

Universitätsbibliothek Wuppertal

The correspondence of M. Tullius Cicero

arranged according to its chronological order

Cicero, Marcus Tullius

Dublin, 1904

Letters of the twelfth year of Cicero's correspondence (first eight months),
epp. 87-89

Nutzungsrichtlinien Das dem PDF-Dokument zugrunde liegende Digitalisat kann unter Beachtung des Lizenz-/Rechtehinweises genutzt werden. Informationen zum Lizenz-/Rechtehinweis finden Sie in der Titelaufnahme unter dem untenstehenden URN.

Bei Nutzung des Digitalisats bitten wir um eine vollständige Quellenangabe, inklusive Nennung der Universitätsbibliothek Wuppertal als Quelle sowie einer Angabe des URN.

urn:nbn:de:hbz:468-1-1953

ndum esse;
spes salutis
discessisse
e videamur,
adfirmasti,
1705.67

LETTERS OF THE TWELFTH YEAR OF CICERO'S CORRESPONDENCE
(FIRST EIGHT MONTHS).

EPP. 87-89.

A. U. C. 697; B. C. 57; AET. CIC. 49.

COSS. P. CORNELIUS LENTULUS SPINTHER, Q. CAECILIUS
METELLUS NEPOS.

THE only letters of the first eight months of 697 (57) are three letters, Att. iii. 26, 27, and Fam. v. 4. The last is addressed to the consul Metellus Nepos, begging for his aid, which Metellus heartily accorded, generously laying aside all recollection of the misunderstanding disclosed above in the letter from Metellus Celer to Cicero (Ep. 14). Lentulus brought in a bill for Cicero's recall on January 1, which drew so favourable an expression of opinion from the Senate that Cicero (Ep. 87) speaks of an intention on his part to return on the strength of that *auctoritas senatus*, even though the actual bill for his recall was prevented from passing by Serranus, one of the unfriendly tribunes. Again on January 23, a bill was brought before the popular assembly, but was foiled by the violence of Clodius. This is the occasion of the second letter of this year (Ep. 88). During the spring of the year, constant street riots took place, in one of which Sestius was severely handled; and when Milo accused Clodius *de vi*, some of the magistrates who were favourable to Clodius, among them the consul Metellus, by edicts, forbade the praetor to receive the charge. The result was that Milo and Sestius hired gladiators, and prepared to resist force by force, *manum manu, vim vi esse superandam* (post Red. in Sen. 19). In the early summer, Pompey, in his capacity of Duovir at Capua, caused the Senate of that colony to pass a

vote in favour of Cicero (ep. Mil. 39 and Sest. 9), which gave a great stimulus to the movement in Cicero's favour. In June a meeting of the Roman Senate was held in the Temple of Honor and Virtus (the Monumentum Marii: ep. Planc. 78; De Div. i. 59), and a resolution passed recommending Cicero to the provincials and the provincial magistrates, and urging the citizens resident in Italy to come to Rome and support the Senate on his behalf (ep. Planc. 78; Pis. 34). In July the consul Lentulus proposed that he should be recommended by the Senate to bring a motion for Cicero's recall before the *comitia centuriata*. In this he was supported by Metellus, the other consul, whose patriotic conduct on this occasion was warmly eulogised by the venerable Servilius Isauricus (Sest. 130), and by Pompey, who read a carefully-prepared speech on the subject; and the resolution was carried by 416 to 1, Clodius being the only dissentient (post Red. in Sen. 26). On August 4 the bill for Cicero's return passed the *comitia centuriata*. It would probably not have been allowed to pass but for the bravoes of Milo. Thus was Cicero at length restored mainly by the same unconstitutional means by which his exile was brought about, and might have been averted; but it is only fair to say that, in the use of violence, the extreme democratic party, with Clodius at their head, were the aggressors in the whole business connected with the exile of Cicero.

During his exile Cicero composed nothing. He appears to have shrunk even from his necessary correspondence (63 fin.; 79. 1, 4); but the last months of 697 (57) were signalized by the delivery of the orations *post Reditum in Senatu*, *post Reditum ad Quirites*, and *pro Domo sua*. These speeches, together with the speech *pro Sestio* (698) and *pro Plancio* (700), should be read with the letters from exile, as giving with them a complete and connected history of this interesting crisis in the life of Cicero.*

* The authenticity of the first-mentioned speeches is now generally recognized; but, however this question may be decided, they are valuable sources of history.

So wenige Briefe aus dieser Zeit des Exils, weil Att.
von Rom abwarten: Biol. II p. 129. Att. bei Cios Rückkehr
87. TO ATTICUS (ATT. III. 26). ^{1/2} mit Att. Rom + Att. 4

DYRRACHIUM; JANUARY; A. U. C. 697; B. C. 57; AET. CIC. 49.

Misso ad se a Q. fratre senatus consulto de se facto legum lationem vult exspectare
et Atticum ad se arcessit.

CICERO ATTICO SAL.

Litterae mihi a Quinto fratre cum senatus consulto, quod de
me est factum, adlatae sunt. Mihi in animo est legum lationem
exspectare et, si obtrectabitur, utar auctoritate senatus et potius
vita quam patria carebo. Tu, quaeso, festina ad nos venire.

88. TO ATTICUS (ATT. III. 27).

DYRRACHIUM; FEBRUARY; A. U. C. 697; B. C. 57; AET. CIC. 49.

Acceptis ab Attico litteris de se desperat et suos Attico commendat.

CICERO ATTICO SAL.

Ex tuis litteris et ex re ipsa nos funditus perisse video. Te oro
ut, quibus in rebus tui mei indigebunt, nostris miseriis ne desis.
Ego te, ut scribis, cito videbo.

senatus consulto] This is the *senatus consultum* of Jan. 1, 697 (57), made on the proposal of Lentulus for the recall of Cicero. The *Scutum* was never vetoed. The unfriendly tribune who was suborned by Clodius to desert Cicero, Sex. Atilius Serranus Gavianus, non ausus est, cum esset emptus, intercedere; noctem sibi ad deliberandum postulavit (Sest. 74). The result of this was that no further definite step was taken in Cicero's favour until Jan. 23, when the attempt was foiled by the violence of Clodius (see next letter). Accordingly, this decree of the Senate, thus rendered abortive by the ruse of Serranus, was not strictly a *senatus auctoritas*, or 'decree of the Senate vetoed by a tribune'; it was only an informal expression of opinion on the part of the Senate. Cicero expects that the matter will be resumed in the Senate on the follow-

ing day, and that a bill will be brought before the people for his recall (for as yet there was no bill, but only expressions of opinion in the Senate that his banishment was illegal: see Sest. 74); if then Serranus vetoes this *Scutum* (*si obtrectabitur*), it will be a *senatus auctoritas*; and Cicero says he will return on the strength of it. *Senatus auctoritate* (Sest. 73) is used in a vaguer sense, 'an expression of opinion on the part of the Senate,' when Cotta votes *non restitui lege sed revocari senatus auctoritate oportere*.

nos funditus perisse video] This refers to the bill brought before the people on Jan. 23, which was defeated by the violence of Clodius. Sestius and Q. Cicero were severely injured in the fray.

tui mei indigebunt] He seems to think of destroying himself.

89. TO THE CONSUL, METELLUS NEPOS,
IN ROME (FAM. V. 4.).

DYRRACHIUM; BETWEEN MARCH AND JULY; A. U. C. 697; B. C. 57;
AET. CIC. 49.

M. Cicero Q. Metelli consulis opem implorat.

M. CICERO S. D. Q. METELLO COS.

1. Litterae Quinti fratri et T. Pomponi, necessari mei, tantum spei dederant ut in te non minus auxili quam in tuo collega mihi constitutum fuerit. Itaque ad te litteras statim misi, per quas, ut fortuna postulabat, et gratias tibi egi et de reliquo tempore auxilium petii. Postea mihi non tam meorum litterae quam sermones eorum qui hac iter faciebant animum tuum immutatum significabant: quae res fecit ut tibi litteris obstrepere non auderem. 2. Nunc mihi Quintus frater meus mitissimam tuam orationem quam in senatu habuisses prescrispsit, qua inductus ad te scribere sum conatus et abs te, quantum tua fert voluntas, peto quaeque ut tuos mecum serves potius quam propter adrogantem crudelitatem tuorum me oppugnes. Tu, tuas inimicitiias ut rei publicae donares, te vicisti: alienas ut contra rem publicam confirmes adduceris? Quod si mihi tua clementia opem tuleris, omnibus in rebus me fore in tua potestate tibi confirmo: sin mihi neque magistratum neque senatum neque populum auxiliari propter eam vim

1. *immutatum*] 'turned against me.'
2. *obstrepere*] 'pester you with letters.'

2. *orationem*] on the motion of Lentulus for Cicero's recall.

quantum tua fert voluntas] This is to be taken, not with *ut serves*, but with *peto*; it means, 'I beseech you as strenuously as I may without offending you.' Otherwise, *fert* must be changed to *ferat*, or *feret*, which Wesenberg reads.

tuos mecum serves] 'by aiding me (I beg you) to secure the safety of your whole family,' referring to his promise below, *omnibus in rebus me fore in tua potestate*.

tuorum] Clodius, whose sister was the widow of the consul's late brother, Metellus Celer.

Tu, tuas inimicitiias] 'you have conquered yourself so far as to resign a private (personal) grudge (see above, 14) for the sake of the State. Will you be persuaded to injure the State to satisfy the resentment of another?' (i. e. Clodius).

eam vim] referring especially to the violence with which Clodius foiled the attempt of Jan. 23 in favour of Cicero.

quae me cum re publica vicit licuerit, vide ne, cum velis revo-

vide ne] ‘take care lest afterwards, when you would gladly recall the opportunity you now have for restoring all your fellow-citizens to safety and happiness, you may find yourself unable to do so, as there may not then be one whom you can even save from utter ruin.’ Such is the explanation of Orelli. The following are his words: *sanissima est ista sententia peracuta propter oppositionem verborum *reservandi* et *servandi*, sed varie corrupta a criticis.* Hoc dicit: ‘*vide ne, cum frustra in eo labores, ut revoces nunc tempus illud, quo omnes in republica illaesi atque incolumes reservari etiam tunc poterant, id ipsum efficeri non possis, cum nemo iam omnino erit, qui queat vel *servari* dumtaxat (id quod minus etiam est quam *reservari*).*’ But this antithesis between *servari* and *reservari* seems to need defence; and, feeling this, most edd. give *servandorum* for *reservandorum*. It is quite possible that this is right, and that *re-* arose from the *re* of *revocare*. Martyni-Laguna alters to *cum velis revocari ipsum omnium conservatorem* (Ciceronem). We cannot find a single passage in Cicero in which *reservare* is used merely as an intensive of *servare*. It is possible that *reip. (reipublicae)* dropped out before *reservandorum*, or should be read for *re-*; and that the sentence means, ‘when you wish to recall the opportunity you had of saving the State from the loss of all her best citizens.’ The rule of violence will produce universal destruction. In this sense Cicero often uses *reservare*: cp. Flacc. 106 *nomen clarissimum reipublicae reservare*, ‘save the State from the loss of one so distinguished’; Sest. 50 *vitam suam ad reipublicae fatum reservavit*. But *reservare* absolutely can only mean in Cicero, ‘to hold over,’ ‘reserve.’ We have in Provl. Cons. 47 *inimicitias in aliud tempus reservare*; but it would be too harsh to construe here, ‘when you may wish to recall your present opportunity of at least holding in abeyance all your feuds with me.’ The general view is that, in this clause, Cicero is referring to himself, and that he uses the plural in order to render the personal application somewhat less marked: cp. above *propter adrogantem crudelitatem tuorum*, which refers to Clodius alone. On this theory, in the words *cum qui servetur non erit*, Cicero hints at his design to destroy himself if the attempts

to restore him should fail. Draeger calls this plural the *pluralis modestiae (Historische Syntax, i., p. 25)*, and gives as examples, *Moloni dedimus operam, Brut. 312; scripsimus . . . tenebanus, De Div. ii. 3; vides . . . nos multa conari, Orat. 105; adolescentuli diximus, ib. 107; imperatores appellati sumus, Att. v. 20, 3 (228). Cp. poscimur, Hor. Carm. i. 32, 1.* The singular and plural are often found together, as *video . . . mea voce . . . nobis, Catil. i. 22; dissuasinus nos. Sed nihil de me, De Am. 96; ardeo . . . cupiditate nomen ut nostrum illustretur, Fam. v. 12, 1 (109).* A good example in poetry is, *Et festi et nostros vidisti flentis ocellos, Ovid Her. v. 45.* But, perhaps, if there is any marked characteristic of this plural in Cicero’s Epistles, it is rather a *pluralis dignitatis*, as Professor R. S. Conway has pointed out in his interesting discussion (‘On the use of the singular *nos* in Cicero’s Letters,’ 1898). He there says (p. 16): ‘*Nos* had come to be used by a speaker of himself alone when he thought, not of the *ego* he was to his own consciousness, but of the person visible or admirable to his neighbours’; and supports his theory in great detail. So that we cannot think that the allusion in the plural is to Cicero himself: and, if the reference is not quite general (‘when you wish to recall the opportunity of saving society, you may not be able to do so, as there will be no one to save,’ if this mob-violence continues), we are of opinion that the general tone of the letter and the character of Metellus lend much weight to the view of Mr. Shuckburgh, who thinks the reference is not to Cicero but to Clodius. He says: ‘This intentionally enigmatical sentence is meant to contain a menace against Clodius, who is hinted at in the word *omnium*, just as he is, earlier in the letter, in the word *tuorum*. Clodius was a connexion by marriage of Metellus; and Cicero assumes that Metellus is restrained from helping him by regard for Clodius. He knows, however, by this time that one of the new tribunes, Milo, is prepared to repel force by force; and he hints to Metellus that, if he countenances Clodius’s violence, he may some day find that there is no Clodius to save—if that is his object.’ For the indirect manner in which Metellus was supporting Clodius at this time, see Dio Cass. xxxix. 7, and Cic. Sest. 89. Mr. H. Everard, of Eton, has

care tempus omnium servandorum, ^{uif.} cum qui servetur non erit, ^{nicht mehr am Le-}
non possis. ^{benzen} ^{wird}

made an attractive suggestion that we should read *cum cui serventur non erit*, understanding by *cui* the State, 'when that for which they should be preserved (viz. the State) is no longer existent.' But if the reference is to the State, the expression would be needlessly obscure; and we cannot help thinking that if Cicero had intended this meaning, he would have added *respublica* before *cui*. Dr. Reid, in a note which he has kindly sent us, says: "The real and only difficulty of the passage lies in the *re-* of *reservandorum*. It is an *almost*, but not quite, invariable practice with Cicero to express with *reservare* the *purpose* of the act (by *ad* and acc. or dat.) or the *person* for whose

benefit the act is done (in the dat.). There are some passages which show that it is not absolutely necessary to *express* either purpose or person. But, on the whole, I think you are right in supposing a dat. to have fallen out: and other passages might be quoted in support of *reip.* But I am inclined to think that *tibi* (often written in mss. ^{it}) has fallen out after *tempus*. Supplying this, I would render *vide ne . . . possis* thus, 'Take care lest, when you may wish to call back again the opportunity of saving yourself the loss of us all, you may find it beyond your power, at a moment when there will be no one left for you to save.' "