilitas: possem aliquid in ea re necne ratio non habebatur. Flagitabar bonorum etulatione: improborum convicia sustinere non poteram. Delegavi amico locupletiori, non quo illi ita de me merito onus illud imponerem--succubuissem enim potius ipse--sed quia videbam id quod omnes, quod nos de Cn. Pompeio polliceremur, id illum fide consilio virtute auctoritate felicitate denique sua facillime perfecturum.</p>	<p>16 Being expected, I came. After many opinions had been already pronounced, I was asked mine. I delivered one very advantageous to the republic, and at the same time necessary for my own interests. Abundance of corn and cheapness of price was demanded of me; as if I had any influence in producing such a state of things as that. Things were in a very different condition. I was pressed by eager expostulation from many good men. I was unable to support the abuse of the wicked. I proposed to entrust the business to an influential friend, not in order to impose a burden on one to whom I was under such heavy obligations, (for I would rather have sunk under it myself, than done that,) but</p>

	<p>because I saw, what every one else saw, that, whatever we promised in behalf of Cnaeus Pompeius, he would most easily accomplish by his integrity, wisdom, virtue, and authority, and by his invariable good-fortune.</p>
<p>17 Itaque sive hunc di immortales fructum mei reditus populo Romano tribuunt, ut, quem ad modum discessu meo frugum inopia, fames, vastitas, caedes, incendia, rapinae, scelerum impunitas, fuga, formido, discordia fuisset, sic reditu ubertas agrorum, frugum copia, spes otii, tranquillitas animorum, iudicia, leges, concordia populi, senatus auctoritas mecum simul reducta videantur, sive egomet aliquid adventu meo, consilio, auctoritate, diligentia pro tanto beneficio populi Romani praestare debui: praesto, promitto, spondeo,--nihil dico amplius, hoc quod satis est huic tempori dico,--rem publicam annonae nomine in id discrimen quo vocabatur non esse venturam.</p>	<p>17 Therefore, whether the immortal gods give this to the Roman people as the fruit of my return, that, as on my departure there ensued a want of corn, and famine, and devastation, and bloodshed, and conflagration, and pillage, and impunity for all crimes, and flight, and terror, and discord, so my return is followed by fertility of the lands, by abundant harvests, by hopes of tranquillity, by peaceful dispositions on the part of the citizens, by a restoration of the courts of justice and of the laws, while unanimity on the part of the people and the authority of the senate seem to have been brought back in my company; or, if the fact is that I, on my arrival, was bound, in return for such kindness, to do something for the Roman people by my prudence, authority and diligence; then I do promise, and undertake, and pledge myself to do it. I say no more. This, I say, which is sufficient for the present occasion, that the republic shall not, on any pretence connected with the price of corn, fall into that danger into which some people endeavoured to bring it.</p>
<p>18 Num igitur in hoc officio, quod fuit praecipue meum, sententia mea reprehenditur? Rem maximam fuisse summi que periculi, non solum a fame, sed etiam a caede incendiis vastitate, nemo negat, cum ad causam caritatis accederet</p>	<p>18 Are then my sentiments found fault with in this business which fell especially to my share? I rescued affairs of the greatest consequence from the mischief of the most imminent danger; and I saved not only it, but you also, from</p>

<p>iste speculator communium miseriarum, qui semper ex rei publicae malis sceleris sui faces inflammaret. Negat oportuisse quicquam uni extra ordinem decerni. Non iam tibi sic respondebo ut ceteris, Cn. Pompeio plurima, periculosissima, maxima mari terraque bella extra ordinem esse commissa: quarum rerum si quem paeniteat, eum victoriae populi Romani paenitere.</p>	<p>massacre, and conflagration, and devastation. No one denies this; as to the pretext of dearness there was added that spy of the general misery, who always lit the firebrand of his guilt in the misfortunes of the republic. He says that nothing ought to have been decreed irregularly to any one. I do not at present make the same reply to you that I make to the rest,—That many wars, and these wars of the greatest danger and of the greatest importance, both by land and sea, have been entrusted to Cnaeus Pompeius out of the regular order. And if any one repents of those measures, he must also repent of the victory of the Roman people.</p>
<p>19 Non ita tecum ago; cum his haec a me haberi oratio potest qui ita disputant, se, si qua res ad unum deferenda sit, ad Cn. Pompeium delaturos potissimum; sed se extra ordinem nihil cuiquam dare; cum Pompeio datum sit, id se pro dignitate hominis ornare et tueri solere. Horum ego sententiam ne laudem impediatur Cn. Pompei triumphis, quibus ille, cum esset extra ordinem ad patriam defendendam vocatus, auxit nomen populi Romani imperiumque honestavit: constantiam probo, qua mihi quoque utendum fuit, quo ille auctore extra ordinem bellum cum Mithridate Tigraeneque gessit.</p>	<p>19 I do not deal with you in this manner. I can address this argument to those men, who state that if any matter must be entrusted to one individual, then they would rather entrust it to Cnaeus Pompeius than to any one, but that they make a rule of never entrusting anything to any one in an irregular manner; still, after it has been entrusted to Pompeius, that they then vindicate and uphold the measure, as is due to the dignity of the man. From praising the statements of these men I am hindered by the triumphs of Cnaeus Pompeius, by which he (though it was quite out of the regular order of things that he was summoned to defend his country) increased the reputation of the Roman people, and crowned their empire with honour. At the same time I praise their firmness, which is a virtue which I have need to avail myself of, since it was on my proposition that he was appointed,</p>

	quite out of the regular routine, to conduct the war against Mithridates and Tigranes.
<p>20 Sed cum illis possum tamen aliquid disputare: tua vero quae tanta impudentia est ut audeas dicere extra ordinem dari nihil cuiquam oportere? qui cum lege nefaria Ptolomaeum, regem Cypri, fratrem regis Alexandrini, eodem iure regnantem causa incognita publicasses, populumque Romanum scelere obligasses, cum in eius regnum bona fortunas patrocinium huius imperi inmisisses, cuius cum patre avo maioribus societas nobis et amicitia fuisset, huius pecuniae deportandae et, si ius suum defenderet, bello gerendo M. Catonem praefecisti.</p>	<p>20 But still there are some points which I can argue with them; but still, how great is your impudence, when you dare to say that nothing ought to be given to any one out of the regular routine! You who, when, by an iniquitous law, for some unknown cause you had confiscated the property of Ptolemy, King of Cyprus, the brother of the King of Alexandria, who was reigning by the same right as he was, and had involved the Roman people in the crime,—when you had sent a band of robbers from this empire to ravage his kingdom, and goods, and property, though there had been a long alliance and friendship between us and his father, and grandfather, and still more remote ancestors,—appointed Marcus Cato to superintend the carrying away of his money, and the managing the war if any individual was found hardy enough to defend his own property.</p>
<p>21. Dices: Quem virum! sanctissimum, prudentissimum, fortissimum, amicissimum rei publicae, virtute, consilio, ratione vitae mirabili ad laudem et prope singulari! Sed quid ad te, qui negas esse verum quemquam ulli rei publicae extra ordinem praefici?</p>	<p>21. Will you say, “Yes, but what a man Cato was! A most religious, most prudent, most gallant man; the firmest friend to the republic, a citizen of a most marvellous and almost unique virtue, and wisdom, and purity of life.” Very fine, but what is all that to you, when you say that it is untrue that any one ought to be appointed to any public duty out of the regular course?</p>
<p>22. Litteras in contione recitasti quas tibi a C. Caesare missas diceres 'Caesar Pulchro,' cum etiam es argumentatus amoris esse hoc signum, cognominibus tantum uteretur neque</p>	<p>22. You read letters in the assembly which you said had been sent to you by Caius Caesar. “Caesar to Pulcher.” And when you proceeded to argue that this was a proof of intimacy,</p>

<p>adscriberet 'pro consvle' aut 'tribvno plebi'; dein gratulari tibi quod M. Catonem tribunatu tuo removisses, et quod ei dicendi in posterum de extraordinariis potestatibus libertatem ademisses. Quas aut numquam tibi ille litteras misit, aut, si misit, in contione recitari noluit. At, sive ille misit sive tu finxisti, certe consilium tuum de Catonis honore illarum litterarum recitatione patefactum est.</p>	<p>because he only used the names of himself and you, and did not add “proconsul,” or “tribune of the people,” and then began to congratulate you that you had got Marcus Cato out of the way of your tribuneship for the remainder of the time, and that you had also taken away for the future the power of giving extraordinary commissions;—letters which he never sent to you at all, or which, if he did send them, he certainly never meant to be read in the public assembly;—at all events, whether he sent them or whether you forged them, your intention with respect to the honours conferred upon Cato was revealed by the reading of those letters.</p>
<p>23. Sed omitto Catonem, cuius eximia virtus, dignitas, et in eo negotio quod gessit fides et continentia tegere videretur improbitatem et legis et actionis tuae: quid? homini post homines natos turpissimo, sceleratissimo, contaminatissimo quis illam opimam fertilemque Syriam, quis bellum pacatissimis gentibus, quis pecuniam ad emendos agros constitutam, ereptam ex visceribus aerari, quis imperium infinitum dedit? Cui quidem cum Ciliciam dedisses, mutasti pactionem et Ciliciam ad praetorem item extra ordinem transtulisti: Gabinio pretio amplificato Syriam nominatim dedisti. Quid? homini taeterrimo, crudelissimo, fallacissimo, omnium scelerum libidinumque maculis notatissimo, L. Pisoni, nonne nominatim populos liberos, multis senatus consultis, etiam recenti lege generi ipsius liberatos, vinctos et constrictos tradidisti?</p>	<p>23. But, however, I will say no more about Cato, whose eminent virtue, and dignity, and integrity, and moderation in that business which he executed, appear like a screen to veil the iniquity of your law and of your argument. What more need I say? Who was it who gave to the most infamous man that has ever existed, to the most wicked and polluted of all men, that rich and fertile Syria? Who gave him a war to carry on against nations who were in a state of profound peace? Who gave him the money which was destined for the purchase of lands and which had been taken by violence out of the fruits of the achievements of Caesar? Who gave him an unlimited command?¹ And, indeed, when you had given him Cilicia, you altered the terms of your bargain with him, and you transferred Cilicia to the praetor, again quite out of the regular course. And then, when the bribe</p>

<p>Nonne, cum ab eo merces tui benefici pretiumque provinciae meo sanguine tibi esset persolutum, tamen aerarium cum eo partitus es?</p>	<p>had been increased, you gave Syria to Gabinius—expressly naming him. What more? Did you not, naming him expressly, deliver over, bound and fettered, to Lucius Piso, the foulest, the most cruel, the most treacherous of men, the most infamous of all men, as stigmatised for every sort of wickedness and lust, free nations, who had been declared free by numerous resolutions of the senate, and even by a recent law of your own son-in-law? Did not you, after the recompense for your service and the bribe of a province had been paid by him at my expense, still divide the treasury with him?</p>
<p>24. Itane vero? tu provincias consularis, quas C. Gracchus, qui unus maxime popularis fuit, non modo non abstulit a senatu, sed etiam ut necesse esset quotannis constitui per senatum lege sanxit, eas lege Sempronia per senatum decretas rescidisti, extra ordinem sine sorte nominatim dedisti non consulibus, sed rei publicae pestibus: nos, quod nominatim rei maximae paene iam desperatae summum virum saepe ad extrema rei publicae discrimina delectum praefecimus, a te reprehendemur?</p>	<p>24. Is it so? Did you annul the arrangement of the consular provinces, which Caius Gracchus, than whom there hardly ever lived a man more devoted to the people, not only abstained from taking from the senate, but even passed a solemn law to establish the principle that they were to be settled every year by the senate;—did you, I say, disturb that arrangement, and that too after it had been formally settled according to the Sempronian law? You gave the provinces, in an irregular manner, without casting lots, not to the consuls, but to the pests of the republic, expressly naming them. And shall we be found fault with, because we have appointed a most illustrious man, who has often been selected before on occasions of the greatest danger to the republic, (expressly naming him,) to superintend a matter of the most urgent importance, and which was previously in an almost desperate condition?</p>

25. Sed excitatus aliquando Cn. Pompei--dicam ipso audiente quod sensi et sentio, quoquo animo auditurus est-- excitatus, inquam, aliquando Cn. Pompei nimium diu reconditus et penitus abstrusus animi dolor subvenit subito rei publicae, civitatemque fractam malis, imminutam ac debilitatam, abiectam metu ad aliquam spem libertatis et pristinae dignitatis erexit. Hic vir extra ordinem rei frumentariae praeficiendus non fuit? Scilicet tu helluoni spurcatissimo, praegustatori libidinum tuarum, homini egentissimo et facinerosissimo, Sex. Clodio, socio tui sanguinis, qui sua lingua etiam sororem tuam a te abalienavit, omne frumentum privatum et publicum, omnis provincias frumentarias, omnis mancipēs, omnis horreorum clavis lege tua tradidisti; qua ex lege primum caritas nata est, deinde inopia. Impendebat fames, incendia, caedes, direptio: imminebat tuus furor omnium fortunis et bonis.

26. Queritur etiam importuna pestis ex ore impurissimo Sex. Clodi rem frumentariam esse ereptam, summisque in periculis eius viri auxilium implorasse rem publicam a quo saepe se et servatam et amplificatam esse meminisset! Extra ordinem ferri nihil placet

25. But at last the indignation of Cnaeus Pompeius, (I will say, even in his hearing, what I have felt, and still do feel what ever may be the way in which he takes it,)—the indignation I say, of Cnaeus Pompeius, which had been too long concealed and slumbering, being at last aroused, came on a sudden to the aid of the republic, and raised the city crushed with misfortunes, dumb, weakened, and broken spirited through fear to some hope of recovering its liberty and former dignity. And was this man not to be appointed to superintend the providing the city with corn? You, forsooth, by your law abandoned all the corn, whether belonging to private individuals or to the state, all the provinces which supply corn, and all the contractors, and all the keys of the granaries, to that most impure of gluttons, the taster of your lusts, to that most needy and most impious man, Sextus Clodius, the companion of your family, who by his tongue alienated even your sister from you. And it was by this action of yours that dearth was first produced, and afterwards scarcity. Famine, conflagration, bloodshed, and pillage were impending. Your insane frenzy was threatening the fortunes and property of every man.

26. That ill-omened pest of the state even complains that the corn should have been taken out of the impure mouth of Sextus Clodius, and that the republic in its extremest peril should have implored the aid of that man by whom it recollected that it had often been preserved,

<p>Clodio. Quid? de me quod tulisse te dicis, patricida, fratricida, sororicida, nonne extra ordinem tulisti? An de peste civis, quem ad modum omnes iam di atque homines iudicarunt, conservatoris rei publicae, quem ad modum autem tute ipse confiteris, non modo indemnati sed ne accusati quidem, licuit tibi ferre non legem sed nefarium privilegium, lugente senatu, maerentibus bonis omnibus, totius Italiae precibus repudiatis, oppressa captaque re publica: mihi populo Romano implorante, senatu poscente, temporibus rei publicae flagitantibus, non licuit de salute populi Romani sententiam dicere?</p>	<p>and had its power extended. Clodius thinks that nothing ought to be done out of the regular course. What! what sort of law is it that you say that you passed about me, you parricide, you fratricide, you murderer of your sister; did you not pass that out of the regular course? Was it lawful for you to pass, I will not say a law, but a wicked private bill, concerning the ruin of a citizen, the preserver of the republic, as all gods and men have long since agreed to call him, and, as you yourself confess, when he was not only uncondemned but even unimpeached, amid the mourning of the senate and the lamentation of all good men, rejecting the prayers of all Italy, while the republic lay oppressed and captive at your feet? And was it not lawful for me, when the Roman people implored me, when the senate requested me, when the critical state of the republic demanded it of me, to deliver an opinion concerning the safety of the Roman people?</p>
<p>27. Qua quidem in sententia si Cn. Pompei dignitas aucta est coniuncta cum utilitate communi, certe laudandus essem si eius dignitati suffragatus viderer qui meae saluti opem et auxilium tulisset.</p>	<p>27. And if that opinion the dignity of Cnaeus Pompeius was increased, in connection with the common advantage, certainly I ought to be praised if I seemed to have given my vote for honour of that than who had brought his influence to aid in the ensuring of my safety.</p>
<p>28. Hanc nostram coniunctionem, hanc conspiracyem in re publica bene gerenda, hanc iucundissimam vitae atque officiorum omnium societatem certi homines fictis sermonibus et falsis criminibus diremerunt, cum idem illum ut me metueret, me caveret,</p>	<p>28. This union of ours, this unanimity and concert in managing the affairs of the republic successfully, this most delightful agreement in life and all its duties, certain men, by false reports of conversations and false accusations, broke, interrupted; going to him, and warning</p>

<p>monerent, idem apud me mihi illum uni esse inimicissimum dicerent, ut neque ego ab illo quae mihi petenda essent satis audaciter petere possem, neque ille, tot suspicionibus certorum hominum et scelere exulceratus, quae meum tempus postularet satis prolixè mihi polliceretur.</p>	<p>him to be afraid of me, to guard against me, and at the same time telling me that he was hostile to me above all men: so that I had not sufficient confidence to ask of him what it was desirable for me to ask, nor did he, having been made sore by the jealousies and wickedness of certain individuals, promise me with sufficient freedom what my necessities required.</p>
<p>29. Data merces est erroris mei magna, pontifices, ut me non solum pigeat stultitiae meae sed etiam pudeat, qui, cum me non repentini aliquod tempus meum, sed veteres multo ante suscepti et provisi labores cum viro fortissimo et clarissimo coniunxissent, si passus a tali amicitia distrahi, neque intellexerim quibus aut ut apertis inimicis obsisterem aut ut insidiosis amicis non crederem. Proinde desinant aliquando me isdem inflare verbis: 'Quid sibi iste vult? nescit quantum auctoritate valeat, quas res gesserit, qua dignitate sit restitutus? Cur ornat eum a quo desertus est?'</p>	<p>29. A great price has been paid for my error, O priests, so that I am not only grieved for my folly, but ashamed of it too; since, though it was not some sudden and accidental occasion, but many labors of long standing, encountered and undertaken long before, which had united me with a most gallant and most illustrious man, I still suffered myself to be led away to abandon such a friendship, and did not perceive who they were whom it became me either to oppose as open enemies, or to distrust as treacherous friends. Let them now at length cease to try and excite me with the same language as before: "What is that man about? Does not he know how great his influence is, what great achievements he has performed with what great honour he has been restored? Why does he do honour to the man by whom he was deserted?"</p>
<p>30. Ego vero neque me tum desertum puto sed paene deditum, nec quae sint in illa rei publicae flamma gesta contra me, neque quo modo, neque per quos, patefaciundum mihi esse arbitror. Si utile rei publicae fuit haurire me unum pro omnibus illam indignissimam calamitatem, etiam hoc utile est, quorum id</p>	<p>30. But I neither think that I was deserted at that time, but rather surrendered; nor do I think it needful for me to explain what at the time of that unhappiness to the republic was done against me nor how, nor by whose instrumentality it was done. If it was beneficial to the republic that that alone, as the victim</p>

<p>scelere conflatum sit, me occultare et tacere. Illud vero est hominis ingrati tacere, itaque libentissime praedicabo Cn. Pompeium studio et auctoritate aequae atque unum quemque vestrum, opibus, contentione, precibus, periculis denique praecipue pro salute mea laborasse.</p>	<p>offered for the general safety, should quaff that most unworthy cup of calamity, it may be useful also for me to conceal and be silent respecting the men by whose wickedness it was brought about. But yet it is the part of an ungrateful man to be silent. Therefore I will most willingly proclaim that Cnaeus Pompeius laboured with all his zeal and influence as much as any one of you, and with all his means, and labour, and by entreaty, and even at his own personal risk, to promote my safety.</p>
<p>31. Qua re istam orationem qua es usus omittas licet, post illam sententiam quam dixeram de annona pontificum animos esse mutatos; proinde quasi isti aut de Cn. Pompeio aliter atque ego existimo sentiant, aut quid mihi pro exspectatione populi Romani, pro Cn. Pompei meritis erga me, pro ratione mei temporis faciendum fuerit ignorent, aut etiam, si cuius forte pontificis animum, quod certo scio aliter esse, mea sententia offendit, alio modo sit constituturus aut de religione pontifex aut de re publica civis quam eum aut caerimoniarum ius aut civitatis salus coegerit.</p>	<p>31. Wherefore, you may desist from that language which you have been using, namely, that the dispositions of the priests were changed after my delivering the opinion which I did about the corn. As if they had any different opinion from what I myself had about Cnaeus Pompeius, or as if they were ignorant what I ought to do either with regard to the expectation of the Roman people, or to the services which I have received from Cnaeus Pompeius, or to my own circumstances and condition; or as if even, if my sentiments had perchance been offensive to any one of the priests, though I know for a certainty that the contrary was the case, any priest was on that account going to decide about religion, or any citizen about the republic, in any other manner than the laws respecting religious ceremonies compelled the one, or the interests and safety of the republic compelled the other.</p>
<p>32. Intellego, pontifices, me plura extra causam dixisse quam aut opinio tulerit aut voluntas mea;</p>	<p>32. I am aware, O priests, that I have said more things which are foreign to this cause, than</p>

<p>sed cum me purgatum vobis esse cuperem, tum etiam vestra in me attente audiendo benignitas provexit orationem meam. Sed hoc compensabo brevitate eius orationis quae pertinet ad ipsam causam cognitionemque vestram; quae cum sit in ius religionis et in ius rei publicae distributa, religionis partem, quae multo est verbosior, praetermittam, de iure rei publicae dicam.</p>	<p>either your opinion is likely to approve of, or than my own inclination prompted. But I was anxious to be acquitted in your eyes; and, further, your kindness in listening to me with attention carried me on to say more than I had intended. But I will make amends for this by the brevity of that part of the speech which relates to the actual matter now brought under your examination; and as the affair is divided into two heads,—one relating to the laws of religion, and the other to the laws of the state, —I will pass over the question of religion, which would take a longer time to discuss, and speak to the point of what is the law of the state.</p>
<p>33. Quid est enim aut tam adrogans quam de religione, de rebus divinis, caerimoniis, sacris pontificum conlegium docere conari, aut tam stultum quam, si quis quid in vestris libris invenerit, id narrare vobis, aut tam curiosum quam ea scire velle de quibus maiores nostri vos solos et consuli et scire voluerunt?</p>	<p>33. For what can be so arrogant as for a layman to endeavour to lecture the college of priests about religion, about divine affairs, and ceremonies, and sacrifices; or so foolish as for a man, if he has found anything of consequence in your books, to take up time in detailing it to you; or so superfluous, as to seek to acquire learning on those points concerning which our ancestors have laid down the principle that you alone have knowledge, and that you alone ought to be consulted?</p>
<p>34. Videsne me non radicitus evellere omnis actiones tuas neque illud agere, quod apertum est, te omnino nihil gessisse iure, non fuisse tribunum plebis, hodie esse patricium? Dico apud pontifices, augures adsunt: versor in medio iure publico. Quod est, pontifices, ius adoptionis? Nempe ut is adoptet qui neque procreare iam liberos possit, et cum potuerit sit</p>	<p>34. Do you not see that I am destroying all your proceedings by the roots? that I am arguing, what is manifest, that you did nothing whatever according to law,—that you were not a tribune of the people at all? I say this, that you are a patrician. I say so before the priests; the augurs are present. I take my stand on the common public law. What, O priests is the law</p>

<p>expertus. Quae deinde causa cuique sit adoptionis, quae ratio generum ac dignitatis, quae sacrorum, quaeri a pontificum conlegio solet. Quid est horum in ista adoptione quaesitum? Adoptat annos viginti natus, etiam minor, senatorem. Liberorumne causa? At procreare potest; habet uxorem, suscipiet ex ea liberos; exheredabit igitur pater filium.</p>	<p>concerning adoption? Why that he may adopt children who is no longer able to have children himself, and who failed in having them when he was of an age to expect it. What reason, then, any one has for adopting children, what considerations of family or dignity are involved what principles of religion are concerned, are questions which are accustomed to be put to the college of priests. What if all these circumstances are found to exist in that adoption? The person who adopts him is twenty years old; a minor adopts a senator. Does he do so for the sake of having children? He is of an age to have them of his own. He has a wife; he has actually got children of his own. The father, then, will be disinheriting his own son.</p>
<p>35. Quid? sacra Clodiae gentis cur intereunt, quod in te est? quae omnis notio pontificum, cum adoptarere, esse debuit: nisi forte ex te ita quaesitum est, num perturbare rem publicam seditionibus velles et ob eam causam adoptari, non ut eius filius esses, sed ut tribunus plebis fieres et funditus everteres civitatem. Respondisti, credo, te ita velle. Pontificibus bona causa visa est: adprobaverunt. Non aetas eius qui adoptabat est quaesita, ut in Cn. Aufidio, M. Pupio quorum uterque nostra memoria summa senectute alter Oresten, alter Pisonem adoptavit, quas adoptiones sicut alias innumerabilis hereditates nominis pecuniae sacrorum secutae sunt. Tu neque Fonteius es, qui esse debebas, neque patris heres, neque amissis sacris paternis in haec adoptiva venisti.</p>	<p>35. What? why should all the sacred rites of the Clodian family perish, as far as it depends on you? And that must have been the idea of all the priests when you were adopted. Unless, perchance, the question was put to you in this way,—whether you were intending to disturb the republic by seditions, and whether you wished to be adopted with that object, not in order to become that man's son, but only in order to be made a tribune of the people, and by that means utterly to overthrow the state? You answered, I presume, that your object was only to be made a tribune. That appeared to the priests to be a sufficient reason. They approved of it. No questions were asked about the age of the man who was adopting you; as was done in the case of Cnaeus Aufidius and Marcus</p>

<p>Ita perturbatis sacris, contaminatis gentibus, et quam deseruisti et quam polluisti, iure Quiritium legitimo tutelarum et hereditatum relicto, factus es eius filius contra fas cuius per aetatem pater esse potuisti.</p>	<p>Pupius, each of whom, within our recollection, when extremely old, adopted as sons, the one Orestes, and the other Piso. And these adoptions, like others, more than I can count, were followed by the inheritance of the name and property and sacred rites of the family. You are not Fonteius, as you ought to be, nor the heir of your new father; nor, though you have lost your right to the sacred ceremonies of your own family, have you availed yourself of those which belong to you by adoption. And so, having thrown the ceremonies of religion into confusion,—having polluted both families, both the one which you have abandoned and the one which you have entered,—having violated the legitimate practices of the Romans with respect to guardianships and inheritances, you have been made, contrary to all the requirements of religion, the son of that man of whom you were old enough to be the father.</p>
<p>36. Dico apud pontifices: nego istam adoptionem pontificio iure esse factam: primum quod eae vestrae sunt aetates ut is qui te adoptavit vel filii tibi loco per aetatem esse potuerit, vel eo quo fuit: deinde quod causa quaeri solet adoptandi, ut et is adoptet qui quod natura iam adsequi non potest legitimo et pontificio iure quaerat, et ita adoptet ut ne quid aut de dignitate generum aut de sacrorum religione minuatur: illud in primis, ne qua calumnia, ne qua fraus, ne qui dolus adhibeatur: ut haec simulata adoptio filii quam maxime</p>	<p>36. I am speaking before the priests; I say that that adoption did not take place according to the sacerdotal law. In the first place, because your respective ages are such that the man who has adopted you as your father might, as far as his age went, have been your son; in the second place, because a question is usually put as to the reason for the adoption, in order that the adopter may be a person who is seeking by regular and sacerdotal law that which by the ordinary process of nature he is no longer able to obtain; and that he may adopt a son in such a manner, as to in nowise impair the dignity of</p>

<p>veritatem illam suscipiendorum liberorum imitata esse videatur.</p>	<p>the families or the reverence belonging to their sacred ceremonies; and, above all things, that no false pretence, or fraud, or trickery, may creep in; so that this fictitious adoption of a son may appear to imitate as far as possible the real case of children being born to a man.</p>
<p>37 Quae maior calumnia est quam venire imberbum adulescentulum, bene valentem ac maritum, dicere filium senatorem populi Romani sibi velle adoptare; id autem scire et videre omnis, non ut ille filius instituatur, sed ut e patriciis exeat tribunus plebis fieri possit, idcirco adoptari? neque id obscure; nam adoptatum emancipari statim, ne sit eius filius qui adoptarit. Cur ergo adoptabat? Probate genus adoptionis: iam omnium sacra interierint, quorum custodes vos esse debetis, iam patricius nemo relinquetur. Cur enim quisquam vellet tribunum plebis se fieri non licere, angustiore sibi esse petitionem consulatus, in sacerdotium cum possit venire, quia patricio non sit is locus, non venire? Vt cuique aliquid acciderit qua re commodius sit esse plebeium, simili ratione adoptabitur.</p>	<p>37 But what greater false pretence can there be than for a beardless young man, a vigorous man and a husband, to come forward, and to say that he wishes to adopt as his own son a senator of the Roman people, and for all men to know and see that this senator is adopted, not in order to become really the son of the plebeian, but merely in order that he may quit the patrician body, and be made a tribune of the people? And all that without any disguise. For in this case the adopted son was immediately emancipated, lest he should really have become the son of him who adopted him. Why then is he adopted at all? Only approve of this sort of adoption, and in a moment the sacred ceremonies of every family, of which you ought to be the guardians, will be abolished, and not one patrician will be left. For why should any one be willing to be incapable of being made a tribune of the people? to have his power of standing for the consulship narrowed? and, while he might arrive at the priesthood, not to arrive at it because there is not a vacancy at the moment for a patrician? Whenever anything happens to any one to make it more convenient for him to be a plebeian, he will be adopted in the same manner as Clodius.</p>

<p>38 Ita populus Romanus brevi tempore neque regem sacrorum neque flamines nec Salios habebit, nec ex parte dimidia reliquos sacerdotes neque auctores centuriatorum et curiatorum comitiorum, auspiciaque populi Romani, si magistratus patricii creati non sint, intereant necesse est, cum interrex nullus sit, quod et ipsum patricium esse et a patriciis prodi necesse est. Dixi apud pontifices istam adoptionem nullo decreto huius conlegi probatam, contra omne pontificum ius factam, pro nihilo esse habendam; qua sublata intellegis totum tribunatum tuum concidisse.</p>	<p>38 And so in a short time the Roman people will neither have a king of the sacrifices, nor flamines, nor Salii, nor one half of the rest of the priests, nor any one who has a right to open the comitia centuriata, or curiata; and the auspices of the Roman people must come to an end if no patrician magistrates are created, as there will be no interrex, for he must be a patrician, and must be nominated by a patrician. I said before the priests, that that adoption had not been approved by any decree of this college; that it had been executed contrary to every provision of the sacerdotal law; that it ought to be considered as no adoption at all; and if there is an end to that, you see at once that there is an end likewise of the whole of your tribuneship.</p>
<p>39 Venio ad augures, quorum ego libros, si qui sunt reconditi, non scrutor; non sum in exquirendo iure augurum curiosus; haec quae una cum populo didici, quae saepe in contionibus responsa sunt, novi. Negant fas esse agi cum populo cum de caelo servatum sit. Quo die de te lex curiata lata esse dicatur, audes negare de caelo esse servatum? Adest praesens vir singulari virtute, constantia, gravitate praeditus, M. Bibulus: hunc consulem illo ipso die contendo servasse de caelo. 'Infirmas igitur tu acta C. Caesaris, viri fortissimi?' Minime; neque enim mea iam quicquam interest, exceptis iis telis quae ex illius actionibus in meum corpus inmissa sunt.</p>	<p>39 I come now to the augurs and if they have any secret books I do not inquire into them; I am not very curious about inquiring into the principles of the augurs. I know, what I have learnt in common with all the people, what answers they have frequently given in the public assemblies. They say that it is contrary to divine law for any public business to be brought before the people when any proper officers observing the heavens. Will you venture to deny that, on the day when the Lex curiata concerning you is said to have been passed, the magistrates were observing the heavens? A man is here present in court, of the most eminent wisdom, and dignity, and authority, Marcus Bibulus. I assert that on that very day he, as consul, was observing the heavens. "What then," you will</p>

	<p>say, "are then the acts of Caius Caesar, that most admirable citizen, invalid in your opinion?"</p> <p>By no means; for there is not one of them which concerns me in the least, nor anything else except these weapons which by that man's proceedings are hurled at me.</p>
<p>40 Sed haec de auspiciis, quae ego nunc perbreuiter attingo, acta sunt a te. Tu tuo praecipitante iam et debilitato tribunatu auspiorum patronus subito exstitisti; tu M. Bibulum in contionem, tu augures produxisti; tibi interroganti augures responderunt, cum de caelo servatum sit, cum populo agi non posse; tibi M. Bibulus quaerenti se de caelo servasse respondit, idemque in contione dixit, ab Appio tuo fratre productus, te omnino, quod contra auspicia adoptatus esses, tribunum non fuisse. Tua denique omnis actio posterioribus mensibus fuit, omnia quae C. Caesar egisset, quod contra auspicia essent acta, per senatum rescindi oportere; quod si fieret, dicebas te tuis umeris me custodem urbis in urbem relaturum. Videte hominis amentiam * * * per suum tribunatum Caesaris actis inligatus teneretur.</p>	<p>40 But the matter of the auspices, which I am now touching on with extreme brevity, has been handled in this manner by you. You, when your tribuneship was in danger and was falling to pieces as it were, all of a sudden came forward as a patron of the auspices; you brought forward Marcus Bibulus and the augurs into the assembly; you questioned the augurs, and they replied that when any magistrates was observing the heavens, no business could be transacted in the assembly of the people. You questioned Marcus Bibulus, and he told you in reply that he had been observing the heavens; and he also said in the public assembly, when he was brought forward there by your brother Appius, that you were no tribune of the people at all, because you had been adopted contrary to the auspices. In the succeeding months your language constantly was, that everything which Caius Caesar had done ought to be rescinded by the senate, because they had been done in disregard of the auspices; and if they were rescinded, you said that you would bring me back on your own shoulders into the city as the guardian of the city. See now, O priests, the insanity of the man when by means of his</p>

	tribuneship he was connected to such an extent with the acts of Caesar.
41 Si et sacrorum iure pontifices et auspiciorum religione augures totum evertunt tribunatum tuum, quid quaeris amplius? an etiam apertius aliquod ius populi atque legum?	41 If the priests deciding according to the law relating to sacrifices, and the augurs according to the religious observance due to the auspices, upset your whole tribuneship, what more do you ask? do you want some still more evident argument drawn from the rights of the people and the laws?
42 Iam intellegis omni genere iuris, quod in sacris, quod in auspiciis, quod in legibus sit, te tribunum plebis non fuisse. At ego hoc totum non sine causa relinquo. Video enim quosdam clarissimos viros, principes civitatis, aliquot locis iudicasse te cum plebe iure agere potuisse; qui etiam de me ipso, cum tua rogatione funere elatam rem publicam esse dicerent, tamen id funus, etsi miserum atque acerbum fuisset, iure indictum esse dicebant; quod de me civi ita de re publica merito tulisses, funus te indixisse rei publicae, quod salvis auspiciis tulisses, iure egisse dicebant. Qua re licebit, ut opinor, nobis eas actiones non infirmare, quibus illi actionibus constitutum tribunatum tuum comprobaverunt.b>	42 And it is not without reason that I say no more on this point, for I see that some most eminent men, the chief men of the city, have given their decision on different occasions, that you could legally proceed with matters which came before the common people; who said too, with reference to my own case, though they said that the republic was murdered and buried by your motion, still that that burial, miserable and bitter as it was, was all according to law: they said that in carrying such a motion as you had carried concerning me a citizen, and one who had deserved well of the republic, you had inflicted a deadly wound on the republic; but, inasmuch as you had carried it with all due reverence for the auspices, they said that you had acted legally. Wherefore we, I imagine, may be allowed to abstain from attacking those actions by which they were induced to approve of the establishment of your tribuneship.
43 Fueris sane tribunus plebis tam iure legeque, quam fuit hic ipse P. Servilius, vir omnibus rebus clarissimus atque amplissimus:	43 Suppose, however, that you were as rightly and legally tribune as Rullus himself, who is here present, a man most illustrious and honourable on every account; still, by what law,

<p>quo iure, quo more, quo exemplo legem nominatim de capite civis indemnati tulisti?</p>	<p>or in accordance with what precedent or what custom, did you pass a law affecting, by name, the civil rights of a citizen who had not been condemned?</p>
<p>44 Hanc vos igitur, pontifices, iudicio atque auctoritate vestra tribuno plebis potestatem dabit, ut proscribere possit quos velit? Quaero enim quid sit aliud nisi proscribere Velitis iubeatis ut M. Tullius in civitate ne sit bonaque eius ut mea sint: ita enim re, etsi aliis verbis, tulit. Hoc plebei scitum est? haec lex, haec rogatio est? hoc vos pati potestis, hoc ferre civitas, ut singuli cives singulis versiculis e civitate tollantur? Equidem iam perfunctus sum; nullam vim, nullum impetum metuo; explevi animos invidorum, placavi odia improborum, saturavi etiam perfidiam et scelus proditorum; denique de mea causa, quae videbatur perditis civibus ad invidiam esse proposita, iam omnes urbes, omnes ordines, omnes dii atque homines iudicaverunt.</p>	<p>44 Will you, then, O priests, by this decision, and by your authority, give a tribune of the people power to proscribe whomsoever he chooses? For I ask what else proscribing is, excepting proposing such a law as this, "That you will decide and order that Marcus Tullius shall no longer be in the city, and that his property may become mine?" For this is the effect of what he carried, though the language is somewhat different. Is this a resolution of the people? Is this a law? Is this a motion? Can you endure this? Can the city endure that a single citizen should be removed out of the city by a single line? I, indeed, have now endured my share. I have no more violence to fear. I am in dread of no further attacks. I have satisfied the hostility of those who envied me; I have appeased the hatred of wicked men; I have satiated even the treachery and wickedness of traitors; and, what is more, by this time every city, all ranks of men, all gods and men have expressed their opinion on my case, which appeared to those profligate men to be exposed above all others as a mark for unpopularity.</p>
<p>45. Vobismet ipsis, pontifices, et vestris liberis ceterisque civibus pro vestra auctoritate et sapientia consulere debetis. Nam cum tam moderata iudicia populi sint a maioribus constituta, primum ut ne poena capitis cum</p>	<p>45. You now, O priests, are bound; as becomes your authority and your wisdom, to have regard in your decision to your own interests, and to those of your children, and to the welfare of the rest of the citizens. For as the forms of</p>

<p>pecunia coniungatur, deinde ne improdicta die quis accusetur, ut ter ante magistratus accuset intermissa die quam multam inroget aut iudicet, quarta sit accusatio trinum nundinum prodicta die, quo die iudicium sit futurum, tum multa etiam ad placandum atque ad misericordiam reis concessa sunt, deinde exorabilis populus, facilis suffragatio pro salute, denique etiam, si qua res illum diem aut auspiciis aut excusatione sustulit, tota causa iudiciumque sublatum est: haec cum ita sint in iure, ubi crimen est, ubi accusator, ubi testes, quid indignius quam, qui neque adesse sit iussus neque citatus neque accusatus, de eius capite, liberis, fortunis omnibus conductos et sicarios et egentis et perditos suffragium ferre et eam legem putari?</p>	<p>proceeding before the people have been appointed by our ancestors to be so moderate,—so that in the first place no punishment affecting a man's status as a citizen can be joined to any pecuniary fine in the next place, that no one can be accused except on a day previously appointed; again, that the prosecutor must accuse him before the magistrate three times, a day being allowed to intervene between each hearing, before the magistrate can inflict any fine or give any decision; and when there is a fourth hearing for the accusation appointed after seventeen¹ days, on a day appointed on which the judge shall give his decision; and when many other concessions have been granted to the defendants to give them an opportunity of appeasing the prosecutor, or of exciting pity; and besides this the people is a people inclined to listen to entreaties, and very apt to give their votes for a defendant's safety; and, beyond all this, if anything prevents the cause from being proceeded with on that day, either because of the auspices, or on any other plea or excuse, then there is an end to the whole cause and to the whole business.</p>
<p>46. Ac si hoc de me potuit, quem honos, quem dignitas, quem causa, quem res publica tuebatur, cuius denique pecunia non expetebatur, cui nihil oberat praeter conversionem status et inclinationem communium temporum, quid tandem futurum est iis quorum vita remota ab honore populari et</p>	<p>46. As these things then are so where is the accusation, where is the prosecutor? where are the witnesses? What is more scandalous, than when a man has neither been ordered to appear, nor summoned, nor accused, for hired men, assassins, needy and profligate citizens, to give a vote touching his status as a citizen,</p>

<p>ab hac inlustri gratia est, pecuniae autem tantae sunt ut eas nimium multi egentes sumptuosi nobiles concupiscant?</p>	<p>his children and all his fortune, and then to think that vote a law? But, if he was able to do this in my case, I being a man protected by the honours which I had attained, by the justice of my cause, and by the republic; and being not so rich as to make my money an object to my enemies, and he had nothing which could be injurious to me, except the great chances which were taking place in the affairs of the state, and the critical condition of the times; what is likely to happen to those men whose way of life is removed from popular honours and from all that renown which gives influence, and whose riches are so great that too many men, needy, extravagant, and even of noble birth, covet them?</p>
<p>47. Date hanc tribuno plebis licentiam, et intuemini paulisper animis iuventutem et eos maxime qui inminere iam cupiditate videntur in tribuniciam potestatem: conlegia medius fidius tribunorum plebis tota reperientur, hoc iure firmato, quae coeant de hominum locupletissimorum bonis, praeda praesertim populari et spe largitionis oblata. At quid tulit legum scriptor peritus et callidus? Velitis ivbeatis vt M. Tvllio aqua et igni interdicatvr? Crudele, nefarium, ne in sceleratissimo quidem civi sine iudicio ferundum! Non tulit vt interdicatvr. Quid ergo? vt interdictvm sit. O caenum, o portentum, o scelus! hanc tibi legem Clodius scripsit spurciorem lingua sua, ut interdictum sit cui non sit interdictum? Sexte noster, bona venia, quoniam iam dialecticus es</p>	<p>47. Grant this licence to a tribune of the people, and then for a moment contemplate in your minds the youth of the city, and especially those men who seem now to be anxiously coveting the tribunitian power. There will be found, by Jove! whole colleges of tribunes of the people, if this law is once established, and they will all conspire against the property of all the richest men, when a booty so especially popular and the hope of great acquisitions is thus held out to them. But what vote is it that this skillful and experienced law-giver has carried? "May you be willing and may you command that Marcus Tullius be interdicted from water and fire." A cruel vote, a nefarious vote, one not to be endured even in the case of the very wickedest citizen, without a trial. He did not propose a</p>

<p>et haec quoque liguris, quod factum non est, ut sit factum, ferri ad populum aut verbis ullis sanciri aut suffragiis confirmari potest?</p>	<p>vote, "That he be interdicted." What then? "That he has been interdicted." O horrible, O prodigious, O what wickedness! Did Clodius frame this law, more infamous than even his own tongue?—that it has been interdicted to a person to whom it has not been interdicted? My good friend Sextus, by your leave, tell me now, since you are a logician and are devoted to this science, is it possible for a proposition to be made to the people, or to be established by any form of words, or to be confirmed by any votes, making that to have been done which has not been done?</p>
<p>48. Hoc tu scriptore, hoc consiliario, hoc ministro omnium non bipedum solum sed etiam quadrupedum impurissimo, rem publicam perdidisti; neque tu eras tam excors tamque demens ut nescires Clodium esse qui contra leges faceret, alios qui leges scribere solerent; sed neque eorum neque ceterorum, in quibus esset aliquid modestiae, cuiusquam tibi potestas fuit; neque tu legum scriptoribus isdem potuisti uti quibus ceteri, neque operum architectis, neque pontificem adhibere quem velles, postremo ne in praedae quidem societate mancipem aut praedem extra tuorum gladiatorum numerum aut denique suffragiatorem in ista tua proscriptione quemquam nisi furem ac sicarium reperire potuisti.</p>	<p>48. And have you ruined the public, with the man who drew this law for your adviser, and counselor, and minister, a fellow more impure, not only than any biped, but even than any quadruped? And you were not so foolish or so mad as to be ignorant that this man who violated the laws was Clodius; but that there were other men who were accustomed to frame laws: but you had not the least power over any one of them, or over any one else who had any character to lose; nor could you employ the same framers of laws, or the same architect for your works, as the others; nor could you obtain the aid of any priest you chose. Lastly, you were not able to discover, not even when you were dividing your plunder, any purchaser, or any one to share your plunder with you, out of your own band of gladiators, nor any one to support that proscription of yours with his vote except some thief or assassin.</p>

<p>49. Itaque cum tu florens ac potens per medium forum scortum popolare volitares, amici illi tui te uno amico tecti et beati, qui se populo commiserant, ita repellebantur ut etiam Palatinam tuam perderent; qui in iudicium venerant, sive accusatores erant sive rei, te deprecante damnabantur. Denique etiam ille novicius Ligus, venalis adscriptor et subscriptor tuus, cum M. Papiri, sui fratris, esset testamento et iudicio improbatus, mortem eius se velle persequi dixit: nomen Sex. Properti detulit: accusare alienae dominationis scelerisque socius propter calumniae metum non est ausus.</p>	<p>49. Therefore, when you, flourishing and powerful, were triumphing in the middle of your mob, those friends of yours, safe and happy in having you for their only friend, who had entrusted their fate to the people, were repelled in such a way that they lost the support of even that Palatine tribe of yours. They who came before a court of justice, whether as prosecutors or as defendants, were condemned, though you endeavoured to beg them off. Lastly, even that new recruit, Ligur, your venal backer and seconder, when he had been disgraced by being passed over in the will of Marcus Papirius his brother, who expressed his opinion of him by that action, said that he desired to have a legal investigation into the circumstances of his death, and accused Sextus Propertius as accessory to it. He did not venture to accuse his partners of a crime in which they had no concern, and to endeavour to procure their condemnation, lest he himself should have been convicted of bringing false accusations.</p>
<p>50. De hac igitur lege dicimus, quasi iure rogata videatur, cuius quam quisque partem tetigit digito voce praeda suffragio, quocumque venit, repudiatus convictusque discessit? Quid si iis verbis scripta est ista proscriptio ut se ipsa dissolvat? est enim: Qvod M. Tvllivs falsvm senatvs consvltvm rettvlrit. Si igitur rettulit falsum senatus consultum, tum est rogatio: si non rettulit, nulla est. Satisne tibi videtur a senatu iudicatum me non modo non ementitum esse auctoritatem eius ordinis, sed etiam unum</p>	<p>50. We are speaking, then, of this law which appears to have been legally brought forward, while yet every one that has had anything to do with any part of it, either by hand, voice, vote, or by sharing in the plunder, wherever he has been, has come off rejected and convicted. What shall we say if the proscription is framed in such terms that it repels itself? For it is, "Because Marcus Tullius has forged a decree of the senate." If, then, he did forge a decree of the senate, the law was proposed; but if he did not</p>

<p>post urbem conditam diligentissime senatui paruisse? Quot modis doceo legem istam, quam vocas, non esse legem? Quid? si etiam pluribus de rebus uno sortitore tulisti, tamenne arbitraris id quod M. Drusus in legibus suis plerisque, perbonus ille vir, M. Scauro et L. Crasso consiliariis non obtinuerit, id te posse, omnium facinorum et stuprorum hominem, Decumis et Clodiis auctoribus obtinere?</p>	<p>forge one, no proposition has been made at all. Does it or does it not appear sufficiently decided by the senate that I did not falsely allege the authority of that order, but that I, of all the men that have ever lived since the foundation of the city, have been the most diligent in my obedience to the senate? In how many ways do I not prove that that which you call a law is no law at all? What shall we say if you brought many different matters before the people at one and the same time? Do you still think that what Marcus Drusus, that admirable man, could not obtain in most of his laws,—that what Marcus Scaurus and Lucius Crassus, men of consular rank, could not obtain, you can obtain through the agency of the Decurii and Clodii, the ministers of all your debaucheries and crimes?</p>
<p>51. You carried a proposition respecting me, that I should not be received anywhere,—not that I should depart, when you yourself were not able to say that it was unlawful for me to remain in Rome.</p>	<p>51. Tulisti de me ne reciperer, non ut exirem, quem tu ipse non poteris dicere non licere esse Romae. Quid enim diceres? Damnatum? certe non. Expulsum? qui licuit? Sed tamen ne id quidem est scriptum, ut exirem; poena est, qui receperit, quam omnes neglexerunt; eiectio nusquam est. Verum sit: quid? operum publicorum exactio, quid? nominis inscriptio tibi num aliud videtur esse ac meorum bonorum direptio? praeterquam quod ne id quidem per legem Liciniam, ut ipse tibi curationem ferres, facere potuisti. Quid? hoc ipsum quod nunc apud pontifices agis, te meam domum consecrasse, te monumentum fecisse in meis aedibus, te signum dedicasse, eaque te ex una</p>

	rogatiuncula fecisse, unum et idem videtur esse atque id quod de me ipso nominatim tulisti?
<p>52. Tam hercule est unum quam quod idem tu lege una tulisti, ut Cyprius rex, cuius maiores huic populo socii atque amici semper fuerunt, cum bonis omnibus sub praeconem subiceretur et exsules Byzantium reducerentur. 'Eidem,' inquit, 'utraque de re negotium dedi.' Quid? si eidem negotium dedisset ut in Asia cistophorum flagitaret, inde iret in Hispaniam, cum Romam decessisset, consulatum ei petere liceret, cum factus esset, provinciam Syriam obtineret,-- quoniam de uno homine scriberet, una res esset?</p>	<p>52. It is just the same thing that you did when you also carried these different enactments in one law,—one, that the king of Cyprus, whose ancestors had always been allies and friends to this nation, should have all his goods sold by the public crier, and the other, that the exiles should be brought back to Byzantium. “Oh,” says he, “I employed the same person on both those matters.” What? Suppose you had given the same man a commission to get you an Asiatic coin in Asia, and from thence to proceed into Spain; and given him leave, after he had departed from Rome, to stand for the consulship, and, after he was made consul, to obtain Syria for his province; would that be all one measure, because you were mentioning only one man?</p>
<p>53. Quod si iam populus Romanus de ista re consultus esset et non omnia per servos latronesque gessisses, nonne fieri poterat ut populo de Cyprio rege placeret, de exsilibus Byzantiis displiceret? Quae est, quaeso, alia vis, quae sententia Caeciliae legis et Didiae nisi haec, ne populo necesse sit in coniunctis rebus compluribus aut id quod nolit accipere aut id quod velit repudiare? Quid? si per vim tulisti, tamenne lex est? aut quicquam iure gestum videri potest quod per vim gestum esse constet? An, si in ipsa latione tua capta iam urbe lapides iacti, si manus conlata non est,</p>	<p>53. And if now the Roman people had been consulted about that business, and if you had not done everything by the instrumentality of slaves and robbers, was it impossible for the Roman people to approve of the part of the measure relating to the king of Cyprus, and to approve of that part which affected Byzantine exiles? What other force, what other meaning, I should like to know, has the Caecilian and Didian law, except this; that the people are not to be forced in consequence of many different things being joined in one complicated bill, either to accept what it disapproves of; or reject what it approves? What shall we say if you</p>

<p>idcirco tu ad illam labem atque eluviem civitatis sine summa vi pervenire potuisti?</p>	<p>carried the bill by violence? is it, nevertheless, a law? Or can anything appear to have been done rightfully which was notoriously done by violence? And if, at the very time of your getting this law passed, when the city was stormed, stones were not thrown, and men did not actually come to blows hand to hand, is that any proof that you were able to contrive that disgrace and ruin to the city without extreme violence?</p>
<p>54. Cum in tribunali Aurelio conscribebas palam non modo liberos sed etiam servos, ex omnibus vicis concitatos, vim tum videlicet non parabas; cum edictis tuis tabernas claudi iubebas, non vim imperitae multitudinis, sed hominum honestorum modestiam prudentiamque quaerebas; cum arma in aedem Castoris comportabas, nihil aliud nisi uti ne quid per vim agi posset machinabare; cum vero gradus Castoris convellisti ac removisti, tum, ut modeste tibi agere liceret, homines audacis ab eius templi aditu atque ascensu reppulisti; cum eos qui conventu virorum bonorum verba de salute mea fecerant adesse iussisti, eorumque advocationem manibus ferro lapidibus discussisti, tum profecto ostendisti vim tibi maxime displicere.</p>	<p>54. When in the Aurelian tribunal you were openly enrolling not only freemen but slaves also, got together out of all the streets in the city, were you not at that time preparing for violence? When by your edicts, you ordered all the shops to be shut, were you aiming not at the violence of the mob, but at a modest and prudent gathering of honourable men? When you were having arms collected and carried to the temple of Castor, had you no other object beyond preventing others from being able to effect anything by violence? But when you tore up and removed the steps of the temple of Castor, did you then, in order to be able to act in a moderate manner, repel audacious men from the approaches and ascents leading to the temple? When you ordered those persons who, in an assembly of virtuous men, had spoken in defence of, my safety, to come forward, and had driven away their companions and seconders by blows and arms and stones; then, no doubt, you showed that violence was excessively disagreeable to you.</p>

55. Verum haec furiosa vis vaesani tribuni plebis facile superari frangique potuit virorum bonorum vel virtute vel multitudine. Quid? cum Gabinio Syria dabatur, Macedonia Pisoni, utrique infinitum imperium, ingens pecunia, ut tibi omnia permitterent, te adiuuarent, tibi manum, copias, tibi suos spectatos centuriones, tibi pecuniam, tibi familias compararent, te suis sceleratis contionibus sublevarent, senatus auctoritatem inriderent, equitibus Romanis mortem proscriptionemque minitarentur, me terrerent minis, mihi caedem et dimicationem denuntiarent, meam domum refertam viris bonis per amicos suos complerent proscriptionis metu, me frequentia nudarent virorum bonorum, me praesidio spoliarent senatus, pro me non modo pugnare amplissimum ordinem, sed etiam plorare et supplicare mutata veste prohiberent, ne tum quidem vis erat?

56. Quid igitur ego cessi, aut qui timor fuit? non dicam in me: fac me timidum esse natura: quid? illa tot virorum fortissimorum milia, quid? nostri equites Romani, quid? senatus, quid? denique omnes boni, si nulla erat vis, cur me flentes potius persecuti sunt quam aut increpantes retinuerunt aut irati reliquerunt? An hoc

55. Oh, but this frantic violence of a demented tribune of the people could easily be crushed and put down by the virtue and superior numbers of the good citizens. What? when Syria was given to Gabinius, Macedonia to Piso, boundless authority and vast sums of money to both of them, to induce them to place everything in your power, to assist you, to supply you which followers, and troops, and their own prepared centurions, and money, and bands of slaves; to all you with their infamous assemblies, to deride the authority of the senate, to threaten the Roman knights with death and proscription, to terrify me with threats, to threaten me with contests and murder, to fill my house with their friends, which had heretofore been full of virtuous men; through fear of proscription; to deprive me of the crowds of good men who used to associate with me, to strip me of their protection; to forbid the senate, that most illustrious body, not only to fight for me, but even to implore men, and to entreat them in my behalf, and, changing their garments, to lament my danger,—was not even this violence?

56. Why then did I depart, or what fear was there? I will not say in me. Allow that I am timid by nature; what are we to say of so many thousands of the bravest men? what did our Roman knights think? what did the senate? what, in short, did all good men think? If there was no violence, why did they escort me out of the city with tears, instead of reproving and

timebam, si mecum ageretur more institutoque maiorum, ut possem praesens sustinere?	detaining me, or being indignant with me and leaving me? Or was I afraid that I could not, while present, resist their accusations if they proceeded against me according to the usages and principles of our ancestors?
<p>57. Vtrum, si dies dicta esset, iudicium mihi fuit pertimescendum an sine iudicio privilegium? Iudiciumne? Causa tam turpis scilicet, homo qui eam, si iam esset ignota, dicendo non possem explicare. An quia causam probare non poteram? cuius tanta bonitas est ut ea ipsa non modo se, sed etiam me absentem per se probarit. An senatus, an ordines, an ii qui cuncta ex Italia ad me revocandum convolaverunt, segniores me praesente ad me retinendum et conservandum fuissent, in ea causa quam ipse iam parricida talem dicat fuisse ut me ab omnibus ad meam pristinam dignitatem exspectatum atque revocatum queratur?</p>	<p>57. If a day had been appointed for my trial, must I have dreaded the investigation? or must I have feared a private bill being introduced against me without any trial? A trial in so shameful a cause I suppose I am a man who, if the cause were not understood, could not speak so as to explain it at all, or could I not make people approve of my cause, when its excellence is such that of its own merits it made people approve not only of itself while it was before them, but of me also though I was absent? Was the senate, were all ranks of the people, were those men who flew hither from all Italy to cooperate in my recall, likely to be more indifferent, while I was present, about retaining and preserving me, in that cause which even that parricide says was such, that he complains that I was sought out and recalled to my previous honours by the whole people?</p>
<p>58. An vero in iudicio periculi nihil fuit: privilegium pertimui, ne, mihi praesenti si multa inrogaretur, nemo intercederet? Tam inops autem ego eram ab amicis aut tam nuda res publica a magistratibus? Quid? si vocatae tribus essent, proscriptionem non dicam in me, ita de sua salute merito, sed omnino in ullo civi comprobavissent? An, si ego praesens fuisset, veteres illae copiae coniuratorum</p>	<p>58. Was there then no danger to me whatever in a court of justice; but was I to fear a private bill, and that if a penalty were sought to be recovered from me while I was present, no one would interpose a veto? Was I so destitute of friends, or was the republic so entirely without magistrates? What? supposing the tribes had been convoked, would they have approved of a proscription, I will not say against me who had</p>

<p>tuique perditī milites atque egentes et nova manus sceleratissimorum consulum corpori meo pepercissent? qui cum eorum omnium crudelitati scelerique cessissem, ne absens quidem luctu meo mentis eorum satiare potui.</p>	<p>deserved so well of them by my efforts for their safety, but would they have approved of it in the case of any citizen whatever? Or, if I had been present, would those veteran troops of conspirators, and those profligate and needy soldiers of yours, and that new force of two most impious consuls, have spared my person, when, after that I had, by departing, succumbed to their inhumanity and wickedness, I could not though absent satisfy their hostility to me by my misfortunes?</p>
<p>59. Quid enim vos uxor mea misera violarat, quam vexavistis, raptavistis, omni crudelitate lacerastis? quid mea filia, cuius fletus adsiduus sordesque lugubres vobis erant iucundae, ceterorum omnium mentis oculosque flectebant? quid parvus filius, quem, quam diu afui, nemo nisi lacrimantem confectumque vidit: quid fecerat quod eum totiens per insidias interficere voluistis? quid frater meus? qui cum aliquanto post meum discessum ex provincia venisset neque sibi vivendum nisi me restituto putaret, cum eius maeror, squalor incredibilis et inauditus omnibus mortalibus miserabilis videbatur, quotiens est ex vestro ferro ac manibus elapsus!</p>	<p>59. For what injury had my unhappy wife done to you? whom you harassed and plundered and ill-treated with every description of cruelty. What harm had my daughter done to you? whose incessant weeping and mourning and misery were so agreeable to you, though they moved the eyes and feelings of every one else. What had my little son done? whom no one ever saw all the time that I was away, that he was not weeping and lamenting; what, I say, had he done that you should so often try to murder him by stratagem? What had my brother done? who, when, some time after my departure, he arrived from his province and thought that it was not worth his while to live unless I were restored to him, when his chief and excessive and unprecedented mourning seemed to render him an object of pity to every one, was constantly attacked by you with arms and violence, he escaped with difficulty out of your hands.</p>
<p>60. Sed quid ego vestram crudelitatem exprobro quam in ipsum me ac meos</p>	<p>60. But why need I dilate upon your cruelty which you have displayed towards me and</p>

<p>adhibuistis, qui parietibus, qui tectis, qui columnis ac postibus meis hostificum quoddam et nefarium omni imbutum odio bellum intulistis? Non enim te arbitror, cum post meum discessum omnium locupletium fortunas, omnium provinciarum fructus, tetrarcharum ac regum bona spe atque avaritia devorasses, argenti et suppellectilis meae cupiditate esse caecatum: non existimo Campanum illum consulem cum saltatore conlega, cum alteri totam Achaïam, Thessaliam, Boeotiam, Graeciam, Macedoniam omnemque barbariam, bona civium Romanorum condonasses, alteri Syriam, Babylonem, Persas, integerrimas pacatissimasque gentis, ad diripiendum tradidisses, illos tam cupidos liminum meorum et columnarum et valvarum fuisse.</p>	<p>mine? when you have waged a horrible and nefarious war, dyed with every description of hatred against my walls, my roofs, my pillars and door-posts. For I do not think that you, when, after my departure, you in the covetousness of your hopes had devoured the fortunes of all the rich men, the produce of all the provinces, the property of tetrarchs and of kings, were blinded by the desire of my plate and furniture. I do not think that that Campanian consul with his dancing colleague, after you had sacrificed to the one all Achaïa, Thessaly, Boeotia, Greece, Macedonia and all the countries of the barbarians, and the property of the Roman citizens in those countries, and when you had delivered up to the other Sulla, Babylon, and the Persians those hitherto uninjured and peaceful nations, to plunder, I do not think, I say, that they were covetous of my thresholds and pillars and folding doors.</p>
<p>61. Neque porro illa manus copiaeque Catilinae caementis ac testis tectorum meorum se famem suam expleturas putaverunt; sed ut hostium urbes, nec omnium hostium, verum eorum quibuscum acerbum bellum internecivumque suscepimus, non praeda adducti sed odio solemus exscindere, quod, in quos propter eorum crudelitatem inflammatae mentes nostrae fuerunt, cum horum etiam tectis et sedibus residere aliquod bellum semper videtur [...]</p>	<p>61. Nor, indeed, did the bands and forces of Catiline think that they could appease their hunger with the tiles and mortar of my roofs. But as, without being influenced by the idea of booty, still out of hatred we are accustomed to destroy the cities of enemies;—not of all enemies indeed, but of those with whom we have waged any bitter and intestine war; because when our minds have been inflamed against any people by reason of their cruelty, there always appears to be some war still lingering in their abodes and habitations, ***</p>

<p>62. Nihil erat latum de me; non adesse eram iussus, non citatus afueram; eram etiam tuo iudicio civis incolumis, cum domus in Palatio, villa in Tusculano, altera ad alterum consulem transferebatur--scilicet eos consules vocabant--columnae marmoreae ex aedibus meis inspectante populo Romano ad socrum consulis portabantur, in fundum autem vicini consulis non instrumentum aut ornamenta villae, sed etiam arbores transferebantur, cum ipsa villa non praedae cupiditate --quid enim erat praedae?--sed odio et crudelitate funditus everteretur. Domus ardebat in Palatio non fortuito, sed oblato incendio; consules epulabantur et in coniuratorum gratulatione versabantur, cum alter se Catilinae delicias, alter Cethegi consobrinum fuisse diceret.</p>	<p>62. No law had been passed respecting me. I had not been ordered to appear in court; I had not been summoned. I was absent. I was even in your own opinion a citizen with all my rights as such unimpaired, when my house on the Palatine hill, and my villa in the district of Tusculum, were transferred one a-piece to each of the consuls; decrees of the senate were flying about; marble columns from my house were carried off to the father-in-law of the consul in the sight of the Roman people; and the consul who was my neighbour at my villa had not only my stock and the decorations of my villa, but even my trees transferred to his farm; while the villa itself was utterly destroyed, not from a desire of plunder, (for what plunder could there be there?) but out of hatred and cruelty. My house on the Palatine hill was burnt, not by accident, but having been set on fire on purpose. The consuls were feasting and reveling amid the congratulations of the conspirators, while the one boasted that he had been the favourite of Catiline, and the other that he was the cousin of Cethegus.</p>
<p>63. Hanc ego vim, pontifices, hoc scelus, hunc furorem meo corpore opposito ab omnium bonorum cervicibus depuli, omnemque impetum discordiarum, omnem diu conlectam vim improborum, quae inveterata compresso odio atque tacito iam erumpebat nancta tam audacis duces, excepi meo corpore. In me uno consulares faces iactae manibus tribuniciiis, in me omnia, quae ego quondam rettuderam,</p>	<p>63. This violence, O priests, this wickedness, this frenzy, I, opposing my single person to the storm, warded off from the necks of all good men, and I received on my body all the attacks of disaffection, all the long-collected violence of the wicked, which, having been long coming to a head, with silent and repressed hatred, was at last breaking out now that it had got such audacious leaders. Against me alone were</p>

<p>coniurationis nefaria tela adhaeserunt. Quod si, ut multis fortissimis viris placuit, vi et armis contra vim decertare voluissem, aut vicissem cum magna internecione improborum, sed tamen civium, aut interfectis bonis omnibus, quod illis optatissimum erat, una cum re publica concidissem.</p>	<p>directed the consular firebrands hurled from the hands of the tribunes; all the impious arrows of the conspiracy, which I had once before blunted, now stuck in me. But if, as was the advice of many most gallant men, I had determined to contend with violence and arms against violence, I should either have gained the day with a great slaughter of wicked men, who notwithstanding were citizens, or else all the good men would have been slain, to the great joy of the wicked, and I too should have perished together with the republic.</p>
<p>64. Videbam vivo senatu populoque Romano celerem mihi summa cum dignitate reditum, nec intellegebam fieri diutius posse ut mihi non liceret esse in ea re publica quam ipse servassem. Quod si non liceret, audieram et legeram clarissimos nostrae civitatis viros se in medios hostis ad perspicuam mortem pro salute exercitus iniecissee: ego pro salute universae rei publicae dubitarem hoc meliore condicione esse quam Decii, quod illi ne auditores quidem suae gloriae, ego etiam spectator meae laudis esse potuissem? Itaque infractus furor tuus inanis faciebat impetus; omnem enim vim omnium sceleratorum acerbitas mei casus exceperat; non erat in tam immani iniuria tantisque ruinis novae crudelitati locus.</p>	<p>64. I saw, that if the senate and people of Rome existed, I should have a speedy return with the greatest dignity, and I did not think it possible that such a state of affairs should longer continue to exist, as for me not to be allowed to live in that republic which I myself had saved. And if I were not allowed to live there, I had heard and read that some of the most illustrious men of our country had rushed into the middle of the enemy to manifest death for the sake of the safety of their army. And could I doubt that if I were to sacrifice myself for the safety of the entire republic, I should in this point be better off than the Decii, because they could not even hear of their glory, while I should be able to be even a spectator of my own renown?</p>
<p>65. Cato fuerat proximus. Quid ageres? non erat ut, qui modus moribus fuerat, idem esset iniuriae. Quid posses? extrudere ad Cypriam pecuniam? Praeda perierit. Alia non deerit; hinc</p>	<p>65. Cato was next to me. Was there nothing which you could do beyond making him who had been my leader and guide in all my conduct a partner also in my misfortune? What? Could</p>

<p>modo amandandus est. Sic M. Cato invisus quasi per beneficium Cyprum relegatur. Eiciuntur duo, quos videre improbi non poterant, alter per honorem turpissimum, alter per honestissimam calamitatem.</p>	<p>you banish him? What then? You could send him away for the money of Cyprus. One booty may have been lost; another will be sure to be found; only let this man be got out of the way. Accordingly, the hated Marcus Cato is commissioned to go to Cyprus, as if it was a kindness that was being conferred on him. Two men are removed, whom the wicked men could not bear the sight of; one by the most discreditable sort of honour, the other by the most honourable possible calamity.</p>
<p>66. Atque ut sciatis non hominibus istum sed virtutibus hostem semper fuisse, me expulso, Catone amandato, in eum ipsum se convertit quo auctore, quo adiutore in contionibus ea quae gerebat omnia quaeque gesserat se et fecisse et facere dicebat: Cn. Pompeium, quem omnium iudicio longe principem esse civitatis videbat, diutius furori suo veniam daturum non arbitrabatur. Qui ex eius custodia per insidias regis amici filium hostem captivum surripuisset, et ea iniuria virum fortissimum lacessisset, speravit isdem se copiis cum illo posse configere quibuscum ego noluissem bonorum periculo dimicare, et primo quidem adiutoribus consulibus; postea fregit foedus Gabinius, Piso tamen in fide mansit.</p>	<p>66. And that you may be aware that that man had been an enemy not to their persons, but to their virtues, after I was driven out, and Cato despatched on his commission, he turns himself against that very man by whose advice and by whose assistance he was in the habit of saying in the assemblies that he had done and continued to do what he was then doing and everything which he had hitherto done. He thought that Cnaeus Pompeius, who he saw was in every one's opinion by far the first man in the city, would not much longer tolerate his frenzy. After he had filched out of his custody by treachery the son of a king who was our friend,—himself being an enemy and a prisoner,—and having provoked that most gallant man by this injury, he thought that he could contend with him by the aid of those troops against whom I had been willing to struggle at the risk of the destruction of all virtuous citizens, especially as at first he had the consuls to help him. But after a time Gabinius</p>

	broke his agreement with him; but Piso continued faithful to him.
<p>67. Quas iste tum caedis, quas lapidationes, quas fugas fecerit, quam facile ferro cotidianisque insidiis, cum iam a firmissimo robore copiarum suarum relictus esset, Cn. Pompeium foro curiaque privarit domique continuerit, vidistis: ex quo iudicare potestis quanta vis illa fuerit oriens et congregata, cum haec Cn. Pompeium terruerit iam distracta et exstincta.</p>	<p>67. You saw what massacres that man then committed, what men he stoned, what numbers he made to flee; how easily by means of his armed bands and his daily plots did he compel Cnaeus Pompeius to absent himself from the forum and the senate-house, and to confine himself to his own house, even after he had been already deserted by the best part of his forces. And from this you may judge how great that violence was at its first rise, and when first collected together, when even after it was scattered and almost extinct it alarmed Cnaeus Pompeius in this way.</p>
<p>68. Haec vidit in sententia dicenda Kalendis Ianuariis vir prudentissimus et cum rei publicae, cum mihi, tum etiam veritati amicissimus, L. Cotta, qui legem de meo reditu ferendam non censuit; qui me consuluisse rei publicae, cessisse tempestati, amiciorem vobis ceterisque civibus quam mihi exstitisse, vi, armis, dissensione hominum et caede instituta novoque dominatu pulsum esse dixit; nihil de meo capite potuisse ferri, nihil esse iure scriptum aut posse valere, omnia contra leges moremque maiorum temere, turbulente, per vim, per furorem esse gesta. Quod si illa lex esset, nec referre ad senatum consulibus nec sententiam dicere sibi licere; quorum utrumque cum fieret, non oportere ut de me lex ferretur decerni, ne illa quae nulla esset esse lex iudicaretur. Sententia verior, gravior, melior,</p>	<p>68. That most prudent man, Lucius Cotta, a man most deeply attached to the republic and to me, and above all to truth, saw this when he delivered his opinion on the first of January. He then considered it unnecessary that any law should be passed for my return. He said that I had consulted the interests of the republic; that I had yielded to the tempest; that I had been more friendly to you and to the rest of the citizens than to myself and to my own relations; that I had been driven away by the disturbances of a body of men banded together for purposes of bloodshed, and by an unprecedented exercise of power; that no law could possibly have been passed affecting my status as a citizen; that no law had been drawn up in writing, that none could have any validity; that everything had been done in disregard of the</p>

<p>utilior rei publicae nulla esse potuit; hominis enim scelere et furore notato similis a re publica labes in posterum demovebatur.</p>	<p>laws and of the usages of our ancestors, in a rash and turbulent manner, by violence and frenzy. But if that were a law, then it was not lawful for the consuls to refer the matter to the senate,¹ nor for him himself to express his opinion upon it in the senate. And as both these things were being done, it was not right that it should be decreed that a law should be passed concerning me, lest that which was no law at all, should be in consequence decided to be a law. No opinion could be truer, sounder, more expedient, or better for the republic. For the wickedness and frenzy of the man being stigmatized by it, all danger of similar disgrace to the republic for the future was removed.</p>
<p>69. Neque hoc Cn. Pompeius, qui ornatissimam de me sententiam dixit, vosque, pontifices, qui me vestris sententiis auctoritatibusque defendistis, non vidistis, illam esse nullam, atque esse potius flammam temporis, interdictum sceleris, vocem furoris; sed prospexistis ne quae popularis in nos aliquando invidia redundaret, si sine populi iudicio restituti videremur. Eodemque consilio M. Bibuli, fortissimi viri, senatus sententiam secutus est, ut vos de mea domo statueretis, non quo dubitaret quin ab isto nihil legibus, nihil religionibus, nihil iure esset actum, sed ne quis oreretur aliquando in tanta ubertate improborum qui in meis aedibus aliquam religionem residere diceret. Nam legem quidem istam nullam esse, quotienscumque de me senatus sententiam dixit, totiens iudicavit.</p>	<p>69. Nor did Cnaeus Pompeius, who delivered a most elaborate opinion and most honourable to me, nor did you, O priests, who defended me by your decision and authority, fail to see that that was no law at all, and that it was rather the heat of the times, an interdict of wickedness, a voice of frenzy. But you were anxious to guard against any popular odium being excited against you; if we appeared to have been restored without any decision of the people. And with the same idea the senate adopted the opinion of Marcus Bibulus, a most fearless man, that you should decide the question relating to my house: not that he doubted that nothing had been done by Clodius with due regard either to the laws, or to the requirements of religion, or to the rights of the citizens; but that, as wicked men were so numerous, no one should at any time arise and</p>

<p>Quoniam quidem scripto illo istius sententiam dicere vetabatur,</p>	<p>say that there was anything holy about my house. For as often as the senate has expressed any opinion at all in my case, so often has it decided that that was no law at all, since indeed, according to that writing which that fellow drew up, it was forbidden to express any opinion at all.</p>
<p>70. atque hanc rem par illud simile, Piso et Gabinius, vidit, homines legum iudiciorumque metuentes, cum frequentissimus senatus eos ut de me referrent cotidie flagitaret, non se rem improbare dicebant, sed lege istius impediri. Erat hoc verum; nam impediabantur, verum ea lege quam idem iste de Macedonia Syriaque tulerat. Hanc tu, P. Lentule, neque privatus neque consul legem esse umquam putasti. Nam tribunis plebis referentibus sententiam de me designatus consul saepe dixisti; ex Kalendis Ianuariis, quoad perfecta res est, de me rettulisti, legem promulgasti, tulisti; quorum tibi, si esset illa lex, nihil liceret. At etiam Q. Metellus, conlega tuus, clarissimus vir, quam legem esse homines alienissimi a P. Clodio iudicarent, Piso et Gabinius, eam nullam esse frater P. Clodi, cum de me ad senatum tecum una rettulit, iudicavit.</p>	<p>70. And that kindred pair, Piso and Gabinius, saw this. Those men, so obedient to the laws and courts of justice, when the senate in very full houses kept constantly entreating them to make a motion respecting me,—said that they did not disapprove of the object, but that they were hindered by that fellow's law. And this was true; but it was law which he had passed about giving them Macedonia and Syria.</p>
<p>71. Sed vero isti qui Clodi leges timuerunt, quem ad modum ceteras observarunt? Senatus quidem, cuius est gravissimum iudicium de iure legum, quotienscumque de me consultus est, totiens eam nullam esse iudicavit. Quod idem tu, Lentule, vidisti in ea lege quam de me tulisti. Nam non est ita latum ut mihi Romam venire</p>	<p>71. But how did those men who had such respect for Clodius's laws observe the rest of the laws? The senate indeed, whose authority is of the very greatest weight on all questions affecting the power of the laws, as often as it has been consulted in my case, has decided that that was no law at all. And you, O Lentulus,</p>

<p>liceret, sed ut venirem; non enim voluisti id quod licebat ferre ut liceret, sed me ita esse in re publica magis ut arcessitus imperio populi Romani viderer quam ad administrandam civitatem restitutus.</p>	<p>showed that you were aware of its not being one in that law which you carried concerning me. For that law was not framed in such terms as that I might be allowed to come to Rome, but that I should come to Rome. For you did not wish to propose to make that lawful for me to do, which was lawful already; but you wished me to be in the republic, appearing to have been sent for by the command of the Roman people, rather than to have been restored for the purpose of aiding in the management of the republic.</p>
<p>72. Hunc tu etiam, portentosa pestis, exsulem appellare ausus es, cum tantis sceleribus esses et flagitiis notatus ut omnem locum quo adisses exsili simillimum redderes? Quid est enim exsul? ipsum per se nomen calamitatis, non turpitudinis. Quando igitur est turpe? re vera, cum est poena peccati, opinione autem hominum etiam, si est poena damnati. Vtrum igitur peccato meo nomen subeo an re iudicata? Peccato? Iam neque tu id dicere audes, quem isti satellites tui 'felicem Catilinam' nominant, neque quisquam eorum qui solebant. Non modo iam nemo est tam imperitus qui ea quae gessi in consulatu peccata esse dicat, sed nemo est tam inimicus patriae qui non meis consiliis patriam conservatam esse fateatur.</p>	<p>72. Did you then, O you most monstrous pest, dare to call that man an exile, when you yourself were branded with such wickedness and such crimes that you made every place which you approached very like a place of banishment? For what is an exile? The name itself is an indication of misfortune, not of disgrace. When, then, is it disgraceful? In reality when it is the punishment of guilt; but in the opinion of men, when it is the punishment of a condemned person. Is it then owing to any crime of mine that I hear the name of an exile, or owing to any judicial sentence? Owing to any crime? Even you, whom those satellites of yours call the prosperous Catiline, do not dare to affirm that, nor do any one of those men who used to say so, venture to say so now. There is not only no one so ignorant now as to say that those actions which I did in my consulship were errors; but no one is such an enemy to his country as not to</p>

	confess that the country was preserved by my counsels.
<p>73. Quod enim est in terris commune tantum tantulumve consilium, quod non de meis rebus gestis ea quae mihi essent optatissima et pulcherrima iudicarit? Summum est populi Romani populorumque et gentium omnium ac regum consilium senatus: decrevit ut omnes qui rem publicam salvam esse vellent ad me unum defendendum venirent, ostenditque nec stare potuisse rem publicam si ego non fuisset, nec futuram esse ullam si non redisset.</p>	<p>73. For what deliberative assembly is there in the whole earth, whether great or little, which has not expressed that opinion of my exploits which is most desirable and most honourable for me? The greatest council of the Roman people, and of all peoples, and nations, and kings, is the senate. That decreed that all men who desired the safety of the republic should come forward to defend me alone, and showed its opinion that the republic could not have been saved if I had not existed, and could not last if I did not return.</p>
<p>74. Proximus est huic dignitati ordo equester: omnes omnium publicorum societates de meo consulatu ac de meis rebus gestis amplissima atque ornatissima decreta fecerunt. Scribae, qui nobiscum in rationibus monumentisque publicis versantur, non obscurum de meis in rem publicam beneficiis suum iudicium decretumque esse voluerunt. Nullum est in hac urbe conlegium, nulli pagani aut montani, quoniam plebei quoque urbanae maiores nostri conventicula et quasi concilia quaedam esse voluerunt, qui non amplissime non modo de salute mea sed etiam de dignitate decreverint.</p>	<p>74. The next in rank to this dignified body is the equestrian order. All the companies of public contractors passed most favourable and honourable decrees respecting my consulship and my actions. The scriveners, who are much connected with us in matters relating to public registers and monuments, took good care that their sentiments and resolutions respecting my services to the republic should not be left in doubt. There is no corporation in all this city, no body of men either from the higher or lower parts of the city,¹ (since our ancestors thought fit that the common people of the city should also have places of meeting and some sort of deliberative assemblies,) which has not passed most honourable resolutions, not merely respecting my safety, but relating also to my dignity.</p>

75. Nam quid ego illa divina atque immortalia municipiorum et coloniarum et totius Italiae decreta commemorem, quibus tamquam gradibus mihi videor in caelum ascendisse, non solum in patriam revertisse? Ille vero dies qui fuit cum te, P. Lentule, legem de me ferente populus Romanus ipse vidit sensitque quantus et quanta dignitate esset! Constat enim nullis umquam comitiis campum Martium tanta celebritate, tanto splendore omnis generis hominum aetatum ordinum floruisse. Omitto civitatum, nationum, provinciarum, regum, orbis denique terrarum de meis in omnis mortalis meritis unum iudicium unumque consensum: adventus meus atque introitus in urbem qui fuit? Vtrum me patria sic accepit ut lucem salutemque redditam sibi ac restitutam accipere debuit, an ut crudelem tyrannum, quod vos Catilinae gregales de me dicere solebatis?

75. For why need I mention those divine and immortal decrees of the municipal towns, and of the colonies, and of all Italy, by which, as by a flight of steps, I seem not only to have returned to my country, but to have mounted up to heaven? And what a day was that when the Roman people beheld you, O Publius Lentulus, passing a law respecting me, and felt how great a man and how worthy a citizen you were. For it is well known that the Campus Martius had never on any comitia seen so vast a crowd, or such a splendid assembly of men of every class, age, and order. I say nothing of the unanimous judgment and unanimous agreement of the cities, nations, provinces, kings,—of the whole world, in short,—as to the services which I had done to the whole human race. But what an arrival at and entry into the city was mine! Did my country receive me as it ought to receive light and safety when brought back and restored to it, or as a cruel tyrant, as you, you herd of Catiline, were accustomed to call me?

76. Itaque ille unus dies, quo die me populus Romanus a porta in Capitolium atque inde domum sua celebritate laetitiaque comitatum honestavit, tantae mihi iucunditati fuit ut tua mihi conscelerata illa vis non modo non propulsanda, sed etiam fuisse videatur. Qua re illa calamitas, si ita est appellanda, exussit hoc genus totum maledicti, ne quisquam iam audeat reprehendere consulatum meum tot tantis tam ornatis iudiciis, testimoniis, auctoritatibus

76. Therefore that one day on which the Roman people honoured me by escorting me with immense numbers and loud demonstrations of joy from the gate to the Capitol, and from the Capitol home, was so delightful to me, that that wicked violence of yours which had driven me away appeared not to be a thing from which I ought to have been defended, but one which it was worth my while even to purchase. Wherefore that calamity, if it

<p>comprobatum. Quod si in isto tuo maledicto probrum non modo mihi nullum obiectas, sed etiam laudem inlustras meam, quid te aut fieri aut fingi dementius potest? Vno enim maledicto bis a me patriam servatam esse concedis: semel, cum id feci quod omnes non negant immortalitati, si fieri potest, mandandum, tu supplicio puniendum putasti, iterum, cum tuum multorumque praeter te inflammatum in bonos omnis impetum meo corpore excepi, ne eam civitatem quam servassem inermis armatus in discrimen adducerem.</p>	<p>deserves to be called a calamity, has put an end to the whole previous system of abuse, and has prevented any one for the future from daring to find fault with my consulship, which has now been approved of by such numerous, and such important, and such dignified decisions, and testimonies, and authorities.</p>
<p>77. Esto, non fuit in me poena ulla peccati; at fuit iudici. Cuius? quis me umquam ulla lege interrogavit? quis postulavit? quis diem dixit? Potest igitur damnati poenam sustinere indemnatus? est hoc tribunicium, est popolare? Quamquam ubi tu te popularem, nisi cum pro populo fecisti, potes dicere? Sed, cum hoc iuris a maioribus proditum sit, ut nemo civis Romanus aut libertatem aut civitatem possit amittere, nisi ipse auctor factus sit, quod tu ipse potuisti in tua causa discere (credo enim, quamquam in illa adoptione legitime factum est nihil, tamen te esse interrogatum auctorne esses, ut in te P. Fonteius vitae necisque potestatem haberet, ut in filio), quaero, si aut negasses aut tacuisses, si tamen id xxx curiae iussissent, num id iussum esset ratum? certe non. Quid ita? quia ius a maioribus nostris, qui non fecte et fallaciter populares sed vere et sapienter fuerunt, ita comparatum est ut civis</p>	<p>77. There was not in my case any punishment imposed for any offence. Still there was punishment imposed on me by a judicial decision. By what decision? Who ever examined me as a defendant under any law whatever? Who ever accused me? Who ever prosecuted me? Can then a man who is uncondemned be made to bear the punishment of a condemned man? Is this the act of a tribune of the people? Is this the act of a friend of the people? Although, when is it that a man can call himself a friend of the people, except when he has done something for the advantage of the people? Forsooth, has not this principle been handed down to us from our ancestors, that no Roman citizen can be deprived of his liberty, or of his status as a citizen, unless he himself consents to such a thing, as you yourself might learn in your own case? For, although in that adoption of yours nothing was done in a legal manner, still I suppose that you were asked,</p>

<p>Romanus libertatem nemo possit invitus amittere.</p>	<p>whether it was your object that Publius Fonteius should have the same power of life and death over you that he would have over an actual son. I ask, if you had either silenced it or had been silent, if, nevertheless, the thirty curies had passed a vote to this effect would that vote have had the force of law? Certainly not. Why? Because the law was established by our ancestors, who were not fictitiously and pretendedly attached to the people, but were so in truth and wisdom, in such a manner that no Roman citizen could be deprived of his liberty against his consent.</p>
<p>78. Quin etiam si decemviri sacramentum in libertatem iniustum iudicassent, tamen, quotienscumque vellet quis, hoc in genere solo rem iudicatam referri posse voluerunt; civitatem vero nemo umquam ullo populi iussu amittet invitus. Qui cives Romani in colonias Latinas proficiscebantur fieri non poterant Latini, nisi erant auctores facti nomenque dederant: qui erant rerum capitalium condemnati non prius hanc civitatem amittebant quam erant in eam recepti, quo vertendi, hoc est mutandi, soli causa venerant. Id autem ut esset faciundum, non ademptione civitatis, sed tecti et aquae et ignis interdictione faciebant.</p>	<p>78. Moreover, if the decemvirs had given an unjust decision to the prejudice of any one's liberty, they established a law that any one who chose might on this subject alone, make a motion affecting a formal decision already pronounced. But no one will ever lose his status as a citizen against his will by any vote of the people.</p>
<p>79. Populus Romanus L. Sulla dictatore ferente comitiis centuriatis municipiis civitatem ademit: ademit eisdem agros. De agris ratum est; fuit enim populi potestas; de civitate ne tam diu quidem valuit quam diu illa Sullani temporis arma valuerunt. An vero Volaterranis, cum</p>	<p>79. The Roman people on the motion of Lucius Sulla, the dictator, in the comitia centuriata, took away the rights of citizenship from the municipal towns, and at the same time took away their lands. The decree about the lands was ratified, for that the people had power to pass; but their</p>

<p>etiam tum essent in armis, L. Sulla victor re publica recuperata comitiis centuriatis civitatem eripere non potuit, hodieque Volaterrani non modo cives, sed etiam optimi cives fruuntur nobiscum simul hac civitate: consulari homini P. Clodius eversa re publica civitatem adimere potuit concilio advocato, conductis operis non solum egentium, sed etiam servorum, Fidulio principe, qui se illo die confirmat Romae non fuisse?</p>	<p>decree concerning the rights of citizenship did not last even as long as the disturbances of the time of Sulla. Shall we then say that Lucius Sulla, victorious as he was, after he had been restored to the republic, could not in the comitia centuriata take away the rights of citizenship from the people of Volaterra, even though they were in arms at the time;—and the Volaterrans to this day enjoy the rights of citizenship in common with ourselves, being not only citizens, but most excellent citizens too;—and allow that Publius Clodius, at a time when the republic was utterly overturned, could take away his rights as a citizen from a man of consular rank, by summoning an assembly, and hiring bands not only of needy citizens, but even of slaves, with Sedulius as their imputed leader, though he declares that on that day he was not in Rome at all?</p>
<p>80. Quod si non fuit, quid te audacius, qui eius nomen incideris? quid desperatius, qui ne ementiendo quidem potueris auctorem adumbrare meliorem? Sin autem is primus scivit, quod facile potuit, qui propter inopiam tecti in foro pernoctasset, cur non iuret se Gadibus fuisse, cum tu te fuisse Interamnae probaveris? Hoc tu igitur, homo popularis, iure munitam civitatem et libertatem nostram putas esse oportere, ut, si tribuno plebis rogante 'Velitis ivbeatisme' Fidulii centum se velle et iubere dixerint, possit unus quisque nostrum amittere civitatem? Tum igitur maiores nostri populares non fuerunt, qui de civitate et libertate</p>	<p>80. And, if he was not, what could be a more audacious thing than your putting his name to that bill? What could be more desperate than your condition, when, even if you told a lie about it you could not get up any more respectable authority? But if he was the first person who voted for it as he easily might have been, as he was a man who, for want of a house, slept all night in the forum, why should he not swear that he was at Cadiz, when you have proved so very distinctly that you were at Interamna? Do you, then,—you, a man devoted to the people,—think that our rights as citizens, and our freedom, ought to be established on this</p>

<p>ea iura sanxerunt quae nec vis temporum nec potentia magistratum nec praetorum decreta nec denique universi populi Romani potestas, quae ceteris in rebus est maxima, labefactare possit.</p>	<p>principle; so that when a tribune of the people brings forward a motion, "Do you approve and determine"</p> <p>* * *if a hundred Sedulii should say that they do approve and determine, any one of us may lose our privileges? Our ancestors, then, were not attached to the interests of the people, who with respect to the rights of citizenship and liberty established those principles which neither the power of time, nor the authority of magistrates, nor the decisions of judges, nor the sovereign power of the whole people of Rome, which in all other affairs is most absolute, can undermine.</p>
<p>81. At tu etiam, ereptor civitatis, legem de iniuriis publicis tulisti Anagnino nescio cui Menullae pergratam, qui tibi ob eam legem statuam in meis aedibus posuit, ut locus ipse in tanta tua iniuria legem et inscriptionem statuae refelleret; quae res municipibus Anagninis multo maiori dolori fuit quam quae idem ille gladiator scelera Anagniae fecerat.</p>	<p>81. But you, also, you who take men's rights as citizens from them, have also passed a law with respect to public injuries in favour of some fellow of Anagnia, of the name of Maerula, and he on account of that law has erected a statue to you in my house; so that the place itself, in hearing witness to your prodigious injustice, might refute the law and inscription on your statue. And that law was a much greater cause of grief to the citizens of Anagnia than the crimes which that gladiator had committed in that municipal town.</p>
<p>82. Quid? si ne scriptum quidem umquam est in ista ipsa rogatione, quam se Fidulius negat scivisse, tu autem, ut acta tui praeclari tribunatus hominis dignitate cohonestes, auctorem amplexeris--sed tamen, si nihil de me tulisti quo minus essem non modo in civium numero, sed etiam in eo loco in quo me honores</p>	<p>82. What shall I say, if there is nothing said about the rights of citizenship even in that very form of motion which Sedulius declares he never voted for? Do you still cling to his authority in order to throw a lustre on the exploits of your splendid tribuneship by the dignity of that man? But although you passed</p>

<p>populi Romani conlocarunt, tamenne eum tua voce violabis quem post nefarium scelus consulum superiorum tot vides iudiciis senatus, populi Romani, Italiae totius honestatum, quem ne tunc quidem cum aberam negare poteras esse tua lege senatorem? Vbi enim tuleras ut mihi aqua et igni interdiceretur? quod C. Gracchus de P. Popilio, Saturninus de Metello tulit, homines seditiosissimi de optimis ac fortissimis civibus: non ut esset interdictum, quod ferri non poterat, tulerunt, sed ut interdiceretur. Vbi cavisti ne meo me loco censor in senatum legeret? quod de omnibus, etiam quibus damnatis interdictum est, scriptum est in legibus.</p>	<p>no law respecting me, to prevent my continuing not only in the number of Roman citizens, but even in that rank in which the honours conferred on me by the Roman people had placed me; will you still raise your voice to attack him whom after the abominable wickedness of the preceding consuls you see honoured by the decisions of the senate, of the Roman people, and of all Italy? whom even at the time when I was departing you could not deny, even by your own law, to be a senator. For, where was it that you passed the law that I should be interdicted from fire and water? When Gracchus passed such a decree respecting Publius Popillius, and Saturninus respecting Metellus, and other most seditious men respecting other most virtuous and gallant citizens, they did not pass a decree that they had been interdicted, which could have been quite intolerable but that they should be interdicted. When did you insert a clause that the censor should not enter me on the rolls of the senate in my proper place? which is a clause in the law concerning every one who has been condemned when the interdict is being framed.</p>
<p>83. Quaere haec ex Clodio, scriptore legum tuarum, iube adesse; latitat omnino, sed, si requiri iusseris, invenient hominem apud sororem tuam occultantem se capite demisso. Sed si patrem tuum, civem medius fidius egregium dissimilemque vestri, nemo umquam sanus exsulem appellavit, qui, cum de eo tribunus plebis promulgasset, adesse propter</p>	<p>83. Ask this of Sextus Clodius the framer of your laws. Bid him come forward; he is keeping out of the way; but if you order him to be looked for they will find the man in your sister's house hiding himself with his head down. But if no one in his senses ever called your father a citizen—yes, by Jove, a good citizen, and one very unlike you, if no one I say, ever called him an</p>

<p>iniquitatem illius Cinnani temporis noluit, eique imperium est abrogatum --si in illo poena legitima turpitudinem non habuit propter vim temporum, in me, cui dies dicta numquam est, qui reus non fui, qui numquam sum a tribuno plebis citatus, damnati poena esse potuit, ea praesertim quae ne in ipsa quidem rogatione praescripta est?</p>	<p>exile, who, when a tribune of the people had proposed a bill against him, would not appear on account of the iniquity of that period of Cinna's triumph, and who, on that account had his command taken from him; if, I say, in his case, a punishment inflicted by law carried no disgrace with it, on account of the violent character of those times, could there, in my case, be any penalty against me as if I had been condemned when I never was tried when I never was accused when I never was summoned by any tribune of the people, and, especially, a penalty which was not mentioned not even in the proposed bill itself?</p>
<p>84. Ac vide quid intersit inter illum iniquissimum patris tui casum et hanc fortunam condicionemque nostram. Patrem tuum, civem optimum, clarissimi viri filium, qui si viveret, qua severitate fuit, tu profecto non viveres, L. Philippus censor avunculum suum praeteriit in recitando senatu. Nihil enim poterat dicere quare rata non essent quae erant acta in ea re publica, in qua se illis ipsis temporibus censorem esse voluisset: me L. Cotta, homo censorius, in senatu iuratus dixit se, si censor tum esset cum ego aberam, meo loco senatorem recitaturum fuisse.</p>	<p>84. But just remark what the difference is between that most iniquitous misfortune inflicted on your father and between my fortune and condition which I am now discussing Lucius Philippus the censor, in reading the roll of the senate, passed over his own uncle, your father, a most excellent citizen; the son of a most illustrious man, himself a man of such severity of character that if he were alive you would not have been suffered to live. For he had no reason to allege why those acts should not be ratified which had been done in that republic in which, at that very time, he had been willing to take upon himself the office of censor. But as for me, Lucius Cotta, a man of censorian rank, said in the senate, on his oath, that if he had been censor at the time that I left the city, he should have retained me on the list as a senator in my proper place.</p>

<p>85. Quis in meum locum iudicem subdidit? quis meorum amicorum testamentum discessu meo fecit qui mihi non idem tribuerit quod [et] si adessem? quis me non modo civis, sed socius recipere contra tuam legem et iuvare dubitavit? Denique universus senatus, multo ante quam est lata lex de me, gratias agendas censuit civitatibus iis quae M. Tullium--tantumne? immo etiam--civem optime de re publica meritum, recepissent. Et tu unus pestifer civis eum restitutum negas esse civem quem eiectum universus senatus non modo civem, sed etiam egregium civem semper putavit?</p>	<p>85. Who appointed any judge in my place? who of my friends made a will at the time that I was absent, and did not give me the same that he would have given me if I had been in the city? who was there, I will not say only among the citizens, but even among the allies, who hesitated to receive and assist me in defiance of your law? Lastly, the whole senate, long before the law was passed respecting me, "Voted, that thanks should be given to all those cities by which Marcus Tullius..." Was that all? No—it went, "a citizen who had done the greatest services to the republic, had been received:" and do you, one single pernicious citizen, deny that that citizen has been legally restored, whom the whole senate, even while he was absent, considered not only a citizen, but has at all times considered a most illustrious one?</p>
<p>86. At vero, ut annales populi Romani et monumenta vetustatis loquuntur, Kaeso ille Quinctius et M. Furius Camillus et C. Servilius Ahala, cum essent optime de re publica meriti, tamen populi incitati vim iracundiamque subierunt, damnatique comitiis centuriatis cum in exsilium profugissent, rursus ab eodem populo placato sunt in suam pristinam dignitatem restituti. Quod si his damnatis non modo non imminuit calamitas clarissimi nominis gloriam, sed etiam honestavit (nam etsi optabilius est cursum vitae conficere sine dolore et sine iniuria, tamen ad immortalitatem gloriae plus adfert desideratum esse a suis civibus</p>	<p>86. But as the annals of the Roman people and the records of antiquity relate, that great man Caeso Quintius, and Marcus Furius Camillus, and Marcus Servilius Ahala, though they had deserved exceedingly well of the republic, still had to endure the violence and passion of an excited people; and after they had been condemned by the comitia centuriata and had gone into banishment, were again restored to their former dignity by the same people in a more placable humour. But if, in the case of those men who were thus condemned, their calamity not only did not diminish the glory of their most illustrious names, but even added</p>

<p>quam omnino numquam esse violatum), mihi sine ullo iudicio populi profecto, cum amplissimis omnium iudiciis restituto, maledicti locum aut criminis obtinebit?</p>	<p>fresh lustre to it; (for, although it is more desirable to finish the course of one's life without pain and without injury, still it contributes more to the immortality of a man's glory to have been universally regretted by his fellow-citizens: than never to have been injured;) shall a similar misfortune have in my case the force of a reproach or of an accusation, when I left the city without any sentence of the people, and have been restored by most honourable resolutions of every order of society?</p>
<p>87. Fortis et constans in optima ratione civis P. Popilius semper fuit; tamen eius in omni vita nihil est ad laudem inlustrius quam calamitas ipsa; quis enim iam meminisset eum bene de re publica meritum, nisi et ab improbis expulsus esset et per bonos restitutus? Q. Metelli praeclarum imperium in re militari fuit, egregia censura, omnis vita plena gravitatis; tamen huius viri laudem ad sempiternam memoriam temporis calamitas propagavit. Quod si [et] illis, qui expulsi sunt inique, sed tamen legibus, reducti inimicis interfectis rogationibus tribuniciis, non auctoritate senatus, non comitiis centuriatis, non decretis Italiae, non desiderio civitatis, iniuria inimicorum probro non fuit, in me, qui profectus sum integer, afui simul cum re publica, redii cum maxima dignitate te vivo, fratre tuo alieno, altero consule reducente, altero [praetore] patiente, tuum scelus meum probrum putas esse oportere?</p>	<p>87. Publius Popillius was always a brave and wise citizen in every point of view; yet in the whole of his life there is nothing which sheds a greater lustre on his character than this very calamity. For who would have recollected now that he conferred great benefits on the republic, if he had not been expelled by the wicked and restored by the good? The conduct of Quintus Metellus as a military commander was admirable, his censorship was splendid, his whole life was full of wisdom and dignity; and yet it is his calamity which has handed down his praises to everlasting recollection.</p>
<p>88. Ac si me populus Romanus, incitatus iracundia aut invidia, e civitate eiecisset</p>	<p>88. But now, when of all the people no one has accused me, when it is impossible for me to</p>

<p>idemque postea mea in rem publicam beneficia recordatus se conlegisset, temeritatem atque iniuriam suam restitutione mea reprehendisset, tamen profecto nemo tam esset amens qui mihi tale populi iudicium non dignitati potius quam dedecori putaret esse oportere. Nunc vero cum me in iudicium populi nemo omnium vocarit, condemnari non potuerim qui accusatus non sim, denique ne pulsus quidem ita sim ut, si contenderem, superare non possem, contraque a populo Romano semper sim defensus, amplificatus, ornatus, quid est qua re quisquam mihi se ipsa populari ratione anteponat?</p>	<p>have been condemned, seeing that I have never been accused, since I was not even expelled in such a way that I could not have got the better of my adversaries if I had contested the point with them by force; and when, on the other hand, I have at all times been defrauded and praised and honoured by the Roman people; what pretence has any one for thinking himself better off than I am, at all events as far as the people are concerned?</p>
<p>89. An tu populum Romanum esse illum putas qui constat ex iis qui mercede conducuntur, qui impelluntur ut vim adferant magistratibus, ut obsideant senatum, optent cotidie caedem, incendia, rapinas? quem tu tamen populum nisi tabernis clausis frequentare non poteras, cui populo duces Lentidios, Lollios, Plaguleios, Sergios praefeceras. O speciem dignitatemque populi Romani, quam reges, quam nationes exterae, quam gentes ultimae pertimescant, multitudinem hominum ex servis, ex conductis, ex facinerosis, ex egentibus congregatam!</p>	<p>89. Do you think that the Roman people consists of these men who can be hired for any purpose? who are easily instigated to offer violence to magistrates? to besiege the senate? to wish every day for bloodshed, conflagration and plunder? people, indeed, whom you could not possibly collect together unless you shut up all the taverns; a people to whom you gave the Lentidii, and Lollii, and Plaguleii, and Sergii, for leaders. Oh for the splendour and dignity of the Roman people, for kings, for foreign nations, for the most distant lands to fear; a multitude collected of slaves, of hirelings, of, criminals, and beggars!</p>
<p>90. Illa fuit pulchritudo populi Romani, illa forma quam in campo vidisti tum cum etiam tibi contra senatus totiusque Italiae auctoritatem et studium dicendi potestas fuit. Ille populus est dominus regum, victor atque imperator omnium gentium, quem illo clarissimo die, scelerate,</p>	<p>90. That was the real beauty and splendour of the Roman people, which you beheld in the Campus Martius at that time, when even you were allowed to speak in opposition to the authority and wishes of the senate and of all Italy. That is the people—that, I say, is the</p>

<p>vidisti tum cum omnes principes civitatis, omnes homines ordinum atque aetatum omnium suffragium se non de civis sed de civitatis salute ferre censebant, cum denique homines in campum non tabernis sed municipiis clausis venerant.</p>	<p>people which is the lord of kings, the conqueror and commander-in-chief of all nations, which you, O wicked man, beheld in that most illustrious day when all the chief men of the city, when all men of all ranks and ages considered themselves as giving their votes, not about the safety of a citizen, but about that of the state; when men arrive into the Campus, the municipal towns having been all emptied, not the taverns.</p>
<p>91. Hoc ego populo, si tum consules aut fuissent in re publica aut omnino non fuissent, nullo labore tuo praecipiti furori atque impio sceleri restitsem. Sed publicam causam contra vim armatam sine publico praesidio suscipere nolui, non quo mihi P. Scipionis, fortissimi viri, vis in Ti. Graccho, privati hominis, displiceret, sed Scipionis factum statim P. Mucius consul, qui in gerenda re [publica] putabatur fuisse segnior, gesta multis senatus consultis non modo defendit, sed etiam ornavit: mihi aut te interfecto cum consulibus, aut te vivo et tecum et cum illis armis decertandum fuit.</p>	<p>91. By the aid of this people, if there had then been real consuls in the republic, or if there had been no consuls at all, I should without any difficulty have resisted your headlong frenzy and impious wickedness. But I was unwilling to take up the public cause against armed violence, without the protection of the people. Not that I disapproved of the late rigour of Publius Scipio, that bravest of men, when he was only a private individual; but Publius Mucius the consul, who was considered somewhat remiss in defending the republic, immediately defended, and, more than that, extolled the action of Scipio in many resolutions passed by the senate. But, in my case, I, if you were slain, would have had to contend by force of arms against the consuls, or if you were alive, against both you and them together.</p>
<p>92. Erant eo tempore multa etiam alia metuenda. Ad servos medius fidius res publica venisset; tantum homines impios ex vetere illa coniuratione inustum nefariis mentibus bonorum odium tenebat. Hic tu me etiam gloriari</p>	<p>92. There were many other circumstances also to be feared at that time. The contest, would, in truth, have reached the slaves. So great a hatred of all good men had still got possession of the minds of impious citizens, being burnt as</p>

<p>vetas; negas esse ferenda quae soleam de me praedicare, et homo facetus inducis etiam sermonem urbanum ac venustum, me dicere solere esse me lovem, eundemque dictitare Minervam esse sororem meam. Non tam insolens sum, quod lovem esse me dico, quam ineruditus, quod Minervam sororem Iovis esse existimo; sed tamen ego mihi sororem virginem adscisco, tu sororem tuam virginem esse non sisti. Sed vide ne tu te soleas lovem dicere, quod tu iure eandem sororem et uxorem appellare possis.</p>	<p>it were into their wicked minds by that ancient conspiracy. Here, too, you warn me not to boast. You say that those things are intolerable which I am accustomed to assert concerning myself; and being a witty man, you put on quite a polite and elegant sort of language. You say that I am accustomed to say that I am Jupiter; and also to make a frequent boast that Minerva is my sister. I will not so much defend myself from the charge of insolence in calling myself Jupiter, as from that of ignorance in thinking Minerva the sister of Jupiter. But even if I do say so, I at all events claim a virgin for my sister; but you would not allow your sister to remain a virgin. Consider rather whether you have not a right to call yourself Jupiter, because you have established a right to call the same woman both sister and wife.</p>
<p>93. Et quoniam hoc reprehendis, quod solere me dicas de me ipso gloriosius praedicare, quis umquam audivit cum ego de me nisi coactus ac necessario dicerem? Nam si, cum mihi furta largitiones libidines obiciuntur, ego respondere soleo meis consiliis periculis laboribus patriam esse servatam, non tam sum existimandus de gestis rebus gloriari quam de obiectis confiteri. Sed si mihi ante haec durissima rei publicae tempora nihil umquam aliud obiectum est nisi crudelitas eius unius temporis, cum a patria perniciem depuli, quid? me huic maledicto utrum non respondere an demisse respondere decuit?</p>	<p>93. And since you find fault with me for this, that you assert that I am accustomed to speak too boastfully of myself; I ask, who ever heard me speak in this way, or speak of myself at all, except when I was compelled, and was doing so of necessity? For if, when robberies, and bribery, and lust are imputed to me, I am accustomed to reply that the country was saved by my prudence, and labour, and personal danger, I ought not to be considered as boasting of my own exploits, so much as refusing to confess what is imputed to me. But if, before these most miserable periods of the republic, nothing else was ever imputed to me, except the cruelty of my conduct at that time</p>

	<p>when I warded off destruction from the republic, what will you say? Ought I when accused in this manner, not to have replied at all, or to have replied in an abject tone?</p>
<p>94. Ego vero etiam rei publicae semper interesse putavi me illius pulcherrimi facti, quod ex auctoritate senatus consensu bonorum omnium pro salute patriae gessissem, splendorem verbis dignitatemque retinere, praesertim cum mihi uni in hac re publica audiente populo Romano opera mea hanc urbem et hanc rem publicam esse salvam iurato dicere fas fuisset. Exstinctum est iam illud maledictum crudelitatis, quod me non ut crudelem tyrannum, sed ut mitissimum parentem omnium civium studiis desideratum, repetitum, arcessitum vident.</p>	<p>94. But I have always thought it for the interest of even the republic itself, that I should uphold by my language the propriety and glory of that most noble exploit which I performed by the authority of the senate, with the consent of all virtuous men, for the safety of my country; especially when I am the only person in this republic who have been able to say on oath, in the hearing of the Roman people, that this city and this republic had been saved by my exertions. That accusation of cruelty has long since been extinguished, because men see that I was regretted, and demanded and sent for back by the wishes of all the citizens, not as a cruel tyrant, but as a most merciful parent. Another charge has risen up.</p>
<p>95. Aliud exortum est: obicitur mihi meus ille discessus: cui ego crimini respondere sine mea maxima laude non possum. Quid enim, pontifices, debeo dicere? Peccatine conscientia me profugisse? at id quod mihi crimini dabatur non modo peccatum non erat, sed erat res post natos homines pulcherrima. Iudicium populi pertimuisse? at id nec propositum ullum fuit, et, si fuisset, duplicata gloria discessissem. Bonorum mihi praesidium defuisse? falsum est. Me mortem timuisse? turpe est.</p>	<p>95. That departure of mine from the city is attacked, which accusation I cannot reply to without the greatest credit to myself. For what, O priests, ought I to say? That I lied from a consciousness of guilt? But that which was imputed to me as a crime, not only was not a crime, but was the most glorious action ever performed since the birth of man. That I feared the sentence of the people? But not only was there no trial at any time before the people, but if there</p>

	<p>had been, I should have departed with redoubled glory. That the protection of the good was wanting to me? It is false. That I was afraid of death? That is an assertion disgraceful to those who make it.</p>
<p>96. Dicendum igitur est id, quod non dicerem nisi coactus, --nihil enim umquam de me dixi sublatius adsciscendae laudis causa potius quam criminis depellendi,--dico igitur, et quam possum maxima voce dico: cum omnium perditorum et coniuratorum incitata vis, duce tribuno plebis, consulibus auctoribus, adflicto senatu, perterritis equitibus Romanis, suspensa ac sollicita tota civitate, non tam in me impetum faceret quam per me in omnis bonos, me vidisse, si vicissem, tenuis rei publicae reliquias, si victus essem, nullas futuras. Quod cum iudicassem, deflevi coniugis miserae discidium, liberorum carissimorum solitudinem, fratris absentis amantissimi atque optimi casum, subitas fundatissimae familiae ruinas; sed his omnibus rebus vitam anteposui meorum civium, remque publicam concidere unius discessu quam omnium interitu occidere malui. Speravi, id quod accidit, me iacentem posse vivis viris fortibus excitari; si una cum bonis interissem, nullo modo posse rem publicam recreari.</p>	<p>96. I am therefore compelled to say that which I would not say if I were not compelled. (For I have never said anything at all in the way of extolling myself for the sake of gaining praise, but only with a view to repel an accusation.) I say, therefore, and I say it with the loudest voice I can command, when the inflamed violence of all the profligate citizens and conspirators, a tribune of the people being the leader, the consuls being their instigators, the senate being beaten down, the Roman knights being terrified, the whole city being in suspense and anxiety, was making an attack, not so much on me as, through me, on all good men—I say that I then saw that if I conquered, there would be but little of the republic left, and if I were conquered, none at all. And when I had decided that this would be the case, I lamented indeed my separation from my unhappy wife, the desolate state of my most beloved children, the distress of my most affectionate and excellent brother, who was away, and the sudden ruin of a family which had seemed so thoroughly established; but still I preferred to all these considerations the safety of my fellow-citizens, and I preferred that the republic should rather fall, if fall it must through the departure of one man, than through the slaughter of every one. I hoped (as indeed</p>

	<p>happened) that I, though overthrown, might be raised again by gallant men who were still alive; but I expected that if I perished, involving all virtuous men in my fall, I could not by any possibility be recovered.</p>
<p>97. Accepi, pontifices, magnum atque incredibilem dolorem: non nego, neque istam mihi adscisco sapientiam quam non nulli in me requirebant, qui me animo nimis fracto esse atque adflicto loquebantur. An ego poteram, cum a tot rerum tanta varietate divellerer, quas idcirco praetereo quod ne nunc quidem sine fletu commemorare possum, infitiri me esse hominem et communem naturae sensum repudiare? Tum vero neque illud meum factum laudabile nec beneficium ullum a me in rem publicam profectum dicerem, si quidem ea rei publicae causa reliquissem quibus aequo animo carerem, eamque animi duritiam, sicut corporis, quod cum uritur non sentit, stuporem potius quam virtutem putarem.</p>	<p>97. I felt indeed, O priests, a great and incredible pain; I do not deny it; nor do I pretend to that wisdom which some expected of me, who said that I was too much dispirited and cast down. Could I, when I was torn from such a number and variety of enjoyments, (which I pass over, because even now I cannot speak of them without tears,) deny that I was a human being, and repudiate the common feelings of our nature? But in that case I should neither call that action of mine praise-worthy, nor should I say that any service had been done to the republic by me, if I had only given up, for the sake of the republic, those things which I could bear the loss of with calmness; and that firmness of the mind, resembling that hardness of body, which, even when it is burnt, does not feel it, I should consider insensibility rather than virtue.</p>
<p>98. Suscipere tantos animi dolores, atque ea quae capta urbe accidunt victis stante urbe unum perpeti, et iam se videre distrahi a complexu suorum, disturbari tecta, diripi fortunas, patriae denique causa patriam ipsam amittere, spoliari populi Romani beneficiis amplissimis, praecipitari ex altissimo dignitatis gradu, videre praetextatos inimicos nondum morte complorata arbitria petentis funeris: haec</p>	<p>98. To encounter voluntarily such great grief of mind, and by oneself to endure, while the city is standing, those things which, when a city is taken, befall the conquered citizens; to see oneself torn from the embrace of one's friends, one's houses destroyed, one's property plundered; above all for the sake of one's country, to lose one's country itself to be stripped of the most honourable favours of the</p>

<p>omnia subire conservandorum civium causa, atque id cum dolenter adsis non tam sapiens quam ii qui nihil curant, sed tam amans tuorum ac tui quam communis humanitas postulat, ea laus praeclara atque divina est. Nam qui ea quae numquam cara ac iucunda duxit animo aequo rei publicae causa deserit, nullam benivolentiam insignem in rem publicam declarat; qui autem ea relinquit rei publicae causa a quibus cum summo dolore divellitur, ei cara patria est, cuius salutem caritati anteponit suorum.</p>	<p>Roman people, to be precipitated from the highest rank of dignity, to see one's enemies in their robes of office demanding to conduct one's funeral before one's death has been properly mourned;—to undergo all these troubles for the sake of saving one's fellow-citizens, and this with such feelings that you are miserable while absent, not being as wise as those philosophers who care for nothing, but being as attached to one's relations and to oneself as the common feelings and rights of men require,—that is illustrious and godlike glory. For he who with a calm spirit for the sake of the republic abandons those things which he has never considered dear or delightful is not showing any remarkable good will towards the republic but he who abandons those things for the sake of the republic from which he is not torn without the greatest agony, his country is dear to that man and he prefers her safety to his affection for his own relations.</p>
<p>99. Qua re dirumpatur licet ista furia atque pestis, audiet haec ex me, quoniam laccessivit: bis servavi rem publicam, qui consul togatus armatos vicerim, privatus consulibus armatis cesserim. Vtriusque temporis fructum tuli maximum: superioris, quod ex senatus auctoritate et senatum et omnis bonos meae salutis causa mutata veste vidi, posterioris, quod et senatus et populus Romanus et omnes mortales et privatim et publice iudicarunt sine meo reditu rem publicam salvam esse non posse.</p>	<p>99. Wherefore that fury may burst itself; and it must hear me say these things since it has provoked me—I have twice saved the republic both when as consul in the garb of peace I subdued armed enemies, and when as a private individual I yielded to the consuls in arms. Of each piece of conduct I have reaped the greatest reward—I reaped the reward of my first achievement when I saw the senate and all virtuous men, in pursuance of a resolution of the senate, change their garments for the sake of my safety; and that of my subsequent conduct,</p>

	<p>when the senate, and the Roman people, and all men, whether in a public or a private capacity, decided that without my return the republic would not be safe.</p>
<p>100. Sed hic meus reditus, pontifices, vestro iudicio continetur. Nam si vos me in meis aedibus conlocatis, id quod in omni mea causa semper studiis consiliis auctoritatibus sententiisque fecistis, video me plane ac sentio restitutum; sin mea domus non modo mihi non redditur, sed etiam monumentum praebet inimico doloris mei, sceleris sui, publicae calamitatis, quis erit qui hunc reditum potius quam poenam sempiternam putet? In conspectu prope totius urbis domus est mea, pontifices; in qua si manet illud non monumentum virtutis, sed sepulcrum inimico nomine inscriptum, demigrandum potius aliquo est quam habitandum in ea urbe in qua tropaea de me et de re publica videam constituta.</p>	<p>100. But this return of mine, O priests, depends now on your decision. For if you place me in my house, then I do plainly see and feel that I am restored, which is what all through my cause you have been always labouring to effect by your displays of zeal, by your counsels, and influence, and resolutions; but if, my house is not only not restored to me, but is even allowed to continue to furnish my enemy with a memorial of my distress, of his own wicked triumph, of the public calamity, who is there who will consider this a restoration, and not rather an eternal punishment? Moreover, my house, O priests, is in the sight of the whole city; and if there remains in it that (I will not call it monument of the city, but that) tomb inscribed with the name of my enemy, I had better migrate to some other spot, rather than dwell in that city in which I am to see trophies erected as tokens of victory over me and over the republic.</p>
<p>101. An ego tantam aut animi durtiam habere aut oculorum impudentiam possim ut, cuius urbis servatorem me esse senatus omnium adsensu totiens iudicarit, in ea possim intueri domum meam eversam, non ab inimico meo sed ab hoste communi, et ab eodem exstructam et positam in oculis civitatis, ne umquam conquiescere possit fletus bonorum? Sp. Maeli regnum adpetentis domus</p>	<p>101. Could I have such hardness of mind or such shamelessness of eye, as to be able in that city, the preserver of which the senate has so often unanimously decided that I am, to behold my house thrown down, not by my own private enemy, but by the common foe, and then again built up and placed in the sight of the whole city, that the weeping of the virtuous citizens might know no cessation? The house of</p>

est complanata, et, quia illud 'aequum' accidisse populus Romanus 'Maelio' iudicavit, nomine ipso 'Aequimaeli' iustitia poenae comprobata est. Sp. Cassi domus ob eandem causam est eversa atque in eo loco aedis posita Telluris. In Vacci pratis domus fuit M. Vacci, quae publicata est et eversa ut illius facinus memoria et nomine loci notaretur. M. Manlius cum ab ascensu Capitoli Gallorum impetum reppulisset, non fuit contentus benefici sui gloria; regnum adpetisse est iudicatus; ergo eius domum eversam duobus lucis convestitam videtis. Quam igitur maiores nostri sceleratis ac nefariis civibus maximam poenam constitui posse arbitrati sunt, eandem ego subibo ac sustinebo, ut apud posteros nostros non exstinctor coniurationis et sceleris sed auctor et dux fuisse videar?

Spurius Maelius, who aimed at the kingdom, was razed. What else ensued? The Roman people by the very name of Aequimaelium, which they gave the place, decided that what had happened to Maelius was deserved; the punishment inflicted on his folly was approved. The house of Spurius Cassius was destroyed for the same reason; and on the same spot was built the temple of Tellus. The house of Marcus Vaccus¹ was in Vaccus's meadows, which was confiscated and destroyed in order that his crime might be kept alive in people's recollection by the name of the place. Marcus Manlius, when he had beaten back the attack of the Gauls from the Capitoline steep, was not content with the renown of his good deed; he was adjudged to have aimed at regal power, and on that account you see that his house was pulled down and the place covered with two groves. That therefore which our ancestors considered the greatest penalty which could be inflicted on wicked and infamous citizens, am I to undergo and to endure, so as to appear to posterity not to have been the extinguisher of conspiracy and wickedness, but its author and leader?

102. Hanc vero, pontifices, labem turpitudinis et inconstantiae poterit populi Romani dignitas sustinere, vivo senatu, vobis principibus publici consili, ut domus M. Tulli Ciceronis cum domo Fulvi Flacci ad memoriam poenae publice constitutae coniuncta esse videatur? M. Flaccus quia cum C. Graccho contra salutem rei

102. And will the dignity of the Roman people, O priests, be able to support this stain of infamy and inconsistency, while the senate live, while you are the chief man of the public council, if the house of Marcus Tullius Cicero appears joined with the house of Fulvius Flaccus by the memory of a punishment publicly inflicted?

<p>publicae fecerat ex senatus sententia est interfectus; eius domus eversa et publicata est; in qua porticum post aliquanto Q. Catulus de manubiis Cimbricis fecit. Ista autem fax ac furia patriae cum urbem Pisone et Gabinio ducibus cepisset, occupasset, teneret, uno eodemque tempore et clarissimi viri mortui monumenta debebat et meam domum cum Flacci domo coniungebat, ut, qua poena senatus adfecerat eversorem civitatis, eadem iste oppresso senatu adficeret eum quem patres conscripti custodem patriae iudicassent.</p>	<p>Marcus Flaccus because he had acted with Caius Gracchus in a manner opposed to the safety of the republic, was put to death by the sentence of the senate, and his house was destroyed and confiscated, and on the spot Quintus Catulus some time after erected a portico out of the spoils of the Cimbri. But that firebrand and fury of his country, when, under those great generals Piso and Gabinius, he had taken the city, and occupied, and was in entire possession of it, destroyed the memorials of a most illustrious man who was dead, and united my house with the house of Marcus Flaccus, in order that he, after he had crushed the senate, might inflict on him whom the conscript fathers had pronounced to be the saviour of his country, the same punishment which the senate had inflicted on the destroyer of the constitution.</p>
<p>103. Hanc vero in Palatio atque in pulcherrimo urbis loco porticum esse patiemini, furoris tribunici, sceleris consularis, crudelitatis coniuratorum, calamitatis rei publicae, doloris mei defixum indicium ad memoriam omnium gentium sempiternam? quam porticum, pro amore quem habetis in rem publicam et semper habuistis, non modo sententiis sed, si opus esset, manibus vestris disturbare cuperetis, nisi quem forte illius castissimi sacerdotis superstitiosa dedicatio deterret.</p>	<p>103. But will you allow this portico to stand on the Palatine Hill, and on the most beautiful spot in the whole city, erected as an everlasting token to keep alive the recollection of all nations and of all foes of the frenzy of the tribunes, of the wickedness of the consuls of the cruelty of the conspirators, of the calamity of the republic, and of my sufferings? A portico which, out of the affection which you have and always have had for the republic, you ought to wish to pull down, not only by your votes, but, if it were necessary, even by your hands. Unless, perchance, the religious consecration of it by that chastest of pontiffs deters any one.</p>

104. O rem quam homines soluti ridere non desinant, tristiores autem sine maximo dolore audire non possint! Publiusne Clodius, qui ex pontificis maximi domo religionem eripuit, is in meam intulit? Huncin vos, qui estis antistites caerimoniarum et sacrorum, auctorem habetis et magistrum publicae religionis? O di immortales!--vos enim haec audire cupio--P. Clodius vestra sacra curat, vestrum numen horret, res omnis humanas religione vestra contineri putat? Hic non inludit auctoritati horum omnium qui adsunt summorum virorum, non vestra, pontifices, gravitate abutitur? Ex isto ore religionis verbum excidere aut elabi potest? quam tu eodem ore, accusando senatum quod severe de religione decerneret, impurissime taeterrimeque violasti.

105. Aspicite, pontifices, hominem religiosum et, si vobis videtur, quod est bonorum pontificum, monete eum modum quendam esse religionis: nimium esse superstitiosum non oportere. Quid tibi necesse fuit anili superstitione, homo fanatice, sacrificium quod alienae domi fieret invisere? quae autem te tanta mentis imbecillitas tenuit ut non putares deos satis posse placari nisi etiam muliebribus religionibus te implicuisses? Quem umquam audisti maiorum tuorum, qui et sacra privata

104. O that action, which careless men laugh at, but which graver citizens cannot hear of without the greatest indignation; has Publius Clodius, who removed religion even out of the house of the Pontifex Maximus,¹ introduced it into mine? Do you, you who are the ministers of the religious ceremonies and sacrifices, admit this man to be an originator and regulator of public religion? O ye immortal gods! (for I wish you to hear these things), does Publius Clodius have the management of your sacred rites? Does he feel a reverent awe of your divine power? Is he a man who thinks that all human affairs are regulated by your providence? Is he not mocking the authority of all those eminent men who are here present? Is he not abusing your authority, O priests? Can any expression of religion escape or fall from that mouth? of religion, which with that same mouth you have most foully and shamefully violated, by accusing the senate of passing severe degrees about religion.

105. Behold, behold, O priests, this religious man, and if it seems good to you, (and it is only the duty of virtuous priests,) warn him that there are some fixed limits to religion that a man ought not to be too superstitious. Why was it necessary for you, O fanatical man, with an old woman's superstition, to go to see a sacred ceremony which was being performed at

coluerunt et publicis sacerdotiis praefuerunt, cum sacrificium Bonae Deae fieret interfuisse? neminem, ne illum quidem qui caecus est factus. Ex quo intellegitur multa in vita falso homines opinari, cum ille, qui nihil viderat sciens quod nefas esset, lumina amisit, istius, qui non solum aspectu sed etiam incesto flagitio et stupro caerimonias polluit, poena omnis oculorum ad caecitatem mentis est conversa. Hoc auctore tam casto, tam religioso, tam sancto, tam pio potestis, pontifices, non commoveri, cum suis dicat se manibus domum civis optimi evertisse et eam isdem manibus consecrasset?

another person's house? And how was it that you were possessed with such weakness of mind as to think it not possible for the gods to be sufficiently propitiated, unless you intruded yourself into the religious ceremonies of women? Whom of your ancestors did you ever hear of, of those men who were attentive to their private religious duties, and who presided over the public priesthods, who were present when a sacrifice was being offered to the Bona Dea? No one; not even that great man who became blind: from which it may be easily seen that in this life men form many erroneous opinions; when he, who had not knowingly seen anything which it was impious to see, lost his eyesight; but in the case of that fellow, who has polluted the ceremonies, not only by his presence, but also by his incestuous guilt and, adultery, all the punishment due to his eyes has fallen on the blindness of his mind. Can you, O priests, avoid being influenced by the authority of this man, so chaste, so religious, so holy, so pious a man, when he says that he, with his own hands, pulled down the house of a most virtuous citizen, and with the same hands consecrated it to the gods?

<p>106. Quae tua fuit consecratio? 'Tuleram,' inquit, 'ut mihi liceret.' Quid? non exceperas ut, si quid ius non esset rogari, ne esset rogatum? Ius igitur statuetis esse unius cuiusque vestrum sedis, aras, focos, deos penatis subiectos esse libidini tribuniciae? in quem quisque per homines concitados inruerit, quem impetu perculerit, huius domum non solum adfligere, quod est praesentis insaniae quasi tempestatis repentinae, sed etiam in posterum tempus sempiterna religione obligare?</p>	<p>106. What was that consecration of yours? "I had carried a bill," says he, "to make it lawful for me to act." What? had you not inserted this clause in it, that if there was anything contrary to what was right in the bill, it should be invalid? Will you then, O priests, by your decision, establish the point that it is right that the home of every one of you, and your altars, and your hearths, and your household gods, should be at the mercy of the caprice of the tribunes? that it is right for any one, not only to throw down the house of that man whom he may have chosen to attack with a body of excited men, and may have driven away by violence,—which is an act of present insanity, like the effect of a sudden terror,—but for him to bind that man and property for all future time by the everlasting obligation of religion?</p>
<p>107. Equidem sic accepi, pontifices, in religionibus suscipiendis caput esse interpretari quae voluntas deorum immortalium esse videatur; nec est ulla erga deos pietas nisi sit honesta de numine eorum ac mente opinio, ut expeti nihil ab iis, quod sit iniustum atque inhonestum, iustum aut honestum arbitrare. Hominem invenire ista labes, tum cum omnia tenebat, neminem potuit cui meas aedis addiceret, cui traderet, cui donaret. Ipse cum loci illius, cum aedium cupiditate flagraret ob eamque causam unam funesta illa rogatione sua vir bonus dominum se in meis bonis esse voluisset, tamen illo ipso in furore suo non est ausus meam domum, cuius cupiditate</p>	<p>107. I indeed, O priests, have always understood that in undertaking religious obligations the main thing is to interpret what the intention of the immortal gods appears to be. Nor is piety towards the gods anything but an honourable opinion of their divine power and intentions, while you suppose that nothing is required by them which is unjust or dishonourable. That disgrace to the city could not find one single man, not even when he had everything in his power, to whom he could adjudge, or deliver, or make a present of my house; though he himself was inflamed with a great desire for that spot and for the house, and though, on that account alone, that excellent</p>

<p>inflammatus erat, possidere: deos immortalis existimatis, cuius labore et consilio sua ipsi templa tenuerunt, in eius domum adflictam et eversam per [vim] hominis sceleratissimi nefarium latrocinium immigrare voluisse?</p>	<p>man had brought in that exceedingly just bill of his to make himself master of my property, yet even in the height of his madness he did not dare to take possession of my house, with the desire of which he had been so excited. Do you think that the immortal gods were willing to remove into the house of that man to whose labour and prudence it was owing that they still retained possession of their own temples, dismantled and ruined as it was by the nefarious robbery of a most worthless man?</p>
<p>108. Civis est nemo tanto in populo, extra contaminatam illam et cruentam P. Clodi manum, qui rem ullam de meis bonis attigerit, qui non pro suis opibus in illa tempestate me defenderit. At qui aliqua se contagione praedae, societatis, emptionis contaminaverunt, nullius neque privati neque publici iudici poenam effugere potuerunt. Ex his igitur bonis, ex quibus nemo rem ullam attigit qui non omnium iudicio sceleratissimus haberetur, di immortales domum meam concupiverunt? Ista tua pulchra Libertas deos penatis et familiaris meos lares expulit, ut se ipsa tamquam in captivis sedibus conlocaret?</p>	<p>108. There is not one citizen in this numerous people, out of that polluted and blood-thirsty band of Publius Clodius, who laid hands on a single article of my property, or who did not in that storm defend it as if it had been his own. But they who caught the infection and polluted themselves with any partnership in the plunder, or in the purchase of anything, were not able to escape every sort of condemnation, whether public or private. Of this property then, of which no one touched a single thing without being accounted in every one's opinion one of the wickedest of men, did the immortal gods covet my house? Did that beautiful Liberty of yours turn out my household gods and the eternal divinities of my hearth, in order to be established there herself by you, as if in a conquered country?</p>
<p>109. Quid est sanctius, quid omni religione munitius quam domus unius cuiusque civium? Hic arae sunt, hic foci, hic di penates, hic sacra, religiones, caerimoniae continentur; hoc</p>	<p>109. What is there more holy, what is there more carefully fenced round with every description of religious respect, than the house of every individual citizen? here are his altars,</p>

<p>perfugium est ita sanctum omnibus ut inde abripi neminem fas sit. Quo magis est istius furor ab auribus vestris repellendus qui, quae maiores nostri religionibus tuta nobis et sancta esse voluerunt, ea iste non solum contra religionem labefactavit, sed etiam ipsius religionis nomine evertit.</p>	<p>here are his hearths, here are his household gods: here all his sacred rites, all his religious ceremonies are preserved. This is the asylum of every one, so holy a spot that it is impious to drag any one from it.</p>
<p>110. At quae dea est? Bonam esse oportet, quoniam quidem est abs te dedicata. 'Libertas,' inquit, 'est.' Tu igitur domi meae conlocasti, quam ex urbe tota sustulisti? Tu cum conlegas tuos summa potestate praeditos negares liberos esse, cum in templum Castoris aditus esset apertus nemini, cum hunc clarissimum virum, summo genere natum, summis populi beneficiis usum, pontificem et consularem et singulari bonitate et modestia praeditum, quem satis mirari quibus oculis aspicere audeas non queo, audiente populo Romano a pedisequis conculcari iuberis, cum indemnatum me exturbares privilegiis tyrannicis inrogatis, cum principem orbis terrae virum inclusum domi contineres, cum forum armatis catervis perditorum hominum possideres, Libertatis simulacrum in ea domo conlocabas, quae domus erat ipsa indicium crudelissimi tui dominatus et miserrimae populi Romani servitutis? Eumne potissimum Libertas domo sua debuit pellere, qui nisi fuisset in servorum potestatem civitas tota venisset?</p>	<p>110. And what goddess is she whom you have established there? She ought indeed to be the good goddess; since she has been consecrated by you. "She is Liberty," says he. Have you then established her in my house whom you have driven out of the whole city? Did you, after you had denied that your colleagues,—men invested with the highest power,—were free; after you had closed all access to the temple of Castor against every one; after you had ordered in the hearing of the Roman people, this most illustrious man, of a most noble family, who has received the greatest honours from the Roman people, a priest, and a man of consular rank, a citizen of singular gentleness and modesty of character, (a man of whom I cannot sufficiently wonder how you can dare to look him in the face,) to be kicked and trampled on by your attendants; after you had driven him out of the city without being condemned, having proposed a most tyrannical privilege against him; after you had confined the first man in the whole earth to his house; after you had occupied the forum with armed bands of profligate men;—did you then place the image of Liberty in that house, which was of itself a proof of your most</p>

	<p>cruel tyranny and of the miserable slavery of the Roman people? Was he the man whom Liberty ought, of all men in the world, to have driven from his house, whose existence was the only thing that prevented the whole city from coming under the power of slaves?</p>
<p>111. At unde est ista inventa Libertas? quaesivi enim diligenter. Tanagraea quaedam meretrix fuisse dicitur. Eius non longe a Tanagra simulacrum e marmore in sepulcro positum fuit. Hoc quidam homo nobilis, non alienus ab hoc religioso Libertatis sacerdote, ad ornatum aedilitatis suae deportavit; etenim cogitarat omnis superiores muneris splendore superare. Itaque omnia signa, tabulas, ornamentorum quod superfuit in fanis et locis communibus in tota Graecia atque insulis omnibus honoris populi Romani causa sane frugaliter domum suam deportavit.</p>	<p>111. But from whence was that Liberty brought? for I sought for her diligently. She is said to have been a prostitute at Tanagra. At no great distance from Tanagra a marble image of her was placed on her tomb. A certain man of noble birth, not altogether unconnected with this holy priest of Liberty, carried off this statue to decorate his aedileship. He had in truth cherished the idea of surpassing all his predecessors in the splendour of his appointments. Therefore he brought away to his own house, like a prudent man as he was, all the statues and pictures, all the decorations of any sort, that remained in the temples and public places, out of Greece and out of all the islands, for the sake of doing honour to the Roman people.</p>
<p>112. Is postea quam intellexit posse se interversa aedilitate a L. Pisone consule praetorem renunciari, si modo eadem prima littera competitorem habuisset aliquem, aedilitatem duobus in locis, partim in arca, partim in hortis suis conlocavit: signum de busto meretricis ablatum isti dedit, quod esset signum magis istorum quam publicae libertatis. Hanc deam quisquam violare audeat, imaginem meretricis, ornamentum sepulcri, a fure</p>	<p>112. After he understood that he might give up the aedileship, and still be appointed praetor by Lucius Piso the consul, provided he had any competitor whose name began with the same letter as his own, he stowed away what he had prepared for his aedileship in two places, partly in his strong-box, and partly in his gardens. He gave the statue which he had taken from the prostitute's tomb to that fellow, because it was much more suited to such people as he is than</p>

<p>sublatam, a sacrilego conlocatam? haec me domo mea pellet? haec victrix adflictae civitatis rei publicae spoliis ornabitur? haec erit in eo monumento quod positum est ut esset indicium oppressi senatus ad memoriam sempiternae turpitudinis?</p>	<p>to Public Liberty. Can any one dare to profane this goddess, the statue of a harlot, the ornament of a tomb, carried off by a thief; and consecrated by a sacrilegious infidel? Is it she who is to drive me from my house? Is she the avenger of this afflicted city? Is she to be adorned with the spoils of the republic? Is she to be a part of that monument which has been erected so as to be a token of the oppression of the senate, and to keep alive for ever the recollection of this man's infamy?</p>
<p>113. O Q. Catule!--patremne appellem ante an filium? recentior enim memoria fili est et cum meis rebus gestis coniunctior--tantumne te fefellit, cum mihi summa et cotidie maiora praemia in re publica fore putabas? Negabas fas esse duo consules esse in hac civitate inimicos rei publicae: sunt inventi qui senatum tribuno furenti constrictum traderent, qui pro me patres conscriptos deprecari et populo supplices esse edictis atque imperio vetarent, quibus inspectantibus domus mea disturbaretur, diriperetur, qui denique ambustas fortunarum mearum reliquias suas domos comportari iuberent.</p>	<p>113. O Quintus Catulus! (Shall I appeal rather to the father, or to the son? The memory of the son is fresher, and more closely connected with my exploits.) How greatly were you mistaken when you thought that I should find the greatest possible reward—a reward, too, becoming every day greater in this republic when you said that it was impossible for there to be at the same time in this city two consuls hostile to the republic. Two have been found who gave over the senate bound hand and foot to a frantic tribune; who, by edicts and positive commands, prohibited the conscript fathers from entreating the people and coming to it as suppliants on my behalf; who looked on while my house was being sacked and plundered; who ordered the damaged relics of my property to be carried off to their own houses.</p>
<p>114. Venio nunc ad patrem. Tu, Q. Catule, M. Fulvi domum, cum is fratris tui socer fuisset, monumentum tuarum manubiarum esse voluisti, ut eius qui perniciosa rei publicae</p>	<p>114. I come now to the father. You, O Quintus Catulus, chose the house of Marcus Fulvius, though he was the father-in-law of your own brother, to be the monument of your victories, in</p>

<p>consilia cepisset omnis memoria funditus ex oculis hominum ac mentibus tolleretur. Hoc si quis tibi aedificanti illam porticum diceret, fore tempus cum is tribunus plebis, qui auctoritatem senatus, iudicium bonorum omnium neglexisset, tuum monumentum consulibus non modo inspectantibus verum adiuvantibus disturbaret, everteret, idque cum eius civis qui rem publicam ex senatus auctoritate consul defendisset domo coniungeret, nonne responderes id nisi eversa civitate accidere non posse?</p>	<p>order that every recollection of that man who had embraced designs destructive of the republic should be entirely removed from the eyes and eradicated from the minds of men if, when you were building that portico, any one had said to you that the time would come when that tribune of the people, who had despised the authority of the senate and the opinion of all virtuous men, should injure and overthrow your monument, while the consuls were not looking on only, but even assisting in the work, and should join it to the house of that citizen who as consul had defended the republic in obedience to the authority of the senate; would you not have answered that that could not possibly happen, unless the republic itself was previously overthrown?</p>
<p>115. At videte hominis intolerabilem audaciam cum proiecta quadam et effrenata cupiditate. Monumentum iste umquam aut religionem ullam excogitavit? Habitare laxe et magnifice voluit duasque et magnas et nobilis domos coniungere. Eodem puncto temporis quo meus discessus isti causam caedis eripuit, a Q. Seio contendit ut sibi domum venderet: cum ille id negaret, primo se luminibus eius esse obstructurum minabatur. Adfirmabat Postumus se vivo illam domum istius numquam futuram. Acutus adolescens ex ipsius sermone intellexit quid fieri oporteret; hominem veneno apertissime sustulit; emit domum licitatoribus defatigatis prope dimidio carius quam</p>	<p>115. But remark the intolerable audacity of the man, and at the same time his headlong and unbridled covetousness. That fellow never thought of any monument, or any religion; he wished to dwell splendidly and magnificently, and to unite two large and noble houses. At the same moment that my departure deprived him of all pretence for bloodshed, he was begging Quintus Seius to sell him his house; and when he refused to do so, he threatened that he would block up all his lights. Postumus declared that as long as he was alive that house should never belong to Clodius. That acute young man took the hint from his own mouth, as to what was best for him to do; and in the most open manner he took the man off by poison. He</p>

<p>aestimabatur. Quorsum igitur haec oratio pertinet?</p>	<p>bought the house, after wearying out all the other bidders, for almost half as much again as he thought it really worth. What is my object in making this statement.</p>
<p>116. Domus illa mea prope tota vacua est; vix pars aedium mearum decima ad Catuli porticum accessit. Causa fuit ambulatio et monumentum et ista Tanagraea oppressa libertate Libertas. In Palatio pulcherrimo prospectu porticum cum conclavibus pavimentatam trecentum pedum concupierat, amplissimum peristylum, cetera eius modi facile ut omnium domos et laxitate et dignitate superaret. Et homo religiosus cum aedis meas idem emeret et venderet, tamen illis tantis tenebris non est ausus suum nomen emptioni illi adscribere. Posuit Scatonem illum, hominem sua virtute egentem, ut is qui in Marsis, ubi natus est, tectum quo imbris vitandi causa succederet iam nullum haberet, aedis in Palatio nobilissimas emisse se diceret. Inferiorem aedium partem adsignavit non suae genti Fonteiae, sed Clodiae, quam reliquit, quem in numerum ex multis Clodiis nemo nomen dedit nisi aut egestate aut scelere perditus. Hanc vos, pontifices, tam variam, tam novam in omni genere voluntatem, impudentiam, audaciam, cupiditatem comprobabitis?</p>	<p>116. That house of mine is almost entirely empty; scarcely one-tenth part of my house has been added to Catulus's portico. The pretence was a promenade, and a monument, and that Tanagran lady Liberty, (all Roman liberty having been entirely put down). He had set his heart upon a portico with private chambers, paved to the distance of three hundred feet, with a fine court surrounded by a colonnade, on the Palatine Hill, commanding a superb view, and everything else in character, so as far to surpass all other houses in luxury and splendour. And that scrupulous man, while he was both buying and selling my house at the same moment, still, even in a time of such darkness as that, did not venture to give in his own name as the purchaser. He put up that fellow Scato, a man whose virtue it was, no doubt, that had made him poor; so poor that among the Marsi, where he was born, he had no house in which he could take refuge from the rain and yet he said now that he had purchased the finest house on the Palatine hill. The lower part of the house he assigned not to his own Fonteian family, but to the Clodian family which he had quitted; but of all the numerous family of Clodius, no one applied for any share in his liberality except those who were utterly destitute from indigence and wickedness.</p>

<p>117. 'Pontifex,' inquit, 'adfuit.' Non te pudet, cum apud pontifices res agatur, pontificem dicere et non conlegium pontificum adfuisse, praesertim cum tribunus plebis vel denuntiare potueris vel etiam cogere? Esto, conlegium non adhibuisti: quid? de conlegio quis tandem adfuit? Opus erat enim auctoritate, quae est in his omnibus, sed tamen auget et aetas et honos dignitatem; opus erat etiam scientia, quam si omnes consecuti sunt, tamen certe peritiores vetustas facit.</p>	<p>117. Will you, O priests, sanction this universal and unprecedented tyranny of every sort, this impudence and audacity and covetousness? "Oh," says he, "a priest was present." Are you not ashamed, when the matter is being discussed before the priests, to say that a priest was present, not the college of priests? especially when, as tribune of the people, you had power to summon them and even to compel their attendance. Be it so. You did not call in the whole college. Well. Which of the college was it who was present? For he had vested that authority in one individual which belongs to all of them; however, the age and rank of the man invest him with additional dignity. There was need also of knowledge and although they were all of them learned men, still no doubt age gives them still more experience.</p>
<p>118. Quis ergo adfuit? 'Frater,' inquit, 'uxoris meae.' Si auctoritatem quaerimus, etsi id est aetatis ut nondum consecutus sit, tamen, quanta est in adolescente auctoritas, ea propter tantam coniunctionem adfinitatis minor est putanda; sin autem scientia est quaesita, quis erat minus peritus quam is qui paucis illis diebus in conlegium venerat? qui etiam tibi erat magis obstrictus beneficio recenti, cum se fratrem uxoris tuae fratri tuo germano antelatum videbat. Etsi in eo providisti ne frater te accusare possit. Hanc tu igitur dedicationem appellas, ad quam non conlegium, non honoribus populi Romani ornatum pontificem, non denique adolescentem quemquam~, cum</p>	<p>118. Who then was it who was present? "The brother," says he, "of my wife." If we ask what was his authority, although he is of such an age that he cannot as yet have much, still even such authority as a young man can have is to be considered as diminished in his case, by reason of his near connection with and relationship to you. But if we ask what knowledge he has, who could have less than he who had only come into the college a few days before? And he was the more bound to you by your recent kindness to him, inasmuch as he had seen himself, the brother of your wife, preferred by you to your own brother. Although in that matter you took care that your brother should not be able to</p>

<p>haberes in conlegio familiarissimos, adhibere potuisti? Adfuit is, si modo adfuit, quem tu impulisti, soror rogavit, mater coegit.</p>	<p>accuse you. Do you then call that a dedication, to which you were not able to invite the college of pontiffs, or any single priest distinguished by honours conferred on him by the Roman people nor even any other young man, though you had some most intimate friends in the college? He only was present, if indeed he was present, whom you yourself instigated, whom his sister entreated, and whom his mother compelled to be so.</p>
<p>119. Videte igitur, pontifices, quid statuatis in mea causa de omnium fortunis: verbone pontificis putetis, si is postem tenuerit et aliquid dixerit, domum unius cuiusque consecrari posse, an istae dedicationes et templorum et delubrorum religiones ad honorem deorum immortalium sine ulla civium calamitate a maioribus nostris constitutae sint. Est inventus tribunus plebis qui, consularibus copiis instructus, omni impetu furoris in eum civem inruerit quem perculsum ipsa res publica suis manibus extolleret.</p>	<p>119. Take care now, O priests, what decision you give in this cause of mine, concerning the fortunes of all the citizens. Do you think that the house of every single citizen can be consecrated by the word of a priest, if he takes hold of a door-post and says something or other? But those dedications, and those religious ceremonies respecting temples and shrines, were instituted by our ancestors to do honour to the immortal gods, without inflicting any misfortune on their fellow-citizens. A tribune of the people has been found, who, assisted by the forces of the consuls, has rushed with all the violence of insanity on that citizen, whom, after he had been beaten down, the republic itself raised up again with its own hands.</p>
<p>120. Quid? si qui similis istius --neque enim iam deerunt qui imitari velint--aliquem mei dissimilem, cui res publica non tantum debeat, per vim adflixerit, domum eius per pontificem dedicaverit, id vos ista auctoritate constituetis ratum esse oportere? Dicitis: 'Quem reperiet pontificem?' Quid? pontifex et tribunus plebis</p>	<p>120. What next? Suppose any one like that fellow,—for there will not be wanting men who will be willing to imitate him,—should by violence oppress some one who does not resemble me, to whom the republic does not owe as much as it does to me, and should dedicate his house by the agency of one priest;</p>

<p>idem esse non potest? M. Drusus, ille clarissimus vir, tribunus plebis, pontifex fuit. Ergo si is Q. Caepionis, inimici sui, postem aedium tenuisset et pauca verba fecisset, aedes Caepionis essent dedicatae?</p>	<p>will you determine by your authority that a deed done in that manner ought to stand? Will you say, "What priest will such a man be able to find?" What? Cannot a tribune of the people be himself a priest also at the same time? Marcus Drusus, that most illustrious tribune of the people, was a priest also. Therefore, if he had taken hold of a door-post of the house of Quintus Caepio his enemy, and had uttered a few words, would the house of Caepio have been dedicated to the gods? I say nothing here about the privileges of the priesthood, nor about the language of the dedication itself;</p>
<p>121. Nihil loquor de pontificio iure, nihil de ipsius verbis dedicationis, nihil de religione, caerimoniis; non dissimulo me nescire ea quae, etiam si scirem, dissimularem, ne aliis molestus, vobis etiam curiosus viderer; etsi effluunt multa ex vestra disciplina quae etiam ad nostras aures saepe permanant. Postem teneri in dedicatione oportere videor audisse templi; ibi enim postis est ubi templi aditus et valvae. Ambulationis postis nemo umquam tenuit in dedicando; simulacrum autem aut aram si dedicasti, sine religione loco moveri potest. Sed iam hoc dicere tibi non licebit, quoniam pontificem postem tenuisse dixisti.</p>	<p>121. I say nothing about religion, or religious ceremonies; I do not deny that I am ignorant of those matters, of which I should conceal my knowledge, even if I were acquainted with them, that I might not appear troublesome to others, and over curious to you; although many particulars of your usages do escape, and often reach the ears of the laity. I think, for instance, that I have heard that at the dedication of a temple, a door-post must be taken hold of. For the door-post is there where the entrance to the temple and its folding-door are. But no one ever took hold of the posts of a promenade in dedicating that; but if you have dedicated a statue or an altar, that cannot be moved from its place afterwards without impiety. But you will not be able now to allege this, since you have said that the priest did lay hands on the post. Although, why do I say anything about the dedication? or why do I discuss your right and</p>

	the religious features of the case, contrary to my original intention?
<p>122. Quamquam quid ego de dedicatione loquor, aut quid de vestro iure et religione contra quam proposueram disputo? Ego vero, si omnia sollemnibus verbis, veteribus et traditis institutis acta esse dicerem, tamen me rei publicae iure defenderem. An cum tu, eius civis discessu cuius unius opera senatus atque omnes boni civitatem esse incolumem totiens iudicassent, oppressam taeterrimo latrocinio cum duobus sceleratissimis consulibus rem publicam teneres, domum eius qui patriam a se servatam perire suo nomine noluisset per pontificem aliquem dedicasses, posset recreata res publica sustinere?</p>	<p>122. But, even if I were to allow that everything had been done with the regularities of expression, according to ancient and established usages, I should still defend myself by the common law of the republic. When, after the departure of that citizen, to whose single exertions the senate and all good men had so often decided that the safety of the state was owing, you, with the aid of two most wicked consuls, were keeping down the republic which was groaning under the oppression of your most shameful robberies; when you had dedicated, with the countenance of some obscure priest, the house of that man who was unwilling that the country which had been preserved by him should perish on any pretence connected with him; could the republic when it had recovered itself endure that?</p>
<p>123. Date huic religioni aditum, pontifices: iam nullum fortunis communibus exitum reperietis. An si postem tenuerit pontifex et verba ad religionem deorum immortalium composita ad perniciem civium transtulerit, valebit in iniuria nomen sanctissimum religionis: si tribunus plebis verbis non minus priscis et aequae sollemnibus bona cuiuspiam consecrarit, non valebit? Atqui C. Atinius patrum memoria bona Q. Metelli, qui eum ex senatu censor eiecerat, avi tui, Q. Metelle, et tui, P. Servili, et proavi tui, P. Scipio, consecravit foculo posito in rostris adhibitoque tibicine. Quid tum? num ille furor</p>	<p>123. Once, O priests, give an opening for such religious acts as this, and you will very soon find no escape at all for any one's property. If a priest has laid his hand on a door-post, and has transferred expressions intended for the honour of the immortal gods to the injury of the citizens, will the holy name of religion avail to procure the ratification of such an injury, and yet will it not avail if a tribune of the people consecrates the goods of any citizen with a form of words no less ancient and almost equally solemn? But Caius Atinius, within the recollection of our fathers, consecrated the property of Quintus Metellus,</p>

<p>tribuni plebis ductus ex non nullis perveterum temporum exemplis fraudi Metello fuit, summo illi et clarissimo viro?</p>	<p>who, as censor, had expelled him from the senate (your grandfather, O Quintus Metellus, and yours, O Publius Servilius, and your great-grandfather, O Publius Scipio;) placing a little brazier on the rostra and summoning a flute-player to assist him. What then? Did that frenzy of a tribune of the people, derived from some precedents of extreme antiquity, do any injury to Quintus Metellus, that great and most illustrious man?</p>
<p>124. Certe non fuit. Vidimus hoc idem Cn. Lentulo censori tribunum plebis facere: num qua igitur is bona Lentuli religione obligavit? Sed quid ego ceteros? Tu, tu, inquam, capite velato, contione advocata, foculo posito bona tui Gabini, cui regna omnia Syrorum Arabum Persarumque donaras, consecrasti. Quod si tum nihil est actum, quid in meis bonis agi potuit? sin est ratum, cur ille gurgis, helluatus tecum simul rei publicae sanguine, ad caelum tamen extruit villam in Tusculano visceribus aerari, mihi meas ruinas, quarum ego similem totam urbem esse passus non sum, aspicere non licuit?</p>	<p>124. Certainly not. We have seen a tribune of the people do the same thing to Cnaeus Lentulus the censor. Did he then at all bind the property of Lentulus to any peculiar sanctity? But why should I speak of other men? You yourself; I say, with your head veiled, having summoned an assembly, having placed a brazier on the spot, consecrated the property of your dear friend Gabinius, to whom you had given all the kingdoms of the Syrians, and Arabians, and Persians. But if nothing was really effected at that time, why should my property be affected by the same measures? if, on the other hand, that consecration was valid, why did that abyss of a man, who had swallowed up with you all the blood of the republic, raise a villa as high as the heavens on my Tusculan estate, out of the funds of the public treasury? And why have I not been allowed to look upon the ruins of my property,—I, who am the only person who prevented the whole city from being in a similar condition?</p>

<p>125. Omitto Gabinium; quid? exemplo tuo bona tua nonne L. Ninnius, vir omnium fortissimus atque optimus, consecravit? Quod si, quia ad te pertinet, ratum esse negas oportere, ea iura constituisti in praeclaro tribunatu tuo quibus in te conversis recusares, alios everteres; sin ista consecratio legitima est, quid est quod profanum in tuis bonis esse possit? An consecratio nullum habet ius, dedicatio est religiosa? Quid ergo illa tua tum obtestatio tibicinis, quid focus, quid preces, quid prisca valuerunt? ementiri, fallere, abuti deorum immortalium numine ad hominum timorem quid voluisti? Nam si est illud ratum--mitto Gabinium--tua domus certe et quicquid habes aliud Cereri est consecratum; sin ille ludus fuit, quid te impurius, qui religiones omnis pollueris aut ementiundo aut stuprando?</p>	<p>125. I say nothing about Gabinius. Why? Did not Lucius Munius,¹ the most fearless and most excellent of all men, consecrate your property by your own precedent? And if, because you yourself are concerned, you say that that action ought not to be ratified, did you in that splendid tribuneship of yours establish laws which, the moment that they were turned against yourself, you repudiated, though you made use of them to ruin other people? If that consecration be legal, then what is there in your property which can be applied to other than holy uses? Or has a consecration no power, while a dedication draws with it the sanctions of religion? What then was the meaning of your summoning that flute-player to be a witness? What was the object of your brazier? What became of your prayers? What was the meaning of all your old-fashioned expressions? Did you wish to lie, to deceive, to abuse the divine reverence due to the immortal gods, in order to strike terror into men? For if that act is once ratified—I say nothing about Gabinius,—most certainly your house and whatever else you have is consecrated to Ceres. But if that was a joke of yours, what can be more impure than you who have polluted every sort of religion by lies and adulteries?</p>
<p>126. 'Iam fateor,' inquit, 'me in Gabinio nefarium fuisse.' Quippe vides poenam illam a te in alium institutam in te ipsum esse conversam. Sed, homo omnium scelerum flagitiorumque documentum, quod in Gabinio fateris, cuius</p>	<p>126. "Well, I confess," says he, "that in the case of Gabinius I did behave wickedly." You see now that the punishment which was established by you with reference to another has been turned against yourself. But, O man, O you who</p>

<p>impudicitiam pueritiae, libidines adolescentiae, dedecus et egestatem reliquae vitae, latrocinium consulatus vidimus, cui ne ista quidem ipsa calamitas iniuria potuit accidere, id in me infirmas, et gravius esse dicis quod uno adolescente quam quod contione tota teste fecisti?</p>	<p>are the very model of every possible crime and wickedness, do you deny with respect to me that which you admit in the case of Gabinius,—a man the immodesty of whose childhood, the lust of whose youth, the disgrace and indigence of whose subsequent life, the open robberies of whose consulship, we have seen,—a man to whom even calamity itself could not happen undeservedly? Did do you? that that was a more solemn act which you performed with one young man alone for your witness, than it would have been if you had had the whole assembly in that character? “Oh,” says he, “a dedication is an act which carries the greatest possible quantity of sanctity with it.”</p>
<p>127. 'Dedicatio magnam,' inquit, 'habet religionem.' Nonne vobis Numa Pompilius videtur loqui? Discite orationem, pontifices, et vos, flamines; etiam tu, rex, disce a gentili tuo, quamquam ille gentem istam reliquit, sed tamen disce ab homine religionibus dedito ius totum omnium religionum. Quid? in dedicatione nonne et quis dedicet et quid et quo modo quaeritur? An tu haec ita confundis et perturbas ut, quicumque velit, quod velit quo modo velit possit dedicare? Quis eras tu qui dedicabas? Quo iure? qua lege? quo exemplo? qua potestate? Vbi te isti rei populus Romanus praefecerat? Video enim esse legem veterem tribuniciam quae vetet iniussu plebis aedis, terram, aram consecrari; neque tum hoc ille Q. Papirius, qui hanc legem rogavit, sensit, neque suspicatus est fore periculum ne domicilia aut</p>	<p>127. Does not Numa Pompilius appear to be speaking to you? Learn his speech by heart, O priests, and flamens. Do you too, O king of the sacrifices, learn of the man of your own family; although, indeed, he has quitted that family; but still learn from a man entirely devoted to religious observances, and just, and deeply skilled in all questions of religion. What? in the case of a dedication do not people inquire who says such and such a thing, and what he says, and how? Do you so confuse and mix up these matters, that whoever chooses can dedicate whatever he chooses, and in whatever manner he chooses? Who were you who performed the dedication? By what right did you do so? By what law? According to what precedent? By what power? When and where had the Roman people appointed you to manage that business?</p>

<p>possessiones indemnatorum civium consecrarentur. Neque enim id fieri fas erat, neque quisquam fecerat, neque erat causa cur prohibendo non tam deterrere videretur quam admonere.</p>	<p>For I see that there is an old tribunitian law, which forbids any one to consecrate any house, land, or altar, without the order of the Roman people. Quintus Papirius, who proposed this law, did not perceive nor suspect that there would be danger lest hereafter the houses or possessions of citizens who had not been condemned might be consecrated. For that could not lawfully be done; nor had any one ever done such a thing; nor was there any reason why a prohibition should be issued, the effect of which appeared likely to be not so much to deter people from an action as to remind them of it.</p>
<p>128. Sed quia consecrabantur aedes, non privatorum domicilia, sed quae sacrae nominantur, consecrabantur agri, non ita ut nostra praedia, si qui vellet, sed ut imperator agros de hostibus captos consecraret, statuebantur arae, quae religionem adferrent ipsi ei loco quo essent consecratae, haec nisi plebs iussisset fieri vetuit. Quae si tu interpretaris de nostris aedibus atque agris scripta esse, non repugno; sed quaero quae lex lata sit ut tu aedis meas consecrares, ubi tibi haec potestas data sit, quo iure feceris. Neque ego nunc de religione sed de bonis omnium nostrum, nec de pontificio sed de iure publico disputo. Lex Papiria vetat aedis iniussu plebis consecrari. Sit sane hoc de nostris aedibus ac non de publicis templis: unum ostende verbum consecrationis in ipsa tua lege, si illa lex est ac non vox sceleris et crudelitatis tuae.</p>	<p>128. But because buildings were consecrated,—I do not mean the licenses of private persons, but those which are called sacred buildings,—and because lands were consecrated, not in such a way that any one who chose might consecrate our farms, but that a general might consecrate lands taken from the enemy; and because altars were erected, which carried with them a degree of sanctity to the place in which they were consecrated; he forbade all these things to be done unless the people ordered them. And if your interpretation of these edicts be that they were framed with reference to our houses and lands, I make no objection. But I ask, what law was passed that you should consecrate my house? where this power was given to you? and by what right you did it? And I am not now arguing about religion,</p>

	but about the property of all of us; nor about the sacerdotal law, but about the common law.
<p>129. Quod si tibi tum in illo rei publicae naufragio omnia in mentem venire potuissent, aut si tuus scriptor in illo incendio civitatis non syngraphas cum Byzantiis exsulibus et cum legatis Brogitari faceret, sed vacuo animo tibi ista non scita sed portenta conscriberet, esses omnia, si minus re, at verbis legitimis consecutus. Sed uno tempore cautiones fiebant pecuniarum, foedera feriebantur provinciarum, regum appellationes venales erant, servorum omnium vicatim celebrabatur tota urbe discriptio, inimici in gratiam reconciliabantur, imperia scribebantur nova iuventuti, Q. Seio venenum misero parabatur, de Cn. Pompeio, propugnatore et custode imperi, interficiendo consilia inibantur, senatus ne quid esset, ut lugerent semper boni, ut capta res publica consulum prodicione vi tribunicia teneretur. Haec cum tot tantaque agerentur, non mirum est, praesertim in furore animi et caecitate, multa illum et te fefellisse.</p>	<p>129. But if then, at the time of that shipwreck of the republic, everything necessary had occurred to you, or if the man who drew that law for you at the time of that general conflagration of the state had not been making contracts with the Byzantine exiles and with the royal ambassadors, but had his mind at leisure to attend to (what I will not call the ordinances, but) the monstrous papers which he was drawing, then you would have done what you wanted, if not in fact at all events as far as regular legal language went. But at one and the same time bonds for money were being drawn, treaties with provinces were being entered into, titles of kings were being put up for sale, the numbering of all the slaves was going on over the whole city street by street enemies were being reconciled, new commands were being given to the Roman youth, poison was being prepared for that unhappy Quintus Seius, designs were being formed for assassinating Cnaeus Pompeius, the bulwark and protector of the empire, and to prevent the senate from having any power, and to cause the good to mourn for ever, and to reduce the captive republic, by the treachery of the consuls, to a state of subjection to the violence of the tribunes. When such numerous and such important designs were all on foot, it is no wonder, especially while you were both in such a state of frenzy and</p>

	blindness, that many things escaped both his notice and yours.
<p>130. At videte quanta sit vis huius Papiriae legis in re tali, non qualem tu adfers sceleris plenam et furoris. Q. Marcius censor signum Concordiae fecerat idque in publico conlocarat. Hoc signum C. Cassius censor cum in curiam transtulisset, conlegium vestrum consuluit num quid esse causae videretur quin id signum curiamque Concordiae dedicaret. Quaeso, pontifices, et hominem cum homine et tempus cum tempore et rem cum re comparete. Ille erat summa modestia et gravitate censor: hic tribunus plebis scelere et audacia singulari. Tempus illud erat tranquillum et in libertate populi et gubernatione positum senatus: tuum porro tempus libertate populi Romani oppressa, senatus auctoritate deleta.</p>	<p>130. But take notice now, what the effect of this Papirian law is in such a case as this; not such a case as you bring forward, full of wickedness and frenzy. Quintus Marcius the censor had made a statue of Concord, and had erected it in a public place. When Caius Cassius the censor had transported it into the senate-house, he consulted your college, and asked whether there was any reason why he should not dedicate that statue and the senate-house to Concord.</p>
<p>131. Res illa plena iustitiae, sapientiae, dignitatis (censor enim, penes quem maiores nostri, id quod tu sustulisti, iudicium senatus de dignitate esse voluerunt, Concordiae signum volebat in curia curiamque ei deae dedicare), praeclara voluntas atque omni laude digna; praescribere enim se arbitrabatur ut sine studiis dissensionis sententiae dicerentur, si sedem ipsam ac templum publici consili religione Concordiae devinxisset. Tu cum ferro, cum metu, cum edictis, cum privilegiis, cum praesentibus copiis perditorum, absentis exercitus terrore et minis, consulum societate et nefario foedere servitute oppressam civitatem teneres, Libertatis signum posuisti magis ad</p>	<p>131. The proposed measure was one full of justice, wisdom, and dignity. For the censor, to whose power (though you have abolished that) our ancestors chose to commit the decision respecting the dignity of each member of the senate, wished the statue of Concord to be in the senate-house, and wished also to dedicate the senate-house to that goddess. It was a noble intention, and one worthy of all praise. For he thought that by that measure he was enjoining that opinions should be delivered without party spirit or dissension, if he bound the place itself and the temple of public counsel by the religions reverence due to the goddess Concord. You, when you were keeping down</p>

<p>ludibrium impudentiae quam ad simulationem religionis. Ille in curia quae poterat sine cuiusquam incommodo dedicari, tu in civis optime de re publica meriti cruore ac paene ossibus simulacrum non libertatis publicae, sed licentiae conlocasti.</p>	<p>the enslaved and oppressed city by the sword, by fear, by edicts, by privileges, by bands of abandoned men constantly present, and by the fear of the army which was absent and by threats of bringing it up, and by the assistance of the consuls, and by your nefarious agreement with them, erected a statue of Liberty in a mocking and shameless spirit, rather than with even any pretence to religion. He was dedicating a thing in the senate-house, which he was able to dedicate without any inconvenience to any one. You have erected an image not of public Liberty, but of licentiousness, on what I may call the blood and bones of that citizen who of all others has deserved best of the republic.</p>
<p>132. Atque ille tamen ad conlegium rettulit, tu ad quem rettulisti? Si quid deliberares, si quid tibi aut piandum aut instituendum fuisset religione domestica, tamen instituto ceterorum vetere ad pontificem detulisses: novum delubrum cum in urbis clarissimo loco nefando quodam atque inaudito instituto inchoares, referendum ad sacerdotes publicos non putasti? At si conlegium pontificum adhibendum non videbatur, nemone horum tibi idoneus visus est, qui aetate honore auctoritate antecellunt, cum quo dedicatione communicares? Quorum quidem tu non contempsisti sed pertimuisti dignitatem. An tu auderes quaerere ex P. Servilio aut ex M. Lucullo, quorum ego consilio atque auctoritate rem publicam consul ex vestris manibus ac faucibus eripui, quibusnam</p>	<p>132. And moreover he referred his design to the sacred college: to whom did you refer yours? If you deliberated at all, if you had anything which you wished to expiate, or any domestic sacrifice which you desired to institute, still according to the ancient practice of other men you should have referred the matter to the priests. When you were beginning a new temple in the most beautiful spot in the city, with some wicked and unheard of object, did you not think that you ought to refer the matter to the public priests? But if you did not think it desirable to consult the whole college of priests, was there no single one of them who seemed to you a suitable man (of those who are eminent among all the citizens for age and honour and authority) for you to communicate your intention</p>

<p>verbis aut quo ritu-- primum hoc dico--civis domum consecraret, deinde civis eius cui princeps senatus, tum autem ordines omnes, deinde Italia tota, post cunctae gentes testimonium huius urbis atque imperi conservati dedissent?</p>	<p>about the dedication to him? The truth was, not that you despised, but that you were afraid of their dignity.</p>
<p>133. Quid diceret, o nefanda et perniciose labes civitatis? 'Ades, Luculle, ades Servili, dum dedico domum Ciceronis, ut mihi praeestis postemque teneatis!' Es tu quidem cum audacia tum impudentia singulari, sed tibi tamen oculi, vultus, verba cecidissent, cum te viri, qui sua dignitate personam populi Romani atque auctoritatem imperi sustinerent, verbis gravissimis proterruissent, neque sibi fas esse dixissent furori interesse tuo atque in patriae parricidio exsultare.</p>	<p>133. "Come forward, come forward, Lucullus, Servilius, while I dedicate the house of Cicero. Come, stand before me, and take hold of the door-post." You are, in truth, a man of extraordinary audacity and impudence, but still your eyes, and countenance, and voice would have failed you while those men who, by their dignity, upheld the character of the Roman people and the authority of the empire, were striking terror into you by their dignified language, and saying that it would be impious for them to be present at your frantic deeds, and at such wicked and parricidal attacks on the country.</p>
<p>134. Quae cum videres, tum te ad tuum adfinem non delectum a te, sed relictum a ceteris contulisti. Quem ego tamen credo, si est ortus ab illis quos memoriae proditum est ab ipso Hercule perfuncto iam laboribus sacra didicisse, in viri fortis aerumnis non ita crudelem fuisse ut in vivi etiam et spirantis capite bustum suis manibus imponeret; qui aut nihil dixit nec fecit omnino, poenamque hanc maternae temeritatis tulit ut mutam in delicto personam nomenque praeberet, aut, si dixit aliquid verbis haesitantibus postemque tremebunda manu tetigit, certe nihil rite, nihil caste, nihil more</p>	<p>134. And when you saw this, then you betook yourself to your kinsman,—not that he was selected by you, but that he was left you by the rest. And yet I believe that he,—if he is really descended from those men who, it is traditionally reported, learnt their sacred ceremonies from Hercules himself; after he had completed his labours,—would not have been so cruel with respect to the distress of a brave man, as with his own hands to place a tomb on the head of a man still living and breathing; as he either actually said and did nothing at all, and bore this as a punishment for the rashness of</p>

<p>institutoque perfecit. Viderat ille Murenam, vitricum suum, consulem designatum, ad me consulem cum Allobrogibus communis exiti indicia adferre, audierat ex illo se a me bis salutem accepisse, separatim semel, iterum cum universis.</p>	<p>his mother, that he lent his presence though mute, and his name to this sin; or, if he did say anything in a few faltering words, and if he did touch the door-post with trembling hand, at all events he did nothing regularly or solemnly, nothing according to proper usages or established forms. He had seen Murena, his stepfather, the consul elect in company with the Allobroges, bring to me when I was consul the proofs of the conspiracy for the general destruction. He had heard from him that he had twice received safety from me, once as an individual, and a second time in common with the whole body of citizens.</p>
<p>135. Qua re quis est qui existimare possit huic novo pontifici, primam hanc post sacerdotium initum religionem instituenti vocemque mittenti, non et linguam obmutuisse et manum obtorpuisse et mentem debilitatam metu concidisse, praesertim cum ex conlegio tanto non regem, non flaminem, non pontificem videret, fierique particeps invitus alieni sceleris cogeretur, et gravissimas poenas adfinitatis impurissimae sustineret?</p>	<p>135. Who is there, then, who can think that this new priest, performing this his first religious ceremony, and uttering these his first official words since his admission to the priesthood, would not have felt his tongue grow mute, and his hand grow torpid, and his mind become weakened and fail through fear; especially when out of all that numerous college he saw neither king, nor flamen, nor priest and was compelled against his will to become a partner in another's wickedness, and was enduring the most terrible punishment of his most disgraceful relationship?</p>
<p>136. Sed ut revertar ad ius publicum dedicandi, quod ipsi pontifices semper non solum ad suas caerimonias sed etiam ad populi iussa adcommodaverunt, habetis in commentariis vestris C. Cassium censorem de signo Concordiae dedicando ad pontificum conlegium</p>	<p>136. But to return to the question of the vindication of the public rights, which the priests themselves have always adapted not only to their own ceremonies, but also to the commands of the people. You have a statement in your records, that Caius Cassius the censor</p>

<p>rettulisse, eique M. Aemilium pontificem maximum pro conlegio respondisse, nisi eum populus Romanus nominatim praefecisset atque eius iussu faceret, non videri eam posse recte dedicari. Quid? cum Licinia, virgo Vestalis summo loco nata, sanctissimo sacerdotio praedita, T. Flaminio Q. Metello consulibus aram et aediculam et pulvinar sub Saxo dedicasset, nonne eam rem ex auctoritate senatus ad hoc conlegium Sex. Iulius praetor rettulit? cum P. Scaevola pontifex maximus pro conlegio respondit, Qvod in loco pvblico Licinia, Gai filia, inivssv popvli dedicasset, sacrvm non viderier. Quam quidem rem quanta severitate quantaque diligentia senatus, ex ipso senatus consulto facile cognoscetis.</p>	<p>consulted the pontifical college about dedicating the statue of Concord, and that Marcus Aemilius, the Pontifex Maximus, answered him on behalf of the college, that unless the Roman people had appointed him by name to superintend that business, it did not appear to them that the statue could properly be consecrated. What more? When Licinia,—a vestal virgin, a woman of the highest rank, and invested with the most holy of all priesthoods,—in the consulship of Titus Flamininus and Quintus Metellus, had dedicated an altar, and a little chapel, and a cushion at the foot of the sacred rock; did not Sextus Julius the praetor refer that matter to this college, in obedience to the authority of the senate? when Publius Scaevola, the Pontifex Maximus, answered on behalf of the college, “that what Licinia, the daughter of Caius, had dedicated in a public place without the authority of the people, did not appear to be holy.” And with what impartiality and with what diligence the senate annulled that act, you will easily see from the words of the resolution of the senate. Read the resolution of the senate. [The resolution of the senate is read.]</p>
<p>137. Videtisne praetori urbano negotium datum ut curaret ne id sacrum esset, et ut, si quae essent incisae aut inscriptae litterae, tollerentur? O tempora, o mores! Tum censorem, hominem sanctissimum, simulacrum Concordiae dedicare pontifices in templo inaugurato prohibuerunt, post autem senatus in</p>	<p>137. Do not you see that a commission is given to the praetor of the city, to take care that that which she had consecrated should not be accounted holy? and that, if any letters had been engraved or inscribed upon it, they should be removed? Shame on the times, and on their principles! Then the priests forbade the censor,</p>

loco augusto consecratam iam aram tollendam ex auctoritate pontificum censuit neque ullum est passus ex ea dedicatione litterarum exstare monumentum: tu, procella patriae, turbo ac tempestas pacis atque oti, quod in naufragio rei publicae, tenebris offusis, demerso populo Romano, everso atque eiecto senatu dirueris, aedificaris, religione omni violata religionis tamen nomine contaminaris, in visceribus eius qui urbem suis laboribus ac periculis conservasset monumentum deletae rei publicae conlocaris, ~ab aequitum nota doloris bonorum omnium sublato Q. Catuli nomine incideris, id sperasti rem publicam diutius quam quoad mecum simul expulsa careret his moenibus esse laturam?

a most holy man, to dedicate it statue to Concord in a temple which had not been duly consecrated. And after that the senate voted that that altar, which had been consecrated on a most venerable spot, should be taken down in obedience to the authority of the priests, and did not permit any memorial of writing to exist as a relic of that dedication. You, O storm ravaging your country,—you whirlwind and tempest dispelling peace and tranquillity,—did you hope that the republic would endure what you (in the shipwreck of the state, when darkness was spread over the republic, when the Roman people was overwhelmed, when the senate was overturned and expelled,) pulled down and built up? what you, after having violated every feeling of religion, still polluted under the name of religion? that it would endure the monument of the destruction of the republic which you erected in the house of this citizen who is now speaking, and in the city which he had preserved by his own exertions and dangers, to the disgrace of the knights and the grief of all virtuous men; that it would endure the inscription which you had placed there after having erased the name of Quintus Catulus, one moment longer than the time that it was absent from these walls, from which it had been driven at the same time that I myself was? But if, O priests, you decide that no man who had a right to do so by law performed this dedication, and that nothing was dedicated which lawfully might be; then why need I prove that third point

	<p>which I originally proposed to establish; namely, that he did not dedicate it with those forms and words which such ceremonies require?</p>
<p>138. Ac si, pontifices, neque is cui licuit, neque id quod fas fuit dedicavit, quid me attinet iam illud tertium quod proposueram docere, non iis institutis ac verbis quibus caerimoniae postulant dedicasse? Dixi a principio nihil me de scientia vestra, nihil de sacris, nihil de abscondito pontificum iure dicturum. Quae sunt adhuc a me de iure dedicandi disputata, non sunt quaesita ex occulto aliquo genere litterarum, sed sumpta de medio, ex rebus palam per magistratus actis ad conlegiumque delatis, ex senatus consulto, ex lege. Illa interiora iam vestra sunt, quid dici, quid praeiri, quid tangi, quid teneri ius fuerit.</p>	<p>138. I said at the beginning, that I was not going to say anything about your peculiar science; nor about the sacrifices, nor about the recondite laws of the priests. The arguments which I have hitherto advanced about the right of dedication, have not been drawn from any secret description of books, but are taken from common sources, from things openly done by the magistrates and referred to the sacred college, from resolutions of the senate, and from the law. Those inner mysteries, what ought to be said, or enjoined, or touched, or taken hold of are still your own.</p>
<p>139. Quae si omnia e Ti. Coruncani scientia, qui peritissimus pontifex fuisse dicitur, acta esse constaret, aut si M. Horatius ille Pulvillus, qui, cum eum multi propter invidiam fictis religionibus impedirent, restitit et constantissima mente Capitolium dedicavit, huius modi alicui dedicationi praefuisset, tamen in scelere religio non valeret, ne valeat id quod imperitus adulescens, novus sacerdos, sororis precibus, matris minis adductus, ignarus, invitus, sine conlegis, sine libris, sine auctore, sine fictore, furtim, mente ac lingua titubante fecisse dicatur: praesertim cum iste impurus atque impius hostis omnium religionum, qui contra fas et inter viros saepe mulier et inter mulieres vir fuisset, ageret illam rem ita raptim</p>	<p>139. But if it were proved that all these things had been done in a manner equal to the knowledge of Coruncanius, who is said to have been the most experienced of priests; or if that great man Marcus Horatius Pulvillus, who when many men out of envy endeavoured to hinder his dedication by false pretences about religion, resisted them, and with the greatest firmness dedicated the Capitol, had himself presided at such a dedication as this, still I say that accuracy of religious observance would not hallow a wicked act; much less can that act have any validity which an unskillful young man, a new priest, influenced by the prayers of his sister and the threats of his mother, ignorant and unwilling, without colleagues, without books, without any adviser or assistant,¹ is said</p>

<p>et turbulente uti neque mens neque vox neque lingua consisteret?</p>	<p>to have performed by stealth, with trembling heart and faltering tongue; especially when that impure and impious enemy of all religion, who in defiance of all that is right or holy had often been as a woman among men, and a man among women, completed the business in so hurried and disorderly a manner, that neither his senses, nor his voice, nor his language, had any consistency in them.</p>
<p>140. Delata tum sunt ea ad vos, pontifices, et post omnium sermone celebrata, quem ad modum iste praeposteris verbis, ominibus obscenis, identidem se ipse revocans, dubitans, timens, haesitans omnia aliter ac vos in monumentis habetis et pronuntiarit et fecerit. Quod quidem minime mirum est, in tanto scelere tantaque dementia ne audaciae quidem locum ad timorem comprimendum fuisse. Etenim si nemo umquam praedo tam barbarus atque immanis fuit, qui cum fana spoliasset, deinde aram aliquam in litore deserto somniis stimulatus aut religione aliqua consecraret, non horreret animo cum divinum numen scelere violatum placare precibus cogeretur, qua tandem istum perturbatione mentis omnium templorum atque tectorum totiusque urbis praedonem fuisse censetis, cum pro detestatione tot scelerum unam aram nefarie consecraret?</p>	<p>140. It was then reported to you, O priests, and after that it became a common topic of conversation, how he, with preposterous language with ill-omened auspices, at times interrupting himself, doubting, fearing, hesitating, pronounced and did everything in a manner wholly different from that which you have recorded as proper in your books. It is, indeed, not very strange that in doing an act of such wickedness and such insanity, even his audacity could not wholly repress his fear. In truth, if no robber was ever so savage and inhuman, as, when he had plundered temples, and then, having been excited by dreams or some superstitious feelings, consecrated some altar on a desert shore, not to shudder in his mind when compelled to propitiate with his prayers the deity whom he has insulted by his wickedness; what do you suppose must have been the agitation of mind of that plunderer of every temple, and of every house, and of the whole city, when he was consecrating one single altar to avert the vengeance due to his numberless acts of wickedness?</p>

141. Non potuit ullo modo--quamquam et insolentia dominatus extulerat animos et erat incredibili armatus audacia--non in agendo ruere ac saepe peccare, praesertim illo pontifice et magistro qui cogeretur docere ante quam ipse didicisset. Magna vis est cum in deorum immortalium numine tum vero in ipsa re publica. Di immortales, suorum templorum custodem ac praesidem sceleratissime pulsum cum viderent, ex suis templis in eius aedis immigrare nolebant, itaque istius vaecordissimi mentem cura metuque terrebant; res vero publica quamquam erat exterminata mecum, tamen observabatur ante oculos exstinctoris sui, et ab istius inflammato atque indomito furore iam tum se meque repetebat. Qua re quid est mirum si iste metu, furore instinctus, scelere praeceps, neque institutas caerimonias persequi neque verbum ullum sollemne potuit effari?

142. Quae cum ita sint, pontifices, revoke iam animos vestros ab hac subtili nostra disputatione ad universam rem publicam, quam antea cum viris fortibus multis, in hac vero causa solis vestris cervicibus sustinetis. Vobis universi senatus perpetua auctoritas, cui vosmet ipsi praestantissime semper in mea

141. He could not possibly (although the insolence of power had elated his mind, and although he was armed by nature with incredible audacity) fail to blunder in his proceedings, or to keep constantly making mistakes, especially when he had a priest and teacher who was compelled to teach before he had learnt himself. There is great power, not only in the divinity of the immortal gods, but also in the republic itself. When the immortal gods saw the guardian and protector of their temples driven away in a most wicked manner, they were unwilling to quit their temples and to remove into his house. Therefore they alarmed the mind of that most insensible man with fear and anxiety. But the republic, although that was banished at the same time with myself, was still constantly present to the eyes of its destroyer, and from his excited and kindled frenzy was constantly demanding my restoration and its own. What marvel then is it, if he, urged on by the insanity of fear and drawn on headlong by wickedness, was neither able properly to perform the ceremonies which he had begun, nor to utter one single word in due order with proper solemnity?

142. And as this is the case, O priests, recall now your attention from this subtle argument of ours to the general state and interests of the republic, which you have before now had many gallant men to assist you in supporting, but which in this cause you are upholding on your own shoulders alone. To you the whole future

<p>causa praeuistis, vobis Italiae magnificentissimus ille motus municipiorumque concursus, vobis campus centuriarumque una vox omnium, quarum vos principes atque auctores fuistis, vobis omnes societates, omnes ordines, omnes qui aut re aut spe denique sunt bona, omne suum erga meam dignitatem studium et iudicium non modo commissum verum etiam commendatum esse arbitrabuntur.</p>	<p>authority of the senate, which you yourselves always led in a most admirable manner during the discussion of my case; to you that most glorious agitation of Italy, and that thronging hither of all the municipal towns; to you the Campus Martius, and the unanimous voice of all the centuries, of which you were the chiefs and leaders; to you every company in the city every rank of men all men who have any property or any hopes, think that all their zeal for my dignity, all their decisions in my favour are not only entrusted, but put wholly under your protection.</p>
<p>143. Denique ipsi di immortales qui hanc urbem atque hoc imperium tuentur, ut esset omnibus gentibus posteritatieque perspicuum divino me numine esse rei publicae redditum, idcirco mihi videntur fructum redditus et gratulationis meae ad suorum sacerdotum potestatem iudiciumque revocasse. Hic est enim redditus, pontifices, haec restitutio in domo, in sedibus, in aris, in focus, in dis penatibus recipiendis; quorum si iste suis sceleratissimis manibus tecta sedisque convellit, ducibusque consulibus tamquam urbe capta hanc unam domum quasi acerrimi propugnatoris sibi delendam putavit, iam illi di penates ac familiares mei per vos in meam domum mecum erunt restituti.</p>	<p>143. Lastly the immortal gods themselves, who protect this city and empire, appear to me to have claimed the credit of my return and of the happiness which it has diffused as due to the power and judicial sentence of their priests in order to make it evident to all nations and to all posterity that I had been restored to the republic by divine agency. For this return of mine, O priests and this restoration consists in recovering my house, my possessions, my altars, my hearths, and my household gods. And if that fellow with his most wicked hands tears up their dwellings and abodes and with the consuls for his leaders, as if the city were taken, has thought it becoming to destroy this house alone, as if it were the house of its most active defender, still those household gods, those deities of my family, will be by you replaced in my house at the same time as myself.</p>
<p>144. Quocirca te, Capitoline, quem propter beneficia populus Romanus Optimum, propter</p>	<p>144. Wherefore, O I pray and entreat you, O thou great God of the Capitol, thee whom the</p>

<p>vim Maximum nominavit, teque, Iuno Regina, et te, custos urbis, Minerva, quae semper adiutrix consiliorum meorum, testis laborum exstitisti, precor atque quaeso, vosque qui maxime repetistis atque revocastis, quorum de sedibus haec mihi est proposita contentio, patrii penates familiaresque, qui huic urbi et rei publicae praesidetis, vos obtestor, quorum ego a templis atque delubris pestiferam illam et nefariam flammam depuli, teque, Vesta mater, cuius castissimas sacerdotes ab hominum amentium furore et scelere defendi, cuiusque ignem illum sempiternum non sum passus aut sanguine civium restingui aut cum totius urbis incendio commisceri,</p>	<p>Roman people has styled, on account of your kindnesses to us, All Good, and, on account of your might All Powerful; and you, O royal Juno; and you, O guardian of the city, O Minerva, you who have at all times been my assistant in my counsels, and the witness of my exertions; and you too, you who above all others have claimed me back and recalled me, you, for the sake of whose habitations most especially it is that I am engaged in this contest, O household gods of my fathers, and of my family; and you too, who preside over this city and this republic, you do I entreat, from whose spires and temples I once repelled that fatal and impious flame, you too do I supplicate, O Vesta, whose chaste priestesses I have defended from the rage and frenzy and wickedness of men whose renowned and eternal fire I could not suffer either to be extinguished in the blood of the citizens or to be confused with the conflagration of the whole city, I entreat you all that,—</p>
<p>145. ut, si in illo paene fato rei publicae obieci meum caput pro vestris caerimoniis atque templis perditissimorum civium furori atque ferro, et si iterum, cum ex mea contentione interitus bonorum omnium quaereretur, vos sum testatus, vobis me ac meos commendavi, meque atque meum caput ea condicione devovi ut, si et eo ipso tempore et ante in consulatu meo commodis meis omnibus, emolumentis, praemiis praetermissis cura, cogitatione, vigiliis omnibus nihil nisi de salute meorum civium laborassem, tum mihi re publica aliquando</p>	<p>145. if at that almost fatal crisis of the republic I exposed my life, in defence of your ceremonies and temples, to the rage and arms of abandoned citizens; and it at a subsequent time, when the destruction of all good men was aimed at through my ruin, I invoked your aid, I recommended myself and my family to your protection, I devoted myself and my life, on condition that it both at that moment, and previously, and in my consulship, disregarding all my own advantage, all my own interests, and all reward for my exertions, I strove with all my</p>

<p>restituta liceret frui, sin autem mea consilia patriae non profuissent, ut perpetuum dolorem avulsus a meis sustinerem: hanc ego devotionem capitis mei, cum ero in meas sedis restitutus, tum denique convictam esse et commissam putabo.</p>	<p>anxiety and thoughts and vigilance for nothing but the safety of my fellow-citizens, I might be allowed some day or other to enjoy my country restored to me; but if my counsels had been of no service to my country, then, that I might endure everlasting misery, separated from all my friends;—I may be allowed to think this devotion of my life accepted and approved by the gods, when I am by your favour restored to my home.</p>
<p>146. Nam nunc quidem, pontifices, non solum domo, de qua cognostis, sed tota urbe careo, in quam videor esse restitutus. Urbis enim celeberrimae et maximae partes adversum illud non monumentum, sed vulnus patriae contuentur. Quem cum mihi conspectum morte magis vitandum fugiendumque esse videatis, nolite, quaeso, eum cuius reditu restitutam rem publicam fore putastis non solum dignitatis ornamentis, sed etiam urbis patriae usu velle esse privatum. Non me bonorum direptio, non tectorum excisio, non depopulatio praediorum, non praeda consulum ex meis fortunis crudelissime capta permovet: caduca semper et mobilia haec esse duxi, non virtutis atque ingeni, sed fortunae et temporum munera, quorum ego non tam facultatem umquam et copiam expetendam putavi quam et in utendo rationem et in carendo patientiam.</p>	<p>146. For at present, O priests, I am not only deprived of my house, which you are at present inquiring into, but of the whole city, to which I appear to be restored. In the most frequented and finest part of the city, look to that (I will not say monument, but) wound of the country. And as you must see that that sight is to me one which is more to be detested and avoided than death itself; do not, I entreat you, allow that man by whose return you have thought that the republic too would be restored, to be deprived not only of the ornaments suited to his dignity, but even of his part in the city.</p>
<p>147. Etenim ad nostrum usum prope modum iam est definita moderatio rei familiaris, liberis autem nostris satis amplum patrimonium paterni nominis ac memoriae nostrae</p>	<p>147. In truth, the moderate amount of my family property very nearly corresponds to my necessities; and I shall leave a sufficiently ample patrimony to my children in the name and</p>

relinquemus: domo per scelus erepta, per latrocinium occupata, per religionis vim sceleratius etiam aedificata quam eversa, carere sine maxima ignominia rei publicae, meo dedecore ac dolore non possum. Quapropter si dis immortalibus, si senatui, si populo Romano, si cunctae Italiae, si provinciis, si exteris nationibus, si vobismet ipsis, qui in mea salute principem semper locum auctoritatemque tenuistis, gratum et iucundum meum reditum intellegitis esse, quaeso obtestorque vos, pontifices, ut me, quem auctoritate studio sententiis restituistis, nunc, quoniam senatus ita vult, manibus quoque vestris in sedibus meis conlocetis.

memory of their father. But I cannot without great discredit to the republic, and great shame and misery to myself, continue deprived of my house, which has been taken from me by wickedness, and, under pretence of religion, built up again with even more impiety than it was pulled down. Wherefore, if you consider that my return is pleasing and acceptable to the immortal gods, to the senate, to the Roman people, to all Italy, to the provinces, to foreign nations, and to yourselves who have always taken the lead in and exercised a principal influence over all measures connected with my safety, I beg and entreat you, O priests, now, since it is the will of the senate that you should do so, to place me, whom you have restored by your authority and zeal and votes to my country, with your own hands in my house.