

MANLIUS' MANDATA: SALLUST
BELLUM CATILINAE 33

KATHRYN F. WILLIAMS

THE ENVOY PLAYED A CRUCIAL ROLE in ancient diplomacy. Roman historians relate many instances where the wishes of a people or person are relayed to an opposing party through *legati* (envoys or ambassadors). Usually the envoys deliver an address detailing the demands or requests of those they represent. Chapters 32.3 through 34.1 of Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae* present one such delegation of *legati* sent by Gaius Manlius to Marcus Rex, a Roman general dispatched by the senate to confront the disturbances in Faesulae. Sallust introduces the passage in the following manner (32.3): "C. Manlius ex suo numero legatos ad Marcium Regem mittit cum mandatis huiusce modi." The quoted demands follow, in which the claim is made that the Manlian forces are not striving for power or wealth, but seek protection befitting free Roman citizens. After the direct quotation, Sallust records in indirect discourse the response of Marcus Rex. Ronald Syme identified the quoted *mandata* as the words of a letter delivered to the Roman general.¹ More recently, Patrick McGushin also has noted, in what is now the standard English-language commentary on Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae*, that the message is a "letter."² Many scholars have agreed.³ There are two scholars, however, who have claimed that the message is presented not in the form of a letter but by way of a speech. Hans Schnorr von Carolsfeld states: "Zu ihm [Marcus Rex] sendet Manlius eine Gesandtschaft, die in seinem Namen spricht."⁴ Karl Vretska remarks emphatically that the ambassadorial report has been "(z)u Unrecht als Brief aufgefaßt."⁵ The assertions of Schnorr and Vretska are correct. Yet, since neither defends his claim, uncertainty about the passage remains: of more recent scholars, some still

1. R. Syme, *Sallust* (Berkeley, 1964), 71: "He inserts a letter from the insurgent leader Manlius to Q. Marcus Rex, urging the plea of men in distress."

2. P. McGushin, *C. Sallustius Crispus. "Bellum Catilinae": A Commentary* (Leiden, 1977), 189: "... the letter which follows. . . ."

3. A. La Penna speaks likewise of "(l)a lettera di Manlio a Marcio (*Cat.* 33) . . ." (*Sallustio e la "rivoluzione" romana*, 2d ed. [Milan, 1969], 147); see also E. Tiffou, *Essai sur la pensée morale de Salluste à la lumière de ses prologues* (Paris, 1974), 408: "Les lettres de Manlius et de Catilina . . ."; K. H. Waters, "Cicero, Sallust, and Catiline," *Historia* 19 (1970): 201: "The letter sent by Manlius to Q. Marcus Rex says nothing of Catiline"; M. L. Paladini, "Discorsi e lettere del Sallustiano *Bellum Catilinae*," *Latomus* 20 (1961): 28: "nella lettera di Manlio."

4. H. Schnorr von Carolsfeld, *Über die Reden und Briefe bei Sallust* (Leipzig, 1888), 24.

5. K. Vretska, *C. Sallustius Crispus. "De Catilinae coniuratione"* (Heidelberg, 1976), p. 399, n. 972.

consider the passage to be a letter; others merely note the different interpretations or avoid the issue entirely.⁶ The primary aim of this paper is to prove conclusively that Sallust has presented chapter 33 as a speech rather than a letter. Discussion of the significance of this conclusion will follow.

The exact form of this communication can be ascertained by considering the following issues: the nature of the term *mandata*, Sallust's use of *huiusce modi*, the Sallustian manner of introducing letters, the use of first-person singulars and plurals, the characterization of Marcius Rex's response, and the presentation of direct speeches of envoys elsewhere in Latin prose literature up through Livy's history. An investigation into these issues, each relevant to the passage, should convince the reader of the oral character of this message to Marcius Rex.

In the effort to gain a sense of the oral or written nature of the term *mandata* during the Republican era, I looked at every passage in which the plural of the noun *mandatum* in its various inflections occurs in the works of Sallust, Caesar, Cicero, and Livy (see table 1).⁷ I discovered that *mandata* as oral messages far outnumber written *mandata*. *Mandata* were counted as oral whenever the text noted or implied that the words were spoken. An example of spoken *mandata* appears in Caesar *Bellum Civile* 3.57: "haec ad eum mandata Clodius refert ac primis diebus, ut videbatur, libenter auditus, reliquis ad conloquium non admittitur." Here both *auditus* and *conloquium* confirm that the *mandata* were delivered orally. Livy also makes clear that *mandata* were spoken when he states (3.25.7): "Eos Aequorum imperator, quae mandata habeant ab senatu Romano, ad quercum iubet dicere." In another phrase, reminiscent of Sallust's "legatos ad Marcium Regem mittit cum mandatis," Livy states (34.61): "Aristonem . . . Carthaginem cum mandatis mittit." Livy acknowledges at the beginning of the chapter that these *mandata* are spoken when he writes that Hannibal decided not to send a letter (*litterae*) back to Carthage for fear of its being intercepted ("ne quo casu interceptae palam facerent conata, scribere non est ausus"). Rather, he found a messenger, Aristo, to whom he could entrust his message, his *mandata*.

6. Cf. R. Geckle, *The Rhetoric of Morality in Sallust's Speeches and Letters* (Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 1995), ii, where he lists this passage as one of Sallust's letters. Unfortunately, I have not had access to this entire work. Chap. 33 is regarded as a letter also by W. Batstone, "Intellectual Conflict and Mimesis in Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae*," in *Conflict, Antithesis, and the Ancient Historian*, ed. J. Allison (Columbus, 1990), 114 and by T. F. Scanlon, *The Influence of Thucydides on Sallust* (Heidelberg, 1980), p. 232, n. 198; J. T. Ramsey refers to the direct discourse as a "dispatch" in *Sallust's "Bellum Catilinae"*, APA Textbook Series, 9 (Atlanta, GA, 1984), 23. W. Schmid (*Frühschriften Sallusts im Horizont des Gesamtwerks* [Neustadt/Aisch, 1993], 270) avoids the issue when he speaks of Manlius' "Anweisung für die Gesandtschaft." G. Ledworski (*Historiographische Widersprüche in der Monographie Sallusts zur Catilinarischen Verschwörung*, Studien zur klassischen Philologie, Band 89 [Frankfurt am Main, 1994], p. 245, n. 122) acknowledges the existence of Schnorr's and Vretska's characterization of the passage but gives no indication that they are to be followed: "Schnorr (24) und Vretska (II 399) vermuten entgegen der üblichen Annahme, daß es sich hier um eine Rede handelt."

7. This was accomplished partly by searching the PHI CD-ROM (#5.3) of Latin texts. The first four columns of table 1 are self-explanatory. Column 5 contains passages where there is no clear way to determine the manner of the delivery of *mandata*. I would classify many, although perhaps not all, of these as oral *mandata*, but this claim requires more argumentation than seems necessary for the proof of this paper's thesis, given the overwhelming number of citations that refer to spoken messages. The last column includes those citations where the term has no official connotation but is used more in the sense of "instructions" to friends or "orders" to troops.

TABLE 1: ORAL AND WRITTEN *MANDATA*

Author	<i>mandata</i> The Noun Appears	<i>mandata</i> Spoken	<i>mandata</i> Written	<i>mandata</i> Cannot Determine	NA
Cicero	96 times (58 applicable)	40 times = 68.97%	0 times = 0%	18 times = 31.03%	38 times
Caesar	24 times (24 applicable)	18 times = 75.0%	1 time = 4.17%	5 times = 20.83%	0 times
Sallust	9 times (5 applicable)	2 times = 40%	0 times = 0%	3 times = 60%	4 times (all spoken)
Livy	54 times (46 applicable)	38 times = 82.6%	1 time = 2.17%	7 times = 15.2%	8 times

Clearly, the *mandata* that Hannibal sent with Aristo were oral, not written.⁸ These are but a few of the many examples in these writings where *mandata* refer specifically to oral commands.

Further proof that the Romans during the Republic typically regarded *mandata* as spoken comes from the many passages that unequivocally oppose *mandata* to *litterae*. Cicero’s *In Catilinam* 3.4 provides a representative example of this contrast: “comperi legatos Allobrogum . . . in Galliam ad suos civis eodemque itinere cum litteris mandatisque ad Catilinam esse missos.” Here Cicero is establishing a clear distinction between written and spoken communications by using the terms *litterae* and *mandata*. He makes the same distinction in his letters. At *Epistulae ad Familiares* 3.5.1, he writes: “Trallis veni a. d. VI Kal. Sext. ibi mihi praesto fuit L. Lucilius cum litteris mandatisque tuis.”⁹ Like Cicero, Caesar employs the contrast between *litterae* and *mandata*, for example, at *Bellum Civile* 3.57: “huic dat litteras mandataque ad eum.” Even Sallust, while he does not employ the same formula, illustrates the distinction at *Bellum Catilinae* 44.4–6 when he introduces Lentulus’ *litterae*, quotes it, then adds “Ad hoc mandata verbis dat.” In these examples and in a number of others, the authors distinguish *mandata*—as spoken instructions—from written correspondence.

This is not to say that Romans did not acknowledge written instructions. It appears, however, at least among these four writers, that when the noun *mandata* is used, it refers almost exclusively to spoken instructions.¹⁰ There are but two instances where any of the authors makes it clear that *mandata* arrived in written form. Caesar states in his *Bellum Civile* 1.10: “scriptaque ad eum mandata . . . remittunt.” Livy writes once of *scripta mandata*

8. Aristo’s response to investigators after certain Carthaginians became suspicious of his conversations and actions provides additional proof: “vocatus Aristo purgare sese et firmissimo propugnaculo uti, quod litterarum nihil ad quemquam attulisset.”

9. The combination of *litterae* and *mandata* appears frequently in Cicero: *Cat.* 3.8: *mandata et litteras*; *Phil.* 13.50: *de mandatis litterisque*; *Fam.* 8.8.10: *mandata et litteras*, 10.24.4: *cum mandatis litterisque*, 13.10.3: *cum litteris et mandatis*; *Att.* 8.9a.2: *cum litteris, cum mandatis*, 8.12c.4: *litteras et mandata*, 12.49.2: *mandata et litteras*, 15.4a.1: *cum mandatis et litteris*. Note that D. R. Shackleton Bailey (*Cicero’s Letters to Atticus* [Cambridge, 1965–68]) frequently translates *litterae* and *mandata* as “letter” and “verbal message” respectively.

10. See columns 3 and 4 in table 1.

(39.33).¹¹ In both instances the authors have modified *mandata* with *scripta* to avoid confusion with what otherwise would be understood as spoken instructions. The paucity of references to written instructions together with the highly frequent use of spoken instructions suggests that Latin prose authors as late as Livy generally used *mandata* to refer to messages delivered orally. Therefore, if Sallust intended his readers to understand that written demands were sent, we should expect him to have noted this clearly. Sallust gives no such indication in this passage.

The phrase *huiusce modi* in Sallust's introductory sentence offers more convincing evidence that the passage is a speech. These two words appear together eleven times in all of Sallust's writings: five times in the *Catiline*, five times in the *Jugurtha*, and once in the fragments of the *Histories*. The phrase *huiusce modi* does not appear in the extant writings of Caesar or Livy and when it occurs in Cicero's works, it never introduces a message.¹² Therefore we should look to Sallust's own writings to determine the phrase's function for him. In the Sallustian corpus, the words, which imitate Thucydides' ἔλεγε τοιάδε in noting that the historian is not recording a verbatim account of actual words, always introduce speeches. Typical examples occur at *Bellum Catilinae* 20.1: "orationem huiusce modi habuit," and *Bellum Jugurthinum* 9.4: "dicitur huiusce modi verba cum Iugurtha habuisse."¹³ Sallust's use of the phrase consistently suggests an association with spoken not written words. This manner of introduction contrasts markedly with Sallust's way of introducing the two indisputable letters in the monograph that he quotes directly: "litteras Q. Catulus in senatu recitavit, quas sibi nomine Catilinae redditas dicebat. Earum exemplum infra scriptum est" (34.3); "Ipse [Lentulus] Volturcio litteras ad Catilinam dat, quarum exemplum infra scriptum est" (44.4). In both instances, Sallust makes it absolutely clear that a written letter is to follow in *oratio recta*. This also holds true for the recorded letters in the *Bellum Jugurthinum*.¹⁴ The introductory formula for the quoted letters in that monograph (*earum sententia haec erat*) is slightly different from that of the *Catiline*, but there is not one single letter in Sallust's writings that is introduced using the phrase *huiusce modi*. Furthermore, in every instance, the author indicates explicitly that he is dealing with a letter and makes it incontrovertible through the use of the word *litterae* or a verb such as *recitavit*,¹⁵ or by the inclusion of a standard epistolary greeting. If

11. The full quotation from Livy requires explanation ("cum legati ab senatu cum litteris aut scriptis mandatis venient," 39.33). I understand *aut* to mean "or more accurately." For this definition of *aut* see Lewis and Short, s.v. II.C.a. *Litterae*, then, appears to be the normal term for *scripta mandata*.

12. Cicero uses it in such phrases as: "Soletis, cum aliquid huiusce modi audistis, iudices, continuo dicere:" (*Rosc. Am.* 105) and "quod umquam huiusce modi monstrum aut prodigium audivimus aut vidimus" (*Verr.* 2.2.79).

13. The other citations occur at *Cat.* 50.5: *huiusce modi verba locutus est*, 52.1: *huiusce modi orationem habuit*, 57.6: *huiusce modi orationem habuit*; *Jug.* 30.4: *huiusce modi verbis disseruit*, 32.1: *Haec atque alia huiusce modi saepe dicundo Memmius populo persuadet*, 86.1: *Huiusce modi oratione habita*, 102.4: *pauca verba huiusce modi locutus*; *Hist.* 1.77.5: *alia huiusce modi decreverunt*.

14. *Jug.* 9.1: "Sic locutus cum litteris eum, quas Micipsae redderet, dimisit. Earum sententia haec erat," 24.1: "Litterae Adherbalis in senatu recitatae, quarum sententia haec fuit." Direct discourse follows in both cases.

15. It is worth noting that Sallust does recognize that letters might be "read aloud" before the senate or another official body, but if that were what the envoys were doing, we might expect Sallust to make this clear with the inclusion of a form of *recitare*, as he does elsewhere with his letters.

chapter 33 were a letter, it would provide the only example of a letter that is not heralded as such and the only letter to join the ten speeches that are introduced with the phrase *huiusce modi*.

Another contrast between the letters in Sallust's corpus and chapter 33 is that all of the letters have a number of first-person singular references, while this message has none. All first-person references in chapter 33 are in the plural. Granted that a general may speak in the first-person plural to show solidarity with his men, quite often he does not. Caesar provides ample evidence for communicating with an enemy in the singular. Even within the corpus of Sallust there is a fine example of a leader referring to himself in the first-person singular while he seeks assistance for his cause in a letter. This is, of course, Mithridates and his letter to Arsaces, which Sallust has incorporated into his *Histories*. Mithridates begins (4.69.1–2):

Rex Mithridates regi Arsaci salutem. Omnes qui secundis rebus suis ad belli societatem orantur considerare debent liceatne tum pacem agere, dein quod quaesitur satisne pium tutum gloriosum an indecorum sit. Tibi si perpetua pace frui licet, nisi hostes opportuni et scelestissumi, egregia fama si Romanos opprimeris futura est, neque petere audeam societatem et frustra mala mea cum bonis tuis misceri sperem.

These opening lines show that King Mithridates is addressing issues of broad importance—like the issues presented in the speech commanded by Manlius—and yet he still speaks in the first-person singular so that the reader constantly associates the king with the ideas that he is espousing. The demands recorded at *Bellum Catilinae* 33 have no first-person singulars. While the exclusive use of the plural in this message does not by itself necessarily mean that the message is oral, it is contrary to Sallust's style of recording letters.

Marcus' response to the communication (*ad haec Q. Marcius respondit*) offers additional support that this is a speech that he has heard from the envoys rather than a letter from Manlius. Through the use of *respondit*, Sallust implies that Marcus is delivering his reply to a speech. The reason for such an implication is that the verb *respondere* is used consistently by Caesar, Sallust, and Livy to present an oral reply to a spoken message. Sallust offers a number of examples of this phenomenon: to Micipsa's speech Jugurtha responded (*respondit*, *Iug.* 11.1), Jugurtha's ambassadors respond (*respondent*) before the senate to Adherbal's speech (*Iug.* 15.1), the Roman senate delivers an oral response (*foedus petentibus hoc modo respondetur*) to the oral pleas of Bocchus' ambassadors (*Iug.* 104.4).¹⁶ Caesar's use of *respondere* can be seen in one of his passages that we have already considered. At *Bellum Civile* 1.10, after Roscius orally presents the demands of Caesar to the consuls and Pompey, "illi (re) deliberata respondent scriptaque ad eum mandata per eosdem remittunt." Clearly Caesar here is making the distinction between a spoken response (*respondent*) and a written one (*remittunt*). Livy, too, uses the verb *respondere* often to indicate a reply spoken in response to a speech. To offer but one example, the

16. There are other examples of oral responses to speeches or to oral inquiries in Sallust that are not quoted directly (*Cat.* 47.2; *Iug.* 11.6, 22.2, 34.1, 64.3, 72.1, 85.26, 85.44, 109.1).

Carthaginian senators deliver an oral reply of acceptance to Fabius' dramatic declaration that Rome was declaring war upon the Carthaginians (21.18.13): "Tum Romanus sinu ex toga facto, 'Hic' inquit, 'vobis bellum et pacem portamus; utrum placet sumite.' Sub hanc vocem haud minus ferociter, daret utrum vellet, succlamatum est; et cum is iterum sinu effuso bellum dare dixisset, accipere se omnes responderunt."¹⁷ Cicero also exhibits this use of *respondere* in his published writings, although we find in his letters that he uses *respondere* when he returns a written response to a letter.¹⁸

Among the historians, if letters are the initial means of communication, the response usually comes also in the form of a letter, but the verb *respondere* is not employed. Caesar provides an example of this type of written exchange (*B Civ.* 1.17–19): "Domitius ad Pompeium in Apuliam peritos regionum . . . cum litteris mittit." He follows this dispatch with the statement: "missi ad Pompeium revertuntur. Litteris perlectis Domitius . . ." Here, Domitius sends a letter to Pompey via envoys and then receives a letter in return from him: one letter receives another letter in response. Caesar does not, however, characterize the response with the verb *respondere*. If Marcius had received the commands of Manlius in a letter, he most likely would have replied in a letter, and in that case, Sallust would not have used the verb *respondere*. There is no hint that the envoys are receiving the response of Marcius by letter here, and there is no hint that Marcius received the communication of Manlius by letter.

One may argue that Sallust intends the reader to understand the message as a letter because he assigns no individual to speak the words. It is customary for Livy, for example, to introduce a message to be delivered orally by singling out the leader of the delegation or another individual who spoke the words. Nevertheless, one can find instances in Livy comparable to this Sallustian scene. At 23.42.1–2 Livy writes: "Itaque extemplo legati ad Hannibalem missi simul ex utraque gente ita Poenum adlocuti sunt. 'Hostes populi Romani, Hannibal, fuimus primum per nos ipsi quoad nostra arma, nostrae vires nos tutari poterant. . . .'"¹⁹ Not specifying an individual envoy to deliver a speech within a historical narrative, therefore, does not preclude the presentation of a speech. While it is unusual for a message to be delivered in direct discourse without greater acknowledgment of the envoys, Sallust manages, with his use of first-person plurals and second-person singulars, to mesh the dramatic setting between the envoys and Marcius with the idiom of Manlius communicating with Marcius.

There is nothing inherent, then, in the introduction, body, or conclusion of this message that signals to the reader that the contents of a letter are being

17. There are far more instances of the use of *respondere* in Livy to indicate oral responses to spoken messages than are necessary to present here, but representative uses appear at 1.24, 8.32, 9.14, 27.4, 30.4, 32.40, 33.20, 34.57, 35.50, 36.12, 37.17, 38.47, 39.36, 39.54, 40.36, 42.24, and 43.8.

18. One example of Cicero's use of the verb to indicate a response to an oral address appears at *Rosc. Am.* 33: "Cum ab eo quaereretur quid tandem accusaturus esset eum quem pro dignitate ne laudare quidem quisquam satis commode posset, aiunt hominem, ut erat furiosus, respondisse: 'quod non totum telum corpore recepisset.'" On the other hand, Cicero often uses this verb in his letters to refer to his response to a letter. Representative passages appear at *Att.* 15.13.4: *Longiori epistulae superiorique respondi* and 16.3.4: *Litteris tuis satis responsum est*.

19. Other examples occur at 3.53 and 3.54.

presented. On the contrary, there are strong arguments to support the interpretation that this passage represents the delivery of a speech rather than the words of a letter: 1) *mandata* far more frequently refer to spoken communication than to written communication among writers as late as Livy; 2) the phrase *huiusce modi*, which is used to introduce this passage, is reserved exclusively in the Sallustian corpus for speeches; 3) in contrast to Sallust's custom throughout his works, this would be the only letter that is not clearly marked as a letter, either by the specific mention of *litterae*, or by an introduction that identifies the writer of the letter, or by the use of a verb such as *recitavit*; 4) unlike all of Sallust's letters, this passage includes no first-person singulars; 5) the response by Marcius Rex gives no indication that he is responding to a letter. Rather, it is far more likely, with the use of *respondere*, that he is presenting a direct response to the envoys who have spoken directly to him; 6) delivery of a speech in direct discourse by more than one envoy occurs elsewhere in historical narrative.

The logical conclusion from these arguments is that Manlius' message was delivered orally, although not as a written message recited by the envoys. The implications of this conclusion are both historical and literary: as a spoken message, the speech cannot be scrutinized for historical information, but rather should be viewed as completely Sallustian in its subject and vocabulary.

In the *Peloponnesian War*, Thucydides explains through his character Nicias the difference between oral and written messages (7.8): "Nicias . . . feared, however, that the messengers, either through inability to speak, or through failure of memory, or from a wish to please the multitude, might not report the truth, and so thought it best to write a letter, to insure that the Athenians should know his own opinion without its being lost in transmission. . . ." ²⁰ For the historian, as well as Nicias, letters are more reliable than oral reports. Although letters can certainly contain false information, they reflect the intentions of the sender more accurately than messengers' reports might. Furthermore, the use of documented letters can enhance the authority of the historian as they do in Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae*. ²¹ Since Manlius' words are not presented as a letter, I would argue that no letter ever existed and that Sallust relied upon reports of an embassy from Manlius to Marcius to create his message. In a well-known passage, Thucydides acknowledges how difficult it is to record speeches verbatim and concludes (1.22): "so my habit has been to make the speakers say what was in my opinion demanded of them by the various occasions, of course adhering as closely as possible to the general sense of what they really said." The historian here admits that some of his speeches could not be authentic. Sallust followed Thucydides in

20. R. Crawley's translation from *The Landmark Thucydides: A Comprehensive Guide to the Peloponnesian War*, ed. R. B. Strassler (New York, 1996). Throughout this article all quotations from Thucydides come from Strassler's edition.

21. McGushin, "*Bellum Catilinae*" (n. 2 above) 189: "The relative frequency of letters in the extant works probably also indicates a desire on his part to impart an air of historical research and veracity to the work." Paladini, "Discorsi e lettere" (n. 3 above), 27: "La funzione delle lettere, in seno alla monografia, è in parte analoga a quella dei discorsi diretti, in parte diversa, giacchè esse dovrebbero servire, nell'intenzione dell'autore, a documentare la narrazione, e quindi a conferirvi serietà e peso." In this regard, it seems likely that Sallust would acknowledge all of his written sources.

his method of speech presentation.²² Therefore we should accept the claim that Manlius' speech is not authentic. Sallust, in fact, says as much with his use of the phrase *huiusce modi*. What makes the potential for inaccuracy even greater, however, as Nicias shows, is that Manlius' *mandata* were delivered to Marcius Rex by envoys rather than by Manlius himself. An additional difficulty for Sallust in determining what the message "really said" was the relative obscurity of the event: this message was not delivered in the senate, for example, where speeches would have been recorded. Since Sallust had to rely upon the report of a speech that was delivered in a general's camp in Faesulae by the *legati* of Manlius, it is very likely that he had a greater hand in creating the speech that we read than he would have had it been based on a written document or had it been a speech delivered in a prominent assembly.²³ This is not to say that Sallust created the event or even the entire contents of the message. What I am suggesting is that the likelihood that the speech contains more of what Sallust thought was "demanded" than what was actually said is too great for its contents to be used as historical evidence.²⁴

In fact, this type of speech may be formulaic in much the same way that prebattle speeches in ancient historiography were formulaic.²⁵ Individuals and groups who challenged Rome often sent representatives to explain and defend their actions and to offer some form of reconciliation. Their own perceived degree of strength or weakness at the moment determined the extent of their conciliatory tone. Sallust's own account of the message of Bocchus, king of Mauretania, provides one example. After suffering defeat at the hands of Marius, Bocchus requests that envoys from Marius be sent to him

22. Scanlon, *Influence of Thucydides* (n. 6 above), 90: "That Sallust saw himself as a successor to Thucydides in his use of speeches is implied by his use of *huiuscemodi verba* to introduce direct quotations."

23. As Victor Hanson in his introduction to Strassler's *Landmark Thucydides* (n. 20 above) explains with regard to Thucydides' seemingly contradictory method of presenting speeches: "Apparently, Thucydides is envisioning two very different circumstances for setting down speeches in his history: well-known addresses in which he was more or less able to find out what was really said, and other instances in which something probably was spoken, but went unrecorded or was forgotten. The latter orations had to be reconstructed more or less according to Thucydides' own particular historical sense of what was likely, appropriate, and necessary. . . . [The reader] can rely on common sense to learn which addresses are more likely to have been spoken as recorded in the text of the history. Is there evidence—a large audience, an annual festive occasion, an official government proceeding—to suggest a speech was actually communicated, recorded, and subject to verification by Thucydides' readership?" (xvi). I would argue that Manlius' message to Marcius Rex is one of the speeches that would have remained unrecorded and would require almost complete reconstruction by Sallust.

24. Vretska ("De Catilinae coniuratione" [n. 5 above], 399) makes the claim that Manlius' speech is "frei komponiert." With the greater certainty that the message is oral rather than written, his claim is less open to objections. While I argue that Sallust most likely invented the substance of the message, it seems to me to go against his historiographical principles to invent this entire episode. Cf. E. G. Hardy, *The Catilinarian Conspiracy in Its Context* (Oxford, 1924), p. 64, n. 1: "It is uncertain whether the correspondence took place, or is the invention of Sallust."

25. C. W. Fornara, *The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome* (Berkeley, 1983), 162: "The battle exhortation, for example, was sufficiently commonplace for any schoolboy to invent its typical substance. . . . What else, for example, could D. Brutus have urged before the second sea battle at Marseilles against Caesar's forces than that 'his men should regard as already conquered those whom they had overcome when their forces were unimpaired' (Caesar *BC* 2.5.2)? Rhetorical precept and the exigencies of the situation converged exactly. In cases of this type, then, where both the historian and the general had recourse to the same generalities, commonplaces, and probabilities, resort to invention may have been regarded as defensible, at least in the absence of more precise information."

so that he might plead his case. Sallust has Sulla address Bocchus first. The historian then continues (*Iug.* 102.12–14):

Ad ea Bocchus placide et benigne, simul pauca pro delicto suo verba facit: se non hostili animo, sed ob regnum tutandum arma cepisse. Nam Numidiae partem unde vi Iugurtham expulerit iure belli suam factam, eam vastari a Mario pati nequivisse; praeterea missis antea Romam legatis repulsum ab amicitia. Ceterum vetera omittere ac tum, si per Marium liceret, legatos ad senatum missurum.

In this speech there is an explanation of why the king has taken up arms against a Roman general. Bocchus insists that genuine hostility towards Rome is not the reason for his opposition, but that he has been wronged in the past and thus has had to defend himself. Bocchus' proposal to send envoys to Rome is an offer of reconciliation. This speech is very similar to Manlius' speech, *mutatis mutandis*. Manlius explains that he and his supporters have taken up arms not because of their hostility towards Rome, but because they have suffered unjust economic, social, and legal hardships (33.1):

Deos hominesque testamur, imperator, nos arma neque contra patriam cepisse neque quo periculum aliis faceremus, sed uti corpora nostra ab iniuria tuta forent, qui miseri egentes, violentia atque crudelitate faeneratorum plerique patriae, sed omnes fama atque fortunis expertes sumus. Neque quoiquam nostrum licuit more maiorum lege uti neque amisso patrimonio liberum corpus habere: tanta saevitia faeneratorum atque praetoris fuit.

In both speeches to Roman generals the denial of hostility and the explanation and defense of aggressive actions are central. Later in the speech, Manlius suggests that his troops will lay down their arms if the Roman government makes certain changes. This is his offer of reconciliation, although it is accompanied by a threat, since Manlius, unlike Bocchus, has not yet suffered defeat. The similar outline of the two speeches suggests that both follow a typical pattern for speeches of defense to a Roman general by an aggressor.

Some scholars have seen in Manlius' statements a confirmation of his historical independence from Catiline. K. H. Waters argues: "If this is a genuine document, (which however I must admit was not my first impression) it supports the view that the union of Manlius and Catiline was a marriage of convenience, or a 'shotgun wedding' forced on by Cicero."²⁶ Robin Seager goes one step further: "[I]f Manlius sent any message *huiusce modi*, he cannot have been part of a project for total revolution. . . . [T]hey were at pains to make it clear why they had taken this course, and it is plain that, if the senate had shown any sincere inclination to right their wrongs, Manlius would have been happy to surrender at once, regardless of any supposed designs of Catiline's."²⁷ On the contrary, the message—delivered orally without written record and under circumstances where the possibility for

26. Waters, "Cicero, Sallust, and Catiline" (n. 3 above), 201. He is followed by McGushin, "*Bellum Catilinae*," 162: "... the contents of the letter of Manlius to Marcus Rex (ch. 33) indicate that S. viewed the activity of Manlius as being initially independent of that of Catiline."

27. R. Seager, "*Iusta Catilinae*," *Historia* 22 (1973): 241.

verbatim reporting would be minimal—provides a strong argument that Manlius may not have said anything of this sort beyond formulaic necessity. Sallust may not have known any more than that a message had been delivered to Marcius Rex by envoys of Manlius.²⁸ In that case, following Thucydides, he was at liberty to write what was in his opinion demanded of Manlius by the particular occasion: explanation and defense of his actions because of past wrongs, followed by some offer of reconciliation. That Catiline is not mentioned in the message and that Manlius hints at surrender tell us more about the historian than about the conspirator. Sallust, for example, may have included the suggestion of surrender by Manlius to expose the disinclination of the Roman general for genuine reconciliation; he may have omitted mention of Catiline in order to develop a more powerful contrast between these words in direct discourse and the quoted letter of Catiline to Catulus, which he recites two chapters later. With a written document, the reader could have more confidence in Sallust's words; we should be extremely wary, however, of the historical accuracy of the report of an oral message delivered by envoys to Marcius Rex in the general's camp.

If we cannot use the speech for close historical analysis, it at least focuses our attention upon Sallust's interests in describing the conspiracy as the action begins to shift from Rome to Etruria. The first item to recognize is that the message and Catiline's letter in chapter 35 form a pair: they are both in direct discourse, they are of similar length, and both discuss the issue of the *miseri*. There is merit, therefore, in studying these two passages together. The most prominent point of Manlius' message is that the social, legal, and economic wrongs suffered by the *miseri* at the hands of Roman leaders justify their rebellion. Having the charges against Rome emanate from Manlius and his troops in Etruria disassociates Catiline from these historically important facts and alienates him from any legitimate causes for the rebellion. This separation is emphasized when Catiline speaks of the *miseri* in his letter in a strikingly different way from their appearance in Manlius' *mandata* (35.3–4):

Iniuriis contumeliisque concitatus, quod fructu laboris industriaeque meae privatus statum dignitatis non obtinebam, publicam miserorum causam pro mea consuetudine suscepi, non quin aes alienum meis nominibus ex possessionibus solvere possem . . . sed quod non dignos homines honore honestatos videbam meque falsa suspicione alienatum esse sentiebam. Hoc nomine satis honestas pro meo casu spes relicuae dignitatis conservandae sum secutus.

Legitimate issues are raised in chapter 33 by the wretched troops, but in chapter 35, Catiline confesses that he has taken up their cause for his own sake. Manlius and his troops defend their actions within the larger historical

28. Although scholars frequently point out that there is no evidence of this correspondence beyond this passage in Sallust (e.g., Ledworowski, *Historiographische Widersprüche* [n. 6 above], 244–45) and that the passage “does not purport to be authentic” (Syme, *Sallust* [n. 1 above], 71), they sometimes exhibit a reluctance to view the message as completely Sallustian. See Paladini, “Discorsi e lettere,” 29: “Non vi è ragione di non credere che la versione sallustiana esprima con una certa fedeltà il messaggio”; La Penna, *Sallustio* (n. 3 above), 147: “Non c'è nessuna ragione di credere che la lettera di Manlio sia una maschera o che come tale la consideri Sallustio.”

context of plebeian suffering; Catiline's explanation is personal and self-serving. The distinction that occurs in chapters 33 and 35 lies between the significant issues that have led the *miseri* in Etruria to support rebellion, and Catiline's own personal stake in the conspiracy. Sallust underscores this distinction by his manner of presentation. The exclusive use of first-person plurals in Manlius' message (*miseri . . . sumus*), which has the effect of absorbing Manlius within the broader issues of the conspiracy,²⁹ focuses the reader's attention upon Manlius' group of supporters. Nothing other than Catiline's private concerns are accentuated by his use of first-person singulars. The troops have some justifiable reasons for opposing Rome; Catiline has only his own failure within the system. Catiline's genuine letter³⁰ prompted the cause of the *miseri* as a topic for both quotations. As Sallust has written the two passages, Manlius' *mandata* provide the backdrop upon which to comprehend the true frame of mind of Catiline as he sets out from Rome.

One similarity that the two passages share, however, is the artful display of words used disingenuously. On the surface, Manlius' speech seems to be an honest request for fair treatment,³¹ but Sallustian composition is more complex. The reader must consider the portrayal and the language of each character throughout the monograph to ascertain the full import of Sallust's words. The appeal for *libertas* by Manlius, for example, harks back to Catiline's cry to his supporters in chapter 20 and so should make the reader suspicious.³² Furthermore, if we consider the group allied with Manlius in 28.4

29. J. Marincola (*Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography* [Cambridge, 1997], 212) notes on Caesar's use of the first-person plural form that it is a technique of "diminishing the focus from the individual and emphasizing instead the common effort." A limited role for Manlius in his speech should not take the reader by surprise at this point in the narrative. After all, Sallust minimizes Manlius' role to the degree historically possible throughout the monograph. Vretska describes Sallust's portrayal of Manlius as follows ("*De Catilinae coniuratione*," 345): "S. schildert Manlius als Trommler für die Truppe (28,4), der als erster die Waffen erhebt (30,1), mit Q. Marcius Rex verhandelt (32,3), den rechten Flügel bei Pistoria führt (59,3) und in tapferem Kampfe fällt (60,6). Nichts über seine Vergangenheit: er ist der Haudegen, der sich aus Gründen der Verschwörung anschließt, die aus den allgemeinen Verhältnissen der Sullaner in Etrurien verständlich sind." He is consistently portrayed in ways that show him only in his capacity as the leader of this larger group without his personal interests in the conspiracy considered. For this reason I believe that it is inaccurate to refer to the message as a "Selbstzeugnis" of Manlius, equivalent to Catiline's (Ledworowski, *Historiographische Widersprüche*, 245).

30. That Catiline's letter is genuine is accepted by most scholars: Vretska, "*De Catilinae coniuratione*," p. 412, at 35: "*exemplum*:"—noch 44.4, beidemale auf die Wörtlichkeit der Briefe (ἀπόγραφον) hinweisend"; McGushin, "*Bellum Catilinae*," p. 196, on 35: "S.'s substantial accuracy in reporting Lentulus' letter makes it probable that he is here [35] also dealing with a genuine document. This presumption is strengthened by the fact that the letter is couched in a style which is not Sallustian and contains a number of words and phrases not found elsewhere in S. . . . The contents of the letter, which gives reasons for Catiline's decision different from those already proposed by S., are also an argument for its genuineness"; Ramsey concurs ("*Bellum Catilinae*" [n. 6 above], 159).

31. Seager's statement of Manlius' sincerity ("[T]hey were at pains to make it clear why they had taken this course, and it is plain that, if the senate had shown any sincere inclination to right their wrongs, Manlius would have been happy to surrender at once . . ." [*Iusta Catilinae*" (n. 27 above), 241]) points out how genuine the request can appear.

32. Tiffou, *Essai* (n. 3 above), 409: "Manlius prétend se battre pour la *libertas*, et l'on sait le sens qu'avait déjà ce mot dans d'autres discours. Catilina veut sauver sa *dignitas*. Ce concept est particulièrement inquiétant." Comment on Catiline's own abuse of language is made by D. C. Earl (*The Political Thought of Sallust* [Cambridge, 1961], 95): "If these sentiments [35.3–4] are really Catiline's, they, with his appeal to *libertas* in his speech to the conspirators, constitute clear proof of Sallust's comment on the debasement of the language for selfish political ends."

(the brigands and Sulla's veterans, conveniently omitted in 33), we must reject the representation of Manlius' supporters as completely innocent victims. Although it seems extreme to see in this speech and Catiline's letter "un appétit de pouvoir et de richesse,"³³ it is important to recognize that Sallust has composed this speech on two levels. One shows the genuine suffering that some of Manlius' troops have endured;³⁴ the other illustrates the perversion of language when used by individuals willing to overthrow the state.³⁵ Marcius Rex' reply to the *mandata* is a further illustration of insincerity. That the conspirators should lay down their arms and seek mercy before a Roman senate that has always been helpful is a categorical response that could persuade only defeated opponents. Marcius' proposal is no more satisfactory for Manlius and his troops than the senate's uncooperative response was for the Allobroges (40.3). Sallust is showing that genuine effort for reconciliation was not forthcoming from either side.

The *mandata* of Manlius, therefore, should be read on different levels with a view to the issues of the *Bellum Catilinae* as a whole. On the one hand, they offer a legitimate defense for the conspirators in the name of someone other than Catiline and from a place where Catiline has yet to arrive, thus denying the protagonist of the monograph legitimacy; furthermore, lengthy focus upon the dreadful lot of the *miseri* prepares us to hear Catiline's letter to Catulus with a less-than-sympathetic ear when he speaks about his support of the commoners' struggles because of his own loss of *dignitas*. At the same time, we can glimpse Sallust's method of illustrating the debasement of language.³⁶ Both issues—the lot of the poor, which has led to their support of the conspiracy, and the abuse of language—are treated in the ensuing digression on the current political difficulties in Rome (36.4–39.5). Aware that an embassy was sent from Manlius to Marcius and that a letter from Catiline to Catulus was recited before the senate, Sallust took advantage of the opportunity presented by these events and created a speech in chapter 33 that defines important issues of the rebellion while it illustrates implicitly how detrimental the actions and words of those involved—Manlius, the *miseri*, Marcius Rex, and Catiline—were to contemporary Rome.³⁷

The University of North Carolina, Greensboro

33. Tiffou, *Essai*, 409.

34. McGushin "Bellum Catilinae," 192: "Manlius' statement may be tinged with rhetorical exaggeration but there is no doubt of the widespread misery caused by debt and the difficulty of combating the influence exercised over the *praetor urbanus* by the group who could afford to lend money."

35. Tiffou, *Essai*, 409: "les faits viennent démentir les belles paroles. Catilina et Manlius prennent les armes contre la cité et mettent en jeu son existence."

36. This second theme culminates in Cato's famous words (52.11): "Iam pridem equidem nos vera vocabula rerum amisimus." Words such as *libertas*, *imperium*, *miseri*, *mansuetudo*, and *misericordia* resonate throughout the *Bellum Catilinae* and, as Vretska rightly notes ("De Catilinae coniuratione," 400), we consider them as germane only to their immediate context at the risk of not fully appreciating Sallust's monograph.

37. I wish to thank the editor and anonymous referees of *Classical Philology* for their assistance with this paper. I would also like to thank those who offered helpful suggestions after hearing an earlier version delivered at the 1998 Annual Meeting of CAMWS, and the Office of Research Services at UNCG, which provided financial support for this work. Most of all, I thank Professor John F. Miller who generously read and commented on more than several drafts of this paper.