Durham University

Durham E-Theses

A commentary on Cic. Fam. 5.1–18 A narrative on Cicero and the Roman republic

LAURA LOSITO

How to cite:

LOSITO, LAURA (2024) A commentary on Cic. Fam. 5.1–18 A narrative on Cicero and the Roman republic. Doctoral thesis, Durham University.

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/15494/ is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the full Durham E-Theses policy for further details.

Academic Support Office, The Palatine Centre, Durham University, Stockton Road, Durham, DH1 3LE
e-mail: e-theses.admin@durham.ac.uk Tel: +44 0191 334 6107
https://etheses.durham.ac.uk

A commentary on Cic. *Fam*. 5.1–18
A narrative on Cicero and the Roman republic

Laura Losito

A thesis submitted for the qualification of Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Classics and Ancient History

Durham University

2024

ABSTRACT

Book 5 of Cicero's (hereafter C.'s) *Ad Familiares* is generally thought to lack internal coherence, with no evidence of a clear rationale for the selection and organisation of its letters. Instead, it is often considered the product of a hurried or unthinking posthumous arrangement. This commentary (first modern commentary of any sort on *Fam.* 5) seeks to demonstrate that the letters in the book have been carefully selected and arranged in four different blocks (1–11; 12; 13–18; 19–21) by anonymous ancient editor(s), to create a meaningful storyline on C. and the republic. These deliberate clusters of letters gravitate around the pivotal letter 12, where C. asks Lucceius (without success) to recount—in an embellished 'monograph' on his career—the years 64–57, with a focus on C.'s activity against Catiline and exile. If in the first part of *Fam*. 5 (1–11), the ancient editor(s) mostly follow Lucceius' agenda (since it includes letters from 64–57 and focuses mainly on C.'s efforts against Catiline and following exile), it is with the second half of the book (13–21) that the editor(s) significantly revise this narrative. Letters 13–21 include references to Clodius and (by extending the book's narrative to encompass letters from the 40s) to the dramatic events of C.'s life, like Tullia's death, C.'s loss of prestige and the fall of the republic. The final product, included in *Fam*. 5, is a narrative that displays a more 'sincere' portrait of C.—one decisively in contrast with the one requested to Lucceius and with which C. wanted to be remembered by posterity. This commentary investigates the narrative that emerges from *Fam.* 5 through a sustained close reading of the extant letters and analysis of their historical, philological, and linguistic features.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT 1

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS 4

PREFACE 6

ABBREVIATIONS 8

INTRODUCTION 9

1. A BRIEF OUTLINE OF THE *AD FAMILIARES* COLLECTION 9
2. BOOK 5: CONTENTS AND STRUCTURE 11
3. THE NARRATIVE OF BOOK 5 15

MACRO NARRATIVE GROUPINGS 16

CATILINE AND CLODIUS 18

AMICITIA AND ITS DUTIES 21

AD LECTOREM 24

COMMENTARY 25

BIBLIOGRAPHY 184

EDITIONS, TRANSLATIONS AND COMMENTARIES 184

OTHER WORKS 184

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without the author's prior written consent and information derived from it should be acknowledged.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is a great pleasure to express my gratitude to those who have helped and supported me during the writing of this thesis and, more broadly, throughout my PhD journey. My deepest gratitude and debt go to my first supervisor, Roy Gibson, who has read and improved every version of this commentary since October 2020. His advice and unwavering encouragement have significantly contributed to my academic, intellectual, and personal development during my time at Durham. I also owe thanks to my second supervisor, Nathan Gilbert, whose constructive criticism during my annual reviews has helped shape this work into its current form.

Thanks are also due to the academics I met at conferences, especially at the Cicero Awayday Conference (London, May 2022), the SCS Annual Conference (New Orleans, January 2023), and Authors, Addressees, and Audiences in Roman Letters Conference (Edinburgh, February 2023), who provided valuable feedback on excerpts from my commentary.

Furthermore, sincere thanks to the entire Department of Classics and Ancient History at Durham, with whom interactions have been inspiring and beneficial, contributing to my development as a junior scholar. A special acknowledgment is also extended to the Bari Department of Classics, where I nurtured my passion for Classical studies.

My professional and personal journey through the PhD would not have been the same without the friends I have had the pleasure to meet. My most sincere thanks go to Serena, with whom I shared a passion for Cicero and his *Letters*, for her support on both personal and academic levels. I also owe my gratitude to Simona, my first contact in Durham, who offered sincere advice. Deep thanks also go to Julene and Giulia, who always offered words of support and encouragement. And to Caitlin, with whom I shared multiple lunch breaks and journeys to the deepest Gilesgate.

Last but not least are my thanks to my family. First and foremost, to my parents, who have seen me grow while nourishing a dream (of which this thesis is a valuable part) that has taken me far away from our hometown. Thank you for being my solid rock and for your encouraging words and support. Finally, deepest thanks to Vincenzo, the person who understands my dreams better than anyone else and helps me take steps toward their future fulfilment. Thank you for your unfailing support.

This PhD thesis was initiated during the Covid-19 outbreak and has been funded by a Northern Bridge Doctoral Studentship.

«Libri mei peculiares. Ad reliquos non transfuga sed explorator transire soleo»

Petrarch, Parisinus lat. 2201

PREFACE

This commentary aims to demonstrate to the reader that a coherent interpretation of Book 5 of C.'s *Ad Familiares* is both possible and necessary. It is written with the conviction that *Fam.* 5 has much to offer if its original non-chronological ordering, transmitted to posterity in the manuscripts, is retained. The monumental efforts of Tyrell and Purser's edition (in which every letter C. ever wrote became part of a single and unified chronological corpus) along with those of Shackleton Bailey[1] (who accepts T.-P.'s chronological reorganisation while preserving the original separate identity of the four Ciceronian collections) obliterate any trace of ancient editorial artistry.

This commentary aligns with the research approach introduced by Beard in 2002, emphasising the importance of respecting the original organisation of letters within books, in order to come to terms with the fact that they are intentionally crafted by ancient editor(s) to create meaningful units (similar to length and other respects to those constituted by Augustan poets: Stover 2021). Since 2002, modern scholarship (e.g. White 2010, Gibson 2012, Cammoranesi 2022, Gibson-Morrison 2022, Gibson, forthcoming) has begun reflecting on the figure of ancient editor(s) and their work, identifying the rationale behind the organisation of some of the books of the *Ad Familiares* (e.g. Grillo 2015 on Books 1 and 6; Martelli 2017 on Book 15; Gibson 2022 on Book 4).

However, not all the books were thought to have been arranged to tell a particular story to the same degree. Book 5 was considered one of the less well-organised books, featuring 'an even more disparate makeup' and where 'the editor has relied on rough categories to organize material' (White 2010, 55). It is only with Cammoranesi 2022 that the importance of Book 5 and the narrative it constitutes has begun to be taken seriously into account.

This commentary seeks to demonstrate that, within Book 5, a narrative about C. and the republic has been deliberately fostered by the ancient editor(s). The careful selection and arrangement of letters into meaningful sequences elevate it above its reputation as one of the less organised units. The editorial narrative presented in the book, as the reader of this commentary will discover, ultimately diverges from the story that C. himself wished to pass on to posterity—a story encapsulated in his request to Lucceius for a 'monograph' on his career that has been placed by the ancient editor(s) at the centre of the book, in *Fam.* 5.12. Covering events from 62 to 44 B.C.E.[2] (from just after his triumphant consulate to months before the end of his own life), the narrative within the book initially follows Lucceius' agenda and portrays C. as the saviour of the state from Catiline and his conspiracy (5.1–11). However, in the subsequent letters (5.13–21), the ancient editor(s) craft a narrative that

[1] Hereafter, Tyrell-Purser's and Shackleton Bailey's names are abbreviated to T.-P. and Sh.-B.
[2] From now on references to B.C.E. will be omitted. References to C.E. will be explicitly indicated.

diverges from the image C. intended to be remembered with; here, C. is observed exchanging letters with individuals less prominent (compared to those in 5.1–11) within the Roman elite; he is also seen grieving for his beloved Tullia and for the fall of the republic. This book stands out as one of the most intriguing in the entire collection, but its narrative unfolds only if the reader is willing to embrace its original structure.

This commentary, therefore, marks a pioneering effort in modern commentaries on the *Ad Familiares* by adopting an innovative approach. As hinted above, it is the first to integrate into its agenda Beard's (and others') recuperation of the books of the *Ad Familiares*' as meaningful units compiled later by ancient editor(s). This approach is complemented by a careful historical, linguistic, and philological analysis of the letters, that aims to fully comprehend the meaning and reason behind both their composition and later selection to constitute a significant storyline on C. and the republic.

The commentary also aims to provide a comprehensive 360° analysis of Book 5 of the *Ad Familiares*, in a manner somewhat different from previously published works that are either overly focused on selected aspects—such as the historical focus of T.-P. (1879–1901) and the philological emphasis of Nardo (1966) on Book 12 and Cavarzere (1983) on Book 8; also, the largely historical edition with notes of Beaujeu (VI–XI, 1980–96), that completes the Collection Budé, started by Constans and followed by Bayet (I–V, 1934–67)—or concentrate on selected letters (How 1926; Sh.-B. 1980). There are also others that attempt (like Sh.-B. 1977's somewhat patchy commentary) to offer a comprehensive analysis, with varying degrees of success. Among these Cavarzere 2016 stands out; however, although it employs a post-Beard approach to the letters, its (brief) notes are still mostly focused on historical and literary analysis, failing to fully grasp the editorial design for individual books of the collection.

The commentary, in its current form as submitted for the PhD, covers letters 5.1–18. This limitation has been imposed by the 100,000-word limit for the PhD thesis. The writer is already actively working on completing the commentary for the remaining section, 5.19–21.

ABBREVIATIONS

E.M.	A. Ernout and A. Meillet, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine. Histoire des mots*, 2nd edn., Paris 1980
LSJ	H.G. Liddell and R. Scott, *A Greek-English lexicon*, 9th edn, rev. H.S. Jones, Oxford 1940
*OCD*4	S. Hornblower, A. Spawforth and E. Eidinow (eds.), *Oxford classical dictionary*, 4th edn., Oxford 2012
OLD	P.W. Glare, *Oxford Latin dictionary*, Oxford 1968–1982
NP	*New Pauly Online: Encyclopedia of the Ancient World*, Leiden 2005–
RE	A.F. von Pauly, *Paulys Realencyclopädie der Altertumswissenschaft*, Stuttgart 1893
TLL	*Thesaurus linguae Latinae*, Munich 1900–

Abbreviations for journal titles follow the guidelines of *L'Année philologique*. Classical authors and texts are typically abbreviated based on *OLD* for Latin and LSJ for Greek.

INTRODUCTION

1. A BRIEF OUTLINE OF THE *AD FAMILIARES* COLLECTION

The *Ad Familiares*, with its 435 letters (in Sh.-B. 1988) organised in 16 books, offers a kaleidoscopic view of the late Roman republic, from January 62 to July 43. Through the correspondence of Marcus Tullius Cicero (106–43), Roman statesman, lawyer, author, and philosopher, along with that of fellow members of the Roman elite,[3] the *Ad Familiares* vividly depicts the events of Roman republic over a nineteen-year span—from the defeat of the Catilinarian conspiracy, to the so-called 'first triumvirate', Caesar's rise to power, and the aftermath of his assassination.[4]

The origin of the 16-book *Ad Familiares* collection has been much discussed.[5] While efforts to assemble letters into single books may have commenced shortly after C.'s death in December 43, the actual publication process likely extended over several decades. Suggestions of allusions by Ovid to the letters have been proposed,[6] but none of them can be regarded as certain. The first explicit reference to a letter found in a book from the collection is made by the Elder Seneca (late 30s C.E.),[7] while the first references to individual books of letters as we know them are made by Gellius (late 170s C.E.).[8] There are no references to a sixteen-book collection until the ninth century, and the title *Ad Familiares* does not appear until after Petrarch.[9]

At any rate, it seems reasonable to assume that single books of the not-yet-constituted *Ad Familiares* collection were already in circulation by the end of the 1st century C.E. These books appear to merged into a collection somewhere between the 4th century and the 9th century, with the *terminus post quem* being Nonius (4th c.)—who refers several times to individual books of *Fam*. but not to a unified collection—and the *terminus ante quem* being the Lorsch catalogue (9th c.), which is the first known reference to the 16-book collection as a whole.[10] A single ms, the Mediceus 49.9 (=**M**; 9th c.),

[3] Three-quarters of C.'s correspondents are, in fact, senators: White 2010, 60.
[4] Book 5 covers eighteen of these nineteen years: cf. below.
[5] See e.g. White 2010, 31–34; 174–175; Cavarzere 2016, 51–61; Cammoranesi 2022, 13–16; Gibson, forthcoming.
[6] E.g. Ov. *Tr*. 4.1.95–96 and *Fam.* 14.2.1; Ov. *Tr*. 5.8.19 and *Fam.* 14.4.5: see Nagle 1980, 33–35; Degl'Innocenti Pierini 1998, 101–103; Kenney 1999, 408; Cammoranesi 2022. See also Losito, forthcoming on *QFr*.
[7] Sen. *Suas*. 1.1.5.
[8] Gel. 1.22.19; 12.13.21.
[9] The late appearance of *Epistulae familiares* may owe something to the influence of Petrarch's *Rerum familiarum libri* (Schmidt 1983, 52 n.82).
[10] Sh.-B.1977, 8.

and its renaissance descendants, preserve the sixteen books as a unified collection. Elsewhere, the collection circulates in two distinct parts, Books 1–8 and 9–16.[11]

The late compilation of the *Ad Familiares* also suggests that the 16-book collection cannot have been the editorial product of Tiro alone (C.'s freedman and the addressee of *Fam*. 16, traditionally believed to be the one who organised the collection along with Atticus).[12] While he might have been involved in the initial editing of the letters soon after C.'s death, when a substantial portion of his letters would still have been accessible, the present 16-book edition is the outcome of the collaborative efforts of multiple editor(s) over a much more extended period of time.[13]

The *Ad Familiares* collection, as transmitted by the Mediceus 49.9 (=**M**; 9th c.), constitutes c. 46% of the 941 extant letters included in the Ciceronian corpus as a whole. Only *Att.* surpasses it (slightly) in number of letters; the latter is composed of 453 letters (in Sh.-B. 1987), constituting c. 48% of the total. The remaining 6% is composed of the 27 letters of the *QFr.* and 26 of the *ad Brut.* (Watt 1958).

Differently from *Att*. (where approximately 94% of the letters are written by C. to Atticus), and from *QFr*. (consisting only of C.'s letters to his brother Quintus), but similarly to *ad Brut*. (where nine out seventeen letters are written by others than C.), the *Ad Familiares* collection presents a wide and varied array of correspondents. The 435 extant letters in the *Ad Familiares* involve exchanges with around ninety different individuals.[14] Approximately 82% of its letters (356) are written by C., while the remaining 18% are from twenty-five different individuals, mostly members of the Roman elite, and mainly focused on the events of the 40s.[15]

That the 40s, with its political and social upheavals, is the major focus of the *Ad Familiares* collection is also demonstrated by the number of datable letters included in the collection, belonging to this period: approximately 66% of the total. Consistent (albeit reduced) interest is also given to letters from the 50s, constituting 30% of the total. Barely any importance is attached to letters datable to the 60s, constituting only about 2% of the total. This preference is also found in *Att.*, composed of approximately 71% of letters from the 40s, about 24% from the 50s, and around 5% from the 60s.

As the reader shall see, Book 5 too—although it is the only book in the whole *Ad Familiares* collection to include an appreciable proportion of missives from the 60s (five out of a total of twenty-three: 5.1–2; 5.5–6; 5.7)—still ultimately adheres to a preference for the 40s (with twelve of its letters

[11] *Fam*. 1–8 is transmitted by Harleianus 2773 (**=G**; 12th c.) and Parisinus lat. 17812 (**=R**; 12th c.). The tradition of *Fam*. 9–16 is exemplified by Harleianus 2682 (**=H**; 11th c.) and Berolinensis 252 (**=F**; 12th-13th c.). Palatinus lat. 598 (**=D**; 15th c.) and Parisinus lat. 14761 (**=V**; 15th c.).
[12] On Tiro cf., above all, McDermott 1972, 259–286. On Tiro as the editor see Sh.-B. 1977, 23–24; Nicholson 1998, 73–75; Cavarzere 2016, 56–57. Beard 2002, 131, instead, invites to caution.
[13] Cammoranesi 2022, 191.
[14] Deniaux 1993, 96–108.
[15] On which, Gibson, forthcoming.

datable to the 40s: 5.9–11; 5.13–16; 5.19–21), while the remaining six are dated to the 50s: 5.3–4; 5.8; 5.12; 5.17–18.

2. BOOK 5: CONTENTS AND STRUCTURE

The letters of *Fam.* 5 were selected and arranged by anonymous ancient editor(s) as follows:

Ep.	**Writer @ Location**	**Addressee @ Location**	**Topic**	**Date**
5.1	Q. Caecilius Metellus Celer @ Cisalpine Gaul	C. @ Italy (Rome?)	Epistolary conflict: Celer's hostile attitude towards C.	c.12 January 62.
5.2	C. @ Rome	Q. Caecilius Metellus Celer @ Cisalpine Gaul	Epistolary conflict: C. defends himself against Celer's accusations.	First half of January 62.
5.3	Q. Caecilius Metellus Nepos @ Hispania Citerior	C. @ Italy (Rome?)	Statement of friendship and political alliance against Clodius.	c. 56.
5.4	C. @ Dyrrachium	Q. Caecilius Metellus Nepos @ Italy (Rome?)	Plea to Nepos to help him to return from exile.	Mid-January 57.

5.5	C. @ Rome	C. Antonius @ Macedonia	Epistolary conflict within a letter of recommendation for Atticus.	c.23 December 62.
5.6	C. @ Rome	P. Sestius @ Macedonia	References to C. and Antonius's conflict in a letter written to pledge support to P. Sestius.	Late December 62.
5.7	C. @ Rome	Cn. Pompeius Magnus @ Asia Minor	Disappointment for the lack of praise of C.'s actions against Catiline.	c. April 62.
5.8	C. @ Rome	M. Licinius Crassus @ Syria	Pledge of support for Crassus and his family.	c. January 54.
5.9	P. Vatinius @ Narona	C. @ Italy	Plea to C.	c. 11 July 45.
5.10a	P. Vatinius @ Narona	C. @ Italy (Rome?)	Reply to C.'s (lost) plea for clemency for the pirate Catilius.	c. January 44.
5.10c	P. Vatinius @ Narona	C. @ Italy	Plea to C. to support him in front of Caesar.	c. early November 45 (?).
5.10b	P. Vatinius @ Narona	C. @ Italy	Further plea to C. to support him in front of Caesar.	c. 5 December 45.
5.11	C. @ Rome	P. Vatinius @ Narona	Pledge of support for Vatinius and his family.	c. mid December 45 (?).
5.12	C. @ Antium	L. Lucceius @ Italy (Rome?)	Request for a monograph on C.'s career.	c. 12 April 55.
5.13	C. @ Rome	L. Lucceius @	Reply to Lucceius' consolatory letter over the current state of the affairs in Rome.	Summer/ autumn 46.

		Italy (Rome?)		
5.14	L. Lucceius @ Rome	C. @ Italy (Astura?)	Consolation offered to C. for the death of his daughter Tullia.	c. 9 May 45.
5.15	C. @ Astura	L. Lucceius @ Italy (Rome?)	Reply to Lucceius' consolatory letter over Tullia's death and demise of the Roman republic.	Early May 45.
5.16	C. @ Rome	T. Titius @ Italy (?)	Consolation offered to Titius for the death of his children.	Summer/ autumn 46 (?).
5.17	C. @ Rome	P. Sittius @ (?)	Letter of consolation for Sittius upon his exile from Rome.	c. 56.
5.18	C. @ Rome	T. Fadius @ Italy (?)	Letter of consolation for Fadius upon his exile from Rome.	Late March 52.
5.19	C. @ Cumae	L. Mescinius Rufus @ Italy	Statement of friendship and the decision to leave Italy in order to join the Pompeian army.	c. 28 April 49.
5.20	C. @ near Rome	L. Mescinius Rufus @ Italy	Epistolary conflict: reply to Rufus' complaints upon the financial reports of Cilicia.	c. 4 January 49.
5.21	C. @ Rome	L. Mescinius Rufus @ Italy	C. and Rufus' renewed friendship: the defeat of the Pompeian army at Thapsus and the fall of the Roman republic.	Mid-April 46.

Book 5 contains twenty-three letters (in Sh.-B. 1988).[16] It possesses the longest chronological span of any book in the *Ad Familiares*, from early January 62 (5.1) to January 44 (5.10a), almost equalling the time span of the entire collection (62–43).[17]

The book includes mention of important events in the Roman republic: the dismantlement of the Catilinarian conspiracy in 62, Clodius' tumultuous activities as tribune in 58 and aedile in 56, the

[16] Twenty-one letters are transmitted by the Mediceus 49.9 (=**M**) for Book 5. Sh.-B. 1988, however, recognises three different letters in 5.10: 5.10a; 10b; 10c; for which: the introduction to 5.9–11.

[17] Only Book 13 has a similar chronological spread (62[?]–44), albeit out of a much higher total of eighty letters (in Sh.-B. 1988).

Lucca conference in 56, and the formation of the so-called 'first triumvirate'. It also includes civil war events, culminating in the final clash between Pompey and Caesar at Pharsalus in 48, followed by Caesar's dictatorship.

These letters also cover eighteen years of C.'s life, focusing on key events in his career: from the period following the end of his consulship and defeat of the Catilinarian conspiracy (5.1–2; 5.7) to exile by the aristocratic politician Clodius (5.4), the devastating outbreak of the civil war with Caesar (5.9–11; 5.13) and the death of C.'s only daughter Tullia (5.14–15).

Book 5 also features some of the longest letters (in words) in the entire collection: 5.2 (approximately 1071 words), 5.12 (approximately 1114 words), and 5.20 (approximately 1017 words). These letters contribute to making Book 5 the unit with the highest average letter length (in words) in the entire *Ad Familiares*. Despite comprising only twenty-three letters, it has an average length of approximately 362 words—significantly larger than, for example, Book 10, which has (in Sh.-B. 1988) an average of c. 279 words across thirty-seven letters, and Book 13, with, in the same edition, an average of c. 158 words across eighty letters.

Sixteen of the letters included in *Fam*. 5 (5.2; 5.4–8; 5.11–13; 5.15–21) were written by C.; the remaining seven were addressed to C. by four other individuals (Metell. Celer: 5.1; Metell. Nepos 5.3; P. Vatinius: 5.9–10b; L. Lucceius: 5.14). Although this is a practice attested elsewhere in the collection (e.g. Book 8, that includes only letters from M. Cael. Rufus), *Fam*. 5 is the book that possesses, after Books 8 and 10, the highest number of letters written by correspondents other than C.

The letters are exchanged with individuals who occupy different levels within the Roman elite.[18] The first four letters (5.1–4) are exchanged with members of the highly aristocratic Caecilii-Metelli family, Metell. Celer (5.1–2) and Metell. Nepos (5.3–4); the following two with C. Antonius (5.5) and P. Sestius (5.6). Letters 5.7 and 5.8 are addressed to the triumvirs Pompey and Crassus; while 5.9–11 exchange correspondence with the governor of Illyricum, P. Vatinius. These letters are followed by a set of four letters exchanged with the historiographer L. Lucceius (5.12–15) and others addressed to members of lower senatorial elite: T. Titius (5.16), P. Sittius (5.17) and T. Fadius (5.18). The book is concluded by 5.19–21, all letters sent to L. Maescin. Rufus, C.'s ex quaestor in Cilicia. All of them (except for P. Sittius) hold public roles—although (significantly) only the addressees of 5.1–11 seem to have held important offices on the *cursus honorum* at the time of the writing of the letters, *i.e.*: promagistracies (Metell. Celer, governor of Cisalpine Gaul; Metell. Nepos, governor of Hispania Citerior in 5.3; C. Antonius, governor of Macedonia and his proquaestor P. Sestius; Pompey

[18] For some of the individuals here mentioned: cf. the introductions to 5.1–4 (on the Caecilii Metelli); to 5.5–6 (on C. Antonius and P. Sestius); to 5.7–8 (on Pompey and Crassus); to 5.9–11 (on P. Vatinius); to 5.12 (on L. Lucceius). See also the introductions to 5.16 (on T.Titius); to 5.17 (on P. Sestius) and to 5.18 (on T. Fadius).

and his proconsular *imperium* in the East; Crassus, governor of Syria; P. Vatinius, governor of Illyricum); and consulship (Metell. Nepos in 5.4).

The majority of the letters in the book (in so far as it is possible to pinpoint the place from which they were written)[19] are sent from Rome, the centre of socio-political life, to the provinces or elsewhere in Italy; in particular to: Cisalpine Gaul (5.2); Macedonia (5.5–6); the East (in 5.7; Syria in 5.8; Illyricum in 5.11); to Astura (5.13). The book also includes letters that display the inverse movement, from outside Rome (generally but not exclusively from the provinces) to the capital; these are sent from: Cisalpine Gaul (5.1); from Hispania Citerior (5.3); from Dyrrachium (5.4); from Narona (5.9–10b); from Cumae (5.12; 19); from Astura (5.15).

3. THE NARRATIVE OF BOOK 5

What sets Book 5 apart from the other books in the collection is not just its extended chronological span, or the total of senders other than C., or its length. What truly distinguishes this book is the narrative on C. and the republic that emerges when one reads the letters in the order they have been passed down to posterity (*i.e.*, not chronologically rearranged as in the editions of T.-P. and Sh.-B.). Through the careful selection and arrangement of letters in meaningful sequences,[20] the ancient editor(s) crafted a narrative unparalleled anywhere else in the *Ad Familiares*.

Book 5 shows the parabola of the lives of both C. and the republic: from pre-eminence and prestige to despair and death;[21] from C.'s endeavours against Catiline and his followers, and his role as saviour of the state, to the death of his only daughter Tullia. In addition, the book concludes with a set of letters where C. consoles less important members of the Roman elite (e.g. P. Sittius in 5.17, who did not pursue a political career; T. Fadius in 5.18, who was a *homo novus*), and with C.'s (somewhat undignified) efforts to defend himself against L. Mescin. Rufus (C.'s ex-quaestor in Cilicia) and his accusations of misgovernment in the province.

The emergent narrative—depicting a movement from light to darkness, characteristic of human lives (and, arguably, an organising principle of other letter collections)[22]—was not, however, the one by which C. wanted to be remembered by posterity.[23] C.'s desire for the celebration of his political career, particularly in regard his efforts on behalf of the state, is unmistakably evident in 5.12, a

[19] On ancient epistolary travel in C.'s correspondence: Rossi 2010.
[20] On common principles of organisation of letters in *Fam.*: Beard 2002, 103–144; Gibson 2012, 56–78; Cammoranesi 2022, 18–26; Gibson-Morrison 2022, 11–57. In specific books: Grillo 2015, 1–14; 2016, 399–413; Martelli 2017, 90–115; Gibson 2022, 105–146.
[21] A similar narrative is observable in *QFr.*: Losito, forthcoming.
[22] See e.g. *QFr.*: Losito, forthcoming; it is also observable in Pliny's letters: Gibson 2015, 187–224.
[23] This movement is also shown in microcosm in 5.1–4, foreshadowing the movement from light to dark of the entire book, but in the shorter compass of four letters: on which, the introduction to 5.1–4.

renowned letter addressed to L. Lucceius, wherein he requests a 'monograph' covering the years 64–57.[24] The centrality of this letter within the book suggests it served as a model for the ancient editor(s) in crafting their version of C.'s 'monograph'—filling a gap left uncompleted by Lucceius, whose 'monograph' remained 'unpublished'.[25] However, while the narrative in *Fam*. 5.1–11 by the ancient editor(s) appears to conform to the kind of narrative requested from Lucceius in 5.12, it ultimately deviates in terms of time span, events narrated, and tone starting from 5.13 onwards.[26] It includes events, as we shall see later in the introduction, such as C.'s defence of individuals allegedly involved with Catiline and Clodius' affairs, and accusations of C. of disrespect of *amicitia* and its duties, that he would never want to incorporate into a 'monograph' about himself.

To understand the narrative crafted by the ancient editor(s) in Book 5, it is important to briefly examine the macro narratives formed within the book through the deliberate selection and arrangement of letters in clusters, then to observe how the storyline on C. and the republic unfolds across these distinct blocks. It is equally important to explore how events which C. might have wished to omit from any narrative about himself, contribute to shaping the narrative of *Fam*. 5.

MACRO NARRATIVE GROUPINGS

The storyline on the lives of C. and of the republic evidently fostered within Book 5 is divisible into four macro groups: 1–11, 12, 13–18, 19–21.[27] As the narrative transitions from one block to another (excluding 5.12, which serves as the central point shaping the narrative), the account of C.'s loss of prestige and pre-eminence unfolds. This decline in prestige and pre-eminence is made clear through two key elements: the declining socio-political status of C.'s addressees and C.'s evolving perception of the effect of his endeavours on behalf of the state.

Block 1–11: C.'s prestige and pre-eminence. This block includes the earliest (5.1, early January 62) and latest (5.10a, c. January 44) letters of the whole book. Despite including a handful of letters from the gloomy 40s,[28] C.'s image (except for 5.4, a letter from exile)[29] is that of an esteemed politician; at the beginning of the book he has not long demitted his consulship, whose main achievement was the defeat of the Catilinarian conspiracy. C. is seen communicating with topmost members of the Roman senatorial elite, who also hold the most important socio-political roles at the

[24] On which, the introduction to 5.12.
[25] Similarly (but independently) noted by Cammoranesi 2022, 8–9; 64–79.
[26] On similarities and differences between the narratives of 5.12 and the book: see the detailed introduction to the narrative proposed by 5.12.
[27] For more details, cf. the introduction to 5.1–4; 5–6; 7–8; 9–11.
[28] 5.9–11 introduce (albeit with 'milder' tones than those in 5.13–18, where darker tones prevail) the theme of the decline of the republican institutions.
[29] On which, n.23.

time of the writing of the letters,[30] offering them favours and/or requesting them to reciprocate his *officia*. In the majority of these letters, C. is proud of his endeavours against the Catilinarian conspiracy and his safeguarding of the republic (cf. e.g. 5.2.1n *rem publicam a me conservatam*; 5.7.3n *pro salute patriae gessimus*).

Block 12: the letter that gives meaning and purpose to the entire book. The centrally-placed letter to the historiographer Lucceius, in which C. requests a 'monograph' on 64–57.[31] In this letter, as in many of the letters in 5.1–11, C. proudly reminisces about his endeavours on behalf of the state with joy (cf. e.g. §1n *res nostras monumentis commendari tuis*). However, the seeds of despair and loss of pre-eminence, typical of 5.13–18, have already been planted: Lucceius had a brief and unsuccessful political career (in contrast to the addressees of 5.1–11); and C.'s statements about his efforts for the republic are consistently accompanied by frequent allusions to his concerns for both his personal future and that of the state. This is evident in C.'s repeated references, in the letter, to being in a 'hurry' and his exhortations to Lucceius to complete his 'monograph' before it becomes 'too late'.[32]

Block 13–18: C.'s progressive loss of prestige and pre-eminence and the republic's decline. These letters focus on a shorter time span of ten years, from 56–45, a period dominated by the collapse of the Roman republic and Tullia's death. Here, C. is seen (thanks to the ancient editor[s]' choice of selecting certain kinds of letters) communicating with individuals from less important elite families, who did not stand out or make a mark in any political capacity (in a marked contrast with the addressees of 5.1–11) at the time of the missives.[33] The letters' themes also align with the gloomier image of C. and the republic that the ancient editor(s) aim to convey here. Letters 13–18 are, thus, all letters of consolation—addressing the plight of the republic (5.13), the loss of children (5.14–16), and exile (5.17–18). They also show a C. who is no longer proud of his endeavours (5.15.3n *...maxime florere...puderet...*); the fall of the republic is now an undeniable reality (5.13.3n *...circumspice omnia membra rei publicae...fractum debilitatumve*; 5.15.4n *summum...odium...fori, curiae...*; similar to 5.16.4n *...misceri...impendere rei publicae...*; 5.17.3n *re publica...neminem...ulla delectet*; 5.18.2n *...condicio impendere...re publica discesserit*). C. desires a momentary respite (5.15.4n *exiguam oblivionem...*) from the pain resulting from both personal and public losses.

Block 19–21: C. defends himself against the accusations of misgovernment in Cilicia made by his former quaestor, L. Mescin. Rufus. These letters focus on an even shorter time span than the previous block, covering the years 49–46. They effectively complete the narrative on C.'s loss of

[30] On which, above: pp. 14–15.
[31] See above, pp. 15–16.
[32] On which, see the introduction to 5.12.
[33] The only exception might be T. Fadius (addressee of 5.18)—a *homo novus* who reached tribuneship. However, the tones and theme of this letter contribute to that image of despair depicted by 5.13–18.

prestige and also reconnect with the opening of the first block. Just as in the opening 5.1–2 (where C. defends himself against the charge of a lack of display of *amicitia*), the concluding 5.19–21 are potentially face-threatening letters. However, it is crucial to note that, while at the beginning of the book, C. was accused by one of the foremost members of the aristocracy (Metell. Celer), in 5.19–21, the accuser is 'merely' his former quaestor, L. Maescin. Rufus.

CATILINE AND CLODIUS

As observed earlier, when C. wrote 5.12 to request the 'monograph' from Lucceius, he urged Lucceius to primarily emphasise his actions against the Catilinarian conspiracy, as well as highlighting the sacrifices he endured (such as e.g. exile) in the service of the republic. The ancient editor(s) attempted, to some extent, to adhere to C.'s guidelines offered in 5.12, since the book, as we shall see, often focuses on the Catilinarian conspiracy, even in letters written long after the events of 63. However, the ancient editor(s) diverged from the events that C. wanted his 'monograph' on 64–57 to encompass, since they also included (amongst other things)[34] a set of references to Clodius. Most notably, they incorporated letters in which C. appears to be granting favours/support to individuals who had (allegedly) participated in the Catilinarian conspiracy, as well as to individuals who had been close to Clodius. Ultimately, this is not the narrative that C. would have wanted from Lucceius.

Recurrent references to C.'s role in the Catilinarian conspiracy, in 5.1–18, can be found in:

- 5.2.1n *rem publicam a me conservatam*; *in rei publicae salute retinenda*; *domesticis insidiis...intestino scelere...armatis hostibus... occulta coniuratione*; §6n *...comperio...*; §7n *improbissimus civis*; *rem publicam conservassem...*; §8n *hominem gravem...qui…liberasset*;
- 5.5.2n *...comperio...*;
- 5.6.2n *sed partim...me excludunt...partim...exemerit; aperte*; *vindicem coniurationis*: *ex obsidione; meis rebus gestis*;
- 5.7.2n *...mea summa erga te studia…parum...adiunxerint…coniuncturaque sit*; §3n *pro salute patriae gessimus*; *rei publicae causa*;
- 5.12.1n *res nostras monumentis commendari tuis*; §2n *civilem coniurationem*; *quid si illa...ornanda...*; §4n *a principio...coniurationis...*; §9n *vivi gloriola nostra perfruamur*;
- 5.13.4n *recordationes conscientiae nostrae rerumque...te in primis auctore gessimus*;

[34] On which, cf. pp. 11–15.

- 5.14.2n *acumen occultissima*;
- 5.15.3n *...in ea tempora nostra...maxime florere...vivere etiam puderet*;
- 5.17.1n §1n *priora tempora ruinis rei publicae nostrique...intervallum...satis longum...*; §2n *proxime recenti adventu meo*.

C.'s actions against the Catilinarian conspiracy are evident not just through verbal references to its events but also by the involvement of some of his addressees in these circumstances:[35]

- Metell. Nepos (mentioned in 5.1–2 and addressee of 5.3–4), as tribune of the plebs for 62, prevented C. from offering his thanksgiving speech to the people on account of his decision to condemn the Catilinarians to death without *provocatio ad populum*. Nepos was also the one, as consul for 57, to support (after previous enmity) C.'s recall from exile.
- P. Sestius (addressee of 5.6) as a tribune of the plebs in 57 strenuously supported and succeeded in facilitating C. returning from exile.
- L. Lucceius (with whom C. exchanges letters 5.12–15) had also supported C.'s action against the Catilinarians.
- T. Fadius (addressee of 5.18) who served as quaestor under C. in 63, possessed knowledge of and probably supported C.'s campaign against Catiline. He helped C. in his return from exile.

As stated before, the narrative in Book 5 is also and most importantly constituted by exchanges with people who seem to have had a role in/supported the events of the conspiracy:

- C. Antonius (addressee of 5.5): alleged participant in the first stages of the Catilinarian conspiracy (although to which extent it is hard to tell). C. was probably able to discourage him from prolonging this (possible) closeness to Catiline, by promising Antonius the lucrative province of Macedonia for the year 62.
- Crassus (addressee of 5.8): alleged supporter of the Catilinarian conspiracy (he might have been falsely accused). C. offers to take care of his family and affairs while in Syria.
- P. Sittius (addressee of 5.17): he may have been involved in the conspiracy and chose voluntary exile, likely due to crimes associated with it. It appears he sought C.'s assistance multiple times with such accusations, and C. eventually provided help.

[35] For a detailed analysis, see the introductions to the cited letters.

Similarly, there are various references—albeit limited in comparison to the material on the Catilinarian conspiracy—to Clodius included in the letters. Like the references to Catiline, mentions of Clodius and related events are disclosed both at a verbal level and in the biography of C.'s addressees.

Verbal references to Clodius, in 5.1–18, can be found in:

- 5.4.2n *adrogantem crudelitatem tuorum*;
- 5.8.2n ...*pestes hominum...laude...dolentium*; §3n *quae...violata*.

Among the people who were linked to Clodius can be mentioned:

- Metell. Celer: brother-in-law of Clodius;
- Metell. Nepos: brother-in-law of Clodius, who seems to have been pestered by Clodius when the decision to recall C. from exile was being made;
- P. Sestius: supported C.'s recall from exile against Clodius and tried to prevent Clodius' election to the aedileship of 56;
- Pompey: assisted C. against Clodius especially at the time of his recall from exile;
- P. Sittius was sent into exile probably due to Clodius' machinations;
- T. Fadius, as designated tribune in 58, aided C. in his return from exile, despite Clodius' vehement opposition.

Similarly for Catiline, the ancient editor(s) included letters to/from people who seem to have been involved in Clodius' activities:

- Crassus: Clodius probably served as Crassus' henchman. Crassus seemingly supported Clodius against C.'s recall from exile.
- Vatinius: cooperated with Clodius many times between 58–56.

Another significant aspect highlighting the importance of the distinctive Catiline (and Clodius) theme, in the ancient editor(s)' narrative for the book, is the recurrent use of C.'s vocabulary of the Catilinarian conspiracy. Within the book his vocabulary is—beyond its normal, literal usage—predominantly applied in relation to Clodius, C. himself, and the contemporary era. While C. might have sometimes unintentionally re-used this vocabulary in the letters we have today, it is thanks to the thoughtful selection and organisation by ancient editor(s) of letters within units that this language acquires a new significance and contributes to the construction of such a narrative.

C.'s vocabulary on the Catilinarian conspiracy is also employed in reference to:

- C.'s own actions: 5.2.1n *suspicor*; §3n *suspicari* (C. and Antonius' activity); 5.2.9n *lenis* (C.'s conduct during the conspiracy, now C.'s conduct with Metell. Celer); 5.5.2n

comperio (Clodius uses it against C.); 5.6.2n *insidias*; 5.7.1n *incredibilem voluptatem*; §3n *consilio...magnitudine*; 5.12.1n *audacius*; §6n *demens*; 5.13.3n *turpissimum*.

- Others' actions: Metell. Nepos' (5.2.6n *illius impetum…crudelissimum*; §9n *...si...nescisti…esse celatum*; *...sui consili...*; §10n *si crudeliter*). The *optimates*' (5.9.1n *conspirationem*). Catilius' (5.10a.1n *hominem crudelissimum*). Dionysius' (5.11.3n *improbus*). Lucceius' (5.12.3n *largiare*). T. Fadius' (5.17.5n *conscientia*).
- Clodius' actions: 5.2.1n *scelere*; 5.3.1n *homo importunissimus*; 5.4.2 *crudelitas*; 5.6.2n *odio*; 5.8.2n *pestes hominum*; §3n *repentinus*; §3n *suspicio*.
- The period in which they live: 5.15.5n *metus*; 5.16.4n *misceri...impendere*; *libertati...saluti*; *pestilentissimo*.

AMICITIA AND ITS DUTIES

Amicitia held a pivotal role in Roman socio-political interactions, encompassing a set of duties that friends had to observe to be recognised as such.[36] *Fam.* 5 presents an excellent standpoint from which to analyse and catalogue these interactions.

That *amicitia* is a duty of a friend, especially towards an *amicus* in need, is evident from the repeated references to what one has done (***officium*/*studium*/*opera***) for the benefit of an *amicus*: 5.1.1n *meum studium*; 5.2.4n *officium meum in te…possit*; 5.5.1n *meorum in te studiorum*; 5.5.3n *multo maius meum studium*; 5.8.2n *operam* (also §5n); 5.8.4n *...meum studium...spectet*; 5.11.1n *…pari me studio erga te…*; 5.16.6n *officio...amicissimi*; 5.17.3n *officiis amicitiae*. Various reasons may prompt a friend to request (***peto*/*rogo***: 5.4.2n; 5.9.1n; 5.10b.1n; 5.12.3n; 8n; 9n; 5.14.3n) an *officium*.[37] In Book 5, these requests are often tied to leave-taking protocols,[38] seeking support (***recipere causam*** and variations in 5.9.1n; 5.10a.1n; 5.12.9n; 10n; 5.14.3n) or entrusting relatives and their interests to a friend in Rome while a magistrate is away (***commendo*:** 5.5.3n; 5.12.3n). However, once someone had received a favour, it was imperative to acknowledge the favour (***memoria***: 5.8.2n; 5.17.5n) and demonstrate reciprocity (***mutuus animus*** and variations: 5.2.3n; 5.11.1n; 5.10a.3n; 5.10b.1n).

Given the fluctuating and public nature of the friendships depicted in most of the letters in the *Ad Familiares*, it was crucial for Roman senators to demonstrate goodwill and a positive disposition towards their friends. Goodwill in Book 5 is generally conveyed through references to actions

[36] On Roman friendship, cf. selected: Brunt 1965, 1–20; Pérez 1994, 293–360; Konstan 1996, 7–19; Konstan 1997; Derrida 1997; Wilcox 2012; Prost 2015, 7–35.
[37] Other e.g. can be found in Hall 2009, cf. especially 18; 20; 50–54.
[38] On leave-taking protocols: cf. the introduction to 5.8.

(***erga...voluntas***: 5.2.10n; 5.3.2n; 5.4.2n; 5.5.3; 5.7.2n; 5.8.2n [twice]; also in §5n; 5.11.1n), as well as the use of standard language of affection: ***amor*** (5.5.1n [referred to Atticus]; §3n; 5.12.3n; 5.15.1n; also in §2n); **(*nostra*) *necessitudo*** (5.2.6n; 5.7.2n; 5.8.1n; 5.16.1n; 5.18.2n); **(*nostra*) *coniunctione*** (5.7.2n; 5.13.5n; 5.15.2n; 5.18.2n); ***consuetudo*** (5.14.3n; 5.15.2n; 5.17.1n); ***vetustas*** (5.8.1n; 5.15.2n; 5.17.5n). These expressions of affection are generally strengthened by references to ***cura***: 5.8.2n; 5.2.9n. ***Diligentia***: 5.8.2n; 5n; 5.6.3n; 5.17.3n. ***Benevolentia***: 5.2.10n; 5.8.3n; 4n; 5.12.1n; 5.13.1n; 5.16.1n; 5n; 5.18.2n. ***Constantia***: 5.2.8n; 5.5.3n; 5.8.5n. ***Gratia***: 5.1.1n; 5.2.1n; 5n; 5.4.1n; 5.8.5n; 5.11.1n; 5.12.6n; 5.13.1n; 2n; 5.14.3n (from which the importance of ***gratulatio*** derives: 5.6.2n; §2n). Proximity and affection are also displayed by references to a desire to live more closely together: ***tecum vivere***: 5.15.2n; their shared activities/hobbies: ***studia paria*****:** 5.7.2n; 5.13.5n; 5.15.2n.

These strategies and vocabulary of *amicitia* employed by C. and his addressees in Book 5 represent the standard language of Roman friendship, which could, at times, break down. Quarrels could easily occur in the highly competitive world of Roman friendships, and relationships might temporarily rupture, even though Roman friends were less inclined to openly refer to disagreements unless they had previously reconciled with the addressee (e.g., 5.1.1n *reconciliata gratia*; 5.8.1n *nostrae necessitudini...interruptum officium...reddidi*).

What distinguishes this book from others—further suggesting that this is not a narrative C. would have chosen for himself—is the unique inclusion of a set of notably confrontational letters (5.1–2; 5; 7; 20). To accentuate this feature, the ancient editor(s) chose to commence the book with one of the most confrontational and harsh letters in the entire collection. Thus, 5.1 (of c. 114 words), written by Metell. Celer, accuses C. of violating diverse principles of *amicitia* (mutuality: 5.1.1n *...pro **mutuo**…animo...*; abandoning his friend in a moment of necessity: 5.1.1n ***desertum***; inconsistency: 5.1.2n ***mobili***); this is an agglomeration of accusations that stands out as unique in the entire collection.

Metell. Celer is not the only correspondent to employ such confrontational language. C. himself employs it in the book, not only to defend himself against Metell. Celer's accusations (cf. e.g. 5.2.3n *...in amicitia mutuum* and 5.2.10n *stabili*), but also to accuse others of lapses in reciprocity (5.2.4n *satisne...mutue respondisse*; 5.5.1n *ne…aliquid de nostra coniunctione imminutum esse ostenderem*; §2n *...nullam...gratiam*; 5.7.2n *...non mutue respondetur...*; §3n *gratulationem exspectavi*).[39]

[39] C. also employs confrontational language in other letters: ***odium***, the very opposite of *amicitia*, is found four times in the book, of which, two in reference to a fellow senator (Metell. Nepos: 5.2.10n *odisse...odio*). It is also found in reference to the Catilinarians (5.6.2n *odio inducti*) and to the symbols of (by the time of the letter lost) republic (5.15.4n...*odium...fori...curiae*).

The accumulation of confrontational language (as well as the inclusion of letters exchanged with people arguably close to Catiline and Clodius) underscores the idea that Book 5 has been organised with the aim of highlighting, in part, the very things that C. wanted Lucceius to omit from his 'monograph'. While friendships could easily break down in the highly competitive world of Roman *amicitia*, the portrait that emerges from the book was not necessarily the one C. wanted to convey to posterity. Lucceius' 'monograph' was meant to recount only those events that would elevate C. as one of the most significant and influential people of his time; however, whoever selected and organised the letters in *Fam.* 5 had a different agenda from C.'s.

AD LECTOREM

The commentary is divided into three main parts: introductory notes to clusters of letters (organised into main groups according to principles outlined in the introduction to Book 5), followed by single introductions to individual letters, and finally, commentaries on the body of individual letters. The reader is encouraged to read the two types of introduction here presented before delving into the commentary on individual letters.

The introductory notes to clusters of letters precede the introductions to the individual letters. They serve different purposes, looking to identify similarities in tones, themes, addressees, and relationships with C., among other factors, shared exclusively within that particular sequence of letters. Identifying these characteristics also aids in understanding the role that different clusters of letters play in the constitution and progression of the ancient editor(s)' narrative.

The introductions to individual letters look inward, aiming to provide readers with the knowledge to understand the elements discussed in the commentary. These introductions typically include a brief summary of the letter's key elements, followed by an analysis of the letter's themes and, where relevant, the consistent use of specific vocabulary or linguistic strategies. Additionally, they provide information on the addressee/addresser and links to other letters to/from the same writer/recipient in the collection. These introductions also propose hypotheses regarding the inclusion/exclusion of particular letters to/from the same addressee, known to exist thanks to references in other letters/collections.

The commentary adheres to the order of letters found in the Mediceus 49.9 (=**M**; 9th c.), and the Latin text used is based on Sh.-B. 1988 (as printed by Cavarzere 2016). Nevertheless, this commentary occasionally presents alternative readings of the Latin text, differing from those suggested by Sh.-B. The commentary generally consists of a brief summary of each paragraph within a letter, followed by a close analysis of the Latin text. While the Latin text in each paragraph is usually divided into single phrases and analysed individually, there are cases where a few phrases are considered and analysed collectively. Cross-references constitute a vital aspect of the commentary. Notations like '5.1.1n' are employed to suggest that the reader consults the cited *Fam.* 5 passage in conjunction with my commentary note or notes *ad loc*. These references are intended to enhance readers' understanding of the cohesive structure of the text. Furthermore, this commentary offers a comprehensive study that incorporates, when necessary, historical, linguistic, philological, and literary analysis.

COMMENTARY

5.1–4: C. and the Caecilii Metelli

An opening set of four letters exchanged with Metell. Celer (5.1–2) and Metell. Nepos (5.3–4), during some of the most crucial years of C.'s life: the period immediately after the end of his consulate and his return to Rome after exile.

Like the other missives included in the first part of the book (for which, cf. their introductions), 5.1–4 show C.'s difficult relationships (for which, the introduction to 5.1) with top members of Roman aristocracy—who, at the time of the writing of these letters, held provincial magistracies (on leave-taking protocols: the introduction to 5.8); the only exception to this common feature is 5.4, written, however, from Dyrrachium.

Like 5.5–11, 5.1–3 are all exchanged with magistrates in province: Q. Caecil. Metell. Celer was proconsul of Cisalpine Gaul in 62 (Broughton 1952, 176); his brother, Q. Metell. Nepos (with whom C. exchanged 5.3–4 and was the main reason for the writing of 5.1–2), was proconsul of Hispania Citerior in 56 (Broughton 1952, 218). These letters, like the following ones, show how leave-taking protocols were conducted (on which, the introduction to 5.8); furthermore, 5.1–2 demonstrate the consequences where one of the two parties was believed to have failed to behave according to these rituals (see the introduction to 5.1).

The Caecilii Metelli are also linked to the events involving the two main figures (Catiline and Clodius) of the book's narrative, as well as some of the addressees of the letters included in 5.1–11 (*i.e.* C. Antonius, P. Sestius and Pompey). This perhaps suggests the ancient editor(s)' inside knowledge of the events here discussed.

In 66, Metell. Celer acted as Pompey's legate in Asia (Broughton 1952, 156) and in 63, while city praetor, he gathered troops for fighting Catiline's supporters (5.2.1n ...*mihi tecum*...*officium*...*rei publicae*...*retinenda*). He was probably assigned to the province of Cisalpine Gaul thanks to C.'s (and C. Antonius', addressee of 5.5) machinations at the time of the redistribution of the provinces for 62 (5.2.3n *nihil in ea re per collegam meum me insciente esse factum*). The two brothers were also connected to Clodius; Metell. Celer was, in fact, his brother-in-law (5.3.1n ...*te mihi fratris loco*...).

Metell. Nepos served as Pompey's legate too: in 67 in Asia Minor and later in Syria where he remained until 63 (Broughton 1952, 148; 160). As the people's tribune for 62 (Broughton 1952, 174), he acted against C. for his decision to condemn the Catilinarian to death without *provocatio ad populum* (for a summary of the events: the introduction to 5.2.6n–8n). In the same period, he collaborated with Caesar (who interestingly remains conspicuously absent in the 5.1–11 narrative, yet is persistently alluded to in 5.9–11: the introduction to 5.7–8). Together, they advocated for the recall of Pompey from the East (where Pompey was stationed at the time of C.'s writing of 5.7). The

aim was to restore order in Italy, where Catiline's rebellion persisted, and to put an end to C.'s oppressive influence (Plu. *Cic*.23). The commotion that resulted from their project encouraged the senate to pass its 'Ultimate Decree' and remove both Metell. Nepos and Caesar from their offices; but they were restored to their offices promptly (5.2.9n ...*adiuvi*...*tuus frater*...). Nepos would then (probably) desert his tribuneship and join Pompey in Syria.

In 57, during discussion of C.'s return to Rome, the consul Metell. Nepos clashed (5.4.1n *animum*...*immutatum significabant*) with the tribune P. Sestius (the addressee of 5.6, who strongly supported the idea of recalling C. from exile: cf. the introduction to 5.5–6). However, in the same year, Metell. Nepos, together with L. Corn. Lentul. Spinther, decided to support C.'s return. It is possible that this conduct of Metell. Nepos led to a breakdown in his relationship with Clodius. The following year, during his proconsulate in Hispania Citerior in 56, he would seek C.'s help against Metell. Celer's brother-in-law Clodius (5.3.1n *Hominis importunissimi contumeliae*).

The letters exchanged with the Caecilii Metelli have been selected and arranged not only due to their links with other letters in the book, but also because 5.1–4, on a smaller scale, embody the narrative of the entire book. 5.1–4, in fact, begin with an image of C.'s pre-eminence and prestige, challenging even the powerful Metell. Celer, and conclude with a theme of loss and despair. A structural similarity can be seen in *QFr*., where each book of the collection portrays a movement from prestige to loss, reflecting the overarching narrative of the three-book collection (Losito, forthcoming). In particular in *QFr*. 1.1–4, where C. is seen transitioning from a position of prestige (*QFr*. 1.1–2) to exile (*QFr*. 1.3–4).

The set (and the book itself) commences with the harsh and provocative 5.1 in which Metell. Celer accuses C. of lacking respect towards himself and his brother Nepos—members of one of Rome's most prominent aristocratic families. In 5.1, Celer talks down to C., accusing him of disrespect, especially regarding his brother Nepos, with whom C. had a clash concerning the Catilinarian conspiracy. In 5.2, strategically placed after 5.1, the structure is inverted. Now C., offering explanations for his behaviour and the support shown to the two brothers, claims the higher moral and political ground.

The deliberate positioning of 5.3 after 5.2, offers to the reader a glimpse of how C. and Metell. Nepos' relationship changed through the years. The letters suggest that C. reconciled with Metell. Nepos (as he had promised to Celer in 5.2.10n *amore tui fratrem tuum odisse desinam*...*odio*...*nostra benevolentia detraham*). Differently from 5.2 (e.g. on Nepos' violent and disrespectful campaign against C.: 5.2.76n *de tui fratris iniuria*), in 5.3, Nepos shows a deferential attitude and conveys the appropriate degree of respect to C. (5.3.1n ...*te mihi fratris loco*...).

Fam. 5.4 (c. mid-January 57) has been positioned out of chronological order after 5.3 (c. 56). Like 5.5 in relation to 5.6 (arranged out of their probable chronological order), 5.3 provides a proper context for 5.4: C.'s request for support included in 5.4 was more credible if preceded by a letter (5.3) in which Nepos professed his friendly feelings.

However, the choice to conclude with 5.4 is also explicable by the fact that, as suggested earlier, the ancient editor(s) aimed to encapsulate the narrative of the entire book within these opening four letters. In 5.4, Cicero accepts his subordinate position, supplicating (as required by his condition of exile) and requesting help from Nepos (5.4.1n *gratias tibi...et...auxilium petii*; *non auderem*; §2n *quaesoque...serves*). This behavior is similarly observable in the final letters of the book, where C. consoles members of less important aristocratic families and needs consolation himself after Tullia's passing (introduction to 5.13–18). This pattern is also evident in the letters to his quaestor L. Mescin. Rufus, who appeared to have accused him of misgovernment of the province.

1

Letter written by Q. Caecilius Metellus Celer, the proconsul of Cisalpine Gaul in 62, to accuse C. of disrespecting the noble family of the Caecilii Metelli.

5.1 is one of seven letters (5.1; 5.3; 5.9; 5.10a; 10c; 10b; 5.14), written by someone other than C. to be included in the book (the number of letters written by someone other than C. included in the *Ad Familiares* is just under 20% of the total 435 extant letters: Gibson, forthcoming; see also the general introduction).

The letter alleges the failure of standard leave-taking protocols. When a magistrate left for the province, they would entrust the defence of their (and their families') prestige and affairs to influential *amici*—who should not fail their requests (on these protocols: the introduction to 5.8). However, here, according to Metell. Celer, not only has C. failed to provide support (§1n *absente...ludibrio...*) but has also sullied the Caecilii Metelli's reputation (§1n *...illum circumventum me desertum...*). Contrast 5.3, where C. is portrayed as a good friend, someone whom Metell. Nepos would love to have as a brother (on which, the introduction to 5.2 and 5.3).

Very little effort is made by the writer to outline the actual content of the dispute: Metell. Celer merely says that—because of a phrase pronounced by Celer's brother Metell. Nepos (§1n *ob dictum*)—C. has tarnished the reputation of the Caecilii Metelli. In order to restore the good name of the Caecilii Metelli, Metell. Celer counterbalances the alleged offences with an emphasis on his family's values (§1n *pudor*; *dignitas*; *clementia*), his commitment towards the republic (§1n *meum studium...remque publicam*) and his standing (§1n *qui provinciae, qui exercitui praesum, qui bellum*

gero.). He also employs harsh and confrontational language to emphasise his displeasure with C.'s conduct (e.g. §1n *Existimaram...nec...*; *ludibrio laesum iri*, *oppugnatum iri*; *a quibus minime conveniebat*; §2n *si vos paenitebit*; *cuiusquam iniuria*; for examples of abusive language targeting C., especially in oratory: van der Blom 2014, 37–57).

It is only thanks to the deliberate positioning of 5.2 after 5.1 (on which the introduction to 5.1–4), that the reader can understand the context for Metell. Celer's accusations. He likely wrote 5.1 after learning about the speech that C. delivered against Celer's younger brother, Metell. Nepos (who intended to prosecute C. for his handling of the Catilinarians: 5.2.7n ...*prid. Kal. Ian.* ...), on 1 January 62 (5.2.8n ...*in senatu Kal. Ian. ...disputavi...pugnandum*). 5.1 was written surely after hearing about Nepos' removal from his tribuneship in early January (5.1.1n ...*capite ac fortunis*...), but (probably) before the news of C.'s commitment to ensuring Nepos' reinstatement in his office reached Cisalpine Gaul (5.2.9n ...*nulla...sententia dicta in fratrem tuum...sedens iis adsensi qui mihi lenissime...meus inimicus*...).

Q. METELLUS Q.F. CELER PRO COS. S.D. M. TULLIO CICERONI 'Quintus Metellus Celer, son of Quintus, proconsul, sends greetings to Marcus Tullius Cicero'. Standard formal communication between two not intimate interlocutors (Cugusi 1983, 48). The absence of C.'s filiation here highlights their inequality (at least for Celer since C. in 5.2. employs his family name to stress his belonging to the Roman aristocracy) in standing. He does not consider C. as a peer but, instead, as a *homo novus* not entitled to a family name.

1 Metell. Celer emphasises two main moments in which C. has (allegedly) misbehaved: the unexpected contempt that arose immediately after the restoration of their relationship (*ludibrio laesum iri*); and C.'s offence against Metell. Nepos (*Metellum fratrem…oppugnatum iri*). **Existimaram...nec:** the opening *existimaram* stresses Celer's astonishment. In 5.2.1n, C. paraphrases Celer's statements to demonstrate the unfoundedness of his accusations. *Existimo* is found largely in confrontational letters in the book: 5.2.1n; 8n; 9n; 5.5.2n; 5.8.3n. **pro mutuo...animo...pro reconciliata gratia:** Metell. Celer alludes to a past event when they seem to have had a disagreement which somehow damaged their relationship. This, whether true or not, might have helped Celer construct an image of C. as a bad friend from the start of the letter (on mutuality and the language of *amicitia* here employed: the general introduction). In 5.2, C. uses the same tactic, but aims at distancing himself from Celer's depiction of C. as a 'bad friend' (C., in fact, states multiple times that he does not understand the meaning of Metell. Celer's words: 5.2.1n *pro mutuo...satis intellegere non possum*; §5n *de reconciliata gratia non intellego*...; he also asserts he helped Celer in multiple

occasions: the introduction to 5.2.3n–5n); instead, Metell. Celer is, according to C.'s own depiction of the events, the one who has failed to reciprocate C.'s favours (on which, the introduction to 5.2.3n–5n). **absente<m umquam me abs te> ludibrio laesum iri:** Metell. Celer highlights that C. disrespected him while he was away (possibly in the province: the introduction to 5.1–4) from Rome and could not defend himself (on C.'s description of the events: 5.2.4n *postea vero quam profectus es*...). This contravenes the leave-taking protocols (on which, the introduction to 5.8) and in general *amicitia* (on this, the introduction to the letter). The text printed by Cavarzere has been emended by Sh.-B. *ad loc*. to recreate 5.2.1n *existimasse…numquam te a me ludibrio laesum iri*; however, it is probably not necessary to intervene significantly, since *absente<m> ludibrio laesum iri* already conveys Celer's accusations clearly (Hoffer 2003, 95 n.9). *ludibrium* 'mockery' (*OLD* 3a): one of the two reasons that compelled Metell. Celer to write this letter (for the other, below). Metell. Celer's assertion becomes more comprehensible when one considers C.'s statements (and allusions) in 5.2.1n–2n. Here we learn that, in a speech possibly delivered before the senate in early 62 (§1n ...*in senatu*...), C. expressed his desire to have Metell. Celer praise his activity against the Catilinarians (§2n *sermone...visa est oratio non iniucunda...risus consecutu*). In doing so, C. (although he does not admit it for obvious reasons) appears to have mimicked Metell. Celer's voice: §2n *testimonium tuae vocis habere voluisse*; this caused laughter: §2n ...*risus consecutu* (that 'mockery' could cause laughter is possibly displayed by 7.25.1 too: *videris enim mihi vereri ne, si istum <ludibrio> habuerimus, rideamus* γέλωτα σαρδάνιον). A similar situation occurs in 5.5, where C. angrily writes a letter to C. Antonius, who not only had not reciprocated C.'s favours but had also mocked him. **Metellum fratrem ob dictum...oppugnatum iri:** the second reason (for the first, above) for Metell. Celer writing to C. (it was Celer's duty as the elder brother and higher-ranking individual to defend his brother; on brotherhood: Bannon 1997, 91–93): C.'s threat to Metell. Nepos' life and property (ultimately prompted by something Nepos said). Metell. Celer's vague statement can, again, be understood only thanks to C.'s reply (on their deliberate arrangement in sequence: the introduction to 5.1–4). The words that Metell. Nepos seems to have pronounced against C. may well not have been 'just a phrase' (*ob dictum*: Celer wanted to deliberately give the impression that C. overreacted but also reduces the importance of Nepos' assault: on which, 5.2.9n ...*non me dicto Metelli, ut scribis, sed...inimicissimo*...); rather Metell. Nepos' pronouncement (as the tribune of plebs in 62) actively prevented C. from delivering his thanksgiving speech after the conclusion of his consulship—owing to C.'s decision to send the Catilinarians to their deaths without the *provocatio ad populum* (5.2.6n *Metellum...oppugnari*; cf. also §8n *insigni iniuria...Metellum*; *in contione dixerat...dicendi...non oportere*). C. then responded to Metell. Nepos' attack on 1 January 62 (5.2.8n ...*Kal. Ian.* ...), and Metell. Nepos would counterattack on 3 January (5.2.8n *a.d. III Non. Ian. ...mihi minabatur*). ...*capite*

ac fortunis...: a phrase recurrent in C.'s speeches and frequently employed with the meaning of 'civic life' (*OLD* 5a) and 'property' (*OLD* 12); 14.4.2; *Quinct.* 8; 94; *Verr.* 2 3.131; 133 with references to the *Lex de repetundis*; see also *Rab.Perd.* 1; 2; *Dom.* 45; *Cael.* 67; *Sest.* 1; *Deiot.* 1. These terms make sense if we assume that Metell. Nepos is under threat of serious punishment. In early January 62, Metell. Nepos (along with Caesar) proposed to recall Pompey from the East (possibly to counter Catiline and C.'s growing power: cf. the introduction to 5.1–4), and to grant him election to the consulship in *absentia*. It appears that these bills were forcefully pushed through (against the veto of his colleague Cato) to the extent that martial law was declared (Broughton 1952, 174). Consequently, Metell. Nepos and Caesar were suspended from their offices (Broughton 1952, 173). Despite Nepos' enmity and the fact that C. was not directly involved in Nepos' suspension, C. assisted him (5.2.9n *adiuvi...meus inimicus...sublevare*). It is unclear whether this implies that Nepos was reinstated in his office, enduring some form of punishment, or granted the possibility of leaving Italy (this possibility is not considered by Sh.-B., who, following Plu. *Cic.*26 and D.C. 37.43, believes that Nepos deserted his office); however, he faced some penalty (cf. §2n ...*nec...nec...non...*, where it seems that Metell. Celer had probably requested a milder punishment). The idea that Nepos voluntarily chose exile to reach Pompey in the province might find support in Metell. Celer's affirmation here (and also in §2n *in luctu et squalore sum*). Those condemned to exile, even if initially voluntary, were generally deprived of the right to be in Rome and of their properties. A similar situation is described in 5.17, where P. Sittius chose voluntary exile to avoid punishment for the crimes he (allegedly) committed. Metell. Celer could not have known how things developed since he was likely traveling to his province at the time of the events; he might have received bits of information (possibly factional) about the happenings. For this reason, in 5.2, C. goes through the events meticulously. **...pudor...familiae nostrae dignitas...meum studium...sublevare...conveniebat:** Celer emphasises the importance and resonance of the Caecilii Metelli family, which C. has disrespected (again in §2n *mobili...animo*; cf. C.'s ironic reply in 5.2.8n *hominem gravem...civem egregium*; C. gives a different picture of Metell. Nepos in 5.2.8n *a.d. III Non. Ian...mihi minabatur...non iudicio neque disceptatione sed vi...evertere*); this reproach seems to be directed not only at C. but also at those senators who prosecuted Metell. Nepos (on which, §1n *Metellum fratrem ob dictum...oppugnatum iri*), as the passage (in both §§1–2) from the 2nd person singular to 2nd person plural might indicate. Celer's assertions suggest his higher political and social standing (he was a proconsul, who had also fought against Catiline: the introduction to 5.1–4) compared to that of a 'new man' (who, however, had fought against Catiline too and had just concluded his consulship; on Celer and C. shared efforts against Catiline: 5.2.1n ...*dispertitum officium*...). Celer warns (similar to §2n *non...mirandum...vos paenitebit*) C. by stating that this is the kind of family he has disrespected (again in §2n *qui...qui...*

qui...; *maiorum nostrum clementia*...) although, according to C., he did not disrespect them (cf. e.g., §1n ...*capite ac fortunis*...; 5.2.9n *adiuvi...meus inimicus...sublevare*). To Metell. Celer, C.'s behaviour produced a sense of shame (for which: Kaster 2005) that extended to the entire family. Cf. also 5.16.4n, where, differently from here, it is the fall of the republic that wipes out socio-political virtues; on the gloomier narrative presented in 5.13–18, cf. the general introduction. On the importance of *dignitas*: 5.12.7n; Metell. Celer might also allude to the *defensio dignitatis* of individuals away from Rome conducting their offices in the province (as C. did in 5.5.2n; 5.8.1n; 4n; 5n; 5.9.1n [twice]). However, Metell. Nepos was not away from Rome for an office, but his brother Metell. Celer was; he probably believed that C.'s services should extend to his brother Nepos in this case (on the display of C.'s failure of leave-taking protocols here: cf. the introduction to the letter). A different setting is presented by 5.3.1n *tuis...me officiis leniuntur* (written six years after 5.1), where Metell. Nepos thanks C. for his *amicitia*. ...*a quibus minime conveniebat*: it was probably their shared efforts against the Catilinarians (5.2.1n ...*dispertitum officium*...) that had to urge C. behaving as a good friend (on which, the introduction to the letter). A similar scene is depicted in 5.5: on which, cf. §1n *absente<m umquam me abs te> ludibrio laesum iri*.

2 Harsh conclusion to the letter, that is well suited to Celer's exhibition of moral and political superiority (see also §1n ...*pudor...familiae nostrae dignitas...meum studium...sublevare...conveniebat*). **in luctu et squalore sum** 'I am in a state of grief and I wear the black of mourning'. Weeping relatives, dressed in squalid raiment (*OLD* s.v. *squalor* 2b), were a regular feature of Roman trials (Quint. *Inst.* 6.1.30–33), especially when the convicted was sentenced to death or exile (*Cluent.* 192; *Att.* 3.10.2; *Red.Pop.* 8; *Sest.* 145; *Cael.* 4; *Pis.* 32; *Planc.* 21). Metell. Nepos had probably decided to leave Rome (as a voluntary exile) to reach Pompey: §1n ...*capite ac fortunis*... . **qui...qui...qui...:** the anaphora of *qui* emphasises Metell. Celer's political superiority (§1n ...*pudor...familiae nostrae dignitas...meum studium...sublevare...conveniebat*); on his career: the introduction to 5.1–4. *Bellum gero* is probably an exaggeration of Celer's limited responsibility during the military operations against Catiline and his followers (on C.'s reply about this: 5.2.1n ...*dispertitum officium*...), since he was 'merely' in charge of those legions that had the duty of blocking access to the Alps for Catiline (Leveghi 2016, 425 n.8). Celer's mention of being in charge of legions will be possibly used by C. to link him to the events connected to the Gracchi: §10n *meus...me sensus...admonet*. **...nec...nec...non...:** again (cf. above), rhetorical strategies help Metell. Celer's narrative of his socio-political pre-eminence. A similar statement is found in §1n ...*pudor...familiae nostrae dignitas...meum studium...sublevare...conveniebat*, where Metell. Celer broadens his accusations to include the senators who decided to remove Nepos from office: on which,

§1n *Metellum fratrem ob dictum...oppugnatum iri*). According to Celer, Nepos should have been spared/pardoned (*OLD* s.v. *clementia* 1a), not least because of Celer's political career and the importance of their family (on *maiorum nostrum* as a direct attack to C.'s *novitas*: Leveghi 2016, 425 n.9; on C.'s reply: cf. 5.2.8n *hominem gravem...civem egregium*). It might be possible that Celer had requested (or rather demanded) a milder punishment for Nepos (similar to 5.10a, where C. requested a less harsh treatment of Catilius; for other references to possible exemption from laws: 5.5 and Atticus' request). ... *si vos paenitebit*: a serendipitous anticipation of the dreadful event of C.'s exile in 57 (5.4.2n, where C. asks Metell. Nepos to help him return to Rome), which occurred precisely because of C.'s lack of clemency towards Catiline's followers. For the narrative fostered by the ancient editor(s), see the introduction to 5.1–4. **mobili animo...cuisquam iniuria:** concluding strong remarks (cf. e.g. the use of *cuisquam*) in keeping with Metell. Celer's tone in the letter. Celer accuses C. of being inconstant—an abrasive accusation from which C. distances himself throughout all 5.2 and especially in §8n *viro forti et constanti* and §10n ...*stabili...permanerem*. Similarly in 5.5.3n, where C. refers to his *constantia* to highlights C. Antonius' inconstancy; cf. also 5.8 (see its introduction) where C. tries to defend himself from possible accusations of inconstancy due to his seesawing relationship with Crassus. On the *iniuria* to which (according to Metell. Celer) he and his brother were subjected: §1n *Metellum fratrem ob dictum...oppugnatum iri*; Cf. also 5.2.6–9, where C. demonstrates that he has received an *iniuria*.

2

This 10-paragraph long letter (the second longest in the book, following 5.12: for which, see its introduction), written from Rome in c. mid-January 62, aims to defend C. against the accusations made by Metell. Celer in 5.1 (for the two brothers: the introduction to 5.1–4).

5.2 has been placed strategically after 5.1 because it both completes and helps contextualise some of Metell. Celer's accusations (on the ancient editor[s]' narrative: cf. the introduction to 5.1–4). The letter at the same time defends and exculpates C. from those accusations.

The letter largely follows the structure of defence speeches, where the strongest arguments are generally placed at the beginning (§1: C., saviour of the republic from the Catilinarians, has not offended Metell. Celer) and end of the letter (§§ 9–10: Celer has been pardoned by C. for his attacks, but he is urged to reciprocate his goodwill). As in a standard defence speech, C. relies on arguments written in response to the accusations included in 5.1; thus, in 5.2, C. proceeds by quoting from Metell. Celer's letter and then providing a longer response (than what Celer had bothered to put into writing: similar to 3.7 and 3.8, where C. defends himself against App. Claud. Pulcher's attacks). For example, C.'s response to Celer's claim to have been mocked (5.1.1n *ludibrio laesum iri*) is found in

§§1–2. Celer's reference to their reconciled friendship and mutuality (5.1.1n *pro mutuo...animo...pro reconciliata gratia*) is echoed in C.'s §§3–5. C.'s reply to Celer's accusation of having attacked Metell. Nepos (5.1.1n *Metellum fratrem ob dictum...oppugnatum iri*) is found in §§6–8. In the concluding §§9–10, C. overturns Metell. Celer's accusations and demonstrates once and for all that Celer was wrong in accusing him of inconsistent behaviour (5.1.2n *mobili animo*...)—while he has always been a steadfast friend (in §10n *stabili*...) to them. The language (e.g. selected §6n *impetum…crudelissimum*; *...iniuria...conqueri*; *...comperissem…perniciem...parare atque meditari*; §8n *viro forti et constanti*) and the periodic style (cf. §8n *hominem gravem...liberasset*: one of the longest sentences in the whole letter) are also typical of courtroom speech.

Throughout the entire letter, C. tries to achieve (like Metell. Celer in 5.1) a superior socio-political standing (differently from 5.4, where he accepts his subordinate position to Metell. Nepos). While Metell. Celer establishes his pre-eminence through his political role and family *dignitas* (5.1.1n *...pudor...familiae nostrae dignitas...meum studium...sublevare...conveniebat*), C. lays claim to it not only on the ground that he saved the republic from the Catilinarian conspiracy (e.g. selected §1n *...mihi tecum…dispertitum officium fuisse in rei publicae salute retinenda... ut ego urbem a domesticis insidiis…defenders…muneris*; §6n *...ego...rei publicae... rei publicae...*; §7n *consulem...rem publicam conservassem*; §8n *hominem gravem...liberasset*), but also on account of his composed attitude and understanding of the rules of Roman *amicitia* (e.g. selected §4n *tu ipse…iudices satisne…mutue respondisse*; §6n *fratris iniuria*; §8n *Hac accepta tam insigni iniuria tamen illo ipso die misi ad Metellum communis amicos...oportere*; *hominem gravem...civem egregium*; *viro forti et constanti*; *ego temeritati…virtute*; §9n *lenis…et facilis*; *humanitatem meam*; §10n *stabili*). Furthermore, to the alleged vindictiveness of his enemies (§6n *illius impetum…crudelissimum*; *fratris iniuria* §8n *insigni iniuria*; *mihi minabatur*; *vi atque impression evertere*; §9n *eius animoque in me inimicissimo*; *acerbissima iniuria*), C. contraposes his strategies of politeness (e.g. selected §1n *praeclari muneris*; §2n *te cupisse laudari*; §§3n–4n *senatum...coegerim...cum tu ipse mihi dixisti orationem meam...honorificam...possit*; §6n *Metellum...oppugnari...fraternam...humanitatis ac pietatis voluntatem*).

This confrontational language (here employed by C. in reference to Nepos and Celer) will be then re-employed: by Metell. Nepos in 5.3, but in allusion to Clodius (whereas C. is portrayed as a good friend, someone whom Metell. Nepos would love to have as a brother); and by C. in 5.4 in reference to Clodius (whereas Metell. Nepos is described as a lenient and clement man).

M. TULLIUS M. F. CICERO Q. METELLO Q. F. CELERI PRO S.D. 'Marcus Tullius Cicero, son of Marcus, sends greetings to Quintus Metellus Celer son of Quintus, proconsul'. The

employment of the extended formula of greetings *s.t.e.v.b.e.* is typical of official letters (Cugusi 1983, 48). For C.'s choice of employing his filiation see the heading of 5.1.

1 First, C. pretends not to understand (§1n *satis intellegere non possum*; similar to §5n *non intellego*) Celer's words (here quoted: *scribis ad me te*); then, he prepares the context for answering Celer's accusation of mockery (5.1.1n *ludibrio laesum iri*), which will be given in fuller detail in §2. There is strong emphasis on the role that C. (and Metell. Celer) had against the Catilinarian conspiracy. **suspicor...rem publicam a me conservatam...propinquos tuos...laude:** C. refers to a speech he delivered in the senate in which he expressed his desire to have Celer praise his endeavours against the Catilinarians (similar to his letter to Pompey, where, as in this case, Pompey appears to have refrained from congratulating C. so as not to hurt someone else: 5.7.3n *gratulationem exspectavi*; *...ne cuius animum offenderes*). It is not clear when this speech was delivered. An *ante quem* limit is set by Metell. Nepos' decision to impede C.'s thanksgiving speech (c. 29 December 63: §8n *abeuntem magistrate contionis...privavit*); C., in fact, refers to the enmity of someone close to Celer that prevented him from publicly congratulating C. (*propinquos tuos*; similar below, *a tuis propinquis*: an indirect reference to Metell. Nepos). The *post quem* limit is set by §1 *ad te esse adlatum*—a probable reference to the fact that Metell. Celer was no longer in Rome and had likely departed to reach Cisalpine Gaul in early January 62. *Suspicor* is an item in C.'s vocabulary for the Catilinarian conspiracy (e.g. 5.8.3n *suspicio* employed in reference to Clodius; again in §3n *suspicari*; similar to §1n *scelere*; §6n *...comperissem…perniciem...*; .§9n *si...nescisti…esse celatum*); here it is re-employed in reference to C.'s suspicion that Metell. Celer had been informed of C.'s speech by someone else (for other examples of this reusage and the posthumous narrative that it helps create: see the general introduction). *rem publicam a me conservatam*: stock phrase of C.'s narrative of the Catilinarian conspiracy: e.g. §7n; 10.19.2; 12.28.2; 15.4.11; *Att.* 2.1.6 and Dyck on *Catil.* 3.1. **...mihi tecum...dispertitum officium fuisse in rei publicae salute retinenda... ut ego urbem a domesticis insidiis…defenders...muneris:** C. wants to praise his addressee (differently from Celer in 5.1): they cooperated in the republic's defence against the Catilinarian conspiracy (cf. e.g. *praeclari muneris*: Celer's endeavour are depicted as a gift offered to the city). This intent is also visible from *dispertire officium,* which alludes to the fact that C. and Metell. Celer's safeguarding of the republic (see also *Sest.* 131 in *socius laborum, periculorum, consiliorum meorum*: Dyck on *Catil.* 1.19.6–8)—although Metell. Celer played a minor role; in 63, as praetor, he had operated in the Picenum and ager Gallicus to enlist troops that would block Catiline's retreat in Gallia (cf. also 5.1.2n *qui...qui...qui...*, on Metell. Celer's activity against Catiline in the last stages of the campaign against the Catilinarians). However, despite Metell. Celer's marginal role in the events, C.'s admission that he shared the republic's

defence with someone else is not something he would typically affirm (cf. *rem publicam a me conservatam* and its exclusive focus on C.'s actions; see also §2n *clarissimis meis...amplissimis rebus*; §8n *hominem gravem...liberasset*). The circumstances, however, necessitate showing goodwill to his addressee and demonstrate that he does not harbour resentment (differently from Metell. Celer) for the injustices he had endured. *domesticis insidiis...intestino scelere...armatis hostibus...occulta coniuratione*: standard vocabulary of C.'s language on the Catilinarians (cf. §7n *...improbissimus civis...*; §8n *hominem gravem...liberasset*; for other examples of this: the general introduction). C. never openly mentions the Catilinarians or Catiline himself, either here or in the other letters that constitute *Fam.* 5; but the expressions employed here clearly hint at him and his endeavours (on Catiline as one of the main threads of the book's narrative: the general introduction). The *iunctura domesticae insidiae* is employed for the first time in *Catil.* 3.17 (whose dramatic date is c. a month before this letter: on 3 December 63); however, C.'s commonest way of referring to the conspiracy is *domesticum bellum* (Dyck on *Catil.* 2.1.6–7). For Catiline's *insidiae*: Dyck *Catil.*1.11.5; 1.31.1–4). *Scelere*, like §1n *suspicor*, belongs to C.'s vocabulary for the Catilinarian conspiracy that is then re-employed in reference to different political enemies—including Clodius; this is a pattern within the book: the general introduction (on *intestinum*: *Catil.* 2.28). The representation of the enemy as an *armatus hostis* is a *topos* well attested in the Latin literature of the late republic (Nicolet 1960, 236–263). For the Catilinarian movement as a *coniuratio*: Dyck on *Catil.* 1.1.5–9. *occultus* is pleonastic: *coniuratio* carries already the meaning of secret operation (*occultae insidiae* is found e.g. in Dyck, on *Catil.* 2.1.10–12).

2 After introducing the events in §1n, C. can now provide a fuller explanation of his behaviour. The public speech C. delivered before the senate (*hoc in sermone...orationis...oratio...*: cf. §1n *suspicor...rem publicam a me conservatam...propinquos tuos...laude*) caused some laughter; this was misinterpreted by Metell. Celer and his informants (he had probably already left Rome: §1 *ad te esse adlatum*; on Celer's knowledge of the events: §7n...*prid. Kal. Ian. ...*; §9n *Haec si tu...nescisti, debes existimare te maximis de rebus a fratre esse celatum...sin autem aliquid impertivit tibi sui consili...*) as a sign of mockery (for which, 5.1.1n *...ludibrio laesum iri*). C. attempts to counter Celer's accusation here (as demonstrated by C.'s choice of downplaying the importance of his speech: *errore...errorem*; *mediocris*; *ingenue*); the laughter (*risus consecutus*)—he says (deceptively: §2n *testimonium tuae vocis habere voluisse*)—resulted from his desire to earn Celer's praise (*cupisse laudari*) for his efforts against the Catilinarians (*clarissimis meis...amplissimis rebus*), not from anything he said or did about Metell. Celer. **...oratio non iniucunda...risus consecutus:** *iniucunda* refers to *iocus* (as 'jeu de mots': E.-M.) and alludes to the joke that C. did pronounce in the senate

(§2n *testimonium tuae vocis habere voluisse*). *mediocris…risus* rejects the idea that C.'s joke caused excessive laughter, a task unsuitable to C. as the ex-consul who defended the republic, but entirely consistent with C.'s personality, known for his penchant for telling jokes, even in inappropriate moments (on which, Beard 2014). Excessive laughter was connected with such figures as the *mimus*, *scurra* and *ethologus* (Quint. *Inst.* 6.3.1–5 and Plu. *Comp. Dem. et Cic.* 1, who highlight that C.'s jokes were sometimes dangerously similar to the ones of *mimus* and *scurra*; for the contrast between orators and jokers, see *de Orat.* 2.252; Fantham 2002, 362–376; Beard 2014, 99–127; 156–184. On the employment of wit in oratory, see esp. Clarke 2007, 16–19). **in errorem meum...cupisse laudari aperte atque ingenue confitebar...honorifice esse dictum...in clarissimis meis atque amplissimis rebus...:** he represents himself as a respectable man whose only desire was to receive Celer's praise (see §1n *suspicor...rem publicam a me conservatam...propinquos tuos...laude*). The rare juxtaposition of *aperte* and *ingenue* is designed to depict C. as a trustworthy person. The repetition of *error* is a clear attempt to reduce the potential face-threatening act caused by his joke at Celer's expense (similar to *Att.* 10.11.5 where C. is concerned about the possibility that Vettienus took offence at his joke). *...clarissimis meis...amplissimis rebus*: C. apparently reduces the significance previously given to Metell. Celer's activity during the Catilinarian conspiracy: §1n *...mihi tecum...dispertitum officium fuisse in rei publicae salute retinenda... ut ego urbem a domesticis insidiis…defenders...muneris* (see also §7n *rem publicam conservassem*). The two superlatives enhance the importance of C.'s (not of C.'s and Metell. Celer's) actions against the Catilinarians. *Clarissimus* and *amplissimus* also contrast with §1n *intestino scelere* and *occulta coniuratione*: the opposition between the clarity and respectability of C.'s actions and the obscurity of Catiline's is a standard practice in C.'s narrative on the conspiracy. **testimonium tuae vocis habere voluisse:** C.'s jeu de mots. The employment of *vox* might be helpful in understanding how C. had mocked Metell. Celer; it is probable that, during the meeting of the senate, C. had imitated Celer's voice and way of speaking, especially when he mentioned his endeavours against the Catilinarians (§2n *...clarissimis meis...amplissimis rebus*). In this way, the imitation of Celer's voice would grant C. something that the actual Celer did not fulfil (*i.e.* a congratulation for his activity: similarly requested from Pompey: 5.7.3n *gratulationem exspectavi*)—likely due to his brother Nepos' hostility (§1n *propinquos tuos*; *tuis propinquis*).

3–5 C.'s reply to Celer's mention of their reconciled friendship and mutuality (5.1.1n *pro mutuo...animo...pro reconciliata gratia*)—that C. has now allegedly disrespected. C. asserts he has been an affectionate and loyal friend—not least because he needs to move Celer on from the allusion to his insult (§2n *testimonium tuae vocis habere voluisse*). C. mentions two main events (that both precede the quarrel with Metell. Nepos: Hoffer 2003, 98), in which he has helped Metell. Celer: his

allotment to Cisalpine Gaul for 62 (§3n *nihil dico de sortitione vestra*) and the support offered to Celer after his departure for Cisalpine Gaul (§4n *postea vero quam profectus es*). Both help C. overturn the accusations and highlight that Celer was the one who failed to reciprocate their friendship (§4n *tu ipse…iudices satisne…mutue respondisse*). **pro mutuo...mutuum...par voluntas accipitur et redditur...ego...praetermisisse provinciam…meae...rationes...:** the employment of vocabulary of *amicitia* (and especially the importance of reciprocity) is designed to demonstrate that C. (contrary to what Celer says in 5.1) knows his duties as a friend. ...*praetermisisse provinciam*...: the province of Cisalpine Gaul. During the distribution of provinces for the year 62 (Allen 1952, 233–241), C. had drawn the province of Macedonia, but retired from it to give it to his colleague C. Antonius (the addressee of 5.5: cf. the introduction to 5.5–6; for the reason behind this choice: §3n...*meae...rationes*), who, in return, gave him Cisalpine Gaul—an office that then C. refused to accept during a *contio* (§3n *ut primum in contione provinciam deposuerim*). It was then allocated to Metell. Celer. *meae…rationes*: C. realised that C. Antony (who was allegedly involved in the Catilinarian conspiracy) would take advantage of the military and economic resources of Cisalpine Gaul and make them available to Catiline (*Pis.* 4–5 ...*provinciam Galliam senatus auctoritate exercitu et pecunia instructam et ornatam…*). It is also probable that C. intended to remain in Rome to protect the city from Catiline's plots (on which, cf. e.g. *Agr.* 1.26; *Pis.* 5; *Phil.* 11.23). C. was notorious for his reluctance to accept a command outside Rome: Leach 2016, 503–523 on C.'s complaints about his office in Cilicia. **ut primum in contione provinciam deposuerim:** in a *contio* of c. 63 (see Allen 1952, 236, who believes it took place in May or June; similarly in Sh.-B. *ad loc.*), C. refused to leave Rome and ensured that (§3n *nihil dico de sortitione vestra*) the province of Cisalpine Gaul was assigned to Celer instead (on the event, see 15.4.13; *Mur.* 42; *Pis.* 5; Sal. *Cat.* 26; Plu. *Cic.* 12; D.C. 37.33). **nihil dico de sortitione vestra...nihil...me insciente esse factum:** on C. Antonius' crucial role during the draw for the assignation of the provinces between the eight praetors, Sh.- B. *ad loc.* The present letter is the only source that reports on C.'s involvement in the allotment of Cisalpine Gaul. On *suspicari* as Ciceronian language for the Catilinarian conspiracy (here employed in reference to C. and C. Antonius' activity in the allotment of provinces), cf. §1n *suspicor*. **senatum...coegerim...cum tu ipse mihi dixisti orationem meam...honorificam...possit:** C., consul in 63, summoned the senate after the draw. The speech (*orationem meam*) to which C. is referring, was held in the senate and probably delivered around May/June 63 (the supposed date of the *contio*, for which see §3n *ut primum in contione provinciam deposuerim*). It is a challenging task to reconstruct the argument of C.'s speech and the *praescriptio* of the *senatus consultum* to which he refers here. C. is probably alluding to Metell. Celer's activity (not mentioned by ancient sources) as praetor for 63—before his departure from Rome in October 63 (when he travelled to northern Italy

to face the Catilinarians: cf. note below). This suggestion finds support in the reference to the discontentment of Metell. Celer's colleagues (*collegas...contumeliosam...*: cf. 5.3.1n, where *contumelia* refers to Clodius). If C. had praised Metell. Celer for his actions against the Catilinarian conspiracy (which had not yet occurred: §1n *...mihi tecum...dispertitum officium fuisse in rei publicae salute retinenda...ut ego urbem a domesticis insidiis...defenders...muneris*), his colleagues would not have perceived C.'s praise as detrimental to themselves. It is also possible that C. is exaggerating (cf. C.'s assertion he shared with Metell. Celer the task of defending the republic: §1n *dispertitum officium*; similar conduct is displayed in his letter to Crassus: cf. the introduction to 5.8), in order to praise the addressee (on which, the introduction to the letter). **postea vero quam profectus es...tu ipse velim iudices...mutue respondisse:** C. refers to the support offered to Metell. Celer when he was away from Rome (it was his duty to support a friend who was away; on leave-taking protocols: the introduction to 5.8; cf. also the previous note)— that Metell. Celer has not reciprocated (on which, the introduction to §§3–5). *postea vero quam profectus es...*: Sh.-B. *ad loc*. believes that C. alludes to the events of c. October 63, when Metell. Celer departed for northern Italy to carry on his activity against Catiline (on which, §1n *...mihi tecum…dispertitum officium fuisse in rei publicae salute retinenda... ut ego urbem a domesticis insidiis…defenders...muneris*). *...Romam venisti*: Celer returned to Rome probably at the end of 63 (cf. Constans 1962, 107 who dated it to December 63) to take over the command of Cisalpine Gaul on c. 1 January. There is no evidence that Celer drew his army near to Rome to demonstrate his support for Nepos—as T.-P. *ad loc.* believes. However, C. is implying that, during that visit, Celer did something that clearly disappointed him. **de reconciliata gratia, non intellego...numquam imminuta est:** C. adopts a vocabulary of 'non-comprehension', so as to remove any suspicion from his conduct (*non intellego*: cf. §1n. *satis intellegere non possum*). According to C., there has not been a fallout in their friendship (differently for Metell. Celer: 5.1.1n).

6–8 For the first time in this lengthy reply to Celer's accusation (on which, 5.1.1n *Metellum fratrem ob dictum...oppugnatum iri*), C. at last provides a detailed description of the main moments of his quarrel with Metell. Nepos: the matter of the oath on 29 December 63 (§7n *prid. Kal. Ian.*); the clash in the senate on 1 January 62 and Metell. Nepos' hostile *contio* on 3 January (§8n *Kal. Ian. ...a.d III Non. Ian.*). C. aims to highlight three main points: 1) he did not initiate the argument but was the one under attack (§6n *de tui fratris iniuria*). For this reason, 2) he had to defend himself (§6n *meam salutem contra illius impetum in me crudelissimum defenderim*) and the public interest (§6n *ego in re fratri tuo rei publicae causa restiterim*) from his attacks (C. had also to ask for the help of their family members: §6n *egi cum Claudia…et…Mucia*; §7n *misi ad Metellum communis amicos*). He also emphasises 3) the gravity of Metell. Nepos' offense (§8n *mihi minabatur...vi atque impressione*

evertere) in order to demonstrate to Celer that he was wrong to diminish the importance of his brother's attack (5.1.1n *ob dictum*). **Metellum...oppugnari...fraternam...humanitatis ac pietatis voluntatem:** this is the first time within 5.2 that C. refers directly to Metell. Nepos (he had previously alluded to him: §1n *propinquos tuos*; *a tuis propinquos*). C. structures his statement to mirror the one written by Metell. Celer (5.1.1n *Metellum fratrem ob dictum...oppugnatum iri*). However, in contrast to Metell. Celer, C. refrains from immediately attacking his addressee. Instead, he initially aims to please him with his affection towards his brother Nepos. Fraternal *pietas* (a blend of affection and duty that structured kinship: Bannon 1997, esp. 90–135; on the juxtaposition of *humanitas*—employed in §9n in reference to C.'s leniency towards the Caecilii Metelli—and *pietas* in relation to brothers: cf. *Off.* 3.41–42, in reference to the fratricide Romulus) is the only valid reason for Metell. Celer's confrontational behaviour (similar to §10n). This is, however, just a façade of politeness: it might refer also to the danger of the interplay of brotherly love and political vicissitudes, of which the Gracchi constituted the most important and still vivid example (on fraternal *pietas* and its implications: Bannon 1997, 91; cf. also §10n *meus...admonet*). **...ego...rei publicae...rei publicae...:** C. asserts that Celer should not perceive his actions against Nepos as a personal affront. Just like Metell. Celer (whose conduct is prompted by his fraternal love), C. argues that he too was compelled by a higher cause: the protection of the state. By attacking C., Metell. Nepos damaged the republic as well (on C.'s 'L' État, c'est moi' complex: MacKendrick 1995, *index*). In a concise and non-confrontational passage (e.g. *ut mihi ignoscas*, a clear strategy of redressive politeness; similar to §10n *ego dolori tuo non solum ignosco* and in the confrontational 5.19.2n *si non feceris, ignoscam*), C. not only attains the moral and socio-political high ground but also defends himself against Celer's accusations. **meam salute...illius impetum in me crudelissimum defenderim...de tui fratris iniuria conqueri:** C. overturns Metell. Celer's words (5.1.1n *Metellum fratrem…per te oppugnatum iri*) and demonstrates that Metell. Nepos (not C.) started the quarrel (cf. the introduction to §§6–8). C. depicts himself as the injured party who suffered Nepos' attack, to whom was left no other choice but to defend himself from his adversary's aggression. *crudelissimum* (which belongs to C.'s vocabulary of the Catilinarian conspiracy: 5.4.2n *adrogantem crudelitatem*, where it is employed in reference to Clodius) accentuates the sense of violence already expressed by *impetus* and highlights the ruthless cruelty of Nepos' attack (similar to 5.10a.1n *hominem crudelissimum*, where it is employed in reference to the murderer Catilius). The hyperbaton *impetum…crudelissimum* will be employed again in *Phil.* 13.19 in reference to Antony's conduct. *fratris iniuria*: differently from Celer in 5.1 (§2n *cuiusquam iniuria*), C. chooses not to complain about Metell. Nepos' *iniuria*. In this way, he further awards himself the moral high ground (see also above: *...ego...rei publicae... rei publicae...*). Despite the polite pleasantries, C. was offended by the Caecilii Metelli's behaviour—as

the employment of the significant term *iniuria* shows (§6n *Claudia…et Mucia…ab ilia iniuria deterrerent*; §7n *qua iniuria nemo…adfectus est*; §7n *cuius iniuria mihi…honori summon fuit*; §8n *Hac accepta insigni iniuria*; §9n *in acerbissima iniuria remissio animi ac dissolutio*); *nihil...conqueri...tecum*: hyperbaton (cf. §9n *nihil tecum…expostulem*). The juxtaposition of *iniuria* to *conqueror* is also attested in *Q.Rosc.* 25 and *Verr.* 2.84. **...comperissem…perniciem...parare atque meditari:** C. claims to have learnt about Metell. Nepos' plans from others but he gives no specific information on his source; he seems to have planned his attack well in advance. The language here offers an agglomeration of courtroom style speech—especially that employed in C.'s speeches against the Catilinarians. *comperio* is usually employed by C. in reference to a conspiracy (e.g. Dyck on *Catil.* 1.10; Berry on *Sul.* 12; 86) and it was later taken up by his enemies to jeer at him (on which, cf. 5.5.2n *nam comperisse me non audeo dicere*). *pernicies* and its related adjectives are vocabulary of C.'s language against the conspirators (cf. Dyck on *Catil.* 1.8.6–8; 11–10; Tedeschi 2017, 293–310). On the re-employment this vocabulary within the letter: §1n *suspicor*; for its contribution to the narrative the ancient editor(s) wanted to constitute: the general introduction. **egi cum Claudia...et cum Mucia…ut eum ab illa iniuria deterrerent:** to re-establish good relations between aristocrats was sometimes a delicate activity that required the intercession of intermediaries. Women acted as surrogates for their absent husbands (e.g. 5.6.1n *sed postea...Cornelia...Terentiam...Cornelio...litteris*; on the role of intermediaries, cf. also §8n *communis amicos*). *Claudia, uxore tua*: the apposition *uxor* conveys a degree of respect (cf. 5.2.8n *...uxor tua...tui Crassi...*). C. possibly employs *Claudia* (and not the 'vulgar' spelling *Clodia*) as a mark of deference to her husband Celer (on Clodius' sister, Skinner 2011, 83–84; on Clodius as one of the main threads of the book's narrative: the introduction to 5.1–4). *vestra sorore Mucia*: again, the apposition confers respect. Mucia was probably a close relative of the two Caecilii Metelli and Pompey's third wife (Sh.-B. *ad loc.*). *cuius erga me studium pro Cn. Pompei necessitudine…perspexeram*: C. sought out Mucia's help because he was aware that she considered him an associate (as emphasised by *necessitudine*: on which, the general introduction) of her husband Pompey (the addressee of 5.7; on the posthumous links between 5.1–4 and 5.5–11: the introduction to 5.1–4). **...prid. Kal. Ian. ...:** a reference to the events of 29 December 63, when Metell. Nepos prevented the outgoing consul C. (*abeuntem magistratu*: below) from addressing his concluding speech to the people on account of his condemnation of the Catilinarians to death without *provocatio ad populum* (*contionis habendae potestate privavit*: below). C. surmounted this insult by delivering the most eloquent of oaths (*...iurarem...iuravi...ius iurandum...iurasse iuravit*: below). C. is certain (albeit he does not reveal his source: similar to §6n *ego …comperissem*) that Celer had learnt about his brother's conduct (possibly by hearsay or at second hand: cf. *OLD* 9 s.v. *audio*) before the writing

of 5.1. Whether true or not, C. accuses Metell. Celer of attacking C., even when aware of Nepos' conduct (again in §9n *Haec si tu...nescisti, debes existimare te maximis de rebus a fratre esse celatum...sin autem aliquid impertivit tibi sui consili...lenis a te et facilis existimari debeo qui nihil tecum...expostulem*). **...iniuria...magistratu improbissimus civis adfectus est ea...me consulem adfecit, cum rem publicam conservassem...:** again C.'s actions are contrasted to those of the Catilinarians (§2n ...*clarissimis meis...amplissimis rebus*). Metell. Nepos is criticised for choosing to punish C. (*iniuria*: on which, cf. above) for the death of the Catilinarians instead of taking action against Catiline. *improbissimus civis*: a scoundrel, a man without rectitude (cf. Dyck on *Catil*. 1.5.9–10; 3.6) who operates against the laws of the state (cf. Hellegouarc'h 1963, 528–530). Standard Ciceronian language on Catiline and the conspiracy: similar to §1n *domesticis insidiis...intestino scelere...armatis hostibus... occulta coniuratione*. *adfectus...adfecit*: polyptoton. C. could not conceal the deep resentment he felt at the way he had been treated. The repetition of *afficio* gives C. the chance to prove that he was the victim (similar to §8n ...*ego Metello, fratri tuo, praesenti restiti*) of Metell. Nepos' offensive acts, not the executioner (and, in this way, counteracting Metell. Celer: 5.1.1n *Metellum fratrem…per te oppugnatum iri*). *cum rem publicam conservassem*: C. claims to be the sole saviour of the state (similar to §1n *esse…rem publicam a me conservatam*): a statement that differs from his earlier assertion that Metell. Celer had shared with him the task of safeguarding the republic (§1n ...*dispertitum officium*...). **...atque abeuntem magistratu contionis habendae potestate privavit:** first specific mention of Metell. Nepos' activity against C. *abeuntem magistratu*: official formula that denotes the leaving of a public office (*OLD* s.v. *abeo* 14b). *contionis habendae potestate privavit*: Nepos deprived C. of the right of addressing the people (*habere contio*: *TLL* IV 731,7 ff.; similar to §8n *qui …animum advertisset indicta causa*) on the events of the year, as was usual with outgoing magistrates (Mommsen 2010, 510–511. The event is recalled in Plu. *Cic.*23; D.C. 37.42). It was probably the *dictum* to which Celer alludes in his 5.1 (§1n *ob dictum*). **cuius iniuria mihi tamen honori summon fuit...iurarem...iuravi...ius iurandum...iurasse iuravit:** C.'s damaged honour (cf. §6n ...*iniuria*...) was restored thanks to the public display of gratitude received after his oath (the importance of this is emphasised by the polyptoton ...*iurarem*...*iuravi*...*ius iurandum*...*iurasse iuravit*); on that occasion, thousands of people accompanied C. to his house (cf. Plu. *Cic.*22). ...*verissimum pulcherrimumque*...: C. pronounced a modified version of the oath; he swore that he had protected the state (*Pis.* 6; *Rep.* 1.7; Plu. *Cic.*23). For the customary formula, to the effect that the outgoing magistrate had done nothing contrary to the laws and had acted for the highest interests of the state, cf. e.g. Liv. 29.37.12; D.C. 37.38; 38.12; 53. **Hac accepta tam insigni iniuria tamen illo ipso die misi ad Metellum communis amicos…oportere:** C. demonstrates that he tried to reconcile with Metell. Nepos, offering him the possibility of undoing his actions and giving C. the

opportunity to pronounce his thanksgiving speech in the *contio* (on which, see above). C. immediately sent (*illo ipso die*: 29 December 63: cf. §7n ...*prid. Kal. Ian.* ...) mutual friends (§8n *communis amicos*; on the role of intermediaries: §6n *egi cum Claudia...et cum Mucia...ut eum ab illa iniuria deterrerent*) to persuade Nepos to change his mind (§8n *de illa mente desisteret*). But the message seems to have arrived too late (§8n ...*ille respondit...non esse integrum*): Metell. Nepos had already spoke to the people and decided that C. had to be punished (§7n *contionis habendae potestate privavit*) for his decision to inflict capital punishment on the Catilinarians without the possibility to appeal to the people (*qui …animum advertisset indicta causa*). C. made efforts to demonstrate (on the importance of displaying *amicitia*, even in confrontational settings: Konstan 1997, 126) that he had not done anything wrong but had suffered injustices (on the recurrence of *iniuria*, see above), thereby claiming the moral and political higher ground: on which, the introduction. **hominem gravem...liberasset:** this is one of the longest sentences in the entire letter. Its highly periodic style (and rhetorical devices: cf. the anaphora of *qui* that confers to the text a crescendo of anguish) serves to emphasise C.'s deeds on behalf of the republic (here made even more majestic: cf. the earlier statement in §1n *rem publicam a me conservatam*; similar to §7n) and reveal the fictional nature of the statement about C. and Metell. Celer's collaboration against Catiline at the opening of the letter: §1n ...*dispertitum officium. hominem gravem...civem egregium*: sarcastic statement (on irony in C.'s orations: Canter 1936, 457–464) about Metell. Nepos' conduct (on which, §7n *contionis habendae potestate privavit*), that would probably annoy Celer (especially after 5.1.1n ...*pudor...familiae nostrae dignitas...meum studium...sublevare...conveniebat*, where the virtues of his brother and their family leverage Celer's reprimand of C.). In this final part of the letter, C. dismisses the patina of ingratiating remarks and strategies of politeness, and makes it clear to Celer that he should respect C. not only for being an innocent man (similar to §6n ...*ego...rei publicae...rei publicae*...) but also for having been the consul who saved Rome from Catiline and the conspirators. On C.'s attempt to reach the higher moral and socio-political ground: the introduction. *qua poena…adfecerat*: exaggeration: here, differently from before (§2n ...*clarissimis meis...amplissimis rebus*), the fact and relevance of the decision that C. had to endure (§7n *contionis habendae potestate privavit*) are compared to the penalties given to the Catilinarians—possibly the declaration of Catiline as a *hostis* or the decision of the senate to sentence the Catilinarians to death. Both of these penalties are in reality rather more severe than what C. had to endure—a fact which must have damaged his dignity (cf. the repetition of the term *iniuria* in the letter: §6n *iniuria*) as an ex-consul and saviour of the state. *qui…voluissent*: hyperbolic description of the Catilinarians' plan (for C.'s rhetoric of terror: Neel 2017, 437–453; on C's language on the Catilinarian conspiracy: §1n *domesticis insidiis...intestino scelere...armatis hostibus... occulta coniuratione*). It is improbable that Catiline's followers intended to ignite Rome and murder senators,

although they might have planned small-scale actions to sow terror and confusion (Berry on *Sul.* 3, who believes that they organised small fires). *...dignum...*: differently from above *qua poena…adfecerat* (but in line with previous statements: §2n *...clarissimis meis...amplissimis rebus*), C. contrasts his actions with those of the Catilinarians. On Metell. Nepos' decision to prevent him from delivering his final speech to the people: §7n *abeuntem magistrate contionis habendae potestate privavit*. There may also be allusion to the *supplicatio* decreed in C.'s honour on 3 December (Berry on *Sul.* 33). **...ego Metello, fratri tuo, praesenti restiti:** C.'s actions are simply a reaction against Metell. Nepos' cruel attack (similar to §7n *adfectus...adfecit*). The only way to defend his honour is to counterattack immediately (on 'reflexive' honour: Kaster 2005, 35 n.21. On Celer's 'reflexive' sense of honour, 5.1.1n *...pudor...familiae nostrae dignitas...meum studium...sublevare...conveniebat*). **...in senatu Kal. Ian...disputavi...pugnandum:** on the first comitial day of January 62, C. confronted Nepos in the senate (on Nepos' attack: §7n *contionis habendae potestate privavit*). *viro forti et constanti*: by reacting to Nepos' offences, C. demonstrates himself to be an honourable and resolute man (one's toughness is judged on how one reacts to insults, cf. e.g. *Cael.* 21 *faciunt quod viri fortissimi solent*: *laesi dolent, irati efferuntur, pugnant lacessiti*; similar to §8 *huius ego temeritati si virtute…non restitissem, quis…existimaret…fortem fuisse*?). The *iunctura* is typical of courtroom speeches and occurs in *Sul.* 82 (cf. Berry *ad loc.*); *Flacc.* 98; *Dom.* 87; *Planc.* 77; *Phil.* 11.32; 13.15; *Off.* 1.80; *Mil.* 1. C. chooses to employ *constans* to answer to Metell. Celer's accusation of fickle disposition towards his family (5.1.2n *mobili animo in me meosque*; see also §10n *sed ita stabili*). **a.d. III Non. Ian...mihi minabatur...non iudicio neque disceptatione sed vi...evertere:** Metell. Nepos' hostile *contio* on 3 January (on which, cf. esp. §8n *Hac accepta tam insigni iniuria tamen illo ipso die misi ad Metellum communis amicos...oportere*). C. depicts his rival as the opposite of the good politician (differently from Metell. Celer' depiction of his brother: 5.1.1n *...pudor...familiae nostrae dignitas...meum studium...sublevare...conveniebat*): he is a violent and irrational (*OLD* s.v. *iudicium* 4a) man (cf. 5.4, where Metell. Nepos becomes lenient and clement) who is determined (*deliberatus*) to ruin C. politically and socially (*OLD* s.v. *everto* 5a), howsoever he may (*quacumque ratione posset*). His actions are unlawful (*vis* is the violent force of the plebs which Nepos embodies in his position as tribune; cf. also §8n *temeritati*) and his tools are threat (*minor*) and assault (*OLD* s.v. *impressio* 1). Similar language is employed by Nepos in 5.3, but to describe Clodius (cf. its introduction). **huius ego temeritati si virtute...non restitissem, quis...existimaret...fortem fuisse?:** differently from Nepos (cf. previous note), C. is the politician and nobleman par excellence: he ponders his choices (*consilio*; *non casu*; it is the contrary of *non iudicio*) and acts courageously and rationally (on *fortis*: cf. e.g. *Off.* 1.67; 80; it is the opposite of *temeritas*, that indicates the impulsivity of the crowd: e.g. Sen. *Ep.* 85.28).

9–10 These are the most confrontational segments of the letter, strategically placed towards its end (similar to e.g. 5.7.3n and 5.8.4n). C. works up to this point: if the first sections were mostly full of pleasantries and strategies of politeness (e.g. §1n ...*dispertitum officium*), now he can finally and definitively set himself on the higher moral and political ground (differently in 5.4, at the time of C.'s exile). C. overturns Metell. Celer's accusations: all he did was defend himself from Metell. Nepos' attacks; C. repeats it many times within the letter (e.g. §6n ...*ego...rei publicae... rei publicae...*; §8n ...*ego Metello, fratri tuo, praesenti restiti*), and especially in this conclusive part, to make it clear to both Metell. Celer and Nepos. **Haec si tu...nescisti, debes existimare te maximis de rebus a fratre esse celatum...sin autem aliquid impertivit tibi sui consili...lenis a te et facilis existimari debeo qui nihil tecum...expostulem:** C. sets out two possibilities for Metell. Celer's harsh accusations. Celer might not have known about Metell. Nepos' plans (improbable because C. more than once suggests that Celer was in fact aware of the events: §1n ...*ad te esse adlatum...*; §7n ...*prid. Kal. Ian.* ...). In this scenario, Nepos refrained from informing his brother about his conduct against C. (cf. *celo*, Ciceronian vocabulary for the conspiracy, here referred to Nepos' actions: similar *sui consili*, below; for other e.g. of this in the letter: §1n *suspicor*). Thus, in Cisalpine Gaul, Celer learnt that C. attacked Nepos and sent him a letter full of resentment to preserve the honour of his family. However, if Celer was informed (the second—and most probable—possibility) of Nepos' plot (*sui consili*: again, C.'s vocabulary for Catiline and his followers here re-employed in reference to Nepos, as mentioned above), he must be pleased that C. is not complaining about the treatment received (*expostulem*: C. does not assail the friends of his enemies: Brunt 1988, 371; similar to 3.10.7; on the competition to achieve a moral and socio-political higher ground: the introduction). C. counteracts Metell. Celer's allegations of hostility (cf. the introduction to 5.1), by showing Celer lenience (*OLD* s.v. *lenis* 5a; on the relation with *clementia*, see Hellegouarc'h 1963, 261–263) and tolerance (*OLD* s.v. *facilis* 9a). *lenis* is C.'s vocabulary for the Catilinarian conspiracy (on which, Berry on *Sul.* 1). It generally hints at his behaviour during the conspiracy (for which he had been attacked by Metell. Nepos and, retrospectively, by Celer) and aims at countering accusations of cruelty in the execution of the Catilinarians. Here it is re-employed (similar to *celatum*; *sui consili*; for other e.g. in the letter, cf. §1n *suspicor*; in the book: the general introduction) to describe C.'s lenient behaviour towards Metell. Celer. Cf. also 5.3.1n *leniuntur*, where Metell. Nepos praises C. for his leniency and display of *amicitia* and 5.4.2n, where Metell. Nepos is described as a lenient (§2n *mitissimam tuam orationem*) and clement (§2n *tua clementia*) man. **et si intellegis non me dicto Metelli...sed consilio…inimicissimo esse commotum... cognosce nunc humanitatem meam, si humanitas...dissolutio:** C. insists on the premeditation of Nepos' plan (above and the introduction

to §§9–10; on C.'s innocence, cf. §8n *...ego Metello, fratri tuo, praesenti restiti*; on *consilium* as language of the Catilinarian conspiracy: cf. previous note); also on his goodwill (*humanitatem…humanitas*: on *humanitas* in *amicitia,* see *Cluent.* 57; *Att.* 1.1.4; *QFr.* 2.3.5; Beckmann 1952, 26; cf. §6n *...fraternam plenam humanitatis ac pietatis...*, where it is Celer to be remembered for his *humanitas*) and moderate behaviour (*remissio animi ac dissolutio*: the man who is neglectful about revenging himself must enjoy a good repute: *Red. Pop*. 23 *qui in ulciscendo remissior fuit, secundo rumore aperte utitur*), facing Nepos' antagonistic conduct (*acerbissima iniuria*: e.g. selected §6n *meam salute...illius impetum in me crudelissimum defenderim...de tui fratris iniuria conqueri*; §8n *a.d. III Non. Ian...mihi minabatur...non iudicio neque disceptatione sed vi...evertere*; similar following note). This is the first time that C. refers to Metell. Nepos as *inimicus* (similar to §9n). It is again found in 5.4.2n *tu, tuas inimicitias…te vicisti*, at the time of C.'s exile, in reference to Nepos and C.'s reconciliation; cf. also 5.17.2n. **...nulla...sententia dicta in fratrem tuum...sedens iis adsensi qui mihi lenissime...meus inimicus...:** again (cf. previous note), C. demonstrates that he behaved in accordance with Roman *amicitia* (cf. e.g. *lenissime*: §9n *lenis***)**: he assisted (*...curare...adiuvi...*) Metell. Nepos even when Nepos attacked him; in fact, when Metell. Nepos had been suspended from his office (cf. 5.1.1n *...capite ac fortunis...*), C. did not hold a grudge (on *inimicus*: cf. previous note) and willingly (allegedly) supported his reinstatement. He did so due to his affection for his brother Celer, who is now the 'bad friend' who attacked C. even when C. did nothing wrong (on this narrative, cf. also §9n *Haec si tu...nescisti, debes existimare te maximis de rebus a fratre esse celatum...sin autem aliquid impertivit tibi sui consili...lenis a te et facilis existimari debeo qui nihil tecum...expostulem*). **qua re non ego oppugnavi...sed...repugnavi; nec in te...animo fui mobili, sed...stabili ut in me erga te voluntate etiam desertus ab officiis tuis permanerem:** C. restates what was already affirmed above: §9n *Haec si tu...nescisti, debes existimare te maximis de rebus a fratre esse celatum...sin autem aliquid impertivit tibi sui consili...lenis a te et facilis existimari debeo qui nihil tecum...expostulem*. *mobili...stabili* clearly refers to Celer's 5.1.2n *...mobili animo...*; C. had already described himself as §8n *viro forti et constanti* and §9n *lenissime* (for other e.g., see the introduction). Here, he employs *stabili* (which explicitly contrasts with *mobilis*), to describe his firmness (similar *permanerem*) in displaying them goodwill, even when Metell. Celer failed to display *amicitia* (on *in mea erga te voluntate* as a stock phrase of Roman friendships: the general introduction) to C. This is further demonstrated by *desertus* (generally employed in reference to the violation of one's *officium* towards family's members or friends: cf. *TLL* V 672, 68), that clearly alludes to Celer's *me desertum* (5.1.1n). **...tibi paene minitanti nobis...hoc rescribo atque respondeo: ego dolori tuo non solum ignosco sed...laudem tribuo...admonet:** again, C. implies he is morally superior to Metell. Celer. Despite Celer's actual threat included in his letter (5.1.2n *...si vos paenitebit*), C.

forgives him (*dolori tuo...ignosco*): it was Celer's affection for Nepos which urged him to defend this brother (§6n ...*fraternam plenam humanitatis ac pietatis*...). *meus...me sensus...admonet*: C's political expertise (*OLD* s.v. *sensus* 4b; differently from Sh.-B. *ad loc.* who refers it to C.'s relationship with Quintus), warns him against Celer's fraternal devotion—that might lead to political violence (*vis*: Lintott 1968, 107–124). Metell. Celer (like C. Gracchus) might be prepared to do violence (5.1.2n *non erit mirandum si vos paenitebit* and C.'s reply at §10n *tibi paene minitanti nobis*) to vindicate his brother (similar to *Rab. Perd.* esp. 5, where T. Labienus' prosecution of Rabirius—for the death of his uncle—is compared to C. Gracchus' attack). **...a te peto ut tu...te iudicem dolori meo praebeas...acerbe, si crudeliter, si sine causa sum a tuis oppugnatus... tuo atque exercitus tui auxilio...:** C. urges Celer to reconsider his conduct. *aequum...iudicem...praebeas*: at the conclusion of the letter, after having 'proved' his innocence (on *acerbe*: §9n *acerbissima iniuria*; on *crudeliter*: §6n *illius impetum…crudelissimum*; on *sine causa*: §8n *non casu*), C. invites Celer to judge wisely (*OLD* s.v. *praebeo* 5c; for the *iunctura*, *Caec.* 8; *Fin.* 1.15) C.'s conduct (similar to §4n *tu ipse velim iudices*, where C. asks Celer to reflect on his behaviour). *dolori*: for the cause of C.'s resentment: §7n ...*prid. Kal. Ian. ... . tuo atque exercitus tui auxilio*: with decided irony (similar §2n ...*testimonium tuae vocis habere*...), C. recalls Metell. Celer's mention, at the conclusion of 5.1.2n, of his command over legions—which he might utilise (a threat to which C. also alludes above); C.'s reference, to Celer's army, might also aim at strengthening the (possible) correlation between Metell. Celer and the events related to the Gracchi's family given above: cf. §10n *meus...me sensus...admonet*. See also 5.4.2n ...*crudelitatem tuorum me oppugnes*, where C. requests Metell. Nepos' help against Clodius. **Ego te mihi semper amicum...amicissimum laboravi...maneo in voluntate...benevolentia detraham:** standard language of *amicitia* (cf. the general introduction). *odisse desinam*: Nepos is C.'s political enemy (§9n *meus inimicus*; on the use of 'hate' language at the time of the republic's fall: 5.15.4n *odium temporum, hominum, fori, curiae*); however, C. can easily overcome this obstacle (thanks to his affection for Celer: cf. the contrasts *amore*/*odisse*), if Metell. Celer is willing to demonstrate his goodwill toward him. Thanks to the arrangement of 5.3 and 5.4 after 5.2, the ancient editor(s) demonstrated that Metell. Nepos and C. did, in fact, reconcile: cf. e.g. 5.3.1n *te mihi fratris loco*; 5.4.2n *mitissimam tuam orationem*; *clementia*; cf. also their introductions.

3

The proconsul of Hispania Citerior Metell. Nepos requests C.'s help with his affairs in the province.

The letter was written six years after 5.2 (C.'s letter to Metell. Celer). During this period, Metell. Celer had passed away (in 59), his brother Nepos had served as consul (in 57) and was currently proconsul of Hispania Citerior; most importantly, he had reconciled with C. (on C. and

Nepos' quarrel: 5.2.6n–8n). C. had also been in exile (as depicted in 5.4: cf. its introduction) but had since returned (on Metell. Nepos and the ancient editor[s]' narrative fostered by arranging letters in meaningful sequences: cf. the introduction to 5.1–4).

Their reconciliation was not as immediate as portrayed in the ancient editor(s)' narrative and often occasioned second thoughts; in fact, in 57, as consul Metell. Nepos (Clodius' brother-in-law) opposed C.'s recall from exile multiple times (as also shown in *Att*. 3.12.1, 3.23.1, 3.24.2, and 4.3.3–4; for the events, cf. the introduction to 5.4). Eventually, Nepos allowed C. to return to Rome.

In 5.3, Metell. Nepos employs a confrontational vocabulary (§1n *homo importunissimus*; *contumelia*; *ne memini*) similar to that which C. uses in 5.2 (for which, cf. its introduction) when criticising the activities of Nepos and Celer; but now that vocabulary is turned on a new party, Clodius—one of the main threads in the book's narrative (cf. the general introduction). Moreover, in 5.3, C. becomes the lenient and friendly *amicus* (§1n *lenio*; *frater*; similar Nepos in 5.4: cf. its introduction) he asserted he always been in 5.2—but unappreciated by both Metell. Celer and Nepos at the time of its writing.

This letter primarily focuses on two main themes present in the first section of the book and, more broadly, throughout the entire *Fam*. 5: leave-taking protocols (on which, the introduction to 5.8) and Clodius (§1n *Hominis importunissimi contumeliae*: one of the two primary narrative threads in the book: the general introduction). Similar to C. in 5.4 and 5.5, and P. Sestius in 5.6, Nepos chooses to communicate the reason for seeking C.'s help through an intermediary, Lollius, who likely conveyed the message to C. (§2n *ad Lollium perscripsi...vos doceret et commonefaceret*).

Q. METELLUS NEPOS S.D. M. CICERONI 'From Q. Metellus Nepos to M. Cicero, greetings': standard formal heading.

1 In a lengthy sentence, Nepos contrasts his tumultuous relationship with his troublesome brother-in-law Clodius to the amicable and now restored friendship with C. This comparison is facilitated through the use of vocabulary associated with disagreement and that of friendship. **Hominis importunissimi contumeliae...me onerat:** a passage that provides some difficulties, owing to Nepos' deliberate vagueness. The principal reference might be to Clodius' troublesome *contiones* probably in April 56, after the Lucca conference (Sh.-B. *ad loc.*) and at the time of Clodius' aedileship (Broughton 1952, 208). Nepos may have been attacked by Clodius for his support shown for C.'s return from exile in 57; this might be one of the reasons why Nepos decided to write to C. (who at the time of the missive was in open conflict with Clodius: *Har. Resp.* 1; 7; 9; 11; 14; 20; 61–62) asking for favours. *Hominis importunissimi* is standard Ciceronian language to describe especially

Catiline (*Catil*. 1.23; 2.12; 4.12); it is here re-employed in reference to Clodius (this is a common strategy observable in the book: see the general introduction; C. employs it also in *Sest*. 29; 42). On *contumelia* as insulting behaviour, cf. 5.2.3n, where C. uses it to emphasise the significance of his praise for Celer's actions. *creber...onerat* strengthens the description of Clodius as a dreadful man, who showers him with accusations (similar to *Phil*. 2.99 *omnibus eum contumeliis onerasti*). **tuis...me officiis leniuntur:** differently from Celer in 5.1 (who depicts C. as disrespectful to his obligations as a friend), Nepos thanks C. for his display of *amicitia. lenio* is here employed to praise C.'s leniency (that C. had praised in himself multiple times in the confrontational 5.2.9n) and, at the same time, to highlight Clodius' cruelty. **ut sunt leves ab eius modi homine...libenterque commutata persona te...duco:** *levis* describes the fickle disposition of the *populares* (that Clodius embodies: similar to *Amic.* 95 *quid intersit inter popularem, id est adsentatorem et levem civem, et inter constantem et severum et gravem*). The expression *commutata persona* is juridical language that identifies a *commutatio* (cf. Ulp. *dig.* 2.15.8 *vel personam commutavit, ut quod a pluribus erat acceptums, ab uno accipere*). Nepos asserts that he would do everything to distance himself from Clodius, including replacing (*OLD* 4a s.v. *commuto*) his own brother-in-law with C. (similar to *Fam.* 12.14.8).

2 The three main topics are condensed in a six-line paragraph: 1) Clodius' disrespectful behaviour; 2) Lollius' newest information on Hispania Citerior; 3) Nepos' request for support. **de illo ne meminisse...volo...tametsi bis eum invitum servavi:** Nepos carries out a private *damnatio memoriae* of Clodius. The precise context for Metell. Nepos' words is not clear (similar to §1n *Hominis importunissimi contumeliae...me onerat*). *...bis eum invitum servavi*: in 57, Nepos helped Clodius (probably against his will: E.-M., s.v. *invitus*) to escape Milo's prosecution for *de vi* crimes twice (Kaster 2006 on *Sest*. 89; cf. also *Att.* 4.3.2–3; *Mil.*40): in c. February (Rundell 1979, 322) and in November of the same year (Sh.-B. *ad loc*.). **De meis rebus...ne vobis multitudine litterarum molestior essem...ad Lollium perscripsi...provinciae qui vellem fieri, ut is vos doceret et commonefaceret:** Metell. Nepos transitions to the primary purpose of his letter: informing C. that Lollius (via intermediaries: see the introduction to this letter; on Lollius' identity: Sh.-B. *ad loc*.) will convey communication regarding his request, likely related to the province (*de rationibus provinciae*; on leave-taking protocols: the introduction to 5.8). Nepos employs standard stratagems of politeness when requesting a favour (similar behaviour is displayed in e.g. P. Vatinius' 5.9–10b and, especially, C.'s 5.12; cf. also 5.4.1n *obstrepere non auderem*). *de rationibus provinciae*: Nepos was probably concerned (*OLD* 8a s.v. *ratio*) with the uprising of the Vaccaei (and other indigenous tribes) that occurred in Hispania Citerior at the time of the missive. The sole extant source, D.C. 39.54.1–2 (who probably misdated it to 55: cf. Amela Valverde 2002, 270 n.4, who believes that the events can be

dated back to 56) suggests the inadequacy of Nepos' resistance and refers to the later intervention of Pompey to suppress the insurrection. **Si poteris...voluntatem conserves:** standard language of *amicitia* (for which, the general introduction). It refers to a time (likely before 5.1–2) when the relationship between C. and Metell. Nepos had not yet soured. Cf. 5.4.2n *quantum tua fert voluntas*, where it is C. who asks Nepos' help.

4

Letter written by C. probably in early 57 from Dyrrachium. It is a desperate plea for help addressed to the consul for 57 Metell. Nepos.

5.4 concludes the series 5.1–4 on a bitter note (similar to e.g. *QFr.* 1.1–4: cf. the introduction to 5.1–4): C. did indeed end up in exile for his activity against the Catilinarians (as Celer's threat in 5.1.2n *si vos paenitebit*—thanks to the deliberate arrangement of these letters in this particular sequence—seemed to forecast). C.'s struggle to achieve the moral and socio-political ground in 5.2 (cf. its introduction) is surmounted here by his knowledge of being in an inferior position (on the editorial narrative for 5.1–4: its introduction). However, in 5.4, the cruel Metell. Nepos (cf. the introduction to 5.2) becomes here lenient (§2n *mitissimam tuam orationem*) and clement (§2n *tua clementia*): C.'s statement in 5.2.10n, where he says he is willing to stop hating Metell. Nepos, is now fulfilled.

The addressee is Metell. Nepos, sender of 5.3 and brother of Celer (*Fam.* 5.1–2), with whom C. had a troubled friendship (for which, the introduction to 5.3). He shared, with his brother-in-law Clodius, the conviction that C. should be punished for his actions against the Catilinarians (on the events of 62: cf. 5.2.6n–8n). In February 58, Clodius punished C. for his conduct towards the Catilinarians and forced him to go into exile (on the law *de capite civis Romani*: Rotondi 1922[2]). Subsequently, C. (who received updates on the debate concerning his exile from Quintus and Atticus: §1n *Litterae...dederant*), wrote 5.4 to secure Nepos' support for his recall. However, Nepos' role in this was marginal; it was the result of the joint efforts of Nepos' colleague, P. Corn. Lent. Spinther and Pompey (addressee of 5.7), but also P. Sestius (addressee of 5.6: cf. the introduction to 5.14).

The structure of the letter (in which expressions of hope and goodwill alternate with statements of angst and despair) reflects C. and Nepos' seesawing relationship. ll. 1–5 (in Sh.-B. 1988) *petii* probably refers to the events that occurred in early December 58, when C. was optimistic about the possibility of his recall from exile thanks to Nepos' display of goodwill (*Att.* 3.24.2 ...*Metello, qui simultatem humanissime deponeret*). The actual reason for Nepos' lenient behaviour is difficult to establish (the latest information we have on his feelings towards C. is in *Att.* 3.12—a

letter of c. mid-July 58—where he is described as C.'s professed enemy). It might be connected to Quintus and Atticus' machinations to ingratiate the designated consuls for 57 (in early December 58, they ensured that military equipment and grain supply were exceptionally assigned to Lent. Spinther and Metell. Nepos before the beginning of their consulship: *Att.* 3.24.1). Pompey might have had also a role in this. Nepos was Pompey' *legatus* from 67 to 63 and had already acted as Pompey's henchman in 62 (on which, the introduction to 5.1–4). Nepos probably decided to support the motion on C.'s recall from exile to do a favour to Pompey (as Lentulus did: D.C. 39.6: ὁ γὰρ Σπινθὴρ ὁ ὕπατος τὸ μέν τι καὶ τῷ Πομπηίῳ χαριζόμενος).

The subsequent lines (ll. 5–8) show C. discouraged and disillusioned due to Nepos' change of behaviour: *Att.* 3.25.1 (mid-December 58), *...perspicio nobis in hac calamitate tabescendum esse*; similar to *QFr.* 1.4.4 (August 58), *alienatio consulum, etiam praetorum...* . The ancient sources do not provide information on this event either; it is probable that, at the end of 58, C.'s enemies managed to discourage Nepos from supporting the proposal on C.'s recall.

Starting from l.9, C. regains hope in the possibility of leaving Dyrrachium; the reason is a letter written by his brother Quintus in early January 57 (cf. *Att.* 3.26.1) that updated him on the actions taken in his favour. In this lost letter, Quintus probably informed C. that, on 1 January 57 in the meeting of the senate, the consul Lent. Spinther supported (with the approval of his colleague Metell. Nepos) Lucius A. Cotta's law proposal on C.'s recall (on the events: e.g. selected *Red. Pop.* 11–12; *Red. Sen.* 5–9; *Sest.* 72–74; 84).

The final ll.12–21 reveal C.'s anxiety for his future. It is highly probable that, at the time of the writing of this letter, C. was aware of Clodius' machinations to stop him from leaving the province (he, in fact, prevented the reading of the law proposed by the tribune Q. Fabritius on his return on 23 January 57 and incited a riot: *Sest.* 73–77; Plu. *Cic.* 33; *Pomp.* 49; D.C. 39.7); C. was also worried that Clodius' activity would affect Nepos' opinion on his recall. Thus, soon after the assembly of 23 January 57, he wrote *Fam.* 5.4 to beg (§2n *peto quaesoque...serves*) his addressee to show compassion for his condition.

M. CICERO S.D. Q. METELLO COS. 'From M. Cicero to Q. Metellus, consul, greetings': standard formal heading.

1 C. justifies his decision to ask Nepos for support. He also explains the reason why he stopped writing to him. Expedients of redressive politeness are put in place to mitigate the intrusion on Nepos' time and energy. **Litterae Quinti fratris et T.Pomponi...spei dederant:** for the events here mentioned: cf. the introduction. C.'s confidential informants, Quintus and Atticus, keep C. posted on

the events in Rome; this was a standard practice of leave-taking protocols (on which, the introduction to 5.8): cf. e.g. Lollius in 5.3 and Decius in 5.6 and/or family members (e.g. in 5.8 and 5.9–10b). *necessari mei*: bond of obligation toward family (Hellegouarc'h 1963, 72. Atticus' sister Pomponia was C.'s sister-in-law: cf. e.g. *Att.*1.5.2) that is strengthened by the emphatic *mei. in te…auxili…in tuo collega*: reference to the consuls for 57 Metell. Nepos (recipient of this letter) and P. Corn. Lent. Spinther. C., from a subordinate position (differently from 5.2: cf. the introduction to 5.4), insistently asks (cf. §1n *auxilium petii*; §2n *auxiliari*) Nepos to be merciful and have compassion for his condition. **...ad te litteras...misi...ut fortuna postulabat, et gratias...egi et...auxilium petii:** C. observed the etiquette that the circumstances demanded: 1) he sought political support from a powerful ally; 2) he reduced the possible irritation caused by his request by showing gratitude and respect. *gratias egi*: strategy of politeness commonly used in epistolary negotiations between aristocrats (Hall 2009, 198); C. thanks Nepos for the help received (the phrase may refer to the events of early December 58, when Nepos seemed favourably disposed to help C.: cf. the introduction to the letter) and renews his request for support. **postea...animum tuum immutatum significabant...litteris...non auderem:** rumours about Nepos' unexpected change of mind (as highlighted by *postea*, whose incipitary position marks the beginning of a new phase in C. and Nepos' friendship) urged C. to hold back. *non tam meorum litterae quam sermones…*: the letters from his inner circle (*meorum*) barely reported on Nepos' reconsideration. Instead, C. had to discover the news from the passers-by (similar to *Sest.* 72 *equidem audita dico*). The scarcity of written sources makes it difficult to reconstruct the events (cf. the introduction to the letter). *Att.* 3.25 is likely the only surviving letter that hints at the changes in events in mid-December 58. Here, the news of Atticus' departure to reach his friend in Dyrrachium was probably a signal of the unfolding events (as C. points out in §1). However, rumours in Dyrrachium reached C. before Atticus' arrival, plunging C. into deep depression. *obstrepere non auderem*: asymmetric communication: after the discovery of Nepos' second thoughts, C. ceased sending him letters so as not to disturb him; this is also a stratagem of redressive politeness: cf. e.g. 5.3.2n *ne...litterarum molestior essem*. On C.'s subordinate position: cf. the introduction to the letter.

2 A new phase in C. and Nepos' friendship: Nepos' supportive speech pronounced on 1 January 57 encouraged the writer to renew his plea for help (cf. the introduction to the letter). C. gives his addressee two options: Nepos can either act virtuously by saving C. (and the state: cf. 5.2.6n *ego...rei publicae...rei publicae*) from Clodius' machinations or let events unfold by not intervening. **Nunc...Quintus frater...tuam orationem...perscripsit:** as §1n *postea*, *nunc* introduces a new stage in their relationship. *Quintus frater…habuisses*: C. refers to a lost missive written by C.'s brother

Quintus to inform him on Nepos' favourable disposition. It presumably included or referred to the text of the opening speech that Nepos pronounced in the senate at the beginning of his office (a section of it has been preserved in *Sest.* 72: cf. §2n *tu, tuas inimicitias…vicisti*). *mitissimam tuam orationem*: *mitissimus* is a hyperbole used to flatter the addressee: cf. *Sest.* 72 where C. employs *moderatio* to describe Nepos' behaviour on 1 January 57. Cf. 5.2.8n ...*mihi minabatur*... (and also its introduction for other e.g.), where Metell. Nepos is depicted very differently from the portrayal given here (cf. also §2n *tua clementia*). **qua inductus...conatus...:** strategy of redressive politeness: C. places the responsibility for having intruded Nepos' time and energy on the friendliness shown in Nepos' speech (cf. above). C. deceitfully affirms that he did not want to disturb Nepos but, considering the extremely favourable circumstances, he had to force himself (*conatus*) to send his request. **...et...peto quaesoque ut...crudelitatem tuorum me oppugnes:** desperate request for help that combines a recognition of the constraints of decorum (as C.' s subordinate position required: cf. §1n *obstrepere non auderem*) with concerns for C.'s future. *quantum tua fert voluntas*: redressive politeness: C. offers compensation for the annoyance that his request may provoke. C. asks Nepos' help against Clodius and his supporters as far as his *voluntas* (his friendly disposition: *OLD* s.v. 8b) allowed (Nepos was still Clodius' brother-in-law: 5.3.2n *te mihi fratris...duco*; cf. also 5.3.2n where it is Nepos who appeals to C.'s *voluntas*). Similar request for help is found in 5.2.10n ...*auxilio*..., where, however, the enemy against whom C. requests Celer's protection is his brother Nepos. *adrogantem crudelitatem*: allegations of *crudelitas* are usually aimed at C. for his execution of the Catilinarians (Berry on *Sul.* 7); here, however, it emphasises the cruelty of Clodius' machination; on this re-employment of C.'s vocabulary on the Catilinarian conspiracy: cf. the general introduction. Nepos' conduct is often described as cruel by C. in 5.2 (cf. e.g. §6n *illius impetum…crudelissimum*; §10n *si crudeliter*). Clodius is here assimilated to the category of *arrogans*—a person who claims what is not his own (MacKendrick 1995 on *Mur.* 11). C. is probably referring to the legal unsoundness of Clodius' adoption into the plebs and, consequently, his election to tribuneship (*Dom.* 34–42, where Clodius is again depicted as arrogant). *arrogans* is also Clodius' decision to propose a law *ad personam* and sentence C. to exile without a regular trial (*Dom.* 43–46). His legislation appears as an act of cruelty rather than one done in accordance with the Roman law. **tu, tuas inimicitias...te vicisti:** reference to Nepos' speech of 1 January in which he probably (*Sest.* 72 is the only ancient source that reports a part of the text) referred to his decision to give up (*OLD* s.v. *dono* 3 c) his ancient hostility (on which, cf. 5.2.9n *in me inimicissimo*; *meus inimicus*) for the sake of the state (the authority of the senate, the prestige of his colleague Lentulus and the persuasiveness of P. Servilius' speech contributed to Nepos' change of mind: cf. the introduction to the letter). **alienas ut contra rem publicam confirmes adduceris? :** C. was afraid that Clodius would dissuade Nepos from helping

him. He almost reprimands his addressee: why would he support (*OLD* s.v. *confirmo* 7a; for its political connotation, cf. below) a project that it is not of his own and, in addition, detrimental to the republic (*i.e*. to do something good for C. is equivalent to doing good for the state: cf. 5.2.6n *ego…rei publicae…rei publicae*)? **...mihi tua clementia...tuleris, omnibus...me...tibi confirmo:** first of two scenarios (both introduced by *si mihi*): if Nepos helps C., he will benefit from C.'s *amicitia*, when he returns to Rome. *clementia*: Nepos' merciful disposition (similar to §1n *mitissimam tuam orationem*) stands in contrast to which Clodius and his supporters' *crudelitas* (§2n *adrogantem crudelitatem tuorum*). Similar to 5.3, where Nepos praises C. for his friendly support, that stands in contrast with Clodius' enmity (§1n *hominis importunissimi contumeliae*). See also 5.2, where C., differently from here, emphasises his leniency against the Caecilii Metelli's cruelty (§9n *cognosce nunc humanitatem meam, si humanitas…dissolutio*). **si mihi...auxiliari...vide ne...revocare tempus...non possis:** second (and gloomiest) of the two scenarios here proposed: if Nepos (but also the whole senate and people) allow Clodius to carry on his plot, a negative outcome is inevitable both for C. and the republic (language of a foretold catastrophe: similar to *Att*. 2.21.1 *tota periit*, written while Clodius is trying to get C. exiled). Retrospectively, this conclusion anticipates (on C.'s foresight: White 2010, 123) the upheavals in C.'s own personal life and the dramatic outcomes of the civil war (as shown in the final section of the book: cf. the general introduction). *magistratus* is Martyni-Laguna's correction of *magistratum* **Ω**; Sh.-B. *ad loc*. accepts the correction because he sees in it a reference to both the consuls for 57. However, one cannot exclude that *magistratum* hints at Nepos' colleague, Lent. Spinther (who is remembered as the protector of the republic and the saviour of C.'s life: *Red. Pop.* 11); in this case, C. would refer only to him because he has already (and repeatedly) pledged his request for help to Nepos within the letter. *eam vim*: the violence of the plebs that Clodius (but also Nepos, if he decides to support his brother-in-law's plan; cf. 5.2.8n for Nepos' *vis*) represents. It probably refers to the events of 25 January, when Clodius and his supporters took over the *forum*, *comitium* and *curia* and caused a carnage of civilians (cf. *Sest*. 75–77). *me cum re publica vicit*: for C.'s identification with the republic, cf. §2n *alienas ut contra rem publicam confirmes adduceris*. *vide ne…possis*: overdramatic and somewhat vague closure of letter. C. warns Nepos (*vide ne*: cf. *TLL* X 152, 30): there is no turning back if he joins efforts with Clodius; [*re*]*servandorum*: the reading **Ω** *reservandorum* ('to keep alive/intact': *OLD* s.v. *reservo* 4) should be therefore retained (cf. differently Sh.-B. *ad loc.*, who prefer Manutius' correction: *servandorum*).

5.5–6: C.'s exchanges with C. Antonius Hybrida and P. Sestius

C.'s correspondence with C. Antonius (5.5) and P. Sestius (5.6) takes place in 62 during their magistracies in Macedonia.

Letters 5 and 6 have been selected and positioned here because they enhance the narrative fostered by the ancient editor(s) of the book (on which, the general introduction). Not only do the letters connect with the previous set of letters (5.1–4) and the following set (5.7–11), sharing themes with them, but they are also exchanged with addressees that are intrinsically linked to each other (see further below). This might indicate the ancient editor(s)' possible close knowledge of events narrated in the letters. Like *Fam.*5.1–4 and 5.7–11, 5.5 shows C.'s seesawing relationship (reflected in 5.6, C.'s letter to C. Antonius' proquaestor P. Sestius) with a member of Roman aristocracy. Similarly in C.'s exchanges with Metell. Celer (5.1–2), Metell. Nepos (5.3), Pompey (5.7), Crassus (5.8) and Vatinius (5.9–11), C. Antonius Hybrida and P. Sestius, at the time of writing, held magistracies that obliged them to be in their province (the only exception is 5.4, that, however, is written by C. during his exile).

5.5–6, similarly to 5.3, 5.7–11, display leave-taking protocols (on this, the introduction to 5.8), in which the request of favours (hardly ever returned: the introduction to 5.7–8), from friends in Rome, was a standard practice. C. Antonius requests C.'s defence against the accusation of malversation (cf. below and 5.5.3n ...*reliqua*...*studium*...*desiderant*); P. Sestius requested—through the intercession of Decius—a delay to the nomination of his successor to the proquaestorship of Macedonia (5.6.1n *Decius*...*operam dare*...*succederetur*...). C. appears to have requested favours in return, specifically asking Antonius for help with Atticus' request (cf. the introduction to 5.5) and (possibly) for a loan (5.5.1n *Ego si abs te*...*debeat*). Assistance is also requested from Sestius, potentially related to C.'s debts, and relationship with Antonius (cf. the introduction to 5.6). Similar requests were made to those who seemed to have received favours from C.: Pompey and Crassus (as discussed in the introduction to 5.7–8); 5.9–11 is the only set of letters that explicitly display favours requested and reciprocated.

The image of power and pre-eminence displayed by C. in 5.5–6 contrasts with the one revealed in 5.4, written during C.'s exile. By placing this letter here, the ancient editor(s) intended to depict C. as standing up to the established aristocracy (on the book's narrative: the general introduction).

Like the majority of the letters included in the book, C.'s correspondents here are linked to events concerning C.'s enemies Catiline and Clodius (although to different degrees). Not only are C. Antonius and P. Sestius personally connected; they are also connected to the correspondents of the preceding and following letters, particularly Metell. Celer, Metell. Nepos, Pompey and Crassus. This clearly displays the ancient editor(s)' intention to establish a coherent narrative within the book.

Antonius (who was C.'s colleague in 63) was believed to be in cahoots with Catiline (allusions are found in e.g. *Catil.* 3.14; *Sest.* 8; 12). It seems that C. was able to discourage him from prolonging this (possible) closeness to Catiline, by promising (at the time of their consulship) Antonius the

lucrative province of Macedonia for the year 62 (similar Dyck on *Catil*. 3.14). For this reason, C. Antonius, with Metell. Celer and C., was involved in the redistribution of the provinces for 62 (5.2.3n *nihil in ea re per collegam meum me insciente esse factum*); Antonius was allotted Cisalpine Gaul and C. Macedonia; however, C. refused to go (5.2.3n *meae...rationes*), leaving Macedonia to Antonius. By the end of October 63 (and again in January 62), Antonius decided to support the republican cause against Catiline (Broughton 1952, 166; 175).

Antonius is intrinsically linked to Pompey (addressee of 5.7) too. Early in 62 Antonius left Rome to reach Macedonia where he was accused of malversation. Pompey tried to replace him with someone else in the command of Macedonia (*Att.*1.12.1). Antonius requested C.'s help with this (5.5.2n *omnia...ad tuum commodum...honorem...dignitatem pertinerent*); however, his extortion of provincial money eventually caused Antonius conviction and exile in 59: Deniaux 1993, 391). The decision to put 5.5 after 5.4 (a letter written by C. from Dyrrachium: cf. its introduction), and, therefore, to link Antonius and C.'s experience of exile, further shows the ancient editor(s)' intent to constitute a coherent narrative.

Like C. Antonius, P. Sestius is connected to the events involving not only Catiline (and, it this case, Clodius) but also Metell. Nepos, Pompey and Crassus. According to C., Sestius played a crucial role in the defeat of the Catilinarian conspiracy (*Catil*. 1.21, where he is referred to as an 'admirable youth'). Not only did he keep Antonius under surveillance during his quaestorship in Etruria in 63 (when he was suspected of colluding with Catiline), but he also, with the assistance of M. Petreius (Antonius' lieutenant who replaced him in the battle of Pistoria: cf. 5.5's *inscriptio*), encouraged him to stand up for the Roman republic (*Sest*. 12).

P. Sestius also assisted C. after his condemnation of the Catilinarians without *provocatio ad populum*. His intervention appears to have been crucial in December 63, when the tribune of 62, Metell. Nepos (with whom C. exchanged 5.3–4 and whose actions are described in 5.2, the letter to his brother Celer), attempted to punish C. for this (5.2.7n *prid. Kal. Ian...abeuntem magistratu...potestate privavit*; on Sestius' intervention: *Sest*. 11).

In late 62 and January 61, Sestius acted as a go-between C. and Antonius; he might have helped C. secure a loan from Antonius to extinguish the debts incurred for the purchase of his new house (5.6.2n ...*aeris alieni*...). The house that C. bought was that of Crassus (the addressee of 5.8) on the Palatine (5.6.2n ...*de Crasso domum emissem*...). P. Sestius also supported C. in his return from exile. In 58, as tribune elect for 57, P. Sestius went to the province to seek Caesar's support for C.'s return from exile (*Sest*. 71). During his tribuneship in 57, he, along with Milo, opposed Clodius and Metell. Nepos (who would ultimately seek C.'s help against Clodius in 56: 5.3) and ardently

supported C.'s recall from exile (*Sest.* 84). C. portrayed him as his savior (*Sest.* 144) and brother (*Red. Sen.* 20). Sestius also tried to prevent Clodius' election to the aedileship of 56 (Broughton 1952, 202).

In 49, rumors about Pompey's closeness to Sestius circulated (*Att.* 7.17.2, where C. mentions that Pompey entrusted Sestius with the composition of a public letter to Caesar). Sestius entered the civil war on the side of Pompey.

5

Letter written with the ostensible purpose of recommending Atticus to C. Antonius in late December 62. In reality, it contains numerous complaints about C. and Antonius' relationship.

Fam. 5.5 takes the reader back to 62 to a period closer to the events of the Catilinarian conspiracy (similar 5.1–2, both datable to 62). The letter—like the following one (with which it constitutes a thematic group: cf. the introduction to 5.5–6)—is written from Rome and addressed to Macedonia, where C. Antonius served as its proconsul (and P. Sestius was his proquaestor; on both: cf. the introduction to 5.5–6). The letter performs the perfunctory task of introducing Atticus to Antonius (a standard feature of aristocratic patronage: Hall 2009, 161). At the time of its writing, Atticus was departing for Macedonia (cf. §1n *ad te proficisceretur*), where he would meet Antonius to discuss personal business. C. does not state the real reason for Atticus' voyage (which seems to have involved an illicit request: §1n *ad…non possem*).

The letter is generally dated to January 61 (see T.-P. *ad loc.*) due to its supposed correlation with *Att.* 1.12, dated 1 January 61 (where C. informs Atticus about various events, especially C.'s need for a loan and matters related to Pompey and C. Antonius: see the introduction to 5.5–6). However, Sh.-B. backdated it to late December 62, on the basis that *Fam.* 5.5 was dispatched when Atticus was on the point of leaving Rome (cf. §1n *ad te proficisceretur*), whereas in *Att.* 1.12 there is no reference to his voyage (it may have been sent some time after his departure).

The letter mainly focuses on C.'s disappointment with Antonius' unfriendly conduct. C.'s disappointment (Deniaux 1993, 108 describes the tones of the letter as 'presque brutale') is, thus, evident from the first line of the letter (similar Celer in 5.1.1n; also in §2n *cuisquam iniuria*): he announces his intention to deliver a formal and detached communication to his addressee (§1n *de nostra coniunctione imminutum esse*). The reason for this is soon revealed: if *amicitia* is the disposition to give and receive equally (5.2.3n *par voluntas accipitur et redditur*), Antonius has proven to be an ungrateful friend who failed to reciprocate C.'s favours (§2n *nullam mihi abs te relatam esse gratiam*). Two other events embittered their relationship: 1) Antonius' mockery of C.'s handling of the accusation of the Catilinarians (§2n *verbum…abs te aiunt falso in me…conferri*); 2)

Antonius' probable (§2n *ad me delata sunt*) involvement in the spreading of false rumours on C.'s alleged interest in the provincial money.

Despite this, Antonius appears to have written to C. (in a lost letter) seeking his assistance (on leave-taking protocols: cf. the introduction to 5.8) in his defence against the accusation of malversation that Antonius faced in Macedonia (§2n *omnia...ad tuum commodum...honorem...dignitatem pertinerent*). C. accepted reluctantly: on one hand, C. hoped that Antonius would return the favours received by helping him with Atticus' business (C. might have also been economically tied to Antonius; he had asked him for money to repay debts: 5.6.2n *emi eam ipsam domum*). On the other, he was clearly annoyed by Antonius' deceitful comments on his alleged involvement in the extortions in Macedonia (Atticus is asked to investigate: *Att.* 1.12.2).

Letter 5 has been placed before 5.6 (although it was probably written few days after the letter to Sestius: cf. Sh.-B. *ad loc.*) for the narrative's sake: it introduces Antonius and give context to C.'s allusions to debts (§2n *Ego si abs te...debeat*), and to their relationship (on Antonius' mocking comments, cf. §2n *nam comperisse me non audeo*) included in 5.6. A similar structure is found in Book 10, where letters 1–24 (correspondence with L. M. Plancus—governor of Transalpine Gaul in 44) have been arranged before those addressed to C. Furnius—Plancus' legate.

M. CICERO S.D. C. ANTONIO M.F. IMP. 'From M. Cicero to C. Antonius, son of Marcus, Imperator, greetings': formal greeting that emphasises Antonius' recent title. He was acclaimed *imperator* by his troops, after Catiline's death (D.C. 37.40, who highlights that M. Petreius—not Antonius—was the one who conducted that battle against the Catilinarians).

1 The opening words address the most crucial theme of the letter: Antonius' past ingratitude and the potential now for him to demonstrate reciprocity by looking after Atticus' business in the province. **Etsi statueram...tamen...non possem:** a long and complex sentence; *statueram* (generally employed in confrontational letters: e.g. 5.2.10n; for a different usage, cf. 5.8.4n) promptly underscores C.'s discontent with Antonius' behaviour (on which, the introduction to the letter) and encourages him to contemplate his actions. The opportunity for Antonius to change C.'s opinion of him is offered shortly after C.'s initial remark: Antonius can assist with Atticus' affairs in the province; for this reason, C. is addressing him a letter of recommendation on Atticus' behalf. *litteras...commendaticias*: typical language of recommendation—although the precise *iunctura* appears only here and in 13.26.3. C. employs *commendo* again at the end of the letter (§3n *ita commendo ut...petam ut...*). *ne…aliquid de nostra coniunctione imminutum esse ostenderem*: a vocabulary of disappointment that recalls 5.2.5n *de…gratia…imminuta est*. Like Celer in 5.1.1, C. chooses not to conceal his resentment and

annoyance (similar to §3n *Ego…feci, voluntate…constantia*); he is aware of the strained status of their relationship (differently from 5.2.5n, where he pretends not to understand the reason of Celer's disappointment) but does nothing to improve it. *Coniunctio* has a purely political meaning (cf. 5.8.3n *coniunctio et amicitia*): here it alludes both to C. and Antonius' collaboration during their consulship and campaign against Catiline in 63 (on which, the introduction to 5.5–6); it also (and most importantly) emphasises the exchange of favours between friends (here not reciprocated, as also highlighted by *imminutum*; cf. also §2n *ego…official desiderem…debeat*). *T. Pomponius*: standard, formal form (cf. Adams 1978, 159–160) of reference, found in 5.4.1n too; other references to Atticus in 5.5 can be found in §2 and 3. *homo…conscius*: C. emphasises the fact that Atticus not only is the person best (cf. *OLD* s.v. *maxime* 3a) acquainted (cf. *OLD* s.v. *conscius* 1a; on *conscius* as a synonym of *socius*, cf. Hellegouarc'h 1963, 87) with the events (the introduction to 5.5), but also that he shares C.'s opinion of Antonius (*i.e*. that Antonius is §3n *ingratus*). *meorum in te studiorum et officiorum*: C. constantly (cf. above) reminds Antonius that he did not reciprocate C.'s favours (similar to 5.1.1n *meum studium*, where Celer is annoyed by C.'s ungrateful conduct. On the vocabulary of *amicitia* here employed: cf. the general introduction). Although C. often repeats (§2n *Ego si abs te...debeat*) that Antonius is in debt to him, he never specifies what his favours consisted of. This is the first instance in the book where C. deliberately conceals this information; it contrasts with other letters where he (more or less insidiously) requests the addressee to reciprocate his favours, explicitly spelling them out (on which, the introduction to 5.7–8). However, there are probably two main reasons for this deliberate concealment: 1) Antonius already knew the extent and reasons for his indebtedness to C., likely related to C.'s assistance in obtaining the province assignment and defending against accusations of malversation (§2n *ad…commodum…honorem…dignitatem*); 2) C.'s concerns about his status and *dignitas* led him to believe that it was not his duty to explain to Antonius (to whom he talks down: similar to §3n *Ego...tua causa feci, voluntate...constantia*) the reasons for his disappointment (similar to Celer in 5.1.1n). *tui cupidus nostri amantissimus*: C. compares his relationship with Atticus to the one that Antonius has with him. *cupidus* belongs to the political vocabulary of Roman friendship (it is here employed as a synonym of *studiosus*: Hellegouarc'h 1963, 176–180) and highlights the fact that Antonius had a detached relationship with Atticus (he was probably bound to Atticus by *officia*—although the reference is unclear). *amantissimus* is a term of affection: C. employs *amans* to emphasise that their friendship is based on their mutual love—and not on political duties (C. generally employs the words related to *amor* to describe his relations with Atticus and Quintus: Prost 2015, 7–35). A similar use of superlatives, to further emphasise closeness is found e.g. in 5.8.2n *amicissimum. ad...non possem*: conventionalised phrases of recommendation (see also §3n *commendo ut...petam ut...ostendas*)—especially when C.

introduces his protégés to other influential people (Deniaux 1993, 32–36; similar to 13.10.1, where C. notifies Brutus of the arrival of M. Varro). C. knows his duties towards his friends; it is highly probable that Atticus asked C. for a letter of support to smooth his negotiation with Antonius (as mentioned in *Att.* 1.13.1; 1.16.16; similar to *Att.* 16. 16a–f, all letters written by C. on behalf of Atticus' interests in Buthrotum). It is possible that Atticus wanted the governor's support for recouping the money he had lent to the free city of Sicyon (on Sicyon's debt: Plin. *Nat.* 35.127)—a request that was almost certainly illicit, since it probably contravened the *Lex Gabinia de versura Romae provincialibus non facienda* of 67 (Rotondi 1922[2])—which forbade the lending of money to provincials and obliged governors not to recognise the validity of the creditors' promissory notes (in 51, C., as governor of Cilicia, will himself violate this law to help Brutus regain the money he lent to Salamis: *Att.* 5.21.10–12; 6.1.5–7; 6.2.7–9; Perlwitz 1992, 81–85; cf. also Cotton 1986, 454 n.48, who mentions a lost letter written to C. Octavius, Antonius' successor to the province, that appears to have had a similar purpose). In fact, in *Att.* 1.19.9 (March 60), C. states that he could not help his friends because of 'that well-known decree' (*Att.* 1.19.9 *illud senatus consultum*. Its purport is unknown: cf. Sh.-B. *ad loc.*) and of Publius Servilius Isauricus' additional note, which denied recognition to debts incurred to Roman citizens by free communities (as Sicyon was: *Verr.* 2.1.44. Atticus was damaged by this decree: *Att.* 2.1.10 *quod Sicyonii te laedunt…attribues Servilio*). C. was surely aware of the *lex Gabinia* and probably knew the text of this decree mentioned in his letter to Atticus (he, in fact, says he contributed to its formulation: *Att.* 1.19.9 *nam quod me esse ad scribendum vides*). In addition, C. was probably conscious that Atticus eventually regained possession of his money illegally (*Att.* 1.19.9 *tu is tuis blanditiis tamen a Sicyoniis nummulorum aliquid expresseris*). Despite that, he urged Antonius to help his friend (§3n *...tibi Pomponium ita commendo ut...tamen...petam ut...si...amoris...ostendas*).

2 Antonius' lack of reciprocity and the damage done to C.'s reputation. Here, he accuses Antonius, mirroring the allegations previously made by Metell. Celer against C. (5.1.1n *absente<m umquam me abs te> ludibrio laesum iri*). **Ego si abs te...debeat:** C.'s disappointment with Antonius' conduct is highlighted from the beginning of the paragraph (similar to §1n *Etsi statueram*...). The incipitary *ego* and its juxtaposition to *te* (that recalls §3n *Ego…tua…constantia*) highlights C.'s claim to a position of moral superiority (similar §1n in *meorum in te studiorum et officiorum*). *debeat* is employed to hint at the role of Antonius as an insolvent debtor (cf. E.-M., s.v. *debeo*. Cf. also *Planc.* 69, where C. compares the relation between two friends, that exchange *officia*, to that of a debtor with his creditor). This recalls 5.6.3n *officia...desiderant* (in reference to Antonius' conduct) and, especially, 5.7.3n *...tuis litteris desiderarim...*, where C. reminds Pompey to reciprocate the services received. The

reference to ‘debt’ recalls (thanks to the selection and arrangement of 5.5 and 5.6 in this order) two points that C. makes in 5.6.2n: 1) the fact that C. got into debts because of the purchase of Crassus’ house (for which he probably requested a loan from Antonius: the introduction to 5.6); 2) debts were one of the reasons for the emergence of the Catilinarian conspiracy (in which Antonius may have been involved: the introduction to 5.5–6). **...ad tuum commodum...pertinerent:** C. presumably refers to his efforts to defend Antonius from accusations of misgovernment of Macedonia (5.6.3n *Antonium…in senatu…defendi*). The accusation and proposed removal (not yet made effective at the time of the letter: on which, *Att.* 1.12.1) of Antonius from the command of the province would damage his reputation. C. says that he did everything he could to help his friend (similar to 5.8.5n *ad commodum...pertinere*). He took care of Antonius’ business interests (*ad commodum*) and ensured that he would not lose his office (*ad honorem*) and reputation (*dignitas*). **pro his rebus...nullam...gratiam...testis:** C. first reminds his addressee what he did for him; then, he complains about what he got in return (similar to 5.2.10n *desertus ab officiis tuis permanerem*, where a similar accusation is made against Celer). *nullam mihi…relatam…gratiam*: this is a modification of the usual motif *gratiam referre alicui*—which C. generally employs to emphasise the promptness with which he reciprocates the favours (e.g. *Red. Sen.* 23; *Planc.* 77–78; 101; *Off.* 1, 47). *testis*: a term of juridical language (see E.-M. s.v. *testis*). Since ingratitude belonged to the socio-ethical sphere—and for this reason was not prosecutable by Roman law (Lentano 2009 on Sen. *Ben.* 3.6.1)—C. encourages Antonius to be witness of his own behaviour (similar to 5.2.4n *tu ipse velim iudices* and §10n *a te peto ut*). **contra...aliquid...ex multis audivi**: Antonius’ conduct is depicted as the very opposite of polite aristocratic manners: not only did he not reciprocate C.’s favours (although, in 61, he might have helped C. with his debt: §2n *Ego si abs te...debeat*), but he also spread calumnies. *aliquid*: it may be that Antonius spread a rumour that a part of the provincial money was destined for C. (*Att.* 1.12.2 *Antonium porro in cogendis pecuniis dictitare partem mihi quaeri*; see also the introduction). The deliberately vague statement is part of C.’s posture against Antonius: §1n *meorum in te studiorum et officiorum*. *ex multis audivi*: C. probably got the news from different friends (*Att.* 1.12.2, where he says he was informed by Valerius and Thyillius; see also below). **...comperisse...non audio...conferri:** C.’s claim of knowledge regarding the Catilinarians’ conspiracy is used as an ironic slogan by his enemies to mock him (on *comperio*: 5.2.6n *quem ego cum comperissem...parare atque meditari*). Antonius was probably the first to use *comperio* with this meaning (it was then re-employed against C. by Clodius and possibly by Caesar at Clodius’ trial: Berry on *Sul.* 12) to highlight C.’s decision to sentence without having certain proofs. *ne forte…verbum…falso…conferri*: C. defends himself from these ‘lies’. However, *aiunt* (which recalls §2n *ex multis audivi* and *ad me delata sunt*) emphasises the that he really got his information from people aware of gossip in

Antonius' inner circle—and that, on this basis, he accused his addressee. **ea quae ad me delata sunt...ex Pomponio...cognoscere:** Atticus (on *Pomponius*, §1n *T. Pomponius*) acts as an intermediary: his task is to discuss with Antonius these complaints and to support C.'s side of the dispute (on the real reason of Atticus' voyage, §1n *litteras...commendaticias*). Entrusting a friend with the delivery of important news was an established practice in Roman *amicitia* (on the role of intermediaries, cf. e.g. 5.3.2n *ad Lollium perscripsi*): 1) it reduces the possible friction that might have arisen if C. had confronted him personally; 2) it prevents a highly private matter ending up in unwanted hands (on the unreliability of the couriers, White 2010, 11–21). *ad me delata sunt*: again (§2n *...comperisse…non audeo…conferri*), C. highlights that he got a tip-off on what Antonius said about C. himself. *molesta*: C. avoids accusing Antonius directly; instead, he puts the blame on the rumours about Antonius' activity (similarly at §3n *ingrata*). On *molestus,* as the very opposite of how a friend should behave: 5.2.9n *non moleste*; 5.3.2n *ne…molestior*; cf. also Kinsey on *Quinct.* 44. **meus...te...officio...senatus et populus...testis est; tu...gratus...me...debeas...existiment:** again (cf. §2n *Ego si abs te…debeat*), the contrast between the first and second person pronouns highlights their different treatment of *amicitia*. C. underlines that senate and assembly can testify how remarkable his services were. It probably refers to the meetings in which C. defended Antonius from the accusation of bad government (§2n *omnia...ad tuum commodum...pertinerent*); in this case, senate and assembly are witness of the assistance given to Antonius (similar to 5.8.1n *non dubito...tui scripserint*). The polyptoton *existimare...existiment* underlines C.'s annoyance about Antonius' ingratitude. C. talks down to his addressee and encourages him to reflect on his behaviour (Celer employs a similar phrase in 5.1.1n *existimaram nec*; it is found again in C.'s reply: 5.2.9n *debes existimare…existimari debeo*). *gratus* recalls §2n *pro his rebus…nullam…gratiam…testis* and bolsters the portrait of Antonius as an *ingratus.* On *debeas* (here employed to emphasise Antonius' debt to C.), cf. §2n *Ego si abs te…debeat*. By positioning this letter here, the ancient editor(s) presumably wanted the modern readers to see C. standing up to the established aristocracy, particularly in the aftermath of 5.4, where C.'s fall in status (at the time of exile) is revealed (on this, the introduction to 5.5–6).

3 The conclusion mirrors the beginning: C. renews his willingness to assist Antonius but urges his addressee to reciprocate the favours received, particularly in regard to Atticus' affair (on which, §1n *litteras...commendaticias*). **Ego...tua causa feci, voluntate...constantia:** C. strives for an appearance of great self-control: he depicts himself as a restrained person, who is ready to forgive and help Antonius as long as he changes his attitude (similar to §2n *Ego si abs te…debeat*). By drawing attention to his coherence and devotion to Antonius' cause (conversely on his ungrateful behaviour: §2n *molesta*; §3n *ingrata*), C. asserts a claim to the moral high ground (§1n *meorum in te studiorum*

et officiorum; similar to 5.2.9n *lenis a te et facilis…debeo*). Differently from Antonius, C. asserts he has been a good friend (on *voluntas* as vocabulary of *amicitia*: see the general introduction): he has kept his pledge of support even when Antonius disrespected him. *Constantia* is the bedrock of Roman ethical behaviour (Fulkerson 2013, 186–212); C. refers to this other two times in the book, all in confrontational letters: in 5.2.8n and 5.8.5n. On accusation of inconstancy, 5.1.2n *mobili animo...cuiusquam iniuria*. **sed reliqua…studium…gravitatem…laborem desiderant:** C. was probably aware that Antonius' defence would require more effort (§2n *...ad tuum commodum...pertinerent*). In fact, in early spring 59, Celius, Fabius Maximus and Caninius Gallus would institute a litigation *de repetundis* (for a detailed analysis of Antonius' trial, Gruen 1973, 301–310). **quae ego...videar:** C. gives Antonius an *ultimatum*: he needs to reciprocate C.'s favours, otherwise he will lose C.'s support: §2n *pro his rebus…nullam…gratiam…testis*. *ingrata*: C. avoids calling Antonius *ingratus* directly; instead, he points at his actions (similar to §2n *molestus*). The adjective is here employed with the meaning of 'not deserving a favour' (cf. *TLL* VII 1560, 32. The reciprocation of a *beneficium* was perceived as a moral duty: on which, the introduction to 5.5–6; cf. also *Att.* 4.15.1, where C. affirms that he is not an *ingratus* because he has reciprocated the received favours. For a broader analysis, Moussy 1966, 181–200). *insanire*: colloquialism used hyperbolically: cf. *TLL* VII 1830, 26. The verb has here the meaning of 'to act foolishly' and it is similarly employed in Prop. 1.5.3 (Fedeli *ad loc.*). **...tibi Pomponium ita commendo ut...tamen...petam ut...si...amoris...ostendas:** C. solicits Antonius to prove (*ostendas*) his friendly feelings by supporting Atticus' request (similar §1n). Here, differently from most of his letters of recommendation (Cotton 1986, 443–460 for a broader analysis of the theme), there is no attempt to flatter the addressee with references to his *existimatio* or *dignitas* (instead, allusions to his ingratitude are recurring: §2n *molesta*; §3n *ingrata*) to obtain the requested favour. Antonius was already in debt to C., and C. darkly reminds him of that by referring to his *fides* and *amor*. The non-committal terminology employed (he uses several formulaic phrases typical of letters of recommendation: *commendare aliquis* and *petere ut*, Deniaux 1993, 543–544) conceal C.'s attempt to tamper with the working of the law (cf. Kelly 1966, 31–68). C. was perfectly aware that there was legislation that debarred governors from helping creditors to recover their debts—especially from free cities (§1n *meorum in te studiorum et officiorum*). Nevertheless, he asks Antonius to help Atticus. **hoc mihi nihil gratius facere potes:** stock phrase to request a favour for *amici* (3.6.1; 9.15.2; 16.22.2; *Att.* 5.14.3)—which is generally placed at the end of letters of recommendation (6.9.2; 11.16.3; 11.17.2; 13.44; 13.55.2; 13.57.2; 13.65.2; 13.66.2; 13.74.1; 13.79.1): here it conceals the deep irregularity of the request.

6

Letter sent from Rome to update P. Sestius, Antonius' *proquaestor* in Macedonia, on the development of C.'s business in late December 62.

C. himself gives his addressee the time coordinates of the events mentioned: it was written between 10 December, when the tribune Q. Fufius came into office (§1n *plurimumque…negoti habui…tribunum pl.*) and 1 January 61 (§1n *omnino…in mensem Ianuarium*). The letter was probably written at the same time as 5.5 and entrusted to Atticus for delivery (cf. the introduction to 5.5). It was then positioned in the book after the letter to Antonius to give coherence to its storyline: on which, the introduction to 5.5–6.

The letter contains three different topics: C.'s activity in favour of Sestius; the purchase of Crassus' house and C.'s debts; Antonius' conduct. On P. Sestius, C. Antonius and the narrative they help foster within the book: the introduction to 5.5–6.

C. says he received communication from Sestius' freedman in which Sestius asked for C.'s help to delay the appointment of his successor in Macedonia (§1n *mutatam voluntatem tuam*; on leave-taking protocols: the introduction to 5.5–6). At first, C. was sceptical about the veracity of the news (it seems that Sestius, in a previous but lost correspondence with C., urged him to find a new *proquaestor* for the province as soon as possible: §1n *memoria…litteras antea misses, non satis credidi…*). The involvement of Sestius' wife, Terentia and Cornelius (cf. §1n *Cornelia tua Terentiam…Q. Cornelio*) made him reconsider Decius' message.

C. informs his friend of the purchase of Crassus' expensive house and of his subsequent involvement with debts. It seems that Antonius had promised C. a loan, but (as C. writes in the only extant letters on this matter to Atticus dated 61: Sh.-B. on *Att.*1.12.1; *Att.*1.13.6) it was delayed in arriving. Sestius was possibly the mediator and C. probably wanted him to urge Antonius (C.'s discovery of the conspiracy and condemnation of the Catilinarians spoiled their already fragile friendship: the introduction to 5.5–6) to conclude the negotiation quickly (although there is no open mention of it in either letter); it will be closed on February 61 (*Att.*1.14.7).

The letter closes with: a) a brief update (probably requested by Sestius in his lost letter) on the refurbishment of his house in Rome; b) C. and his *amici*'s consternation about Antonius' ingratitude (5.5.2n *nullam…gratiam*); c) a reference to his endeavours on Antonius' behalf.

M. CICERO S.D. P. SESTIO L.F. PRO Q. 'From M. Cicero to P. Sestius, son of Lucius, proquaestor, greetings'. Typical formula of address in formal letters (on this, cf. the *inscriptio* of 5.5). It acknowledges Sestius' title held from 62 to 60 in Macedonia.

1 C. updates Sestius on the development of the service requested: ensuring that his successor for his office in Macedonia is not nominated yet. **Cum...Decius...venisset...non satis credidi...tuam:** Sestius entrusted his secretary Decius with a message to C. *librarius*: a trusted person (generally a freedman; on the *cognomen* Decius: Sh.-B. *ad loc.*), that carried out various tasks. *venisset egissetque mecum...operam darem*: it is probable that Decius handled a (lost) letter from Sestius to C. and supplemented it with an oral message (it was an important part of aristocratic correspondences: White 2010, 13–18) to urge him to devote his attention to Sestius' case (*opera* generally describes the request of services from a more influential man: Hellegouarc'h 1963, 174; on mutuality in friendship: the introduction to 5.5–6). *ne…succederetur*: the content of Decius' message: the prorogation of Sestius' office. The laws established a mandatory year of service in a province, but with the possibility of a prorogation (Pina Polo 2019, 141); it was essential to have the support of respected politicians (Rosillo-López 2021, 96; similar to 2.10.4). *hominem frugi…amicum existimabam...mutatam volutatem tuam*: C. describes Decius as an honest (E.-M. s.v. *frux*), reliable (on *prudens*, *Inv.* 2.160) and affectionate friend of Sestius. This is a strategy of politeness that also mitigates Sestius' possible irritation due to C.'s initial lack of trust in his assistant (similar to 5.8.2n and 5.17.4n, where, however, C. highlights the virtues of the family members of the addressees that are away from Rome). *non satis credidi*: it was difficult to establish whether a letter sent from abroad had been forged or not. Cf. *ad Brut.* 2.5, where C. admits to having had some troubles in recognising that the letter, which Brutus dispatched from Cisalpine Gaul, was probably a forgery. *mutatam voluntatem tuam*: Sestius seems to have sent several (lost) letters in which he asked for C.'s help not to have his office extended. However, none of those have been preserved/selected and arranged in the book (on the reasons why this letter has been positioned here: the introduction to 5.5–6). The reason for Sestius' change of mind is not clear (on which, cf. also the introduction); however, it was crucial in determining his decision to stay in Macedonia until late 60 (Broughton 1952, 181). He probably remained in Macedonia to profit from Antonius' extortions (Kaster 2006, 140. On Antonius' misgovernment of Macedonia, 5.5.2n ...*ad tuum commodum...pertinerent*) or because Antonius convinced him that leaving the office would weaken his own position (Brennan 2000, 533 n.70). **sed postea...Cornelia...Terentiam...Cornelio...litteris:** after having heard from Sestius' intermediaries, C. was persuaded to intervene. On the importance of women as intermediaries, especially when their husbands/relatives were away: 5.8.2n ...*uxor tua*... . *Cornelia tua*: Sestius' second wife (Richardson 2001, 50) and repository of the newest instructions from her husband. *Terentiam convenit*: Cornelia was on sufficiently cordial terms with Terentia to go to see her to further her husband's interests (it was elite etiquette that the wife of a junior senator should approach Terentia and not C.: cf. Treggiari

2007, 48–49). Cornelia was aware that Terentia would share the news with C. *Q. Cornelio*: a friend or a relative of Cornelia (Rosillo-López 2021, 96 n.37). *adhibui diligentiam* conveys the intensity (that is strengthened by *quotienscumque*) of the effort that C. puts in the accomplishment of his task. On *diligentia* as a political term—usually allied with *amicitia*: cf. Hellegouarc'h 1963, 251–252). *plurimumque…negoti habui*: C. faces difficulty persuading individuals, who had previously received a letter from Sestius (cf. below), that Sestius had changed his mind; senators were (perhaps) supposed to display *constantia* and not change their minds too publicly (on this, 5.5.3n ...*constantia*...). *Q. Fufium tribunum pl*...: Sestius also wrote to the tribune Q. Fufius Calenus and other senators with the same request. Q. Fufius Calenus, tribune for 61 (Broughton 1952, 190).

2 The purchase of Crassus' house left C. in deep in debt; he had to ask for a loan from wealthy friends (among whom was probably Antonius: the introduction to 5.6). This paragraph refers openly and clearly to the Catilinarian conspiracy and employs its standard vocabulary (also re-employed by C. in different contexts). This constitutes one of the most important and recurrent themes in the book's narrative (cf. the general introduction). **Ego tua gratulatione...gratulationem:** again, a reference to a lost letter sent by Sestius to C. that (if available) the ancient editor(s) decided not to include in the book (on the narrative that 5.5 and 5.6 help foster: the introduction to 5.5–6). This lost letter appears to have contained Sestius' congratulations (on which, Moussy 1966, 126) on C.'s decision to buy Crassus' house. The display of *gratulatio* on personal achievements was an important part in Roman friendships (2.7.1; 2.10.1; 6.6.1; 15.6.1; 15.14.3; *Att*. 1.17.6; 4.1.2)—and when it did not arrive, it could annoy the addressee (5.7.3n *nostrae necessitudinis…gratulationem exspectavi*, where C. complains of Pompey's lack of congratulations on his activity against the Catilinarians). By stating that his congratulations stirred him to action (*commotus*), C. humorously shifts the responsibility for the purchase to Sestius (similar to §2n *emi…post tuam gratulationem*). This might be a strategy of affiliative politeness: he flatters Sestius probably to have him secure payments from Antonius (§2n *itaque…aeris alieni*; on Sestius as a go between C. and Antonius: the introduction to 5.6). *quod…emissem*: that a *homo novus* had bought a house on the Palatine (the most aristocratic residential section in Rome) caused some biting comments: *Att*. 4.5.2. Crassus (addressee of 5.8) had probably bought it (or only its site: Hales 2000, 45) from M. L. Drusus (Richardson 1992, 123). |$\overline{\text{XXXV}}$| *aliquanto*: c. HS3,500,000, a fair price according to C. (Sh.-B. on *Att*. 1.13.6). **itaque...habere aeris alieni...recipiat:** witty references to the Catilinarian conspiracy and his actions against the cancellation of debts proposed by Catiline (on C.'s jokes: Beard 2014, 99–127; for the Catilinarians as one of the main themes of the book: see the general introduction). C. had to get a loan from wealthy friends (such as P. Sulla who, at the time, was facing accusations for his alleged participation to the

Catilinarian conspiracy: Gell. 12.12.2–3) as well as from usurers (Sh.-B. on *Att*. 1.12.1) to purchase the house. He was deep into debt: he seems to have asked Sestius possibly to negotiate a loan from Antonius (the introduction to 5.6). *aeris alieni*: debt (*TLL* I 1076, 72ff.). On debt as a cause of the Catilinarian conspiracy, Dyck on *Catil.* 2.4.7–11. Cf. also 5.5.2n *debeas*, referred to Antonius (who was allegedly involved in the conspiracy) and his lack of mutuality. *ut cupiam coniurare*: sarcastic allusion (the only one preserved in the entire Ciceronian corpus) to his desire to participate in a conspiracy (although he is clearly referring to the Catilinarian conspiracy and their cancellation of debts' proposal). For *cupio* + infinitive, to introduce self-mockery: 5.2.2n *cupisse laudari*. *si…recipiat*: another witticism: no one will collude with C. (*OLD* s.v. *recipio* 3a), given his role in the Catilinarian conspiracy. **sed partim...me excludunt...partim...exemerit:** on Catiline and C.'s vocabulary for the conspiracy: the introduction to §2n. C. keeps joking about taking part in a plot to pay his debts; he would be hardly accepted by the other conspirators because of his reputation. Some bear a grudge (*odio inducti*: 'hate' is part of C.'s vocabulary for the Catilinarian conspiracy, re-employed to describe Clodius' activity: the general introduction) against C. because of the loss of profits caused by his dismantlement of the conspiracy; others do not believe (*non credunt*) that C. (the one who has dismantled the conspiracy—whose major proposal was the cancellation of debts: cf. §2n *nummos…exemerit*) is now seeking ways to extinguish his debts. C. is presumably alluding to the people from whom he asked for a loan (*i.e.* wealthy men who participated in the Catilinarian conspiracy—perhaps including Antonius: for whom, the introduction to 5.5–6). *aperte*: sarcastic comment: the conspirators—who were accustomed to concealing their actions (5.2.1n *intestine scelere*; *occulta coniuratione*)—now show their hostile feelings for C. openly. *vindicem coniurationis*: 'the one who freed the republic from the conspiracy'. Standard Ciceronian vocabulary to describe his efforts against the Catilinarians: MacKendrick 1995, *index. insidias*: a word generally used in reference to the Catilinarian conspiracy (5.2.1n *domesticis insidiis*). It is employed to make a joke: now it is the conspirators who fear (*OLD* s.v. *metuo* 1a) ambushes from the one who dismantled the conspiracy. *nummos…exemerit*: the cancellation of debts proposed by Catiline was meant to damage creditors, generally moneylenders (on *feneratores* as scapegoats, Dyck on *Catil*. 2.18.6–8; Sal. *Cat*. 21.2; C. disapproved of the professionalisation of moneylending but accepted it only as a personal favour to a friend: *Fin.* 2.117. For a broader analysis: Barlow 1978, 184–203). C. stood against it (*Off*. 2.84) and threatened debtors (on *locupletes*, *Catil*. 2.18; *Sul.* 59; *QFr*. 1.1.6) with selling their goods at auction (by *tabulae auctionariae*: Dyck on *Catil*. 2.18.8–10). *ex obsidione*: typical vocabulary (on which, the introduction to §2n) that C. employs to describe the actions of the Catilinarians: Dyck on *Catil.* 1.6.1–4. **omni<no> semissibus magna copia est:** C. might refer to the fact that he received a loan at a low rate of interest (*semissibus*: rate of interest of 6% *per annum*).

This could be because: 1) moneylenders showed gratitude because he saved their profits (T.-P. *ad loc.*). 2) he received a loan from wealthy friends (*Att.* 1.14.6), who were able to lend him money at an inferior interest rate (differently from Atticus' uncle Caecilius, who, in 61, charged at least 12% on all his loans: *Att.* 1.12.1). 3) It was probably related to the recovery of the economy at the end of 62 (Barlow 1978, 185). **ego...meis rebus gestis...existimer:** again, references to and standard language of the Catilinarian conspiracy (the introduction to §2n). *bonum nomen*: metaphorical meaning: the reputation that derives from repaying one's debts (similar to Hor. *Ep.* 2.1.105 *nominibus rectis*; Sen. *Ben.* 5.22.1 *lenta nomina*). Obscure joke: it appears to depend on the fact that his reputation does not derive from his financial soundness (he was strangled by debts: §2 *tantum…aeris alieni ut…coniurare*), as was usual in Rome (MacKendrick 1995 on *Pis.* 86), but on his endeavours against Catiline. Moneylenders probably chose to lend him money (§2 *omni<no> semissibus magna copia est*) because of his efforts in protecting their interests.

3 Aristocratic business; the two main points are highlighted by the incipitary keywords: 1) *domus* (C. updates Sestius on his house that was being built up); 2) Antonius (C.'s continued patronage of Antonius despite his ungrateful conduct). **Domum...vehementer probavi:** affiliative politeness: C. agrees to oversee the construction of Sestius' house and to update him while he is in Macedonia (on Sestius' office as *proquaestor*, cf. the introduction). In return, he is implicitly asked to encourage Antonius to reciprocate C.'s favours (cf. below). *vehementer*: intensifying adverb that introduces a conventionalised strategy of affiliative politeness (similar to 5.2.6n *vehementer probari*). By showing his appreciation for the successful refurbishment of Sestius' house, C. demonstrates his goodwill. **Antonium...defendi senatumque...commovi:** C. summarises here the most relevant points of his letter to Antonius (that probably was carried by Atticus together with 5.6: cf. 5.5.1n *T. Pomponius*): 1) Antonius' failure in reciprocating favours (*officia...desiderant*, that recalls 5.5.2n *officia desiderem*); 2) C.'s undertakings on Antonius' behalf (on the nature of his service: 5.5.2n *omnia...ad tuum commodum...pertinerent*). *vehementer oratione*: this is the sole extant reference to the speech that C. seems to have pronounced on Antonius' behalf in Senate. **Tu...litteras...mittas:** closing remark: C. encourages Sestius to write to him more often. With this request C. probably wanted more updates on Antonius' government in Macedonia or/and on his negotiations for his loan (Sestius had already been C.'s informant on Antonius' conduct during the Catilinarian conspiracy: cf. the introduction to 5.5–6).

5.7–8: C.'s exchanges with Pompey and Crassus

Letter 5.7 (to Pompey) and 5.8 (to Crassus) were written by C. within an 8-year span. 5.7 can be dated to c. April 62, while 5.8 to c. January 54.

The reasons for the ancient editor(s) choosing to select and arrange these letters in this position and sequence in the book differ for each letter, but both missives are connected to the narrative of C. and the republic they seek to foster.

Letters 5.7–8, along with those included in the first part of the book (for which, the general introduction), share similar totents and tones. They depict C. navigating complex and fluctuating relationships with fellow aristocrats, with C. typically being the one who grants unilateral favours (the only exception of a display of mutuality is in 5.9–11: cf. its introduction). For this reason, the vocabulary of *amicitia* (e.g. selected: 5.7.2n *litteras...iucundas...*; *non mutue respondetur...patior*; *inter nos conciliatura...sit*; §3n *amicitia postulat*; 5.8.1n *...studium...augendae*; *nostrae necessitudini...*; §2n *memoria nostrae voluntatis...amicitiae fides*; §5n *litteras...foederis*) and of affiliative politeness (e.g. selected: 5.7.1n *incredibilem voluptatem*; §2n *tuae erga me voluntatis*; 5.8.2n *mehercule...*; *praestantissima...uxor...tui Crassi...operam...meam*) is here recurrent. Similar vocabulary of *amicitia* is found in the gloomier letters, exchanged with less prominent members of Roman aristocracy, included in the second part of the book: 5.15.2 *tecum...vetustas, amor, consuetudo...coniunctioni*]*s...nec...impediat...vicinitas.*

Furthermore, 5.7–8, similarly to the preceding 5.1–6 and the following 5.9–11, are exchanged with magistrates in their provinces (except for 5.4, that is, however, written by C. from exile). C., who is in Rome, is depicted (depending on the status of their relationship) offering support to the magistrates and/or their families while abroad (on leave-taking protocols, cf. esp. the introduction to 5.8).

The letters to Pompey and Crassus, like many of the letters included in this book, are linked to the further significant threads in *Fam.* 5's narrative: Catiline and Clodius. In both 5.7 and 8, the references to these figures are quite clear. Letter 5.7 was written by C. with the aim of requesting public words of congratulations from Pompey for his activities against the Catilinarians (5.7.3n...*rei publicae causa gratulationem exspectavi*). Prior to and following C.'s exile, Pompey assisted him against Clodius (Evangelou 2020, 110). Letter 5.8 alludes to Crassus' involvement with Catiline (Marshall 1974, 804–813) and Clodius, a connection that fuelled the prolonged enmity between C. and Crassus: 5.8.1n ...*interruptum officium*; §2n *pestes hominum...* . In particular, Crassus had helped Clodius during the trial for the *Bona Dea* scandal (Evangelou 2020, 101).

The connections between 5.7–8 extend beyond external factors; the deliberate sequencing of *Fam.* 5.7–8 aims, in fact, to highlight links between the two letters and their correspondents (on Pompey and Crassus' relationship: Parrish 1973, 357–380). Not only were Pompey and Crassus two

of the triumvirs (Caesar is introduced via 5.9–11, intentionally arranged after 5.8: see the introduction to 5.9–11), but they also shared the consulship in 55 (Broughton 1952, 214; the consistent arrangement of letters exchanged with addressees who shared offices appears to be a common practice in the collection: Gibson 2022, 105–146, on Book 4). They seem to have both received C.'s aid at the time of their proconsulships; with the *Pro Lege Manilia*, C. supported the proposal, made by the tribune C. Manilius, that Pompey be given sole command against Mithridates in the third Mithridatic war (the introduction to 5.7). Similar aid seems to have been offered to Crassus in 54, at the time of his proconsulship in Syria (the introduction to 5.8).

Moreover, both Crassus and Pompey were involved in Parthia, with Pompey negotiating with the Parthian king Phraates III between 66–63 (Schlude 2013, 163–181). They were preparing to depart to/from the East when C. wrote to them. Pompey likely supported Crassus' campaign in that region, as he had done with the previous governor of Syria, A. Gabinius (Arnaud 1998, 24–31). Furthermore, it was Pompey and Caesar who encouraged C. to strengthen his ties with Crassus (§1n *...perpetuam propugnationem...*; similarly, in C. and Vatinius' relationship: the introduction to 5.9–11).

The narrative that these letters constitute also suggests that both Pompey and Crassus sought (in lost letters) C.'s support. Pompey appears to have sought C.'s assistance in securing a triumph for his actions in the East (see the introduction to 5.7). Similarly Crassus, who might have written to C. also (Crassus might have also wanted to thank C. for his support in 54: §1n *studium...dignitatis...augendae*) to request his support while in the province (§2n *praestantissima...uxor...tui Crassi...operam...meam*). C., however, seems to have requested them to return the favours received: 5.7.2n *ad me...litteras...misisti*; 5.8.4n *qua mob rem tu...iudicio tribuendum...*; similar to 5.5–6 (for which, their introduction) and 5.9–11, the only set of letters that shows a clear exchange of favours. Both letters reinforce an image of C.'s power and prestige that the ancient editor(s) wanted to emerge from 5.1–11 (on which, the general introduction).

5.7–8 also presents small differences, although these do not invalidate the narrative being fostered by the ancient editor(s). 5.8 displays a neat geographical reversal of 5.7; if in 5.7, Pompey is in the East and is returning to Rome (cf. its introduction), in 5.8, Crassus is heading towards the East. This reversal is also emphasised by C.'s different approach to the two recipients. If in 5.7, C. is trying to repair the damage that Pompey's lack of congratulations on his endeavours against the Catilinarians (5.7.3n *gratulationem exspectavi*) had caused to their long-standing relationship (cf. e.g. 5.7.2n *res publica nos inter nos conciliatura...sit*), in 5.8, C. is trying to create a relationship after a period of prolonged hostility (possibly because of Crassus' closeness to Catiline and/or Clodius: above). For

this reason, the letter addressed to Crassus is filled with more expressions of goodwill and support (cf. its introduction).

7

Highly formal letter of c. April 62 sent from Rome by C. to Pompey. It is written, on one hand, to congratulate him on the activity in Asia Minor and Syria; on the other, to express disappointment in his lack of public appreciation for C.'s defeat of the Catilinarian conspiracy.

Fam. 5.7 is the only surviving missive written by C. and addressed to Pompey included in the collection (on the lost *Letters to Pompey*, Nicholson 1998, 63–105). In *Att.*, there are six letters from Pompey preserved as enclosures: 8.11a, 8.11c, 8.12a, 8.12b, 8.12c, 8.12d; cf. also 8.6 (a quoted letter from Pompey) and 8.11b and d (enclosed letters from C. to Pompey written at the prodromes of civil war); on this, Gibson, forthcoming.

At the time of writing this missive, Pompey was still in the East, where he had completed the reorganisation of eastern and northern Asia Minor (§1n *Ex litteris...publice...*). Pompey had been away from Rome for an extended period. In 67, the *lex Gabinia de bello piratico* (Rotondi 1922[2]) granted him command with unrestricted *imperium* for a minimum of three years over the Mediterranean Sea and its coastal regions up to 50 miles inland; this mandate aimed to eradicate piracy. Pompey's command was extended in 66 by the *lex Manilia* (Rotondi 1922[2]), which (thanks to C.'s support; similar to 5.8: cf. its introduction) conferred upon him the leadership of the war against Mithridates VI and Tigranes, along with authority over the provinces of Bithynia, Pontus, and Cilicia (§3n *nulla...laetari soleo...officiorum conscientia*). Between 66 and 62, Pompey reorganised the government of a number of provinces (summarised by Broughton 1952). Among the most significant were the organisation of the province of Bithynia and Pontus in 65, the initiation of the organisation of Syria as a Roman province in 64, and the capture of Jerusalem in 63. In April 62, Pompey was ready to return to Rome (§3n *cum veneris*).

The letter probably belonged to a set of at least three letters that C. and Pompey exchanged between 63–62. The original set may have included: 1) the lost résumé that C. sent to Pompey to inform him of the achievements against Catiline during his consulate (the letter was probably written soon after the execution of the conspirators, in c. early December 63: How on 5.7.2). 2) Pompey's lost reply to C.'s missive that was probably written in early 62 (presumably after the receipt of the lost résumé but before 5.7: §2n *ad me...litteras quas misisti...*). 3) 5.7, a letter written from Rome to the East in c. April 62 (where Pompey was reorganising the territorial acquisitions after the defeat of Mithridates VI: Broughton 1952, 176) in response to Pompey's lost letter on C.'s activity against the

Catilinarians and to the official report that Pompey had sent to the senate on his actions in the province.

The brevity of the letter (c. 207 words) in comparison to the lengthier 5.8 (c. 558 words) has various explanations. A *comparandum* is offered by 10.7, where L. Munat. Plancus (governor of Gallia Comata), writes to C. apologising for the letter's brevity; he attributes it to two main reasons: he has already composed an official letter wherein he explains everything; he has entrusted close friends with details on his request. While C. is not serving as a promagistrate in this context (despite having held the position of consul not too long before the writing of this letter), he may employ a similar approach here. As suggested above, C. could have written a more extensive and formal letter, elucidating all the details for which he sought commendation. He might have also delegated the task to a friend (similar to Decius' role in 5.6).

5.7 consists of two major parts, one (§1) jovial and congratulatory, the other (§§ 2–3) more critical and biting.

The first paragraph contains C.'s reply to Pompey's official report (§1n *Ex litteris…publice misisti*), probably on his operations in the East, where he had been active since 67 (Broughton 1952). His dispatch arrived in Rome around March 62 (Sh.-B., introduction to 5.7). It presumably notified the senate and magistrates of the conclusion of his operations in the East (for which ten days of thanksgiving were proclaimed: *Prov.* 27) and requested the ratification of his re-organisation of eastern and northern Asia Minor. Pompey would leave the East and arrive at Brindisium by December of 62.

The second paragraph contains C.'s biting comments on the lost 'private' letter that Pompey dispatched to C. (along with the also lost official report sent by Pompey to the senate). Here, C. reprimands Pompey because in his (lost) letter (§1n *Ad me…misisti*) he did not congratulate him (as C. expected him to do) on the defeat of the Catilinarian conspiracy (§3n *res eas gessi...exspectavi*). One can only speculate about the reason for Pompey's conduct. Either he was aware that public approval of C.'s actions could irritate C.'s enemies (e.g. Metell. Nepos, who—supported by Caesar—at that time had launched a campaign against C. for his actions against Catiline's supporters: cf. the introduction to 5.1–2); or he was annoyed by the arrogant tones of C.'s missive (Berry on *Sul.* 67). C. probably suspected the latter—given what he wrote to Atticus (*Att.* 1.13.4 [*Pompeius*] *nos...aperte laudat, occulte...invidet*) upon Pompey's return from the East (Holliday 1969, 19).

M. TULLIUS M.F. CICERO S.D. CN. POMPEIO CN. F. MAGNO IMPERATORI 'From M. Tullius Cicero, son of Marcus, to Cn. Pompeius Magnus, son of Cnaeus, Imperator, greetings'. The highly formal heading (different from the formal *Att.* 8.11a–d, where C. and Pompey do not use their

family names) and extended formula of greetings highlight the official nature of this letter. As in 5.2 (another challenging letter for C. to write), both sender and recipient are named formally by *tria nomina* + filiation (on C.'s name, cf. the analysis of the *inscriptio* of 5.1. On Pompey's *cognomen Magnus*—adopted in 81: Adams 1978, 160)—alongside an acknowledgment of the *titulus honoris* of the addressee (Pompey was acclaimed *imperator* in 67: Broughton 1952, 146). The greetings formula (*s.t.e.q.v.b.e.<v.> = si tu exercitusque valetis benest. Ego valeo*) further underlines the formality of this letter (similar to 5.9 and 10a). On the formula, see Sh.-B. *ad loc.* (who accepts Lambinus' integration <*v.*>) and T.-P. *ad loc.* (where, conversely, the correction is not accepted).

1 C. updates Pompey (who, at the time of the missive, was still in the East: see the introduction) on the reactions of Roman aristocracy to his (lost) official résumé. Stratagems of affiliative politeness are here employed (§1n *...cepi...incredibilem voluptatem*; *ego...te...pollicebar*) to prepare the ground for C.'s reprimand of Pompey (§§2n–3n) **Ex litteris...publice...:** sending an official dispatch (*litterae...publice*) to Rome to inform the senate of tasks accomplished in the assigned province was a common procedure for a promagistrate—who thereby sought to receive the appropriate recognition for his endeavours (similar to 5.9.1n *litteras ad senatum...*; cf. also e.g. 2.10.4; 10.12.2; 12.14.3; 15.13.3). It might have included news on the conclusion of the re-organisation of eastern and northern Asia Minor following victories over the pirates, and over Mithridates VI and Tigranes (cf. the introduction). For this reason, the senate proclaimed ten days of *supplicatio* in his honour (*Prov.* 27: *supplicationem dierum decem decrevistis*; on his triumph in 61: Broughton 1952, 181). **...cepi...incredibilem voluptatem:** strategy of affiliative politeness: to rejoice at another's success was a good friend's duty (Hall 2009, 41–42; similar to 10.12.2 and 15.12.1)—especially if this friend was Pompey. C.'s intention to please his addressee is also evident from the employment of *incredibilis*: his (and the senate's) joy is extraordinary because the endeavours accomplished by Pompey are far beyond their hopes; the phrase is found in *Catil.* 1.25 to describe Catiline's activity (on C.'s reusage of the vocabulary found in his depiction of the Catilinarians, cf. the general introduction). **tantam...spem...te uno fretus pollicebar:** the memory of Sulla's dictatorship (established, just twenty years before, after his return from the East) was still vivid in the minds of the Romans (in fact, the first challenges to his arrangements came in the mid 60's: Gruen 1970, 240); the worry that Pompey would follow his example (especially when, in early 62, Metell. Nepos and Caesar proposed to recall Pompey and his army from the East to subdue Catiline: e.g. Plu. *Cat. Mi.* 26; *Cic.* 23; *Pomp.* 43.; D.C. 37.43; 44) was substantial. For this reason, in his (lost) official dispatch, Pompey (possibly) announced his decision to return to Rome without his army (that will be fulfilled in December 62: Broughton 1952, 176); an announcement that had to emphasise his commitment to

civil peace (on *otium* as 'freedom from civil strife', cf. How *ad loc.*). The phrase highlights C.'s conviction that—back in 62—all hopes for a 'freedom from civil strife' rested in Pompey (on C.'s rhetoric on Pompey as guardian of Rome's safety, see *Man.* and especially 50: *cui* [*Pompeio*] *cetera…cum salute rei publica commissa sunt*; similar to *Agr.* 2. 23–25). A belief that C. would not give up even during the terrible years of civil war (cf. *Att.* 6.1.11 *in Pompeio te spem omnem oti ponere non minor*. Similar to Lucan. 9.190: Holliday 1969, 61–64)—when it was clear that Pompey (like Caesar) had ruling ambitions (*QFr.* 3.4.1; *Att.* 4.18.3; 8.11.1–2; 9.7.3; 9.10.2; 6; 9.11.3; 10.7.1). This forward link to the civil war period and its aftermath is implicitly revealed by the use of the 'one man' (*uno*) language, which C. later employs to refer to (and criticise) Caesar's dictatorship. While C. could not have known the course of future events, the readers of this book (and its ancient editor[s]) presumably did, and C.'s reference to *te uno* might have strengthened this connection for them. **...veteres hostis, novos amicos...deturbatos iacere:** Pompey's official letter did not meet the approval of everybody. According to C., some reacted with deep disappointment (§1n *vehementer litteris perculsos*) and agitation (§1n *ex magna spe deturbatos iacere*) to Pompey's intention to return to Rome in peace. But who were they? *veteres hostis, novos amicos* throws (possibly deliberately) little light on this question, and has been much discussed in modern scholarship (summarised by Sh.-B. *ad loc.*). It might refer to the victims of Sulla's proscriptions (Gruen 1970, 237–243: perhaps corroborated by *percello*: cf. below)—who saw in Pompey's armed return to Rome the opportunity to restore their fortunes through constitutional upheaval and eventual redistribution of land (cf. Plu. *Cat. Mi.* 27). For this reason, they were willing to support their ancient enemy (Pompey, in fact, had been Sulla's chief agent in the 80's: Plu. *Pomp.* 6–8; 10–11)—especially after the failure of Rullus' proposal and Catiline's conspiracy, both designed to reverse Sulla's enactments. *vehementer...perculsos...*: Pompey's official letter unravelled their plans. *percello* (*OLD* s.v. 4a) supports Gruen's analysis: in *Mur.* 49 (*...homines perculsi Sullani temporis calamitate*), C. uses the same verb in reference to the victims of Sulla's proscriptions—then recruited in Catiline's army. *Vehementer* is emphatically tautological: *percello* has already the meaning of 'frapper violemment' (E.-M. s.v. *–cello*[2]). *...ex...spe...iacere*: Pompey's commitment to civil peace—that C. and the senate greeted enthusiastically (cf. §1n *tantam…spem*)—destroyed their hopes to upset the status quo.

2 First of two paragraphs (cf. §3) dedicated to the reply to the (lost) private letter that Pompey addressed to C. This lost letter might have included Pompey's brief reply to C.'s lost résumé on his endeavours against the Catilinarians (on this, cf. the introduction to the letter) as well as a plea for support in view of his return from the East (cf. §2n *Ad me...litteras...misisti*). C. tries to achieve the higher moral ground (similar to 5.2: cf. its introduction): he proves to be sympathetic, even though

Pompey's failure in reciprocating C.'s favours (the basis of Roman *amicitia*: e.g. 5.5.2n ...*nullam mihi abs te*...; 5.9–11 is the only set of letters included in the book in which C.'s favours are reciprocated) must have offended him (as displayed in §3). In this way, C. demonstrates that he is a better friend than Pompey: he thanks Pompey for his letter (cf. §2n *tamen...iucundas fuisse*); he seems willing to accept (without any problems: cf. §2n ...*facillime patior*) that Pompey will not reciprocate his favours (cf. §2n ...*non mutue respondetur*). Despite Pompey's hostile disposition towards him, C. still hopes to construct an harmonious relation (cf. §2n ...*inter nos conciliatura...sit*): a stratagem of politeness aimed at reducing the possible irritation that his assertions about Pompey's poor display of *amicitia* might cause. **Ad me...litteras...misisti...:** sending letters to influential friends to ask for their support on political matters (especially when they were far from Rome: 5.6.1n *Cum...Decius...venisset...ut operam darem*...), is a well-consolidated practice. Governors who sought the triumph for their endeavours in province would normally send, along with the official dispatch to the senate, a series of private letters in which they asked their friends to uphold their request (similar to 5.9.1n *litteras ad senatum...tibi perscripsi*). **...exiguam...tuae erga me voluntatis habebant, tamen...iucundas fuisse:** C. depicts Pompey as a bad friend. According to C., Pompey's (lost) letter contained a scarce expression (*exiguam significationem*) of goodwill (*voluntatis*)—a prerequisite for courtly interactions between friends (cf. e.g. 5.2.10n *in mea erga te voluntate* and 5.3.2n *tuam erga me voluntatem*)—especially when those interactions involved the request for a favour (on which, cf. above). *quamquam...tamen...iucundas*: strategy of affiliative politeness: he goes beyond Pompey's conduct and says he is pleased to receive his letter. In this way, he not only proves to be a good friend, but also one aware of the epistolary etiquette (cf. the introduction to §2). **nulla...laetari soleo...officiorum conscientia:** C. deliberately foregrounds the idea that he has been a good friend (similar to 1.7.7, where he asserts that one should be pleased with one's own undertakings). *Laetor* is generally employed in friendly exchanges as a strategy of affiliative politeness, where the writer conveys affection for the correspondent and demonstrates pleasure in the achievements of the addressee (cf. Hall 2009, 199). Here it highlights Pompey's lack of respect for the conventionalised strategies of politeness: C. hoped that Pompey, in return for his support (cf. below), would undertake to praise him for his endeavours against Catiline (cf. §3n *gratulationem exspectavi*). It clearly would have had an impact on C.'s reputation (after all, praise is welcome, especially when it comes from those who are praised themselves: 5.12.7; 15.6.1; *Tusc.* 4.67)—particularly after Nepos' accusations at the end of C.'s consulship in 5.2.7n *atqui ille...qua iniuria*... (similar below: ...*mea summa erga te studia...parum...adiunxerint...coniuncturaque sit*). *officiorum conscientia*: by emphasising his rectitude, C. invites his addressee to judge his behaviour (similar to 5.5.1n *meorum...officiorum...conscius* and 3.7.6). *Officium* presumably refers to C.'s support (cf. §2n *summa*

erga te studia) shown in: 1) the approval of the *lex Manilia*—for which Pompey obtained the command of the war against Mithridates; 2) the award of two *supplicationes* (in 63 for the defeat of Mithridates and in 62, for the conclusion of his activity in the East: *Prov.* 27). **...non mutue respondetur...patior:** typical vocabulary of mutuality in *amicitia* (cf. e.g. 5.2.4n *satisne…mutue respondisse*.; other example can be found in the general introduction). Differently from 5.2.3n *...in amicitia mutuum...arbitror...par voluntas accipitur et redditur* and 5.5.2n *...nullam...gratiam*, C. seems ready to tolerate (*OLD* s.v. *patior* 4c; similar to §3n *facile...patiare*) Pompey's provocation. This display of magnanimity and leniency helps him achieve a position of moral superiority (C. employs a similar strategy in 5.2.9n *...facilis existimari debeo*). **...mea summa erga te studia...parum...adiunxerint...coniuncturaque sit:** conventional vocabulary of political association (Hellegouarc'h 1963, 80–82) highlighted by the recurring alliterations. C. hoped that Pompey felt beholden to him for his services (§2n *officiorum conscientia*) and that, for this reason, Pompey might offer in return public support for his efforts against Catiline; this would surely benefit C.'s reputation damaged by the attack of Metell. Nepos (§2n *nulla...laetari soleo...officiorum conscientia*). *mea...erga...te...studia*: affiliative politeness (especially employed in confrontational contexts, to remind the addressee what the writer did for him: 5.1.1n *meum studium erga vos*; 5.5.1n *meorum in te studiorum*; 5.5.3n *multo maius meum studium*). *Adiungo, concilio* and *coniungo* are usually employed in reference to *amicitia:* C. uses them together only here (whereas *concilio* and *coniungo* are found again in 3.10.5, in a friendship-related context) to underline and perform his wish to move closer to his addressee. It is possible that the verbs show different phases of the creation of a political alliance (as also demonstrated by the use of the pronouns of 1st and 2nd person singular and 1st person plural): 1) to cause A, 'tu' (in this case Pompey) to come close to B, 'ego' (that is C.; *OLD* s.v. *adiungo* 7b; the verb is employed again at §3n *Laelium...adiunctum esse*); 2) to render A favourably disposed to B (*OLD* s.v. *concilio* 2) and 3) to bring them in close association (*OLD* s.v. *coniungo* 7a). It is their shared care for the state (*i.e.* C.'s defeat of Catiline and Pompey's decision not to enter Rome with his army, or his endeavours in the East: §1n) that will bring them closer—rather than C.'s *officia*; similar to 5.8.3n *...in eadem...tempora incidimus*; 4.13.2 (*...amicis...benevolentiam...conciliarat...res publica*); *Mil.* 21 (*res publica nos coniunxit cum bonis*); *Deiot.* 39 (*...Deiotari...mihi amicitiam res publica conciliavit*).

3 Requests (that could irritate the addressee) are generally left until nearly the end of the letter; in this way, the writer can firstly prepare the ground with strategies of politeness and then he can ask his requests (similar to 5.8.4n; for a similar strategy, cf. 5.2.9n–10n). It is a friend's duty to give a frank advice to an acquaintance (*Amic.* 44)—and C. (who has extensively demonstrated how good as a

friend he was: see the introduction to §2) does not lose the opportunity to lecture Pompey (§3n *Ac ne ignores...desiderarim...*; *gratulationem exspectavi*). Strategies of redressive politeness (§3n *...scribam aperte...*) and assertions of goodwill (§3n *natura...amicitia postulat*; *nostrae necessitudinis*; *tibi...Africanus fuit...me...Laelium*) are here employed to reduce the possible irritation that C.'s words might provoke. **Ac ne ignores...desiderarim...:** the sentence recalls 5.5.2n *Ego si...officia desiderem...nemini videri debeat*, but the tones here are milder, well-suited for a more influential addressee. *Ac ne* is generally used to clarify what has been said before (similar to 5.12.9; 7.26.2; *Att.* 1.11.1; 2.18.2). **...scribam aperte...natura...amicitia postulat:** expressions of *amicitia* and strategies of redressive politeness aimed at: 1) reducing the possible irritation that could arise from C.'s complaints; 2) removing any suspicion of C.'s conduct and asserting, instead, how attentive he was; 3) strengthening C.'s relationship with his addressee. *scribam aperte*: Pompey is (fictively or presumptively) depicted as a true friend—one to whom C. can talk frankly (*Amic.* 44: *...in amicitia...ad monendum non modo aperte sed etiam acriter*). This is a strategy of redressive politeness: C. adopts the vocabulary of intimate friendship (and commits to an open-hearted conversation with Pompey) to mitigate the tone of his reprimand (§3n *gratulationem exspectavi*). Similarly in 3.7.6 (*ad te scripsi liberius*), a letter written to App. Claud. Pulcher, where C. rebukes Appius for his unfriendly conduct in the affairs concerning his succession in Cilicia; in contrast, cf. *Att.* 11.7.8 *aperte...scribas*, where C. seems sincere in his statement. *mea natura...nostra amicitia postulat*: strategies of redressive politeness that strengthen C.'s narrative: not only frankness is his innate temperament (*mea natura*), but also what their friendship requires (*nostra amicitia postulat*). The word *amicitia* opens and closes this paragraph (§3n *in amicitia adiunctum esse*). The repetition of this word appears to be standard in letters addressed to people with whom C. is or was in conflict (cf. 5.2, where it is repeated five times, and 5.8, where it is employed six times). This is a rather insincere statement of friendship; in *Att.* 1.13.4 (January 61), Pompey is described as a deceitful and envious man: *occulte...invidet. Nihil come, nihil simplex, nihil...illustre, nihil honestum, nihil forte, nihil liberum* (similar to *Att.* 1.14.1–4; similar 'honest' statements are found only in C.'s letters to Atticus: cf. also C.'s real consideration of Crassus: the introduction to 5.8). **res eas gessi...nostrae necessitudinis...gratulationem exspectavi:** having carefully prepared the ground, C. can finally express complaints about Pompey's conduct (differently to his letter to Crassus, where C. tries to ingratiate the addressee: the introduction to 5.7–8). Given the significance of his endeavours against Catiline (emphasised by *gero* and *res publica*, repeated several times in this last section), C. expected a word of congratulation (*gratulationem exspectavi*; on its importance: 5.6.2n *Ego tua gratulatione...gratulationem*) in Pompey's letter (on which, see the introduction)—both for their friendship (*nostrae necessitudinis*) and state's sake (*rei publicae causa*). It silently contradicts C.'s

previous statement (§2n *non mutue respondetur…facillime patior*), where he appears willing to accept Pompey's lack of reciprocation. *nostrae necessitudinis...rei publicae causa*: the reasons for which Pompey should have congratulated to C.: 1) their close relationship (previously mentioned in 5.2.6n *pro Cn. Pompei necessitudine*) and the resulting obligations (the expression *causa...necessitudinis* is typical of C.'s language of *amicitia*: cf. the general introduction); 2) out of consideration for his devotion to the state (*rei publicae causa*: stock phrase in C.'s rhetoric on the defeat of the Catilinarian conspiracy; for the repetition of C.'s vocabulary on the Catilinarians in the book: see the general introduction). Again, C. combines references to their friendship with their shared interest for the state, probably to prove to Pompey that they are worth of similar recognitions (§2n *res publica...conciliatura coniuncturaque sit*; §3n *...in re publica et in amicitia...*). *gratulationem exspectavi*: C.'s reprimand is delayed (and placed at the end of the sentence) to link it to the incipitary §3n *res eas gessi*; C.'s request for recognition, and the reason for which he should have received it, frame the entire sentence. The term *gratulatio* is employed with the meaning of 'congratulation' (one of the purposes of the epistolary exchanges between friends: 6.6.1 *melius exspectans gratulationem...litteris maluissem*. It is found previously in 5.6.2n *Ego tua gratulatione commotus...domum emissem, emi...gratulationem*)—that C. expected to receive from his addressee for his efforts against Catiline. Only in March 60, during a meeting of the senate, will Pompey fulfil C.'s request: *Att.* 1.19.7 *Itaque primum...de rebus nostris tacuerat, Pompeium...in senatu...saepe multisque verbis...mihi salute imperi...orbis...adiudicarit*. **quam ego...praetermissam...ne...animum offenderes:** C. pretends not to know the reason for Pompey's hesitation and tries to figure it out. *Ego...praetermissam...arbitror*: objective infinitive construction where the subject (*praetermissam*) refers to the favour requested (but not promptly obtained: see above) from C.'s addressee (similar to 5.12.8n [*ego*]*...arbitror...me rogantem*). *praetermissam*: 'omit to mention' (*OLD* 3)—clearly referring to Pompey's lack of congratulations on C.'s efforts against Catiline (§3n *gratulationem exspectavi*). It is similarly employed in 2.7.1, where C. apologises for his delay in congratulating Curio on his election to the tribunate. The verb is found again early in the book—but, this time, with the different meaning of 'to fail to take advantage of' (5.2.3n *praetermisisse provinciam*). *quod verer<er>e ne...offenderes*: C. might imply that Pompey was afraid of (*verer<er>e ne* + subj. : *OLD* s.v. *vereor* 5a) displeasing (*animum offenderes*) somebody (*cuius*: very likely, Caesar and Metell. Nepos, who had proposed Pompey's recall from the East—within a broader campaign against C.—to put a stop to C.'s tyranny after his discovery of the Catilinarian conspiracy). To erase every possible confrontational element (that could arise from his §3n *gratulatio*), Pompey might have decided not to engage in the discussion (similar to 5.2.1n *suspicor...rem publicam a me conservatam...propinquos tuos...laude*, where C. offers an analogous explanation for Metell. Celer's decision of not praising

him for his endeavours against Catiline. See also 12.7.1 [*Servilia*] *mulier timida verebatur ne Pansae animus offenderetur*). *ne cuius animum offenderes*: 'to offend nobody': language of *amicitia* (Hellegouarc'h 1963, 194 n.7)—generally employed: 1) to show displeasure with a friend's conduct (1.9.5; 12.7.1; *Att*. 1.11.1; 4.15.4; 11.13.2; 15.21.1); 2) as a strategy of redressive politeness (11.28.1; *QFr*. 2.16.1; 3.7.3). Within this last group, it is possible to recognise a set of letters, all dated to the years of the civil war, where it might refer (hardly ever explicitly) to Caesar (4.1.1; 9.16.6; *Att*. 8.11d.7; 8.12.2) and Pompey (*Att*. 9.13.4). *Fam.* 5.7 is probably the earliest letter in which this *iunctura* hints to Caesar (who might have been the principal instigator of the events of 62: for which, see the introduction to 5.1) and Metell. Nepos. **sed...nos pro salute patriae gessimus...iudicio ac testimonio comprobari:** typical Ciceronian vocabulary employed in reference to the defeat of the Catilinarian conspiracy (for similar vocabulary, cf. the general introduction). The memory of the honours decreed by the senate on 3 December 63 to C. (and highlighted earlier in 5.2.8n *...qui,...qui...qui...*) should have encouraged Pompey to praise him publicly. *pro salute patriae gessimus*: stock phrase of Ciceronian rhetoric for the conspiracy (MacKendrick 1995, s.v. *index*). *orbis terrae...comprobari*: emphatic and tendentious (as demonstrated by 5.2, but also by 5.4, a letter written by C. from exile) language: the whole world approved his actions against Catiline's associates (and, therefore, granted C. honours for his merits: see below). It might also refer to the approval of his efforts against the conspirators that he says he received from the people, after his valediction in 63 (5.2.7n *quod populus idem magna voce me vere iurasse iuravit*). *orbis…testimonio*: solemn phrase (*TLL* IX 918, 51) that enhances the importance of the endeavours accomplished during his consulate (similar to *Sul.* 33; *Arch*. 30; *Att.* 1.19.7; *Flacc*. 103; *Dom*. 75–76). *comprobari* belongs to juridical language and it is here employed with the meaning of 'approbare decreta' (*TLL* III 2164, 9). It might refer to the honours (for the *supplicatio* see Dyck on *Catil*. 3.15.5–7; for the title of *pater patriae* and the conferment of the *corona civica*, see Berry on *Sul*. 85) approved for C., after he had successfully defeated the plans of Catiline. **quae...consilio...animi magnitudine...cognosces ut tibi...patiare:** C. also demonstrates that he has been the republic's reliable and trustworthy champion, who could be a valuable ally (if only Pompey would accept him as such). C. gives Pompey the space and time to change his mind: *venio, cognosco* and *patior* are, for this reason, key verbs; Pompey's return (*cum veneris*) to Italy is the necessary condition to acknowledge (*cognosces ut*) the importance of C.'s actions; only after that he will be content (*patiare*) to accept C. as political ally. *cum veneris*: Pompey was still in Asia Minor (on his campaigns in the East, cf. the introduction to the letter) at the time of the writing of this missive; he probably arrived at Brundisium (where he discharged his army) only in December 62 (Broughton 1952, 176). C. might imply that Pompey's absence from Rome (where the events, for which C. seeks recognition, took place) could have been the reason for his lack of

congratulation. He, in fact, might have relied on second-hand (and probably biased: Pompey seems to have been in contact with C.'s opposition: §3n *quam ego...praetermissam...ne...animum offenderes*) reports on the events—but once he returns to Italy, he will realise (§3n *ut...patiare*) that he underestimated the relevance of C.'s endeavours. *tanto...tanta...*: rhetorical repetition of *tantus* that emphasises C.'s distinctive capacity for judgment (*consilio*) and great dignity (*animi magnitudine*). Polyptotons are recurrent in the book (*i.e.* 5.4.2n *tuos...tuorum*, employed by C. to give a touching tone to his request). These are found especially in the confrontational missives, where the writers, by highlighting their own qualities and/or endeavours on the republic's behalf (see 5.1.2n *qui...qui...qui*; 5.2.7n *adfectus...adfecit*; *iurasse iuravit*; §9n *humanitatem…humanitas*), try to defend themselves from the recipients' accusations or acts of disrespect (cf. 5.2.10n *te...tu...te*; *amicum...amicissimum*; 5.5.2n *existimare…existiment*). *consilio...magnitudine*: the virtues of a good politician (Hellegouarc'h 1963, 254; 292): C. justifies his conduct against the conspirators and, at the same time, demonstrates that he could be a sage adviser (on this, see below). The vocabulary employed here is typical of C.'s rhetoric on the Catilinarian conspiracy (similar to *Sul.* 14: Berry *ad loc.*). After Catiline's plot, the *iunctura* becomes a *topos* that C. attributes to the saviours of the republic: *Sest.* 139 (C. against Clodius); *Phil.* 8.13 (P. Nasica against T. Gracchus); 11.9 (C. Trebonius against Caesar); 14.37 (C. Pansa, A. Irtio and C. Caesar Octavianus against M. Antonius). *Consilium* is found in 5.2.8n *in consulate...consilio...fuisse*. *a me gesta esse*: stock phrase of C.'s vocabulary for the Catilinarian conspiracy, for which §3n *res eas gessi*. *cognosces ut...*: expedient of affiliative politeness (similar to 5.2.9n *cognosce nunc*); the acknowledgement of C.'s endeavours is of primary importance (as demonstrated by the construction *cognosco* + *ut*, that supports the entire sentence) to consolidate their friendship. The verb suggests a didactic manner—that is in line with the position of Pompey's ally (and adviser) into which C. is trying to manoeuvre himself (see below). *...tibi...Africanus...me...Laelium...patiare*: after having laid the groundwork (§3n *consilio...magnitudine*; *cognosces ut*), C. can now propose himself as Pompey's adviser (differently in Holliday 1969, 20, who attributes it to C.'s alleged jealousy). His attempt could appear intrusive, but by casting himself as Laelius to Pompey's Scipio, C. manages to reduce the possible irritation that could arise from it (on their friendship: §3n *mea natura...nostra amicitia postulat*). The analogy between Laelius–Scipio and C.–Pompey has no precedents in C.'s works, but similar strategies of political courtship (Hall 2009, 184) can be found in 5.12.7n (where Lucceius is as Timaeus to C.'s Timoleon, Herodotus to C.'s Themistocles and Homer to C.'s Achilles) and in *Att.* 14.17 (where C. is as Nestor to Dolabella's Agamemnon). *tibi...maiori...Africanus*: strategy of affiliative politeness. Pompey is said to be more influential than his illustrious predecessor P. Corn. Scipio Aemilianus. Parallels with Pompey's career are obvious: both were great generals with an upright character and

recipients of multiple triumphs. However, besides their ingratiating purpose, C.'s words have an aura of credibility: Pompey was going to receive his third triumph (conversely, Scipio celebrated only two: Broughton 1952, 463. On Pompey's triumphs, cf. the introduction to the letter)—and with his eastern campaign, Pompey had probably conquered a wider area than any previous Roman general (Rawson 1978, 97). In *QFr.* 2.3.3, it is Pompey that compares Crassus to P. Corn. Scipio Aemilianus in the matter of taking good care of one's life. *me...minore<m>...Laelium*: strategy of redressive politeness: false modesty that serves C.'s purpose to mitigate his words. If Pompey–Scipio is the military man, C.–Laelius is the man-at-home, the wise adviser of the prestigious captain (for Scipio and Laelius' different traits: *de Orat*. 3.28; *Brut*. 84)—who, especially in times of peace (like those after the defeat of the Catilinarian conspiracy), should be consulted for guidance (*Rep*. 1.18 *...belli gloriam Africanum ut deum coleret Laelius, domi…Laelium…observaret in parentis loco Scipio*). *in re publica...amicitia adiunctum esse*: differently from the famous pair, C. is not only the adviser of the great general, but he also shares with him the task of preserving the republic (similar to *Att.* 1.19.3 *ut nos duo...pignora rei publicae retineri videremur*). This might refer to C.'s role as *dux togatus* of the Catilinarians. The link between their friendship and common interest for the state is recurrent in the letter: §2n *...summa erga...adiunxerint, res publica...conciliatura coniuncturaque sit*; §3n *nostae necessitudinis et rei publicae*.

8

In probably January 54, C. writes to M. Licin. Crassus, proconsul of Syria, to pledge his support while abroad.

Letter 5.8 transports the reader 8 years after the preceding 5.7 (c. April 62), to a period that follows the Lucca congress and the constitution of the so-called 'first triumvirate', whose members are brought together thanks to the juxtaposition of 5.7 (to Pompey) and 5.9–11 (to Vatinius but mainly about Caesar) in sequence (on the narrative of 5.7–8, see its introduction).

It demonstrates, as other letters in the book do (although it is extensively presented here and is also linked to celebrative language to ingratiate the addressee), how leave-taking protocols were performed between the party that usually remained in Rome and the promagistrate who moved away to the province. The promagistrate would write to influential people in Rome to request their support while absent from the capital (cf. e.g. 5.9.1n *...Vatinius cliens...*); these people, like C. here, would defend their prestige (cf. §1n *Quantum...meum studium...dignitatis...augendae...*) if needed, offer support to them (cf. §2n *in omnibus rebus...te pertineant...meam*), and their family members (§2n *...uxor tua...tui Crassi...*). The ancient editor(s) have selected different letters to show how C. would

generally reply to requests of supports from governor in province: cf. 5.5–6 (C. to C. Antonius and P. Sestius), 5.7 (C. to Pompey), and 5.11 (C. to Vatinius). They have also included letters written from promagistrates to C.: cf. 5.3 (Metell. Nepos to C.) and 5.9–10b (Vatinius to C.); letter 5.1, although being written by a magistrate in province (Metell. Celer to C.), has a different aim than asking for support.

At the time of the missive, C.'s newly reconciled friend (on which, Evangelou 2020, 95–122 and the introduction to 5.7–8) Crassus was in Syria (whose process of organisation into a Roman province was started by Pompey in 64: cf. the introduction to 5.7). The *lex Trebonia de provinciis consularibus* of 55 (Rotondi 1922[2]) conferred on Crassus command of Syria (and the command of Hispania Citerior and Ulterior to Pompey) for 5 years. Crassus, however, died in 53 during in his campaign in Parthia.

5.8 presents difficulties concerning its dating (and, for this reason, it has been uncertainly assigned to January 54: Sh.-B. *ad loc.*). Leveghi 2016, in his introductory note to 5.8, identifies two events that chronologically frame the letter, that might help date the letter to early January 54. 1) limit *ante quem*: C. refers to Crassus' sons as they were in Rome at the time of the writing of the missive; Marcus especially had to leave Rome early 54 to reach Caesar in Gallia where he was his quaestor (§2n *...tui Crassi meis consiliis*; on Publius: §2n *Publio deditus quod me*). 2) limit *post quem*: C. refers to §1n *nam et cum consulibus...contentione decretavi*, most likely the consuls for 54 since Pompey and Crassus himself were consuls in 55 (the introduction to 5.7–8).

Other elements might help date the letter to early January 54. C. alludes to the fact that he wrote this letter a few days after he delivered his (lost) speech on Crassus' behalf (§1n *meum studium exstiterit*) in the senate. This might have been delivered in the first comitial days of January 54, between 13 and 16 (Sh.-B. *ad loc.*), in the presence of the consuls (§1n *nam et cum consulibus...contentione decretavi*) Domit. Ahenobarbus and App. Claud. Pulcher.

The main topic for C.'s (lost) speech is difficult to determine, but it was probably concerned with the defence of Crassus' *dignitas* (§1n) and honour (§1n *pro omnibus ornamentis*), particularly in the aftermath of events that occurred after the enactment of the *lex Trebonia de provinciis consularibus* (similar probably to the *Pro Lege Manilia* delivered in 66 in support of bestowing sole command of the third Mithridatic war to Pompey: the introduction to 5.7).

The *lex Trebonia de provinciis consularibus* (cf. above) seems to have also granted Pompey and Crassus the power to declare war and make peace (Rotondi 1922[2]). Crassus was soon at the centre of political turmoil. Ancient sources narrate that his request to levy troops to fulfil his plans for war (*ornatio provinciae*) against Parthia (Sh.-B. on *Att*. 4.13.2) encountered strong opposition. In 55, the tribune C. Ateius Capito—probably encouraged by the *optimates* (among who there were the consuls

for 54 Domit. Ahenobarbus and App. Claud. Pulcher)—resorted to religious obstruction (App. *BC* 2.18; Plin. *Nat.* 2. 147; D.C. 39.39). Consequently, the war Crassus wanted to pursue was described as a *bellum iniustum* (Plu. *Crass.*16): it disregarded the peace treaties of 69 (Plu. *Luc.* 30) and 66 (Plu. *Pomp.* 33) concluded with the allied community of Parthians (Flor. *Epit.* 1.46); as such, the war was aimed at increasing Crassus' prestige and political power (Plu. *Crass.* 16), especially after the Lucca conference. This was probably the result of the *optimates*' propaganda against the *triumviri*. Back in 58, the then governor of Syria A. Gabinius (Pompey's right-hand man) arrived in the province with a similar project of war—but with the consent of the senate (Arnaud 1998, 13–34).

However, in the end, the unpropitious signs seen by the tribune C. Ateius Capito were declared invalid (probably thanks to Pompey's intervention: Wardle on *Div.* 1.29) and Crassus was able to leave Rome, between 15 and 16 November 55, not without resentments (*Att.* 4.13.2 *Crassum...minore dignitate aiunt profectum paludatum quam olim aequalem eius L. Paulum*...). C. was, for this reason, invited by Pompey and Caesar to help restore the honour of his newly reconciled friend Crassus (1.9.20 *Pompeius...ut cum Crasso redirem in gratiam Caesarque...ostenderet*; *...illius* [*Crassi*] *commendatione susceptam defendi in senatu*; similar to Plu. *Cic.* 26)—even if it meant going against the *optimates*; sometimes it is wise to adapt to the political circumstances (1.9.21).

In 46–45 (after c. 7 years from Crassus' death) C. expresses his real thoughts on Crassus' war: Crassus (as Gabinius: *Dom.* 23; 60; 124) declared a war *sine causa* (*Fin.* 3.75; *Rep.* 3.23) against an allied community of Rome (see Arnaud 1998, 16, who believes that C. inaugurated the hostile literary tradition on Crassus' campaign in Parthia).

C.'s intent in writing this letter was to openly (cf. e.g. §5n *...promitto...recipio*) please Crassus and establish a closer relationship with him (as also displayed by the repeated use of rhetorical devices: §1n *nam...contentione decretavi...pro...ornamentis*...). This is particularly evident when there is reconciliation, becoming even more crucial when that reconciliation has been encouraged by Pompey and Caesar (cf. the introduction to 5.7–8; for C.'s real thoughts on Crassus: cf. *Att.* 4.13.2, where Crassus is depicted as *homo nequam*; similar to C.'s truthful description of Pompey: §3n *...scribam aperte...natura...amicitia postulat*) and when C. could be accused of *inconstantia* (§2n *...me...immutarunt*...; §3n *...non...repentina...voluntate...fortuito*...; §5n *constantiae meae causa permanebo*; similar to 5.1.2n *mobili...animo*, where Metell. Celer accuses C. of inconstancy). For this reason, the letter is filled with ingratiating remarks and (vague: Parrish 1973, 371) references to C.'s goodwill toward the addressee (§2n and §5n *amicissimum*; on the comparative usage of the term *amicitia*, especially in difficult exchanges: 5.7.3n *amicitia*; similar language of *amicitia*, although employed with less prominent figures of Roman aristocracy, is found in 5.13–18: cf. e.g. in 5.15.2 *tecum...vetustas, amor, consuetudo...coniunctioni*]*s...nec...impediat...vicinitas*.

M. CICERO M. LICINIO P.F. CRASSO 'From M. Cicero to M. Licinius Crassus, son of Publius'—standard formal heading with *s.d.* omitted. Differently from 5.7, no family names are here employed.

1 The incipit encapsulates the character and summarises the main themes of the letter (on which C. will return at the end of his letter): 1) C. overstates how much he did to defend Crassus' *dignitas* and the effect of his speech in the senate (on which, the introduction to the letter); 2) C. puts aside their past animosities and shows his strong feeling of affection (*veterique nostrae necessitudine...interruptum officium...*)—hoping that Crassus will reciprocate. Strategies of affiliative politeness and flattering language (*Quantum...meum studium...dignitatis...augendae...*; *tanta contentione...ulla...suscepique*; *...perpetuam propugnationem*) are here employed to ingratiate Crassus and demonstrate that C. could be a reliable political ally—if his addressee accepts him as such (similar to 5.7.3n *quae...consilio...animi magnitudine...cognosces ut tibi...patiare*). **Quantum...meum studium...dignitatis...augendae...:** overemphatic use of epistolary conventions. According to epistolary etiquette, an aristocrat is supposed to defend a friend's *dignitas* (on the *defensio dignitatis*, cf. Hellegouarc'h 1963, 157 ff.; see also Hall 2009 *appendix*, no.7), especially when the friend is far from Rome (cf. also §2n *...tibi absenti...operam...meam*; §5n *defensio...te absente dignitatis*). Similarly, but with a more annoyed tone, in 5.2.4n *postea...profectus es...recordere quae ego de te in senatu egerim*; 5.5.2n *omnia...ad dignitatem* and in 5.6.3n *Antonium...in senatu...defendi*). Here, C. goes further: not only did he safeguard (*OLD* s.v. *tueor* 4b) Crassus' reputation (that was at risk probably because of the events related to his departure to Parthia: see introduction), but he even enhanced Crassus' political prestige (*dignitatis...augendae*: *TLL* II 1350, 84 ff.; for *tueor* and *augeo* to indicate the offered political support: 7.17.2; *Phil*. 11.37.6). **non dubito...tui scripserint:** when a magistrate went abroad, it was of crucial importance to leave trustworthy agents behind (similar to §3n *domesticorum...litteris*; cf. also 5.6.1n *Cum...Decius...venisset...ut operam darem...*). *omnes tui* might also refer to the witnesses of C.'s support on Crassus' behalf he mentions throughout the letter: the consuls and ex consuls (§1n); Rome and its citizens ([twice]§2n); Crassus' family members (§2n). Similar to 5.5.2n, where senate and Roman people are witnesses of Antonius' lack of reciprocity. **non...aut...aut...aut...praeteriri:** the importance of C.'s speech on Crassus' behalf (on which, the introduction). *non...mediocre...obscurum...*: to highlight the importance of his actions, C. employs vocabulary of overstatement (that becomes even more artificial below) such as 1) the polysyndeton *aut...aut...aut*; 2) the accumulation *mediocris* (*OLD* 5c)–*obscurus* (*OLD* 5a); 3) the litotes *non mediocre*; *non obscurum*; *non silentio posset praeteriri*. *...silentio posset praeteriri*: the importance of his speech,

that ‘could not be passed over in silence’. C. employs the *iunctura* again in reference to the importance of someone’s achievements/skills: cf. e.g. P. Sulla’s achievements (*Sul*. 62); Galba’s oration (*Brut*. 88); Decimus Brutus’ dispatch (*Phil*. 3.8); the legates’ activity at the time of the Mutina war (*Phil*. 13.13); Messalla’s skills (*ad Brut*. 1.15.1). It is also found in reference to the deaths of praised people (*Part*. 82) and the study of wisdom (*Leg*. 1. 63). **nam...contentione decretavi...pro...ornamentis...:** the employment of repeated rhetorical devices (similar to the letter to Lucceius: see its introduction) gives the language a contrived and fulsome effect (similar above): 1) alliteration of: a) *con-* (*consulibus consularibus contentione*); b) *p-* and *pro-* (*perpetuam propugnationem pro*); c) *o-* (*omnibus ornamentis*); d) *n-* (*nostrae necessitudini*); e) *d-* (*diu debitum*) and 2) polysyndeton of *et cum* (*et cum consulibus–et cum...consularibus*). *...cum consulibus...consularibus...*: meeting of the senate, where C. defended Crassus in front of the ingoing consuls Domit. Ahenobarbus and App. Claud. Pulcher and other ex-consuls (on this, the introduction to the letter). They, as Crassus’ family members and the whole city (§2n *sum...consecutus...ut...sed ut...amicissimum esse cognosceret*), can attest C.’s efforts on Crassus’ behalf. *...tanta contentione decertavi...*: ‘I fought the issue (see §1n *pro...ornamentis*) out with such vehemence...’. Again C. emphasises his debating power (here intensified by the adjective *tantus*—in line with the exaggerate tone of the letter: §1n *non...mediocre...obscurum...*) in defending Crassus (for *contentio* as the kind of discourse to be employed in pleadings in the senate: *Off*. 1. 132; Rousselot 1996). C. probably hoped that, for his public speech, he would be received with high admiration by Crassus and indirectly by Pompey and Caesar (*Off*. 2. 48). *...quanta...ulla in causa suscepique...*: ‘...which I have never before displayed in any cause’: insincere overstatement and strategy of affiliative politeness. Such statement of effort on behalf of an *amicus* is common in the heightened atmosphere of a publicly delivered speech, but it appears as overstatement in the context of an ostensibly private letter. Cf. e.g. *Dom*. 27, where C. remembers how eloquently he defended Pompey’s honour under any circumstance (*Qui tantus fuit labor...quae contentio...quam ego non pro illius dignitate susceperim*?). The *iunctura* is similarly employed in reference to the defence of Dolabella (3.10.5), Cassius (12.7.1) and Plancius (*Planc*. 78). *...perpetuam propugnationem...*: emphasis on his strenuous defence of Crassus to pay homage to their friendship (§1n *veterique nostrae necessitudini*). However, both he and his addressee knew that C. was directed not only by Pompey and Caesar but also by Crassus himself (1.9.20 *quam ob rem eius causam...magna illius commendation susceptam defendi in senatu, sicut mea fides postulabat*). *pro...ornamentis*: solemn vocabulary that is in line with the tone of the letter (*TLL* IX 1011, 25ff). C.’s lost speech on Crassus’ behalf intended to defend Crassus’ *dignitas* (§1n) and honour (*OLD* s.v. *ornamentum* 6), after the events following the promulgation of the Trebonian law (cf. the introduction). **...tuis...veterique...necessitudine...officium...reddidi:** by defending Crassus’ honour

(§1n *pro...ornamentis*), C. finally paid tribute (*debitum reddere*: *TLL* V 103, 64) to their long-established friendship (§1n *veterique nostrae necessitudine*). C. gives a deliberately vague justification for his decision to advocate for Crassus later than sooner—and it is probably linked to Crassus' closeness to Clodius (§1n *...interruptum officium*). *...veterique nostrae necessitudine...*: common vocabulary of *amicitia* (cf. the general introduction). The sentence self-consciously embellishes the (fictional: see the introduction to 5.8) narrative on their seesawing friendship (1.9.20 *iracundia...sed cum inclusum illud odium multarum eius in me iniuriarum...omne repente apparuit*.). *...debitum...reddidi*: language of reciprocity in friendships. From the choice of vocabulary, it appears that C. received an unspecified favour from Crassus (probably Crassus' approval of his actions in 63 or/and his help on C.'s house after his return from exile: §2n *memoria*). However, he delayed reciprocating it; C. might be inventing this owed favour, possibly to emphasise that C. had to help Crassus due to reciprocity in *amicitia* (on its importance, see 5.9.1n *repudiabis in honore...*). After stating this, C. (whether he has or has not received a favour) displays that he has abundantly (*OLD* s.v. *cumulate*) returned the favour (on mutuality in friendship, see also 5.2.3n *amicitia...par voluntas accipitur et redditur*). *...interruptum officium*: reference to their seesawing friendship—mainly because of Crassus' closeness to Clodius (§2n *pestes hominum*; cf. also Marshall 1974, 804–13). However, it might also be possible that C. might be referring to Catiline too, Crassus' alleged involvement in the Catilinarian conspiracy is debated (cf. Ward 1972, 244–258, who, however, supports the idea that Crassus aided Catiline in his campaign to consulate in 64).

2 Ingratiating tone and insincere (or at least purely instrumental) assertions of *amicitia* that are in line with the purpose of the letter. The paragraph focuses on two stages of their friendship (both highlighted by the two incipitary *sed*): 1) past hostility; 2) present friendliness. **Neque mehercule...colendi...ornandi voluntas defuit:** C. asserts his amicable disposition towards Crassus (similar to §1). Even if his real feelings were different from those expressed, he would not offend or refuse to help an *amicus*—whether hostile (similar to 5.5) or not (cf. §1n.*..veterique nostrae necessitudine...*). The overemphatic tone of the sentence prepares the ground for C.'s recollection of their past animosities. *Neque mehercule*: strategy of affiliative politeness that intensifies the earnestness of his words (similar to 5.10a.1; cf. also 5.15.2n, where it is used with a different purpose). *....umquam mihi...voluntas defuit*: redundant and flattering employment of vocabulary of *amicitia*. C. demonstrates that he has never failed his duties as a friend (*OLD* s.v. *desum* 2—generally employed in reference to obligations towards a friend in need: 5.17.5n; 11.24.2). He has always paid constant attention to Crassus' needs (*OLD* s.v. *colo* 7a; on *colere* as an equivalent of *blandiri*: Hellegouarc'h 1963, 214) and worked to honour him (§1n *studium...dignitatis*; *pro...ornamentis*). His favourable disposition towards Crassus is overemphasised by the repetition of *voluntas* (§2n *nostrae voluntatis*;

§3n *non me...voluntate*; §5n *ad voluntatem...pertinere*; for the language of *amicitia* employed in the book: the general introduction). **sed...pestes hominum...te...a me alienarunt...me...immutarunt tibi:** C. looks at their past relationship: there is no denying that conflicts arose in their friendship (§1n *...interruptum officium*; §3n *...quae inciderunt...suspicione violata*; similar to 5.5.1n *de nostra coniunctione imminutum*); however, C. ably puts the responsibility for this on someone else: *pestes hominum*. The expression serves as an invective (similar usage can be found in Catul. 77.6) against Clodius (for his probable closeness to Crassus: the introduction to 5.7–8). C. employs the standard vocabulary of his anti-Catilinarian language to refer to Clodius and his supporters (MacKendrick 1995, *index*). The reuse of Catilinarian vocabulary to describe someone else's actions is a recurring theme in the book (cf. the general introduction); an example of this reuse of Catilinarian vocabulary to describe Clodius is in 5.3.1n *homo importunissimus*. The practice of not mentioning people's names, especially those of enemies, appears to be a standard feature of C.'s letters; it is particularly evident in Book 5: cf. e.g. C.'s allusions to Catiline and his supporters in 5.2.1n *domesticis insidiis*; *intestino scelere*; *armatis hostibus*; *occulta coniuratione*; 5.2.7n *improbissimus civis*; 5.2.8n *qui...incendere...trucidare...voluissent*. *laude...dolentium*: Clodius is depicted here as an envious man, who suffers from seeing others being praised. On *invidia* as a common feeling in the highly competitive political life, cf. 5.9.1n; 5.12.6n–8n; 5.17.2n. See also Kaster 2005, 84–103; 180–187). *et te...a me...et me...tibi*: chiasmus that emphasises the role that the activity of §2n *pestes hominum* might have had in damaging C. and Crassus' friendship. C. refers to two events in their relationship: 1) the estrangement (*OLD* s.v. *alieno* 6) of Crassus from C. (§2n *te...alienarunt*) and 2) C.'s changing attitude (*OLD* s.v. *immuto* 1 b) towards Crassus (§2n *me…immutarunt*…). *te...alienarunt...*: language that highlights the conflicts which arose between them. The ingratiating construction of the phrase is aimed at absolving Crassus of the blame for their previous tensions (Hall 2009, 73; on their seesawing relationship, see §1n *veterique nostrae necessitudini*). There are vague references to episodes that damaged their friendship (see also §3n *suspicione violata*): C. might refer to Crassus' relationship with Clodius (which grew stronger in 56: *QFr*. 2.3.4; 2.8.2; on this see Marshall 1976, 116, who sees Clodius as Crassus' henchman. Differently, Ward 1977, 244) or to Clodius' claims to be supported in his actions by Crassus (in 58 and 56: *QFr*. 2.3.2; *Har*. 47; *Sest*. 39–40; *Planc*. 86). *...me...immutarunt...*: once again (cf. §2n *pestes hominum*), C. attributes to Clodius the change in his behaviour towards Crassus, suggesting that his actions are merely a reflection of the treatment he receives from others. By emphasising this (and his assistance on Crassus' behalf while absent: §1n *studium...dignitatis*), he attempts to pre-emptively deflect potential accusations of inconstancy (on this, cf. the introduction; on *constantia* as a cardinal elite virtue: §5n *constantia meae*). Similar to 5.4.1n *animum...immutatum...*, where C. fears a change in Metell. Nepos' conduct towards him while

he is still in exile. **sed exstitit tempus...nostrae voluntatis et amicitiae fides:** the incipitary *sed* introduces a new stage of their relationship (on this, see the introduction to §2): the rekindling of their goodwill. ...*tempus optatus...speratum*: the time of their reconciliation—that C. says he more wished for than hoped (strategy of affiliative politeness)—has come, probably thanks to the involvement of Pompey and Caesar (cf. the introduction to the letter). C. flatters his addressee: they had never been close friends (§1n *veterique nostrae necessitudini*)—but the façade of their cordial relations had to be maintained. *ut florentissimis...rebus*: 'your splendid success' (on *florens*, Nisbet on *Dom*. 75). It is not clear to what C. is alluding, but it must refer to something that happened before or contemporaneously with the writing of this letter. C. might be embellishing the events surrounding Crassus' departure to Syria (which were turbulent and required his intervention: cf. the introduction to the letter) to praise the addressee. The use of *florentissimis...rebus* here appears as overemphasis, possibly indicated by its recurrent use as an apposition to or with the genitive of *civitas* or *vir*/*homo* as an honorific title in other contexts: cf. e.g. Kinsey on *Quinct*. 72. ...*memoria...voluntatis...amicitiae fides*: language of reciprocity in *amicitia* in a chiastic structure (similar to §2n *et te...a me...et me...tibi*) that focuses on C.'s respect of his duties as friend (on *voluntas*: §2n *ornandi voluntas*). *Memoria* is a key term of Roman friendship (Williams 2019, 985–994): C. asserts he is mindful (§3n *memoria teneo*) of their *amicitia* and exchange of favours (again, not specified: probably Crassus' support of C.'s activity in 63 and/or the restoration of C.'s house: Gruen 1974, 302 n.157; similar to §1n *debitum...reddidi*; §3n *liberalitatem*; on C.'s favours (§1n *studium...dignitatis*). This could be a strategy of affiliative politeness, as C. and Crassus had recently reconciled, encouraged by Pompey and Caesar (§1n *veterique nostrae necessitudine*; see also the introduction to the letter); similar to 5.17.5n, where C. highlights his long-standing friendship with P. Sittius, who was allegedly involved in the Catilinarian conspiracy (similar language is found in 6.17.2; 13.68.1). ...*amicitiae fides*: pleonasm and Ciceronian *hapax* (*TLL* I 1897, 27): *fides* is the sacred pact which underlies Roman friendships (Hellegouarc'h 1963, 23–38 and Fedeli 1970, 97–113)—but C. constructs it with the genitive of *amicitia* to overstate his devotion towards Crassus. The reiterated use of *amicitia* and *amicus* serves C.'s purpose of flattering and ingratiating his addressee (similar e.g. §3n *ut primum forum attigerim*; on which, the introduction). **sum...consecutus...ut…sed ut…amicissimum esse cognosceret:** additional witnesses (§1n ...*consulibus*...) of C.'s support offered to his addressee (§1n *studium...dignitatis*): not only Crassus' family (§2n *uxor...tui Crassi meis consiliis*…), but also the whole city (§2n...*senatus populusque...intellegit*...), see C.'s fondness for his friend (similar to §2n ...*et senatus populusque Romanus*...). In this way, C. places equal emphasis on '*the private and* public dimension of their *amicitia*' (Evangelou 2020, 105: emphasis added). ...*amicissimum esse cognosceret*: stock phrase of C.'s language of *amicitia*, here overemphasised by the employment of

the superlative of *amicus* (similar to 10.10.2: *QFr*. 1.4.5); similar use of a superlative to emphasise closeness can be found in e.g. 5.5.1n *amantissimus* (here referred to Atticus). The lack of actual content to their relationship is evidence—to the posthumous reader—of C.'s continual overstatement: similar to e.g. §3n ...*amplitudinem...amplectendam*; on which, cf. the introduction to the letter. **...uxor tua...tui Crassi...:** standard statement of leave-taking protocols: cf. the introduction to the letter. C.'s attention to Crassus' wife and sons are a clear substitute for attention to Crassus himself (White 2010, 25 n.44). Women were important intermediaries, especially when their husbands/ family members were away: cf. e.g. 5.2.6n *Claudia...Mucia...necessitudine...*; 5.6.1n *Cornelia tua Terentiam. ...praestantissima...feminarum...*: Ciceronian coinage that provides an overtly flattering description of Crassus' wife Tertulla—that is, however, in line with the tone of the letter (cf. its introduction). C. generally uses the superlative of *praestans* in reference to influential men (consuls or high state officials: Hellegouarc'h 1963, 337–338)—but otherwise never to a woman. C. praises Tertulla with this title (differently Plu. *Cic*. 25; Suet. *Jul*. 50, who report C.'s jokes on Tertulla's alleged infidelity: this might help reveal C.'s 'insincere' statements in 5.8). ...*eximia...tui Crassi*: overstated description of Crassus' sons Marcus and Publius (Broughton 1952, 199 and 223. On Publius' role in the reconciliation between C. and his father Crassus, §4n ...*Publio deditus*). The language here employed is clearly laudatory: the adjective *eximius* and the references to the *pietas, virtus* and *gratia* are more appropriate to influential men, who stood out for their merits (similar to 5.17.4n, employed to celebrate the virtues of P. Sittus' son, a *homo novus*), not to two *adulescentes* at the beginning of their *cursus honorum* (cf. *QFr*. 2.3.7, where C. employs it in reference to the much senior Quintus). Marcus and Publius were probably born in 86/85 and 80 (Syme 1980, 403–408) and began their career respectively in 58 (on Publius' office as *praefectus equitum*, Broughton 1952, 199) and in 54 (on Marcus' quaestorship, Broughton 1952, 223). At the time of the writing of this letter, Marcus was probably in his early thirties, while Publius was in his late twenties; they were too young to gain access to the senior magistracies (as regulated by the *lex Villia annalis*: Rotondi 1922[2]), and, consequently, arguably too young to receive honorifics titles like these (which, nevertheless, fit the overemphatic style of the letter perfectly). *tui Crassi* is informal and intimate language: the adjective possessive *tuus* (Brown-Gilman 1960, 253–276), which recalls *uxor tua*, and the employment of Crassus' *cognomen* (Adams 1978, 149–151) confer on C.'s words a warm and affectionate tone. ...*meis...nituntur*: the possessive adjective *meus* is deliberately placed after §2n *tua...tui* to emphasise C.'s familiar bond with Crassus' family. The choice of *nitor* (*OLD* 3a: 'to rely on') highlights C.'s role as adviser of Crassus' family members—especially of his sons, to which he is like a teacher in relation to students (Dyck on *Off*. 1.122). Moreover, *consilium*, *monita* (*OLD* s.v. *monita*: 'warnings'), *studium* (§1n *meum studium*) and *actio* have the double aim to 1) praise C.'s skills as

'mentor' (similar to 5.7.3n *consilio*); 2) demonstrate he has been a good friend (since Crassus is abroad, C. steps in as his family's adviser: cf. §2n ...*uxor tua*...*tui Crassi*...; on C.'s role as his nephew's preceptor: Ash 2021, 71–103). **...et senatus populusque Romanus intellegit...nihil esse tam promptum...quam...meam:** the official formula referring to the Roman senate and people, and the enumeration of C.'s services (similar to that offered to his wife and sons: §2n ...*meis*...*nituntur* and again in §5n *opera*...*gratia mea*...), highlight the artificial and pompous nature of this phrase. By listing all the support available to Crassus (§2n ...*operam, curam, diligentiam, auctoritatem meam*), C. demonstrates the trustworthiness of his pledge of support (§2n *sed exstitit tempus*...*nostrae voluntatis et amicitiae fides*). *senatus populusque Romanus*: C. overemphasises the concept previously expressed (§2n *cuncta civitas*...*cognosceret*): the two most important Roman institutions are here witnesses of C.'s endeavours towards Crassus (cf. §2n *sum*...*consecutus*...*ut*...*sed ut*...*amicissimum esse cognosceret*; similar to 5.5.2n *senatus et populus Romanus testis*). On *intellego* as 'grasp': see 5.2.9n; cf. also 5.2.1n; §5n, where C. employs *non intellego* as stratagem of affiliative politeness. ...*tibi absenti*: on leave-taking protocols: §2n ...*uxor tua*...*tui Crassi*... . *promptum*...*paratum*...: language of *amicitia* strengthened by alliterations. The choice of synonyms (*TLL* X 1886, 9)—which stresses the image of C. as a careful friend—is consistent with the verbose and openly flattering tone of the letter (cf. also e.g. §4n *falsa–inania*; *amo–diligo*; §5n *remitto–condono*; similar to 5.12.1n *illustrare–celebrare*). ...*operam, curam, diligentiam, auctoritatem meam*: ascending climax (similar to §5n *opera, consilio, auctoritate, gratia mea*): it opens by emphasising C.'s diligence in fulfilling his obligations as a friend (similar to §4n *polliceor*...*meum studium*...*spectet*) and climaxes with a reference to his prestige and influence. *opera* bolsters the language of *amicitia*, and highlights C.'s willingness to offer his assistance to Crassus (as he already did in the occasion of his speech on Crassus' defence: §1n ...*studium*...*dignitatis*). *cura* and *diligentia* are political virtues (Hellegouarc'h 1963, 251–252); they are also found in (somewhat different) confrontational contexts such as 5.2.9n and 5.6.3n. The focus of the phrase is on *auctoritatem meam*, the exercise of C.'s well-known influencing force (Farmer 2001, 16–48) in defending friends' *dignitas*, while they are abroad (on which, §2n ...*uxor tua*...*tui Crassi*...).

3 The authenticity of this paragraph (as well as that of §4) has been challenged by Bardt 1897 and Gurlitt 1901, but is well defended by Sh.-B. *ad loc.* The repetition of the *topoi* of §§1–2 (e.g. the witnesses of C.'s endeavours on Crassus' behalf; the praise of C. and Crassus' old and well-established friendship and their clash; C.'s pledge of support) is not a sufficient element to question the authenticity of the structure of a letter that is, by its own nature, deliberately dense and overlaudatory (similar Leveghi 2016, 452 n.60); such elements are a clear sign, if anything, of the

lack of authenticity of C. himself (§2n...*praestantissima*...*feminarum*...). The language is that of *amicitia*, but its tones are even more ingratiating than that of §§1–2; cf. e.g. the repeated use of intensifiers (*vehementer*; *semper*; *maxime*). **...domesticorum...declarari puto**: on the witnesses for C.'s endeavours on Crassus' behalf: §1n *non dubito...tui scripserint*. On his family members: §2n ...*uxor tua*...*tui Crassi*... . **...existimes...persuadeas vehementer velim...:** courteous and affectionate tone that emphasises C.'s goodwill and willingness to reconcile with Crassus. *existimo* ('to form/ hold an opinion of someone/ something': *OLD* s.v. 2) is language of *amicitia*. In Book 5, it is employed in: 1) confrontational contexts to criticise someone else's actions (5.1.1n; 5.2.1n; §9n; 5.5.2n; 5.6.2n but referred to Antonius); 2) in defence of one's activity (5.2.8n; §9n; 5.6.1n). ...*tibi persuadeas*...*velim*: stereotyped formula of politeness—generally employed in C.'s formal correspondence (Roesch 2004, 146 and *appendix*, n.10). Its courteous tone (emphasised by the alliteration *vehementer velim*; on the polite subjunctive *velim*, Hall 2009, 74 n.137 and *appendix*, n.10 [b]. On *vehementer*, 5.2.6n *vehementer probari*) has a double aim: 1) to please Crassus and demonstrate (to him but also to the wider public, given the public nature of this letter) that he has always acted in good faith; 2) to alleviate the memory of their past animosities (§3n *si quae inciderunt*...; similarly in §1, where C.'s statements of goodwill toward Crassus precedes the mention of their clash: §2n *sed*...*quaedam pestes hominum*...). **...non...repentina...voluntate...fortuito...:** flattery and ingratiating tone, in line with the aim of the letter. C. clarifies that the support shown to Crassus' cause (on which, the introduction to the letter) was a planned intervention, not an impromptu decision. C. usually employs *repentinus* with a negative nuance since it very often refers to the *impetus* of Catiline (e.g. *Catil*. 2.20; *Sul*. 40); it is then re-employed (for this, §2n *pestes hominum*) in reference to Clodius (*Dom*. 13; 106; *Sest*. 53; *Cael*. 60; 63) or to other rivals (*S. Rosc*. 154; *Verr*. 2.4.94; *Cluent*. 5; *Sest*. 126). Prior to C., Caesar employs it with a similarly negative meaning; cf. Caes. *Gall*. (where it occurs thirteen times and it generally refers to the turmoil caused by subjugated communities and their danger for the Roman people) and *Civ*. (thirteen times to describe wars and enemies' actions). In *amicitia*, sudden and fortuitous acts of goodwill and benevolence towards a friend are not as esteemed as those which are performed with judgment and deliberation (*Off*. 1.49; C. tries to free himself from possible accusation of *inconstantia*: cf. §2n...*me*...*immutarunt*...). Sometimes, the display of unexpected support can indicate unfriendliness: *Agr*. 2. 60, where *repentinus* is ironically employed to describe Rullus' hostility towards Pompey). **...ad tuam amplitudinem...amplectendam incidisse...:** C. recalls and emphasises (note the alliteration of *ampl-*) the assistance offered to Crassus. On the recurrent use of synonyms in the letter, §2n ...*promptum*...*paratum*. ...*amplitudinem*...*amplectendam*: C. does not express himself directly—especially in relation to the nature of the support offered to Crassus. This is a cliché of aristocratic

interactions: C. is more willing to present himself as a good friend—as demonstrated by the reiterated use of the conventional (but vague: the introduction) vocabulary of *amicitia*—than to spell out how he has behaved like one. See e.g. the reference to his *officia* as a friend (on which, §1n *interruptum officium*) or the promise to support Crassus (on *amplector*, *TLL* I 1993, 5) and protect his prestige (*OLD* s.v. *amplitudo* 2a); the *iunctura* is found again in §5n *ad amplitudinem tuam* and similarly in 3.9.2; 11.5.3). **...sed...semper...tibi...maxime esse coniunctus:** the already flattering and ingratiating tone of the letter is here reinforced by the employment of intensifiers (cf. §2n *Neque mehercule*): *semper* (Evangelou 2020, 104) and *maxime* (generally employed in confrontational letters to defend one's conduct: 5.2.6n and 5.5.1n). ...*ut primum forum attigerim*: C. proposes a fictional narrative of their friendship: he has desired (ever since his entry in public life) to be on the closest terms with his addressee (cf. also §3n *quo...neque...observantiam neque...benevolentiam...liberalitatem defuisse*); however, both he and Crassus knew that this was a façade (on their seesawing friendship: §1n *veterique nostrae necessitudini*). It functions as an element of politeness designed to facilitate their reconciliation (similar to 15.16.3). The *iunctura* is found again in *Mur.* 21, where S. Sulp. Rufus employs it not as a strategy of affiliative politeness but to denounce Murena's military service. ...*ut tibi...maxime...coniunctus*: 'very closely bound together' (similar to 13.32.2; 15.2.2). On the meaning of the phrase, Hellegouarc'h 1963, 63. For further (openly flattering) statements of friendship: cf. e.g. §2n *memoria...voluntatis...amicitiae fides*; *amicissimum esse cognosceret*; §5n *ad me scribas...ut ad hominem amicissimum*. **quo...neque...observantiam neque...benevolentiam...liberalitatem defuisse:** fictional narrative on their friendship, for which see §3n ...*ut primum forum attigerim*. On *memoria* as part of the language of *amicitia*, §2n ...*memoria...voluntatis...amicitiae fides*. The repetition of *neque...neque*, the chiasmus of the cases in *meam tibi–mihi tuam* (similar to §2n *et te...a me...et me...tibi*), and hyperbaton *meam...observantiam*, confer emphasis to the phrase. In his flattering narration on their relationship, C. presents himself as a subordinate to the triumvir Crassus (C. willingly accepts the junior role in 5.4.1n *in te...auxili...in tuo collega*, a letter of the period of his exile; in the letter to Pompey 5.7.3n *tibi…maiori…me…minore*; also in 5.13, where Lucceius is admired for his imperturbability in the face of the republic's decline). *observantia* is generally directed to superiors, whether in age or wisdom or honour; similar to 10.4.1 and 10.21a, where Plancus highlights his *observantia* towards C.; in 13.74, C. uses it in reference to the respect that the consul Q. Filippus has for C. and their friendship. Cf. also *Att.* 11.17 on Atticus' behaviour towards Tullia. Crassus' extreme (on the laudatory meaning of *summus*, Hellegouarc'h 1963, 231) goodwill (on *benevolentia*, 5.2.10n ...*nostra benevolentia detraham*) and generosity (on *liberalitas*, Manning 1985, 73) are here emphasised (similar to 7.5.3, a letter of 54 written from C. to Caesar). C.'s reference to Crassus' *liberalitas* might hint at Crassus' involvement in the matters related to C.'s

house (similar to T.-P. *ad loc.*), especially after his return from exile (cf. §2n *mea...memoria*). After all, *liberalitas* is the virtue of those who assume their friends' debts or assist them in acquiring property (*Off.* 2.56). On *liberalitas* as a word that characterises Caesar, MacKendrick 1995, *index*. **...interciderunt...suspicione violate...falsa et inania...:** C., while apparently denying any rupture with Crassus, is simultaneously hinting that there really was a rupture—caused by Crassus's association with Clodius: §2n ...*pestes hominum*...). *interciderunt* is the *lectio* transmitted by **Ω** (and printed by T.-P. *ad loc.*) that Cratander altered, by editorial intervention, to *inciderunt* (a variant accepted and printed by Sh.-B. *ad loc.*). *interciderunt* is arguably the correct *lectio*; employed with the meaning of '*in* (*per*) *intervallum cadere*' (*TLL* VII 2162, 8), *intercido* emphasises that, for a (short) period of time, C. and Crassus fell out (§1n *interruptum officium*). *incido*, on the other hand, would here be employed with the more common meaning of 'occur' (*OLD* s.v *incido*[1] 10 a) and would not highlight the duration of their disagreement. In addition, if Cratander's reading is to be accepted, one should then ask why C. would use a common verb like *incido* three times in a row (§3n ...*ad tuam amplitudinem...amplectendam incidisse...*; *in eadem...tempora incidimus*). It is not especially well suited to a high-level letter like 5.8, where, although concepts are often repeated (see the use of synonyms §2 ...*promptum...paratum*...), the principle of lexical *variatio* is in place. *quae...violata*: the temporary (§3n *interciderunt*) interruption of their friendly relationship (on account of a suspicion: §3n *suspicione*) is presented as an infringement (*OLD* s.v. *violo* 3) of the oath of *fides* (cf. §2n *nostrae...amicitiae fides*; on the violation of *fides*, 3.10.9 and Celentano 2002, 157–171). *Violare* is a strong verb (usually implying physical violence as well as religious desecration: *Off.* 3.104; Maltby on Tib. 1.2.81); it is generally employed in C.'s defence speeches in relation to *amicitia* (*S. Rosc.* 112; *Cluent.* 118; *Flacc.* 57; *Sest.* 59; *Prov.* 43; *Phil.* 2.3.2 in defence of his own conduct) and *necessitudo* (*Sul.* 2) to emphasise the damage caused to one's friendship; however, it might also hint at Clodius. *Violare* is found fourteen times in *Har.* and always refers to Clodius' outrageous activity (MacKendrick 1995, *index*). Its proximity to *suspicio* makes it even more clear that C. is hinting at Clodius (and his closeness to Crassus: §2n *te...alienarunt*); *suspicio* is vocabulary of the language of conspiracy (cf. 5.2.1n *occulta coniuratione*), that C. employs in reference to Catiline; it is re-employed (on which, cf. §2n *pestes hominum*) to refer to Clodius (twelve times in *Mil.*, where Milo is said to be lacking suspicion of Clodius' doings: MacKendrick 1995, *index*). ...*fuerint et falsa et inania*...: the use of synonyms (§2n ...*promptum...paratum*) is in line with the overemphatic tone of the letter (similar to *Verr.* 2.5.48; *Planc.* 101; *Marc.*13; *Div.* 2.127). ...*evulsa...nostra*: the phrase has two levels of meaning: 1) expedient of affiliative politeness that serves C.'s narrative of their relationship. In this case, *memoria* (previously employed to emphasise their mutual affection: §2n *memoria nostrae voluntatis*) is used to invite Crassus to get rid of (*OLD* s.v. *evello* 2) the memory of

their past animosities (on their seesawing relationship, §1n *interruptum officium*). 2) Crassus might be encouraged to distance himself from Clodius; *ex memoria evellere* is found again in *Sest*. 33, where the *iunctura* refers to the consuls Piso and Gabinius, both supporters of Clodius. In 5.3.2, Nepos expresses a similar wish: *de illo* [*Clodio*] *meminisse...volo*. **...vir es...cupio ut...in eadem rei publicae...incidimus...laudi sperem fore:** flattering politeness, emphasised by the frequent alliteration of *e* (*enim...es et eum...esse*) and polyptoton (*nostram...nostrum*). *...vir es...cupio ut*: tone excessively flattering that well complies with the aim of the letter (cf. its introduction). The phrase *is...tu vir es* might conceal an ironic meaning (similar to *Mur*. 64 in reference to Cato and *Flacc*. 34 to Asclepiades). On C.'s depiction of being a junior to a much greater man: §3n *quo...neque...observantiam...liberalitatem defuisse*. *...in eadem...tempora incidimus*: by emphasising their shared activity, C. aims at bringing Crassus closer (similar to other confrontational letters exchanged with leading figures of the Roman political scenario: 5.2.1n *mihi tecum...officium fuisse in rei publicae...*; 5.7.2n *res publica...conciliatura coniuncturaque sit*). On the repeated use of *amicitia*, see §2n *amicitiae fides*; on *coniunctio*, see the general introduction. *...nostrum laudi...*: on *laus*, cf. Hellegouarc'h 1963, 367; it is majorly found in 5.12 (cf. e.g. §7n *...laudari...laudato...*). The employment of *spero* (and its repetition early in §4n) might suggest that C. was probably still concerned about his reputation. By helping Crassus with his (problematic; cf. the introduction to the letter) decision to campaign in Parthia, or Crassus' (alleged) closeness to Clodius (§2n, *...pestes hominum...*), C. might have put his reputation in danger.

4 For the first time in the entire letter, C. asks Crassus for something in return for his favours (on mutuality in friendship: §1n.*..debitum...reddidi*). A similar structure is found in 5.7, where, after praising Pompey's actions (§§1n–2n), C. requests Pompey to reciprocate his favours (§3n). Flattering politeness is extended to Publius, Crassus' younger son and broker of C. and Crassus' reconciliation. **...quantum tuo iudicio tribuendum...putes:** C. politely asks Crassus to return the favours received (similar to 5.5–6: its introduction; 5.7.2n *ad me...litteras quas misisti*; cf. also 5.9–11, where favours are actually returned): Crassus should decide the place, in his esteem, which he thinks appropriate for C. (similar to §3n *...observantiam...benevolentiam...liberalitatem defuisse*). The formula *quantum* + dative of the possessive pronoun + dative of *iudicium* + *tribuere* + dative of the receiving person, is attested in C.'s epistles. C. generally employs it as a stratagem of politeness to strengthen the ties with his *amici*, especially when he is abroad (cf. e.g. 2.8.1, at the time of C.'s proconsulship in Cilicia). Now, however, it is Crassus who is abroad, not C. On *iudicium*, cf. 5.2.8n, where C. refers to Metell. Nepos' lack of *iudicium* in his activity against him. *statues...statues...*: the repetition of *statuo* serves to reinforce C.'s narrative on their friendship. The junior C. (on this, cf. §3n

quo...neque...observantiam...liberalitatem defuisse) asks the senior Crassus to 'determine' (*OLD* 12b s.v. *statuo*) the place, in his esteem, that he thinks appropriate for C. *Statuere* is found again in the confrontational 5.5.1. If in 5.5.1, the outgoing consul C. talks down to Antonius from a higher social and political moral ground and dictate the terms of his and Antonius' relationship; then in 5.8.4, C. puts the decision in Crassus' hands. See also the confrontational 5.2, where C. urges (from a superior standpoint) Metell. Celer 'to judge' (§10n *ut statuas*) the correctness of his and Metell. Nepos' behaviour. The parenthetical *ut spero* hints at the duties of *amicitia*: Crassus is subtly reminded to return C.'s favours (similar to 2.6.3, where C. advocates Milo to Curio, to return a favour to the first; on C.'s *officia*: §1n *...studium...dignitatis*). C.'s reference to his *dignitas* is not irrelevant: for a brief moment, C. sets the junior-senior narrative (for which, above) aside and reminds his addressee of his political prestige and influence (*dignitas*), for which he should be treated accordingly. *Dignitas* is also used earlier in reference to C.'s efforts to protect Crassus' *dignitas* (§1n *dignitatis tuae*): a treatment that Crassus should reciprocate. **ego...profiteor...polliceor...ad...tuam...spectet:** language of affiliative politeness here doubled (*profiteor–polliceor* / *eximium–singulare* / *honestatem–gloriam*) to emphasise C.'s goodwill towards Crassus (see Hall 2009, *appendices*). *polliceor* is more common in pledges of support (Hall 2009, *appendix*, n. 2), whereas *profiteor* is generally employed: 1) in public contexts (E.-M., s.v. *fateor*); 2) in tricky letters to influential members of aristocracy (similar to 3.13.2). Only here (and in *QFr.* 1.2.16 in reference to the support shown by C.'s friends to himself) the two verbs are employed together. *Singularis* has already been employed in 5.5.2n, to highlight how remarkable C.'s efforts towards the ungrateful Antonius were. *Honestas* and *gloria* are two of the virtues of magistrates (Hellegouarc'h 1963, 387)—that C. pledges to defend. **in quo...si multi...contendent...superabo:** language of *amicitia*. To praise his addressee and demonstrate his commitment to Crassus' cause, C. transforms a standard practice of Roman political friendships into a competition (on *contendo*, MacKendrick 1995, *index*; on the theme, Wiseman 1985, 3–19). Here, C. is confident enough to state that not only will his support surpass that of Crassus' other friends and clients, but his personal victory will be easily accomplished; *in...contendent* recalls §1n *tanta...contentione* and shares with it a similar laudatory and ingratiating intent. *...iudicibus* strengthens the idea of a competition: Crassus' sons, who stand here as surrogates for the head of the family, (and all the other witnesses: §1n *...studium...dignitatis*; cf. also the letter's introduction) are called to judge C.'s efforts and validate his words. **quos...Publio...diligit:** C. aims at showing devotion to Crassus by emphasising his closeness to both his sons (the use of *amo*/*diligo* as synonyms is in keeping with the inflated tone of the letter: §2n *...promptum...paratum...*; *diligere* is re-employed below to emphasise Publius' affection toward C.). *in* [*Marco*] *benevolentia pari*: the phrase prepares the ground for C.'s statement of greater affection for Publius (on *benevolentia*: 5.8.3n); C. probably

did mention *Marco* (expunged by Mendelssohn), since the incipitary *quos* and the adjective *par* already alludes to both of Crassus' two sons (on which, §2n ...*tui Crassi*). *Publio deditus*: Publius was the one who helped C. to reconcile with Crassus, and for this is remembered by C. as his 'favourite' (on Publius: 13.16.1; *QFr.* 2.8.2; *Brut.* 281–282; see also Plu. *Crass.* 13 and *Cic.* 33; D.C. 38.17). ...*a pueritia*...*alterum parentem*...: by emphasising his closeness to Crassus' family members (§2n *uxor*...*tui Crassi*...), C. reinforces the idea that their *amicitia* is not just 'political', like many Roman senatorial friendships—but a real and sincere bond from Publius' childhood (on this, see also Evangelou 2020, 105). Crassus should consider Publius' respect (on *observantia*, Deniaux 1993, 85–87 and 139–140) and affection towards C. as another proof of his family's devotion to the writer; a feeling that C. emphasises as being mutual, since he depicts himself as a second father to Crassus' younger son (similar to *Mil.* 102, where, however, Milo is as a virtual father to C.'s sons. On the theme, Wilcox 2012, 32–34).

5 Concluding and ingratiating remarks. To defend himself against (anticipated) accusations of *inconstantia* (§2n ...*me*...*immutarunt*; §5n *constantiae meae*), C. employs a vocabulary that emphasises, instead, his *constantia* (*foederis*...*vim*; *promitto ac recipio*; *constantiae*...*permanebo*). **...foederis...vim...promitto ac recipio...facturum:** by promising to honour their friendship, C. not only presents himself as the guarantor of their *foedus amicitiae* (similar to §2 *amicitia fides*), but also demonstrates his respect of the sacred obligations (*sanctissime*) that it entailed (see below). On the theme, Brunt 1988, 358–359 and Hall 2009, 75 n.139. *promitto*...*recipio*...: high and emphatic language, generally employed in public contexts (on the public nature of this letter, see its introduction)—such as public speeches (*Agr.* 2.103; *Phil.* 5.51) or letters of recommendation (13.10.3) with public intent (Deniaux 1993, 51–52)—to negotiate working alliances (Hall 2009, 39). *Recipere* bolsters the meaning of *promittere*: not only does C. promise his help, he also guarantees (*OLD* s.v. *recipio* 10b) it to Crassus. ...*sanctissime*...*diligentissimeque*...: overemphatic statement that reinforces the solemnity and gravity of C.'s oath (*observo* and *diligo* are found in reference to Publius at §4n; on C.'s *observantia*: §3n; on his *diligentia*: §2n). A similar expression is found in the second part of the book (for which, the general introduction), in 5.17, a letter written to console P. Sittius, a rich landowner, who was probably involved in the Catilinarian conspiracy (§3n ...*officiis amicitiae diligenter a me sancteque servatis*). **...a me suscepta defensio...dignitatis tuae...constantiae meae...permanebo:** a circular structure for the letter: the reference to C.'s defence of Crassus' *dignitas* is found already in §1n ...*studium*...*dignitatis tuae* (on the leave-taking protocols, cf. the letter's introduction). C.'s references to their friendship are recurrent in the letter: §2n *amicitiae fides*. ...*constantiae*...*permanebo*: C. might fear being accused of inconsistency (a reputation for consistency

was fundamentally important in Rome: Tracy 2012, 79–112), because of their past animosities (§2n *...me...immutarunt*); by demonstrating that he was consistent in his duties as a friend, C. aims to depict himself as worthy of the title. C. refers to this term twice elsewhere in the book, in the confrontational 5.2.8n and 5.5.3n. **quam...intellegerem...ad voluntatem...commodum...amplitudinem...mea sponte...facturum...a te...a tuis...detulisse:** this is how C. will take care of Crassus' prestige while he is abroad (on the vocabulary of leave-taking protocols: the introduction to the letter). C. will either take the initiative (*mea sponte*) or accept suggestions thereon, especially from Crassus and his family (on which, §2n *...uxor tua...tui Crassi...*). *quam ob rem*: summing-up part (similar to public speeches: Berry on *Sul.* 86; on C.'s usage of language of courtroom in the letter, §5n *promitto...recipio...*). C. uses it here (and below) to re-emphasise his goodwill towards Crassus and to pledge his support one more time. *intellegerem...ad voluntatem...commodum...amplitudinem...*: standard vocabulary of mutuality in *amicitia*, similar employed in 5.5.2n *ad…commodum…honorem…dignitatem pertinerent* (cf. also 11.5.3). C. has already pledged his support to Crassus before (§2n *pertineant operam...meam* and §4n *profiteor...meum studium...spectet*). On *intellego*, §2n *senatus populusque Romanus intellegit*; on C.'s promise to help Crassus increase his prestige, §1n *...studium...dignitatis...augendae*. The phrase *mea sponte* + *facere* is language of affiliative politeness, generally employed to emphasise that one has envisaged a friend's need and acted prior to any request (similar to 6.8.3, *Att.* 1.10.2; 1.11.1, 9.7c.1, 15.27.1). *Facturum* (deliberately) recalls §5n *diligentissimeque...facturum* and stresses C.'s commitment to remain loyal to his promise of support. *ut…te…tuorum…detulisse*: statement of affiliative politeness—generally found at the end of a pledge of support (similar to 5.17.5 *tu…scripseris…ne te frustra scripsisse arbitrere*). **...ad me scribas...minimis, maximis, mediocribus...ut ad hominem amicissimum...minuatur:** again (§5n *quam ob rem*), C. summarises what he has previously stated. *ad me scribas de omnibus...amicissimum*: when a magistrate went abroad, it was a common practice to ask close friends/ kin in Rome to inform them on the state of affairs in the capital (on which, the introduction; cf. also 5.9.1n *in me absente defendendo*). Such a request is made by C. several times (see e.g. 1.7.1)—especially when he is abroad, during exile (*QFr.* 1.3.10; 1.4.5) or his proconsulship in Cilicia (2.11.2) or when he must take refuge in his villas at time of civil war (*Att.* 4.8a.4; 11.16.5). However, C. reverses this practice here—as, probably, part of his junior-senior narrative (on which, §4n *statues...statues...*): he (who at the time of the letter is in Rome) is the one who asks Crassus (who is abroad) to update him. On the repeated reference to their *amicitia*, §5n *amicitiae nostrae*. *...et tuis...*: once more (§5n *quam ob rem*) C. reiterates and summarises what he wrote at the beginning (on the letter's circular structure: §5n *...a me suscepta defensio...permanebo*). C. reminds Crassus, his family and his associates that they can count on his services (similar to §2 *operam*, *curam*, *diligentiam*,

auctoritatem meam) in both the private and public sphere. *...in omnibus publicis, privatis, forensibus, domesticis...*: C. illustrates the broad scope of his *officia* and their applicability (Dyck on *Off.* 1.4.15 *publicis...privatis...forensibus...domesticis in rebus*). It emphasises C.'s 'junior-senior' (on which, §4n *statues...statues...*; a similar statement is employed in 16.4.3, in reference to Tiro's services towards C.) and 'affectionate friend' narrative (similar to *Att.* 1.17.6, where Atticus' services are seen as a proof of his affection towards C.; cf. also §5n *hominem amicissimum*). *...desiderium...labore minuatur*: ingratiating concluding remark that emphasises, once again, C.'s affection.

9–11

A set of five letters exchanged between C. and Vatinius, at the time of the latter's proconsulate in Illyricum (Broughton 1952, 310), all centered around a request for C.'s help with his bid for *supplicatio*. The correspondence has been dated between early July 45 and January 44; two letters out of five carry embedded dates: 5.9 (11 July 45) and 5.10b (5 December 45).

The set, as in Sh.-B. 1988 (that Cavarzere 2016 prints), is composed of: 5.9 (Vatinius' letter to C., 11 July 45); 10a (Vatinius to C., c. January 44); 10b (Vatinius to C., 5 December 45); 10c (Vatinius to C., c. November 45); 11 (C. to Vatinius, c. early December 45).

The *MSS* present a different picture. According to the *apparatus criticus* in Sh.-B. 1988, **ΩI** recognise three letters (instead of five): 5.9, 5.10 (a single letter including 10a, c, b), and 5.11. Differently from **ΩI**, **ϛ** separates the letter—that will be later identified as 5.10b in Sh.-B. 1977—from 5.10. T.-P. then prints the four letters as they appear in **ϛ**, but re-arranging them chronologically. In his edition of 1977, Sh.-B. recognises a fifth letter (5.10c) in §3 of letter 5.10 transmitted by the *MSS*; similarly to T.-P., the five letters are then re-organised chronologically (5.9; 5.10c; 5.11; 5.10b; 5.10a).[40] However, in Sh.-B. 1988 edition, he prints the five letters (5.9; 5.10a; 5.10c; 5.10b; 5.11) but re-arranges their order (5.9; 5.10a; 5.10b; 5.10c; 5.11).

I have chosen to adopt a middle ground between *MSS* and Sh.-B. 1988. While I acknowledge the division of 5.10 into three letters (5.10a; 5.10b; 5.10c) as presented in Sh.-B. 1988 (as printed by Cavarzere in 2016), I have opted to restore the original order of letters transmitted by *MSS* (5.10a; 5.10c; 5.10b). This decision is aimed at preserving the ancient editor(s)' storyline for the book. 5.10c belongs, in fact, to a period (c. November 45) preceding that of 5.10b (5 December 45), when Vatinius was still waiting to receive the desired *supplicatio* (further requested in 5.9, the letter that opens the

[40] In Sh.-B. 1977, the letter that, in his 1988 edition, is labelled as 5.10c is named 5.10a.3. Similarly, for 5.10a (in Sh.-B. 1988), which, in his 1977 edition, is labelled as 5.10a.1–2.

correspondence), which in 5.10b has been bestowed (on which, cf. their introductions; on the narrative constituted by 5.9 and 5.10a, see the introduction to 5.10a).

The set of letters exchanged with Vatinius contains the highest number of letters addressed to C. from the same correspondent found in the book; other letters addressed by someone else different from C., and included in the book, are: 5.1 (from Metell. Celer), 5.3 (Metell. Nepos) and 5.14 (L. Lucceius). For the statistics on the percentage of letters, addressed from someone else to C., in the whole Ciceronian corpus: Gibson, forthcoming.

Under the patronage of the Iulii Caesares, P. Vatinius (a *homo novus*) was elected quaestor in 63 and tribune in 59; in 55 he reached the praetorship, although in 54 he was tried for *ambitus*, probably due to irregularities in his campaign; C. had to defend him: 5.9.1n *in periculo recepisti*. In 47 he reached the consulship, then between 45–43 became proconsul for Illyricum (Broughton 1952).

Vatinius was a long-standing enemy of C. (on C.'s activity against Vatinius: §1n *Scis...obtrectatores invenire...merito...accidit*), but he was reconciled in 54 thanks to the involvement of the triumvirs (for which, below). He appears to have cooperated with Clodius (one of the treads of the book's narrative: see the general introduction) several times in the years 58–56; e.g. in the lawsuits against P. Sestius and A. Milo, and against representatives of the interests of the *optimates* or of Pompey (*NP* s.v. Vatinius [I 2]). This, however, is not the first time the ancient editor(s) decided to include in the book's narrative letters exchanged with people who were somehow involved with Catiline and/or Clodius: e.g. Antonius Hybrida in 5.5 and P. Sittius in 5.17 (on this, see also the general introduction)

5.9–11 have been selected and positioned (unchronologically) in the first part of the book because they enhance the storyline the ancient editor(s) wanted to foster in *Fam*. 5 (on which, the general introduction). Three are the main reasons for this choice.

1) The letters exchanged with Vatinius display, like letters 1–8, an image of C. as a pre-eminent man, who deals with *difficult* relationships within the Roman elite. As in the previous letters, and as seen above, C.'s addressee is a remarkable member of the Roman elite: although being a *homo novus*, he held the most important offices of the *cursus honorum*, like the Caecilii Metelli brothers in 5.1–4, C. Antonius in 5.5, Pompey in 5.7 and Crassus in 5.8.

Moreover, similarly to 5.1–8, letters 5.9–11 display C. dealing with difficult and seesawing relationships. C. had disagreements with Vatinius (as with his recipients in 5.1–8)—and especially between the years 60–54 (*NP*, s.v.Vatinius [I 2]), when Vatinius was in fact a declared enemy of C. From 54 to C.'s death, they were on good terms (e.g. 5.9.1n *si me sicut soles amas...*): the triumvirs had encouraged C. to reconcile with him (5.9.1n *non puto, repudiabis in honore quem in periculo recepisti*; similar to C.'s reconciliation with Crassus: 5.8.1n *...ad meum studium...dignitatis tuae* and

with Appius in *QFr.*2.11.3; App. Claud. Pulcher is mentioned in 5.10a.1n)—since Vatinius had been of assistance to their political careers (e.g. the support granted, when he was a tribune in 59, to Caesar and Pompey's political measures: *NP* s.v. Vatinius [I 2]).

The correspondence with Vatinius offers a vocabulary similar to the previous letters. In particular, 5.9–11, like the majority of 5.1–8, are exchanged with a magistrate in province and focus on leave-taking protocols. In 5.9–11, we find standard language generally employed to request support from province to Rome (e.g. selected: 5.9.1n *Vatinius...in honore...recepisti*; *tuendum...sustinendum*; *in me absente defendendo*; 5.10a.3n *defendes*; 5.10bn *meam causam agas...*; 5.10bn *qua re te rogo*; 5.11.2n *uxorem tuam commendas*; cf. also the introduction to 5.9) and to promise support from Rome to the province (5.11.1n *tuis...me studio...*; §2n *...rebus agam...videbuntur*). In addition, the employment of language of *amicitia* (and of politeness: van Gils–Risselada 2022, 260–264) is notable, especially when requesting a favour (e.g. selected: 5.9.1n *consuetudinem*; *amas*; §2n *ames*; 5.10a.2n *mi Cicero*; 5.11.1n *officia*; *gratiam*; *pari me studio...*).

2) The connection between 5.9–11 and 5.7–8 is further established through a reference/allusion to Caesar. This intentional arrangement of letters in this order links Caesar (5.9–11) to both Pompey (5.7) and Crassus (5.8). Caesar, only mentioned twice (5.10c; 10b) over 88 lines (Gibson, forthcoming), is the reason why Vatinius is writing to C.: on which, see 5.9.1n *Vatinius cliens*.

3) The letters exchanged with Vatinius anticipate the narrative of loss of prestige and despair more evident from 5.13–21. Letters 5.9–11, all dated to the period after Pharsalus and to Caesar' government, illustrate (although with 'milder' tones compared to those of 5.13–18: see the introduction to 5.13–18) the decline of republican institutions. For example, when Vatinius requests C.'s help with the *supplicatio*, C. seems to accept the current state of politics in Rome: he does not criticise how affairs are conducted in the capital; he just complains about the delay with which Caesar is processing his request (5.10cn *Caesar...iniuriam facit*); similarly C. in 5.11, where he does not allude to Caesar or the lost republic. This changes when the reader approaches 5.17.2n *iniquitas...iudici* and 5.18.2n *iudicium...sententia...dubia*; although written c.10 years before 5.9–11, they contain strong claims against the juridical system and Pompey and Caesar's power.

Moreover, like T. Fadius in 5.18, Vatinius is a *homo novus*; however, (probably) differently from T. Fadius, Vatinius completed the *cursus honorum* and attained acknowledgment for his endeavours in Illyricum (5.10b *supplicationes...decretas*).

9

The letter contains an assertive request of support for Vatinius' *supplicatio* (§1n ...*me absente defendendo mihi praestes*).

The letter is written during Vatinius' first year as governor of Illyricum (on his career: the introduction to 5.9–11), and soon after his acclamation as *imperator* (for which, see the heading of the letter). He requests C.'s help (to which C. had to reply since it was a duty of *amicitia* to help a friend in need: §1n ...*repudiabis in honore...recepisti...defendente vincere*...) to get a *supplicatio* for his military success in the province (§1n *Si tuam consuetudinem...vult*; on Vatinius' reference to his success in Dalmatia before the *supplicatio* was granted: 5.10cn *supplicationibus...rebus gestis Dalmaticis*; ...*iustissimi triumphi in Dalmatia res gesserim*). The delay in getting it—probably due to Caesar (5.10cn *Caesar...supplicationibus...non refert*)—threatened to damage Vatinius' *dignitas*, as highlighted repeatedly throughout the letter (cf. introduction to §1).

However, a *supplicatio* was granted before 5 December 45 (5.10bn *Ego post supplicationes...decretas*). Vatinius will return to Dalmatia after 5 December 45 hoping to conclude his campaign in Illyricum (5.10bn ...*in Dalmatiam profectus sum*). He seems to have celebrated a triumph for his endeavours in the province in 42 (Broughton 1952, 363).

VATINIUS IMP. CICERONI SUO S., 'From Vatinius, Imperator, to his friend Cicero greetings'. Vatinius' attempt to show affection to C. is visible from the letter's heading, which combines formal and official elements (e.g. Vatinius' *titulus honoris*) with informal ones (e.g. the use of *suus*; *salutem* instead the more formal *salutem dicit*: Cugusi 1983, 47–48). The resulting form of address (the least formal *inscriptio* among 5.1–8) is not reciprocated by C. in 5.11: he refers to himself with the commoner *praenomen+cognomen* (similar to 5.13–21) but addresses Vatinius with the formal *nomen+titulus honoris*. The reference to Vatinius' title of *imperator* (achieved during his campaign in Illyricum in 45: Broughton 1952, 310) presumably encouraged Sh.-B. to emend the more informal greetings formula *s.v.b.e.e.v.* (= *si vales bene est, ego valeo*), transmitted by the copyists, to the formal *s.v.b.*; *e.e.* <*q.*> *v.* (=*si vales, benest; ego exercitusque valem*). However, there is no need to emend the transmitted formula (similar to T.-P. *ad loc.*) since, like the other elements of the heading, it combines formality with a certain degree of familiarity.

1 The topic of the letter is introduced straight away: Vatinius depicts himself as a client in need (§1n ...*Vatinius cliens...*; *adoptem...invocem*) of (C's) defence to safeguard his *dignitas* (...*repudiabis in honore...*; *pro mea salute*; *pro honore meo*; *pro mea dignitate*; *merito*; *nostrae dignitati*; *in me absente defendendo*). This 'legal' setting is highlighted by the repeated use of courtroom vocabulary (§1n *in patrociniis tuendis...*; *pro se causam...*; *defendente...*; ...*tuendum...puta*); similar to 5.2, where C. has

to defend himself from Metell. Celer's accusations (for which, its introduction). Vocabulary of the language of affiliative politeness (the introduction to 5.9–11) is also in operation here to backup Vatinius' role as C.'s *cliens*. **Si tuam consuetudinem...vult:** language of recommendation for someone who has to endure a legal sitting: similar to 13.64.1, where C. requests Thermus to delay processing Nero's client Pausanias until Nero arrives in the province of Asia. However, Vatinius was not facing a real trial here, but he requests C.'s help as if he were to highlight the importance of what is here at stake: his reputation (for the occurrence of this theme in the letter: introduction to §1). Vatinius presumably considered his endeavours in Illyricum (*i.e*. expansion of territory under Rome's control: Marasco 1995, 286) already worthy of a *supplicatio* (on which, the introduction to 5.9; cf. also §10cn *nisi omnia expugno...supplicationes non decernuntur*). The delay in conferring one (owing to Caesar's absence from Rome until mid-September 45; on the decrease of the importance of the republican legal setting documented in C.'s letters of late 50s-mid 40s: the introduction to 5.17), plus rivals' *invidia* (§1n *...pusillorum...obtrectationes...obterat*), threatened to damage his *dignitas* (as highlighted in 5.10cn *Caesar...iniuriam facit*; 10cn *...supplicationes non decernuntur...imperatores*). C. was probably asked for support because: 1) he was in Rome from where he could physically help Vatinius, and 2) Vatinius believed that C. had still an influence on Caesar (5.10bn *si opus erit, ad Caesarem…agas*). **...repudiabis in honore...vincere...:** emphasis on the request for C.'s patronage (on *recipio* + *in*, to defend the protegee's status: *TLL* 11 345, 34–35 and see also T.-P. *ad loc.*; similar to 5.10a.1n *sed…clientis…recipitis?* See also the repetition of *defendere*: *defendente didici* and *me absente defendendo*). *repudiabis...in honore*: it was a duty of *amicitia* to help a friend in need (5.16.6n *officio...amicissimi*), especially if away (similar to 5.5.2n *omnia...tuum commodum...honorem...dignitatem*; *meus in te animus...officio*; 5.6.1n *adhibui diligentiam...quos tu scripseras...*; 5.8.1n *meum studium...dignitatis tuae...augendae*; 5.8.2n (*Neque*)*...umquam mihi...voluntas defuit* ; *...ad te pertineant...*; 5.8.4 *meum studium...offici...spectet*; 5.8.5 *defensio te absente dignitatis tuae*). Refusing a favour to a friend was not well regarded in Roman *amicitia* (cf. 5.12.8n *non impetro...non impetrare*). This also applies to Vatinius and his concession (requested by C.) to treat the crimes of the murderer Catilius more leniently (5.10a.1n *De Catilio...*; *hominem...crudelissimum...cepi*). *...in periculo*: C. had already defended Vatinius (as Pompey and especially Caesar demanded: 1.9.19 *...intercesserat...per Pompeium...Caesaris ut illum defenderem...*) in the *de ambitu* process of 54, probably for irregularities in his campaign for praetorship (cf. also 5.5 and 5.17, where C. had to defend the probably guilty Antonius Hybrida and P. Sittius). Vatinius leverages the help that C. provided in the past to persuade C. to assist him once again (see also §1n *...neglexerit pro mea salute*). *adoptem...invocem*: language of the courtroom employed by Vatinius as client to request the assistance of his advocate. In legal settings, *adoptare* is

generally used in reference to the *patronus* (*Div. Caec.* 73; *Sest.* 9; *Phil*. 6. 12; 13), whereas *invocare* refers to the *advocatus* (*de Orat*. 2. 196)—but 1) the repeated use of vocabulary of the language of courtroom and 2) Vatinius' presentation of himself as C.'s §1n *cliens,* makes the distinction unnecessary. *vincere*: probable reference to Vatinius' acquittal (thanks to C.'s defence) from the process of 54 (for which, §1n *...in periculo*). **an verear ne...conspirationem neglexerit pro mea salute...obterat:** the comparison between C.'s efforts for Vatinius' defence in 54 (cf. above) and the latter's request for C.'s support (probably) for his *supplicatio* is here highlighted by the incipitary *an* (*OLD* 4a). The interrogative particle is followed by *vereor ne* (similar to *Phil*. 2.18), which aims at emphasising the easiness of the service requested (*pusillorum...obterat*)—especially when compared to C.'s efforts in 54. *potentissimorum hominum...*: generally employed in relation to high magistracies (*TLL* X 279, 40 ff.), here it possibly refers to the *optimates* (similar to Sh.-B. *ad loc.*), who, according to Vatinius, joined forces against him; *conspiratio*, here employed in reference to the 'coalition' of these powerful men, reminds, the reader of the ancient editor(s)' narrative of Catiline (crucial figure for the narrative fostered for *Fam*. 5: cf. the general introduction, with a list of recurrent expressions that belong to the Catilinarian conspiracy but employed in other contexts; similar to 5.10a.1n *hominem...crudelissimum...civis Romanos occidit...cepi*). In the years 59–56, Vatinius (in cahoots with Clodius) started lawsuits against leading members of senate and *optimates* (*Vat*. 5; 21–26; D.C. 38.6) and promoted the annulment of essential laws (e.g. the *lex Aelia et Fufia*: Rotondi 1922[2]). This hostility was undoubtedly reciprocated by the *optimates*, as C. highlights in *Vat*. 1. *...neglexerit pro mea salute*: in Vatinius' narration of the events of 54 (§1n *...in periculo*), C. is depicted as disregarding (*OLD* s.v. *neglego* 1) the demands of the *optimates* (whose position, against Vatinius, he previously supported: *Vat*. 9ff.)—who possibly had wanted to condemn him—that he not defend his client. However, C. would have not defended an enemy (also in cahoots with Clodius), if it was not for Pompey and Caesar's intervention (similar to the previous letter addressed to Crassus: cf. the introduction to 5.8); Vatinius' recall of this event was probably unwelcome to C. *...pusillorum...obtrectationes...obterat*: again (cf. above), Vatinius refers to C. as his *patronus* (cf. *TLL* X 2232, 20 on the usage of *prosterno-obtero*) and asks him to defend his honour (it will be effortless, when compared to C.'s aid offered in 54; on Vatinius' *dignitas* here at stake: §1n *Si tuam consuetudinem...vult*). Vatinius chooses not to directly mention his accusers (portrayed as *pusilli* and *malevolentes*: the vocabulary of invective against political enemies: similar to 2.17.7)—but identifies jealousy/envy as the reason for their attacks. *obtrectatio* ('attack inspired by envy': *OLD* 1; the verb is also used below) and *invidia* (similar to 5.8.2n; 5.9.1n; 5.12.6n; 8n; 5.17.2n) are especially used in reference to the activity of a rival who wants to damage a peer's *dignitas*: 10.8.7; *Inv.* 1. 16; 2. 37; *Brut.* 156. For this reason, Vatinius might be referring to accusations about his conduct in Illyricum

(similar to 5.5.3n *sed reliqua* on Antonius' misgovernment of Macedonia), made by political opponents to prevent him achieving a triumph (T.-P. *ad loc.*), although there is no certain reference to the events. **Qua re...amas...pro mea dignitate...puta:** if in the preceding statements Vatinius encouraged C.'s support by recalling the latter's (probably unwelcome and embarrassing) memory of his defence (§1n ...*in periculo*), now he leans on their mutual affection. *si...soles...amas*: variation of the conventionalised (Hall 2009, 132–133) formula of the language of affiliative politeness—usually employed to request a favour. The *iunctura* is found again in 5.5 (§3n *si...in te residet amoris erga me*), where C.'s fictional narrative of his friendship with Antonius (as is Vatinius' here) is only a strategy of politeness. *suscipe meme totum*: polite request for a favour (similar to 9.25.3; 10.11.1; *Att.* 7.1.2; 12.19.4; 14.13.4), that here emphasises the *cliens*/*patronus* narrative (§1n *cliens*; *adoptem...invocem*). *oneris...pro dignitate...tuendum...puta*: standard language of redressive politeness: Vatinius acknowledges that his request might be a burden for C. (13.56.1; 64.1); however, C. needs to take on that responsibility, since it is his duty as friend (§1n *repudiabis in honore*). *tuendum...sustinendum*: vocabulary of courtroom language (*Rab. Post.* 41; on *tueor*, §1n *in patrociniis tuendis*). **Scis…obtrectatores invenire...merito...accidit:** Vatinius' complaint: his political rivals (on *obtrectator*, see above) have repeatedly (and unjustly) hindered his achievements. C. presumably knew (as emphasised by the incipitary *scis*) the meaning of Vatinius' words—which today remain obscure owing to the lack of illuminating sources. They might refer to the process of 54, in which Vatinius was accused of having bribed his election to the praetorship (§1n ...*in periculo*)—violating the *Lex Licinia de sodaliciis* (Rotondi 1922[2]); if this reconstruction is correct, his accuser C. Licin. Macer Calvus legitimately took him to court. However, one cannot exclude the possibility that Vatinius is referring also to C.'s accusations before their (forced) reconciliation in 54 (as possibly emphasised by *scis*; on their reconciliation, the introduction to 5.9–11). Between 63–55, C. 1) accused Vatinius of being elected to his quaestorship in 63 thanks to a manipulation of the ballot (Pocock on *Vat.* 11); 2) in 56, C. accused Vatinius of various contraventions of laws promulgated in 59–58 (*Att.* 2.9.1 *qui auspicia, qui Aeliam legem, qui Iuniam et Liciniam, qui Cae<ci>liam et Didiam neglexerunt*; in *Sest.* 135, C. adds the violation of the *Lex Iulia de pecuniis repetundis*; for a broader analysis, Pocock on *Vat.* 14; 21–26; 29; 33). **...peto a te ut...me absente defendendo...praestes:** standard vocabulary of language of *amicitia* employed to request support while absent (on the leave-taking protocols, the introduction to 5.9–11; other examples are found in Cugusi 1998, 182; see also §1n *repudiabis in honore*). On Vatinius' *dignitas* here at stake: §1n *Si tuam consuetudinem...vult*. **litteras ad senatum...perscripsi:** Vatinius refers to the official dispatch, on his campaign in Illyricum (for which he was hailed *imperator*: cf. the analysis of the header), sent to the senate, to (probably) request a *supplicatio* (similar to 5.7.1n *Ex litteris tuis...publice misisti* and 15.1–2, C.'s own official

dispatch from Cilicia). Vatinius might have sent a copy (now lost) to C. to support his cause (similar Pompey's letter to C. in 5.7.2n *Ad me...litteras...misisti...*; cf. also 15.4, from C. to M. Porc. Cato).

2 Concluding shorter paragraph on C.'s *servus* Dionysius. The sudden change to a more informal (see for e.g. the use of *nisi si*: T.-P. *ad loc.*) topic helps Vatinius strengthen his relationship with C. and demonstrates readiness in reciprocating C.'s favours (on reciprocity in *amicitia*, 5.1.1n *pro mutuo inter nos animo*). **Dicitur...servus...Vardaeis esse:** Vatinius gives C. updates on Dionysius, who, after having stolen valuable books from C.'s library, sought (probably) refuge in Narona. C. had already tried to trace his slave in late 46, when he wrote a letter to P. Sulp. Rufus, Vatinius' predecessor in Illyricum (13.77.3). *anagnostes*: 'a slave trained to read aloud' (*OLD* s.v. *anagnostes*)—generally employed without *servus. Varadaei*s: Dionysius' current location according to Vatinius (on the *Varadaei*, Sh.-B. *ad loc.*). For the reason why Dionysius escaped to Illyricum, Tramonti 1996, 123–134, who suggests he might be a pirate (cf. also 5.10a). **...nihil mandasti...terra marique...reperiam...:** C. had probably not requested Vatinius' intervention yet; however, Vatinius (resolved on showing C. goodwill) anticipates (*OLD* s.v. *praemando*) his request (probably included in a lost letter; cf. also 5.11.3n *De Dionysio*). *...terra...marique*: solemn formula that Romans adapted from Greek treaties of peace and alliance (Momigliano 1942, 62; similar to Dyck on *N.D.* 1.77b). Vatinius might employ it here to prove the truthfulness of his intentions—and of his words, binding as an alliance (similar to 5.8.5n *Has litteras velim existimes foederis...*). **...nisi si in Dalmatiam aufugerit...:** Vatinius was sent to Illyricum to carry on a campaign against the Dalmatians (Šašel Kos 2022, 61–70). From the letter is evident that Vatinius, who had conquered the area of the Varadaei (near Narona: Marasco 1995, 286), had not ventured into the Dalmatian lands yet (that will happen only in late 45: 5.10c *iustissimi triumphi in Dalmatia res gesserim*; 5.10bn *in Dalmatiam profectus sum...*; 5.10a.1n *frigus Dalmaticum*). *inde...aliquando eruam*: Vatinius was confident of the success of his campaign against the Dalmatians (as demonstrated in 5.10bn *...cepi...captum...cepi*); however, the war was far from ending (5.10bn *...oppidum...bellum...relinquere...*). **Tu nos fac ames...Narona:** standard informal *subscriptio* (Cugusi 1983, 56–57)—which works as a strategy of affiliative politeness—that mitigates the formal closing of the letter. This combination of informal and formal elements is already visible in the heading.

10a

Letter that Vatinius addresses to C.—at the time of his proconsulship in Illyricum; in the *MSS* tradition it comes second after 5.9. In **ΩI** it appears as a longer letter, since it includes those letters later

identified as 10c and 10b: on which, the introduction to 5.9–11. 5.10a continues Vatinius' display of goodwill towards C.—already visible from 5.9.2n.

The letter (probably datable to January 44) is the latest missive in time to be included in the book; it takes the reader six-months beyond the date of 5.9, after Vatinius' *supplicatio* (bestowed before 5 December 45: 5.10bn *Ego post supplicationes...decretas*) had been approved. In a period of six months, Vatinius had entered Dalmatia (5.10cn ...*rebus gestis Dalmaticis*;...*iustissimi triumphi in Dalmatia res gesserim*; 10bn *Dalmatiam profectus sum*; 10a.1n *frigus Dalmaticum*; differently from 5.9.2n *nisi si in Dalmatiam aufugerit*) and conducted his campaign there (5.10bn *sex oppida...cepi*...).

The ancient editor(s) appear to have placed 5.10a after 5.9 with a deliberate intent: if 5.9 shows Vatinius making a request that must be unpalatable to C. (5.9.1n *Si tuam consuetudinem...vult*)—incidentally recalling the unwelcome memory of C.'s defence of Vatinius (5.9.1n ...*in periculo*)—5.10a shows C. making an unpalatable request in return to a reluctant Vatinius: the request for a more favourable treatment of the murderer Catilius (§1n ...*huiusce modi vos clientis...causas recipitis*?; C.'s unpalatable request to which Vatinius alludes in 5.10a is then followed by Vatinius' [further] request for his help with the *supplicatio* in the following 5.10cn *si mihi supplicationes non decernuntur*...). In 5.10a, Vatinius might have chosen to abide by C.'s request because he was mindful of the support received by C. in the past (5.9.1n ...*in periculo*) and of his duty as a friend to reciprocate (including unwilling: 5.9.1n ...*repudiabis in honore*...) favours. 5.10a.1n also continues the story of C.'s slave Dionysius, introduced to the reader in 5.9.2n *servus...fugitivus.*

5.10a provides an example of a reply to a request for a more lenient application of laws (§1n *De Catilio...deprecationis*; similar to 5.1.2n ...*nec...nec...non...*, where Metell. Celer demanded a milder punishment for his brother Nepos; see also 5.5.1n *Pomponius...ad te proficisceretur*, where C. asks the governor of Macedonia to help Atticus with his *negotium* in his province). In 5.10a the reader finds out that C. had requested (probably in a lost letter written to Vatinius) a more indulgent handling of the case of this pirate (and probably ex-Pompeian: §1n *De Catilio*) Catilius, imprisoned by Vatinius himself for his crimes against Roman citizens and freemen (§1n *hominem...crudelissimum...civis Romanos occidit...vastavit*), but also because he bore arms against Vatinius (§1n *contra me arma tulit*). If C. had not intervened, Catilius would probably have faced *perduellio*, since murdering Roman citizens, freemen and assaulting a magistrate were considered one of the gravest cases of treason. Catilius seems to have faced trial (although nothing is known about his fate: §2n ...*in eum...remitto tibi et condono*); Vatinius just says that he was defended by Q. Volusius, C.'s pupil (5.10a.2n *defenditur a Q. Volusio tuo discipulo*).

VATINIUS CICERONI SUO S. 'From Vatinius to his friend Cicero greetings'. Mixture of informal (cf. e.g. *suus*) and formal (cf. the *salutatio*) elements similar to the heading of the preceding letter.

1 Vatinius deals with C.'s requests: Dionysius and Catilius. **De Dionysio tuo...nihil extrico...:** on C.'s fugitive *servus*, 5.9.2n *Dicitur...Vardaeis esse*. *nihil extrico*: 'to achieve nothing' (*OLD* s.v. *extrico* 2): a rare *iunctura*, that appears elsewhere only in Phaed. 4.24.4. It was probably avoided in aristocratic communication: no one likes to disappoint a friend (as Vatinius himself points out in 5.9.1n ...*repudiabis in honore*...) by reporting failures (on the importance of reciprocating favours, 5.2.3n *pro mutuo inter nos animo*). **...frigus Dalmaticum...:** the cold of the Dalmatia forced Vatinius to pull back (Marasco 1995, 287), possibly to Narona, from where he writes this letter. **sed tamen...dura imperas:** Vatinius re-emphasises his subordinate position (for Vatinius' self-representation as C.'s *cliens*, 5.9.1n *Vatinius cliens*): he holds literal *imperium*, but C. is represented as holding a (superior) 'metaphorical' version. This is a strategy of redressive politeness: C.'s requested favour is challenging (*omnia...dura*) and Vatinius might not be able to fulfil his request. However, Vatinius is mindful of C.'s favours, both past (5.9.1n ...*in periculo*) and present (his request to support his *supplicatio*: 5.9.1n *si tuam...consuetudinem...vult*; cf. also the introduction to 5.10a). For this reason, he delicately explores the possibility of not satisfying C.'s request with gentleness and politeness. *dura*: C.'s request for a more indulgent treatment of Catilius might have caused real trouble to Vatinius (Catilius' crimes were, in fact, punishable by law: cf. the introduction to the letter). For this reason, *imperas* (repeated a few lines below: §2n *tu mi imperas*) also transfers on C. (and, retrospectively on Pompey: §1n *De Catilio*) the responsibility for his release. **De Catilio...deprecationis diligentissimae:** C.'s (possibly deliberately omitted) appeal for a more favourable treatment of Catilius (conceded by Vatinius: §2n ...*in eum...remitto tibi et condono*). This is the first reference to Catilius in their correspondence. C. was probably worried that his request could fall in wrong hands; for this reason, he might have erased further references to Catilius (cf. 5.11, written c. a few days before 5.10a., where C. alludes only to Dionysius but not to Catilius). This is supported by Vatinius' allusion to C.'s (deliberate) vagueness about this request (*nescio quid...scripsisti deprecationis...*). *deprecationis diligentissimae* serves to counteract the obscurity of C.'s words and emphasise (e.g. the alliteration of *d* and the use of the superlative) C.'s actual appeal. *Diligentia* alludes to C.'s fervent (according to Vatinius' words) attempt to defend Catilius. It also recalls 5.6.3n ...*diligentissime defendi*, in reference to C.'s (probably unwilling) *defensio* of the (possibly guilty) Antonius. **...Sex. Servilio...mehercule...illum amo:** on Sex. Servilius, Sh.-B. *ad loc.* Vatinius employs the intensifier *mehercule* (and his reference to his affection: *amo*) as a strategy of affiliative politeness (similar to 5.8.2n *neque mehercule*). **...huiusce modi vos clientis...causas**

recipitis?: Vatinius' pretence of incredulity towards the type of clients that C. and Sex. Servilius take on; it becomes even wittier when juxtaposed to 5.9—where Vatinius himself (while not reaching the level of Catilius) beseeched C. to accept him as his client (5.9.1n ...*Vatinius cliens*), despite being aware of having disregarded Roman laws (5.9.1n ...*in periculo*). **hominem...crudelissimum...civis Romanos occidit...vastavit...contra me arma tulit...cepi:** Catilius is depicted as a 'monster of savagery' (*crudelis* is C.'s epithet for Metell. Nepos: 5.2.6n *impetum…crudelissimum*; §10n *si crudeliter*) and an 'apelike creature not worth a half-penny' (for its abusive language, T.-P. *ad loc.*); similarly harsh language (even more abusive if one considers his political significance) is employed to describe App. Claud. Pulcher (§2n *Appi os haberem*...). Vatinius accuses Catilius of having murdered, kidnapped, and ruined freeborn men, matrons, and Roman citizens (an assertion emphasised by the employment of an ascending and descending *climax*; cf. Sh.-B. *ad loc*. on the use of *matresfamilias*); similar to §2n ...*quid illis respondere possum*... . He is also said to have laid whole districts waste and borne arms against Vatinius himself. If this is considered accurate (T.-P. *ad loc.* suggests that Vatinius might be exaggerating), then Catilius must have been liable to punishment for treason; murdering or attempting to murder a magistrate, as well as killing Roman citizens and freemen, was, in fact, among the gravest instances of *perduellio* (Lear 1965, 1–5). Vatinius would normally have sent Catilius (as his prisoner of war: *eum bello cepi*) to Rome to be processed (§2n *meam animadversionem...supplicium*...)—if C. had not intervened (§1n *deprecationis diligentissimae*; §2n ...*in eum...remitto tibi et condono*). Vatinius is here employing standard language to depict an enemy—generally found in C.'s description of his political adversaries (MacKendrick 1995, *index*; esp. Catiline and Clodius: the two main treads of the intentional narrative of *Fam*. 5: the general introduction; similar to 5.9.1 *conspirationem*). In particular, the reference to *homo crudelissimus* and the accusation of having murdered Roman citizens might evoke, for the 'modern' reader, events related to C.'s condemnation of the Catilinarians without the *provocatio ad populum*. In fact, he was accused of *crudelitas* (Catiline's attribute in *Catil*. 2.28.3) for choosing to condemn Roman citizens to death without affording them the right to appeal to the populace. This connection is further emphasised by a deliberate arrangement whereby, following the set of letters exchanged with Vatinius, of 5.12, C. requests Lucceius to narrate his endeavours against Catiline. This arrangement suggests that the ancient editor(s) possessed a deep familiarity with these events.

2 Vatinius grants C. what he requested: he will treat Catilius' crimes more leniently. Q. Volusius (C.'s pupil) will defend him. **Sed tamen...imperas:** Vatinius knows his duties as a friend (also stressed by the employment of *mi Cicero* and *imperas*: §1n *mi…imperas*), and the importance of reciprocating a favour (see the introduction to the letter). After a brief parenthesis (in which Vatinius

seems to question C.'s request: §1n *hominem...crudelissimum...contra me arma tulit...*), he agrees to show greater leniency regarding Catilius' crimes. On *mehercule* as colloquialism: §1n. **meam animadversionem...supplicium...:** 'my right to punish Catilius and the punishment I was going to exercise'. The *imperium* of a promagistrate might include the right to punish (similar to 10.32.4) those who, by their actions (on Catilius' crimes, §1n *hominem...crudelissimum...cepi*), threatened the welfare of the state (*Off.* 1.88 *...animadversio...ad rei publicae utilitatem referri*); by trying to harm Vatinius and killing Roman citizens, Catilius had (metaphorically) harmed the republic; for this reason, he deserved the most ferocious of punishments: *S. Rosc.* 8 *homines sicarios...supplicia vitent*; a *supplicium* is repeatedly requested for Verres' crimes: cf. esp. *Verr.* 2.1.9 *...crudelissimum carnificem civium sociorumque...Populus Romanus istius…supplicio*). C. alludes to this right of Vatinius in 5.11.3n *duces eum captivum in triumph*, but in reference to the *servus* Dionysius, who (compared to Catilius' crimes) had 'only' stolen books from C. (5.9.2n *servus...fugitivus*); Catilius, differently from Dionysius, had powerful friends (§1n *De Catilio...*). **...remitto tibi et condono...:** Vatinius waives his right to punish Catilius, in deference to C.'s request (similar to *QFr.* 1.2.11 *...rogo ut...Flavi remittas...*, where C. solicits his brother Quintus, who was proconsul of Asia, to countermand his orders against Flavius, his client and a friend of Pompey and Caesar). *Remitto* (*OLD* 13b) and *condono* (*OLD* 5) are here synonyms, that emphasise (similar to 5.8.2n *...promptum...paratum*) Vatinius' (unwelcome) choice. **...quid...illis respondere...qui...actione expostulant?:** Vatinius implies that C.'s request is (potentially) illegal, and that Catilius should be punished as the Roman law prescribed (on this, §2n *meam animadversionem...supplicium...*). On *expostulo,* 5.2.9n *nihil...expostulem*. **si mehercules Appi os...sustinere non possem:** the repetition (§§1n–2n) of the colloquialism *mehercules* emphasises Vatinius' attempt to build closeness with C. The reference to App. Claud. Pulcher is made clearer by the allusion to the designation of Vatinius as Appius' successor (*in locum suffectus sum*: *TLL* VII 1587, 71) probably to the augurate in 48 (Sh-B. *ad loc.*). Appius (who was dead at the time of this letter: T.-P. *ad loc.*) is here harshly described (similar to Catilius: §1n *hominem...crudelissimum...cepi*) as an 'impudent' man (*si...os haberem*: *OLD* s.v. *os* 8b)—a characteristic that Vatinius (deceitfully: on which, the introduction to the letter) claims to lack. Vatinius might refer to Appius' alleged misgovernment of Cilicia between 53–51 (*Att.* 5.16.2 *...in perditam...eversam...provinciam...*; see also Muñiz Coello 2003, 205–228)—or to his well-known impertinence (as C. points out in *Att.* 4.17.2: *Hic Appius erat idem...nihil sane iacturae*). However, Vatinius' political conduct was comparable to that of Appius: both relied on Pompey to reconcile with C. (on this, introduction to 5.9–11) and were involved in bribery scandals (on Vatinius, and in general for his violations of Roman laws 5.9.1n *Scis...obtrectatores invenire...accidit*; on Appius' failures, 1.9.25; *Att.* 4.17.2). **faciam omnia...te sciam velle:** strategy of affiliative politeness

(e.g. §2n ...*mi Cicero*) that also emphasises Vatinius' façade of being subordinated to C. (on *sedulus* as adjective generally employed by Ovid in reference to 'slaves': Soldevila 2009, s.v. tercería; for similar vocabulary in the letter: §2n *imperas*; cf. also 5.9.1n ...*Vatinius cliens*). **defenditur a Q. Volusio...:** Q. Volusius had been chosen to defend Catilius from the accusers (probably the victims' relatives: §2n ...*fratres...expostulant*). On Q. Volusius, *NP* s.v. Volusius [I 3], who discriminates between (differently from T.-P., Sh.-B. *ad loc.*) Cn. Volusius (who was part of C.'s entourage in Cilicia) and Q. Volusius (defence lawyer, C.'s successor in Cyprus in 50). **Nos...defendes:** standard reference to reciprocity in *amicitia* and the leave-taking protocols (similar to 5.10b.1n *si opus erit*; on the theme, cf. the introduction to 5.9–11).

10c

The letter focuses on Vatinius' campaign in Dalmatia. In **ΩI**, the missive is circulated together with 10a and 10b, in second position after 10a but before 10b. Starting from Sh.-B. 1977, the letter stands independently. The letter (probably datable to c. November 45) focuses on the period immediately before the bestowal of a *supplicatio* to Vatinius (bestowed in c. October 45, but the news will reach Vatinius on 5 December 45: 5.10bn *Ego post supplicationes...decretas...*).

1 Caesar...iniuriam facit...: Vatinius emphasises his right to receive a *supplicatio* (bestowed already in c. October 45, but he could not know that: 5.10b.1n *Ego post supplicationes...decretas...*), for his achievements (emphasised by the repetition of *res gestae*/ *res gero*: similar C. in 5.7.3n) in Illyricum (further references to his campaign in the province can be found in the later 10bn ...*Dalmatiam profectus sum...sex oppida...arcem...totam*); this was a normal practice for victorious generals (as Vatinius highlights: ...*ceteri imperatores*). The delay in conferring on him the deserved recognition—which would also cause the postponement of his triumph (obtained only in c. July 42: the introduction to 5.9)—could damage his reputation (as Vatinius points out in 5.9.1n *Si tuam consuetudinem...vult*). On *iniuria* as a 'face-threatening act': 5.2.7 *atqui ille...qua iniuria*. After all, he had already been hailed *imperator* by his troops (cf. the *inscriptio* of 5.9)—but only Caesar could give him what he desired. **...dum totum bellum conficiam...imperatores:** again, Vatinius stresses the different treatment accorded to his success by comparison with that of other generals (on the conditions for a *supplicatio*, Sh.-B. *ad loc.*). However, Vatinius was probably the only general to receive a *supplicatio* in 45 (there are no extant sources recording *supplicationes* for the other promagistrates for 45: Broughton 1952). *ceteri imperatores* might hint at Pub. Sulp. Rufus, the promagistrate of Illyricum for 47–46 (*NP* s.v. Sulpicius [I. 20]), who was granted a *supplicatio* (probably c. in autumn 46:

13.77.1) for his campaign in the province, during the summer of the same year (Sh.-B. *ad loc.*). The timing of Sulpicius' *supplicatio* is comparable with Vatinius' experience (C. also had to wait a few months before receiving a supplicatio in early 50: Broughton 1952); however, Vatinius, at the time of the writing of this letter, could not know that news on his *supplicatio* was about to reach him (§1n *Caesar...iniuriam facit*..).

10b

Intended as the final part of 5.10a, the letter circulates with 10a, c, b in the *MSS*. Its autonomy is attested starting from ς (on which, the introduction to 5.9–11). Like 5.9, 5.10b carries an embedded date. The letter focuses on the events after Vatinius' *supplicatio* (§1n *ego post...supplicationes...decretas*) and contains updates on the progress of his campaign in Dalmatia (§1n *Dalmatiam profectus sum*; see also the introduction to 10a).

1 Ego post supplicationes...decretas...: a *supplicatio* (for which he had requested C.'s help: cf. the introduction to 5.9) for his endeavours in Illyricum is (finally) granted to Vatinius (probably in late October 45: Sh.-B. *ad loc*.). However, the news arrived in Narona (from where Vatinius writes) only in mid/late November (on the estimated time, Leveghi 2016, introduction to 5.11)—since in 5.10c (c. early November 45), Vatinius complains about the delay in conferring the deserved recognition (*de meis supplicationibus…rebus…Dalmaticis*). He celebrated the triumph only in late 42 (the introduction to 5.9) **...Dalmatiam profectus sum...sex oppida...arcem...totam:** Vatinius' campaign in Dalmatia; he seems to have moved to Dalmatia after July 45 (5.9.2n *nisi si in Dalmatiam aufugerit*; 10a.1n *frigus Dalmaticum*). Here he completed important tasks: 5.10cn ...*rebus gestis Dalmaticis*; ...*iustissimi triumphi in Dalmatia res gesserim*). On the topography of Dalmatia: 5.10cn *viginti oppida...Dalmatiae...sexaginta*. Vatinius' decision to keep C. informed about the progress of his campaign in Dalmatia, even after receiving the *supplicatio*, is standard practice (5.9.1n *litteras ad senatum...perscripsi*)—particularly given Vatinius' ambition for a triumph. If C. was well-informed about the success of the Dalmatian campaign, he could effectively support this ambition in front of Caesar (10bn *ad Caesarem...putes*). **ex qua...nives...oppidum...bellum...relinquere...:** the adverse weather conditions prevented Vatinius from concluding his campaign (similar to 5.10a.1n *frigus Dalmaticum*...). On Vatinius' affectionate way of addressing C.: 5.10a.2n *mi Cicero*. **qua re te rogo...ad Caesarem...:** standard way of framing a request (similar 5.9.1n ...*peto a te ut...me...defendendo*...), especially to get support while abroad (again in 5.10a.3n *Nos...defendes*). As T.-P. *ad loc.* rightly points out, Vatinius was worried that his temporary retreat from Dalmatia might

disappoint Caesar (Illyricum seems to have been in Caesar's expansionist aims from 59, when he was appointed proconsul of Illyricum, thanks to the *Lex Vatinia*: Rotondi 1922[2]; on Caesar's command of Illyricum, Marasco 1997, 307–326). The reference to Caesar is perfectly in line with the period in which this letter is written (on the fall of the republican institutions: the introduction to 5.13–18). **...neminem te tui amantiorem habere:** strategy of affiliative politeness (cf. the introduction to 5.9–11), emphasised by the alliteration of *t* and the comparative *amantiorem* (similar C. in 1.5a.4 and *QFr.* 1.1.15)—carefully arranged after Vatinius' request (similar to 5.10a.2n *mi Cicero*).

11

C.'s reply to a lost letter written by Vatinius probably before the bestowal of the *supplicatio*. It emphasises the mutual exchange of *officia* typical of Roman *amicitia*.

The letter has been dated to c. early December 45 (Sh.-B. *ad loc.*; differently T.-P. *ad loc.*, who dated it to late October 45), based on how long Vatinius' (lost) letter (in which he probably also thanked C. for helping defend his *dignitas*: 5.9.1n *si...consuetudinem...cliens...*) would take to arrive to Rome (on which, 5.10bn *ego post...supplicationes...decretas*).

However, it is difficult to determine the exact content of Vatinius' (lost) letter, as C. (deliberately) does not explicitly reference its contents. C. merely mentions Vatinius' gratitude (§1n *grata...gratissimum...gratiam*) for C.'s services (possibly related to the support for the *supplicatio* and the defense of his *dignitas*: 5.9.1n *Si tuam consuetudinem...vult*), demonstrated by his actions (probably concerning the matter of Catilius, though it remains uncertain: §1n *...rettulisti*). C. also pledges continued support for Vatinius while in the province (§1n *...pari me studio...*).

Furthermore, the reference to the Dalmatian population and Vatinius' challenges against them (§3n *Dalmatis...molesti sunt...bellicosi*) might suggest that at the time of this missive, Vatinius had likely already commenced his campaign in Dalmatia. Therefore, C.'s letter might have been written after 5.9 (written after Vatinius was acclaimed *imperator* but before he ventured into Dalmatia) and 10b (where Vatinius alludes to both the *supplicatio* and his activities in Dalmatia).

Through placement in this position, 5.11 effectively summarises all the (unwelcome) favours that both Vatinius and C. had to perform, in the name of *amicitia* (on C. and Vatinius' *officia*: §1n *Grata...gratissimum...gratiam*; see also the introduction to 5.10a).

The exchange with Vatinius stands as the only example, in the book, of an *amicitia* where the two parties promptly return favours (on the importance of reciprocity, 5.2.3n *...cum par voluntas accipitur et redditur*). This is in contrast to the examples of ungrateful behaviour and unilateral bestowal of favours collected elsewhere in the book: cf. e.g. Metell. Celer's depiction of C. in 5.1.1n

pro mutuo...animo...pro reconciliata gratia... (and C.'s reply in 5.2.1n *pro reconciliata gratia...*; 5.2.3n *in amicitia mutuum*; 5.2.5n *de reconciliata gratia...imminuta est*); cf. also C.'s representation of Antonius in 5.5.2n *nullam...gratiam*; §2n *...ingrata...sentiam*).

M. CICERO VATINIO IMP. S. 'From M. Cicero to Vatinius, Imperator, greetings'. A more formal heading (when compared to that of 5.9), which emphasises (as a form of respect) Vatinius' *titulus honoris* (on which, the heading of 5.9).

1 Standard vocabulary of reciprocity in *amicitia*. **Grata...gratissimum...gratiam...:** in his lost letter, Vatinius might have thanked C. for the support shown in defending his *dignitas*: 5.9.1n *Si tuam consuetudinem...vult*. He seems to have already reciprocated C.'s favours, probably in reference to C.'s request for a more favourable treatment of Catilius (5.10a.1n *De Catilio*). C. employs *cumulatissime refero* again in 13.4.1, to indicate the exchange of *beneficia* between himself and the city of Volterra. **...pari me studio erga te...voluntate cognosces:** standard language of *amicitia* and affiliative politeness; here he also pledges to support Vatinius' future endeavours (*pari me studio erga te*) and the promise of an unchanged feeling of affection (*voluntate cognosces*). This is typical of leave-taking protocols (the introduction to 5.9–11); similar statements are found in other letters exchanged with promagistrates, who were away from Rome: 5.3.2n *velim...tuam erga me voluntatem conserves* (from Metell. Nepos, during his proconsulate in Hispania Citerior, to C.); 5.8.2n *...tibi absenti...meam*; 5.8.4n *...meum studium...spectet* (from C. to Crassus, the appointed promagistrate in Syria).

2 As usual when a promagistrate went to the province, Vatinius had commended (as highlighted by *commendas*) family members and affairs to people who were in Rome (similar to 5.8: below). **Quod...feminam primariam...uxorem tuam, commendas...:** C. refers to Vatinius' wife Pompeia as 'a woman of the highest importance' (possibly Pompey's sister: Sh.-B. *ad loc.*). The *iunctura* is found elsewhere only in *Verr*. 2.1.153, 2.24, 3.97, where C. employs this honorific title in reference to exemplary (according to his description) but mostly (except for Verres' mother-in-law Servilia: 2.2.24) nameless women—probably to counteract (and accentuate) Verres' cruelty. Referring with honorific language to family members of promagistrates, who were away on duty, seems to have been a standard practice in letters written to them (similar to Crassus' wife and sons in 5.8.2n). In the second part of the book (on the book's narrative of decline for C.'s life and career: see the general introduction), similar language is employed in reference to Sittius' son, a *homo novus* whose father was believed to have taken part in the Catilinarian conspiracy (cf. 5.17.4n *...eius virtutis...pietatem...industriam...intuemur*). **...quicquid opus...summo studio...facturum...**: standard

vocabulary of affiliative politeness, found especially in 5.8, a letter concerning leave-taking protocols. By pledging his support to Vatinius' wife (*me omnia quae ea vellet...facturum*; similar to 5.8.2n *...uxor tua...meis studiis*), C. means promising Vatinius assistance with his affairs in Rome while he is in the province (likewise, but with a more laudatory intent, in 5.8.5n *...neque...scripsisse...tuorum...ad me detulisse*). Similar below, where the consistent use of alliteration (*tu tamen...tam...tam*; *nullam...neque...neque*; *parvam putet...parum*; *aut...aut*) serves to overemphasise (similar to 5.8, for which, cf. its introduction) C.'s promptness in helping a friend in need (5.9.1n *...repudiabis in honore*) and reciprocating his favours (for which, see the introduction to 5.11). The abundance of promises to assist a longstanding rival, with whom he was compelled to reconcile (the introduction to 5.9–11), reveals an unmistakable undertone of lingering bitterness towards the addressee (cf. below). On the crucial role of women as intermediaries, see also 5.2.6n *...egi* [*Cicero*] *cum Claudia, uxore tua et...sorore Mucia*; and 5.6.1n *...Cornelia tua Terentiam convenit*. **omnia…non laboriosa…honesta:** further statement of support. C. seems here to modify the standard pledge of support offered to an absent magistrate (cf. e.g. 5.5.2n *omnia...ad honorem...pertinerent* and 5.8.4n *meum studium in omni genere offici...ad honestatem...spectet*), *i.e.* to promise his help with unbecoming requests. The employment of *non laboriosa* and *honesta* might hint at C. and Vatinius' exchange of (unpalatable) favours, which were anything but honest (see the introduction to 5.10a).

3 Concluding remarks that repeat the main points of their correspondence: 1) the capture of C.'s fugitive *servus* Dionysius; 2) Vatinius' activity in Dalmatia: **...si me amas...fidem...:** standard strategy of affiliative politeness (already employed by Vatinius in 5.9.1n *si me...amas*) to request favours; here it is emphasised by C.'s reference to his *fides* (similar to 5.8.2n *nostrae voluntatis et amicitiae fides*). **...improbus...duces...captivum in triumpho:** Dionysius (5.9.2n *tuus servus...fugitivus*) is described as 'disloyal' (the adjective is employed again in reference to Catiline's activity in 5.2.7n *improbissimus civis*; for the recurrence of Catilinarian vocabulary in the book: the general introduction), since he ran off with some of C.'s books. *duces...in triumpho*: reference to the triumphal ceremony that usually followed the granting of a *supplicatio* (on Vatinius'. 5.10bn *Ego post supplicationes...decretas*); captured enemies probably accompanied this parade (*Verr.* 2.5.66–67; 77; *Prov.* 18; *Pis.* 60). C.'s suggestion that Vatinius should take Dionysius to Rome in chains is made promptly, but there is no reference to Catilius (5.10a.1n *De Catilius*), who, of all people, deserved punishment (as Vatinius highlights in 5.10a.1n *...eum bello cepi*) for his crimes against the state (5.10a.1n *hominem...crudelissimum...*). **Dalmatis...molesti...bellicosi:** On Vatinius' campaign

in Dalmatia: the introduction to 5.10a. On the use of *molestus* in the book: 5.5.2n ...*ea quae ad me delata sunt...ex Pomponio...cognoscere*. The colloquialism *di male faciant* is found only in 11.21.1.

5.12: A narrative within the narrative

The centrally placed letter 12 stands as a testament to the ancient editor(s)' aim for Book 5: to compile, by selecting and organising pertinent letters, an account of C.'s life and career, from 62 to 44. Significantly, this account appears to largely align (although with a few variations) with C.'s guidance offered to Lucceius in this letter (where he asks the historiographer for an account of his career—that Lucceius failed to deliver).

According to C.'s guidelines included in 5.12:

1. this narrative is to focus on the years 64–57, from the discovery of the Catilinarian conspiracy to his return to Rome from exile (§4n *a principio...coniurationis...ad reditum nostrum*...).
2. It must include not only the most important events and undertakings of his career (§9n ...*nostrorum temporum consilia atque eventus*) but also what he suffered for the republic (§6n *secernas hanc quasi fabulam rerum eventorumque nostrorum*).
3. From a stylistic point of view, this account of C.'s career must disregard the chronological narration of the events (§5n ...*ordo ipse annalium mediocriter*...), and, for this reason, follow the principle of *variatio* (§4n *multam...varietatem tibi in scribendo*...). Only in this way would the sequence of the events that characterised C.'s life fascinate readers and get them emotionally involved (§5n *at viri saepe excellentis ancipites variique casus habent admirationem*...).

For comparison, the ancient editor(s)' narrative:

1. covers a longer time span (the years 62–44), almost from the beginning of C.'s career to his death.
2. primarily focuses (as C. himself requested to Lucceius) on C.'s endeavours against Catiline (and Clodius), all in the service of the republic. This is, however, achieved not only by gathering contemporary letters concerning C.'s efforts against these two (5.1–2; 7; 5.17), but also in retrospect, since most of the letters and/or C.'s correspondents are somehow tied to the events involving Catiline and Clodius (cf. the general introduction).

3. displays *variatio*. Thanks to the non-chronological arrangement of letters and the extended timeframe, the ancient editor(s)' account honours C.'s request to Lucceius for a varied narrative. It encompasses not only C.'s endeavours on behalf of the republic and his experience of exile, but also his interactions with the highest-ranking members of the aristocracy (5.1–8). It also includes C.'s advocacy for fellow aristocrats in the presence of the influential Caesar (5.9–11), as well as his consolation in times of loss—whether for the republic, his children, or during periods of exile (5.13–18). Additionally, the account captures C.'s interactions with his quaestors (5.18–21). The language is adapted accordingly to suit the context of each letter.

However, the narrative that ultimately emerges from the letters selected for Book 5 deviates from the one that C. originally desired Lucceius to convey. This account, particularly, does not align with the legacy C. wished to leave behind. As discussed in the general introduction, while the ancient editor(s)' narrative does adhere in important respects to C.'s guidelines in 5.12, it also diverges from them.

Within their narrative:

1. C. is depicted extending favours and assistance to individuals who were somehow connected to his enemies Catiline and/or Clodius (5.1–4; 5.9–11), or even those suspected of involvement in the Catilinarian conspiracy (5.5; 5.17).
2. The ancient editor(s) have taken the initiative to include letters that potentially diminish C.'s prominence. These include the confrontational and impolite 5.1, as well as the accusations of malversation in the Cilician province from C.'s quaestor (5.19–21) and C.'s correspondence with *homines novi* (5.9–11; 5.18). Furthermore, letters expressing his despair over Tullia's loss, and by extension, the loss of the republic (5.13–15), where he also articulates his desire to distance himself from Rome—the very epicentre of the political life he tirelessly sought to preserve on numerous occasions—have also been included. Additionally, there is a set of consolatory letters to less prominent individuals (when compared to those in the first half of the book) regarding the loss of children and exile (5.16–18).

5.12 is then the last letter in the book to portray an image of C.'s power and prestige—yet, it also plants the seeds of despair, and loss of pre-eminence (cf. 5.12.1n *festinationi meae*, where C. appears anxious for his future and that of the republic), evident in the subsequent letters. Beyond 5.12, letters 5.13–21, including those exchanged with Lucceius himself (5.13–15), unveil an image of C.

markedly distinct from the one depicted in the initial set of letters (on this correlation: cf. also the general introduction). If in 5.12, C. takes pride in his endeavours on the republic's behalf to the point of wanting them eternalised by Lucceius' account (§1n *res nostras...commemoratio...immortalitatis*), in the following 5.15, he is no longer proud of his deeds, and even feels ashamed of being alive (§3n *...vivere...puderet*); he desires to forget those memories (§4n *odium temporum, hominum, fori, curiae*) to temporarily erase the pain they provoke (§4n *oblivionem doloris*). Moreover, while C. still registers belief (although with some doubt: see above) in the republic's future in 5.12 (highlighted by his desire to take pride of Lucceius' narration on the most important part of his career when still alive: §1n *vivi perfruamur*), in 5.13 (§3n *circumspice omnia membra rei publicae...fractum debilitatumve*) and in 5.15 (§4n *odium temporum, hominum, fori, curiae*) the fall of the republic becomes a certainty (cf. also in 5.16.3n *...re publica perdidissent*).

The dynamics of his relationship with Lucceius also change between 5.12 and 5.15. If in 5.12, C. occupies the higher moral and political ground (§7n *ingenium...suppeditatum...tuum*), in 5.13, Lucceius is described as a wise man offering advice to C. (§2n *...te opitulari...*; see also its introduction). The set of letters exchanged with Lucceius is closed by 5.15.1n *accusas*, where C. refers to Lucceius' reprimand of C. (similar to 5.14.2n *accusare*).

12

First of a set of four letters (12–15) exchanged with L. Lucceius. Written for public circulation, 5.12 aims at persuading Lucceius to write an account of C.'s political life between the years 64–57.

Letter 5.12 is the longest letter in the book, featuring c. 1114 words: only 5.2, consisting of c. 1071 words, nears it in length. Only six letters in the collection contain a larger number of words per letter: two in Book 1 (1.7 with c. 1261 words and 1.9 with c. 3692); two in Book 3 (3.8 with c. 1217 words and 3.10 with c. 1320); one in Book 8 (8.8 with c. 1554 words) and one in Book 15 (15.4 with c. 1736 words). Its importance is also emphasised by its deliberate (cf. above) placement at the core of the book. This is a fact that ancient readers may have been able to discern for themselves from the *index* for each book provided in the Mediceus 49.9 (which seems to go back to late antiquity and perhaps earlier).

The letter takes the reader back a decade earlier than the preceding letter 5.11 (c. December 45)—to c. early April 55, when the 'triumvirs' were consolidating their powers after the Lucca congress. 5.12 has been generally dated to early April (Sh.-B. *ad loc.*) owing to *Att.* 4.6.4 (early April 55)—where C. refers to the present letter. The letter is the only one in the book datable to 55, after c. a year from the congress of 56.

The anxiety for the imminent future, exacerbated by the pact between the three 'triumvirs', affects both the republic and C. himself. This anxiety is reflected in C.'s urgency to have his endeavours narrated, seeking the deserved recognition before it is too late. The circular structure of the letter emphasises this urgency: §1n *festinationi meae*; *celerrime*; *commemoratio posteritatis...immortalitatis*; *vivi perfruamur*; §2n *ad properationem*; *tempus adripere*; §9n *festinationis*; *viventibus...perfruamur*. The ancient editor(s)' positioning of 5.12 before 5.13–15 (and the subsequent letters) emphasises this anxiety for the future. The narrative that unfolds in the following 5.13–18 suggests, in retrospect, that C. was right to feel anxious at this point in the book (on this, cf. the introductory note to the narrative proposed by 5.12).

C.'s addressee is the famous L. Lucceius an old friend of C. (and Atticus: *Att.* 1.3.3; 1.5.5; 1.8.1;1.10.2; 1.11.1), and a well-known historiographer, who at the time of the missive was writing a history of the years 91–81 (§2n ...*Italici belli et civilis historiam...autem...reliquas res ordiri*...). Praetor in 67 (Broughton 1952, 143), Lucceius had been at C.'s side in his fight against Catiline and Clodius. In 64, Lucceius accused Catiline of the murder of Marius Gratidianus (Cloud 2009, 141) and, in the following year, he probably supported C. in his bid for the consulate against Catiline (§7n *auctoritas...rei publicae...gravissimisque*...). Lucceius had also an important role in C.'s decision to prosecute Catiline's supporters (5.13.4n ...*nostrae rerumque...te...auctore gessimus*). In 56, Lucceius was defended by C. against charges of murder brought forth by Clodius and his supporters (Dyck *Cael.* 51–54). Although in c. the 60s he seems to have allied with Caesar, c. 10 years later (c.49–48) he sided with Pompey (5.15.2n *communis*); however, when Pompey was defeated in 48, he asked for Caesar's pardon and was able to return to Rome (*NP* s.v. Lucceius [I 3]).

C.'s attempts to have specific parts of his career praised and narrated appear to have been numerous (Tatum 2011, 176–181)—above all his consulate (cf. also 5.7, where although C. does not request a narrative on it to Pompey, he asks him to be praised for his endeavours: 5.7.3n *gratulationem exspectavi*). In 62, C. mentions that the poet Archias had commenced composing a poem about his consulate (*Arch.* 28; Diegel 2021, esp. 93–96). Two years later, he appears to have entrusted the composition of a work on his consulate to his friend Pomponius Rhodes (Deligiannis 2018, 144 n.2). During the same period, he had also begun working on it himself (although he decides not to mention it here: §8n *scribam ipse de me*): *De consulatu suo*, an epic poem on his activity against Catiline (Volk 2013, 93–112), had been composed between 60 and 55 (whereas his *De temporibus suis* will be probably written after returning from exile: Diegel 2021, 90–232); references to his endeavours had already been flagged in C.'s own literary works (Steel 2012, 251–266).

However, this letter stands out as the only formal (and most elaborated: *Att*. 4.6.4 *valde bella*) request (which Lucceius probably did not honour, as he seems to have promised: §1n *saepe ostendis*

te) for an account, of selected events in C.'s career (§1n *nomen...nostrum...celebretur tuis*), that has survived. It is also an example of heterobiography: C. prepares the material that is then entrusted to someone else for the narration (Diegel 2021, 188–189).

Fam. 9.8, written in 45 and addressed to Varro, share similarities with 5.12 (Hall 1998, 317–318). The language in 9.8 is elevated and embellished, much like in 5.12 (C. requests Atticus' opinion on this letter too: *Att.* 13.12.3). However, differently from 5.12, this elaborate language serves to remind Varro of his promise regarding the dedication of *De Lingua Latina* to C., not the writing of an account on C.'s deeds (on 5.12 and 9.8 similarities: e.g. §1n ...*expromam absens audacious...erubescit*; §1n *ardeo cupiditate incredibili...celebretur*).

C. offers to Lucceius ideas on how the work should be carried out: it should not be included in a larger narrative (§2n *bella separaverunt...bellis seiungeres*; §5n *annalium mediocriter*; §6n *perpetuam rerum...historiam...secernas*); it should focus on one main topic and character (§2n *in argumento unaque in persona*), similarly to Callisthenes' work on the *Phocian War*, Timaeus' treatment of Pyrrhus in his *War with Pyrrus*, and Polybius' treatment of the *Numantine war* in a (lost) work (§2n *Callisthenes...Polybius*). In doing this, the historiographer should disregard §3n *leges historiae* to embellish his narration (§2n *ornatiora…ornes*; *gratiam*; *veritas largiare*).

Furthermore, given the narrative's singular focus on a central set of events, Lucceius' account will be of modest length (§4n *modicum...corpus*). This approach allows Lucceius not only to recount the (embellished) events of C.'s life between 64 and 57 but also to dedicate ample space to providing his own (factitious) explanation of the narrated events (§4n *reprehendes...vituperanda*). This includes exploring their causes (§4n *explicandis causis rerum*; *exponendis rationibus*) and presenting his own suggestions on how to address these issues (§4n *remediis*). This will grant the narration a certain variety (§4n *varietatem...varietates*; §5n *variique*; §6n *varios actus*...) that will attract the readers' interest (§4n *delectationem lectoris*; *misericordia*; §5n ...*lectionis voluptate*).

C.'s description does not allude to a precise genre, but rather seems to theorise one (Puccioni 1981: below) by 'mixing' characteristics of different genres (Chalkomatas 2007, 91–93: this definition of it as 'metahistory' has been criticised: Diegel 2021, 185 n. 864). The work requested from Lucceius follows historical narrative in part, since it focuses on real events occurring in a specified period of time; it is partially biographical because it focuses on elements of C.'s personal biography; it is partially epic because it follows C.'s endeavours for the sake of the republic (similar to *De Consolatu suo*, where C. seems to have 'challenged the boundaries of epic genre': Volk 2013, 93–112); and it is a *quasi fabula*, since it requires embellishment of real events, but also its author is encouraged to offer judgment on it.

According to Puccioni 1981, 28, C. appears to theorise the genre of 'historical monograph'—an idea supported by the opening reference to his 'models' (§2n *Callisthenes...Polybius*), and as highlighted by scholarship (Ullman 1942, 44–53, who also summarises the previous analyses of Reitzenstein 1906 and Guillemin 1938, and discusses the possible link between this 'historical monograph' and Aristotle's *Poetics*—rejected by Puccioni 1981, 30–31). For a comprehensive analysis of the letter and its possible genre, see Diegel 2021, esp. 185–187.

The language employed in the letter (not by chance defined in *Att*. 4.6.4 as *valde bella*) is a mixture—like the genres to which the letter refers (above)—of different styles. The reader will even find a deployment of a 'proto-elegiac' language (§1n *pudor...subrusticus*; *audacius*; *erubescit*; *ardeo*; *cupiditate, cepit, incendit, cuperem, rapit*).

Rhetoric is employed to persuade Lucceius to undertake the writing of the 'monograph' (e.g. alliteration, hyperbaton, asyndeton, personification; the use of persuasive language typical of courtroom speeches: e.g. §1n *expromere*). It is also employed to explain the characteristics that this 'monograph' should or should not possess (§2n *coniunctene...perpetuis...historiis*; *bella separaverunt...bellis seiungeres*; *in argumento unaque in persona*; §2n *ornatiora...ornes*; §3n *leges historiae...gratiam*; *veritas largiare*; §4n *modicum...corpus*; *explicandis causis rerum*; *reprehendes...vituperanda*; *exponendis rationibus*; *varietatem*; *delectationem lectoris*; *misericordia*; §5n *annalium mediocriter*; *variique*; *...lectionis voluptate*; §6n *perpetuam rerum...historiam...secernas*; *quasi fabulam*; §6n *varios actus*).

The language is also enriched by classical *exempla* (§2n *Callisthenes...Polybius*; §3n *Herculem...Voluptate*; §5n *Epaminondas...Themistocli*; §7n *Alexander...Lysippo...Agesilaus...Xenophontis*; *...Timoleonti...Themistocli*; *Alexander...Naevianus*), and by a careful circular construction of the letter itself—which begins and ends with the same topics: C.'s urgency to have Lucceius write the 'monograph' and reference to Lucceius' previous promise to fulfil it.

In C.'s language it is also possible to recognise standard strategies of affiliative and redressive politeness (e.g. §1 and *passim*) as well as references to C. and Lucceius' *amicitia* (§1n *tui...benevolentiae...*; §6n *tuam gratiam*; §9n *si recipis causam nostram*: and *passim*).

M. CICERO S.D. L. LUCCEIO Q.F. 'From M. Cicero to L. Lucceius, son of Quintus, greetings': formal heading that is repeated throughout the whole correspondence with Lucceius (except for 5.14, where Lucceius adds C.'s filiation to praise his addressee).

1 *Exordium* that contains the central focus of the letter: C.'s request to Lucceius (*nomen...nostrum...illustretur...celebretur*). C.'s insistence on having his deeds narrated by Lucceius is also conveyed by repeated use of figures of speech (alliteration, hyperbaton, asyndeton, personifications) and future-oriented vocabulary (*munumentum, commemoratio posteritatis, immortalitas, testimonium*); those are counterbalanced by strategies of redressive (*...pudor...subrusticus*; *...ignoscas*; *scriptorium tuorum*) and affiliative politeness (for e.g. C.'s admiration for Lucceius' literary skills: *genus...scriptorium tuorum*). For the 'proto-elegiac' language (§1n *pudor...subrusticus*; *audacius*; *erubescit*; *ardeo*; *cupiditate, cepit, incendit, cuperem, rapit*) employed here, see also Chalkomatas 2007, esp. 89. **...pudor...subrusticus...erubescit:** emphatic opening: the sprung rhythm, based on the recurring alliterations (of 'm' in *coram me tecum eadem...conantem*; of 'p' in *pudor...paene*; of 'q' *quidam...quae*; of 'a' in *absens audacis*; of 'e' in *epistulae enim...erubescit*) and hyperbatons (*me...conantem*; *pudor...subrusticus*), plus references to his timidness (*pudor, absens audacis, erubescere*)—all play a crucial role in C.'s attempt to persuade Lucceius (cf. also Rudd 1992, 18–32). The incipitary adverb *coram* (*OLD*, s.v. *coram* 1b) introduces C.'s self-representation as a timid man: his shyness prevented him from addressing his request to Lucceius in one of their face-to-face interactions. The frequent use of *coram* (+ accusative/ + *cum* and ablative) in C.'s letters (e.g. 5.21.2; 1.10.1; 2.9.2; 3.5.4, 7.3.6; 13.57.2) suggests this was a common practice in Roman aristocratic etiquette. *pudor...subrusticus*: Ciceronian *hapax* (*TLL* X 2494, 41) that emphasises C.'s (fictional: Valencia Hernández 1997, 30) timidness (the importance of displaying *verecundia*—especially when 'pursuing self-interested ends'—is well-documented by Kaster 2005, esp. 44–45). Other references to C.'s *pudor*—employed generally to highlight the embarrassment that comes with making a request—are found in §3n *verecundiae*; cf. also *de Orat.* 1.163 *Ego vero, inquit Cotta, a te peto, Scaevola—me enim, et hunc Sulpicium impedit pudor ab homine omnium gravissimo*. If here C. feels (not too much) ashamed about his request, in 5.15.1n the tone shifts dramatically: C. is now ashamed even of being alive (on the intentional display of a decrease in C.'s prestige, evident from the intentional arrangement of the letters in the book: cf. the general introduction; see also the introductory note to the narrative proposed by 5.12). The fact that *subrusticus* ('clumsy': *OLD* 1) is found, in reference to himself, only here (it is however attested at *Brut.* 137 and 259 in allusion to Cotta's modest oratory abilities, and in *Orat.* 161, to describe phonological phenomena), is additional proof that C.'s self-representation here is hardly genuine. However, it works well as a strategy of redressive politeness (Hall 1998, 315 n.34); by deprecating himself (C. was, in fact, well-known for his *urbanitas*—as also the well-crafted 5.12 demonstrates), C. aims at praising his addressee (similar to 5.8, see its introduction) and alleviating any potential irritation that his request may cause. ...*expromam absens audacious...erubescit*: the letter is given the

personified role of an 'intermediary' mediating between two parties, of which one is generally abroad (this can also be achieved by close friends/ associates left behind in Rome: e.g. Decius' role in 5.6.1n and Sura's in 5.11.2n). In C.'s strategy of politeness, the letter becomes a shield for his (fictional) timidness: it will be his letter, rather than he himself in person, to disclose his request to Lucceius (similar to 9.8.1, where C.'s books of *Academia* are equally personified and delegated to present C.'s request to Varro). The occurrence of *expromere* ('to disclose': *OLD* s.v. 3) in C.'s speeches (*Caecin.* 39; *Verr.* 2.3.53; *Agr.* 1.22; *Rab. Perd.* 8; *Cael.* 29; *Mil.* 33) and rhetorical (*Brut.* 25; *Orat.* 125; *Div.* 2.150) and philosophical (*Leg.* 2.17; 18; *Ac.* 2. 144; *Fin.* 5.11) works is higher than in his letters (only in 13.6.4, *Att.* 2.12.2, *QFr.* 1.1.28). This supports the idea that the language of the letter intentionally looks at the strategies of persuasion typical of courtroom speeches and employed in most of his rhetorical and philosophical works (cf. the letter's introduction; similar to 5.2, where C. uses an analogous vocabulary, probably with the same intent). *absens audacius*: another combination of adjective and adverb found only here (cf. §1n *pudor…subrusticus*) employed as a strategy of redressive politeness. C.'s 'audacity' is allowed only from far away—where its political and social implications lose strength—but not entirely, since C. feels the necessity to emphasise his embarrassment (on the relation between *pudor* and *audacia*: Kaster 2005, 45; on *erubescere*, see above). *Audacia* (as §3n *largiare*) belongs to C.'s vocabulary employed to describe Catiline (Langerwerf 2015, 155–166) and Clodius (e.g. *Dom.* 130). Here it is employed in reference to C.'s own conduct (similar to 5.13.3n *turpis*). The re-usage of C.'s vocabulary, previously employed to describe Catiline and Clodius' activity, is particularly resonant in a book like *Fam.* 5, where Catiline and Clodius constitute one of the main threads of narrative (on which, the general introduction). **ardeo cupiditate incredibili...nomen...celebretur:** having prepared the ground for his request—and demonstrated to Lucceius how embarrassed he is—C. proceeds without any further circumlocutions. Similar, although with a less 'intense' choice of vocabulary, in 9.8.1 *ego...exspectatione...tui moveor...admoneam te*. The agglomeration of terms from a 'proto-elegiac' language (counterbalanced by strategies of redressive politeness: e.g. *ut ego arbitror*) emphasises C.'s deep wish to have his name celebrated through Lucceius' works (and, in this way, become an example to emulate: Marincola 2003, 305–306). However, what C. is probably not saying here is that having Lucceius praise his deeds helps him avoid writing about them himself (thereby preventing self-praise for his own endeavours: Gibson 2003, 235–254)—an activity that does not seem to have been highly valued by contemporaries (§8n *scribam ipse de me*). The juxtaposition of synonyms (*illustrare–celebrare*, found only here and both employed with the meaning of *notum reddere*: *TLL* III 746, 42; VII 398, 53) aims to praise the addressee (similar to 5.8.2n *promptum...paratum*). **...ignoscas...festinationi...celerrime...commendari:** again, C. employs a 'proto-elegiac' language:

vehementer exspectatum, cepit et incendit, cuperem). On C.'s 'anxiety' (*festinationi meae, celerrime*) to have his deeds narrated by Lucceius sooner than later (§1n *vivi perfruamur*) and the ancient editor(s)' narrative: see the introduction to the letter. The fact that Lucceius had promised to write this account for C. (*saepe ostendis te*: §9n *saepe ostenderis te*) encouraged C. to request it more insistently. However, by urging Lucceius, not only might C. open himself up to accusations of a lack of poise (*Off.* 1.131 *cavendum...ne...in festinationibus suscipiamus nimias celeritates...non adesse constantiam*), but he also risks that Lucceius might feel offended. Strategies of redressive politeness are, for this reason, necessary: C. requests to be excused for his behaviour (similar to 5.2.6n *ut mihi ignoscas*) and, at the same time, he praises Lucceius' works and writing abilities (cf. Lucceius' praise of C.'s works, as a motif of consolation, in the darker 5.14.1n *erudito...ipsum laudibus illustret*; for other examples of this narrative shift: §1n *...pudor*). *res nostras...commendari*: the hyperbaton and personification (for which, see the introduction to §1) of C.'s achievements emphasise his request. C.'s deeds—regularly described as *res nostra* in the letter (§2n, §6n: Salamon 2009, 8 n.32)—are entrusted to Lucceius as if they were *amici* for recommendation (for *commendare* and dative as a verb of recommendation: 5.5.3n *tibi Pomponium...commendo*; the verb is employed also in §6n *gloriae...commendari...*); for the events he wants Lucceius to narrate, cf. §4n *...a principio...coniurationis...reditum*. For parallelism between great deeds and monuments: see Immerwahr, 1960 261–290. *commendari tuis*: C. is probably referring to the broad genre of the *commentarii*/*De vita sua*—influenced by the Greek *hypomnemata*, used to report services to the republic and recorded qualities for which one wanted to be remembered (Candau 2011, 124). The *commentarii* are close to the modern concept of 'autobiography', although the modern tradition was arguably inaugurated only with Augustine's *Confessions*: Gibson 2013, 394. However, starting from §2, the kind of work that C. wanted Lucceius to create on his deeds (a Latin 'monograph', not yet possibly theorised and, for this reason, probably a mixture of different genres: see the introduction to the letter), begins to take shape. **...commemoratio posteritatis...vivi perfruamur:** C.'s wish—again emphasised by the 'proto-elegiac' language (*rapit, cupiditas*) and the use of figures of speech (e.g. the anaphora of *vel*)—to be remembered for his deeds, is accompanied (for this recurrent pattern: the introduction to §1) by praise of Lucceius (*auctoritate...tui*; *suavitate ingeni*, that is employed again only in the ingratiating 3.1.1 to Appius) and display of affection (*benevolentiae*: 5.2.10n *maneo in...benevolentia*). C.'s desire to be remembered through literary works is also evident in *Arch.* 28–29. However, he does not wish to wait until his death for recognition and celebration, as was the case with many notable figures mentioned in the letter (as discussed in §§5n–7n, and following customary practices: *Rab. Perd.* 29; *Sen.* 82; *Tusc.* 1.33; *Phil.* 14.33). Instead, C. seems to desire to experience this acknowledgment while still alive (*vivi perfruamur*; again in §9n *vivi gloriola nostra perfruamur*):

a natural consequence of the political turmoil in Rome after the Lucca conference—further accentuated by the intentional arrangement of the gloomy 5.13–15 after 5.12 (see the introduction to the letter).

2 Although C. acknowledges that Lucceius is occupied with the writing of his own work (*Italici...civilis historiam...*), he employs various tactful strategies (e.g. acknowledging the considerable effort Lucceius has invested in his current project: *...quantis oneribus...*) to persuade him to fulfil his request. **...te admonerem ut cogitares...separaverunt...seiungeres:** C. offers Lucceius two possible ways of narrating his achievements: the 'annalistic' approach ('connected in time': *OLD* s.v. *coniunctus* 2; *a perpetuis...historiis*), where C.'s achievements are woven together with others (*OLD* s.v. *contexo* 3a)—although C. seems not to like it: §5n *annalium mediocriter*. Or the 'monographic' one, where the account of particular events is detached (*separaverunt...seiungeres*; §6 *secernas*) from the general narration. C. seems to prefer the latter (§6n *Quo...perpetuam rerum gestarum historiam...scernas*). The passage is rich in vocabulary (*coniunctene, a perpetuis...historiis, separaverunt...seiungeres*) typical of rhetoric (cf. the introduction to 5.12 and Puccioni 1981, 32–33). The employment of examples, to strengthen statements, is a well-known rhetorical strategy (van der Blom 2011, 49–67), used by C. throughout the entire letter. The reference to Callisthenes' *Phocian War*, Timaeus' *War with Pyrrhus* (not a monograph but an episode with a certain autonomy inserted in the *Sikelikaì*: Leveghi 2016, 470 n.90; mentioned again in §7), and Polybius' *Numantine War*, all point to C.'s desire to have Lucceius write a 'monograph' on his endeavours from 64 to 57, following their example (on this the introduction to 5.12; on these Greek 'monographs': Ullman 1942, 46–49; C. also mentions Xenophon's *Agesilaus*: §7n). These 'monographs' had to employ rhetorical devices to embellish the narrative, probably following the example of 'tragic history' (§2n *ornatiora*). *...ab hostilibus externisque*: since Lucceius had completed his *civilis historia* (§1n), C. might here refer to the Sertorian war (80–72) and, especially, the third Mithridatic war (73–63) that ended in the same year of his discovery of the Catilinarian conspiracy (*civilem coniurationem*)—whose narration he asks Lucceius to separate from the latter. **ad nostram laudem...futura sint:** C. wants to become an example to emulate (§1n *nomen...celebretur*). Despite claiming to be indifferent to the choice (*...non multum video interesse*), he shows the advantages of opting for the 'monographic' approach: it enables Lucceius to begin writing immediately (compiling with C.'s urgency: *ad properationem*; *tempus adripere*; similar to §1n *festinationi meae*; *celerrime*) without having to bridge the gaps (*ad locum venias*) between 81 (where he stopped according to C.: §2n *civilis historiam*) and 64. In addition, by limiting the topic to one person (typical of Greek 'monographs': §2n *Callisthenes...Polybius*), Lucceius can concentrate on other aspects such as style and details

(*uberior...ornatior*). However, in *Orat*. 45–46, C. seems surpass these ideas for oratory: the outstanding orator (*orator...excellens*) is said to remove discussion from particular times and persons (*a propriis personis et temporibus...avocat controversiam*) to privilege a more general topic (*ad universi generis*). C.'s request for an adorned (*ornatiora*) narrative (that should celebrate C.: *ornes*: *OLD* s.v. 7) is central in §3n *ornanda...ornes*, where the request to disregard the 'historical' truth (§3n *leges historiae neglegas*; *plusculum...veritas largiare*) concludes the section. The reference to an ornate style as the style apt to 'glorify' actions (and therefore being the right style for this historical 'monograph', but not of the annalistic tradition: *de Orat.* 2.53) and 'delectate' the public (similar to §4n *delectationem lectoris*) is found in the closer in time *Leg.* 1.5–6 (Dyck *ad loc.*); here Atticus encourages C. to write a 'history' (*historia*)—a genre close to oratory (*oratorium*)—to delight those who take pleasure in literature (*qui litteris delectantur*) but also the country itself (*patriae*) and to glorify it (*ornata*). Antipater is, according to C. (*de Orat*. 2.54), the first who 'imparted to history a richer tone' (*addidit historiae maiorem sonum vocis...Antipater*). Such usage of rhetorical devices in historical writing is strong in the 'monographs' mentioned in the letter (§2n *Callisthenes...Polybius*; §7n *Agesilaus...Xenophontis*); here the narratives (those that can be reconstructed) tends to be embellished and encomiastic (see also §3n *gratiam*), constituting a 'new' way of fashioning historical prose (discussion on the nature of 'tragic history' is still open; Ullman 1942, 25–53; Marincola 2013, 73). **...impudenter...oneris...:** C. seems to recognise that his behaviour deviates from Roman aristocratic conduct, since he refers to his shamelessness (§1n *pudor...subrusticus*; similar §3n *verecundiae*; *impudentem*) and (probably insincere: on C.'s real thoughts on his activity against Catiline: 5.2.1n *rem publicam a me conservatam*) self-deprecation. This is a strategy of redressive politeness: by anticipating Lucceius' comments on his behaviour (but also offering an explanation for this: §1n *festinationi meae*), C. tries to reduce the possible embarrassment following his request. However, it may also be possible that C. is trying to counterbalance his self-praise (and its negative aspects: §1n *nomen...celebretur*) with self-deprecation. The *lectio impudenter* (**ς**) should be preferred to *inprudenter* (**Ω**), in view of the fact that the whole letter seems to rely on C.'s (lack of) shame (see also its repetition in §3n *impudentem*). On the ornate style that should glorify C.'s deeds: §2n *ornatiora*.

3 C. restates (cf. §2) his desire to have part of his political career (64–57) recounted in a 'monograph' that follows the style of 'tragic history', deploying conventional ways of requesting (*te...rogo*: 5.10bn *qua re te rogo*; *tibi...commendabit*: 5.5.3n *...tibi...commendo*; *amorique nostro*; *in te residet amoris*) personal favours (*gratia, flecto, largior*) in Roman elite exchanges. **...ornanda:** on C.'s preference for an embellished and encomiastic style: §2n *ornatiora*. **...verecundiae...impudentem:** the gradual

degradation of C.'s 'shyness' registers a further step; the §1n *pudor...subrusticus* (to which *verecundiae* refers)—turned into *impudenter* in §2n—becomes here *bene et naviter* ('well and truly': *OLD* s.v. *naviter* 2) *impudentem*. The idea of 'going beyond' the 'bounds of delicacy' (*verecundiae finis transierit*) and of being 'frankly and thoroughly brazen' (*bene et naviter...impudentem*) draws attention to the transgression of Roman elite etiquette (§1n *pudor*). C. voluntarily takes all the blame for his behaviour: §2n *impudenter*. **ornes...leges...neglegas...gratiam...largiare:** C.'s request to Lucceius to 'waive the laws of history' (*leges historiae neglegas*), to privilege an embellished narration (*ornes...vehementius*; *gratiam*; *plusculum...veritas largiare*) of his deeds, is in line with the kind of work he has in mind. A narrative that follows the 'laws of history' was more appropriate to the writing of historiographical accounts (*de Orat*. 2.62–63) and of 'continuous/annalistic narrative' (not what C. wants here: §2n *perpetuis...historiis*), than to the 'monograph' theorised here—which follows a more emotional and embellished narrative (as in §2n *Callisthenes...Polybius*; cf. also §3n *ornanda*). C. further discusses the treatment of the 'historical truth' in *Leg.* and *de Orat*. (esp. 2.62–63), where (in the latter) he appears to express views opposite to those asserted here (for a summary and analysis of the passages: Stok 2021, 9–21). However, as first proposed by Reitzenstein 1906, 84–86, it is possible to reconcile this incongruence by hypothesising that here C. refers to a different genre (a 'monograph'), than the one he has in mind when writing *de Orat*. (likely closer to the historiographical genre: Stok 2021, 19). ...*gratiam*...: I follow Leveghi 2016, 470 n.93, who agrees with Puccioni 1981, 17 in reading in *gratia* a reference to the ornate style (*OLD* s.v. 6c), to which C. repeatedly refers in §§2n–3n, rather than to 'favouritism/partiality' proposed by Sh.-B. *ad loc*. This reading of *gratia* (as a vocabulary of rhetoric: see the introduction to 5.12) is also confirmed by *suavissime*; in *Inv.* 1.50, the 'embellishment of the argument (*exornari...argomentatio*)—which is what C. is requesting to Lucceius (§2n *ornanda*)—is what 'makes the speech attractive (*suavissimum*) to the audience'. ...*prohoemio*...: C. is referring to the preface of the work he says Lucceius had begun to write around the time of this letter (§2n ...*ab hostilibus externisque*), as Cornell 2013, 451 rightly points out. The reference to X. *Mem*. 2.1.21–22 alludes to the fact that Lucceius, like Heracles in the passage (to which *Off*. 1.118 also alludes), has reached a (metaphorical) crossroad. If Heracles had to choose between ἀρετή and κακία (choosing the former), Lucceius likely had to decide between *gratia* and *veritas*—ultimately choosing *veritas* (Stok 2021, 20). ...*plusculum...veritas largiare*...: C. concludes the section with a further reference to his preference for an embellished narrative (§2n *ornanda*; §3n *gratiam*); this implies (as stated before: §3n *leges historiae neglegas*) that Lucceius should somehow disregard 'historical' *veritas* (but not entirely: *plusculum*)—as the Greek models previously mentioned (§2n *Callisthenes...Polybius*) seem to have done in their 'monographs' (similar also in Xenophon's *Agesilaus*: §7n). C. is not suggesting here that Lucceius should resort to

falsehood; instead, the intention is to emphasise particular episodes (§4n *modicum...corpus*) of the narrative to captivate the reader. This further underscores C.'s inclination toward crafting a 'monograph' that also delves into 'tragic history' style (on 'tragic history': Marincola 2013, 73–90). Like §3n *leges historiae neglegas*, C.'s views on *veritas* are stricter in *De orat*. 2.51 (*ut nostri, nihil opus est oratore: satisest non esse mendacem*) and in 2.62, but in both passages, he does not refer to 'monographs'. Only rhetoricians claim the right to distort history in order to give more point to their narrative (*Brut*. 42: Stok 2021, 19–20). *Largior* ('to allow as a concession to', *OLD* 4) belongs to C.'s vocabulary on Catiline and Clodius (major tool of the *popularis* politician: Dyck on *Catil*. 4.10.10–12). This is not the first time in the letter that C. employs similar vocabulary to describe his own actions (cf. §1n *audacius*). The reader of *Fam*. 5 is prompted to recognise the connection created by the employment of this vocabulary, given that Catiline and Clodius are among the most significant themes in the ancient editor(s)' narrative for this book (for other examples of re-usage of C.'s vocabulary on Catiline and Clodius in the book, see the general introduction).

4 C.'s guidelines on the writing of a 'monograph' (cf. also the introduction to the narrative proposed by 5.12)—which have their roots in Hellenic historiography; he asks Lucceius to investigate causes and offer remedies (*...causis...remediis...*)—but also to offer his (rather factious: §2n *...plusculum...veritas largiare*) opinion on the events (*reprehendes...comprobabis...si liberius...putabis...*) with a variegated (*...varietas...*) and emotional style (*voluptatis...*). **...coniurationis...reditum...:** the topic of the proposed 'monograph' is given for the first time (after an allusion in §1n *res nostras*) in full: Lucceius' narration should start c. in 64 (*a principio...coniurationis*) and end in c. 57 (*ad reditum nostrum*). This is also the storyline that the ancient editor(s) have chosen for *Fam*. 5 (albeit with a few modifications: see the introduction to the narrative proposed by 5.12). **...modicum...corpus:** language of rhetoric (cf. the introduction to the letter; *Orat*. 21; 69): C.'s request of a 'brief' treatment of a set of episodes' (Sh.-B. *ad loc*.) confirms the idea that C. is alluding to a 'monograph' (Puccioni 1981, 36–37)—as it is also C.'s reference to §4n *multam...varietatem*. The examples of 'monograph' that C. offers to Lucceius in the letter (e.g. §2n *Callisthenes...Polybius*; §7n *Agesilaus...Xenophontis*)—where it is possible to reconstruct their original form—appear to have all been of 'modest' length (cf. §7n *Agesilaus...Xenophontis...libellus*) and focused on narrating a set of episodes within the 'monograph' theme. Moreover, *modicum* can also be read as a strategy of redressive politeness (Hall 1998, 317): Lucceius (who was busy with the writing of his own works: §2 *...reliquas res ordiri*) should not be intimidated by the amount of work that needs to be done; the comprehensive narration of C.'s deeds requires a 'moderate' amount of space (and effort). **civilium commutationum...:** Lucceius is the right person to narrate the events of

64–57 because of his knowledge of political changes (*civilium commutationum scientia*) caused by the social and Sullan civil wars (on which he was working: §1n *Italici...civilis...*). C. presumably aims to connect the social war and, more probably, the civil war to the political upheavals of 64–57. Connecting Catiline and Sulla was not a new theme in C.'s works; he had already done that himself in *Catil.*: Dyck on *Catil.* 1.18.2–6 *tibi uni multorum ciuium neces*). **...causis...remediis...:** the 'monograph' requested from Lucceius should adhere to the principles of pragmatic-apodictic historiography (Leveghi 2016, 473 n.97). This approach, with Thucydides as its main exponent (e.g., 1.23.5 ...τὰς αἰτίας προύγραψα), delves into the reasons behind political and military events, offering remedies for identified causes. It was later followed by Polybius and Dionysius of Halicarnassus (Formentin 2008, 59–70). C.'s allusion to Thucydides is not necessarily in contradiction with his previous requests (§3n *leges historiae neglegas*; *plusculum...veritas largiare*): 1) Thucydides, although critical of invention and manipulation of factual material (which seems instead a typical element of 'tragic history': Marincola 2013, 73–90), did exploit tragedy to some degrees—even contravening *veritas* (as, also did his 'follower' Polybius: on (un)truth esp. in Thucydides and e.g. in Polybius: Moles 1993, 88–121; see also Wiseman 1993, 122–146 on lying historians; C. had already alluded to Polybius: §2n *Callisthenes...Polybius*). 2) The allusion to Thucydides was probably meant to enhance both the importance of this 'monograph' and Lucceius' abilities (considering C.'s esteem for Thucydides: Wilkins on *de Orat.* 2. 56). C.'s reference to *incommodum* anticipates—at least for the second-time reader—the narrative of loss and despair displayed by 5.13–18, where *incommodum* is found several times (5.16.5n; 5.17.1n; 5.18.1n); similar to §4n *dolor...delectationem,* where the reference to the consoling *topos* of the passing of time, anticipates the themes of 5.13–18. **...reprehendes...comprobabis...si liberius...putabis:** C. emphasises the importance of Lucceius' personal view on the narrated events. The reference to the historiographer's 'freedom (*si liberius*)' in writing this 'monograph' confirms C.'s adherence to the model established by the Greek 'monographs' mentioned in the letter (§2n *Callisthenes...Polybius*; §7n *Agesilaus...Xenophontis*). The ancient editor(s)' narrative offers a rather different image of C. from the one he wanted to be depicted here: cf. the introduction to the narrative proposed by 5.12. **multam...varietatem...vicissitudines:** the references to a 'great variety' (*multam...varietatem*; *varietates fortunaeque vicissitudines*) of episodes narrated (that recalls §4n *modicum...corpus*) and to the 'pleasure' (*voluptatis*; *delectatio*) that the reader will experience when reading it (*in legendo*) emphasise, one more time (§2n *ornatiora*; §3n *ornanda*; *gratiam*; *Herculem Xenophontium a Voluptate*), C.'s predilection for the style of 'tragic history' (one of its main aims was, in fact, to raise the reader's emotions: Marincola 2013, 73). The 'power' that *varietas* has, in avoiding boredom and pleasing readers, is a common topic of C.'s rhetorical works (Fantham 1988, 275–290). For examples of 'monographs' that, according to C.,

display similar features: §2n *Callisthenes...Polybius.* Cf. also §7n *Agesilaus...Xenophontis*, written for epideictic praise and rich in rhetorical devices: Gray 2016, 224. The importance of these features reverberates throughout the whole letter: §5n *...variique casus...lectionis voluptate*; §6n *varios actus...multasque <mut>ationes* and the introduction. On *voluptas* as vocabulary of philosophical diatribe between Epicureans and Stoics: Evenepoel 2014, 45–78. *Voluptas* is Ciceronian vocabulary employed in the book to refer to praise of his actions (5.2.3n) or that of his addressee (5.7.1n); significantly, this term is found in the first part of the book and not in its darker second part (on which, see the general introduction). The ancient editor(s)' narrative for the book (and for probably the entire collection: Cammoranesi 2022) responds to C.'s request for *variatio*; however, their narrative portrays events from C.'s life that he would not want Lucceius to narrate: see the introduction to the narrative proposed by 5.12. **...optabiles...experiendo non...legendo...iucundae...recordatio delectationem:** there are two main threads: 1) by employing a more vivid and ornate style (*multam...varietatem...vicissitudines*: cf. above) in the 'monograph', the narration on C.'s painful (*optabiles...non fuerunt*) deeds (from 64 to 57) will become more pleasurable to the reader (like e.g. those of Epaminondas and Themistocles: §5n *moriens... Epaminondas...delectat*; *...studium in legendo...Themistocli fuga...*) than experiencing it personally. 2) The effect of the passing of time as consolatory *topos* (on which, the introduction to 5.13–18). C. is here quoting from Euripides' (lost) Andromaca (ἀλλ' ἠδύ τοι σωθέντα μεμνῆσθαι πόνων [fr. 133N^2]), as mentioned in *Fin.* 2.105. C.'s description of his activity against Catiline and exile as 'non desirable experiences' finds confirmation in the narrative on his loss of prestige and pre-eminence that the ancient editor(s) fostered in the second part of the book (esp. in 5.13–15: cf. the introduction to the narrative proposed by 5.12).

5 On the features that the 'monograph' on C.'s deeds from 64 to 57 had to possess, and its reliance on 'tragic history', the introduction to §4. **...misericordia...iucunda...:** on the attention towards the public's emotional response: §4n *multam...varietatem...vicissitudines.* The use of emotions (especially pity) to persuade the orator's audience is well attested in *de Orat.* 2.206 and *Brut.* 188. The effect is not limited to an audience but also to readers—as pointed out, e.g., by Dionysius in reading Demosthenes (*Dem.* 22 [I 176 U-R=I 322 Usher]) and Plutarch's reading of Thucydides (*de gloria Ath.* 347A). On this, and for other examples, Marincola 2003, 285–315; on the broader role that 'pity' has in Hellenistic historiography: Hau 2019, 82–98. *Alienos...dolore*: the writer's embellished description of a character's sorrow, and the awareness that suffering is universal and could happen to anybody (consolatory topic, for which: the introduction to 5.13–18), makes even those not accustomed to experiencing difficulties in their lives, sympathise with others' misfortune (Ben-ze'ev 2003, 112–114). The reader might feel compassion especially for those who suffer

undeserved injustices (similar to Arist. *Rhet.*1385b13–14): C.'s exile, as well as events in the lives of Themistocles and Epaminondas (cf. below), clearly fall in this category. On C.'s exile as a theme, not only of C.'s requested 'monograph', but also of the ancient editor(s)' narrative: the introduction to the narrative proposed by 5.12. *Intuentibus*: C. here refers more generally to 'those witnessing' (*OLD* s.v. *intueor* 4) the misfortunes of others, and not simply to the 'readers'—who have been in his mind up until now (§4n *in legendo...lectoris...in legendo*) and will return in §5n *in legendo*. The choice of *intuentes* ('observer') might recall Polybius' 'external observers' (οἱ ἐκτός), who are called to judge/experience compassion for the character's actions (Polyb. 38.3.2: Loehr 2017, esp. 221–226). **Epaminondas...Themistocli...:** Themistocles and Epaminondas' tragic lives are mentioned for two reasons: 1) C. wants to emphasise the undeserved nature of his exile (cf. 5.4.2n, where his exile is 'a violence (*vim*) which has overcome (*vicit*) [him]'; see also §5n *alienos...dolore*); he also seeks to elevate the importance of his sufferings by comparing them to the tragic ones of Themistocles and Epaminondas. This is not the only time C. compares himself to Themistocles and Epaminondas; in *Tusc.* 1.33, C. portrays the two heroes as men (like himself) willing to sacrifice their lives for the state. 2) C. refers to Themistocles and Epaminondas to illustrate to Lucceius that readers are genuinely interested in narratives that delve into painful events (Dugan 2014, 18). C. seems to refer to Epaminondas (c. 418–362) and Themistocles (c. 524–c. 459) in a non-chronological order; this probably suits his request for a 'monograph' not chronologically oriented (§5n *...annalium mediocriter...*). *...Epaminondas...moreretur*: military leader of Theban army who died during the battle of Mantinea in 362. C. describes him as 'the leading man in Greek history' (*Tusc.* 1.2). The portrait of the passing of Epaminondas (similar to *Fin.* 2.97), and the choice of vocabulary here employed (see below) aligns with that style of 'tragic history' that C. wanted Lucceius to follow. Similar 'tragic' narration of the last moments of Epaminondas' life is in X. *HG.* 7.5.1–27 (on Xenophon as one of the models for C.'s 'monograph': §7n *Agesilaus...Xenophontis*). *Spiculum* is found only here and in *Rep.* 3.15, where C. gives a rich and emphatic description of diverse nations and cities. Instead, the much more common *pilum* is found c. seventy times in C.'s works. *Clipeum* 'an embossed or ornamented shield, regarded rather as a work of art than as armour (*OLD* s.v. 2) is used only other six other times by C., but only in his prose works; within these 6 occurrences, *clipeum* is found in reference to the shields of Minerva (*de Orat.* 2.73), Epaminondas (*Fin.* 2.97); it also refers to the shields offered to men by gods (*N.D.* 1.101). The more common *scutum* is found twenty-two times in C.'s works. *...Themistocli...*: Athenian politician and general, ostracised in c. 472/1. Themistocles is frequently found in C.'s works as an *exemplum* to emphasise a shared devotion to the state and (undeserved) exile (van der Blom 2010, 213–216). Themistocles is mentioned again in §7n. *Themistocli fuga redituque*: 'Themistocles' exile and return'. *Redituque*, the *lectio* transmitted by **M**,

implies a reference to Themistocles' return—one that the tradition (except perhaps for Arist. *Ath.Pol.* 25) does not contain. Critics are generally confident that C. does not commit a historical error of such magnitude, especially in a letter addressed to a historiographer; however, they remain uncertain about alternative readings. T.-P. *ad loc.* suggest *Alcibiadis* for *Themistocli*, or *Themistocli fuga, Coriolani fuga redituque* to recall *Brut.* 43, where both Themistocles and Coriolanus are mentioned. Sh.-B. *ad loc.* rejects *reditu* and proposes *interituque* (death: *OLD* 1). Dugan 2014, 19–21 was the first to propose that C.'s reference to Themistocles' return is intentional ('[un]conscious slip of pen or tongue': Dugan 2014, 20 and n.37). According to Dugan, C. gives Themistocles a return from exile to match the story on himself he wanted Lucceius to narrate (§4n *a principio...coniurationis...ad reditum nostrum*). In doing so, C. does exactly what he proposes to Lucceius to do in his 'monograph': §3n *leges historiae neglegas*; *plusculum...veritas largiare*; §4n *multam...varietatem...vicissitudines*. **...annalium mediocriter…variique…exitu notabili…lectionis voluptate:** C. offers a summary of the features that Lucceius' 'monograph' has to possess. It should not be chronologically oriented (*annalium mediocriter*: §2n *a perpetuis...historiis...*; §6n *...perpetuam rerum...secernas*), in order to privilege a much more variegated narrative (*variique casus...*: §4n *multam...varietatem*; *...varietates...vicissitudines*; §6n *...varios...multasque <mut>ationes*), that should delight the reader (*admirationem...voluptate*: §4n *voluptatis*; *delectationem lectoris*; §5n *...misericordia...iucunda...*). A multi-faced narrative on C.'s career and personal life is also in operation in *Fam.* 5: §4n *voluptas*. *Annalium...fastorum*: a comparison is made between the annalistic genre and the *fasti*, from which the *annales* originated: Salamon 2009, 7 n.24.

6 Summary of §§1–5: language of rhetoric and emphatisation of the features the 'monograph' should (or should not) have. Lucceius' 'monograph' should be separated (*secernas*: §2n *separaverunt...seiungeres*) from the continuous history (*perpetuam...historiam*: §2n *perpetuis...historiis*) that Lucceius was already writing (§2n *...Italici belli...civilis historiam...*). It should also embellish (*ornari*: §2n *ornatiora...ornes*; §3n *ornanda...ornes*) and emphasise the variety of episodes it contains (*varios actus...multasque <mut>ationes...*: §4n *multam...varietatem*; *varietas...vicissitudines*; §5n *...viri...variique casus...*). *...quasi fabulam...actos.* **...fabulam...varios actus...<mut>ationes...:** in the reading of this passage, I follow Puccioni 1981, 38–43, who proposes to reinstate *actiones* (**Ω**) instead of the emendation *<mut>ationes*, proposed by Sh.-B. *ad loc.*, on the basis of Madvig's *mutationesque.* According to Puccioni, editors preferred *<mut>ationes* (instead of *actiones*) because of *actus*, that, translated as 'various acts', was believed to be a reference to theatre and to Aristotle's *Poetics*; *actiones* (referring to general 'activities': *OLD* 1) did not hold a similar 'theatrical' meaning. However, as Puccioni rightly points out, *actus* (in this case) refers to the actions

C. has done (for the state: the Catilinarian conspiracy: §2n *civilem coniurationem*) and the hardships he has endured (the exile); this creates no impediment to the printing of *actiones*—read as a reference to C.'s performance of decorous actions, as already found (with this meaning) in *Off*. 1.103: *ut enim pueris non omnem ludendi licentiam damus, sed eam, quae ab honestatis actionibus...* . Freeing C. from the 'spectre' of Aristotle's *Poetics* also involves fully grasping the concept of *fabula* and directing it towards the right orientation: Greek 'tragic histories' in Hellenistic historiography (that C. has been setting as example for his 'monograph' from the beginning: §2n *Callisthenes...Polybius*). *Fabula* should not be interpreted as 'drama' as Sh.-B. *ad loc*. translates it, but rather as 'a quasi-fabulous narrative' where *quasi* emphasises once again (as discussed in the introduction to §4) the genre that inspires this 'monograph'. **...adsentatiuncula...aucupari tuam gratiam...celebrarique velle...laudent adsentatores...:** common strategies of redressive (*non vereor ne...adsentatiuncula*; *aucupari*) and affiliative (*tuam gratiam*: a cornerstone of Roman *amicitia*: 5.1.1, 5.2.1, 5.4.1, 5.5.2, 5.11.1) politeness—designed to reduce Lucceius' possible irritation that might derive from C.'s request. C.'s effort to temper the offense is also evident both in the decision to postpone the main clause and place it at the sentence's conclusion, and in the utilisation of diminutives (*adsentatiuncula*). The emphasis of the passage is on C.'s deliberate attempt to distance himself from the potential accusation of *adsentatio* ('sycophancy/flattery': used two times) and *invidia* ('envy'). C. refers to *invidia* in 5.8.2n *laude aliena dolentium* and in 5.9.1n *obtrectationes...invidias*; but this is the first (and only) reference to *adsentatio* in the book. *Adsentatiunculos* is a Plautine coinage—used for the first time by the parasite Gelasimus in *Stich*. 226–228 (*uel unctiones Graecas sudatorias*/ *uendo uel alias malacas, crapularias*;/ *cauillationes, assentatiunculas*,/ *ac periuratiunculas parasiticas*). Its negative connotation is preserved in *Amic*. 89, where *adsentatio* is 'handmaid of vice [and should] be far removed, as it is unworthy not only of a friend but even of a free man' (the concept is similarly expressed in *Clu*. 36; *Rep*. 4.7. frg.3; *Amic*. 91: Hellegouarc'h 1963, 214). Flattery is clearly what C. aims to achieve here, as the concluding §6n *ingeni gloriam consequatur* and the laudatory examples in §7 demonstrate. **neque...demens...sempiternae gloria...commendari...commendando...gloria consequatur:** C. makes sure to respect the Roman standard etiquette of *amicitia* when asking a favour (*neque...demens*: §6n *non...adsentatiuncula*; *non...invidios*: similar to 5.8.2n *sed…pestes hominum*; 5.8.3n *...non...repentina...voluntate*; *...suspicione violata*). *Demens* is Ciceronian language (MacKendrick 1995, *index*) employed to describe his enemies' insanity—especially of the Catilinarians (Dyck on *Catil*. 3.11; 22; 4.22; *Dom*. 144), Clodius (*Dom*. 3 [twice]; 48; 76; 106; 140) and Gabinius and Piso (*Dom*. 2). It is not the first time C. employs a similar language in reference to his own actions: 5.12.1n *audacius*; §3n *largior*. On *commendare* as a conventionalised phrase of recommendation: §1n *res nostras…commendari*.

That the focus of the letter lies in the plea for everlasting glory (§1n *immortalitatis*), achieved through Lucceius' commendation of C.'s accomplishments, is evident from the repetition of the word *gloria* (in §§6n–7n it is found two times in three lines; on C.'s idea of *gloria*: Mazzoli 2004, 56–81). *sempiternae gloriae* is a common *iunctura* in C.'s letters (*Att.* 14.11.1) and other works (*Sest.* 47; 143; *Vat.* 8; *Balb.* 16; *Pis.* 63; *Mil.* 63; *Phil.* 14.31), especially after the Catilinarian conspiracy (the variant *sempiterna laus* is also attested in works after the conspiracy and return from exile: 2.7.1; *Att.* 13.28.2). C. is not the sole recipient of such praise; Lucceius' glory will 'follow as a necessary consequence' (*consequatur*) of his literary abilities (and the narrated topic): similar to §7n *suppeditatum*. The idea that being praised by someone already celebrated will increase one's glory is found already in 5.7.2n *Africanus...Laelium...* However, in C.'s letter to Pompey, it is C. who will hold Lucceius' position here, as he is the one who will benefit the most from Pompey's praise (being a much more important man). The idea is also emphasised in §7n *Alexander...Apelle...Lysippo...gloriae*; *...Xenophontis...superavit*.

7 carries forward the narrative of §6: C. compares himself and Lucceius to renowned historical figures with a eulogistic intent. Just as Alexander, Agesilaus of Sparta, Timoleontes, Themistocles, and Achilles achieved fame through depictions of their achievements in paintings, sculptures, and narratives, and their artists and narrators received recognition in return, C. and Lucceius will likewise earn mutual renown. Similar to *de Orat.* 2.341, where C. focuses on laudatory narratives of also Themistocles, Agesilaus, and Alexander included in Greek books. **...Alexander...Apelle...Lysippo...gloriae:** the idea that Alexander himself made a personal request to Apelles and Lysippus, to immortalise his achievements, establishes a significant and rather convenient precedent for C., who approached Lucceius with a similar request. Alexander (like C.: §6n *invidious...laudent adsentatores*) is said not to desire to curry Apelles and Lysippus' favour; he rather believed that their artistic talent combined with his own endeavours would bring glory to them all (similar to *Arch.* 24; on *gloria*: §6n *sempiternae gloria*...). As C. is perhaps the earliest Latin source (Sh-B. *ad loc.*) to make mention of this event (recalled by Hor. *Ep.* 2.1.239, Plin. *Nat.* 7.125 and Plu. *Mor.* 335b; on this and the biographies of the painter Apelles and the sculptor Lysippus: Nisbet–Rudd on 2.1.239), it is likely that he strategically highlights Alexander's personal involvement in the request (or possibly even fabricates it, as he does with Themistocles' return: §5n *Themistocli fuga redituque*) to strengthen his own appeal to Lucceius. **...simulacra ignotis nota...nulla...nihilo...obscuriores clari...:** set of oxymorons (*ignotis nota*; *obscuriores clari*) and alliterations that add emphasis to the passage. C. lays the groundwork in case Lucceius refuses his request (as also in §8). He acknowledges that while artistic depictions of prominent individuals

(*artifices corporis simulacra*) enable them to be known even by those who were previously unfamiliar with their activity (*ignotis nota*), the absence of artwork documenting one's endeavours (*nulla* [*simulacra*]) does not diminish the significance of these figures (*nihilo...obscuriores clari viri*). It is their actions and achievements that will ultimately earn them fame. **...Agesilaus...Xenophontis libellus...:** the case of the Spartan king Agesilaus (c. 444–360) serves as a prime example supporting C.'s earlier assertion (C. mentions the Spartan king also in *de Orat*. 2.341, where he is among those who had their endeavours praised in narratives; similar to *Fin.* 2.116). Agesilaus might not initially appear as a suitable example supporting C.'s request to be remembered through art; he is remembered for his lack of desire (*neque...neque...*) to be immortalised through art: e.g. in X. *Ages*. 11.7, Plu. *Ages*. 2 (on Xenophon and Plutarch's depictions of Agesilaus: Hamilton 1994, 205–212). In Nep. *Ages*. 7.3–4 and 8.1, Agesilaus is also remembered for the austerity and frugality of his house. However, C.'s reference here becomes crucial when one considers that: 1) it is a strategy of redressive politeness: by exemplifying a king uninterested in having his deeds narrated, C. downplays the significance of his previous statements (§6n *sempiternae gloriae...gloriam*). 2) It reconnects with what C. says above (§7n ...*simulacra ignotis nota...nulla...nihilo...obscuriores clari...*): Agesilaus will be remembered nevertheless for the importance of his deeds (probably in Asia Minor and in the Corinthian war: *NP* s.v. Agesilaus [2]). This is also echoed in Plu. *Mor*. 191d (12) τὰς εἰκόνας οὕτω προσαγορεύων· 'εἰ γάρ τι καλὸν ἔργον πεποίηκα, τοῦτό μου μνημεῖόν ἐστιν· εἰ δὲ μηδέν, οὐδ' οἱ πάντες ἀνδριάντες. 3) C. does not seem particularly interested in Agesilaus as a figure but rather in the embellished narrative presented by Xenophon in his 'monograph' *Agesilaos* (on which, Roscalla 2018, 20–58; C. mentions this work also in *QFr*. 1.2.7 and *de Orat*. 3.139). Xenophon's *Agesilaos* is also a model of 'length' 'monograph': *libellus* (in this case one 'book' of 11 chapters: Dillery 2016, 202) recalls C.'s guidelines on his 'monograph' in §4n *modicum...corpus. † ille perhibendus* †, '[neither in smaller degree has] the famous [Agesilaus of Sparta] to be remembered...', may be corrupt (Sh.-B. *ad loc.*). The use of *ille*, and its position after the name to which it refers, appears intentional. The entire phrase (*nec minus est...Agesilaus ille...*) recalls C.'s presentation of Alexander a few lines above (*neque enim Alexander ille...*; similar to ...*Hector ille...Naevianus*); the repeated *ille* has a celebratory intention, as C. is providing notable examples (to which C. is comparing himself) to encourage Lucceius to comply with his request. However, it is not impossible that the similarity between the two passages has led the scribe to a homeoteleuton. However, there is no apparent reason for specifying that Agesilaus is 'exactly that' of Sparta, since there are no other (extant) well-known Agesilaus figures from a non-Spartan background (differently from, for e.g., Hector and the various literary sources that refer to him: see below: ...*Hector ille...Naevianus*). **...memoriae...tua scripta...Timoleonti a Timaeo...ab Herodoto Themistocli...Alexander ab**

Homero Achilli...Hector...Naevianus...: further praise of Lucceius' literary (§1n *genus...scriptorum tuorum*) and political abilities. *ingenium...suppeditatum...tuum*: C. recalls the idea that even renowned individuals can gain glory by recounting the accomplishments of important men (cf. the introduction to §7). Nonetheless C. (more explicitly here than in §6n *gloriae...ingeni gloriam*) affirms that Lucceius' literary ability 'comes up as a support' (*OLD* s.v. *suppedito* 1a) to C.'s own significant achievements. Consequently, Lucceius' ability and glory are subordinate to those of C. (differently from 5.13–15, where Lucceius scolds C.: on this, the introduction to the narrative proposed by 5.12). ...*Timoleonti a Timaeo*: Timoleon (c. 411–337), general and ruler of Sicily, who gave rise to the revival of Greek Sicily, freeing it from the tyrannies and the influence of Carthage (*NP* s.v. Timoleon). Timaeus, writer of a history of Sicily (probably in the style of the 'tragic history' trend in Hellenistic historiography: Miano 2012, 365–78), had portrayed Timoleon's endeavours as C. wanted Lucceius to recount his own: by embellishing the narrative (§6n *ornari*) and placing the focus on each episode/character (to the point that C. compares it to a 'monograph': §2n *Callisthenes...Polybius*...). ...*ab Herodoto Themistocli*: like Timaeus, Herodotus constitutes a further example of the characteristics that Lucceius' narrative should have (on Themistocles: §5n *Themistocli*); he is a perfect example of how to spur the readers' emotions with his embellishment of the events narrated: on which, Blösel 2001, 179–197. This is the only Ciceronian reference, in a letter, to Herodotus; similarly in his speeches, where references to Herodotus are made only in (*Verr.* 2.2.128 [four times]; 130). However, different references to Herodotus are found in C.'s other prose work: *de Orat.* 2.55; *Orat.* 39; 186; 219; *Leg.* 1.5; *Fin.* 1.113; *Div.* 1.121; 2.116; *Off.* 2.41. ...*auctoritas...viri...in rei publicae*...: C. is referring to Lucceius' activity against Catiline. In 64 Lucceius had (unsuccessfully) accused Catiline of murder (Lewis on Ascon. *Tog.* 91–92C) and, in 63, he seems to have encouraged C. to act against the Catilinarians (5.13.4n *nostrae rerumque earum quas te in primis auctore gessimus*). ...*praeconium...clari...magni*...: further praise of Lucceius, here depicted as C.'s herald (*OLD* s.v. *praeconium* 1c; again in §8n [twice]) and emphatically compared to Homer. C.'s self-praise is not long in coming; here he says he wants this 'monograph' to make his deeds eternal like Homer did with those of Achilles (Achilles is again employed as *exemplum* in: 10.13.2; *de Orat.* 3.57; *Rep.* 1.30; *Tusc.* 1.105; 3.18; 4.52; *N.D.* 2.166; 3.45; *Div.* 1.65; 2.82). The anecdote included in this passage is found again in *Arch.* 24, but also in Arr. *An.* 1.12 and Plu. *Alex.* 15. On *testimonium*, §1n *auctoritate testimoni*. **...Hector...Naevianus...:** the idea that receiving praise from someone, who is already esteemed, enhances one's glory has already been expressed in §6n *gloriae...gloriam*...; here it finds validation in a passage from Naevius' *Hector* (*trag.*17: *laetus sum laudari me abs te, pater, a laudato viro*). C. employs the quotation again in 15.6.1 (a letter addressed to M. Porc. Cato to thank

him for the help with the *supplicatio*) and in *Tusc*. 4.67.4. On the employment of literary quotations from poetry in C.: Čulík-Baird 2022, esp. 219.

8 For the first time, C. gives more explicit consideration to the idea (only hinted at §2n *quid si illa...?*) that Lucceius might not fulfil his request (although he keeps emphasising the importance of his deeds—that is only one of the reasons why Lucceius should accept to write the 'monograph': the introductions to §§6–7). A similar situation occurs in 5.7.2n–3n, where C. requests from Pompey public praise for his activity against the Catilinarians (on Catiline and Clodius as two of the main threads of the book's narrative: cf. the general introduction). **...non impetro...impedierit...non impetrare...:** standard language for requesting a favour (*me rogantem abs te*: §3n *te…rogo ut*), emphasised by the repetition of *non impetrare* (that frames the first part of the sentence: similar below with the repetition of *reprehendunt*) and of *imp–*. Refusing a request to an *amicus* was a tricky business (Hall 2009, 111), that might damage one's public face (e.g. C.'s decision to help Antonius in 5.5, despite Antonius' disrespectful behaviour). Rejecting a request from a friend, who had already provided assistance, was an even more grievous offense (in 56, C. defended Lucceius from Clodius' accusations of being involved in the assassination of king Ptolemy Auletes' ambassador Dio: cf. the introduction to the letter). However, if there was a personal reason for declining/delaying fulfilling a request (e.g. being busy with other tasks, as C. also points out at §2n *occupatio tua*), the refusal might be more acceptable (similar to 9.8.1 *sed cum tu tardius faceres, id est, ut ego interpretor, diligentius*: Hall 1998, 318). By anticipating it, C. implicitly says to Lucceius that this might be the only reason for him to accept a refusal. **...reprehendunt...reprehendendum...reprehendant...:** C. contemplates the criticisms (and let Lucceius see it as well with the repetition of *reprehendo*: similar above the repetition of *non impetro*) he may face should he opt to personally recount his own actions (on which, Tatum 2011, 162). However, C. appears to prioritise trustworthiness and reliability only when he is the one at risk of criticism (*minor...minor*). When he asks Lucceius to embellish and manipulate the truth in his storytelling (§3n *...leges historiae neglegas...*), C. does not seem concerned about Lucceius' credibility and authority being undermined. C. already acknowledged the possibility of being criticised for narrating his own deeds: *Att.* 1.19.10: *Hic tu cave dicas:* «τίς πατέρ' αἰνήσει»; *si est enim apud homines quidquam, quod potius sit, laudetur, nos vituperemur, qui non potius alia laudemus; quamquam non* ἐγκωμιαστικὰ *sunt haec sed* ἱστορικά*, quae scribimus*. On critiques of C.'s praise of his consulate: Gibson 2003, 240 n.8. *scribam ipse de me*: the 'autobiography' to which C. refers here is not preferred to the 'heterobiography' (Diegel 2021, especially 186; on the idea that it is better to be praised by someone who has already achieved great works: the introductions to §§6–7), whose model should be followed by Lucceius in the writing of his 'monograph' (on which, the

introduction to the letter). As for the works on his deeds written during this period: cf. the introduction to the letter. C. also wove events from his public career into his political and philosophical treatises (in *Rep*. and *Leg*.: Deligiannis 2018, 149–151; in *Brut*.: Magallón García 2016, 361–369; in his letters of 58–56: Lehmann 2014, 85–98; cf. also Steel 2012, 251–266). Significantly, in his dialogues, C. seems to have made sure that narrative and praise of his deeds were expressed by other characters (Marincola 1997, 178 n.13). ...*exemplo...clarorum virorum*: reference to famous examples of Roman 'autobiographies' (from the 2nd century B.C.E.), of which remain fragments. M. Aem. Scaurus, P. Rutil. Rufus, Q. Lutat. Catulus and Sulla are remembered for their *commentarii*; C. Graccus seems to have also written an 'autobiography' (to which, C. probably alludes in *Div.* 1.36). On these *commentarii*, Candau 2011, 124–155 and Tatum 2011, 161–184, who also offers an analysis of Varro's 'autobiography'. On Sulla's: Flower 2015, 208–223; Smith 2009, 65–85; Thein 2009, 87–109; Wiseman 2009, 111–123. ...*in hoc genere vitia*...: that 'autobiographies' led to no credibility, and that 'heterobiographies' (Diegel 2021, 97–110) were a better way to be praised (Marincola 1997, 178 n.14 and 196 n.100), is an idea mentioned again by C. in *Brut.*; there C. underlines that Scaurus and Catulus' 'autobiographies' (for which, above) had poor literary fortune compared to the success that 'heterobiographies' (like Xenophon's Cyropedia; on Xenophon as a model: §7n *Agesilaus...libellus*) had: *Brut.* 112 *de vita ipsius* [*Scauri*] *acta sane utiles, quos nemo legit; at Cyri vitam et disciplinam legunt, praeclaram illam quidem, sed neque tam nostris rebus aptam nec tamen Scauri laudibus* (cf. also 132). This thought contradicts Tac. *Agr*.1.3, where the author says that Scaurus (and Rufus: for which above) neither lost their credibility nor attracted censure for writing their own lives (...*ac plerique suam ipsi vitam narrare fiduciam potius morum quam adrogantiam arbitrati sunt, nec id Rutilio et Scauro citra fidem aut obtrectationi fuit*: Cornell 2009, 15). On this, also Pelling 2009, 46–58, who explores how Plutarch and his audience interpreted Augustus' self-praise. ...*verecundius...laudandum...praetereant...reprehendendum*: negative aspects one should consider when writing one's own 'autobiography': 1) one should avoid excessive self-praise (even if it is, as C. emphasises, well-deserved) to maintain a sense of modesty, because it is *verecundia* that brings *laus* (*Part*. 79). C. seems to agree with Sulla, who at the start of his own 'autobiography' (for which, §8n ...*exemplo...clarorum virorum*) wrote that Lucullus 'would be better able to organise and set out history': see Thein 2009, 89) The narrative might occasion scepticism, as the author is perceived to potentially withhold elements of criticism (*praetereant...reprehendendum...*), leading to questions about his reliability. However, neither Rutilius nor Scaurus (authors of autobiographies: §8n ...*exemplo...clarorum virorum*) seem to have been accused of being untrustworthy (Tac. *Agr*. 1.1–4). **...praecones...praeconem...praedicent:** by mentioning the role of the *praecones* (symbols of competition that alludes to the competitiveness of aristocratic public life, the public of Lucceius'

'monograph'), C. offers Lucceius an example that supports his earlier statements (§8n *...verecundius...laudandum...praetereant...reprehendendum*). *Praecones* exhibit a greater sense of decency (*veracundia*) in contrast to authors who choose to write autobiographies (§8n *scribam ipse de me*); the heralds, unlike those who recount their own stories, allow others to commend their achievements (*ne sua voce se ipsi...praedicent*). *Praeco* (employed twice here with the meaning of 'announcer' of athletic contests) recalls §7n *praeconium* which, in contrast to §8n, was employed with the purpose of praising Lucceius by comparing him to Homer (on the employment of similar rhetorical strategies: 5.13.3n *...gladiatorii...similitudinesque*).

9 Concluding remarks that recall the opening of the letter (C. acknowledges its circular structure: *...de qua initio scripsi*). **Haec...vitare...vitabimus...rogamus:** C.'s worries regarding the composition of his own 'monograph' (§8n *hoc genere vitia*) can be readily resolved if Lucceius fulfils his request (as he had promised: *cum mihi saepe ostenderis te*). *...si recipis causam nostram*: language of *amicitia* here employed to request Lucceius' help. C. assumes the position of a client to Lucceius (similar to Vatinius in 5.9.1n *in periculo recepisti* and 5.10a.1n *huius modi causas recipitis*?), humbly seeking assistance (bolstered by *ut facias rogamus*: similar found in §3n *te…rogo ut* and §8n *me rogantem abs te*); he, however, is fully aware of his superior status and Lucceius' subordinate role (§7n *ingenium mihi...suppeditatum...tuum*)—a condition that appears to invert after the end of this letter (cf. the introduction to the narrative proposed by 5.12). **Ac ne forte...multis verbis petamus...:** strategy of redressive politeness: C. should not face criticism for consistently requesting (*tanto opere...multis verbis petamus*) the 'monograph' from Lucceius, since his behaviour is simply a response to Lucceius' promise to complete the task (*mihi saepe ostenderis*, already mentioned in §1n; this is a promise from which Lucceius should not back down: §8n *...non impetrare*). The incipitary *ac ne* serves to provide an explanation for something mentioned earlier, particularly to clarify the reason behind a request in a polite and formal letter (similar to the letter to Pompey: 5.7.3n). *...consilia...eventus...*: on the theme of the narrative: §4n *a principio...coniurationis...reditum...* **...cupiditas incendit...festinationis...gloriola...perfruamur:** C.'s desire to have his deeds narrated (*...cupiditas incendit*: §1n *ardeo cupiditate...incendit ut cuperem*) sooner than later (§1n *festinationi meae*; *celerrime*), and the hope to be remembered while still alive (§1n *...immortalitatis...vivi perfruamur*), are key themes in the letter. *gloriola*: C. employs the diminutive of *gloria* (employed twice in §6n and one in §7n) as a strategy of redressive politeness to mitigate the sense of bragging (similar to §10n *...si tibi non est molestum*: Hall 1998, 317). It is employed again only in 7.5.3 *ornes gloriolae insignibus*, a letter of recommendation for C. Trebatius addressed to Caesar.

10 Further concluding remarks that include strategies of redressive and affiliative politeness. **...si tibi non est molestum:** strategy of redressive politeness: 5.3.2n *ne vobis multitudine litterarum molestior essem*. C. wishes to avoid directly bothering Lucceius, which is why he urges Atticus to reach out to him instead (*Att.* 4.6.3 *...ut adproperet adhorteris...*). **si...commentarios...diliges.** *si...suscipis causam*: variation of §9n *si recipis causam nostram*. Should Lucceius maintain an interest in recounting C.'s accomplishments, C. will gladly share his *commentarii* 'notes' (*OLD* 4; sim in 8.2.2)—which in *Att*. 4.11.2 are a 'book' (*librum dabis*)—with him. *...coram tecum loquar*: invitation to discuss the matter face-to-face (similar to 6.8.3): he seems to be able now to express his request to Lucceius in person (differently from the letter's *incipit*: §1n *epistulae...non erubescit*). C. is aware that the chances of Lucceius rejecting his request decrease significantly if he personally approaches him. *...perpolies*: 'to put the finishing touches to' (*OLD* 2b) the work Lucceius had already started on the social and civil wars (§2n *Italici belli...civilis historiam*). For the use of *nos diligere* in formal letters, Hall 2009, *appendix*, n.8 (c).

5.13–18: letters of consolation

Letters 5.13–18 form a distinct thematic cluster, clearly set apart from the other thematic groupings in the book (for which, the general introduction). These were exchanged over a period of approximately eleven years (56–45) with four different correspondents: L. Lucceius (5.13–15), T. Titius (5.16), P. Sittius (5.17) and T. Fadius (5.18). The purpose was twofold: to respond to received consolations (5.13, 5.15) and to offer words of comfort (5.14, 16–18) in three specific contexts: the decline of the republic (5.13), the bereavement for the loss of children (5.14–16), and the challenges faced in exile (5.17–18).

A total of seventeen letters of consolation are included in the Ciceronian corpus of letters, constituting less than the 2% of the total 941 preserved letters. Fourteen of those have been included in the *ad Familiares*, of which six are found in Book 5 (5.13–18). The remaining are distributed as follows: four in Book 4 (4.3, 4.5–6, 4.13) and the remaining four in Book 6 (6.1–4). Only two letters of consolation seem to have been included in the *ad Atticum*: 12.10 (on the loss of a member of Atticus' family) and 12.14 (C.'s probable reply to Atticus' lost letter of consolation on Tullia's death). One extant consolatory letter has been included in the *ad Brutum*: 1.9 (on the death of Brutus' wife); Brutus seems to have written a (now lost) letter to C. on Tullia's death (as stated in *Att.* 12.13) as well. This imbalance speaks to the political and public interests of the ancient editor(s); even so, the total number of letters of consolation is small in the context of the collection as a whole.

Fifteen of the seventeen extant consolatory letters were written in the 40s: six were written in 46 (4.3, 4.13, 5.13, 5.16, 6.1, *Att.* 12.10), eight at the time of Tullia's death in 45 (4.5–6, 5.14–15, 6.2–4; *Att.* 12.14) and one in 43 (*ad Brut.* 1.9). The remaining two consolatory letters were written in the 50s: 5.17–18. Only two of the seventeen were written by someone other than C.: 4.5 by S. Sulp. Rufus and 5.14 by L. Lucceius. The seventeen extant consolatory letters focus largely on four themes: consolation for the loss of the republic (4.3, 5.13); consolation upon the addressee's exile (4.13, 5.17–18, 6.1–4); consolation upon death of family members (*Att.*12.10, *ad Brut*. 1.9); consolation upon loss of children (Tullia: 4.5–6, 5.14–15, *Att.* 12.14; others: 5.16).

The letters of consolation in Book 5 exhibit shared linguistic characteristics, suggesting the presence of a standardised approach for composing and responding to correspondences on this topic (since consolation was a duty of *amicitia*: 5.16.6n ...*officio...amicissimi*; on its competitive environment: Wilcox 2005a, 237–255). However, this standardisation is subject to variation based on factors like personal style, proximity to the recipient, and their socio-political standing (of which, an example is in 5.14, Lucceius' consolatory letter to C.).

An examination of 5.16–18 (all letters written by C.) reveals that C. employs a set of standard consolatory *topoi* (for which, Kotsifu 2012, esp. 394–396)—but tailored to fit the particular situation (e.g. the loss of a child or exile) and recipient.

In particular:

1. the consoler empathises with the recipient, asserting that their pain affects the writer emotionally (5.14.2n *doleo...doles...*; 5.16.1n ...*consolandum...consolatione*; 5.17.1n ...*tuis iniustissimis...incommodis*; 5.18.1n *consolari...consolandus...incommodum*);
2. the addressee is encouraged to reflect on their own mortality (5.16.2n *homines nos...esse*; 5.17.3n ...*hominem te...meminisses*; 5.18.1n...*condicione...homines...*);
3. the addressee is asked to recognise that they are vulnerable to the unpredictable turns of fate (5.16.2n ...*telis Fortunae...*; 5.17.3n ...*Fortunae resisters...*; 5.18.1n ...*fortuna abstulit*);
4. the addressee is asked to recognise that they are not the only ones subjected to the capriciousness of Fortune (5.16.2n ...*eventisque aliorum memoria...nihil accidisse novi nobis*; 5.17.3n ...*communem incertumque casum*; 5.18.1n ...*multis fortissimos...viris...*);
5. the addressee is urged to contemplate the socio-political climate in Rome and to find potential solace in the idea that being distant from it could be advantageous (5.16.3n

...status ipse nostrae civitatis...; 5.17.3n *re publica...ulla delectet*; 5.18.1n *...impendere...re publica discesserit*).[41]

C.'s responses to consolatory letters in 5.13 and 15 also reveal common strategies, despite being written for two distinctly different occasions: one concerning the fall of the republic, and the other, the passing of his daughter Tullia.

In particular:

1. each letter begins by expressing gratitude to the addressee for their *amicitia*,[42] evident in their decision to write a letter of consolation (5.13.1n *consolatio litterarum tuarum...gratissima est...*; 5.15.1n *amor tuus...litteris...gratus...*);
2. the writer responds to consolatory themes presented in the addressee's letter: the extent to which they heeded (5.13.3n *ad consolandum...collegisti...*; §4n *domestica...publica...tu...praecipis*; *desperatione fortes...tu...praecipis*; §5n *...mones...adiuvantur...*) or disregarded the consolatory advice (5.15.2n *...remedia...nulla sunt...amicosne...*?; §3n *litterae...*?).

The inclusion of six consolatory letters in Book 5, the highest number found in any Ciceronian book unit, as well as the incorporation of the only two extant consolatory letters from the 50s, was not a random decision but a deliberate editorial choice. The ancient editor(s) had a clear intention to assemble a distinct set of letters with sepulchral themes to reinforce the narrative concerning C.'s decline in power and prestige, that they wanted to emerge from the last part of the book (cf. the general introduction).

These chosen letters exhibit diverse links, whether evident or subtle, including their shared genre and shared allusions to facts and figures associated with Catiline and Clodius (significant characters in the book's storyline: see general introduction), as well as references to children, either lost (as in 5.14–16) or separated from their fathers by the exile of the latter (5.17–18). Furthermore, both 5.13 and 5.18 play pivotal roles, with 5.13 serving as a conclusion to the preceding set of letters (5.1–11) and 5.18 serving as the opening of the following block of letters (5.19–21)

13

[41] Differently from 5.14, where C. is repeatedly invited to return to Rome.

[42] Common in all letters where the writer has received a favour from the recipient, or to strengthen their relationship with someone powerful. An e.g. of this in the book is C.'s 5.11.1n *grata tibi mea esse officia...*, probably in reply to P. Vatinius' thanksgiving for C.'s services.

C.'s reply to a (lost) letter of consolation, on the current state of affairs in the republic, written by Lucceius to C. probably in late 46.

At the time of this letter, the historiographer Lucceius (for which, introduction to 5.12) was not in Rome. He had probably received Caesar's pardon, for his support of Pompey at Pharsalus, and might have been en route to Rome (5.14 is testimony to Lucceius' presence in Rome: §1n *Te...Romae...*).

The letter is C.'s reply to Lucceius' lost (§2n *proximis litteris*; *tuis litteris*) letter of consolation (§1n *consolatio litterarum tuarum*) on the decline of the republic following the events at Pharsalus and Pompey's death. T.P. *ad loc*. dated it to 45, on the assumption that it refers to Tullia's death (§4n *...domestica...*). Sh.-B. *ad loc.* dated it earlier to 46, on the basis of the differences in tones: these are much darker in 5.15 (C.'s actual reply to Lucceius' letter on Tullia's death) than in 5.13. Differently from 5.15 (§1n *remedia...nulla sunt*), consolation in 5.13 and in 4.3 (the other extant letter of consolation for the loss of the republic, dated late 46 and written by C. to S. Sulp. Rufus) can still potentially have a positive effect on C. and his addressees: 5.13.3n *ad consolandum...illa*; 4.3.1 *...consolantur maximeque...meorum* (cf. also 4.3.2).

5.13 belongs to a set of letters (5.13–15: cf. the introductory note above)—selected from a much wider correspondence between C. and Lucceius—that the ancient editor(s) decided to include in this book. However, 5.13 deals in notably different tones and topics from those featured in 5.12: it introduces the motive of consolation that is central in the following letters exchanged with Lucceius (5.14–15) but also with other addressees (5.16–18).

The deliberate arrangement of 5.13, after the emblematic 5.12, marks the start of a section in Book 5 that purposefully presents a more distressed and overwhelmed image of C. The sudden and deliberate shift in tone, subject matter, and portrayal of C., shown starting from 5.13, contrasts with the narrative established in the previous letters. The intention is also evident in the timeframe of 5.13's composition, approximately 9 years after 5.12 (written in c. 55), directly immersing the reader in the years of the civil war (to which 5.9–11 also belong—although, since they do not (fully) partake in this new sombre tone, they have been assigned to the first part of the book: see the general introduction).

C.'s language undergoes dramatic change as the reader passes from 5.12 to 5.13. In 5.12, behind ingratiating remarks (for e.g. §1n *scriptorum tuorum...*), Lucceius' art is subordinated to C.'s political achievements (§7n *ingenium...suppeditatum...tuum*). In 5.13, by contrast, Lucceius becomes C.'s 'instructor in (political) fortitude' (§2n *te opitulari...*; §3n *praeceptorem fortitudinis*; 4n *forties...tu...praecipis*), who also is a wiser sage (§2n *...te...res humanas contemnentem...*; §3n *firmitudinem gravitatemque animi tui*; *fortiore, te...*; §4n *te...aliqua spes consolatur*). Moreover,

while the repetition of different themes in 5.12 serves a purpose of providing fresh examples to support C.'s plea, in 5.13, C. appears to be repeating the same concepts without an apparent rationale, except to amplify here the bleakness of the era they find themselves in.

Philosophical teachings are also found in letters on political consolation to help the addressee to deal with an increasingly sense of political disappointment derived from the fall of the republican dream (§1n *praeclare...Fortunam...sapientiae...rationes*). The theme is recurrent in *Fam*. 4 (Gibson 2021, 105–146) and 6 (Grillo 2016, 407–408).

M. CICERO S. D. L. LUCCEIO Q.F. 'From M. Cicero to L. Lucceius, son of Quintus, greetings'. Formal and standard way of addressing Lucceius also found in 5.12 and 15. Lucceius in 5.14 prefers a more formal heading.

1 Ingratiating remarks: Lucceius is depicted as the Stoic wise man. **...gratissima...benevolentiam...prudentia...:** typical language of affiliative politeness; references to *gratia* are found already in 5.1.1n *pro reconciliata gratia...*, and to *benevolentia* already in 5.2.10n *benevolentia detraham*. C.'s goodwill to Lucceius is also found in 5.12.1n *tui...benevolentiae...*, where it is linked to Lucceius' *ingenium*; conversely, Lucceius is here remembered for his *prudentia* (similar to 5.16.5n *praecipere...prudentiaque,* where *prudentia* is employed to invite the addressee Titius to put the consolatory advice into practice). Lucceius' *prudentia* (Hellegouarc'h 1963, 256–257) might be related to philosophical advice offered to C. in his lost letter—whose main points are summarised by C. in the following lines (on *prudentia* as vocabulary of C.'s work on Stoic philosophy: Aubert-Baillot 2017, 121–136). The tones of Lucceius' lost letter might resemble those of 5.14 (cf. e.g. §2n *sollicitudines...prudentia...*). However, it is also possible that *prudentia* refers to Lucceius' political conduct (similar to 6.7.5, from A. Caecina to C.: *tu pro tua prudentia quibus rebus gaudeat, quibus capiatur Caesar, tenes*; on C.'s *prudentia* as 'foresight': Nelsestuen 2019, 384–386). Lucceius had wisely requested Caesar's pardon after Pompey's defeat at Pharsalus. **...te...res humanas contemnentem...contra Fortuna paratum...sapientiae...rationes:** key themes of the Stoic philosophy on reaching *ataraxia*; Lucceius is depicted as on the path to reach this state (§3n *firmitudinem gravitatemque animi tui*; *fortiore, te...*; 4n *te...aliqua spes consolatur*)—in contrast with C. and the disturbance he experiences (§2n *cogitatio...labefactata...convulsa*). This is presumably a Ciceronian strategy of affiliative politeness rather than necessarily the truth. C. uses the standard philosophical language of his philosophical works; for e.g. *res humanae contemnere* is found again in *Fin*. 5.73 and *Tusc*. 4.51. *contra Fortuna paratum armatumque*: A similar *iunctura* is found in *Tusc*. 5.19 *contra fortunam semper armatus*. Lucceius is a wiser man than C., as he does not allow

external events and Fortune to upset him. C. attempts to emulate Lucceius in this regard (§3n *...firmitudinem...animi tui...imitari...*); however, in C.'s 5.15 (which concludes the set of letters exchanged with Lucceius), he admits that he is incapable of not being deeply affected by an external event such as Tullia's death (and the republic's). *...sapientiae...*: 'wisdom as the study and goal of philosophers': Dyck on *Off.* 1.15a. *extrinsecus...rationes*: true freedom can only be achieved only if internal freedom is possessed: *Parad.* 33–41 (Leveghi 2016, 482 n.116) and *Tusc.* 3.37; 5.36.

2 Expansion of the themes of §1 and introduction of the theme of grieving for the republic, which will be further examined in §3. **...cogitatio...vi...tempestatum...calamitatum...labefactata...convulsa:** *tempesta* and *calamitas* belong to C.'s vocabulary used also to describe: the subversive events that led to the Catilinarian conspiracy, his exile, and that climate of sedition and discord that precedes and follows the civil war: MacKendrick 1995, *index*. Here C. asserts that these events have weakened (*OLD* s.v. *labefacto* 2a) and shaken violently (*OLD* s.v. *convello* 3) his ability to maintain internal stability in the face of external threats. The two verbs are found again together only in *Rab.Post.* 3, in reference to the duties of a good consul towards the republic (*...si est boni consulis, cum cuncta auxilia rei publicae labefactari convellique videat, ferre opem patriae, succurrere saluti...*). The theme of grieving for the republic is found also in §3n *vetabant me rei publicae penitus...*; *circumspice omnia membra rei publicae...*). It is also central in *Fam.* 4 (Gibson 2021, 105–146) and 6 (Grillo 2016, 407–408). **...te opitulari...:** from here on (§3n *praeceptorem fortitudinis*; §4n *forties...tu...praecipis*) Lucceius is depicted as the one who encourages C. to be a better Stoic. The ability to help someone (*opitulor* s.v. *OLD* 1) was extremely important for the political and social influence of the person offering it (on the culture of competitive consolation: Wilcox 2005a, 237–255). However, during and after the civil war, C. presents himself as lacking this power: 4.1.1, *nunc, quoniam nihil iam videmur opitulari posse rei publicae*; also in 4.13.3 and 12.30.4. The fact that Lucceius is the one offering his help to C. serves as further evidence of the ancient editor(s)' decision to create a narrative out of letters 13–21, demonstrating how C.'s socio-political power changed after letter 5.12; on this, see the introduction. **significandum...declarandum...litteris gratius:** standard language of affiliative politeness. On *gratia,* as a display of thanksgiving for a service obtained: §1n *gratissima est*.

3 ...ad consolandum...valent...firmitudinem...animi tui...imitari...: Lucceius has the power of consoling C., an ability that not everybody has: 4.13.4 *at ea quidem facultas vel tui vel alterius consolandi in te summa est, si umquam in ullo fuit.* C. can be still consoled (differently from 5.15.1: cf. §3n *tum rationes...vetabant me rei publicae penitus diffidere*), although accepting/offering

consolation when the republic is in this dreadful condition has become increasingly rare (e.g. 5.16.1n *Etsi unus ex omnibus minime sum ad te consolandum accommodatus...*; 4.3.2 *...quid me ista res consolatur in tantis tenebris et quasi parietinis rei publicae? est omnino vix consolabilis dolor*) and is often met with rejection (4.6.2 *unum manebat illud solacium quod ereptum est*; 4.8.1 *sin te tanta mala rei publicae frangunt, non ita abundo ingenio ut te consoler, cum ipse me non possim*); for more examples, Gibson 2021, 105–146 and esp. 134 n.88. *...collegisti...*: on the probable key topics of Lucceius' lost letter: §1n *...te...res humanas contemnentem...contra Fortuna paratum...sapientiae...rationes*. This finds confirmation in 5.16–18, where C. uses key themes of consolatory letters (the introduction to 5.13–18: above). *...firmitudinem gravitatemque animi...*: Lucceius' 'steadfastness and imperturbability of spirit' console C.; the *iunctura* is found only here in the entire corpus of letters. Differently from *gravitas* (one of the key values of the Roman aristocracy: 5.3.1n *leves* and 5.5.3n *gravitatem*), *firmitudo* is rare in C.'s works (*firmitas* is generally preferred to *firmitudo*: E.-M. s.v. *firmus*). It is found with *animus*, only in 6.6.13 (*tu cura ut cum firmitudine te animi tum etiam spe optima sustentes*) and *Att.* 10.1.1 (*magni aestimo tibi firmitudinem animi nostri...*). *Firmitas* and *gravitas* are two of the characteristics that the wise man should have: *Ac.* 2. 53, *sapiens...Quaerimus gravitatis, constantiae, firmitatis, sapientiae iudicium...* (similar to *Ac.* 2.66). Differently from 5.12, C. allows Lucceius to have the higher moral ground (§3n *fortiorem te*): he is wiser than C., who needs to imitate (*imitari*) Lucceius' aplomb (§1n *...te...res humanas contemnentem...contra Fortuna paratum...sapientiae...rationes*). Not to follow Lucceius' example would be a foul practice (*OLD* s.v. *turpis* 4), because virtuous behaviours should be imitated (cf. e.g. selected *Phil*. 14.17 *uti excellentium civium virtutem imitatione dignam*; also in *De orat.* 1.231). This is another sign of the intentional reversal of 5.12 (see also the introduction to 5.13): §2n *...te opitulari...* . *Turpis* belongs to C.'s language employed generally in reference to his enemies—especially Catiline and Clodius (MacKendrick 1995, *index*)—the two recurring figures within the book (cf. the general introduction). However, *turpis* here (as already in 5.12.1n *audacius* and §3n *largior*, where he requested from Lucceius an account on his career and efforts against Catiline and Clodius), refers to C.'s own actions. On *existimare* as the 'impression' that public figures want to give of themselves: 5.1.1n *existimaram*. **itaque...fortiorem me...spem...fortiorem te...speres...spe...:** two different approaches to *spes* and *fortitudo* (one of the four-fold Stoic passions, 'which champions the cause of right': Dyck on *Off.* 1.62). 1) C. surpasses Lucceius in bravery (again in §4n *forties...quam tu*) since C. harbours (almost: *tum rationes...vetabant me rei publicae penitus diffidere*; on the power of consolation, cf. §3n *ad consolandum*) no hope for the future of the republic. By eschewing hope (similar to §4n *desperatione fortes*), C. avoids being at the mercy of his emotions, thus drawing closer to a state of imperturbability (§1n...*te...res humanas contemnentem*...). However,

2) despite the challenging circumstances they both face, Lucceius remains braver than C. because he has still hope (an 'emotion of utmost significance that one should cultivate': *de Orat*. 2.206; similar to §4n *te...spes consolatur*) for the future of the republic (on *spes* as a future–directed feeling, Graver on *Tusc.* 4.80 *si spes est exspectatio boni*). Although hope could lead to suffering (e.g. Sen. *Ep.* 5.7 *Desines, inquit, timere, si sperare desieris*: on the theme Citti 2004, 35–64)—Lucceius, who is C.'s instructor of fortitude and a wise man (§1n *res humanas...contra Fortunam*...), can maintain hope without succumbing to the influence of his emotions. ...*gladiatorii...similitudinesque*...: examples are common Ciceronian rhetorical strategy: 5.12.8n *praecones ludorum*... . C. ought to follow the example of gladiators by promptly rising again after a fall: Leveghi 2016, 483 n.117. **...adfectum...deletum...exstinctumque...dolore...dolor:** Lucceius is invited to take a comprehensive look at the deteriorating bodies of the republic; none of them appear to be exempt from the degeneration that C. only alludes to in 5.12 (mostly evident in references to the urgency of having his deeds narrated sooner rather than later: §1n *festinationi meae*). C.'s use of a vocabulary that hints at violence and mutilation (*adficio*; *deleo*; on *exstinguo, frango, debilito*: MacKendrick 1995, *index*) reflects the actual trauma suffered by the Roman republic during and after the civil war (Walters 2020, 116–126). *dolore...dolor*: Lucceius' imperturbability (§1n *res humanas...contra Fortunam*...) makes him the right person to offer advice (*monita*/*praecepta*: similar to 10.3.4 a letter of 44) on how to overcome pain (*abicere dolor*: similar to *Att.* 11.21.1; *Tusc*. 3.66). On the difficulty of offering/accepting consolation in the aftermath of the civil war: §3n...*ad consolandum*.

4 Summary of the themes discussed in the preceding paragraphs: political *fortitudo* and *spes*, C.'s endeavours and Lucceius' wisdom. **Ergo...domestica...publica...fortius fortasse...fortes:** C. returns to the theme of political *fortitudo* and *spes* (§3n *itaque...fortiorem me...spem...fortiorem te...speres...spe*). The focus lies on Lucceius' advice (*tu...hortaris...praecipis*) offered to C., that originates from Stoic philosophy (on Lucceius as the Stoic wise man: §1n...*te...res humanas contemnentem*...). Lucceius seems to have urged C. to endure private and public problems—as per Chrysippus' teachings (*Tusc*. 4.53... *Chrysippus...fortitudo est, inquit, scientia rerum perferendarum vel adfectio animi in patiendo ac perferendo summae legi parens sine timore*). Similar S. Sulp. Rufus in 4.5, where, however, grief owed to the republic has not the same importance as the grief owed to individuals. C. is also advised to detach himself from tragic passions and to find courage even in despair (*desperatione fortes*)—where *desperatio* is Stoic terminology (Graver on *Tusc*. 4.19 *desperatio aegritudo sine ulla rerum exspectatione meliorum*). C.'s mention of 'private troubles' (*domestica feremus*) might refer to whatsoever problem he might have faced with his relatives. Scholars have linked C.'s expression to Tullia's death (e.g. T.-P. *ad loc.*); this potential connection

(similar 5.15.1n *vulneris*) may well be what attracted the ancient editor(s) to this letter, since the following 5.14–15 focus exactly on this theme. However, in its original context, the letter may well allude to C.'s private problems with Terentia and/or his brother Quintus and nephew Quintus Jr. (Sh.-B. *ad loc.*). *Domestica feremus* is too vague and lacks the pathos generally found in C.'s letters on Tullia's death (e.g. 5.15 and more extensively in Martelli 2016, 415–437). It is probable that C. is thinking about his divorce with Terentia (on their relationship, Gunderson 2007, 1–48) and/or the seesawing relationship with the Quintii (for a summary: Losito, forthcoming). **...iucundas recordationes...conscientiae...rerumque...praestitimus...postulatum:** sources of consolation in dark times can be found in the recollection of one's conduct and endeavours (4.3.2 *quid me ista res consolatur in tantis tenebris et quasi parietinis rei publicae*?*... sanctitatem et prudentiam et dignitatem tuam. haec tibi ad levandas molestias magna esse debent*); they are effective: §5n *commemoratione lenimur*. These recollections (*recordationes*) are agreeable (*iucundas*) due to the passing of time, which eliminates any cause for sorrow (as stated in 5.12.4n *doloris...recordatio delectationem*). The theme of the recollection of C.'s endeavours establishes a deliberate connection between 5.12 and 5.13. While in 5.12.4, the mention of his accomplishments supports C.'s desire for a biography about himself from Lucceius, in 5.13.4 they provide solace. In addition, C.'s reference to Lucceius' praise in 5.13 effectively concludes the narrative in 5.12 and C.'s wish for an account of his endeavours. Through the positioning of 5.13 after 5.12, the ancient editor(s) aimed to provide C. with what he did not receive directly from Lucceius in reality: an account of his endeavours—although of lesser significance and presented in a different format (an epistle) than originally requested; this is a deliberate symbol of the darker narrative the ancient editor(s) intended to construct starting from 5.13 (on the intentional organisation of Book 5, that voluntarily shows the parabola of C.'s life and career: cf. the general introduction). *Conscientia nostra* emphasises C.'s rectitude, also in reference to his endeavours against the Catilinarians (action supported by Lucceius: similar to §2n *tempestatum...calamitatum...* and below *praestitimus...patriae...*; cf. also 5.12.7n *...auctoritas...viri...rei publicae*)—generally remembered for their guilty consciences (*Catil.* 1.17; 2.13; 3.10; 11; 27).

5 The positive power of recollecting one's deeds and their usefulness in alleviating pain. **Ignosces...praedicanti...:** strategies of redressive politeness to defuse a face-threatening act: C.'s request for forgiveness for having talked boastfully about his endeavours (as the aristocratic etiquette required, 5.12.2n *impudenter*), although he acknowledges that it was not solely his fault; Lucceius had encouraged him to behave in such a manner (similar to 5.12.1n, where C.'s impatience is caused by the excellence of Lucceius' literary skills: *ignoscas...scriptorum tuorum*). **...commemoratione**

lenimur...adiuvantur...: C. intends to prioritise activities that alleviate the distress caused by negative events. These might include recollecting joyful memories (§3n *...iucundas recordationes*), as well as engaging in his literary and philosophical pursuits (Leveghi 2016, 484 n.120)—an activity that seems to offer some relief (5.15.3n *mihi perfugium...domesticis et forensibus...litterae*), although not so much after Tullia's death (5.15.3n *illae* [*litterae*] *excludere me a portu...*) **...tecumque...animorum...coniunctione...:** standard closing remarks aimed at emphasising their closeness (similar to 5.15.2n *...nostrae coniunctioni*]*s*). In contrast to the closing statement found in 5.12.10n (which highlights the unequal nature of C. and Lucceius' relationship), the closing statement in 5.13 depicts a discouraged C., who has suffered a decline in socio-political prominence: all topics of the ancient editor(s)' narrative for 5.13–21 (on which, the general introduction).

14

Lucceius' letter, written to check in on his friend C., a few months after Tullia's death.

5.14 is the only letter written by Lucceius that the ancient editor(s) decided to include in Book 5, extracting it alone from his wider correspondence with C. Relatively little space is thus given to Lucceius' own voice—by contrast with Caecilii Metelli and Vatinius, where the ancient editor(s) selected more than one letter from these addressees (5.1, 5.3, 5.9–10b).

Together 5.14 and 15 introduce a new theme: Tullia's death. If 5.13 deals with the metaphorical 'death' of the republic (§3n *rei publicae...fractum debilitatumve...*), Lucceius and C. now deal with the real death of a child (a theme that also links 5.14–15 to 5.16: for which, the introduction to 5.13–18). The two themes (death of republic, death of Tullia) are often found intertwined in the correspondence: 5.15.3n *domesticis et forensibus*; 4.5.2; 4–5; 4.6.2 (on Book 4: Gibson 2022, 105–146)

Lucceius (differently from S. Sulp. Rufus in 4.5) does not explicitly voice the new theme: he pretends he does not understand why C. is still away (§1n *non habeo certum quae te res hinc maxime retrahat*) and imagines that it is somehow linked to grief (§1n *luctuosis*; *animo defatigato tuo*; §2n *lacrimis...tristitiae*). Significantly, Tullia's death is not openly mentioned even in 5.15, where C. employs allusive language indicating that he is aware of Lucceius' knowledge of the situation (§1n *...ob eam...causam...tu suspicaris*).

Lucceius' reticence stems from adherence to elite protocol and a desire to avoid causing offence (§2n *non...concedis...postulat...*; §3n *cupio...non offendas*). Given C.'s higher status compared to Lucceius (cf. the introduction to 5.12), Lucceius needed to carefully choose his words. A similar phenomenon is observed in 5.16, where, although C. is consoling a member of a lower

aristocratic family, he refrains from directly alluding to the reason for Titius' distress; this might be also seen as a mark of a less intimate relationship (cf. its introduction). Lucceius' conduct stands in contrast to Serv. Sulp. Rufus' one, who, in 4.5, could communicate directly with C. due to their equal standing.

The deliberate decision to incorporate just one (yet highly meaningful) letter from Lucceius, at this precise point of the book, is not casual: it displays an image of C. overcome by personal and public problems (a leitmotif of the second half of Book 5), who has not the stamina to keep fighting for the republic, and takes refuge in his villas (§1n *Romae...discesseras*; similarly in 5.13, the first letter that opens the descending narrative on C.: see the general introduction). The powerful C. of 5.12, who did not consider Lucceius as a peer (§7n *ingenium...suppeditatum...tuum*), is now scolded by him (§1n *reprehendo*; §2n *accusare*; *tu non intelleges...non intelleges*; §3n *cupio...cupio...deterrere*).

This narrative of disarray is further confirmed by the deliberate positioning of 5.14–15 (on Tullia's death) immediately after 5.13 (on the republic's death). C. is displayed suffering both for political and personal losses: a motif that was already implicit in 5.13.4n *domestica...publica*, where C. seeks consolation for the tragic events that characterised his 'two lives'.

At the time of the writing of this letter, C. was still in Astura, grieving for Tullia's death (mid-Feb. 45); he departed from there c. 16th of May, as noted in *Att*. 12.42.3 (*Ego me hinc postridie <Idus> exiturum puto*). According to Lucceius, C. has not returned to Rome after Tullia's death (§1n *Romae...discesseras*); for this reason, he invites his friend to return to the city (§3n *ad convictum nostrum redeas*): time has passed since Tullia died.

On the basis of this observation and the probable relation between 5.14 and 15, the letter has been dated to 9th May 45 (Leveghi 2016, 486). In 5.14, C. seems not to have yet decided to leave Astura (otherwise Lucceius might have mentioned it). In 5.15, C. mentions his decision to leave Astura (and to meet his friend: §5n *propediem te igitur videbo*), although he is not entirely sure of the destination. This finds a parallel in *Att.* 12.42.3 (c. 10 May 45), where C. alludes to his planned departure from Astura on the 16th of May, but that he also does not yet know where to go (*Att*. 12.42.3 *...sed aut in Tusculanum aut domum, inde fortasse Arpinum*).

L. LUCCEIUS Q.F. S.D. M. TULLIO M.F. 'From L. Lucceius, son of Quintus, to M. Tullius, son of Marcus, greetings': standard formal heading. Differently from C. in 5.12–13, and 5.15, Lucceius uses both his and C.'s family name. **S.v.b.; e.v. sicut...soleo:** formal and friendly opening on Lucceius' health (recalled by C. in 5.15.5n *me valetudo tua*).

1 C.'s decision to stay away from Rome and the healing power of *otium*. **Te requisivi...viderem:** Lucceius requested a meeting with C. from one of his agents left in Rome to take care of business while he was away (on this standard practice: 5.6.1n *ad me Decius...venisset egissetque...*, where it is Sestius' secretary Decius who requests C.'s help on Sestius' business, while Sestius was in Macedonia). *saepius* conveys the insistence of Lucceius' request. Since it could have been perceived as a potential face-threatening act (similar to §2n *accusare*), Lucceius employs strategies of redressive politeness: §3n *nostra causa vis*; *cupio...offendas*. **Romae...discesseras...miror...retrahat:** Lucceius is 'puzzled' by C.'s decision to stay away from Rome and 'insists' he does not understand the reason (on this, cf. the introduction). In 5.15., C. admits that he has no desire to improve his condition (§3n *in ea vita maneam*), and consequently, no desire to go back to Rome (§4n *tu me abesse urbe miraris*...). In addition, he seems annoyed by Lucceius' (and others') attempts to tell him what to do: 5.15.1n ...*graviter accusas*. C. had left Rome in early March 45, after Tullia's death and he seems not to have returned until late 45—as 5.9 (11 July 45) and *Att*. 13.47a (30 July 45) suggest. In fact, in 5.9, Vatinius would not have requested C.'s help, while abroad, if he had not believed that C. was in Rome—since this is the only place from where C. could help him (§1n *peto a te...in me absente defendendo*). Similar to *Att.* 13.47a, where C. writes to Atticus that he will 'spend the night at Antium and be home tomorrow forenoon' (§1 *itaque hodie Anti, cras ante meridiem domi*). *res...retrahat*: something is drawing C. away from Rome—the place to which, implied by Lucceius' use of *retrahere* (*OLD* s.v. 5b), C. belonged. *Res* emphasises Lucceius' feigned ignorance about what was keeping C. from returning to Rome (cf. the introduction to this letter). **si solitudine delectare...scribas et aliquid agas...reprehendo...:** C. has left Rome searching for solitude (he is still grieving; on grief and solitude: González Vega 2017, 35–38; also, *Tusc*. 3.63 *animi doloribus alii solitudines captent*). Lucceius keeps pretending not to know (see the letter's introduction): he 'imagines' that C. is devoting himself to *otium*—an activity that requires solitude (e.g. 7.1.1, where Marius is said enjoying his alone time committing to his *otium*: *tu in illo cubiculo tuo...tempora lectiunculis consumpseris*; see also Citroni Marchetti 2006, 388) and that should give him some relief. This idea is confirmed (thanks to the careful disposition of the letters in this order) by 5.15, where C. admits that he is devoting himself to *otium* to find a consolation for his pain (§4n *litteris utor...exiguam oblivionem doloris petam*)—although even it has not the effect hoped for (§3n *mihi perfugium...litterae...quibus utor adsidue*). *scribas*: from May (when this letter was probably written) to July 45 (probably when C. decided to go back to Rome: §1n *Romae...discesseras*), C. was busy with the research and writing of works (*Att.* 12.38a; 40; 44; 13.5; 6; 8; 30; 33)—especially the *Academica* (*Att.* 13.12; 13–14; 16–17; 19–21; 23), *De Finibus* (*Att.* 13.21a; 32) but also the *Tusculanae disputationes* (although not documented in his epistles). *reprehendo*: Lucceius scolds C. and instructs him on what to do (similar

to §2n *accusare*; *tu non intelleges...non intelleges*; §3n ...*cupio...deterrere*), a point that C. will later emphasise in 5.15.1n *tu...me...graviter accusas*. This highlights the apparent change in Lucceius and C.'s relationship (noticeable in the transition from 5.12 to 5.13) that the ancient editor(s) wanted to emphasise (cf. the letter's introduction). Lucceius understands his reprimand could be perceived as a face-threatening act and, for this reason, employs strategies of redressive politeness (§3n *cupio non obtundere te*; *obtemperes...non offendas*). **...iucundius...miseris...luctuosis...tranquillis...illustret:** *otium* is an activity for both challenging and quieter times. *iucundius...miseris...luctuosis*, oxymoron that gives emphasis to Lucceius' words: *otium* provides a pleasant (*iucundus*, impossible in the darker 5.15.1n: *dicerem iucundus nisi id verbum...perdidissem*) consolation in the grimmest times; this is a notorious motif, also well-documented in C.'s correspondence with Atticus of 59—when periods of *otium* were the only acceptable reaction to the triumvirs' (disappointing) politics (Dell'Innocenti Pierini 2006, 283–296); however, in 5.15.1, C. highlights the impossibility of finding consolation in his *otia* (on which, cf. above: *solitudine delectare...scribas et aliquid agas...*). *miser* and *luctuosus* might refer both to the demise of Tullia and that of the republic (although Lucceius 'pretends' to not to know the real cause for C.'s sadness: see the introduction to the letter). Similar allusion to both personal and public unfortunate events is in 5.13.4n *domestica...publica* and in 5.15.3n *domesticis...forensibus*. C. himself employs the *iunctura* in reference to both public events (the devastating effects on the state of Clodius' conduct: *Mil*. 90; C.'s protest at the destruction of the republic: *Phil*. 2.6) and private events (Sulla's ill-fortune: *Sul*. 90; Quintus' entreaties at the time of C.'s exile: *Att*. 3.19.2). *tranquillis et optatis...erudito*: *otium* is not only for §1n *misera* and *luctuosa tempora*, but also for quieter times. Lucceius seems to affirm that, even if the 'external' *tempora* are *tranquilla* and *optata*, C. might be still excused from political life and retire to countryside—considering his personal condition (*animo defatigato*) and his literary pursuits (*erudito*: see also §1n *scribas*). Lucceius is probably referring to the Stoic concept of the 'retired life' (well-contextualised by Seneca, *Dial*. 8.3.2–3)—for which (differently from the Epicureans) the wise man seeks leisure (*otium*) only if something in their life prevents them from engaging in public affairs (on Lucceius' presentation as a wise man: 5.13.1n *re humanas contemnentem...contra Fortunam*...). This is an idea that will also find confirmation in *Off*. 1.69b–71, where withdrawing from public affairs to one's own estate is considered licit, although for only certain reasons (e.g, for literary purposes and ill-health). *delectet...laudibus illustret*: on the concept of the dual nature of literary endeavours, which brings enjoyment to the public while also bestowing glory upon their authors: 5.12.6n *ingeni gloriam*, where it is C. (and not Lucceius as happens here: on the 'reversal' of their roles, cf. the introduction to the letter) who seeks to please Lucceius by promising him glory for his work on C.'s own pursuits.

2 Lucceius encourages C. to overcome his pain and expedite his return to Rome; this might cause C.'s irritation (§2...*non...concedis...accusare...non intelleges...postulat*...)—as it is visible from 5.15.1n *graviter accusas*. **Sin autem †sicut† hinc discesseras...:** a passage that presents some difficulties (similar for §1n *discesseras*): **M** gives the non-sensical *dicas seras*—a mistake probably resulting from post-Ciceronian dictation. The possible right *lectio* (*discesseras*), attested in **ς**, has been accepted by T.-P. and Sh.-B. *ad loc*. The *lectio* in **M** *sicut hinc* is also challenging: Sh.-B, who firstly proposed *sicut <ante quam> hinc discesseras* in his 1977 commentary, opted to write †*sicut*† *hinc discesseras* in his 1988 edition; differently Watt 1982, who reads [*sic*] *ut hinc discesseras*. However, I believe that there is no need to emend the text since (*sin autem*) *sicut hinc discesseras* conveys a clear and concise statement (similar Leveghi 2016, 487 n.122). On C.'s absence from Rome: §1n *Romae...discesseras*. **...lacrimis...tristitiae...doleo...doles...angere...:** offering consolation over the republic's fall (5.13.1n *consolatio litterarum* and §4n ...*circumspice...membra rei publicae*...), for the loss of a relative (§1n *animo defatigato tuo* and C.'s reply in 5.15; also 5.16, on the death of Titius' children), and/or for exile (in 5.17 and 18), was a standard practice in Roman *amicitia* (the introduction to 5.13–18). Despite Lucceius' façade of not knowing the reason for his addressee's pain (cf. the introduction to the letter), C. is depicted in a depressed state (a narrative that continues in 5.15.1n *iucundus...verbum...perdidissem*; §3n *vita...miserrimi*; §4n *oblivionem doloris petam*): he has abandoned himself to tears (probably for Tullia's death)—an image that is markedly (but intentionally) in contrast to the one emerging from 5.1–12 (cf. the general introduction). Among the 941 extant letters constituting the Ciceronian corpus of letters, the reference to C.'s tears (*lacrimae*)/crying (*flere*) is rather scarce. Out of his own 826 letters, C.'s tears/crying are mentioned only eighteen times, generally on account of his exile (14.1.5; 2.1–2; 3.1; 3.5; 4.1; *QFr.* 1.3.3; 3.10; 1.4.4; *Att*. 3.10.2) or for Tullia's death (here, in *Att.* 12.13.1, where C. confides to Atticus that Brutus' consolatory letter made him cry, and in 12.15.1). C.'s tears/crying are also caused by other isolated matters (e.g. the dreadful period preceding and following Pharsalus: *Att.* 9.12.1, 10.12.2; money's matters: *Att.* 11.2.3, 11.7.6; Quintus' behaviour: *Att.* 11.9.3; something C. would rather not mention: *Att.* 11.15.3). References to other's tears/crying, for C.'s misfortunes, registers an even a smaller number: only seventeen times in the whole collection. References are mostly to C.'s exile (Terentia's tears in 14.2.2; Quintus' in *QFr.* 1.3.3 and 1.4.4; Quintus' when parting from C. at the time of his exile in *QFr.* 1.3.1; Atticus' in 3.15.4), or to Tullia's death (Servius and other friends: 4.5.1); but also to other motives related to C.'s choices (Atticus' tears because worried for C.'s being in Cilicia: *Att.* 6.18 and for his decision to support Pompey in *Att.* 10.9.2; Atticus' when they parted in *Att.* 15.27.2; for C.'s decision to stay away from Rome: *Att.* 16.7.5). Only a small part of these is for somebody else's misfortunes (C. Marcellus' in 4.7.6; Ampias' in 6.12.3; Herennius Gallus' in 10.32.3; king

Ariobarzanes Eusebes' in 15.2.6; Publius' in *Att.* 4.15.4; notables' in C.'s province: *Att.* 6.29; Quintus Jr.'s in *Att.* 6.3.8). The relative rarity of the *topos* confirms the idea that Roman aristocrats were somewhat disinclined to discuss or write about their emotions (Fögen 2009, 1–16). *doleo...doles...angere*: strategy of affiliative politeness, typical of letters of consolation: the introduction to 5.13–18. Excluding family members and Atticus, it seems that only Lucceius here and S. Sulp. Rufus in 4.5.1 are willing to empathise with C.'s anguish as if it was their own—although both (with a different nuance) urge C. to focus on more 'serious' problems: *i.e.* the fall of the republic (as also echoed in C.'s consolatory letter for Titius' loss of his children: 5.16.3n *nostrae civitatis...liberos non susceperunt...amisserunt...*). **...non...concedis...liberius dicamus...accusare...non intelleges...postulat...:** C.'s mournful state (§2n *lacrimis...tristitiae...*) has prompted (*non possum te non*) Lucceius (who is conscious of his duties as a friend) to intervene—while being careful not to cause any offence (cf. §3n, where he describes his words as an attempt of *suadere* 'to make a course of action sweet to someone', a rhetorical strategy well-known by C. himself: MacKendrick 1995, *index*; cf. also §3n...*cupio...conturbant...non offendas*). Lucceius is in a delicate position: as C.'s friend (*liberius dicamus*; similar to C.'s letter to Pompey on his activity against the Catilinarians: 5.7.3n…*scribam aperte*), Lucceius feels entitled to offer him (unrequested) advice (a potential face-threatening act: similar to *QFr.*, for which Losito, forthcoming) on C.'s self-imposed 'exile' (a customary approach within the competitive Roman culture of elite consolation: §2n *doleo...doles...angere*). However, he remains conscious of the proper decorum required when conversing with a prominent member of the elite. C. does not exhibit the same level of concern when offering consolation to individuals of lower rank, like Titius (5.16), Sittius (5.17), and Fadius (5.18), nor did S. Sulp. Rufus did in 4.5, when providing comfort to his peer C. (on this, the introduction to 5.14). This duality is mirrored in Lucceius' language: a mixture of complimentary (*acumen*: below) and scolding (*accusare...*; *tu non intelleges...*: below) tones (Wilcox 2005a, 245), which are preceded by strategies of affiliative (*liberius dicamus*: above) and redressive politeness (*si concedes*). Lucceius apparently meets his objective since C. describes his scolding as 'sensible and affectionate' in 5.15.1n *lenissimis et amantissimis verbis...graviter accusas*—although in the more private *Att.* 12.40.2, C. criticises these 'friendly' pressures: *ego quid homines aut reprehendant aut postulent nescio. ne doleam*? *qui potest*? *ne iaceam*? *quis umquam minus*?*...si quis requirit cur Romae non sim: quia discessus est... . acumen occultissima*: reference to C.'s defeat of the Catilinarian conspiracy (similar to 5.2.1n *Italiam...ab occulta coniuratione defenders*); the theme is key in C. and Lucceius' correspondence: cf. 5.12.2n *civilem coniurationem* and 5.13.4n *recordationes conscientiae nostrae rerumque...te in primis auctore gessimus*, where C. highlights Lucceius' involvement in his decision to repress the conspiracy. Despite Lucceius' efforts to praise and cheer C. up with the recollection of

events related to the defeat of the conspiracy, it appears to be futile. In 5.15.3n, C. acknowledges that he lives in a time where the actions that were meant to bestow him with acclaim (possibly referring to his victory over the conspiracy) are no longer significant (*...in ea tempora nostra...maxime florere...vivere etiam puderet*). *...tu non intelleges...non intelleges*: repetition to emphasise the scolding (similar to 5.2.1n). Differently from 5.13, where C. refers to Lucceius' wisdom (§1n *prudentia*) in order to praise him, in 5.14 Lucceius now recalls C.'s *prudentia* in order to scold him (on *prudentia* as 'reliable': 5.6.1n); C. is not behaving as a wise man: he is at the mercy of his emotions (differently from Lucceius who is portrayed as the perfect wise man in 5.13.1n *res humanas contemnentem* and *passim*, for which the introduction to 5.13. On C.'s complaints about these reprimands: above). The idea that the wise man's *prudentia* should drive distress and grief away, leading him to a state of *ataraxia,* is also echoed in the contemporary *Tusc.* 3.66 (Wilcox 2005a, 245): *ratio ab sapienti viro non poterit* [*timor repellere*]? *Quid est autem quod plus valeat ad ponendum dolorem, quam cum est intellectum nihil profici et frustra esse susceptum*?

3 If Lucceius' attempt to talk reason into C. (*suadendo*: §2n *...non...concedis...liberius dicamus...accusare...non intelleges...postulat...*) fails, he can still appeal to their *amicitia*. **gratia contendimus...rogando...nostra causa...propriam:** *gratia* (employed by C. two times in 5.13.1n–2n) *rogare* and *nostra causa* are standard vocabulary of the language of Roman *amicitia* (on which, see the general introduction). Lucceius requests C. to recover (*molestiis laxes*) and return to Rome (*ad nostrum redeas*; on C.'s return to Rome: §1n *Romae...discesseras*), to resume his public (*ad consuetudinem...nostram communem*: his *negotia*) and private (*tuam solius...*: *otium,* on which §1n *si solitudine delectare*) endeavours, as if it was a personal favour to a friend. C. seems not to appreciate these 'pressures', to the point that he asks Atticus to lie about the reason why he is not in Rome (*Att.* 12.40.2: *si quis requirit cur Romae non sim: quia discessus est*; cf. also §2n *...non...concedis...liberius dicamus...accusare...non intelleges...postulat...*). **...cupio...cupio...conturbant...non offendas:** Lucceius is concerned about potentially upsetting C. with his unsolicited advice (similar to §2n *...non...concedis...liberius dicamus...accusare...non intelleges...postulat...*)—although, as observed above, C. was in fact bothered by advice of this sort. Lucceius' 'tactic' of presenting himself as worried about irritating C., and torn about sharing his advice (similar to §2n above), serves as a strategy of redressive politeness, intended to eliminate any possibility of C. feeling uncomfortable by unwanted recommendations. **Vale:** standard informal *subscriptio* (found again only in 5.9.2 and 5.10b)—which works as a strategy of affiliative politeness—that mitigate C.'s possible irritation at Lucceius' statements.

15

5.15 contains C.'s probable reply to Lucceius' 5.14—on Tullia's death and the republic's demise, the uselessness of consolatory motives and friends' pressures to return to Rome.

The letter is sent from Astura, where C. had been since his decision to leave Rome after Tullia's death (5.14.1n *Roma...discesseras*). It has been dated c. 10 May 45 on the assumption that it follows Lucceius' 5.14 (c. 9 May 45) and on C.'s §5n *propediem te igitur videbo*—which shows C.'s intention to leave Astura soon (he planned to depart from there on the 16th: the introduction to 5.14).

The ancient editor(s) appear to have shown relatively little interest in collecting letters of consolation on Tullia's death. As already suggested in the introduction to 5.13–18, only two letters on the theme, addressed to C., have been included in the collection (4.5, 5.14, to which *Att.* 12.13–14 should be added since these missives contain references to lost consolatory letters). C's replies to those epistles generated even less interest: only 4.6, C.'s reply to Servius' 4.5 and this letter, 5.15, in reply to Lucceius' 5.14, are extant.

In 5.15, not only C. does effectively refuse Lucceius (5.14) and S. Sulp. Rufus' (4.5) invitations and advice on Tullia's death; he also seems not to follow the advice he himself gave to Titius for the loss of his children (§1n ...*remedia...nulla sunt*; §2n *ad amicosne confugiam*?; §3n *tempora nostra...puderet*; §3n *litterae...excludere...*; §3n *propagatio miserrimi temporis*). The deliberate positioning of 5.16 after 5.15 (out of chronological order, since 5.16 predates 5.15), amplifies the 'exceptional' nature of C.'s grief: the conventional motifs of consolation served only to console others; when it came to C.'s own need for consolation, he rejected them.

The present letter (c. 10 May 45) recalls some of the themes of 4.6 (c. April 45), that C.'s other extant reply, on Tullia's death, addresses to S. Sulp. Rufus. Both highlight C.'s scepticism about the potential effectiveness of some of the consolatory remedies, such as, (e.g.), the memory of his sociopolitical standing (§§3–4, 4.6.2) and the cares of his friends (§2, 4.6.2); moreover, in both, C. manifests the desire to spend time with the addressee (§2, §5, 4.6.3)—although with slightly different aims: *otium* with Lucceius (§2, §5) and *otium* and *negotium* with S. Sulp. Rufus (4.6.3). In both 5.15 and 4.6, C. decides not to explicitly refer to Tullia, although his mournful language offers to the ancient (and modern) reader enough clues about the topic of the letter: §1n ...*iucundus...perdidissem... vulneris...remedia...nulla*; §3n *propagatio miserrimi temporis*. Tullia's name disappears in C.'s correspondence after her death, probably because it is symbol of a trauma that C. wants to forget: Martelli 2016, 428–429. This choice could also be motivated by the fact that, if the recipients of C.'s letters were writing to console him, they were already aware of the reason behind his need for solace. Therefore, there was no necessity to directly name her in his replies. The correspondent might decide

to mention her in their letters (like Servius in 4.5) or not (like Lucceius in 5.14). This may have been influenced by their individual writing styles, their intimacy with the addressee, as well as their social and political status, all of which played a role in determining the level of formality and politeness of the communication.

5.15 presents some unique features (Wilcox 2005a, 245–246). If in 4.6.1, Servius' words have the potential to console C. (*me autem non oratio tua solum et societas paene aegritudinis sed etiam auctoritas consolatur*: Wilcox 2005b, 267–287), in 5.15, C. cannot find consolation in Lucceius' words (§1n *...remedia...nulla sunt*). C. refrains from entering into political discussions with Lucceius—a stance that is reasonable, considering Lucceius' limited political career (cf. the introduction to 5.12), in contrast to S. Sulp. Rufus' high public status. However, C. appears here 'less guarded' (albeit via a deliberate strategy of affiliative politeness: cf. below): he is even more willing to reveal aspects of his melancholic state to Lucceius (§3n *...vita...propagatio miserrimi temporis*) than to S. Sulp. Rufus, with whom he still competes to achieve a moral and political higher ground. The fact that, in 4.6, C. compares his grief to that of well-known politicians, plus the recurring references to his political activity, also suggest that. C.'s concerns for his reputation are more sharpened when corresponding with a significant political figure like S. Sulp. Rufus than with Lucceius.

The letter constitutes an important example of performative *amicitia* as a key element in Roman elite interactions (similar to 5.2, 7–9; on the topic, cf. the general introduction). The standard expressions of *amicitia* (§1n *amor tuus, gratus et optatus, lenissimis et amantissimis verbis*; §2n *vetustas amor...coniunctionis*? *igitur esse una*; §5n *una fuissemus*)—which recall some employed by C. in 5.13 (§1n *gratissima est*; *benevolentiam*; §2n *tuis litteris gratius*; §5n *...animorum coniunctione*)—serve to mask C.'s irritation with his friend's unrequested advice on Tullia's death and insistence on his return to Rome (5.14.2n *...non...concedis...liberius dicamus...accusare...non intelleges...postulat...*).

M. CICERO S.D. L. LUCCEIO Q.F. 'From M. Cicero to L. Lucceius, son of Quintus, greetings': standard formal heading already employed by C. in 5.13.

1 The opening recalls C.'s language employed in the reply (5.13) to Lucceius' lost letter of consolation for the republic's demise. It works as a summary of the main topics of 5.14: C.'s mournful state (probably for Tullia's death) and his desire not to go back to Rome: §2n *lacrimis ac tristitiae*, §3n *ad convictum nostrum redeas*; it also introduces the darker tones of the letter. **...amor tuus...gratus et optatus:** standard friendly reply to a consolatory letter: the introduction to 5.13–18.

C.'s reference to Lucceius' *gratia* recalls Lucceius' own plea for C.'s *gratia* in 5.14 (§3n ...*gratia contendimus et rogando*). **...iucundus...accusas...remedia...nulla:** thanks to the ancient editor(s)' arrangement of C.'s correspondence with Lucceius (and Titius in 5.16) in this order, it can be seen that, in 5.15, C. restricts the importance and efficacy of Lucceius' 5.14, but uses similar standard consolatory *topoi* to console Titius (cf. the introduction to 5.16). Lucceius' invitation to C. to take pleasure from his solitude, devoting himself to his *otium*, (5.14.1n *solitudine...iucundius*), is declined: nothing delights C. anymore. The consolatory motives that, according to Lucceius, should help him (5.14.1n *solitudine*; *scribas*; §3n *duplicari sollicitudines...elevare...prudentia*...), have not had the desired result (*remedia...nulla*: also cf. §2n *ad amicosne confugiam*?; §3n *tempora nostra...puderet*; §3n *litterae...excludere*...). Even Lucceius' severe reprimands—albeit gently delivered (5.14.2n ...*accusare...non intelleges*...)—cannot move C. to ameliorate himself and return to Rome (similar to §4n *abesse urbe miraris*...). The source of C.'s sorrowful condition is not solely rooted in what 'Lucceius might suspect' (*neque ob eam unam causam quam tu suspicaris*), which pertains to Tullia's death (on the decision not to explicitly name her: cf. the introduction to the letter). This reinforces the notion that Lucceius was aware of C.'s distressing circumstances, when composing his 5.14 letter, yet chose to omit direct mention of it, possibly for reasons of delicacy (cf. the introduction to 5.14). *vulneris*: C. is subtly alluding not only to Tullia's demise but also to the downfall of the republic (a connection that the ancient editor[s] wanted the reader to make when reading C.'s correspondence with Lucceius in sequence: 5.13.4n *domestica...publica*...). This evocative language, commonly found a generation later in elegy (Fedeli on Prop. 1, *index*), is employed only once in reference to the wound caused by both Tullia and the republic's demise (4.6.2 *nunc autem hoc tam gravi vulnere etiam illa quae consanuisse videbantur recrudescunt*). It can be also found in relation only to Tullia's death (*Ac*. 1.11) or to the wounds to the republic caused by Verres (*Verr.* 2.5.179), the consuls Gabinius and Piso (*Sest*. 17), Vatinius (*Vat*. 20, 36); C. Gracchus (*Fin*. 4.66); also, by rascals in 61 (*Att.* 1.16.7) and Pompey and Caesar in 49 (*Att.* 9.5.2). *Vulnus* also concerns C.'s actions to prevent wounds to the republic—mostly his consulate (*Sest*. 31) and exile (*Red. Sen*. 6)—but also others' (Asinius Pollio's recall to Italy in 43 could have prevented wounds to the state: 10.33.1). C.'s misfortunes also wounded the republic: his exile in *Sest*. 31.

2 The disappointing conduct of C.'s friends and Lucceius' affection; the inefficacy of consolatory motives (cf. also §1n ...*iucundus...accusas...remedia...nulla*). **quid...? ad amicosne...? quam...? ...obduruerunt:** the deliberate repetition of interrogatives increases the rhythm with the purpose of evoking pathos. *Amicitia* has no consoling power; yet, the responsibility for consolation lies not with C. but with his friends. Some have passed away, while others have forsaken him, failing to extend

solace to a friend in a time of necessity, thereby contradicting the very essence of *amicitia* (5.16.6n *officio...viri...amicissimi*; cf. also the introduction to 5.13–18). *ad amicosne confugiam...*: there is no 'public' consolation for his 'private' grief; similar to 4.6.2 (*nunc domo maerens ad rem publicam confugere possum ut in eius bonis acquiescam*), where C. affirms that he has lost both his domestic and public refuge, and the consolation they could provide (Wilcox 2005b, 282). *...alii occiderunt...alii...obduruerunt*: C. might be referring to Pompey's supporters—like himself and Lucceius (*communis*: on Lucceius, cf. the introduction to 5.12)—and to their destiny after Pompey's defeat at Pharsalus in 48. C. is not mentioning them directly because Lucceius was surely aware of what C. was alluding to; it was also probably necessary to withhold specifics from the letter, should it happen to end up in the wrong hands, considering the time in which it was written (on the risks of delivery: White 2010, 12–13). The idea that C. might be referring to Pompeians finds some confirmation in 4.13.2 (August 46), where C. employs similar concepts to allude to their destiny after Pompey's defeat (*careo enim cum familiarissimis multis, quos aut mors eripuit nobis aut distraxit fuga, tum omnibus amicis quorum benevolentiam nobis conciliarat per me quondam te socio defensa res publica...in eorum naufragiis et bonorum direptionibus nec audio solum...sed etiam id ipsum video*). *Obduresco* is predominantly used by C. in his letters (2.16.1, 12.18.2, *Att.* 10.9.1, 13.2.1) of 49–45, to discuss the events of the civil war and Caesar's rise to power; it normally refers to C.'s becoming hardened (differently to 5.15) to the pain those events caused. *Obduresco* is only rarely found in reference to other events or to other people—but is nevertheless related to the perpetuation of violence (Verres' in *Verr.* 2.5.34) and to the process of becoming insensitive to it (Clodius' in *Mur.* 76 and Antonius' in *Phil.* 2.108). C. pretends not to know why his friends have become hardened (*OLD* s.v. *obduresco* 2) to his pain; this is a performative act to enhance his portrait of a man abandoned by his friends while experiencing distress. It might be possible that C. (and Lucceius') friends had grown less feeling for C.'s misfortunes because of (not unjustifiable) *invidia* (on which, 5.12.8n *...in hoc genere vitia...*); C. was one of the few of Pompey's supporters to receive Caesar's pardon relatively soon (late September 47: Plu. *Cic.* 39) and to promptly return to Rome (*Fam.* 9.1.2). However, a further reason for his friends' *obdurescere* might be found in C.'s behaviour during the period of mourning for Tullia's death: *Att.* 12.40.2, where his friends' criticisms for his conduct is highlighted (*Quod scribis te vereri ne et gratia et auctoritas nostra hoc meo maerore minuatur, ego quid homines aut reprehendant aut postulent nescio...*; similar to *Att.* 12.38a.1). The true cause, whatever it may be, must have originated during a time of shared and/or individual hardship; this is evident from 4.6.1–2, where C. states that his own losses, both personal and public, led him to neglect his friends' interests (*iis temporibus...ut...luctum...dignitas consolaretur, ea quam ex re publica consequebantur...non amicorum negotiis, non rei publicae procuratione impediebantur cogitationes*

meae...). **tecum...vetustas, amor, consuetudo...coniunctioni]s...nec...impediat...vicinitas...:** Lucceius and C.'s affection is deeper than C.'s others friendships (on C.'s disappointing *amicitiae*: §2n *quid*...? *ad amicosne*...? *quam*...? ...*obduruerunt*); C. employs standard words from the language of *amicitia*, and of affiliative politeness: their *vetustas, amor, consuetudo, studia*, cement (*OLD* s.v. *vinculum* 6b, here in the contracted form to emphasise their closeness) their already stronger bond. *Tecum vivere* is generally found in letters dating to discouraging times—like the ones from his exile in 58 (*Att.* 3.22.3 *mi Pomponi, pugna ut tecum et cum meis mihi liceat vivere*) and in 46, when C. is discouraged for the republic and searches for consolation among his friends: 7.33.2 *ego vero multam salutem et foro dicam et curiae vivamque tecum multum et cum communibus nostris amatoribus*. *Vetustas* is the first of a list of words (*studium, coniunctio*), and intensifiers (*maxime* and *mehercule*), typical of the language of *amicitia*, that C. had already employed in Book 5, when corresponding with important figures of Roman aristocracy (for which, cf. below; on the standard practice of referring to *vetustas*, when doing aristocratic business: 11.27.2: *sed vetustas habet aliquid commune cum multis, amor non habet*; Hall 2009, 61). *Vetustas* might also refer to C. and Lucceius' endeavours against Catiline: 5.13.4n *nostrae rerumque earum quas te in primis auctore gessimus*. It is found in C.'s letter to Crassus: 5.8.1n *veterique nostrae necessitudini* (similar to his exchange with M. Claud. Marcellus in 4.7.1 *amicitiae nostrae vetustas*) and in 5.17.5, a letter of consolation on P. Sittius' exile. *Studia paria* is found in 5.7.2n, where it refers to C. and Pompey's shared interest for the republic, and in C.'s reply to Lucceius' consolatory letter: 5.13.5n *animorum coniunctione...studiis*. *Coniunctio*, employed two times in 5.8.3n ...*esse coniunctus* and *coniunctionem amicitiamque nostram*, is again found in the consolatory 5.13.5n. The repetition of these *amicitia* formulas, directed towards individuals varying in their socio-political resonance, adhered to a customary practice of the period. However, they inevitably become part of a narrative when ancient editor(s) select the letters and arrange them to display the parabola of C.'s life (cf. the general introduction). This language, previously employed to strengthen socio-political relations with leading figures (like Pompey and Crassus), now finds application within missives aimed at individuals possessing a lower political standing, and in circumstances marked by heightened distress. *amor*: used three times in his correspondence with Lucceius, two times in 5.15 (here and in §1n *amor tuus*) and one in 5.12.3n *amorique nostro*. Further references to friends' *amor* are not found elsewhere in Book 5—except for 5.2.9n–10n, where C. refers to Celer and Nepos' affection and in 5.5.3n, where *amor* is referred to Atticus. The reference to their common habits (*consuetudo*) recall Lucceius' words in 5.14.3n *ad consuetudinem...nostram commune*. ...*nec...impediat...vicinitas*...: when the republic was still standing, C.'s political and social obligations prevented him from spending time with his friend, even when they sojourned in nearby estates (Lucceius' in Tusculum; C.' in Cumae, near Puteoli: Beaujeu

ad loc.) or in Rome (on C.'s movements in 46–45: 5.14.1n *Romae...discesseras*). Now that everything is changed, C. has finally time to be with Lucceius. This is presumably performative politeness: C. enjoyed a higher socio-political status and was generally more willing to interact with peers (as the number of letters, dating before 40s, exchanged with the topmost aristocracy, demonstrates) than with someone who, although has a reputation for his literary works (5.12.1n *scriptorum tuorum*), has not been a fellow consul.

3 Inefficacy of the consoling power of *otium* (§1n.*..iucundus...accusas...remedia...nulla*) and distress for his lost socio-political esteem. **...maxime florere...puderet...:** within the scheme of the ancient editor(s)' narrative, this statement highlights a shift in C.'s image as it emerges from the correspondence with Lucceius. In 5.12, C. exhibits a sense of pride in his accomplishments: he eagerly asks for a narrative on his consulate to immortalise his endeavours before his death (5.12.1n *res nostras monumentis commendari tuis*; *immortalitatis rapis...vivi perfruamur*). In 5.15, the tone shifts dramatically: C. feels ashamed even of being alive (*puderet*: 5.12.1n, where *pudor* is a performative act aimed at emphasising C.'s embarrassment for requesting a favour to Lucceius). **...perfugium spoliato...domesticis...forensibus...solaciis...:** after being deprived of what made his private and public (similar to 5.13.4n *domestica...publica*, where C. is still able to oppose difficulties) lives enjoyable, C. searches for consolation in literature (cf. also *litterae...temporis*). *spoilato...ornamentis*, significantly, this expression is found only in C.'s defence speeches, describing an individual who has been stripped of the qualities that brought them respect, causing them to experience humiliation (*Quinct.* 92, 99; *Sest.* 83; *Lig.* 8). Similar to 5.1.2n *luctu et squalore...*, where Metell. Celer accuses C. of having offended the Caecilii Metelli with his conduct. Tullia's death (*domesticis*) and C.'s political inactivity (*forensibus*), in the context of Caesar's rise to power, deprive C. of his private and public prestige (two crucial sources of authority for a Roman aristocrat)—as if he were himself a humiliated public figure. The *iunctura* is echoed in 4.6.2 (*mihi...amissis ornamentis iis quae ipse commemoras quaeque eram maximis laboribus adeptus, unum manebat illud solacium quod ereptum est*) and in *Tusc.* 1.84.9 (*qui et domesticis et forensibus solaciis ornamentisque*). **...litterae...nescio...illae excludere me a portu...perfugio...miserrimi temporis:** *otium* (as *amicitia*: §2n) has no long-lasting consoling power, although C. relies on it constantly (*adsidue*, §4n *consumo tempus*), as he also affirms in *Att.* 12.38a.1–2 (C. is generally more willing to discuss about his literary works with Atticus: 5.14.1n *si solitudine delectare...scribas...reprehendo...*). Differently from C., Pliny in *Ep.* 8.19.1 can find consolation in literature: *Et gaudium mihi et solacium in litteris...laetum quod his laetius, tam triste quod non per has minus triste*. The occurrence of *portus* and *perfugere* is found again only in reference to exile (*Caec.* 100), court (*Cluent.* 7) and tribunate (*Sest.* 18), with no

instances of the terms being connected in tandem to literature. *Portus* and *perfugere* appear individually in C.'s works of 46–44. *Littera...portu...* (that is a variation of the theme of death as the 'last' harbour: *TLL* X 63, 49), is a *iunctura* slightly more common (Sh.-B. *ad loc.*): there are references to philosophy either as a harbour for refuge (7.30.2; *Tusc.* 5.5) or as *otium* (*Brut.* 8). *Littera...perfugere* is found again only in 5.21.2 (*perfugio...utendum censeo, litterulis nostris*) and 6.12.5. Literature cannot fully comfort him (it can merely provide fleeting moments of distraction: §4n *litteris...non...medicinam...*). This purposefully exaggerates C.'s own depiction of his suffering, as if he is striving to take the foremost position, even when it comes to grieving (although, in a culture of competitive consolation, grief can be both performative and real at the same time). *exprobare...*: literature almost reproaches C. for lingering in this miserable state. Beneath this image lies C.'s likely allusion to his friends' admonitions regarding his state, as he reveals to Atticus in *Att.* 12.38a.1–2 and 12.40.2–3; among those there might be also Lucceius' ones: §1n *lenissimis...graviter accusas. ...propagatio miserrimi temporis*: Tullia's death (although not mentioned: cf. the introduction to the letter) adds sorrow to C.'s pre-existing anguish due to the collapse of the republic (similar above: *spoliato...domesticis...forensibus ornamentis*). By taking this line, C. contradicts his own attempts at offering solace to Titius after the loss of his children in 5.16. Here, C. appears to imply that the grief over the republic's downfall should be alleviated by the understanding that his own children have passed away at a time when the republic is already lost, rather than earlier, during its period of glory (5.16.3n *...liberos...perdidissent*).

4 Inefficacy of consolation (similar to §3). **...urbe miraris...domus...odium...curiae...:** Rome does not offer consolation anymore; C. provides Lucceius with an explanation for his (performative) incredulity regarding C.'s choice to be away from Rome (5.14.1n *non habeo certum...retrahat*) and with a reply to his invitation to return to the city (5.14.3n *ad convictum nostrum redeas*). *domus*: the town house, which symbolised C.'s socio-political status (5.6.2n *de Crasso domum emissem*) and delighted him before Tullia's death (6.18.5 and *Att.* 4.18.2), no longer brings happiness to him (on C.'s grief for both private and public loss: §3n *domesticis...forensibus*). *summum...odium...*: harsh yet deliberately vague remark, not to displease Caesar—should this letter fall into enemy hands (on the risks of the delivery: §2n*...alii occiderunt...alii...obduruerunt*). C. expresses dissatisfaction with the present condition of the republic—which in the previous letters, and within the emergent narrative of Book 5 (for which, the general introduction), he says he had taken pride in safeguarding from Catiline's plot (5.2.1n *rem publicam...conservatam*; 5.7.3n *pro salute patriae gessimus*; 5.13.4n *praestitimus...patriae nos*). Now he asserts his strong aversion towards it (also in §3n *...tempora nostra aetas...vivere...puderet*). Similar discontent is expressed in 5.13 (§3n *circumspice omnia*

membra rei publicae...fractum debilitatumve) and in 4.6.2 (*nihil in foro agere libebat, aspicere curiam non poteram*), although with a less bitter vocabulary (especially in the latter, considering the high rank of its addressee: cf. the introduction to 5.15). *Odium* is a strong word, generally employed in relation to political rivals/enemies (MacKendrick 1995, *index*); it is found only once in Book 5, in 5.2 (§10n *odisse...odio*), where it refers to Nepos, C.'s political rival. **...litteris...consumo...non...medicinam perpetuam...exiguam...:** leisure as a medicine to pain is a *topos* of consolatory literature: *TLL* VIII 541, 40ff. (similar to 5.14.1n *solitudine delectare...scribas...*); however, it has no long-lasting effect on C.'s pain (§3n *litterae...absidue...excludere me a portu...perfugio*). *litteris...consumo...tempus*: C.'s choice to embrace leisure, when the political circumstances no longer permit his involvement in politics, is a recognised literary motif, well-exemplified by *Div.* 2.6: *...mihi...philosophiae causam adtulit casus gravis civitatis, cum in armis civilibus nec tueri meo more rem publicam nec nihil agere poteram nec, quid potius, quod quidem me dignum esset, agerem, reperiebam* (similar to §3n...*litterae...adsidue...illae excludere...miserrimi temporis*). *...oblivionem*: C. desires a momentary (*exiguam*) respite from the pain resulting from both personal and public losses. This marks a shift in the narrative that Book 5 intentionally displays; if 5.12 shows C.'s attempts to have his endeavours eternalised (§1n *res nostras...commemoratio...immortalitatis*), 5.15 reveals a C. who wants to forget those memories to erase (temporarily) the pain they provoke. The notion of easing pain through the forgetfulness provided by leisure belongs to Epicurean philosophy (*Tusc.* 5.110: *...motus animi, sollicitudines aegritudinesque oblivione leniuntur traductis animis ad voluptatem*); however, only the passage of time proves to be truly efficacious (standard consolatory motive: the introduction to 5.13–18; similar to 5.12.4n *praeteriti doloris...recordatio...delectationem*).

5 Closing remarks: C. and Lucceius' *amicitia* (similar to §2n) **...si...ne in mentem...veniebat...cottidianos metus:** their daily apprehensions (and political/literary responsibilities) prevented them from spending time together (§2n *adhuc non fuimus...vicini...vicinitas*). A further example of performative politeness: C. portrays Lucceius as a peer (although he was not: 5.12.7n *ingenium...suppeditatum...tuum*), vexed by the same number of worries of C. (the introduction to 5.15). This depiction would only make sense during a time when differences in socio-political standing had diminished in importance, due to the concentration of power in Caesar's hands. *Metus* can refer to Catiline (the frequency of words for 'fear' in *Catil.* is much greater than in the rest of C.'s works: Dyck on *Catil.* 1.10.7–10; also in 5.6.2n *a me insidias metuunt*)—and to C. and Lucceius' (unequal) endeavours against him (5.13.4n *nostrae rerumque...gessimus*). It can also allude to the period of the civil war (*Att.* 5.21.3; 8.9a.2), the anguish

of Pompey's supporters (*Att.* 7.23.1; 8.1.4), among whom there were C. and Lucceius (§2n *communis*) and their destiny after 48 (4.4.4, 6.7.4). **...una...valetudo...consequamur...:** language of standard affiliative politeness that recalls §2n *tecum...vetustas...coniunctioni*]*s...una...* and the closing remarks of 5.13.5n *tecumque...valetudo...coniunctione...* . On the reading <*et*> *omne*: Sh.-B. *ad loc.* The reference to Lucceius' heath conditions (*valetudo*) and Lucceius' worries for C.'s despair recall 5.14.1n *deterius...soleo* and §2n *accusare*. **...propediem te...videbo:** C. and Lucceius will meet soon, probably in Rome: 5.14.1n *Romae...discesseras*.

16

Last letter of consolation upon children's death included in Book 5 (cf. the introduction to 5.13–18)—dating c. late 46 and probably addressed to T. Titius.

Scholarship on the letter debated the identity of its addressee since the *codices* report only the name Titius. T.-P. *ad loc.* hypothesise that the name Titius might refer to T. Titius, who seems to have been Pompey's legate in 62–61 (Leveghi 2016, 492, although this information does not find confirmation in Broughton 1952) and/or a legate (probably in 51) in a province important for the grain supply (Broughton 1952, 245), as *Fam.* 13.75, addressed to the same recipient, demonstrates. The same Titius appears in *QFr.* 2.6.4, a letter of 56, where C. refers to Titius' villa in Anagni. However, there are not sufficient elements to establish that C. is writing to this Titius—since Titius was a common name in the late first century B.C.E. (Broughton 1952, 626).

5.16 not only lacks substantial information about the recipient, but also about the specific reason for consolation; one can only deduce from the scarce references to the death of children, that Titius might have lost his sons (§3n *liberos...perdidissent*; §4n *adulescentulum...puerum mortuum*; §6n *liberis amissis*).

Several potential factors could account for this. One possibility is that Titius belonged to a less aristocratic family and/or had not (yet) particularly distinguished himself in his official roles, if he held any at all. C. was also possibly not intimately familiar with the addressee (Wilcox 2005a, 241) and he did not know exactly for whom and for which specific reason he was writing a letter of consolation (although he still had to write one, since it was his duty: §6n *officio...viri...amicissimi*).

This choice could also be interpreted as a mark of respect towards the addressee: both in 5.14 (Lucceius' letter of consolation for Tullia's death) and 5.15 (C.'s possible reply to that letter), the sender and the addressee refrain from mentioning Tullia's name, her death, or the cause for her demise—although they were both aware of the situation (see the introduction to 5.14).

While it was normal to witness Lucceius being extra cautious in 5.14, as he was corresponding with a prominent figure like C., in 5.16, we observe C. employing a similar approach with someone likely belonging to a lower socio-political status (similar to 5.15.2n *tecum...vetustas...vicinitas...*, where C. uses the same language, he had previously employed with Pompey and Crassus). Although not disclosing personal information about the deceased was a standard practice in consolatory letters (Wilcox 2005a, 241), when reading the letters in the ancient editor(s)' order, it appears that C. in 5.16 is treating Titius with the same caution Lucceius exercised towards him in 5.14. It thus reinforces the narrative of progressive decline, of C.'s loss of socio-political pre-eminence, that we see in operation within the book (cf. the general introduction).

The connection between 5.14–16 is further enhanced by the idea that, if in 5.14–15, Lucceius' consolation had no effect on C., in 5.16, C. employs the same advice to console Titius (§3n *beatissimi...liberos...susceperunt...amisserunt...perdidissent*; cf. also the introduction to 5.15). This narrative emerges from these letters only if they are read in this non–chronological sequence, considering that 5.16 belongs to a time when Tullia was still alive.

The date of composition of the letter is also a matter for scholarly debate. Watt is the only editor to date the letter to a period preceding the civil war, *i.e.* to 52. T.-P., Sh.-B. and Beaujeu *ad loc.*, by contrast, date it to the period following Pharsalus, and preceding Tullia's death. T.-P. date the letter somewhere in 46; Sh.-B. to summer/autumn 46 (followed by Cavarzere 2016); Beaujeu to the end of 46. Hutchinson 1998, 50 hypothesises 44—although he considers 46 plausible.

The language used by C. in this context may suggest that the letter was written before Tullia's passing (as C. might have alluded to her death and drawn a parallel between his own distress and that of Titius), perhaps early in 46. In fact, §3n *status...civitatis, re publica perdidissent*, and §4n *non pudori...liberati*, are expressions that C. employs in other letters datable to 46 written to Pompey's supporters (as T. Titius probably was) worried for their fates after 48: Lucceius in 5.13 (§3n *adfectum...deletum exstinctumque...*); Cn. Plancius in 4.14.3; A. Manlius Torquatus in 6.1.6 and 6.6.13. This language also echoes that of 5.15 (May 45), where C. complains of the state of the republic (cf. the introduction to 5.15 and also §§3–4); however, the frequent mentions of Tullia's death (which are absent in 5.16) and the more forceful language employed in 5.15, compared to 5.16, could serve as additional evidence suggesting that 5.16 predates 5.15.

M. CICERO S.D. TITIO 'From M. Cicero to Titius': less formal heading (on the usage of just the *cognomen*: Adams 1978, 150)—if indeed it is to be considered original. A much more formal heading is employed in 13.75, when T. Titius was a legate (cf. the introduction to the letter).

1 Standard motifs of consolatory letters. **Etsi...minime...ad te consolandum...tuis...doloris...egerem...:** common statements of performative *amicitia* in consolatory letters (5.14.2n *doleo...doles*); providing solace to Titius is challenging: C. has deeply absorbed Titius' pain to the extent that it has become his own (on this standard practice: the introduction to 5.13–18). *minime...accommodatus*: C. has not (yet) experienced the pain of losing a child—although he will in a few months: cf. 5.14–15. **...summi luctus...tuus...:** although C. empathises with Titius, his suffering cannot be equated with the depth of suffering (highlighted by *acerbitate*) that Titius endures (on consolation and the display of pain, as a form of competition: 5.14.2n *doleo...doles...angere*). This is the sole instance where C. directly mentions Titius' mourning (*luctus*). More frequently, C. makes general references to Titius' distress (*molestus, dolor, maeror, maereo*), as well as his own personal anguish over his friend's hardships (§1 *meus...dolor*); on C.'s choice to do so: cf. the introduction to the letter. **...nostrae necessitudinis...benevolentiae:** standard language of *amicitia* and affiliative politeness (again in §5n *viri benevolentissimi...amicissimi*). Like in 5.15.2n *tecum...vetustas...vicinitas...*, C. uses here the same language, he had previously employed with topmost representatives of aristocracy, now with a figure belonging to a lower rank (similar with T. Fadius in 5.18.2n *necessitudine...benevolentia...coniunctissimos*). **non tacere...modicam consolationem...dolorem...minus sanare...:** C. cannot bear to witness his friend in distress without taking action: this is performative politeness, a tactic similarly used by Lucceius in 5.14.2n *non possum...accusare*. The fact that C. employs this approach here, with someone from a lower aristocratic rank, reinforces the ancient editor(s)' narrative on C. (cf. the introduction to the letter). On *maerore*: §4n. *modicam consolationem*: apparent self-modesty and tact (Hutchinson 1998, 53; similar to §2n *consolatio pervulgata*). Consoling Titius is not an easy job; whatever C. will write will not have the power to successfully cure Titius' pain (as also suggested by *dolorem...minus sanare*). The *iunctura* is a Ciceronian *hapax*. *Modicus* also registers a low impact in C.'s corpus of letters. It is employed only eight other times (one is 5.12.4n *modicum...corpus*), and in particular, in relation to the moderate conduct one should show: immediately before Pharsalus (16.9.3); to Caesar before (*Att.* 4.5.2) and during his regime (4.4.4); to the young Ottavianus (*ad Brut.* 1.15.7). It is also employed in reference to C.'s concerns towards Clodius and his supporters in 59 (*Att.* 2.19.1). *Modicus* is found only one other time in a consolatory context; in *ad Brut.* 1.9.2, C. discusses the necessity of being moderate in expressing grief, while consoling Brutus upon the death of his wife. *dolorem...minus sanare*: consolation cannot fully heal one's pain; C. will repeat this when replying to Lucceius' letter of consolation concerning Tullia's death: 5.15.4n *non...medicinam perpetuam*.

2 ...consolatio pervulgata...homines...telis Fortunae...feramus...aliorum...: common—by C.'s own admission (*consolatio pervulgata*: *unicum* in his works)—motifs of consolation (for which, the introduction to 5.13–18), that can vary depending on the recipient. In 5.16, C. appears to touch upon these themes casually and without a genuine interest in providing solace to the less socially prominent recipient Titius (similar to 5.17 and 18, where C. displays no real commitment to comforting his addressees). A different scene is displayed in 5.13 (where C. aims at praising Lucceius), but also in *Att.* 12.10 and *ad Brut.* 1.9 (where C. chooses to refrain from using the typical consolation themes). *debemus...nos...nobis...*: the repeated use of the 1st person plural is sometimes considered a sign of affection (Hutchinson 1998, 53). By using the plural form and referring to mortality (as a generalised human condition: *condicio*: *OLD* s.v. 6a; cf. also Hutchinson 1998, 56 n.11), C. makes his advice universally applicable, meant for everyone (including himself). *...aliorum memoria...cogitemus*: reference to the *topos*, *maioribus hoc–non tibi hoc soli* (on the use of this *topos* in Greek tragedy: Pattoni 1988, 229–262). Others, both in the distant and recent past, have endured similar pain (because humans for their own nature are exposed to Fortune's blows: above). This should reassure and console Titius: he is not isolated in his suffering (the introduction to 5.13–18). However, this and other motifs of consolation (§3n *beatissimi...liberos...susceperunt...amisserunt...perdidissent*) do not work for C.: he finds a way to rise above the mass of humanity in this culture of competitive consolation (cf. the introduction to 5.15).

3 ...neque...consolationes...sapientissimis viris...quantum...liberos...perdidissent: the deplorable state of the republic provides a more compelling source of solace than conventional motifs of consolation. In a period such as the one in which C. and Titius live, fortunate are those who either have not become parents or have experienced the loss of their children. *status...civitatis...per<tur>batio...*: language typical of the letters post Pharsalus (which helps the dating of the letter: cf. the introduction to 5.16) and, especially, of the letters of consolation written in this period. For *loci similes* in letters of consolation from 46–45: 5.13.3n *circumspice omnia membra rei publicae...debilitatumve...*; 5.14.1n *miseris...temporibus...luctuosis*; 5.15.3n *spoliato...forensibus ornamentis*; §4n *urbe...odium...curiae*; 4.5.2 *Fortuna...erepta...patriam...honores omnis*; §4 *de imperio populi Romani tanta deminutio facta est*. *beatissimi...liberos...susceperunt...amisserunt...perdidissent*: first (and rather general) reference to the reason for Titius' grief; more are found in §4n *adulescentulum...puerum mortum*; §5n *iis quos amasti*; *incommodorum tuorum*. C. states something that he himself would not likely find comforting, when he lost Tullia (cf. the introduction to 5.16): Titius should find solace in the fact that he has lost his children during a period when the republic is in a state of decline and has little more to offer. The

same concept is restated at §4n ...*impendere rei publicae...qui reliquerit nullo...deceptus...* . S. Sulp. Rufus offers a similar advice to C., at the time of Tullia's death: 4.5.3 *hisce temporibus non pessime cum iis esse actum quibus sine dolore licitum est mortem cum vita commutare*; *at vero malum est liberos amittere. malum, nisi hoc peius est, haec sufferre et perpeti*. §4 *de imperio populi Romani tanta deminutio facta est, omnes provinciae conquassatae sunt*: *in unius mulierculae animula si iactura facta est, tanto opere commoveris*. §5 *cum res publica occideret, vita excessisse*. However, Lucceius in 5.14 decides not to refer to it (cf. its introduction).

4 C. combines the standard consolatory motives of §2 and the analysis of state of the republic of §3. **...tuum te desiderium...tuarum...maeres...tibi...dolorem...miserias...miseria...non sentiatur:** if Titius sorrows over the unfortunate destiny (*miseria*) of those who have passed away (*qui occiderunt*), he ought not to (this does not apply to C.: the introduction to the letter), for the departed might no longer feel pain (*non sentiatur*) or have any concerns (*nulla...miseria*). Conversely, if his (as highlighted by the recurrent use of the 2nd person singular) sense of loss (*desiderium movet*) and mournful thoughts (*tuarum rerum cogitatione*) about the deceased are what cause him distress, he should address them—by attempting to put into practice the consoling advice C. has previously offered him (even though these consolatory *topoi* might not completely heal him: *non facile exhauriri tibi istum dolorem...universum...*). *desiderium...maeres...miserias...lugeas*: language of *dolor* (similar to 5.14.2n *lacrimis...tristitiae*). The phrase *desiderium movere*, in the sense 'to experience a loss', is found elsewhere only in *Lael*. 10, in reference to Scipio's death; it is found again in *Fin*. 5.54, but in reference to the loss of light. *Maereo* ('to mourn': *OLD* 1) is employed fifty-eight times in C.'s speeches, fifty-six times in his other prose works and (if we consider the total number of 941 extant letters included in the entire Ciceronian corpus of letters) thirty-one times in his letters. Within the letters, ten occurrences are found in the *Fam.*, where *maereo* is used: four times to express sorrow over the loss of children (two in 5.16: §1; §5; also in 5.15.5n; 4.6.2) and once to convey his friends' grief over C.'s suffering due to Tullia's passing (4.5.6); four more times to describe C.'s experience of exile (14.2.2; 14.3.1–2; 14.4.3). Similar usage of the verb is found in *Att.*: eight times in reference to C.'s exile (3.7.2; 3.8.2; 4; 3.9.1; 3.10.3; 3.17.1; 3.20.1) or others' pain for C.'s sufferings (3.15.2); it is similarly employed for Tullia's (12.14.3–4; 12.28.2; 12.40.2) and other children's deaths (e.g. Bibulus' in 6.5.3). In *Att.* it is also found in reference to the terrible period of civil wars and aftermath (10.4.6; 11.2.3). Like *maereo, crucio* ('to be distressed': *OLD* s.v. 3) is generally less frequent in C.'s epistles than in other prose works: it is attested only two other times in *Fam*. (8.7.1; 16.21.2) and five in *Att*. (7.22.1; 8.15.2; 8.15a.2; 9.13a.2; 11.11.1); however, *crucio* is seldom encountered in a 'personal' context of grieving; rather, it is commonly associated with the distress stemming from

wars (Parthian war: 8.7.1), as well as the lead-up to and aftermath of Pharsalus (all the five occurrences found in *Att.* hint to it). *Miserias lugeas*: similar to §5n *iis quos amasti mali...* . The *iunctura* is found again only in *Mil*. 4. *Miseria* ('distress': *OLD* s.v. 1) and its derivatives recur four more times in the letter: §3, §4 (twice) and §5. *Lugeo* ('to mourn': *OLD* s.v. 2a) is found also in §6. Similar to *maereo* and *crucio, lugeo* appears more frequently in C.'s speeches (twenty-nine occurrences) and prose (twenty-one occurrences) compared to his correspondence. It is found other three more times in *Fam*., of which two are related to the events post Pharsalus (4.1.1) and to Caesar's regime (7.28.3); the other to Tullia's death (4.5.6). *Lugeo* is found again in reference to Caesar's regime in (*Att.*12.28.2) and to C.'s exile in *QFr*. 1.3.6. *...nihil mali...morte...*: the concept here expressed revolves around *sensus* ('self-awareness': *OLD* s.v. 5a). Titius needs not fear for those who have passed away; if they still retain consciousness (*resideat sensus*) after death, it should be viewed as a form of immortality (*immortalitas*). However, if, as is the fate of all mortals, the departed lose (*amissus*) their consciousness, they are no longer capable of experiencing anything (*non sentiatur*). The passage seems to summarise what will be the main focus of *Tusc.*1 (esp. 1.15–16; 1.76; 1.84; 1.91; 1.100): immortality and annihilation are two virtuous possibilities (to the sceptic C.) of what might happen to the soul after death (on death and philosophy: Long 2019, 89–114; similar language is found in *Lael*. 14). **...non dubitans...rei publicae...deceptus esse videatur:** repetition of a concept already expressed in §3n *...status...civitatis...liberos...perdidissent...* . *misceri, parari, impendere...*: C.'s disillusion concerning the future of the republic is also found in §4n *non...pudori...libertati...loci* and in 5.13.3 and 5.15.3–4 (the presence of many gloomy letters reinforces the ancient editor[s]' plan to create a sense of death and decline for C. and the republic in the second half of Book 5: cf. the introduction to 5.13–18 and the general introduction). This language also provides a further clue for dating the letter to the post-48 war period (cf. the introduction to 5.16). The usage of these verbs (*misceo*: 'to upset the order of': *OLD* 11a; *paro*: 'to make preparations for': *OLD* 7a; *impendeo*: 'to hang over': *OLD* 3) suggests a state of upheaval, characteristic feature of C.'s letters from the late 50s to 40s, that is also linked to the writer's apprehension regarding the impending conflict (2.11.1; 2.16.4; *QFr*. 3.7.3). However, if in these earlier letters, C. still retains a sense of optimism (e.g. in 2.11.1, where, although the threat of a great war hangs over the republic, C. feels he can still escape it; or in 2.16.4, where C. still considers the possibility that the republic might not fall. In 5.16.4, the republic has already been damaged by conflict, and its downfall is regarded as inevitable (§3n *...temporibus...aliqua re publica perdidissent*; §4n *non...pudori...saluti loci*). Similar language will be employed in the letters written after Caesar's death, hinting at the turmoil that followed his assassination: *Att.* 14.13.4; *ad Brut*. 1.15.4. The indication that this language may pertain to Caesar's actions is potentially reinforced by C.'s use of *misceo* and *impendeo*, particularly when describing

the unconstitutional doings of some *populares*: Rullo's (*Agr.* 2.91); Catiline and his followers (*Catil.* 1.22; 4.4; 4.6); Clodius (*Har.* 4; 46; *Sest.* 16; 73; *Mil.* 25). ...*deceptus esse*: on the notion that it is better to lose someone now (since the republic has been destroyed) than in the past: §3n ...*beatissimi...liberos...re publica perdidissent*. **quid...pudori...studiis...saluti...:** a similar structure is found in 5.13.3n (c. 46) *quid...non...adfectum...fateare* and in 5.15.2n (c. early May 45) *quid...amicosne...*?; §3n *quod...perfugium...*? Yet, in 5.16, the ascending climax, and the separation between *quid est*/*loci* that frame the entire period, intensify C.'s words, rendering his depiction of the post-Pharsalus era more forceful and emotionally distressing (a technique found especially in oratory: e.g. *Quinct.* 82; *Verr.* 2.3.8; *Cluent.* 12; *Sul.* 75). C.'s list of vocabulary can be divided into three micro-groups, each representing values (from the particular to the universal) that seem to be at stake/erased in the post-48 era. 1) *pudor, probitas, virtus* are the required values that a *nobilis* should possess, especially when aspiring to the consulship (on *pudor*: 5.1.1n; on *virtus*: 5.2.8n and 5.8.2n; on *probitas*: Hellegouarc'h 1963, 287; in Book 5 there are only examples of *improbitas*: 5.2.7n and 5.11.3n). 2) *rectum studium, bona ars* refer to the qualities of Roman noble men and their literary/philosophical background (e.g. *Cael.* 24 and *Part.* 80). In the previous letters (included in the section 5.1–11), C. used to discuss these values with important members of Roman *nobilitas*; now he employs them with its less prominent members. This hints at the ancient editor(s)' deliberate arrangement of letters in Book 5 to show the decrease of C.'s power and prestige: similar to 5.15.2n *tecum...vetustas, amor, consuetudo...coniunctioni*]*s...nec...impediat...vicinitas*. If the first two micro-groups refer to the *nobilitas* and their socio-political activities, the third group refers to more 'general' concepts. 3) *libertas, salus* are privileges of all Roman citizens, not only of the *nobiles* (on *libertas*: Hellegouarc'h 1963, 542–559; on *salus*: Hellegouarc'h 1963, 411–412). The words refer to the period after Pharsalus, when not only individual *libertas* and *salus*, but also that of the state were at risk (on the notion that there is no republic without *libertas*, especially in letters from late 40s: 12.2.1; 12.12.2; cf. also *Att.* 14.4.1, of April 44, where C. alludes to the fact that, although the Ides of March have restored the republican institutions, freedom—cancelled by Caesar's regime—has not yet been restored). These also belong to C.'s vocabulary on the defeat of the Catilinarian conspiracy, for which: 5.2.3n…*nos pro salute patriae gessimus* and 5.6.2n *vindicem coniurationis*. **...hoc gravissimo...pestilentissimo anno...:** Sh.-B. *ad loc.* (followed by Wilcox 2005a, 242) believes that C. is referring to a real epidemic (which perhaps occurred in 46), that caused the death of Titius' children. This assumption derives from *Att.* 12.10 (c. late 46), where C. alludes to a ἐπιδήμιον. However, as T.-P. *ad loc.* suggests, there is otherwise no persuasive evidence that an epidemic occurred in 46. It is more plausible, as noted by Beaujeu, that C. is here referring to the dreadful events of 46. C. usually employs *pestis* and its derivates in reference to the civil wars (*Off.* 1.86)—

and in particular to the prodromes (*Att.* 2.17.1; 8.14.2; 9.13.3) and aftermath of Caesar and Pompey's clash (4.3.1 [twice]; 6.6.6). A direct allusion to Caesar occurs only in *ad Brut.* 1.15.4, where C. praises Brutus for having freed the republic from 'a great plague' (*magna pestis...depulsa*). *Pestis* is also a term of C.'s invective against his enemies, primary targeting Catiline and Clodius (MacKendrick 1995, *index*; on Clodius as *pestis*: 5.8.2n *pestes hominum*), but also extending to Antonius (e.g. in 10.28.1; 12.25.2). **...adolescentulum...puerum...videretur:** the previously broad statement in §3n (concerning the loss of children: *liberos...perdidissent*) now encompasses an even wider reference to all the youthful individuals who have departed during this dreadful period for the republic. Nonetheless, this notion is not operative for C. during his mourning for Tullia's passing (cf. the introduction to the letter). C.'s use of *adulescentulus* and *puer* might demonstrate that he was not Titius' closer friend—although his attempt to stress his affection with the diminutive of *adulescens* (on the possible reasons for C.'s conduct: cf. the introduction to the letter). Had he been closer to Titius, he might have been aware of the ages of Titius' sons at the time of their demise; however, it was his duty of *amicitia* to console a friend in need (§6n *officio*).

5 Standard motives of consolation and praise. **...iis quos amasti...cura doloris tui...referetur:** the idea that letting go of the belief that harm befell the departed is already found in §4n *...tuum te desiderium...tuarum...maeres...tibi...dolorem... miseria...non sentiatur*; it is also recalled in §5n *...dilexeris miseria...seiunctus.* **...gravitatis...sapientiae...constantiae...:** Titius is said to possess the values of the Roman *nobilitas*, to which he belonged (although probably as a member of a less important family) since youth. However, if he indulges in excessive mourning, his reputation might be at stake (Wilcox 2005a, 242; Lucceius also provides a similar, albeit more subtle, advice to C. in 5.14.2n *querelis cottidianis...proficere*). Despite the warning, C. employs laudatory language (similar to §3; 5.13.1; 3; 5.17.2; 5) that he has previously used in more straightforward contexts, such as in 5.2.8n, 5.5.3n (twice) and 5.8.5n (similar to §4n *quid...pudori...studiis...saluti*). *Ferre immoderatius*: on the importance of moderation in grief: *ad Brut.* 1.9.2. **...diuturnitas...debemus:** reason should anticipate the effects of time (on the healing power of the passing of time: 5.12.4n *...praeteriti doloris...recordatio delectationem*). This is a standard theme of consolatory literature (on which, see the introduction to 5.13–18), that is recalled in §6n *...consilio...temporis medicinam...* and in 5.14.2n *sollicitudines...elevare...prudentia*; it is also found in other consolatory letters such as 4.5.6 and *Att.* 12.10 (Leveghi 2016, 496 n. 133).

6 Consolation *topos* and affectionate (but standard) closing remarks. **...mulier...consilio...temporis medicinam...:** given its similarity to §5n *...iis quos amasti...cura doloris tui...referetur*, Beaujeu

believes the entire passage (from *etenim* to *debemus*) to be a result of an interpolation. However, its authenticity is demonstrated by C.'s decision to repeat other *topoi* within the letter; e.g. §3n ...*status*...*civitatis*...*perdidissent* and §4n ...*non*...*deceptus esse videatur* on the idea that it is preferable to have lost loved ones now rather than earlier. A similar phenomenon is found in 5.13 (cf. its introduction), where, however, the reiteration is less conspicuous, likely owing to the socio-political significance/closeness to C. of the two recipients. C.'s statement is reinforced by an *exemplum*. For Titius, it will be straightforward to anticipate the effects of time (Titius had been already advised not to keep grieving in §5n ...*gravitatis*...*sapientiae*...*constantiae*...); after all, even a woman of a frailer spirit (*imbecillo*...*animo*: E.-M. s.v. *imbecillus*) ultimately set a limit to her mourning. *Imbecillo*...*mulier*...: women's frailty is a well-attested *topos*: Eur. *Med.* 928 γυνὴ δὲ θῆλυ κἀπὶ δακρύοις ἔφυ. It is found again in *Flac*. 72. On *lugendi* 'to mourn': §4n *miserias*...*lugeas*. **...officio...viri...amicissimi...confidas:** standard closing remark in a consolatory letter (cf. the introduction to 5.13–18), aimed at displaying affection: §1n *nostrae necessitudinis*...*benevolentiae*. On the idea that writing consolatory letters is a friend's duty: see the introduction to the letter.

17

Letter of consolation upon the addressee's exile, written probably in early 56.

5.17–18 mark the commencement of a fresh series of consolatory letters, while still adhering to the established themes of consolation introduced in the previous letters (as seen in the introduction to 5.13–18). While the previous letters dealt with offering solace in the face of the republic's demise (5.13) and the loss of children (5.14–16), 5.17–18 shift their focus towards extending consolation to individuals in exile. The mention of Sittius' son, Publius, in this letter may have influenced the decision of the ancient editor(s) to place it here, particularly following 5.14–16, a section predominantly composed of letters offering consolation for the deaths of children.

The addressee of 5.17 is P. Sittius, Roman knight and rich landowner from Nuceria (cf. also Sh.-B. *ad loc.*), perhaps accused of having had a role in the Catilinarian conspiracy (*NP* s.v. Sittius [1]) and, at the time of the letter, in exile. A friend of C. until the outbreak of the civil war, Sittius sided with Caesar—a decision that C. did not view favourably (he will welcome the news of Sittius' death in 44: *Att.* 15.17.1).

Ten years separate 5.17 from 5.16, the latter being written in c. 46. Similarly to 5.18, 5.17 takes the reader back to the early 50s, to a time preceding the outbreak of the civil war evident in 5.13–16. Letter 17 can be dated to 56 (differently from T.-P. *ad loc.*, who dates it to 52) thanks to C.'s allusions to Clodius' activities during the years 58–57, including C. own exile and subsequent

return to Rome (§1n *priora tempora ruinis rei publicae nostrique...intervallum...satis longum...* and §2n *proxime recenti adventu meo*); to the crisis caused by a grain shortage in September 57, as well as the increasing influence of Pompey and Caesar following the Lucca Conference (§2n *...eo tempore invidia annonae*; §2n *inimici...tui...amicorum tuorum*). According to C., these events impeded his ability to correspond with his recipient earlier (§1n *non...amicitia...consuetudinis...superioribus temporibus...*). Given the considerable amount of time that has elapsed since then (§2n *proxime recenti adventu meo*), C. is now in a position to address Sittius' concerns.

The letter closest in time to 5.17 in the Book is 5.3 (late 56), similarly concerning Clodius' activities to the detriment of C.'s addressee (Metell. Nepos), who was also involved (like Sittius but to a different degree: see the introduction to 5.3) in C.'s activity against Catiline. The recurrent references (sometimes more evident in some letters than in others: see the general introduction) to Catiline and Clodius (and to C.'s efforts against them) constitute one of the important thematic strands in Book 5: the reader keeps on seeing glimpses of the two bitterest enemies of C., especially in this book (they have a resonance that is largely absent in other books of the collection). This is part of the narrative that the ancient editor(s) wanted Book 5 to display.

C. neither refers to Sittius' exile (but instead he alludes to it: §4n *ne refricem meis litteris...dolorem tuum*), nor does he specify the reasons why Sittius had been accused. C. only mentions that he had to defend (§2n *in crimen vocabare defendi*; *te tuamque causam tutatus*; *saluti tuae defui*) Sittius three times (of which, at least two are probably linked to the same event): 1) when Sittius was (unfairly) accused (of something not specified) while not in Rome (§2n *primis temporibus...invidiam absens*). 2) When Sittius was sued alongside a friend (probably P. Corn. Sulla: §2n *...cum in tui familiarissimi...crimen coniungeretur...*). 3) At the time of C.'s return to Rome in 57 (§2n *proxime recenti adventu meo*), when C. discovered that Sittius' trial did not end as he had hoped (§2n *rem aliter institutam...*).

These three events appear to belong to different accusations probably made in 64, 62 and 57 (Heurgon 1950, 374–377): 1) prosecution for debts in 64, that Sittius avoided by going into voluntary exile (§2n *absens*); 2) prosecution for having enlisted troops for Catiline in 62, that seems to have been quashed due to C.'s intervention (§2n *te tuamque causam tutatus*); 3) an unknown accusation (but probably related to his involvement in the Catilinarian conspiracy), that led to a trial (§2n *iniquitas...iudici...*),—while he was presumably still away, since C. says that he had been taking care of Sittius' son Publius (§2n *Publio tuo*)—in 57.

The ancient editor(s)' decision to position this letter here is perfectly in line with the gloomy tones and less prominent image of C. they wanted to emphasise in the second part of the book (on which, see the general introduction). Three elements support this narrative here: 1) the display of the

deteriorating state of the republic and C.'s lost pre-eminence; 2) C.'s choice of helping and flattering an individual involved in the Catilinarian conspiracy; 3) C.'s decision to pledge his support to someone who was away from Rome, but not for official duty. These elements are immediately unpacked below.

1) The letter contains reference to the dire state in which both the republic and C. find themselves; in particular to discontent (§2n *iniquitas...veritasque valuissent*; §5n *iniuria*) with the conduct of trials and condemnations in the 50s (that notably fades away in C.'s consolatory letters to exiled individuals in the early 40s, replaced by references to Pompey and/or Caesar's favour towards the recipient of the letter: cf. also the introduction to 5.18).

2) C. is seen defending a man who likely did not hold magistracies (Sittius' son Publius was a *homo novus*: §4n *industriam*) and, more significantly, was implicated in the Catilinarian conspiracy. He flatters Sittius: C. not only highlights his addressee's qualities (§1n *tuam virtutem...magnitudinem...*; §3n *optimis viris*; *prudentem hominem*; §5n *homines sapientis*) but he also holds him not responsible for the criminal accusations he had been facing (§1n *tuis iniustissimis...acerbissimis incommodes...*; §2n *iniquitas...veritasque*; §3n *optimis viris iniustis*; §5n *nihil meritato*), since (he says) they were fuelled by others' envy, not by Sittius' actions (§2n *invidiam*; §2n *vitia*; §5n *iniuria commoveri*).

3) C. employs a standard statement of support (typical of letters addressed to individuals residing abroad to carry out their official duties) to assure Sittius of his unwavering support during his absence (§2n; §§4n–5n). However, rather differently from C. Antonius and P. Sestius in 5.5–6, Crassus in 5.8, and P. Vatinius in 5.11, Sittius was absent in order to escape punishment, not because he was in service.

Nonetheless, when viewed outside of the perspective of the ancient editor(s)' narrative, it becomes readily understandable why C. behaved as he did. C. was accustomed to helping unknown and guilty men, as he admits in 4.13.3. In addition, C.'s treatment of Sittius bears a resemblance to his treatment of C. Antonius in 5.5: both were accused of involvement in the Catilinarian conspiracy and received support from C. (although—significantly—Sittius receives somewhat more favourable treatment, even though Antonius had held more important offices).

C.'s behaviour might also be explained thanks to his allusion to a very close friend (§1n *tui familiarissimi*) of Sittius: P. Corn. Sulla. Sulla, too, had faced accusations of being implicated in the conspiracy and had been defended by C. in the *Pro Sulla*. Affirming Sittius' involvement in the conspiracy would likely imply Sulla's involvement as well (one of the charges against Sulla was that he sent Sittius to Hispania Ulterior to foment trouble in the province: *Sul.* 56). Furthermore, Sittius

had influential allies; the reference to §2n ...*amicorum tuorum* may allude to Pompey, who was P. Corn. Sulla's brother-in-law and to whom C. proposed to entrust command of the grain supply.

M. CICERO S.D. P. SITTIO P.F. 'From M. Cicero to P. Sittius, son of Publius, greetings': standard formal heading. The *lectio Sittio* has been proposed by Baiter against *Sistio* in **M** and *Sestio* in **GR**. Baiter's *correctio* is supported by the *lectio Sitti* found in §2 in **M**.

1 C. apologises for the delay in writing, citing three factors that contributed to this: 1) the challenges facing the republic; 2) C.'s personal difficulties; 3) the issues affecting Sittius. The whole paragraph is characterised by references to various points in time when events occurred (*superioribus temporibus*; *priora tempora*; *posteriora*; *intervallum...satis longum...*; similar to §2). **Non oblivione amicitiae...sed quod...retardarunt:** writing to a friend in need or abroad, whether to extend assistance (5.5–6; 5.8; 5.11: the introduction) or offer consolation (the introduction to 5.13–18), was considered a fundamental aspect of friendship (on *consuetudo*: 5.14.3 *ad consuetudinem...nostram commune*). Neglecting this duty could potentially lead to irritation (especially when corresponding with influential figures like e.g. Crassus in 5.8.1n *Quantum...meum studium...*). For this reason, C. affirms he has not forgotten their friendship and the socio-political ties it entails (*non oblivione amicitiae*); the delay in his correspondence with Sittius is not due to any fault on his part (differently in 5.5, where C. plainly announces his resolution to cease aiding Antonius, who remains abroad and in need: see its introduction); it is rather a consequence of significant events unfolding, both within the state and in C. and Sittius' lives. By recognising this, C. tries to alleviate any potential face-threatening implications that this delay might have caused. ...*priora tempora...ruinis rei publicae nostrisque*: C. is referring to the year 58, marked by the consulship of Gabinius and Piso, as well as Clodius' tribuneship and the contentious legislation that ensued; C. alludes to the *Lex Clodia de provinciis consularibus* on Gabinius and Piso's provinces for the following year (*Prov.* 13) and the *Lex de capite civis Romani* that sentenced C. to exile. This is also suggested by C.'s use of *ruina* in reference to both Gabinius and Piso and Clodius in *Prov.* 43 *Ecce illa tempestas...ruina...civitatis*. *Ruina* is also found in allusions to Clodius alone (*Dom.* 65; *Sest.* 109; *Att.* 4.3.2) and the two consuls (*Red. Sen.* 18; *Prov.* 13; cf. also MacKendrick 1995, *index*); it is also used in reference to Vatinius, alluding to his actions in support of Caesar (*Vat.* 21). The choice of selecting and positioning a letter, where C. alludes both to Catiline and Clodius, in a book in which they constitute one of the most crucial and recurring themes, is not accidental and is perfectly in line with the intentional editorial narrative: see the introduction to 5.17. On C.'s typical association between negative occurrences affecting the republic and himself: 5.4.2n *revocare...omnium...non...possis*.

...posterioria...incommodis refers to events occurred after C.'s return from exile and probably to accusations on Sittius' involvement in the Catilinarian conspiracy (§2n *proxime recenti adventu meo...*). C. intentionally—as both parties were aware of the meaning of his words—does not specify the precise nature of Sittius' difficulties (*incommodum* is a generic word already employed by C. to refer to Titius' own problems: 5.16.5n). The only information provided (several times throughout the entire letter: see its introduction) is that these troubles were exceedingly unjust (*iniustissimis*) and extremely challenging (*acerbissimis*) to bear. This might have been done to appease Sittius and also absolve him (and P. Corn. Sulla: cf. the introduction to the letter) in case the letter fell into enemy hands. **...intervallum...satis longum...scribere:** sentence that began once more with a temporal reference (cf. above). It is likely that several months elapsed between C.'s return to Rome and the composition of this letter. Upon returning to Rome, C. claims to have learned of the dire straits in which Sittius found himself, offering him assistance (§2n *proxime recenti adventu meo...*). This is also a strategy of politeness: allowing some time to pass before corresponding with someone (particularly after a distressing event as e.g. in 5.16.1n *non tacere...*), was not only a customary practice, but also a gesture to show empathy and solidarity. The praise of the addressee's qualities (again in §5), especially in a letter of consolation, is a common feature: 5.16.5n *gravitas...sapientiae*. On *virtus*: 5.16.4n; on *magnitudo animi*: 5.7.3n; on *diligentia*: 5.8.2n.

2 C. structures his statements and employs his language as if in a courtroom speech (as already in other letters of defence for C.'s activity: e.g. 5.2.8n *iniuria*; *qui...qui...qui*; §10n *peto ut*; to defend Crassus: 5.8.3n *existimo*; §5n *quam ob rem*; Vatinius' request of patronage: see the introduction to 5.9.1). The division of the section into different moments—marked (as in §1) by references to specific periods of time (*primis temporibus*; *cum*; *proxime recenti*; *cumque eo tempore*)—draws attention to different phases of C.'s defence of Sittius (similar to *Sul.* 56, where C. recalls the same events). **Ego te...primis temporibus...defendi...:** language of defence speech, emphasised by *ego* that highlights C.'s main role in the defence (cf. also the use of *defendo*) of his client Sittius (similar to *Font.* 1); it is possible that C. is referring to the fact that he provided legal counsel in a private setting (Sh.-B. *ad loc.*). *primis temporibus* refers to events of 64, when Sittius had been the object of a slanderous attack (*in invidiam...crimen vocare*, courtroom language: *Verr.* 2.5.133; similar found in *Off.* 1.86 on C.'s exile; on *in crimen vocare*: *TLL* IV 1191, 29). C. might be referring to the fact that Sittius was unfairly (cf. the introduction; on *invidia*: 5.8.2n; 5.9.1n; 5.12.6n; 8n) indicted when he was away. *absens*: probably self-exile to escape indictment (possibly similar to Metell. Nepos: 5.1.1n *capite ac fortunis*) or to pursue his interests: cf. below (it was C.'s duty to help a friend abroad: see the introduction to the letter). Heurgon 1950, 373 believes that Sittius was indicted for debts (similar to *Sul.* 56:

Sulla...venditis aes alienum eiusdem est dissolutum). It is also possible that Sittius might have faced allegations for raising trouble in Hispania Ulterior in 64, where (it was believed: *Sul.* 56) he was sent by P. Corn. Sulla to enlist individuals for Catiline's cause (an accusation that C. combats with unconvincing evidence: *Sul.* 56–59). However, Sittius perhaps went to Spain (and Mauretania: Sall. *Cat*. 21) to call in loans made earlier (*Sul.* 58: [*Sulla*] *qui ita Romae debuit ut in provinciis et in regnis ei maximae pecuniae deberentur*). **...cum...crimen coniungeretur...te tuamque causam tutatus...:** another stage in C.'s defence of Sittius that is again introduced by a temporal indicator and marked by courtroom vocabulary. Sittius is here said to have been accused alongside a friend, probably P. Corn. Sulla. This probably refers to 62 and to Sulla's trial for his alleged involvement in the conspiracy of Catiline; C. dismisses this association for both of them in *Sul.* 57–58. By not mentioning Sulla's name, C. likely intended to prevent P. Corn. Sulla (and Sittius) from being once again linked to the Catilinarian conspiracy, particularly during a period when it was still a topic of public discussion (e.g., the events concerning C.'s exile and return; cf. also *...proxime recenti adventu meo...valuissent*). By protecting them, especially P. Corn. Sulla, C. would also safeguard Pompey, who was Sulla's brother-in-law, from additional troubles, at a time when there was growing discontent surrounding him (due to issues concerning the grain supply: *invidia annonae*). On Catiline (and Clodius) as two of the threads of Book 5 intentional narrative: see the introduction to the letter. **...proxime recenti adventu meo...nulla re saluti tuae defui...valuissent...:** the third time that C. helped (or tried to) Sittius: after C.'s return from exile in September 57 (*proxime recenti adventu meo*). It is likely that Sittius faced accusations (deliberately carried out while C. was not in Rome: *si adfuissem*), possibly connected to his alleged involvement in the Catilinarian conspiracy. This condemnation likely reflected the more conservative climate in Rome, which tended to prosecute those associated with the conspiracy (Heurgon 1950, 376; cf. also *...cum...crimen coniungeretur...tutatus...*). Upon C.'s return from exile, he discovered that Sittius had been charged (though the exact nature of the accusation remains unknown) and endeavoured to offer assistance (on the possible reasons for which C. decided to help Sittius, see the introduction to the letter). *invidia annonae*: a few days after C.'s return, a serious grain supply crisis hit Rome, but it was resolved by entrusting Pompey with its command for five years. *Invidia* is of some significance in this section (§2n *invidiam*). Heurgon 1950, 375 (followed by Sh.-B. *ad loc.*) believes it refers to Sittius and his involvement in grain transactions (similar Berry on *Sul*. 56 and Leveghi 2016, 500 n. 139, who emphasise links between Sittius and the grain supply crisis). However, it is worth considering whether C. might also be alluding to himself (and his role in the grain supply crisis) as one of the contributing factors (together with Sittius' own enemies and other institutional problems: below) preventing him from securing Sittius' release from an undisclosed condemnation. In *Att.* 4.1, C. affirms that Clodius

encouraged people to lay the blame for the grain shortage on C. (§6 *homines...impulsu Clodi mea opera frumenti inopiam esse clamarent*; similar to *Dom.* 12; 14–15). In particular, in *Att.* 4.1.8 (*Iam...qui nos absentis defenderunt...aperte invidere*), C. confesses to Atticus that those who had previously defended him have now exhibited overt signs of jealousy; this is probably the same *invidia* to which C. refers in 5.17.2n and in *Dom.* 16. *inimici...amicorum tuorum*: the idea that one's hostility extends to all an enemy's friends is noticeably uncommon in Roman *amicitia* (5.2.10n *maneo...benevolentia detraham*). Until the outbreak of the civil war, when he sided with Caesar (cf. the introduction to the letter), Sittius appeared to align himself with Pompey, a connection that is further supported by his close relationship (§2n *familiarissimi*) with P. Corn. Sulla, who was Pompey's brother-in-law. Here, C. likely refers primarily to Pompey's adversaries, who were also C.'s adversaries, especially the supporters of Clodius. In *Att.* 4.1.6, C. mentions that Clodius' brother App. Claud. Pulcher, along with the tribunes Q. Numer. Rufus and S. Atil. Serrano Gariano (who were known to have opposed C.'s return from exile: *Sest.* 72; 82; 94), did not seem pleased when C. read aloud the senate decree that entrusted Pompey with the command of the grain supply. It is likely that these individuals, along with other backers of Clodius (also probably his cousin Metell. Nepos, consul in 57 and related to the events of C.'s exile and return: cf. 5.4), may have hindered C.'s efforts to aid Sittius. *iniquitas...veritasque valuissent*: the challenges that C. encountered in his efforts to assist Sittius (§2n *invidia annonae*; *inimici...amicorum tuorum*) coupled with the tumultuous state of the republic's political landscape (disfigured by Clodius and his bands), made it impossible for C. to succeed in his goal: to bring Sittius back to Rome, potentially from exile. In 5.18, Fadius seems to experience a similar situation: §2n *iudicium...sententia dubia* (the *iunctura* is recalled in §3n). This dark atmosphere and C.'s evident lack of an authority sufficient to aid Sittius (and Fadius), bolster the narrative on C.'s and the republic's decline that the ancient editor(s) evidently wish to foster in the second part of Book 5: see the introduction to the letter. **...Publio tuo...opera...consilio...defui:** taking care of a friend's family and business, when abroad, was a duty of *amicitia*: e.g. 5.8.2n *...uxor tua...tui Crassi meis consiliis...studiis*, while Crassus was abroad (§5n *a me...defensio...te absente dignitatis tuae*); cf. also the introduction to the letter. The use of *Publius* aims at strengthening their closeness (as also happens in 5.8.4n *Publio deditus*). On the reference to Sittius' son serving as an intentional link between 5.17 and the previous 5.14–16: see its introduction.

3 Standard motives of letters of consolation (*...communem incertumque casum...neque vitare...*; *...ferres...Fortunae resisters*; *...multis fortissimis...iniustis iudiciis...*), already found in the previous consolatory set: for which, the introduction to 13–18. **...officiis amicitiae...sancteque servatis...:** C. emphasises (cf. the use of *diligenter* and alliteration of *o* and *s*) that he has complied with his duties

of friendship: he has helped a friend in need (§2n *ego te...defendi*...) and has also looked after his interests and family when he was away (§2n *absens*; similar to 5.18.2n *animus...in te liberosque...debet*); to this, C. also adds (*ne...praetermittendum...duxi*) consolatory duties (similar to 5.16.6n *officio*). **...hominem...virum...meminisses:** the idea that a human being is, for their nature, exposed to Fortune's blows is a standard consolatory motif (see the introduction to 5.13–18); here C. adds *vir* to praise the addressee (as also in 5.18.1n *...oro te...virumque...*). **...re publica carere...delectet:** the current socio-political situation in Rome, that here is not employed as a further element of consolation; differently from 5.16 (§3n *status ipse nostrae civitatis*) and 5.18 (§1n *condicio impendere...re publica discesserit*)—both written right before/after the escalation of events between Pompey and Caesar.

4 C. dutifully fulfils his role as a friend by looking after Sittius' son while he is away (§2n *...Publio tuo...opera...consilio...defui*). The paragraph focuses on two main points: praise for Publius (that is also praise for Sittius) and Sittius' absence from Rome (*desiderium ac colorem tuum*; *ubicumque eris*). C. employs strategies of redressive politeness (*vereor ne*: 5.12.6n...*adsentatiuncula...laudent adsentatores...*; *si...sin*; *ne refricem*) to strengthen his relation with the addressee; this also serves to divert attention from the fact that he was unable to assist Sittius (§2n *...proxime recenti adventu meo...nulla re saluti tuae defui...*). **...eius virtutis...pietatem...industriam...intuemur:** the qualities of Sittius' son (similar to §5n *illius eximia virtus*); he is depicted by C. as possessing similar virtues to Crassus' sons: *pietas* and *virtus* (5.8.2n). In addition, while Crassus' sons were also celebrated for their *gratia* (5.8.2n), Sittius' son is distinguished by his *industria*. C.'s language is again overly emphatic, likely unsuitable for young individuals (5.8.2n *eximia...gratia*) and, also, for the son of a person allegedly involved in the Catilinarian conspiracy. The reference to Publius' *industria* perhaps implies that he was a *homo novus* (on which, Hellegouarc'h 1963, 254); the limited availability of sources concerning both Sittius and Publius poses a challenge in substantiating this claim (even the information provided by Broughton 1952, 609 mentioning a Publius serving as a *quaestor* in 43, may not offer significant assistance in this regard). Nevertheless, potential evidence arises from the editorial choice of arranging 5.17 just before 5.18—addressed to another *homo novus*, T. Fadius. *ubicumque eris...intuemur*: C. seems not to know where Sittius is (*ubicumque*) but he is certainly not in Rome (probably in a self-imposed exile: §2n *absens*). C. tries to console Sittius; regardless of his location, he will always be accompanied by Publius' love and admirable traits: what individuals imagine in their minds (*animo complectimur*) is just as much a part of them as what they observe with their eyes (*oculis intuemur*). The concept is discussed in more detail in *de orat*. 2. 357: individuals construct mental images of things they have perceived through their senses, with sight being the most

acute, which enhances their ability to recall these experiences (Wilkins *ad loc.*). Despite the distance, Sittius can vividly recall Publius (and the qualities mentioned by C.: above) because he previously had first-hand experience of them when they both were in Rome.

5 Closing paragraph that summarises the main points of the letter: consolatory motives to offer solace to Sittius in light of what C. believed to be an unjust prosecution; and expressions of friendship, which are customary in letters of consolation and when reaching out to a friend in need. **...illius virtus...tibi consolationi...:** on Publius' virtues: §4n...*eius virtutis...pietatem...industriam*... . Variation of the consolatory theme of finding solace in one's own virtues (§5n *animi tui conscientia*; similar to 5.13.5n *ignosces...lenimur*); here Sittius is invited to find consolation in the thought of Publius' virtues and affection. Among C.'s consolatory letters to exiled individuals (5.18; 4.13; 6.1; 6.2; 6.4), this appears to be the only one where this consolatory topic is found. This could be attributed to various factors, such as personal circumstances—perhaps the children of other exiled individuals were too young to distinguish themselves, or they did not have children at all; or material ones—perhaps the consolatory letters that included this motif were not (accidentally or deliberately) preserved. Additionally, individual reasons may have played a role; Sittius might have held a particular pride in Publius for his noted §4n *industria*, though it remains challenging to prove this. **...nos...te...ex virtute tua...pendemus:** Sittius' friends value him for his qualities (*ex virtute*: although not specified) not his wealth (*ex fortuna*: *OLD* s.v. 12). C.'s mention of Sittius' wealth may be linked to the challenges he had to face (for which: §2n *primis temporibus...crimen vocabare*...; §2n ...*crimen coniungeretur*...). As C. considers (or rather pretends: below) Sittius to be innocent, he emphasises (as also stressed by the polyptoton *pendimus...pendemus*) that Sittius should be assessed based on his (unknown) virtues rather than his wealth and the resulting financial obligations. **...maxime animi...conscientia...iniuria...:** it is not only in his son's love and virtues that Sittius should seek solace (§5n ...*illius virtus...tibi consolationi*...), but also in the knowledge that he did not commit the acts for which he has been accused (§5n *nihil merito...iniuria commoveri*). *Conscientia* as 'awareness of one's actions' (*OLD* s.v. 3a) is generally employed in Book 5 in reference to C.'s activity against the Catilinarians: 5.7.2n *officiorum conscientia*; 5.13.4n *conscientiae nostrae*. Here, it is used for the first time to highlight someone else's innocence—that of Sittius—who (allegedly: the introduction) seems to have been part of the conspiracy (C.'s strong defence of Sittius' innocence may have stemmed from their closeness to Pompey: §2n *familiarissimi*). In a letter from 46 (addressed to another exiled friend), C. acknowledges that there were instances when he had to defend individuals he knew were guilty (4.13.3: ...*qui antea...sontibus opitulari poteram*...); this might have been one of those instances. ...*nihil merito...iniuria commoveri* reinforces Sittius' innocence (§5n *conscientia*), in

alignment with the Stoic teaching of *malum nullum esse nisi culpam* (see *Tusc*. 3.34): those who know they are innocent should find solace in their virtue and face challenges with a lighter heart (similar to 9.16.5). The concept is deployed in two other letters of consolation to exiled people: 6.1.4 *nihil...culpam putemus...omnia...moderate feramus*; 6.4.2...*conscientiam rectae...maximam consolationem...culpam*. Sittius is here depicted as the Stoic sage (similar C.'s portrait of Lucceius in 5.13.1n, although for a different reason): he understands that wise individuals are only affected by their own wrongdoing, not by the cruelty of others. *Iniuria* (like *invidia*: §2n), plays a significant role in the letter, underlining the possibility that Sittius' indictment may have been the result of false accusations against an innocent man. Sittius is not the sole figure believed to have been subjected to unjust treatment: §2n *iniquitas...iudici...* . **Ego...memoria...amicitiae...arbitrere:** standard statements in a consolatory letter upon exile (similar to 4.13.7; 6.1.7; 6.4.5) or letter to someone in need, generally found at its end: C.'s awareness of their bond of friendship (*memoria nostrae veteris amicitiae*: 5.8.2…*memoria nostrae voluntatis*…; 5.8.5n *amicitiae nostrae*...); assurance to his addressee of his unwavering support to himself (...*fortunam tuam...ad me...scripseris*: 5.8.5n *defensio...te absente dignitatis...permanebo*; 5.8.5n ...*ad te scribere...ad me detulisse*; 5.11.2n *omnia...non laboriosa*...) but also to his relatives in Rome/friends in times of difficulty (...*fili tui*...: 5.8.5n ...*tuis...tuorum negotiis*...; 5.11.2n *uxorem...quicquid opus esset*; 5.18.2n *meus animus...liberosque tuos...debet*).

18

Final letter of consolation in Book 5, here on the occasion of the addressee's exile. Probably written in 52, to the already exiled T. Fadius.

Letter 18 is one of only three (3.1; 13.75) extant letters, in the whole Ciceronian corpus of letters, that can be dated to 52. It was likely composed approximately four years after 5.17, and its placement after the latter is justified by the striking structural and thematic parallels they share. Both 5.17 and 18 are consolatory missives, forming part of the broader collection of letters dedicated to the theme of consolation that starts with 5.13. In particular, they are both written to console a friend in exile (emphasised by the standard language of *amicitia*: §2) and focus on the 'unjust' Roman legal system of the 50s (§2n ...*unum...iudicium...reprehendatur...una sententia...lenissime*...). In these letters, C. also mentions the addressees' children (§2n ...*fortunas...liberos habeas...vivendi*): a link that goes beyond the relation between 5.17 and 18, intentionally connecting these letters to the preceding 5.14–16, written to console the recipients for the loss of their children.

Moreover, both T. Fadius and P. Sittius (addressee of 5.17) were closely linked, either directly or indirectly, to Catiline and Clodius—whose presence pervades the entire book (cf. the introduction to 5.17). While it is likely that P. Sittius was embroiled in the Catilinarian conspiracy, potentially leading to his exile thanks to Clodius and his supporters (5.17.2n *proxime recenti adventu meo...invidia...*), it was T. Fadius who, as designated tribune in 58, aided C. in his return from exile, despite Clodius' vehement opposition (allusion to the events are in 7.27.1 *tribun<at>um plebi dicis te mea causa petisse*; *Att.* 3.23.4; *Red. Sen.* 21; probably in *QFr.* 1.4.3). Furthermore, a subtle allusion in 7.27 (§1n *ego ...te in consolatu observaram...ais*) suggests that Fadius, who served as quaestor under C. in 63 (Cavarzere 2016, 726 introductory note), possessed knowledge of and potentially endorsed C.'s campaign against Catiline. Although it seems that C. is closer to Fadius than to Sittius, C. displays a greater willingness to defend the latter, possibly because of Sittius' proximity to influential figures in the Roman aristocracy (§2n *molestia*).

The ancient editor(s)' decision to position this letter at this particular location in Book 5 is not solely rooted in these connections. On one hand, the letter brings closure to the narrative thread concerning consolation and exile that began with 5.13. On the other, it anticipates the narrative of C.'s interactions with his quaestors, that will be central in letters 5.19 to 5.21—since both T. Fadius and L. Mescin. Rufus (addressee of 5.19–21) had been C.'s quaestors.

The reason for Fadius' exile remains unspecified, yet stray details from C.'s choice of words suggest it was a concession to an influential but unnamed figure (§2n *unum...iudicium...reprehendatur...sententia...potentiae alicuius*). Despite this, his punishment appears to have been relatively lenient (§1n *levissima poena*).

Determining the date and the reasons behind Fadius' exile poses a considerable challenge. Both Constans III, 180–181, and Sh.-B. *ad loc.* concur in dating the letter to early 52, primarily based on the notion that Fadius was banished due to a breach (probably when applying either for aedileship or pretorship in 55–53: §1n *...plus virtus...dedit quam fortuna...homines novi...*) of the *lex Pompeia de ambitu* (Rotondi 1922[2]). This law, introduced by Pompey in 52, aimed to heighten penalties for *ambitus* offenses already outlined in the *lex Tullia de ambitu* (Rotondi 1922[2]), which mandated a 10-year period of exile. It is unclear how Pompey's proposed law aimed to enhance this punishment (given that Fadius was allowed to reside in Italy and maintain ownership of his possessions during exile: §2n *fortuna...liberos habeas*); however, it seems that Fadius was still in exile in 49: 7.27.1 *fore ut te Caesar restituat*.

Another aspect supporting the notion that the letter may have been composed in the (late) 50s is the fact that it is generally only in this period that C. routinely alludes to legal proceedings—although they are not functioning smoothly or align with the wishes of influential figures (§2n

...unum...iudicium...reprehendatur...una sententia...lenissime...). This observation also applies to 5.17, a consolatory letter addressed to an exiled individual, in which C. makes reference to trials and condemnations—a characteristic that is notably absent from letters of consolation to exiled individuals from the 40s onwards.

M. CICERO S.D. T. FADIO 'From M. Cicero to T. Fadius greetings': formal heading—similar to that found in 7.27, the other extant letter probably addressed to the same recipient.

1 Standard statements employed in C.'s consolatory letters (cf. the introduction to 5.13–18). **...plus virtus...dedit quam fortuna...homines novi...:** reference to Fadius' *novitas* (on the addressee's career: see the introduction). In the book, alongside C. himself and Fadius, only P. Vatinius (sender of 5.9–10a, c, b and addressee of 5.11) and Sittius' son (5.17.4n *industria*) were *homines novi*. C. acknowledges that Fadius achieved more than most self-made individuals ever do. This is likely in reference to the possibility that Fadius may have applied for aedileship and/or praetorship between 55 and 53 (similar to Sh.-B. *ad loc.*). This interpretation gains further weight when considering that, if Fadius was approximately 30 years old during his quaestorship in 63 (a common age requirement for accessing quaestorship in the late republic: Ryan 1996, 37–43), then, by 55–53, he would have been both eligible and potentially ready to apply for aedileship and/or praetorship. This is reinforced by the fact that, over a span of nineteen years, from 69 to 50, only 55 self-made men entered the senate for the first time (Wiseman 1971, *appendix* I). Among them, only ten individuals (whose careers can be reconstructed) held a tribuneship between 69–50. Additionally, just two held aedileship (M. Cael. Rufus and Cn. Plancius), two held praetorships (T. Ann. Milo and Q. Fuf. Calenus), and most likely only one held a propraetorship (T. Amp. Balbus). **...levissima poena:** Fadius was given the opportunity to live in Italy and retain his possessions (§2n *...fortunas...liberos habeas...vivendi*), which constituted a more lenient form of exile than that suffered by C. himself (*aquae et igni interdictio*). The *lex Pompeia de ambitu*, under which Fadius received his condemnation, sought to amplify penalties already specified in the *lex Tullia de ambitu*: the exact nature of these heightened punishments remains unclear (cf. the introduction to the letter). Given the leniency of the sentence, C. later advises Fadius to face it with a cheerful attitude (§2n *lenissime*).

2 The mildness of Fadius' condemnation, the increasing power of Pompey, and standard closing remarks. Standard language of *amicitia*, also employed by C. to pledge his support to a friend in need (similar to 5.17.5n *Ego...memoria...amicitiae...arbitrere*): *necessitudine*, *benevolentia*, *tecum coniunctissimos...vivendi* (similar to 5.15.2n), *in te liberosque...debet*. **...fortunas...liberos**

habeas...vivendi: differently from C., Fadius is allowed to remain in Italy (where his relatives and friends can meet him) and maintain possession of his goods (§1n ...*levissima poena*). The mention of Fadius' fortune and children brings to mind those of Sittius, even though Sittius was likely in exile due to his efforts to settle his debts (5.17.2n ...*crimen vocabare*...), and his exile was probably in a location far from Rome (5.17.2n *absens*), given C.'s remark that Sittius (not Fadius) will miss his son (5.17.4n *ne refricem...dolorem tuum*). Once again, these connections demonstrate the meticulous curation and organisation by the ancient editor(s) in crafting a cohesive narrative (cf. the general introduction). **...unum...iudicium...reprehendatur...una sententia...lenissime...:** according to C., Fadius' condemnation stands out from the other trial: it is criticised for being decided by an 'unclear' (*dubia*) vote (*sententia*) extended as a favour (*OLD* s.v. *condono* 1b) to an influential figure (*potentiae alicuius*: Pompey for Sh.-B. *ad loc.*). C. takes great care not to make explicit references (*existimetur*). It could be assumed that C. might be alluding to either an individual or a collective (*OLD* s.v. *sententia* 4a–b) vote against Fadius, possibly to appease the powerful Pompey, who held the unprecedented position of *consul sine collega* in early 52. However, it remains puzzling why Pompey would desire to see Fadius in exile. The injustices occurring in Roman courts and condemnations are also emphasised in 5.17.2n *iniquitas...iudici*. This might further support the idea that the letter was composed in the late 50s (despite the increasing dominance of Pompey and Caesar in the political landscape, the legal system still operated in the 50s: cf. the introduction to 5.18). *molestia*: although this condemnation is a source of distress (*OLD* s.v. 1)—not only personally but also politically (as it damaged Fadius' *dignitas*)—C. urges Fadius to endure it with great serenity (*lenissime*) because the punishment is one of the most lenient (§1n *levissima poena*). In contrast to 5.17, C. does not appear inclined to defend Fadius' honour by asserting the injustice of the condemnation. Instead, he simply advises Fadius to bear it, as it represents the best outcome he could hope for. The disparity between C.'s treatment of Sittius and Fadius' condemnations may stem from the fact that, unlike Fadius, Sittius had influential and powerful friends (5.17.2n *tui familiarissimi*), who might have persuaded C. to help him out.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

EDITIONS, TRANSLATIONS AND COMMENTARIES

Only cited editions featuring *Fam*. 5 (or some of its letters) are included in this list; a more comprehensive catalogue of editions of the *Ad Familiares* can be found in Cavarzere 2016, 69–74 and Gibson, forthcoming. Commentaries on other texts are incorporated into the general bibliography.

Cavarzere, A. (ed.) (2016) *Cicerone: Lettere ai familiari*, 2nd edn., 2 vols., Milan

Constans, L.-A., J. Bayet, and J. Beaujeu (eds.) (1934–1996) *Cicéron: Correspondance*, 11 vols. (vol. I–IV by L.-A. Constans and J. Bayet, vol. 5 by J. Bayet, vol. VI–XI by J. Beaujeu), Paris

How, W.W. (ed.) (1925–1926) *Select letters, with historical introductions, I-II: Text: Notes*, Oxford

Shackleton Bailey, D.R. (ed.) (1977) *Cicero: Epistulae ad Familiares*, 2 vols., Cambridge

—— (1980) *Select letters*, Cambridge

—— (1988) *M. Tulli Ciceronis Epistulae ad Familiares*, Stuttgart

Tyrrell, R.Y., and L.C. Purser (eds.) (1879–1901) *The correspondence of M. Tullius Cicero, arranged according to its chronological order; with a revision of the text, a commentary and introductory essays on the life of Cicero, and the style of his letters*, 7 vols. (vol. 1–2 by R.Y. Tyrrell., vol. 3–7 by R.Y. Tyrrell and L.C. Purser), Dublin

Watt, W.S. (1982) *M. Tulli Ciceronis epistulae*, Oxford

OTHER WORKS

In the Introduction and Commentary works of secondary literature are generally referred to by author's name and the date of publication. In the case of commentaries, references are made using the author's name along with the cited passage. An exception is made for T.-P.'s commentary and Sh.-B.'s commentary on *Fam*., to which it is generally referred with an abbreviated author's name and *ad loc.* Journal title abbreviations adhere to the guidelines of *L'Année philologique*.

Adams, J.N. (1978) 'Conventions of Naming in Cicero', *CQ* 28: 145–166

Allen, W. (1952) 'Cicero's Provincial Governorship in 63 B.C.', *TAPhA* 83: 233–241

Amela Valverde, L. (2002) 'La sublevación vaccea del año 56 a.C.', *Gallaecia* 21: 269–285

Arnaud, P. (1998) 'Les guerres parthiques de Gabinius et de Crassus et la politique occidentale des

Parthes Arsacides entre 70 et 53 av. J.-C.', in E. Dąbrowa (ed.), *Ancient Iran and the Mediterranean world: proceedings of an international conference in honour of Professor Józef Wolski held at the Jagiellonian University, in September 1996* (Kraków) 13–34

Ash, R. (2022) 'Un-Parallel Lives? The younger Quintus and Marcus Cicero in Cicero's *letters*', *Hermathena* 202: 71–103

Aubert-Baillot, S. (2017) '*Prudentia, prouidentia*: prudence et prévoyance dans les lettres de conseil et de direction chez Cicéron', in E. Gavoille and F. Guillaumont (eds.), *Conseiller, diriger par lettre* (Tours) 121–136

Bannon, C.J. (1997) *The brothers of Romulus: fraternal pietas in Roman law, literature and society*, Princeton

Bardt, C. (1897) 'Zur Provenienz von Ciceros Briefen *ad familiares*', *Hermes* 32: 264–272

Barlow, C.T. (1978) *Bankers, Moneylenders and Interest Rates in the Roman Republic* (diss., UNC-Chapel Hill)

Beard, M. (2002) 'Ciceronian correspondences: making a book out of letters', in T.P. Wiseman (ed.), *Classics in Progress: Essays on Ancient Greece and Rome* (Oxford) 103–144

—— (2014) *Laughter in Ancient Rome: On Joking, Tickling, and Cracking up*, Berkeley

Beckmann, F. (1952) *Humanitas-Ursprung und Idée*, Munster

Ben-Ze'ev, A. (2003) 'Aristotle on emotions towards the fortune of others', in D. Konstan and N.K. Rutter (eds.), *Envy, spite and jealousy: the rivalrous emotions in ancient Greece* (Edinburgh) 99–121

Berry, D.H. (1996) *Pro P. Sulla oratio*, Cambridge

Blösel, W. (2001) 'The Herodotean picture of Themistocles: a mirror of fifth-century Athens', in N. Luraghi (ed.), *The historian's craft in the age of Herodotus* (Oxford; New York) 179–197

Brennan, T.C. (2000) *The Praetorship in the Roman Republic*, Oxford

Broughton, T.R.S. (1952) *The magistrates of the Roman republic*, 2 vols., New York

Brown, R., and A. Gilman (1960) 'The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity', in T.A. Sebeok (ed.), *Style in Language* (Cambridge [Mass.]) 253–276

Brunt, P.A. (1965) '*Amicitia* in the Late Republic', *PCPhS* 2: 1–20

—— (1988) *The Fall of the Roman Republic and Related Essays*, Oxford

Cammoranesi S. (2022) *Cicero's Epistulae ad Familiares. Narratives of the Civil War* (Diss., Manchester University)

Candau, J.M. (2011) 'Republican Rome: Autobiography and Political Struggles', in G. Marasco (ed.), *Political autobiographies and memoirs in antiquity: a Brill companion* (Leiden; Boston [Mass.]) 121–159

Canter, H.V. (1936) ‘Irony in the orations of Cicero’, *AJPh*: 457–464

Cavarzere, A. (1983) *M. Celio Rufo, Lettere* (Cic. *fam*. l. VIII), Brescia

Celentano, M.S. (2002) ‘Giuramenti e tradimenti: chiamare a testimoni gli dei e violare la *fides*: (Hor. *epod*. 15)’, in M.S. Celentano (ed.), Τέρψις*: in ricordo di Maria Laetitia Coletti* (Alessandria) 157–171

Chalkomatas, D. (2007) *Ciceros Dichtungstheorie. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der antiken Literaturästhetik*, Berlin

Citroni Marchetti, S. (2006) ‘L’ assenza degli amici e l’*otium* nelle ville: (Cicerone, *fam*.7,1; Seneca, *epist*. 55)’, *Athenaeum* 94(2): 385–414

Citti, F. (2004) ‘*Spes dulce malum*: Seneca e la speranza, in L. De Finis (ed.), *Colloquio su Seneca* (Trento) 35–64

Clarke, J.R. (2007) *Looking at Laughter: Humor, Power, and Transgression in Roman Visual Culture, 100 B.C.- A.D. 250*, Berkeley

Cloud, J.D. (2009) ‘*Leges de sicariis*: the first chapter of Sulla’ s *lex de sicariis*’, *ZRG* 126: 114–155

Cornell, T.J. (2009) ‘Cato the Elder and the origins of Roman autobiography’, in C.J. Smith, A. Powell, and T.J. Cornell (eds.), *The lost memoirs of Augustus and the development of Roman autobiography* (Swansea) 15–40

Cornell, T.J. (ed.) (2013) *The Fragments of the Roman Historians*, 3 vols., Oxford

Cotton, H.M. (1986) ‘The Role of Cicero’s Letters of Recommendation: *iustitia* versus *gratia*?’, *Hermes* 114: 443–460

Cugusi, P. (1983) *Evoluzione e forme dell’epistolografia latina nella tarda repubblica e nei primi due secoli dell’impero*, Rome

—— (1998) ‘L'epistola ciceroniana: strumento di comunicazione quotidiana e modello letterario’, *Ciceroniana* 10: 163–189

Čulík-Baird, H. (2022) *Cicero and the Early Latin Poets*, Cambridge

Deligiannis, I. (2018) ‘Historiography, autobiography and self-praise in Cicero’s political dialogues (*Rep*. & *Leg*.) and his *Epist*., 5, 12’, *RCCM* 60(1): 141–154

Degl’Innocenti Pierini, R. (1998) ‘Ovidio esule e le epistole ciceroniane dell’esilio’, *Ciceroniana* 10: 93–106

—— (2006) ‘I naufragi degli altri: Cicerone e gli *otia* del 59 nella testimonianza dell'epistolario’, in C. Santini, L. Zurli, and L. Cardinali (eds.), *Concentus ex dissonis: scritti in onore di Aldo Setaioli* (Napoli) 283–296

Deniaux, E. (1993) *Clientèles et pouvoir à l'époque de Cicéron*, Rome; Paris

Derrida, J. (1997) *Politics of Friendship*, London

Diegel, L. (2021) *Life writing zwischen Republik und Prinzipat Cicero und Augustus*, Basel

Dillery, J. (2016) 'Xenophon: The Small Works', in M. Flower (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Xenophon* (Cambridge) 195–219

Dugan, J. (2014) '*Non sine causa sed sine fine*. Cicero's compulsion to repeat his consulate', *CJ* 110(1): 9–22

Dyck, A.R (ed.) (1996) *A commentary on Cicero, De officiis*, Ann Arbor (Mich.)

—— (2003) *De natura deorum. Liber 1*, Cambridge; New York

—— (2004) *A commentary on Cicero, De legibus*, Ann Arbor (Mich.)

—— (2008) *Cicero: Catilinarians*, Cambridge; New York

—— (2010) *Cicero: Pro Sexto Roscio*, Cambridge; New York

—— (2013) *Pro Caelio*, Cambridge; New York

Erskine, A (1997) 'Cicero and the Expression of Grief', in S. Braund and C. Gill (eds.), *The Passions in Roman Thought and Literature* (Cambridge) 36–47

Evangelou, G. (2020) 'Strategies of reconciliation in Cicero's private and public life', *Arctos* 54: 95–122

Evenepoel, W. (2014) 'The stoic Seneca on *virtus*, *gaudium* and *voluptas*', *AC* 83: 45–78

Fantham, E. (1988) '*Varietas* and *satietas*. *De oratore* 3.96.103 and the limits of *ornatus*', *Rhetorica* 6: 275–290

—— (2002) '*Orator* and/*et actor*', in P. Easterling and E. Hall (eds.), *Greek and Roman actors: aspects of an ancient profession* (Cambridge) 362–376

Farmer, M.S. (2001) *Cicero's use of auctoritas and of the opposing advocate as means of persuasion in De finibus bonorum et malorum* (Diss., Loyola University Chicago)

Fedeli, P. (1970) 'Il *carme* 30 di Catullo', in *Studia Florentina A. Ronconi oblata* (Rome) 97–113

—— (1980) *Sesto Properzio: il primo libro delle elegie*, Florence

Flower, H.I. (2015) 'The rapture and the sorrow: characterization in Sulla's *Memoirs*', in R. Ash (ed.), *Fame and infamy: essays for Christopher Pelling on characterization in Greek and Roman biography and historiography* (Oxford) 209–223

Fögen, T. (2009) 'Tears and Crying in Graeco-Roman Antiquity: An Introduction', in T. Fögen (ed.), *Tears in the Graeco-Roman World* (Berlin; New York) 1–16

Fromentin, V. (2008) 'Ordre du temps et ordre des causes: *archè* et *aitia* chez Thucydide, Polybe et Denys d'Halicarnasse', in B. Bureau, C. Nicolas (eds.), *Commencer et finir: débuts et fins dans les littératures grecque, latine et néolatine* (Paris) 59–70

Fulkerson, L. (2013) *No regrets: remorse in classical antiquity*, Oxford; New York

Gibson, R.K. (2003) ‘Pliny and the art of (in)offensive self-praise’, *Arethusa* 36(2): 235–254

—— (2012) ‘On the nature of ancient letter collections’, *JRS* 102: 56–78

—— (2013) ‘Letters into autobiography: the generic mobility of the ancient letter collection’, in T. D. Papanghelis, S.J. Harrison, and S. Frangoulidis (eds.), *Generic interfaces in Latin literature: encounters, interactions and transformations* (Berlin; Boston) 387–416

—— (2015) ‘Not Dark Yet...: Reading to the End of Pliny’s Nine-Book Collection’, in I. Marchesi (ed.), *Pliny the Book-Maker: Betting on Posterity in the Epistles* (Oxford) 185–222

—— (2022) ‘The *Pro Marcello* without Caesar: grief, exile and death in Cicero, *Ad Familiares* 4’, *Hermathena* 101: 105–146

—— (forthcoming) ‘Essays on the Ciceronian Collections’

Gibson, R.K., and A. Morrison (2022) ‘Patterns of arrangement in Greco-Roman letter collections: 400 BCE–400 CE’, in S. Facione (ed.), *Concatenantur sibi epistulae nostrae* (Foggia) 11–57

González Vega, F. (2017) ‘*Otium in litteris*: el placer de la literatura y del conocimiento entre las noches áticas y las vigilias nebrisenses’, *Myrtia* 32: 33–70

Graver, M. (2002) *Cicero On the Emotions. Tusculan Disputations 3 and 4*, Chicago

Gray, V. (2016) ‘Xenophon’s Language and Expression’, in M. Flower (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Xenophon* (Cambridge) 223–240

Griffin, M. (1995) ‘Philosophical Badinage in Cicero’s *Letters to his Friends*’, in J.G.F. Powell (ed.), *Cicero the Philosopher: Twelve Papers* (Oxford) 325–346

Grillo, L. (2015) ‘Reading Cicero’s *Ad Familiares* 1 as a collection’, *CQ* 100: 1–14

—— (2016) ‘The artistic architecture and closural devices of Cicero’s *Ad familiares* 1 and 6’, *Arethusa* 49: 399–413

Gruen, E.S (1970) ‘*Veteres hostes, novi amici*’, *Phoenix* 24: 237–243

—— (1973) ‘The trial of C. Antonius’, *Latomus* 32: 301–310

—— (1974) *The last generation of the Roman republic*, Berkeley

Guillemin, A. (1938) ‘La lettre de Cicéron à Luccéius (*Fam*. V,15)’, *REL* 16: 96–103

Gunderson, E.T. (2007) ‘*S. V. B. ; E. B.*’ *ClAnt* 26(1): 1–48

Gurlitt, L. (1901) ‘Die Entstehung der ciceronischen Briefsammlungen’, *Neue Jahrb. für klass. Altertum* 7: 532–558

Habinek, T.N (1990) ‘Towards a History of Friendly Advice: The Politics of Candor in Cicero’s *De amicitia*’, *Apeiron* 23: 165–185

Hales, S. (2000) ‘At Home with Cicero’, *G&R* 47(1): 44–55

Hall, J. (1996) ‘Cicero *Fam*. 5.8 and *Fam*. 15.5 in the Light of Modern Politeness Theory’, *Antichthon* 30: 19–33

—— (1998) ‘Cicero to Lucceius (*Fam*. 5.12) in Its Social Context: *Valde Bella*?’, in *CPh* 93(4): 308–321

—— (2009) *Politeness and politics in Cicero’s letters*, Oxford

—— (2013) ‘Saviour of the Republic and Father of the Fatherland: Cicero and political crisis’, in C. Steel (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Cicero* (Cambridge) 215–230

Hamilton, C.D. (1994) ‘Plutarch and Xenophon on Agesilaus’, *AncW* 25: 205–212

Hau, L.I. (2019) ‘Pathos with a Point: Reflections on “Sensationalist” Narratives of Violence in Hellenistic Historiography in the Light of Twenty-First-Century Historiography’, in J. Grethlein, L. Huitink, and A. Tagliabue (eds.), *Experience, Narrative, and Criticism in Ancient Greece: Under the Spell of Stories* (Oxford) 81–103

Hellegouarc’h, J. (1963) *Le vocabulair laetin des relationest des partis politique sous la republique* (Publications de la faculte des lettres et sciences de l' universite de Lille II), Paris

Heurgon, J. (1950) ‘La Lettre De Cicerón à P. Sittius (*Ad Fam*., V, 17)’, *Latomus* 9(4): 369–377

Hoffer, S.E. (2003) ‘Cicero’s Friendly Disagreement with Metellus Celer (*Fam.* 5.1–2)’, *SCI* 22: 93–101

Holliday, V. (1969) *Pompey in Cicero’s correspondence and Lucan’s Civil War*, Den Haag

Hutchinson, G.O. (1998) *Cicero’s Correspondence: A Literary Study*, Oxford

Immerwahr, H.R. (1960) ‘Ergon, history as a monument in Herodotus and Thucydides’, *AJPh* 81: 261–290

Kaster, R.A. (2005) *Emotion, Restraint, and Community in Ancient Rome*, Oxford; New York

Kaster, R.A. (ed.) (2006) *Speech on behalf of Publius Sestius*, New York

Kelly, J.M. (1966) *Roman litigation*, Oxford

Kenney, E.J. (1999) ‘*Ut erat nouator*: anomaly, innovation and genre in Ovid, *Heroides* 16–21’, in J.N Adams, and R.G. Mayer (eds.), *Aspects of the language of Latin poetry, Proceedings of the British Academy* 93 (Oxford; New York) 399–414

Kinsey, T.E. (1971) *M.Tulli Ciceronis Pro P. Quinctio Oratio*, Sydney

Konstan, D. (1996) ‘Friendship, Frankness and Flattery’, in J.T. Fitzgerald (ed.), *Friendship, Flattery, and Frankness of Speech: Studies on Friendship in the New Testament World* (Leiden) 7–19

(1997) *Friendship in the Classical World*, Cambridge

Kotsifu, C. (2012) ‘Being Unable to Come to You and Lament and Weep with You’: Grief and Condolence Letters on Papyrus, in A. Chaniotis (ed.), *Unveiling emotions: sources and methods for the study of emotions in the Greek world* (Stuttgart) 389–411

Langerwerf, L. (2015) ‘To have daring is like a barrier: Cicero and Sallust on Catiline’s *audacia*’, *G&R* 62(2): 155–166

Leach, E.W. (2016) ‘Cicero’s Cilician correspondence: space and *auctoritas*’, *Arethusa* 49(3): 503–523

Lear, F.S. (1965) *Treason in Roman and Germanic law: collected papers*, Austin

Lehmann, Y. (2014) ‘Historiographie et autobiographie dans la *Correspondance* de Cicéron des années 58–56, *REL* 92: 85–98

Lentano, M. (2009) ‘La gratitudine e la memoria. Una lettura del *de beneficiis*’, *BStudLat* 39(1): 1–28

Leveghi C. (2016) ‘Libro quinto’, in A. Cavarzere (ed.) *Cicerone: Lettere ai familiari*, 2nd edn., 2 vols (Milano) 415–529

Levens, R.G.C. (1928) Note on Metellus Celer’s letter to Cicero, *CR*: 171–172

Levick, B.M. (2015) *Catiline*, London

Lewis, R.G, J. Harries, and A.C. Clark (eds.) (2006) *Commentaries on speeches of Cicero*, Oxford

Lintott, A.W. (1968) *Violence in Republican Rome*, Oxford

Liong, K. (2016) ‘Breathing crime and contagion: Catiline as *scelus anhelans* (Cic. *Cat*. 2.1), *RhM* 159(3–4): 348–368

Loehr, R.M. (2017) *Emotions in Polybius’ Histories* (Diss., University of California Santa Barbara)

Long, A.G. (2019) *Death and immortality in ancient philosophy*, Cambridge

Losito, L. (forthcoming) ‘The Narratives of Cicero’s *Ad Quintum Fratrem*: Career, Republic and the *Ad Atticum*’, *CQ*.

MacKendrick, P. (1995) *The Speeches of Cicero: Context, Law, Rhetoric*, London

Magallón García, A.I. (2016) ‘Cicerón y las razones de su autobiografía’, in F. Fuentes Moreno, M. Castillo Herrera, P.R. Díaz Díaz, C. Hoces Sánchez, and M. Molina Sánchez (eds.), *Quantus qualisque: homenaje al profesor Jesús Luque Moreno* (Granada) 361–369

Maltby R. (ed.) (2002) *Tibullus*: *Elegies*, Cambridge

Manning, C.E. (1985) ‘*Liberalitas*. The decline and rehabilitation of a virtue’, *G&R* 32: 73–83

Marasco, G. (1995) ‘Appiano e il proconsolato di P. Vatinio in Illiria (45–43 a.C.)’, *Chiron* 25: 283–297

—— (1997) ‘Aulo Gabinio e l'Illiria al tempo di Cesare’, *Latomus* 56(2): 307–326

Marincola, J. (1997) *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography*, Cambridge

—— (2003) ‘Beyond pity and fear: the emotions of history’, *AncSoc* 33: 285–315

—— (2013) ‘Polybius, Phylarchus, and tragic history: a reconsideration’, in B.J. Gibson, and T. Harrison (eds.), *Polybius and his world: essays in memory of F. W. Walbank* (Oxford; New York) 73–90

Marinone, N. (2004) *Cronologia Ciceroniana*, 2nd ed., Roma

Marshall, B.A. (1974) Cicero and Sallust on Crassus and Catiline, *Latomus* 33: 804–813

—— (1976) *Crassus. A political biography*, Amsterdam

Martelli, F. (2017) 'The triumph of letters: rewriting Cicero in *ad Fam*. 15', *JRS* 107: 90–115

—— (2016) 'Mourning Tulli-a: the shrine of letters in *Ad Atticum* 12', *Arethusa*, 49(3): 415–437

Mateo, A. (1999) *Manceps, Redemptor, Publicanus : Contribución al Estudio de Los Contratistas Públicos En Roma*

Mazzoli, G. (2004) 'Riflessioni sulla semantica ciceroniana della gloria', in E. Narducci (ed.), *Cicerone tra antichi e moderni: atti del IV Symposium Ciceronianum Arpinas, Arpino, 9 maggio 2003* (Firenze) 56–81

McConnell, S. (2014) *Philosophical Life in Cicero's Letters*, Cambridge

McDermott, W.C. (1972) 'M. Cicero and M. Tiro', *Historia* 21: 259–286

Miano, D. (2012) '*Tychai* of Timoleon and Servius Tullius: a hypothesis on the sources', *ASNP* 4(2): 365–378

Moles, J.L. (1993) 'Truth and Untruth in Herodotus and Thucydides', in C. Gill, and T.P. Wiseman (eds.), *Lies and Fiction in the Ancient World* (Liverpool) 88–121

Momigliano, A. (1942) '*Terra marique*', *JRS* 32: 53–64

Mommsen, T. (2010) *Römisches Staatsrecht* (Cambridge Library Collection–Classics), Cambridge

Morello, R. (2013) 'Writer and Addressee in Cicero's *Letters*', in C. Steel (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Cicero* (Cambridge) 196–214

Moussy, C. (1966) *Gratia et sa famille*, Paris

Muñiz Coello, J. (2003) 'Ap. Claudio Pulcro, cónsul del 54 a.C.', *Gerión* 21(1): 205–228

Nagle B. (1980) *The Poetics of Exile*, Bruxelles

Nardo D. (1966) *M. Tulli Ciceronis Epistularum ad familiares liber duodecimus*, Bologna

Neel, J. (2017) 'Cicero's rhetoric of terror', *Mouseion* 14(3): 437–453

Nelsestuen, G.A. (2019) 'A matter of *prudentia*: Atticus and his friends in Nepos and Cicero', *TAPA* 149(2): 353–393

Nicholson, J. (1998) 'The survival of Cicero's *letters*', in C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History IX* (Brussels) 63–105

Nicolet, C. (1960) '*Consul togatus*. Remarques sur le vocabulaire politique de Cicéron et de Tite Live', *REL* 38: 236–263

Nisbet, R.G.M. (ed.) (1939) *De domo sua ad pontifices oratio*, Oxford

Nisbet, R.G.M., and N. Rudd (eds.) (2004) *A commentary on Horace: Odes, book III*, Oxford; New York

Parrish, E.J. (1973) 'Crassus' new friends and Pompey's return', *Phoenix* 27: 357–380

Pattoni, M.P. (1988) ‘L’*exemplum* mitico consolatorio: variazioni di un *topos* nella tragedia greca’, *SCO* 38: 229–262

Pelling, C.B.R. (2009) ‘Was there an ancient genre of autobiography? or Did Augustus know what he was doing?’, in C.J. Smith, A. Powell, and T.J. Cornell (eds.), *The lost memoirs of Augustus and the development of Roman autobiography* (Swansea) 41–64

Pérez, C. (1994) ‘Prolégomènes a l’ étude d'un rouage essentiel dans le fonctionnement des relations d’ *amicitia* et de la vie publique de Ciceron: les messagers’, in M.-M. Mactoux, and E. Geny (eds.), *Melanges Pierre Leveque. 8, Religion, anthropologie et societe* (Paris) 293–360

Perlwitz, O. (1992) *Titus Pomponius Atticus*: *Untersuchungen zur Person des einflussreichen Ritters in der ausgehenden römischen Republik*, Stuttgart

Pina Polo, F., Díaz Fernández, A. (2019) *The quaestorship in the Roman Republic*, Berlin; Boston

Pocock, L.G. (1926) *A commentary on Cicero in Vatinium, with an historical introd. and Append*., London

Prost, F. (2015) ‘*Amor et amicitia* dans la correspondence d’exil de Cicéron’, *VL* 191–192: 7–35

Puccioni, G. (1981) *Il problema della monografia storica latina*, Bologna

Rawson, B. (1978) *The politics of friendship. Pompey and Cicero*, Sydney

Reitzenstein, R. (1906), *Hellenistische Wundererzählungen*, Stuttgart

Richardson, L. (1992) *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*, Baltimore

—— (2001) ‘*Sestius noster*’, in N.W. Goldman (ed.), *New light from ancient Cosa: classical Mediterranean studies: in honor of Cleo Rickman Fitch* (Bern) 49–55

Roesch, S. (2004) ‘La Politesse dans la *Correspondance* de Cicéron’, in L. Nadjo, and E. Gavoille (eds.), *Epistulae Antiquae III: Actes du IIIe Colloque International “L’Épistolaire Antique et ses Prolongements Européens”* (Louvain) 139–152

Roscalla, F. (2018) ‘Senofonte e la ricerca di un genere: la lode in prosa’, *Athenaeum* 106(1): 20–58

Rosillo-López, C. (2021) ‘Strategies of Prorogation in the Roman Republic’, in A. Díaz Fernández (ed.), *Provinces, Commanders, and Allies in the Roman Republic* (Zaragoza) 89–106

Rossi, O. (2010) *Letters from far away: Ancient epistolary travel writing and the case of Cicero’s correspondence* (Diss., Yale University)

Rotondi, G. (1922) *Leges Publicae Populi Romani*, 2nd ed., Hildesheim

Rousselot, P. (1996) ‘Les conditions du langage politique: le point de vue de Cicéron’, *BAGB* 3: 232–260

Rudd, N. (1992) ‘Stratagems of Vanity: Cicero, *ad Familiares* 5.12 and Pliny’s *Letters*’, in A.J. Woodman, and J.G.F. Powell (eds.), *Author and Audience in Latin Literature* (Cambridge) 18–32

Rundell, W.M.F. (1979) ‘Cicero and Clodius. The question of credibility’, *Historia* 28: 301–328

Ryan, F.X. (1996) ‘The Minimum Age for the Quaestorship in the Late Republic’, *MH* 53(1): 37–43

Salamon, G. (2009) ‘Cicéron entre histoire et biographie. Propositions pour une relecture de la lettre de Cicéron à Lucceius (*ad Fam.* 5, 12)’, *Interférences* [En ligne]: 5, http://journals.openedition.org/ interferences/899, accessed on 15 September 2020.

Šašel Kos, M. (2022) ‘The creation of the province of Dalmatia in light of the recent research’, *MEFRA* 134(1): 61–70

Schlude, J.M. (2013) ‘Pompey and the Parthians’, *Athenaeum* 101(1): 163–181

Schmidt, P.L. (1983) ‘Petrarca an Livius (*fam.* 24,8)’, in E. Lefèvre, E. Olshausen, *Livius. Werk und Rezeption. Festschrift für Erich Burck zum 80. Geburtstag* (München) 421–433

Shackleton Bailey, D.R. (ed.) (1987) *M. Tulli Ciceronis. Epistulae ad Atticum,* 2 vols., Stuttgart

Skinner, M.B. (2011) *Clodia Metelli: the tribune’s sister*, Oxford; New York

Smith, C. (2009) ‘Sulla’s *Memoirs*’, in C. Smith, and A. Powell (eds.), *The Lost Memoirs of Augustus and the Development of Roman Autobiography* (Swansea) 65–85

Steel, C. (2012) ‘Cicero’s Autobiography: Narratives of Success in the Pre-Consular Orations’, *CCG* 23: 251–266

Stover, J. (2021) ‘The Ciceronian book and its influence: a statistical approach’, *Ciceroniana On Line* 5: 263–283

Stok, F. (2021) ‘Strategie ciceroniane fra storiografia e retorica’, *Maia* 73(1): 9–21

Syme R., (1939) The Roman Revolution, Oxford

—— (1964) *Sallust*, Berkeley

—— (1980) ‘The sons of Crassus’, *Latomus* 39: 403–408

Tatum, J. (2011) ‘The Late Republic. Autobiographies and Memoirs in the Age of the Civil Wars’, in G. Marasco (ed.), *Political Autobiographies and Memoirs in Antiquity. A Brill Companion*, (Leiden; Boston) 161–187

Tedeschi, A. (2017) ‘*Pernicies*: questioni di semantica’, *Classica et Christiana* 12: 293–310

Thein, A.G. (2009) ‘*Felicitas* and the memoirs of Sulla and Augustus. The lost memoirs of Augustus and the development of Roman autobiography’, in C.J Smith, A. Powell, and T.J Cornell, *Roman Culture in an Age of Civil War* (Swansea) 87–109

Tracy, C. (2012) ‘Cicero’s *constantia* in theory and practice’, in W. Nicgorski (ed.), *Cicero’s practical philosophy* (Notre Dame) 79–112

Tramonti, S. (1996) ‘Dionisio, un pirata adriatico del I sec. a.C.’, *RSA* 26: 123–134

Treggiari, S. (2007) *Terentia, Tullia and Publilia: the women of Cicero's family*, London; New York

Ullman, B.L. (1942) ‘History and Tragedy’, *TAPA* 73: 25–53

Valencia Hernández, M. (1997) ‘Cicerón, creador de su imagen política: *Fam*. V, 12’, *Faventia* 19(1): 17–33

van der Blom, H. (2010) *Cicero’s role models: the political strategy of a newcomer*, Oxford

—— (2011) ‘Historical *exempla* as tools of praise and blame in Ciceronian 49 oratory’, in C. Smith and R. Covino (eds.), *Praise and Blame in Roman Republican Rhetoric* (Swansea) 49–67

—— (2014) ‘Character attack and invective speech in the Roman republic: Cicero as target’, in E. Shiraev, and M. Icks (eds.) *Character Assassination throughout the Ages* (New York) 37–57

van Gils, L., and R., Risselada (2022) ‘*Qui Honoris Causa Nominatur*: Form and Function of Third-Party Politeness in Cicero’, in L.U. Gómez, and L. Berger (eds.), *Politeness in Ancient Greek and Latin* (Cambridge) 249–272

Volk, K. (2013) ‘The genre of Cicero’s *De consulatu suo*, in T.D Papanghelis, S.J. Harrison, and S. Frangoulidis (eds.), *Generic interfaces in Latin literature: encounters, interactions and transformations* (Berlin; Boston [Mass.]) 93–112

Walters, B. (2020) *Deaths of the republic: imagery of the body politic in Ciceronian Rome*, Oxford

Ward, A.M. (1972) ‘Cicero’s fight against Crassus and Caesar in 65 and 63 B.C.’, *Historia* 21: 244–258

—— (1977) *Marcus Crassus and the late Roman republic*, Columbia

Wardle, D. (ed.) (2006) *Cicero on divination: De divinatione, book 1*, Oxford

Watt, W.S. (1958) *M. Tulli Ciceronis epistulae*. *Epistulae ad Quintum fratrem*; *Epistulae ad M. Brutum*; *Fragmenta epistularum*, Oxford

White, P. (2010) *Cicero in Letters: Epistolary Relations of the Late Republic*, Oxford

Wilcox, A. (2005a) ‘Sympathetic Rivals: Consolation in Cicero’s *Letters*’, *AJPh* 126(2): 237–255

—— (2005b) ‘Paternal grief and the public eye: Cicero *Ad Familiares* 4.6’, *Phoenix* 59(3–4): 267–287

—— (2012) *The gift of correspondence in classical Rome: friendship in Cicero’s Ad familiares and Seneca’s Moral epistles*, Madison (Wis.)

Wilkins, A.S. (ed.) (2002) *De oratore. I-III*, London

Williams, M.F. (2019) ‘A friend in need: Catullus’ plaintive friendships in *carmina* 50, 30, 38, 73, 77’, *Paideia* 74(2): 985–994

Wiseman, T.P. (1971) *New Men in the Roman Senate 139 b.c.–a.d. 14*, Oxford

—— (1985) ‘Competition and co-operation’, in T.P. Wiseman (ed.), *Roman political life, 90 B.C.-A.D. 69* (Exeter) 3–19

—— (1993) ‘Lying Historians: Seven Types of Mendacity’, in C. Gill and T.P. Wiseman (eds.), *Lies and Fiction in the Ancient World* (Austin; Exeter) 122–146

—— (2009) ‘Augustus, Sulla and the supernatural’, in C.J. Smith, A. Powell and T.J. Cornell (eds.), *The lost memoirs of Augustus and the development of Roman autobiography* (Swansea) 111–123