

Thesis title:

The Epistolary Character of Marcus Caelius Rufus

by:

Kai James Riley-McPhee

Bachelor of Arts, Macquarie University

Department of Ancient History

Supervisor:

Associate Professor Lea Beness

Date of submission:

22/11/2018

Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	p. 1
Thesis Summary.....	p. 2
Statement of Originality.....	p. 3
Acknowledgements.....	p. 4
Abbreviations.....	p. 5
Introduction.....	p. 6
Cicero and Letters.....	p. 8
<i>ad fam.</i> VIII.1 (SB 77).....	p. 16
<i>ad fam.</i> VIII.2 (SB 78).....	p. 22
<i>ad fam.</i> VIII.3 (SB 79).....	p. 26
<i>ad fam.</i> VIII.4 (SB 81).....	p. 31
<i>ad fam.</i> VIII.9 (SB 82).....	p. 37
<i>ad fam.</i> VIII.5 (SB 83).....	p. 42
<i>ad fam.</i> VIII.8 (SB 84).....	p. 46
<i>ad fam.</i> VIII.10 (SB 87).....	p. 53
<i>ad fam.</i> VIII.6 (SB 88).....	p. 58
<i>ad fam.</i> VIII.11 (SB 91).....	p. 64
<i>ad fam.</i> VIII.7 (SB 92).....	p. 69
<i>ad fam.</i> VIII.13 (SB 94).....	p. 72
<i>ad fam.</i> VIII.14 (SB 97).....	p. 75
<i>ad fam.</i> VIII.12 (SB 98).....	p. 80
Conclusion.....	p. 85
Bibliography.....	p. 88
Appendix: M. Caelius Rufus: A Biography.....	p. 93

Thesis Summary

Marcus Caelius Rufus was a young, hot-headed, and complex character in the dramas of the late Roman Republic. This thesis is a study of the fourteen letters he wrote to Marcus Tullius Cicero between 51 and 50 BCE. This small selection of letters will serve as the basis for a subsequent detailed study which aims to read between the lines of the correspondence and identify the underlying *character* of Caelius and the nature of his self-presentation.

To do so, this study will observe the usage or avoidance of particular features of the epistolary genre, including the use of politeness, humour, sarcasm, seriousness, and the making of requests. By observing the circumstances in which these features of communication are employed or avoided, valuable biographical data concerning important historical figures will be revealed, along with sociolinguistic data relevant to how individuals communicate in different circumstances and contexts.

There has been a plethora of scholarly work on different communicative and epistolary features. By and large, this scholarship is concerned primarily with what *function* different features serve, but not what their use tells us about the user. We understand clearly what being polite is meant to achieve, but what does it say about the letter writer himself?

Statement of Originality

This work has not previously been submitted for a degree or diploma in any university. To the best of my knowledge and belief, the thesis contains no material previously published or written by another person except where due reference is made in the thesis itself.

(Signed) 
Kai Riley-McPhee

Date: 22/11/2018

Acknowledgements

Firstly, to my supervisor, Lea Beness. Lea has been an unbelievable support throughout this whole year and I cannot thank her enough. She has been understanding and encouraging, has always made time for me, and has provided such amazing feedback and direction. Without a doubt I couldn't have had a better supervisor, and I feel truly fortunate that Lea took me on, and shared with me her expertise, patience, and insight.

Next, to Tom Hillard, my first university lecturer. I have been lucky enough to have, essentially, two supervisors. Tom's knowledge, guidance, and insightful comments have been invaluable, and he has invariably given me more time than he ought and putting my work before his own. His knowledge and input have been vital, and I am deeply grateful.

I would also like to thank Nicole Moffatt, Patrick Tansey, Dr Reuben Ramsey, Dr Andrew Gillett, and Dr Caillan Davenport. Nicole, for her insightful comments and suggestions, Patrick for his valuable notes, Dr Ramsey for taking the time to chat on directions for my research, and Dr Gillett for kindly providing introductory readings to get me started. To Caillan, my sincerest thanks for his interest in my topic, and for giving me the opportunity to present at my first seminar.

I would like to express my special thanks to Emeritus Professor Harm Pinkster for his kind correspondence. I was touched by his request for a copy of my thesis on completion, and will be delighted to provide it.

Without the assistance of the Macquarie University Library, this thesis would not have been possible. In particular, my thanks to the Macquarie Interlibrary Loan department, and to those of Sydney University, the Australian National University, the University of Melbourne, the University of Newcastle, the University of South Australia, and Deakin University.

I am truly grateful to my sister, Shae Riley-McPhee, for her indispensable editing and proofreading skills, without which I don't know what I would have done.

Lastly, to my parents, Alison and Darren MCPhee. Without your support, none of this would have been imaginable. Thank you.

Thank you, all.

Abbreviations

- Also-Rans* "Candidates Defeated in Roman Elections: Some Ancient Roman "Also-Rans"", Broughton, T.R.S., in *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, vol. 81.4 (1991), pp. 1—64.
- CIL* *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, Mommsen, T. et al., Berlin 1863–2003.
- MRR* *Magistrates of the Roman Republic*, Broughton, T.R.S., 3 vols Atlanta (1951, 1952 [repr. 1984] and 1986).
- OLD* *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, Glare, P.G.W. (ed.), 2nd ed. Oxford 2012.
- RE* *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Pauly, A., Wissowa, G. & Kroll, W. (eds), Stuttgart 1893–1980.
- SB* Shackleton Bailey—all letter dates found within this work are those according to Shackleton Bailey unless stated otherwise. Similarly, all sigla of the form "SB 77" refer to the *ad familiares* unless otherwise stated.
- Trials* *Trials in the Late Roman Republic, 149 BC to 50 BC*, Alexander, M.C., Toronto 1990.

Introduction

The work presented here might be described as the tip of the iceberg, or, a toe in the water. In future, I hope to study the entirety of the Ciceronian epistolary corpus (or a far wider sample, at least) and explore the character of Cicero's various correspondents through an analysis of the various styles and epistolary tactics they adopt, and the different ways in which Cicero chooses to present himself and engage with them in his own communication.

By way of testing the water, I decided to begin by examining the correspondence between Cicero and Caelius, a selection of whose surviving letters provides an opportunity for a test-case. A similarly controlled experiment might have been possible with regard to Cicero's letters to Atticus, where Nepos' *Life of Atticus* allows us to appreciate, by way of independent evidence, the character with whom Cicero was engaging. The time constraints and narrow word limit imposed by this short-term degree, however, discouraged that choice of topic for this preliminary exercise.

Those same constraints have compelled me to narrow this study still further. I am presenting here only an analysis of the letters from Caelius in the years 51 to 50 BCE, and not the exchange of both sides. The tone, style, and epistolary strategies adopted by Cicero in this give-and-take with Caelius are only discussed in the most ancillary fashion and must await a longer treatment. In this respect, I have limited my corpus along the same lines as Emeritus Professor Harm Pinkster who considered the same fourteen letters of Caelius in his study,¹ as they formed a sufficiently large source body written in relatively stable circumstances.

In considering a topic for study, Caelius is a difficult individual to pass over. His style of writing is endearing to most everyone aside from Shackleton Bailey, and who could forget his desperate requests for Cilician panthers? Additionally, previous

¹ Pinkster, 2010, p. 186. Note that Professor Pinkster writes of fifteen letters of Caelius in the period when Cicero was proconsul in Cilicia. He has very kindly advised me that I am likely correct, namely that only fourteen letters had been considered by him in his study.

scholarship, perhaps with the exception of Jim Adams' work on Greek code-switching, has not examined in depth what different epistolary features can reveal about the character of a correspondent, focussing instead on their function. We understand, for example, what being polite or impolite was meant to achieve, but what do different politeness strategies or forms of address say about the writer themselves?

In future work, should I be in a position to pursue this research, I would like to probe the degree to which the character of Cicero's correspondents might be discerned by reading between the lines of Cicero's correspondence. This current submission is an analysis of Caelius' self-presentation, and of what he might subconsciously reveal about himself in his letters to Cicero.

As such, what follows will be a brief discussion on the Ciceronian *Letters* corpus and its features as a source body, followed by a detailed analysis of the first fourteen letters written by Caelius to Cicero, in chronological order according to the dates assigned by Shackleton Bailey. For a brief biographical/prosopographical study on M. Caelius Rufus, and a compressed understanding of his character based on largely non-epistolary sources, please consult the attached Appendix.

Cicero and Letters

Marcus Tullius Cicero was a Roman *eques* born in Arpinum on 3rd January 106 BCE.² He rose to prominence through his skills as an orator before embarking on his political career.³ He was elected quaestor, plebeian aedile, and praetor at the earliest opportunities, and then cemented his status as a *novus homo* when he was elected consul for 63 BCE.⁴ The consulship coincided with the event which made him a name to be remembered—the so-called Catilinarian Conspiracy, his involvement in which was a source of great fame (as he so often reminds us), and coloured his life for years to come.⁵ His involvement in this episode, however, was not what has rendered him such a noteworthy historical figure. Rather, we know of him today from the vast collection of his extant writings.⁶ Many of these, such as the *de Republica* were published during his lifetime.⁷

One collection of texts, however, was not published until after his death; that referred to as Cicero's *Letters*. The *Letters* as we have them today are composed of the *ad familiares*, the *ad Quintum fratrem*, the *ad Brutum*, and the *ad Atticum*. Other collections such as letters to Caesar, Pompey and Octavian are known to have existed in the ancient world, though these are no longer extant.⁸ According to Shackleton Bailey, it is likely that the letters to Atticus were not published until the middle of Nero's reign by an unknown editor,⁹ while the remaining collections were in all likelihood arranged and published

² Shackleton Bailey, 2001 Loeb v. 1 p. 3.

³ Shackleton Bailey, (1971, pp. 10–11) notes, in particular, his defense of Sex. Roscius (*RE* 7) in 81 BCE as a starting point. See Alexander, *Trials* p. 66–67 (no. 129) for details on the case.

⁴ Shackleton Bailey, 2001 Loeb v. 1 pp. 5–6. For Cicero's various public offices, see Broughton *MRR* 2.98, 132, 152, 165.

⁵ Most notably resulting in his banishment at Clodius' engineering in 58 BCE.

⁶ During his life, he produced myriad speeches, along with books and theoretical works on oratory and political theory. Shackleton Bailey, 1971, p. x.

⁷ Caelius describes the work as being "all the rage" in Rome (*tui politici libri omnibus vigent*); *ad fam.* VIII.1.4 (SB 77).

⁸ Shackleton Bailey, 2001 Loeb v. 1 p. 2.

⁹ His argument is based on Seneca the Younger's citation of a letter in its published form and Asconius' silence. Shackleton Bailey dismantles the argument of J. Carcopino (*Les Secrets de la Correspondance de Cicéron*, v. 2 Paris 1947) who postulated that Atticus was directly involved in their publication during his later life, though, he does not go so far as to find his own theory to be conclusive. I quote: "the evidence

during the Augustan period by Cicero's freedman, Tiro.¹⁰ There is evidence to suggest Cicero entertained the idea of publishing a selection of his letters,¹¹ though this does not seem to have eventuated.¹² It should be noted that the date of publication and who published the *Letters* still remains the subject of scholarly debate; Peter White, for example, suggests that the letters of the *ad Atticum* were publicly circulated no later than the end of Augustus' reign, and those of the *ad familiares* no later than the end of Tiberius', adding that both collections "show signs of being compiled on roughly similar editorial principles, [so] it would make sense to put their respective publication dates relatively close together rather than far apart."¹³ There is also scholarly debate as to the total number of letters in the Ciceronian corpus. White gives the total number of entries according to a number of scholars as ranging between 864 and 966. This uncertainty is due to the erasure of letter headings in the manuscripts, leading to the possibility of multiple letters being considered as single entries, along with different methods of counting enclosed and embedded letters.¹⁴ Shackleton Bailey estimates the number in his biography of Cicero in a rather nice way: "Over nine hundred survive, of which about one tenth were not written by Cicero."¹⁵ Those letters included in the corpus which were not written by Cicero are of particular interest, because a majority of them are direct replies to letters he sent. This has the effect of preserving, in many cases, both sides of an epistolary dialogue.

The idea of letters emulating a spoken dialogue between two correspondents is reflected in ancient epistolary theory, and also by Cicero himself. The treatise attributed

such as it is, and it falls distinctly short of proof, supports a date about half-way through Nero's reign" (Shackleton Bailey, 1965 Commentary v. 1 p. 73).

¹⁰ Shackleton Bailey, 2001, p. 2.

¹¹ Cicero, *ad Att.* XVI.5.5 (SB 410); *ad fam.* XVI.17.1 (SB 186).

¹² Of course, according to Cornelius Nepos (*Atticus*, XVI.3–4), at least the letters preserved by Atticus were available to be read by friends.

¹³ White, 2010, pp. 174–175.

¹⁴ White, 2010, pp. 172–173.

¹⁵ Shackleton Bailey, 1971, p. xi.

to Demetrius of Phalerum, *de Elocutione*,¹⁶ cites Artemon,¹⁷ who says that letters “ought to be written in the same manner as a dialogue, a letter being regarded by him [Artemon] as one of the two sides of a dialogue.”¹⁸ The treatise also says that the letter, “like the dialogue, should abound in glimpses of character”,¹⁹ and should “be a compound of ... two styles, the graceful and the plain.”²⁰ These thoughts are echoed by Seneca in the *Epistulae Morales* in the first century CE. He writes of Lucilius as “revealing your real self to me in the only way you can”,²¹ and as letters being most pleasing when they “[bring] us real traces, real evidence, of an absent friend!”²² He also writes that his letters “should be just what my conversation would be if you and I were sitting in one another’s company or taking walks together—spontaneous and easy”.²³ The fact that Cicero shared these epistolary ideas can be observed in his *Letters*. He states numerous times that he is writing in order to mimic conversation, and laments his inability to write ‘normally’ due to the troubled times of the Civil Wars and Caesar’s rule.²⁴

There are markedly different styles between the letters Cicero writes to say, Atticus and Caelius, and those he writes to the Senate or as letters of recommendation. Often, those written to his close friends appear more colloquial, conversational, and less polished than those with a more official focus. Distinct differences can also be seen within the smaller collection of letters to his brother, Quintus. The first letter of the *ad Quintum fratrem*,²⁵ is thought to be more a treatise on governorship rather than an actual letter and written for publication. It was not sincere advice, as Quintus was hardly needing

¹⁶ Malherbe (1988, p. 2) states that this attribution to Demetrius of Phalerum is erroneous and the date of publication is in doubt, with scholars suggesting dates ranging from the third century BCE to the first century CE. In any case, Malherbe states that the sources used in the treatise date to the second, or at the latest, the first century BCE, making them roughly contemporary with Cicero.

¹⁷ The editor of Aristotle’s *Letters*.

¹⁸ Demetrius, *On Style*, 223.

¹⁹ Demetrius, *On Style*, 227.

²⁰ Demetrius, *On Style*, 235.

²¹ i.e. through a letter.

²² Seneca, *Epistulae Morales*, 40.1.

²³ Seneca, *Epistulae Morales*, 75.1–2.

²⁴ See, for example, Cicero’s comments on letter writing which have been collected by Malherbe, 1988. He notes *ad fam.* II.4 (SB 48), IV.13 (SB 225), XVI.16 (SB 44), XII.30 (SB 417), and *ad Att.* IX.4 (SB 173), VIII.14 (SB 164), IX.10 (SB 177), XII.53 (SB 295).

²⁵ *ad Quint. frat.* I.1 (SB 1).

advice during his third year as governor. The artificiality of the text, particularly when compared to the second letter of the collection, which is clearly a private communication,²⁶ also becomes apparent and is indicative of the different styles employed in distinct contexts.²⁷

Those letters which were written to reflect dialogue ought to be simpler in nature and more revealing of incidental data. In this way, letters can be compared to the writings of the Comedic genre. Andreas Willi discusses the linguistic merit of Greek Comedy in relation to other sources, suggesting that it is more varied than inscriptions, more ‘real’ than poetry, and more revealing than the carefully crafted prose and oratorical sources.²⁸ This is not to suggest that the Comedy is not itself a carefully crafted source, but it is undoubtedly of a different nature to works of history or oratory. The literary genres of prose histories or speeches only discuss mundane details of daily life when they need particular attention, while incidental data is invariably revealed by Comedy since “the comic author does not *intend* to inform his audience or readership about the facts of daily life, [and so] he does so in the most immediate, unreflective—or should we say: honest—manner.”²⁹ Similarly, letters, when written to be conversational and reflective of dialogue, will also reveal incidental data. This comparison was also made by R. Tyrrell in his edition of Cicero’s *Letters*, and by G.O. Hutchinson. Tyrrell opined that there is a close parallel between the diction of the letters and comic drama, with both reflecting the language of “familiar dialogue” by being “tinged with idiom ... or colloquialism”,³⁰ and Hutchinson writes that “we should bear in mind not only the dramatic dialogue in comedy, but its reports of dialogue, with their quasi-colloquial but significant exchanges, and their narrative elements, pithy or circumstantial”.³¹ The use of a conversational register is a particular strength of Cicero’s *Letters* in general, which is not found in other sources, including some other letter collections from the ancient world, such as the letters of Pliny,

²⁶ Lintott, A., 2008, pp. 253–254.

²⁷ Trapp, 2003, pp. 4–5.

²⁸ Willi, 2003, p. 2.

²⁹ Willi, 2003 p. 2.

³⁰ Tyrrell, & Purser, v.1 1885, p. 59.

³¹ Hutchinson, 1998, p. 117.

which are considered much more polished literary works that were designed for publication and wide consumption.³² Indeed, there is a general scholarly consensus that Cicero's *Letters* are by and large informal and conversational.³³

Of course, despite the potential for Cicero's *Letters* to reveal useful data, there are several considerations which must be kept in mind when studying them. Firstly, we must be aware of Cicero and/or his correspondents modifying their styles based on whom they are writing to and the contexts in which they are writing. Stowers discusses the importance of the relationship between correspondents with respect to the type of letter that will be written. This, he says, is made implicit by the attempts to categorize different types of letters in works like *de Elocutione* and *Τύποι Ἐπιστολικοί*.³⁴ Essentially, we must not only remain aware of the differences between letters for public and private purposes (such as the example from the *ad Quint. frat.*), but we must also be aware of the differences inherent in whom a correspondent is writing to. The letters Cicero wrote to Tiro, for example, clearly present differently than his letter to Metellus Celer in 62 BCE: he writes to Celer quite brusquely after receiving a less than polite epistle,³⁵ and by way of comparison, writes to Tiro for the third time in a single day to offer his fawning wishes for the man's good health.³⁶ The context within which these men were writing should also be considered; for example, in the month of June in 58 BCE (the year of Cicero's banishment), he writes what is, according to Shackleton Bailey, "a long, lugubriously pathetic letter of apology", and a theme of depression tends to permeate most all of the letters he wrote during this time.³⁷ Similarly, context plays a role in the writing of Caelius' letter in April 49 BCE when in conjunction with Caesar, he urges Cicero not to declare for Pompey.³⁸ Clearly these are very different circumstances under which he was writing compared to the

³² Hall, 2009, p. 27.

³³ See, for example, the works of Trapp, 2003, p. 13; Hoffer, 2007, p. 87; Hall, 2009, p. 27; and the many works of Shackleton Bailey.

³⁴ Stowers, 1986, p. 56.

³⁵ *ad fam.* V.2 (SB 2).

³⁶ *ad fam.* XVI.6 (SB 125).

³⁷ Shackleton Bailey, 1971, pp. 68–70.

³⁸ *ad fam.* VIII.16 (SB 153); also found as *ad Att.* X.9A (SB 200A); Madsen, 1981, p. 153.

circumstances in which he wrote the vast majority of his previous letters, written before the outbreak of the civil war.

Secondly, we have to be aware of how the fear of prying eyes could affect the writing. Ancient letters could take years to be delivered, if they reached their destination at all, and had to be carried by messengers.³⁹ This obviously puts letters at risk of being intercepted or being lost en route. Additionally, the ancient letter writer also had to keep in mind the possibility of his letter's contents becoming public, either through the vagaries of the postal service or through deliberate sharing by its recipient (evidence for which can be found by Cicero regularly sharing letters from the likes of Pompey and Caesar with Atticus, "with no apparent concern regarding the propriety of doing so"),⁴⁰ and so "his letters should avoid rebuke or anything else that might prove embarrassing if made public."⁴¹ The moderating of content at the least is plainly evident in some of Cicero's *Letters*, with him and his correspondents repeatedly making claims to the effect of "I had better not say in a letter".⁴²

Thirdly, we must consider how the manuscript tradition could have affected our epistles. Cicero's *Letters* have not come down to us in their original form, but have been preserved in medieval and Renaissance manuscripts. This has resulted in problems such as manuscript damage, which results in letter headings being obliterated, causing problems of interpretation regarding when one letter may end and another begins,⁴³ and problems with interpreting the text itself.⁴⁴ Additionally, letters preserved in manuscript form have obviously been subjected to editing, losing some of their original authenticity and depriving us of data still found in, for example, papyrological documents, with their

³⁹ Ebbeler, 2010, p. 470.

⁴⁰ Hall, 2009, pp. 24–25.

⁴¹ Ebbeler, 2009, p. 471.

⁴² See, for example, *ad fam.* VIII.6 (SB 88), in which Caelius is particularly coy in writing of the potential engagement of Cicero's daughter, Tullia, to P. Cornelius Dolabella (*RE* 141). For an in-depth discussion of this kind of self-censorship in the Ciceronian letter corpus and their delivery, see Nicholson, 1994.

⁴³ White, *op. cit.* p. 172.

⁴⁴ For example, in *ad fam.* VIII.8.1 (SB 84) there is a corruption which Shackleton Bailey describes as "incurable" (2001 Loeb v. 1 p. 372 n. 4).

original unedited contents, form, format and layout, alongside the fact that the physical artifacts themselves still exist.⁴⁵ Finally, the collections as we have them now were undoubtedly subjected to the editorial ideas of their original compiler. For example, there is some evidence of editorial deletion in the *Letters*, and the arrangement of the *ad familiares* “suggests a desire [by the editor] to facilitate several different kinds of reading”, such as one organized thematically, rather than chronologically.⁴⁶ The order indeed may have been specifically chosen and engineered to create a particular effect in a similar way to the care and attention regularly paid by Roman poets to the design of their poetry books.⁴⁷ This can also be seen in the editorial choice informing most collections, namely the inclusion of only one half of the correspondence. Exceptions exist, to an extent,⁴⁸ but generally, replies are not preserved. The glaring example of this is, of course, the letters of the *ad Atticum* in which almost five hundred letters from Cicero are preserved, and none from Atticus. Given that letter collections are by and large assembled from the records and archives of the writer, which would have included both incoming and outgoing letters, it would have been possible to include both sides of the correspondence.⁴⁹

So, in the *Letters* of Cicero we have a selection of texts, several of which are reflecting the views of some proponents of ancient epistolary theory, when letters of a friendly nature are expected to be colloquial and reflective of dialogue and revealing of the writer’s character. We must, however, be careful in selecting and identifying those friendly letters of the Ciceronian corpus which are appropriate for revealing character, while also remaining conscious of the potential problems inherent in the source body. Essentially, we will have to rely on the assumption that the letters we have in the manuscripts are, by and large, accurate representations of what was written by a

⁴⁵ Gillett, 2012, p. 827.

⁴⁶ Trapp, 2003, pp. 13–14.

⁴⁷ Beard, 2002, pp. 121–122.

⁴⁸ For example, the correspondence between Cicero and Caelius, though it should be noted that the letters of these two men are preserved in separate books.

⁴⁹ Gillett, 2012 p. 835.

correspondent, while remaining aware of the potential for letters to be deliberately modified by the writer, and either deliberately or unintentionally, by later editors.

To begin the preserved correspondence, Caelius employs a standard, though comfortably abbreviated greeting formula (*CAELIUS CICERONI S.*). His relationship with Cicero is such that he need not spell out a complex and formal greeting—they are friends, so it was not necessary. Interestingly, this same address formula is maintained throughout the entire letter series (bar one example, SB 153, which does not fall within the confines of this study), even in light of changing circumstances.

In section 1, Caelius is primarily concerned with his task: write to Cicero of events at Rome. He takes pains to show how dedicated he is to this commission, yet carefully frames himself as faultless if the finished product should not meet Cicero's expectations. He highlights the thoroughness of the job while expressing his worry about doing it properly (*ut verear ne tibi nimium arguta haec sedulitas videatur*). This self-deprecatory uncertainty is contrasted with an oblique compliment to Cicero (*tametsi tu scio quam sis curiosus*),⁵⁰ and this is built on when he attempts to forestall any ideas Cicero might have that he took less interest in the task than he ought (*tamen in hoc te deprecor ne meum hoc officium adrogantiae condemnes quod hunc laborem alteri delegavi*). The introduction and discussion of an agent here, points to a kind of passing of blame from Caelius. If Cicero *should* find the report unsatisfactory, it will not be Caelius' fault. He goes on to employ a double negative (*non quin mihi suauissimum sit*), and pleonasm to emphasise how very pleasurable he finds writing to Cicero.⁵¹ Curiously, he also appears to suggest that Cicero *should* be happy with the result (*sed ipsum volumen quod tibi misi facile, ut ego arbitror, me excusat*), particularly given that he highlights the amount of effort required for him to fulfil the task personally (*nescio cuius oti esset non modo perscribere haec sed omnino animadvertere*). In the section's final sentence, Caelius organises the

⁵⁰ With this compliment, it is as if he highlights how he does not wish to disappoint. Cicero is curious, and he wants to satisfy that curiosity.

⁵¹ a. Indeed, even the amount of space and effort he dedicates to his reasons for not fulfilling the request himself suggests how concerned he is with maintaining both a friendly and epistolary relationship with his former mentor. b. It is particularly noteworthy that he refers to himself as "the laziest of letter writers" (SB trans.), something which Hutchinson points out is quite unusual. It is seen as a device to stress the enjoyment he (quite rightly, as expected) takes in writing (Hutchinson, 1998, p. 18).

three clauses in order that the matter of personal expense incurred is buried and given the least emphasis, with the condition and the imperative given pride of place (*quod exemplum si forte minus te delectarit, ne molestiam tibi cum impensa mea exhibeam, fac me certiores*),⁵² while employing syncopation to reduce the formality of the request.⁵³ A further concern with doing right by Cicero can be seen in his wish for further direction, clarification, and a letter.⁵⁴

In section 2, Caelius continues in his attempts at relationship management. He highlights that he will personally cover any shortfall on the part of his hiring to assuage any fear Cicero might have that he is not taking enough interest in the task:

*si quid in re publica maius actum erit, quod isti operarii
minus commode persequi possint, et quem ad modum actum
sit et quae existimatio secuta quaeque de eo spes sit
diligenter tibi perscribemus.*⁵⁵

After such extended discussion regarding his assignment, the conversation shifts in topic and tone. He becomes conversational, employing the common figurative imagery of temperature to describe rumours circulating hotly concerning elections in Gaul (*nam et illi rumores de comitiis Transpadanorum Cumarum tenus caluerunt*),⁵⁶ contrasted with the behaviour of M. Claudius Marcellus, the consul (RE 229), possibly “slow and inefficient”

⁵² The *quod ... si ...* clause is given first position, and the imperative the final position. This whole section can, I think, be seen as an attempt by Caelius to minimise his “face-threat”, as Hall describes it (Hall, 2009, p. 114). It is as if he is attempting to forestall any possible criticism from Cicero for any perceived negligence on Caelius’ part, akin to how Cicero attempts to construct “an effective piece of facework” to ward off giving offense, as described by Hall (2009, p. 109).

⁵³ *delectarit* for *delectauit*; according to Abbott, this form of syncopation of the perfect tense occurs fifty-five times in Caelius’ seventeen letters (Abbott, 1897, p. lxxv) and shows an attempt at informal and familiar language.

⁵⁴ This is generally in keeping with the principle of discussing the epistolary exchange itself at the start of a letter (Trapp 2003, p. 36).

⁵⁵ a. Note particularly, the use of the adverb *diligenter* with *perscribemus*. b. This is also the only occurrence of the substantive *operarii* (Oldfather, Canter & Abbott, 1965 p. 387), most likely not meant as a compliment. For example, Morello refers to the *volumen* writer as a ‘hack’ (Morello, 2013, p. 198). For the connotations of the word *operarius*, see, in passing, Fabre, 1981, p. 234, and for a discussion of the *operae* that a freedman might be expected to perform for his patron, see Treggiari, 1969, pp. 75–81.

⁵⁶ For the use of figurative heat and cold language, see Abbott, 1897, pp. lxxiii–lxxiv.

(i.e. cold).⁵⁷ He turns to the matter of provincial governors, a topic of great interest to Cicero, and many others, talking up the veracity of the information he is passing on (*ut mihi ipse dixit*), and refers to the “rumours” surrounding Marcellus which both he and Cicero had heard when they were together in Rome.⁵⁸ It is curious that Caelius is relatively light on detail given the importance of the topic. Cicero’s own concern is displayed just a few days earlier, when he writes in a letter to Atticus (*ad Att.* V.7 [SB 100]) that Pompey is prepared to act “against these things which we fear” (my trans.).⁵⁹

In section 3, Caelius’ professed concern with Cicero’s desires continues (*ut volebas*), as does his attempt to continue the epistolary relationship with a strong and imploring directive (*fac mihi perscribas*). The imperative in conjunction with the second person subjunctive and the compound with *per-* add an earnestness to the request for a reply.⁶⁰ He takes this opportunity to deride Pompey extensively,⁶¹ who, according to Caelius, is by his very nature (*ingenium*) accustomed to feel one thing and to say another,

⁵⁷ a. Shackleton Bailey cites VIII.10.3 (SB 87) as evidence for Caelius likely referring to Marcellus’ ‘coolness’ (Shackleton Bailey, 1977 Commentary v.1 p. 383). b. There is also a contrast between the use of *caluerunt* and the reality of the situation in Rome. The rumour mill was running hot outside Rome, but inside there was nothing: *Romam cum venissem, ne tenuissimam quidem auditionem de ea re accepi*; “when I got back to Rome, I did not hear so much as a whisper on the subject.” (SB trans.). Particularly note the superlative adjective *tenuissimam*.

⁵⁸ *qui de eo tum fuerant cum Romae nos essemus*; this reference to shared knowledge and experience creates a closeness with Cicero. It should further be noted that the use of *sermones* is hardly meant as a compliment; indeed, Shackleton Bailey suggests, as was mentioned earlier, that the rumour was “that he was slow and inefficient” (p. 383). Certainly apt, given that he has just delayed the matter. Even if this action was for strategic reasons on the part of Marcellus, Caelius is expressing derision for Marcellus in sympathy with Cicero, while pointing out a shared experience.

⁵⁹ *ad haec quae timentur*; a. Cicero’s displeasure at leaving Rome can also be put down to his anxiety to keep abreast of the situation with Caesar, as lines were being drawn in the Senate (Rawson, 1978, p. 146). b. The concern of the Senate as a whole can be seen in Hirtius, *Bellum Gallicum*, who writes that there was a crowded house who had turned out for the occasion (*senatus frequens*) (BG 8.53).

⁶⁰ a. For the use of compounds with *per-* and *sub-* for emphasis, see Abbott, 1897, p. lxiv. b. Morello writes that Caelius expects a full account of the encounter with Cicero in return for the epistolary effort he goes to as part of a transaction in which communication is the currency (Morello, 2013, p. 198 n. 10), and this certainly adds to the idea of maintaining the epistolary relationship.

⁶¹ *solet enim aliud sentire et loqui neque tantum valere ingenio ut non appareat quid cupiat*.

but cannot conceal his real motives. The use of *enim* certainly intensifies the insult.⁶² This is curious given Cicero's 'tolerance' of Pompey.⁶³

Section 4 discusses rumours circulating at the time about Caesar, and Cicero himself. The rumours about Caesar concern his fortunes in Gaul and that he and the army were suffering.⁶⁴ The only epistolary features of real note are some instances of ellipsis and brevity and the rare use of *susurratores*.⁶⁵ Caelius does not subscribe to the rumours, yet he displays no kind of pleasure or even interest in the misfortunes of Caesar. He appears to report what they were with no nonsense, possibly indicating a still very real fear of the Gauls in Rome.⁶⁶ In the next sentence he refers to the rumours being thrown about not by the mob, but by a small group which he knows (*neque adhuc certi quicquam est, neque haec incerta tamen vulgo iactantur, sed inter paucos, quos tu nosti, palam secreto narrantur*), and follows with the striking phrase, *at Domitius cum manus ad os apposuit*.⁶⁷ The suggestion that these rumours are an "open secret among a small

⁶² Both Shackleton Bailey and Williams translate this as effectively, "Pompey was not smart enough to succeed in hiding his aims."

⁶³ Cicero was pleased with the invitation to meet Pompey on the road to Cilicia, and left after the meeting reportedly filled with confidence (*ad Att.* V.7 [SB 100]), though as Beryl Rawson points out, Caelius was not yet aware of Cicero's renewed confidence in the man (Rawson, 1978, p. 147).

⁶⁴ a. Against the Bellovacii; see *Bellum Gallicum* 8.6 ff and Major-General Fuller, 1965, pp. 158–165. b. In hindsight, these actions seem almost a footnote to Caesar's efforts in 52 BCE, described by Fuller as "nothing more than the backwash of Alesia" (1965 p. 158). By way of example, these events are given in abridged form in an otherwise detailed biography of Caesar's life (Meier, 1995, pp. 328–329).

⁶⁵ a. *sed susurratores dumtaxat*; this serves to downplay the importance of the rumours, and suggest that Caelius put no real stock in them. With regard to *susurratores*, Abbott suggests that this usage was coined by Caelius as its only other appearance, according to Abbott, is in the Vulgate translation of the Bible (Abbott, 1897, p. 115); and certainly, the PHI Latin Texts website provides no other example in surviving classical Latin. b. *alius equitem perdidisse, quod, opinor, certe fictum est, alius septimam legionem vapulasse, ipsum apud Bellovacos circumsederi interclusum ab reliquo exercitu*; this sentence lists what the rumours were and elides a verb of saying.

⁶⁶ Evidence for which can be found in Sallust, *Bellum Jugurthinum* 114.1–2. For further discussion on the Gallic Fear, consult Bellen, 1985. This work explores the origin of "the Great Fear" in Rome, that the city would fall again to an enemy, as it had in 387 BCE, and according to Eckstein (1987, p.335), "serves as a salutary corrective to recent "revisionist" historians who have argued that Roman society was itself extraordinarily aggressive against its neighbors and that the tradition of Roman fear is mere self-justifying propaganda ...".

⁶⁷ "But Domitius claps hand to mouth before he speaks." (SB trans.); this has been interpreted as Domitius' gesture mimicking a trumpet (Rosillo-López, 2017, pp. 80–81), and that he was hinting at but not actively speaking the rumours (Rosillo-López, 2018, p. 251). Either way, it is certainly not complimentary, drawing attention to what Caelius perceives as his lack of subtlety, though it is relatively tame.

coterie—you know who” (SB trans.) certainly has implications, and the reference to Domitius has a deprecatory feel, but not of the magnitude typical of Caelius—he remains rather sober. It seems as if even the slightest possibility there is some truth to the rumours is enough to temper his style.

The rumours concerning Cicero, that he was dead, Caelius discusses very differently (*te a.d. VIII Kal. Iun. subrostrani ... dissiparant perisse*). The use of the derogatory *subrostrani*, upon whom he even wishes misfortune (*quod illorum capiti sit!*),⁶⁸ along with the position of *te* at the start of the sentence, shows a familiar and jocular style, which serves to completely dismiss the rumours.⁶⁹ He displays little concern for the slightest possibility of the rumour’s truth. He emphasises that *he* did not believe the rumours and denigrates Q. Pompeius Rufus (RE 41) to some degree (*ego, qui scirem Q. Pompeium Baulis embaeneticam facere et usque eo ut ego misererer eius esurire, non sum commotus et hoc mendacio, si qua pericula tibi impenderent, ut defungeremur optavi*),⁷⁰ along with T. Munatius Plancus Bursa (RE 32) (*Plancus quidem tuus Ravennae est et magno congiario donatus a Caesare nec beatus nec bene instructus est*). Caelius’ use of *tuus* with *Plancus* is deeply sarcastic, as Cicero had previously prosecuted the man,⁷¹ and his disdain is continued when he writes that he is neither happy nor well despite large gifts

⁶⁸ Compounds such as *subrostrani* are used to strengthen words (Abbott, 1897, p. lxiv), and in this case it is definitely not meant as a compliment! (See also, Pinkster, 2010, p. 191).

⁶⁹ *te* is placed at the start of the sentence, even though it is part of the accusative and infinitive clause (with *perisse*, subordinated to *dissiparant*). So, the two parts of this clause are separated by: the date; the subject; the parentheses; and the verb of saying. On the subject of “fronting” and “topicalization,” see Pinkster, 2010, pp. 197–198, who says features such as this are often considered ‘colloquial’.

⁷⁰ a. *ego* is employed at the start of the sentence, suggesting something along the lines of “I didn’t believe the rumours (as others did).” b. He goes on to state why he did not believe them, namely, because he *knew* Q. Pompeius (the supposed murderer) to be “operating boats at Bauli with so little to eat that my heart bleeds for him” (SB trans.), because Caelius himself put him there (see Alexander, *Trials* p. 160 [no. 328]). c. The use of *embaeneticam facere*, is also rather unique (Shackleton Bailey, 1977 Commentary v.1 p. 384), and hardly complimentary (see also, Pinkster, 2010, p. 191). Though it should be noted that in some editions (such as W. Glynn Williams’ 1965 Loeb), *πεινητικὴν* is provided in place of *embaeneticam*, though this use of Greek is not supported by Shackleton Bailey or Tyrrell and Purser, and Abbott describes the actual word as “hopelessly lost” due to manuscript damage (p. 116). d. The use of *misererer* may appear to continue his denigration, but it is probably less than sarcastic as Caelius acted on his behalf later (See Shackleton Bailey, 1977 Commentary v.1 p. 384).

⁷¹ See Shackleton Bailey, p. 384 and Alexander, *Trials* p. 159 (no. 327).

from Caesar.⁷² Caelius then rounds off the letter quickly and succinctly, telling Cicero his *de Republica* was being well received.⁷³ This is curious, given the magnitude of the work and the desire Cicero might have for details regarding it. The ensuing lack of detail appears indicative of a real familiarity, as Caelius feels under no obligation to heap praise upon it.

From this letter, Caelius appears very concerned with meeting his social and epistolary obligations to Cicero. He is concerned with criticism from or disappointment that could be expressed by his former tutor. He wants to fulfil his obligation to keep Cicero informed of anything relevant to him. He is not afraid to criticise persons in Rome, clearly illustrated by how he writes of Pompey in section 3, yet he is concerned with serious matters of state, and his personal feelings seem separate from matters of real national security, particularly evident in the contrast of styles between the first and second half of section 4. Discussion of Caesar and the Gauls is serious, while rumours of Cicero's death are not worth a moment's thought. Finally, he seems secure in the strength of his relationship with Cicero (possibly in light of the tactics he has employed in this very letter), apparently content to gloss over the matter of provincial governors and the reception of Cicero's *de Republica*.

⁷² Indeed, Shackleton Bailey makes note of the word-play here, saying he was neither *beatus* nor *bene instructus* (Shackleton Bailey, 1977 Commentary v.1, p. 384).

⁷³ *tui politici libri omnibus vigent.*

This short letter shows Caelius writing to Cicero on very interesting developments in Rome, and editorialising in no uncertain terms. He lays on quite heavily his shock at the controversial acquittal of M. Valerius Messala Rufus (*RE* 268) on a charge of *ambitus*,⁷⁴ with considerable employment of a conversational tone, that emphasises the letter's nature as a personal communication.

Section 1 begins with the striking opening, *certe, inquam*, setting the tone and suggesting what Cicero will think of what is to follow.⁷⁵ Caelius states that he was present when the verdict was read out (*me in re praesenti stante pronuntiatum est*),⁷⁶ emphasising the interest he is taking on Cicero's behalf and the reliability of his account. Most importantly, however, Caelius is demonstrating his shock at the outcome, as if to suggest "I wouldn't have believed it if I hadn't seen it with my own eyes." He maintains a conversational tone in the rest of the sentence (*et quidem omnibus ordinibus, sed singulis in uno quoque ordine sententiis*), displaying brevity by choosing not to include more redundant verbs and instead relying on *absolutus est* from the opening line to provide all the requisite meaning. Now follow colloquial outbursts (*'gaude modo,' inquis. non mehercules*) as he mimics what Cicero will say, as on the surface, the outcome is pleasing. But his own outburst, *non mehercules*, answers that no, it is in fact bad.⁷⁷ He expresses the magnitude of his shock (*nihil umquam enim tam praeter opinionem, tam quod videretur omnibus indignum, accidit*), by displaying brevity, intensifiers, and pleonasm in the form of a series of adverbs and prepositions. The next sentence (*quin ego, cum pro amicitia validissime faverem ei ...*) begins with *quin*, adding emphasis to the statement

⁷⁴ For details of the trial, see Alexander, *Trials* p. 160 (no. 329).

⁷⁵ According to Shackleton Bailey, it is reiterating what Cicero will find reading onwards, rather than replying to another question from a previous letter (Shackleton Bailey, 1977 Commentary v.1 p. 385), while Tyrrell and Purser describe the opening as "very harsh and abrupt" and characteristic of Caelius' style (p. 34).

⁷⁶ It should be noted that there is a corruption in the text at this point. Shackleton Bailey's restoration is reproduced above, though the manuscripts offer *me representare pronuntiatum est* (Ω = MGR), with various conjectures being proffered: the conjecture of W.S. Watts, editor of the Oxford Classical Texts edition, which is omitted by Shackleton Bailey, presents *me praesente clare*.

⁷⁷ It is interesting to note that to swear by Hercules is a more masculine way of offering an oath or exclamation (as opposed to swearing by Castor and Pollux). For further details, see Adams 1984, pp. 47–48.

which follows,⁷⁸ and the superlative adverb, *validissime*, is used to emphasise how very earnestly he favoured Messalla Rufus. The use of *cum pro amicitia* shows how despite Caelius' friendship with Messalla, he is still shocked at the seemingly favourable outcome.⁷⁹ He had even prepared himself for a guilty verdict, before being "dumbstruck".⁸⁰ Then follows an exclamatory question, and pleonasm, further indicating Caelius' surprise, the magnitude of the situation, and the reaction to the verdict (*quid alios putas? clamoribus scilicet maximis iudices corripuerunt*).⁸¹ Caelius shifts his focus to Q. Hortensius (*RE* 13), defender of Messalla Rufus, (*accessit huc quod postridie eius absolutionem in theatrum Curionis Hortensius introiit*), with the repetition of *accessit* and *introiit* providing an interesting example of pleonasm, followed up in the rest of the sentence with the exclamatory use of *ut* and some repetition/alliteration (*ut puto, ut suum gaudium gauderemus*).⁸² In describing the venerable orator's reception on entering Curio's theatre, he quotes from the *Teucer* of Pacuvius (*strepitus, fremitus, clamor tonitruum et rudentum sibilus*),⁸³ aiming to convey to Cicero a sense of the experience, and what hearing the sound of the theatre would have been like, particularly for Hortensius.⁸⁴ And goes on at some length besides:

*hoc magis animadversum est quod intactus ab sibilo
pervenerat Hortensius ad senectutem. sed tum tam bene ut*

⁷⁸ See *OLD*, "quin" B5.

⁷⁹ It is also worth noting that this is the only use of the superlative adverb *validissime* in the Ciceronian corpus (see Tyrrell & Purser, 1914 Commentary v.3 p. 35 and Oldfather, Canter & Abbott, 1965, p. 566). Pinkster also has a lengthy discussion of the term in Cicero, particularly in relation to whether it is from *valde* or *validus* (Pinkster, 2010, pp. 192–193).

⁸⁰ ... *et me iam ad dolendum praeparassem, postquam factum est, obstipui et mihi visus sum captus esse*; the use of *obstipui* is unique in the Ciceronian corpus. Also noteworthy is the sense of *captus esse*, which Shackleton Bailey takes as "cheated" (Shackleton Bailey 1977 Commentary v.1 p. 385); it is certainly a strong usage.

⁸¹ Indeed, *corripio* is a relatively rare word, though it does occur more than once in the corpus, and is used more than once by Caelius (Oldfather, Canter & Abbott 1965, p. 176).

⁸² For the exclamatory use of *ut* see *OLD*, "ut" 2a.

⁸³ Pacuv. *Teucer* frg. 365 in Warmington 1967.

⁸⁴ Indeed, it is difficult to determine where "the supplemental sounds of the angry mob end, and the reporter's (Caelius) hyperbole begins" (S. Butler, 2019 p. 252). Butler also raises the possibility that the *Teucer* was actually in the theatre at the time, and that Caelius may have been "playing" with Cicero "at a distance, a favourite Roman meta-sport, in which the naughty audience would respond to lines in the play as double entendres about current events and the individuals in their midst."

*in totam vitam cuius satis esset et paeniteret eum iam
vicisse.*

So Caelius pays a compliment to Hortensius, but again highlights the severity of the reaction to Messalla's acquittal—Hortensius had never been hissed at, *until now*—which is further enforced by the striking claim that he now regretted his victory.

Section 2 appears to be firmly second in importance to the previous. The matters here are not given the same significance as Messalla's trial, as evidenced from the first throwaway sentence.⁸⁵ Caelius rushes over the consular elections,⁸⁶ almost as a way of introducing the preferred topic of his own political tilt. He highlights his candidacy for the curule aedileship (*ego incidi in competitorem nobilem et nobilem agentem*),⁸⁷ and severely ridicules one of his opponents, C. Lucilius Hirrus (*RE* 25) (*... in competitorem nobilem et nobilem agentem; nam M. Octavius Cn. f. et C. Hirrus mecum petit*).⁸⁸ In direct reference to the epistolary exchange, he provides the reason for his writing as a favour to Cicero (*hoc ideo scripsi quod scio te acriter propter Hirrum nuntium nostrorum comitiorum expectaturum*),⁸⁹ before going on to request panthers (*tu tamen simul ac me designatum*

⁸⁵ *de re publica quod tibi scribam nihil habeo.*

⁸⁶ *de comitiis consularibus incertissima est existimatio.*

⁸⁷ Note particularly that the use of *ego* is redundant and clearly used for emphasis. For Caelius' election, see Broughton, *MRR* 2.245.

⁸⁸ a. The use of the qualifier *agentem* certainly has a sarcastic sense. It is also interesting to note that Caelius lists Octavius' father, yet does not afford Hirrus the same courtesy. For a discussion of the use of *ago* and of Hirrus, see Shackleton Bailey 1977 Commentary v.1 pp. 386–387. b. A possible reason for Caelius' rushing over the consular elections could be nervousness on his part, either at his own prospects for election, or at the mounting tension in Rome, particularly given he writes that M. Claudius Marcellus, the consul (*RE* 229; an opponent of Caesar) was showing restraint, though what happened in the Senate meeting on 1 June, we are left to surmise (Shackleton Bailey Commentary p. 386).

⁸⁹ It should be noted the interval between this and the previous letter is not long, and Caelius had not yet received a reply to his previous letter (SB 77). Indeed, he describes Cicero as "fiercely" desiring news of Hirrus, and so suggests he would be remiss if he did not keep the Cilician governor informed of all developments regarding the man.

audieris, ut tibi curae sit quod ad pantheras attinet rogo).⁹⁰ He concludes the letter with another request,⁹¹ and housekeeping in relation to his previous letter.⁹²

From this letter, Caelius appears as a man overwhelmingly surprised at the outcome of Messalla's trial, and more than a little disapproving of its scandalous nature. Expression of that surprise was clearly at the forefront of his mind when writing, though he keeps the tone of the letter conversational while pushing his own reliability as a witness to the described events. He shows himself as largely unconcerned with Marcellus' actions and the consular elections, choosing to focus instead on his own election for the aedileship. He denigrates Hirrus and shows himself rather confident at his prospects, and in his relationship with Cicero, as he seemingly employs no polite tactics in making his request for panthers.

⁹⁰ He demonstrates some certainty here in his election, with "as soon as you hear" suggesting he is assuming he will win – and the lack of respect he demonstrates for Hirrus suggests he thinks himself far more certain of victory than him. Concerning the panthers, it is a very simple and unembellished request made in the closing stages of the letter – it is possible that this is a *reminder*, as there is nothing to suggest this is the first time panthers had been mentioned to Cicero. But interestingly, there is no sense of the awkwardness that might be expected when making a request (Hall, 2009, p. 6).

⁹¹ The matter of Sittius' bond. This Sittius is a shadowy character. Shackleton Bailey (1977 Commentary v.1 p. 387) relies on the scholarship of David Magie as justification for not expanding on the problem of his identity, which need not concern us here.

⁹² Simple reporting of where his letters are, who their carriers are, etc. Section 2 seems, by and large, to just contain the reporting of small, miscellaneous items while section 1 is the focus (cf. Trapp, 2003, p. 36).

ad fam. VIII.3 (SB 79) – Rome, ca. 13 June 51⁹³

In section 1, Caelius opens the letter by expressing how very much he was missing his friend.⁹⁴ The letter begins with the rather tongue-in-cheek rhetorical question, “Well? Have I won?” (SB trans.) (*estne? vici? et tibi saepe, quod negaras discedens curaturum tibi, litteras mitto?*),⁹⁵ which Caelius proceeds to answer while referring to the vagaries of the postal system (*est, si quidem perferuntur quas do*), forestalling any dissatisfaction from Cicero.⁹⁶ As for referring to Cicero’s absence; he mentions their last meeting while Cicero was bound for Cilicia,⁹⁷ and goes on to affectionately blame Cicero (at some length) for depriving him of leisure simply by being absent.⁹⁸ He emphasises how very pleasurable he found it when Cicero was at Rome (*hoc mihi **certum ac iucundissimum** vacanti negotium erat*), and keeps the focus on Cicero and his absence:

*tu cum Romae **eras** ... **tecum** id oti tempus consumere; ... sed
Romae **te** profecto videatur facta ... multos saepe dies ad **te**
cum hic **eras** non accedebam, nunc cottidie non esse **te** ad
quem cursitem discrucior.*⁹⁹

Caelius continues, but shifts the focus to Cicero’s old rival for the augurate and his own competitor for the aedileship, C. Lucilius Hirrus (*RE* 25), maintaining that Hirrus is the main reason he is missing Cicero (*maxime vero ut te dies noctesque quaeram competitor Hirrus*

⁹³ This letter was written after receiving a letter from Cicero which was no longer extant; Shackleton Bailey, 1977 commentary v.1 p. 387.

⁹⁴ As stated in Trapp 2003, p. 36, the beginning of a letter is the usual place to discuss matters of epistolary communication such as acknowledgment of receipt of a letter, reporting one’s feelings on the receipt, explaining the speed/scale of a response, etc.

⁹⁵ This is in reference to the breaking of his usual epistolary habit and writing more often than Cicero would otherwise have been expected.

⁹⁶ If Cicero does find he is writing too often, he is suggesting that it is only because he is trying to make up for letters potentially going missing, and not to be deliberately irritating, or perhaps, even just to make requests.

⁹⁷ ... *discedens* ...

⁹⁸ *quod, cum otiosus sum, plane ubi delectem otium meum non habeo.*

⁹⁹ Trapp identifies expressions regarding the explicit and often wistful missing of the correspondent’s company—and those regarding the maintaining of friendly relations—as important and common epistolary themes (Trapp, 2003 pp. 38–41). Tactics to “reduce the distance” between correspondents, as can be seen here, were vital to cultivating successful relationships in the political arena as well (Hall, 2009, p. 14).

curat).¹⁰⁰ He begins denigrating Hirrus by using sarcasm and referring to his failure to be elected to the college of augurs (*quo modo illum putas auguratus tuum competitorem dolere*; “that bright augur, your competition”) (my trans.),¹⁰¹ emphasising that it is for Cicero’s sake that he wants to defeat the man in the upcoming aedilician elections (*tua me dius fidius magis quam mea causa cupio*).¹⁰² Caelius expresses some small doubt about the likelihood of his election (he is not taking it *wholly* as a sure thing) (*nam mea, si fio, fieri forsitan cum locupletiore referat*), though this does not stop him from musing on what the best outcome would be for his situation, which might not be what Cicero wanted.¹⁰³ Caelius attempts to placate Cicero regarding the possibility of this outcome, saying “we shall never be short of a laugh for the rest of our days” (SB trans.) if he does manage to defeat Hirrus,¹⁰⁴ referring to their continual friendship and suggesting there will be a bright side, before closing out the section by referring to the many problems the voters had with Hirrus (*sed mehercules non multum M. Octavium eorum odia quae Hirrus premunt, quae permulta sunt, sublevant*).¹⁰⁵ It should also be noted that Caelius casts a potential slight at Hirrus, similar to the previous letter (*ad fam.* VIII.2 [SB 78]), by including M. Antonius’ *praenomen*, and not affording Hirrus the same courtesy. In this case, a mark of contempt.¹⁰⁶

¹⁰⁰ Particularly note the emphasis by opening the sentence with adverbs, one of which is a superlative.

¹⁰¹ Referring to the man as a “bright augur” is without a doubt, deeply sarcastic. See Broughton, *Also-Rans* p. 52 for the defeat of Hirrus.

¹⁰² Note particularly the use of the exclamatory phrase, *me dius fidius*.

¹⁰³ Hirrus was richer than the other candidate, M. Octavius (*RE* 33), and both were richer than Caelius (Shackleton Bailey 1977 Commentary v.1 p. 387). So, he is saying it could be in his interest to be elected along with Hirrus, and implies he will pursue the outcome *he* requires, not just the outcome Cicero wanted most (i.e. Hirrus’ defeat).

¹⁰⁴ *sed hoc usque eo suave est ut, si acciderit, tota vita risus nobis deesse non possit*.

¹⁰⁵ a. Particularly emphasised by the use of *sed mehercules!* b. This complex passage, according to Shackleton Bailey, has frequently been botched by editors and translators. His own conclusion is to translate “as for *my* sake, if I do get elected, it might suit my book to be in company with the richer of the pair. But *this* would be too delicious! If it happens, we shall never be short of a laugh for the rest of our days. Yes, it’s worth a sacrifice. But it is a fact that the mislikes which a good many people feel against Hirrus keep him down without buoying M. Octavius up” (Shackleton Bailey 1977 commentary v. 1 p. 387).

¹⁰⁶ Adams, 1978, p. 145. According to Shackleton Bailey (1995, p. 64), Hirrus is generally cited in the Ciceronian corpus by *cognomen* only, with only two exceptions: the previous letter of Caelius (SB 78), and a letter to Atticus in military style (*ad Att.* VIII.11A [SB 161A]).

Section 2 is decidedly short, written as a direct response to the request from Cicero to look into the matter of Philotimus (*RE* 1), the freedman of Terentia, and T. Annius Milo's (*RE* 67) property.¹⁰⁷ Caelius quickly outlines actions he has taken on Cicero's behalf, writing what he himself has done (*dedimus operam*), and emphasises with the superlative how he is doing these things in Cicero's interest (*ut et Philotimus quam honestissime Milone absenti ...*). He refers to the honesty and dedication he will ensure in Philotimus, particularly relevant given Caelius' concern with Cicero's reputation being maintained.¹⁰⁸ Caelius' primary interest lies in conveying to Cicero his dedication to the man's reputation in Rome.

In section 3, Caelius shifts his focus to asking for favours. He begins by offering Cicero a condition to fulfilling the favour, an out (*si eris, ut spero, otiosus*: "if you are going to have time on your hands [SB trans.]),¹⁰⁹ and interestingly, he employs the use of the plural in reference to himself throughout the sentence (*aliquod ad nos, ut intellegamus nos tibi curae esse, σύνταγμα conscribas*).¹¹⁰ The use of σύνταγμα here is worthy of particular note as it is one of the very few instances of Greek employed by Caelius.¹¹¹ He then mimics Cicero's speech and surprise at the request (*'qui tibi istuc' inquis 'in mentem venit, homini non inepto?'*).¹¹² Caelius goes on to answer the question, stating what exactly it is he wants (*cupio aliquod ex tam multis tuis monumentis exstare quod nostrae*

¹⁰⁷ From the no longer extant letter written from Brundisium, see *ad Att.* V.8.3 (SB 101).

¹⁰⁸ *eiusque necessariis satis faceret et secundum eius fidem et sedulitatem existimatio tua conservaretur.*

¹⁰⁹ This is a good example of the strategy identified by Hall (2007 pp. 108–109). The condition lowers the sense of expectation for Cicero to fulfil the request, and also displays an awareness of his situation and the intrusion on Cicero's time.

¹¹⁰ This sentence also provides an example of hyperbaton, as identified by Pinkster (2010 p. 200), adding emphasis to the placating tactic.

¹¹¹ It points to something of an imposition on Cicero; he does not just want a work of whichever kind Cicero might find appropriate or willing to produce, he wants a particular type of work. In this case, a great literary work written in or influenced by the Greek tradition! This does not appear as the use of Greek to identify personally with Greek culture, as Atticus the *philhellene* does. Rather, it presents as the use of a technical term, akin to Cicero's use of Greek in a letter to the Roman scholar Varro (*ad fam.* IX.4 [SB 180]). For further details, see Adams, 2003, p. 316, who also raises the suggestion that the lack of Greek either to or from Caelius could be indicative of the younger man's attitude to Greek in letter writing.

¹¹² The implication of the words placed in Cicero's mouth is that Caelius knows it is an unusual request about which his former teacher will be taken aback.

amicitiae memoriam posteris quoque prodat),¹¹³ and in order to get this, Caelius has complimented Cicero's previous accomplishments by referring to the volume of his literary output, and their ongoing friendship.¹¹⁴ He continues the flattery of his correspondent in the final sentence, which includes Caelius' second use of Greek, in conjunction with *quondam*:

*tu citius, qui omnem nosti disciplinam, quod maxime
convenit excogitabis, genere tamen quod et ad nos pertineat
et διδασκαλίαν quondam, ut versetur inter manus,
habeat.*¹¹⁵

This serves to further emphasise the kind of work he wanted. It is possible he is displaying some literary pretention, wanting something cultured, specifically in the Greek literary tradition.¹¹⁶

So, Caelius shows himself as highly concerned with maintaining his relationship with Cicero. He employs all the usual tactics, expressing how dearly he misses the man and references the future experiences they might share. He even frames developments in his possible election to the aedileship as relevant to Cicero on multiple levels. Of almost

¹¹³ I believe the use of *cupio* as the first word in the sentence is emphasising and serves to highlight what is to follow, as well as gain Cicero's attention. It must be noted, however, that *cupio* is a restoration accepted by Shackleton Bailey.

¹¹⁴ a. Note particularly the use of *monumentis* as a compliment. Furthermore, the references to immortalising their friendship are framed as another reason for Cicero to fulfil the request. It will be to his benefit as well, not just Caelius'. b. His subsequent use of *puto* adds a conversational tone to his continued extrapolation of what exactly he wanted from Cicero, which basically amounts to instructions.

¹¹⁵ Note particularly Caelius' appeals to Cicero's knowledge and the complimenting of his abilities, and also the self-deprecatory comparison to his own abilities (*tu citius*).

¹¹⁶ a. Rawson (1985, p. 45) suggests that "Caelius wanted Cicero to dedicate something didactic to him – possibly on oratory? – as it would circulate well". b. Adams (2003, p. 309) writes that Greek code-switching is often only used with close/comfortable friends, and is often a sign of intimacy, relaxation and merriment. So, the relative absence of Greek from Caelius and in return from Cicero is rather interesting. As mentioned previously, Adams (2003 p. 316 n. 38) asks the question, "Are we to see here an accommodation on Cicero's part to Caelius' attitudes to such practices?" (i.e. the use of Greek). So, it would seem unlikely that Caelius would request a work, with the implication that it should be of the Greek variety, if he were *disapproving* of Greek. According to Swain (2002, p. 150), this usage reflects the metaliterary role of Greek, and that in this instance, it could be a euphemistic useage as Caelius asks for a favour he may well know would not be granted.

equal importance is discussion of favours, though his own request for a literary work (which will be about the pair's friendship) is of greater importance to Caelius than the actions he takes on Cicero's behalf regarding Milo and Philotimus. In making his request, Caelius is calculatingly polite and employs flattery, which, combined with his expressions of friendship, is a tactic to get Cicero to fulfil the favour. He is, however, very specific in what he wants—that being, a polished work of literature (possibly themed or influenced, or actually written in Greek) to commit something of himself to posterity.

ad fam. VIII.4 (SB 81) – Rome, 1 August 51

This letter is written after a gap in the surviving correspondence of a full month. Curiously, it lacks many of the distinguishing features of Caelius' style, and employs an almost no-nonsense approach with a large focus on reporting to Cicero the happenings in Rome. A possible explanation for this can be found in *ad fam.* II.8 (SB 80). Cicero had, by now, received Caelius' first two letters (SB 77 and 78), and had 'reprimanded' Caelius for what he had provided (including pairings of gladiators and similar), asking for *analysis* instead: "Really! Is this what you think I asked you to do—to send me pairings of gladiators, court adjournments, Chrestus' pilfering, all the trivia which nobody would dare tell me when I am in Rome? ... What I want from so far-sighted a fellow as yourself is the future" (SB trans.).

Caelius begins section 1 with a punchy opening: *Invideo tibi*. The second sentence, naturally, explains what it is that Caelius is envious of: many wondrous things (*tam multa cottidie quae mireris istoc perferuntur*), and frames what the rest of this section will be concerned with. In this case, a series of legal and political developments which will be pleasing to Cicero.¹¹⁷ The fact that Caelius says he is envious, however, does suggest that he himself also takes some pleasure in the business. Furthermore, a significant portion of the section is dedicated to the defeat of Lentulus Crus (*RE* 218) by P. Dolabella (*RE* 141) in the election of the *quindecimviri*:

¹¹⁷ a. These include the acquittal and subsequent conviction of M. Valerius Messalla Rufus (*RE* 268) (see Alexander, *Trials* pp. 160–161 [no. 329, 331]), the election of C. Marcellus (*RE* 216) to the consulship (Broughton, *MRR* 2.247) and the defeat of M. Calidius (*RE* 4) (Broughton, *Also-Rans* p. 10); the prosecution of that same Calidius by M. Gallius (*RE* 5) and Q. Gallius (*RE* 7) (Alexander, *Trials* pp. 160–161 [no. 330]). b. With regards to Messalla, the acquittal is reported by Caelius in Letter 78 (VIII.2). Shackleton Bailey (2001 Loeb v. 2 p. 348) says that Messalla and Cicero were friends at this time (and *ad Att.* V.12.2 [SB 105] certainly gives that impression), and Caelius also describes himself as a friend in the letter itself (SB 78.1). The acquittal, however, appears to have been in scandalous circumstances, providing a plausible reason for a change of heart on the parts of Caelius and Cicero. The successful election of Marcellus to the consulship is pleasing because it comes at the expense of Calidius, whom Shackleton Bailey (1977 v. 2 p. 390) describes as "Cicero's oratorical rival" (see *ad Att.* V.19.3 [SB 112], and see Shackleton Bailey 1965 commentary v. 3 Appendix II for a longer discussion). Furthermore, Calidius' prosecution (though eventually unsuccessful) by "the two Gallii" would have been similarly pleasing to Cicero, as he had attempted to prosecute Q. Gallius (*RE* 6), whom Cicero had defended, in 64 BCE (Alexander, *Trials* p. 107 [no. 214]), and was now being prosecuted by his sons, M. Gallius (*RE* 5) and Q. Gallius (*RE* 7).

*hoc tibi non invideo, caruisse te pulcherrimo spectaculo et
Lentuli Cruris repulsi vultum non vidisse. at qua spe, quam
certa opinione descenderat, quam ipso diffidente Dolabella!
et hercules, nisi nostri oculi Curionisque acutius vidissent,
paene concedente adversario superasset.*¹¹⁸

Dolabella's election would have been pleasing to Cicero, or at the very least not offensive, and Shackleton Bailey describes Caelius as a friend of the *quindecimvir*,¹¹⁹ while going on to label the discussion of Crus as a display of *Schadenfreude*.¹²⁰ Caelius employs numerous devices to emphasise the pleasure he takes in Crus' defeat. For example, he repeats the opening from the start of the letter with *hoc tibi non invideo*, uses the superlative phrase *pulcherrimo spectaculo* and the interjection *et hercules!*¹²¹ He highlights the unlikelihood of the victory,¹²² but also, if Shackleton Bailey's reconstruction of the text is accepted,¹²³ refers to his own contribution to the outcome by encouraging Dolabella not to concede. This draws attention to Caelius' own perceptive ability for reading the political situation.¹²⁴

Section 2 continues with Caelius reporting on the misfortune of the tribune-elect, Servaeus (*RE* 3), which "will *not* have surprised you" (SB trans). This suggests that Cicero already knew of the man and his actions, and already had an opinion formed.¹²⁵ The

¹¹⁸ P. Dolabella was elected a *quindecimvir* (Broughton, *MRR* 2.246) at the expense of Lentulus Crus (Broughton, *Also-Rans* p. 51), which was somewhat surprising, according to Caelius.

¹¹⁹ Shackleton Bailey, 1977, commentary vol. 1 p. 390. For evidence of Cicero's approval of Dolabella, see *ad fam.* VIII.6 (SB 88) and *ad fam.* VIII.13 (SB 94), in which Caelius suggests and then congratulates Cicero for his daughter Tullia's engagement to "a very fine fellow" (SB trans.) (*gratulor tibi adfinitatem viri me dius fidius optimi*).

¹²⁰ Shackleton Bailey, 1977, commentary vol. 1 p. 390.

¹²¹ Another example (cf. SB 78.1) of Caelius employing a 'manful' oath (Adams, 1984 pp. 47–48).

¹²² By reporting that Crus was most hopeful, and his election was a surety, and that Dolabella himself did not fancy his chances.

¹²³ In place of *nostri <oculi Curioni>sque*, many texts read *nostri equites*. According to Shackleton Bailey, "the old conjecture *nostri equites*, found in most texts, should be forgotten. Plainly, Lentulus' defeat was foreseen by hardly anyone. I suspect that Caelius was referring to himself, or to himself and someone else; *nostri <oculi Curioni>sque* would account for the paradox. Caelius being a close friend of Dolabella, Curio would naturally be found on his side" (Shackleton Bailey 1977 Commentary v. 1 p. 390).

¹²⁴ Emphasised by the comparative adjective, *acutius*.

¹²⁵ Alexander, *Trials* pp. 161 (no. 332).

majority of this section, however, is dedicated to reporting the political movements of C. Scribonius Curio (*RE* 11). He uses the syncopated form of *nosco*,¹²⁶ and places the phrase *magnum metum* at the end of the sentence, lending it weight. He is sure that Curio will be on the side of the *boni* and the Senate. Further emphasising his thoughts on the matter is the use of the rare and evocative word, *scaturit*.¹²⁷ The reason for this? Caelius says it is because Caesar despised him, including a rather telling relative clause as evidence.¹²⁸ The rest of the section is concerned with Caelius' attitude towards Curio; while "the rest"¹²⁹ thought Curio to be "credited with deep cunning,"¹³⁰ Caelius' interpretation is that it was just a coincidence.¹³¹ He sets himself apart from "the rest" here, going against the general consensus in reference to his interpretive proficiency.

Section 3 provides a possible reason for Caelius reporting so many developments to Cicero in this letter—the delay between the current communication and the last.¹³² It seems he is making amends and playing catch up. Interestingly, he makes no apology, but rather provides his reasons, and even suggests the delay was in Cicero's interest (*quod comitiorum dilationes occupatiorem me habebant et expectare in dies exitum cogeant, ut confectis omnibus te facerem certiores*). Caelius draws attention to the delays in the praetorian elections, and the aedilician elections for which he was campaigning at the time (*praetoriis morae quaedam inciderunt. mea porro comitia quem eventum sint habitura nescio*). Here appears a somewhat rare example of Caelius admitting he does not know what the outcome will be (*nescio*). This seems suggestive, as Caelius is 'hedging his bets,' attempting to appear humble, rather than cocky. Turning now to Gaius Lucilius

¹²⁶ *norunt*.

¹²⁷ From *scatur(r)io*, meaning "to gush". This is the only use of the word in the entire Ciceronian corpus (See Oldfather, Canter & Abbott, 1965 p. 480).

¹²⁸ *qui solet infimorum hominum amicitiam sibi qualibet impensa adiungere*. He is accustomed to associating with the "lowest men," using the superlative to show what he feels about Caesar's associates, and by extension the man himself.

¹²⁹ *reliquis quoque*.

¹³⁰ *rationis et insidiis usus videretur*; Shackleton Bailey translates this difficult section as Curio "is credited with deep cunning in evading the designs of certain persons ..."

¹³¹ Particularly given he believes Curio to be a person "who does nothing except on impulse" (SB trans.); *qui nihil consilio facit*.

¹³² *has ego tibi litteras eo maiore misi intervallo*.

Hirrus (*RE* 25), he refers to him as generating “an amazing current of opinion” (SB trans).¹³³ The words, *opinionem ... incredibilem* are particularly notable, separated as they are, suggesting Caelius’ opinion of Cicero’s rival. He touches on the downfall of M. Coelius Vinicianus (*RE* 27) (*nam M. Coelium Vinicianum mentio illa fatua, quam deriseramus olim*), referring to a suggestion he declares as “silly” (*fatua*) which both he and Cicero had derided in the past.¹³⁴ He reports that his and Cicero’s stance on Coelius is echoed by many others,¹³⁵ suggesting a feeling of pleasure and even vindication. Finally, note Caelius’ employment of variations of the word *spero* three times in the final sentence of the section,¹³⁶ with repetition, syncope, and extravagance,¹³⁷ emphasising that both he and Cicero shared the same desire: the defeat of Hirrus in the elections.

Although section 4 opens in a conversational manner (note the syncope of *desiueramus*) (*de re publica iam novi quicquam expectare **desieramus***), there is a sense of sober concern, given the unfolding political situation,¹³⁸ as Caelius simply reports developments. The use of *convicium* appears emotive (*sub mentionem et convicium*),¹³⁹ and the absence of a verb in mentioning the question of Caesar’s continuation as provincial governor maintains the conversational tone (*inde interrogatum de successione*

¹³³ *opinionem quidem, quod ad Hirrum attinet, incredibilem aedilium pl. comitiis nacta sunt.*

¹³⁴ This casts judgement on Coelius, and shows a commonality with Cicero. The suggestion in question, regarding legislation about a dictator, appears to refer to the proposal by Coelius and Hirrus in 53 BCE for a Pompeian dictatorship in response to “electoral disturbances”, which was rejected, and subsequently came back to damage their political careers (Gruen, 1974, pp. 110–111). For the failed proposal of Coelius and Hirrus during their tribunate in 53 BCE, see Broughton *MRR* 2.228.

¹³⁵ *et deiectum magno clamore insecuta est.*

¹³⁶ *spero; sperasti* (syncopated form of *sperauisti*); *sperare*.

¹³⁷ *quod vix sperare ausus est auditurum.*

¹³⁸ That situation being the developing tension between Pompey and Caesar, including Pompey’s promise that he would defend the state from any threat materialising from Caesar’s camp, Marcellus’ dramatic demonstration in having a citizen of Comum beaten to prove a point against Caesar, and Caesar’s transferring of a legion to northern Italy in response, perhaps bringing us to the crux of this section, regarding the legion Pompey had lent to Cicero in 53 BCE. (For a more detailed summary of the situation, see Gelzer, 1969, pp. 174–175).

¹³⁹ The clamour raised against Pompey is characterised with the idea of indignation, suggesting that Caelius disapproves of Pompey.

C. Caesaris).¹⁴⁰ Caelius employs the passive voice in *reverteretur*,¹⁴¹ then later uses *puto* to qualify his own interpretation, and *actum iri* to refer to the forthcoming debate on provincial governors (*puto Id. Sext. de ea re actum iri*).¹⁴² He also employs the coordinative conjunctions, *aut ... aut*, to emphasise the two possibilities he sees, and so contrasts *profecto* with *turpiter* (*profecto aut transigetur aliquid aut turpiter intercedetur*).¹⁴³ Immediately following is a *nam* clause, attributing the reason for a “scandalous veto” directly to the comment which Pompey “threw out” (*nam in disputando coiecit illam vocem Cn. Pompeius*).¹⁴⁴ He closes the section with a distinctly sarcastic feel as he employs an extravagant, tongue-in-cheek style when discussing the consul-elect, Paullus (RE 81), whom Caelius suspected of being bribed by Caesar (*ego tamen sic nihil exspecto quo modo Paullum, consulem designatum, primum sententiam dicentem*).

Section 5 is the outlier of this letter, as Caelius focusses on requests. He begins with *saepius te admoneo*,¹⁴⁵ and continues with intensifiers to impress upon Cicero how he ought to fulfil the request (*cupio enim te intellegere eam rem ad me valde pertinere*).¹⁴⁶ He follows immediately with a reminder about the panthers (*item de pantheris*), and links this favour and his feelings regarding it intrinsically to those of the Sittius request.¹⁴⁷ He does, however, temper the tone of the requests with brevity and

¹⁴⁰ An example of brevity. Interestingly, there is no suggestion of who may have asked the question, and this is continued in the sentence with the impersonal use of *placitum est*; showing that everyone decided, and there was no need to include details on who was involved.

¹⁴¹ ... *ut quam primum ad urbem reverteretur Cn. Pompeius*; there is an implication that Pompey ought to be returned to Rome by the Senate, suggesting the Senate ought to be in charge.

¹⁴² The use of *actum iri* to refer to the debate is notable because of the many possible meanings of *ago*, possibly used with a denigratory sense, to show Caelius’ low opinion of the debate, particularly combined with *puto*. Note also there is no verb after *puto*, with brevity again lending a conversational tone.

¹⁴³ Namely, contrasting “something will be decided” with “or there will be a scandalous veto” (SB trans.). Kennedy writes that these conjunctions “are used to mark an emphatic distinction.” (Kennedy, 2009, p. 170).

¹⁴⁴ The use of *coiecit* (from *conicio*) is worth noting; a somewhat rare word, hardly meant as a compliment to Pompey.

¹⁴⁵ *Saepius* being a comparative adverb. It reads almost rudely to be saying something akin to “I remind you again” or “more than normal”. He is not just asking again, but he is reminding *and* admonishing Cicero in the light of the governor’s apparent apathy in regard to the requests.

¹⁴⁶ *enim* intensifies *cupio*, and *valde* intensifies *pertinere*. Caelius is emphasising how the favours are for *him*, not just for Sittius, so Cicero ought to fulfil the request lest he be letting down a close friend.

¹⁴⁷ This clause is linked to the previous with *item*.

syncopation (*ut Cibyrratas accersas curesque ut mi vehantur*).¹⁴⁸ At this point follows another request, but of a different nature. Caelius requests Cicero to write to him.¹⁴⁹ He employs a series of deliberative questions asking for Cicero's advice and, using the subjunctive, encourages him to write. It is curious that this is attached to the requests Caelius made. Perhaps this serves to mollify Cicero and make him amenable to the previous requests, by asking for and deferring, in advance, to his wishes.¹⁵⁰

So, Caelius is primarily concerned here with informing Cicero of political developments and, as he was charged, his take on them. This is enforced by his 'apology' for not writing more often. He shows a concern for the epistolary relationship, emphasised by how much time he spends recounting events. Hints of Caelius' opinion regarding these matters, however, often appear, and he seems to take a sober view of the dangerous political situation developing. He shows pleasure in the political misfortunes of others and often reports on matters which should be pleasing to Cicero. It should be noted, however, that Caelius' efforts to keep up his epistolary relationship could be viewed sceptically, as he goes on to remind Cicero of his repeated requests. His own desires are never far from his mind.

¹⁴⁸ He omits a direct and indirect object in regard to *cures*, and shortens *mihi* to *mi*. For the use of this alternative (and colloquial) form, see *OLD*, "ego".

¹⁴⁹ *praeterea (nuntiatum nobis et pro certo iam habetur regem Alexandrinum mortuum) quid mihi suadeas, quo modo regnum illud se habeat, qui procuret, diligenter mihi perscribas*.

¹⁵⁰ It should be noted, however, that Shackleton Bailey (1977 Commentary v. 1 p. 393) says Caelius was possibly one of Ptolemy XII's creditors. This could indicate a lack of concern for Cicero's wishes. The information requested, in that case, is then just another money matter, akin to Sittius' bond.

In section 1 Caelius employs the syncopated form, *tractasti*¹⁵¹ in the first sentence of the letter (*'sic tu' inquis 'Hirrum tractasti?'*),¹⁵² an example of brevity, possibly used here to mimic spoken language and lend a colloquial and familiar tone to the letter. He is far from modest in reporting his defeat of Gaius Lucilius Hirrus (*RE* 25).¹⁵³ Caelius emphatically answers the opening exclamatory question himself,¹⁵⁴ mocking Hirrus for “parading” as Cicero’s competition (*immo, si scias quam facile, quam ne contentionis quidem minimae fuerit, pudeat te ausum illum umquam esse incedere tamquam tuum competitorem*).¹⁵⁵ He continues in this fashion, saying Hirrus is “playing the good citizen”,¹⁵⁶ and continues to denigrate him for his appearance in “freedom suits”.¹⁵⁷ This appears as a friendly and easy-going opening to the letter, which Cicero would be expected to take some pleasure in (given his relationship with Hirrus). Further, by denigrating Hirrus in such a manner, he emphasises himself as firmly part of Cicero’s camp.

In section 2, Caelius reports on a matter of singular interest to Cicero: that of provincial governors (*de provinciis quod tibi scripseram Id. Sext. actum iri, interpellat iudicium Marcelli, consulis designati*). His use of the term *actum iri* is interesting due to the

¹⁵¹ For *tractauisti*.

¹⁵² See Abbott, 1897 p. lxxiii for the use of exclamatory questions.

¹⁵³ See Broughton, *Also-Rans* p. 42.

¹⁵⁴ Indeed, Hutchinson discusses the use of emphatic devices by Quintus Cicero Jr. in a similar way. He says that Quintus “is not merely pouring out his emotion, but preparing to persuade.” (Hutchinson, 1998, p. 121). Certainly, Caelius appears to be pouring out his emotion, revelling in the electoral victory. But it will also become clear that he is also preparing to persuade.

¹⁵⁵ Shackleton Bailey translates *incedere* as “to parade”. This choice of verb is suggesting disrespect, certainly fitting given the context.

¹⁵⁶ *civem bonum ludit et contra Caesarem sententias dicit*; similar to *incedere*, this verb is used derogatorily.

¹⁵⁷ *praeterea, qui numquam in foro apparuerit, non multum in iudiciis versatus sit, agit causas liberalis, sed raro post meridiem*; Shackleton Bailey notes that Caelius is suggesting that Hirrus was not overly exerting himself (1977 Commentary v. 1 p. 394), but also gives the possibility that, according to Manutius, few people wanted to make use of his services.

many meanings possible for *ago*,¹⁵⁸ and he employs the historic present, *interpellat*.¹⁵⁹ This emphasises the poor opinion Caelius has regarding the situation, while also referring to his own task set by Cicero.¹⁶⁰ He writes that “it looks to me... as far as I can prophesy ...” (SB trans.), and “this, to me, is not uncertain” (my trans.).¹⁶¹ Indeed, this whole section seems primarily concerned with fulfilling his obligation to Cicero, which he does not hesitate to demonstrate. He does, however, see fit to lay blame for the continuation of Cicero’s governorship with the anti-Caesarian party who would not allow for the appointment of a successor.¹⁶²

In section 3, Caelius begins discussing the famous favour he requests of Cicero, namely, the request for Cilician panthers for his games (*fere litteris omnibus tibi de pantheris scripsi*).¹⁶³ He speaks quite strongly to Cicero on the matter, and uses pleonasm to emphasise exactly how many panthers Cicero has sent him (i.e. none):

*turpe tibi erit Patiscum Curioni decem pantheras misisse, te
non multis partibus pluris; quas ipsas Curio mihi et alias
Africanas decem donavit, ne putes illum tantum praedia
rustica dare scire.*¹⁶⁴

¹⁵⁸ It is possible this usage is suggestive that the writer does not think much of the debate; according to Oldfather, Canter & Abbott this *actum iri* combination occurs 3 other times in the Ciceronian corpus. Once more by Caelius (8.4.4.12), once to Atticus (6.2.6.8), and once to Quintus (2.6(7?).2.2). It seems that in each usage, the writer does indeed not think much of the debate in question.

¹⁵⁹ A possibility, according to Shackleton Bailey (p. 394). Kennedy suggests that the “Historic Present is used for a Past [tense] by orators, historians, and poets, to give variety, or call up a vivid picture” (p. 157 section 337).

¹⁶⁰ Namely, to write to him concerning the events in Rome (see SB 77).

¹⁶¹ ***ut video***, *causa haec integra in proximum annum transferetur et, quantum divino, relinquendum tibi erit qui provinciam obtineat ... hoc mihi non est dubium*. This double negative is a clear example of pleonasm for drawing emphasis (Abbott, 1897 p. lxxiv).

¹⁶² *quoniam Galliae, quae habent intercessorem, in eandem condicionem quam ceterae provinciae vocantur*; see Shackleton Bailey 1977 Commentary v. 1. pp. 394–395.

¹⁶³ This request first appears in *ad fam.* VIII.2 (SB 78) and again in VIII.4 (SB 81) before this. Caelius only mentions them once more in SB 88 before Cicero finally acknowledges the request in SB 90, though he also mentions panthers to Atticus in *ad Att.* V.21 (SB 114) and VI.1 (SB 115).

¹⁶⁴ a. The use of the word *turpe* is quite striking, suggesting it would be dishonourable if Cicero did not fulfil the request. b. The use of *donavit* suggests that Caelius was emphasising that he had been *gifted* the panthers from Curio, rather than simply given. Perhaps suggesting to Cicero that Curio was granting him

Caelius also repeatedly attempts to minimise the magnitude of the request and the effort required to fulfil it:

*tu si modo memoria tenueris et Cibyrtas arcessieris itemque in Pamphyliam litteras miseris ... nam simul atque erunt captae, qui alant eas et deportent habes eos quos ad Sittianam syngrapham misi.*¹⁶⁵

He offers a compliment to Cicero, however, and is self-deprecating in order to encourage Cicero's acquiescence (*curare soles libenter, ut ego maiorem partem nihil curare*), though he seems to take for granted the request's completion (*nam simul atque erunt captae*),¹⁶⁶ before tempering the tone of the whole section by offering a condition (*puto etiam, si ullam spem mihi litteris, ostenderis, me isto missurum alios*). This condition serves to moderate the assumption he had made that the request would be fulfilled, while also suggesting that he "thinks" he will send more men, rather than saying what he will definitively do. He also refers to C. Scribonius Curio (*RE* 11), along with his aedilician colleague, M. Octavius (*RE* 33), in rather unflattering ways.¹⁶⁷

In section 4 Caelius tries his luck further by requesting Cicero to admit M. Feridius (*RE* 1) to his inner circle with what amounts to a letter of recommendation.¹⁶⁸ He again attempts to minimise the magnitude of the request (*quod tibi facile et honestum factu est*), and to encourage Cicero to its completion with reference to the *honestum* he will communicate and the obligation under which those favoured will be placed (*gratos et*

favours, so he ought to as well lest he be outdone. c. The phrase, *multis partibus pluris*, also contains no verb, so pleonasm is being contrast with brevity.

¹⁶⁵ a. *si modo*, in particular, seems to trivialise the three steps he *suggests* Cicero take: "If you will but (a.) keep it in mind and (b.) send for beasts from Cibra and (c.) write to Pamphylia..." b. In the *nam* clause, Caelius is minimising the effort required by highlighting the work he has already done to facilitate it, with the added bonus of slyly reminding Cicero of the *other* request he has made in relation to Sittius' bond.

¹⁶⁶ Akin to writing "thank you in advance". Something which could be considered quite rude.

¹⁶⁷ *ne putes illum tantum praedia rustica dare scire; hoc vehementius laboro nunc quod seorsus a collega puto mihi omnia paranda*; a. According to Shackleton Bailey the reference to Curio is with regard to a likely unknown incident (p. 395), though in this context it certainly seems not to be complimentary. b. With regard to Octavius, Caelius believes his colleague will be of no help in organising the games. Though, practicality may win out, as Caelius needed someone to share the expense due to his poor financial situation (Shackleton Bailey 2001 Loeb v.1 p. 352 n. 1).

¹⁶⁸ *tibi commendo et te rogo ut eum in tuorum numero habeas*; It seems notable that this request comes *after* that for panthers, demonstrating how he prioritises those over a recommendation for his friend's son.

bonos viros tibi obligaris). Caelius is repeating the beneficial nature of the favour to *Cicero*, not just to himself, so demonstrating a complex web of favours. According to Hall, providing recommendations is fraught with social dangers,¹⁶⁹ and usually comprises various conventional elements.¹⁷⁰ Given the position of the recommendation within the letter, however, and its largely formulaic composition, prominence is clearly given to Caelius' own request for panthers rather than helping out the son of a friend.

In section 5, Caelius turns to the somewhat sober, though quite brief, reporting of affairs of state. He begins with M. Favonius (*RE* 1),¹⁷¹ who had just been defeated in the praetorian elections,¹⁷² and reports that neither the *columnarii* nor anyone else was voting for him (*nolo te putare Favonium a columnariis praeteritum; optimus quisque eum non fecit*). The reference to the "loungers in the colonnades" can hardly be interpreted as complimentary.¹⁷³ Turning to Pompey, Caelius frankly states he is now openly opposed to Caesar becoming consul while retaining his army and province,¹⁷⁴ interestingly referring to him as *Pompeius tuus*.¹⁷⁵ Similarly reticent, he reports Pompey's father-in-law, Q. Metellus Scipio Nasica (*RE* 99), voting in favour of the Gallic provinces question being brought to the Senate before all other matters.¹⁷⁶ He employs the unusual word, *contristavit* in relation to the perceived displeasure of a good friend of Caesar,¹⁷⁷ L. Cornelius Balbus (*RE* 69) (*contristavit haec sententia Balbum Cornelium, et scio eum questum esse cum*

¹⁶⁹ The request obviously has the potential to infringe on time and could well be an unwelcome burden, but the writer is also making a claim to a particular status or level of influence which would be required to make such a request (Hall, 2009 pp. 29–32).

¹⁷⁰ Such as the assertion of the writer's relationship to the recommendee, a statement of the recommendation's relevance, the commendation itself, and an expression of appreciation (Hall 2009 p. 31). These features are all apparent in section 4 of *ad fam.* VIII.9 (SB 82), with Caelius' own appreciation being substituted for that of the recommendee's and that of his family.

¹⁷¹ A satellite of Cato (Shackleton Bailey 2001 Loeb v.1 p. 366 n. 8).

¹⁷² See Broughton, *Also-Rans* p. 37.

¹⁷³ *columnariis*; Shackleton Bailey likens the use of the term to *subrostrani* (p. 395). Again, hardly complimentary.

¹⁷⁴ See Gelzer, 1969, p. 175.

¹⁷⁵ This use of the possessive pronoun with an individual suggests his own opinion of Pompey (Abbott, 1897 p. lxx); as if to say, "your Pompey, not mine."

¹⁷⁶ *ipse tamen hanc sententiam dixit, nullum hoc tempore senatus consultum faciendum, Scipio hunc, ut Kal. Mart. de provinciis Galliis neu quid coniunctim referretur.*

¹⁷⁷ See *ad fam.* IX.19.1 (SB 194).

Scipione),¹⁷⁸ and interestingly, inverts the order of Balbus' *nomen* and *cognomen*.¹⁷⁹ To end the letter, he employs emotive language to editorialise on the courtroom skills of M. Calidius (*RE* 4) (*Calidius in defensione sua fuit disertissimus, in accusatione satis frigidus*),¹⁸⁰ even including a jest in regards to his name.¹⁸¹ All in all, not a particularly favourable assessment of the man.¹⁸²

So, Caelius presents himself as not humble in victory. He appears to take pleasure in the political downturns of his and his correspondent's opponents, and is driven to get what he wants. The insistence to get panthers from Cicero is particularly noteworthy. He has made repeated requests which have not been acknowledged, and continues, while seemingly ignoring the conventions of making a request. His language is brusque, and the way he writes shows an arrogance, or at least a measure of self-assuredness that his letter will be well received by Cicero. At the very least, he appears unconcerned with the possibility of his relationship with the Cilician governor being damaged. It seems reasonable, in any case, that Caelius considered his language adequate for the circumstances and given the goals of the letter, particularly, as Pinkster points out, considering his literary training.¹⁸³ Caelius' interests are paramount, but this does not stop him giving a sober report on the dangerous political situation, a situation he is not thrilled with.

¹⁷⁸ This is the only instance of the word *contristavit* throughout the entire letter corpus, according to Oldfather, Canter & Abbott.

¹⁷⁹ According to Abbott (1897 p. 85 n. 4), this is notable because such a practice was exceedingly rare in formal Latin of the Ciceronian period, only occurring a few times in the Ciceronian corpus; though it was a common feature of colloquial Latin. According to Glynn Williams (1965 Loeb v. 2 p. 148 n. a), "when the *praenomen* is left out, Cicero almost always puts the *cognomen* before the *nomen*, as here; cf. Gallus Caminius, Ahala Servilius, Vespa Terentius". Adams (1978, p. 165), however, suggests that the practice was something of a middle ground, a conflation of address by *praenomen* + *cognomen* and *praenomen* + *nomen*, employed in a "transitional period" as the *nomen* + *cognomen* practice was coming into fashion. At this early stage of its adoption, this practice would likely be used to refer to men whose social status was ambiguous, which seems to be the case for Caelius' usage.

¹⁸⁰ For the court cases of Calidius, see Alexander *Trials* pp. 160–162 (no. 330 & 333).

¹⁸¹ a. The figurative language employing the hot/cold metaphor is a common feature of conversational communication (Abbott, p. lxxiii). Williams (1965 Loeb v. 2 p. 148) draws attention to the wordplay used by Caelius, contrasting *frigidus* with Calidius' name, from *calidus*.

¹⁸² cf. Cicero, *Brutus* 277.

¹⁸³ Pinkster, 2010, p. 187.

ad fam. VIII.5 (SB 83) – Rome, mid September 51

In this relatively short letter, the precise date of which is debated,¹⁸⁴ Caelius exhibits a focus on Cicero and topics of relevance to him, portraying himself as deeply concerned with his friend's safety, and generally displeased with the state of things in Rome. His concern stems from the fact that Cicero is now in Cilicia with a small and reportedly demoralised army.¹⁸⁵

In section 1 Caelius emphasises both Cicero, and himself with the unnecessary use of the first and second person pronouns (*tu* and *ego*), and employs adverbs and a rather striking phrase to convey how fervently he cared:

*qua tu cura sis, quod ad pacem provinciae tuae
finitimarumque regionum attinet, nescio; ego quidem
vehementer animi pendeo.*¹⁸⁶

Then follows a long and complex sentence with several paired words and pleonasm:

*nam si hoc modo rem moderari possemus ut pro viribus
copiarum tuarum belli quoque existeret **magnitudo et**
quantum gloriae triumphoque opus esset adsequeremur,
periculosam et gravem illam dimicationem evitaremus, nihil
tam esset optandum.*

This lengthy and elaborate expression is contrasted to the final clause of the sentence, an altogether shorter affair. The short clause to close the sentence serves to punctuate what came before, and emphasises how greatly Caelius wished for Cicero to be safe, while still being able to achieve the bare minimum for glory. Then comes a potential insult to Cicero

¹⁸⁴ See the discussion of Shackleton Bailey, 1977 Commentary v. 2 p. 396, who has tentatively opted for “mid September”.

¹⁸⁵ Shackleton Bailey, 1971, p. 119.

¹⁸⁶ Rendered exceptionally by Shackleton Bailey as “but for my part I am on tenterhooks”; this all serves to convey a conversational, friendly, and genuine concern for Cicero's safety.

and his abilities as a general (*tuus porro exercitus vix unum saltum tueri potest*),¹⁸⁷ though Caelius' concern for the man's safety appears to outweigh the potential for insult. He continues, lamenting that no-one appears to give Cicero's perceived danger, stuck without adequate forces,¹⁸⁸ the requisite consideration (*hanc autem nemo ducit rationem*),¹⁸⁹ and elucidates in detail how he believes Cicero to be hard done by as a man in public office.¹⁹⁰

In section 2 Caelius switches topics, but continues on with something still of deep relevance to Cicero. He does not see a way out of the situation for the Cilician governor, as a replacement for the province was not going to be found.¹⁹¹ All the same, in the second sentence, Caelius adopts a more relaxed tone, expressing faith in Cicero and his judgement, particularly with the use of *puto*.¹⁹² He employs *enim* to set up the next sentence, relaying to Cicero what he already knows,¹⁹³ while indirectly showing his opinion on the obstructing behaviour of the tribunes. He is disapproving, if at least for Cicero's sake (*nosti enim haec tralaticia: de Galliis constituetur; erit qui intercedat; deinde alius existet qui, nisi libere liceat de omnibus provinciis decernere senatui, reliquas impedit*). In the final sentence of the section, Caelius continues revealing his disapproval and his certainty that nothing will change for a long time (*sic multum ac diu ludetur, atque ita diu ut plus biennium in his tricis moretur*). The use of *sic* sets up the link to the previous sentence, while *ludetur* reveals Caelius' disdain by allusion to 'play'. Indeed, this display of concern for Cicero can be seen as something Caelius feels obliged to express.¹⁹⁴

¹⁸⁷ The use of hyperbaton, described as "an artful deviation from the ordinary pattern or arrangement of words" (Corbett, 1971), draws attention to the sentence and the army's perceived weakness.

¹⁸⁸ Shackleton Bailey, 1971, p. 119 provides a brief summary of the military situation: the forces stationed in Cilicia were depleted and "not much of a force to cope with the Parthians". He also detects the worry felt by Caelius that comes across in this letter, describing it as "cold comfort".

¹⁸⁹ Note the use of hyperbaton, separating *hanc* from *rationem*.

¹⁹⁰ *tamquam nihil denegatum sit ei quo minus quam paratissimus esset, qui publico negotio praepositus est.*

¹⁹¹ *accedit huc quod successionem futuram propter Galliarum controversiam non video.*

¹⁹² *tametsi hac de re puto te constitutum quid factururus esses habere, tamen, quo maturius constitueres, cum hunc eventum providebam, visum est ut te facerem certiores.*

¹⁹³ i.e. that further attempts at finding a replacement governor in Gaul will be made but the matters are hopelessly entangled.

¹⁹⁴ According to Hutchinson (1998, p. 50), it was seen as the personal responsibility of a friend to offer consolation and condolences in an unpleasant position. Caelius clearly sees this as a desperate situation, and so he is fulfilling his responsibilities as Cicero's friend, expressing his shared worry and sympathies in regard to the current state of affairs.

In section 3, Caelius offers assurances to Cicero that he *would* keep him informed of everything as necessary (*si quid novi de re publica quod tibi scriberem haberem, usus essem mea consuetudine, ut diligenter et quid actum esset et quid ex eo futurum sperarem perscriberem*).¹⁹⁵ All the same, he insinuates that this will hardly be needed, as matters are “stuck in a kind of trough” (SB trans.) (*sane tamquam in quodam incili iam omnia adhaeserunt*), a metaphor “both graphic and contemptuous”.¹⁹⁶ In discussing M. Claudius Marcellus, the consul (RE 229), his words could be interpreted as a dig at the man’s ineffectiveness in terms of raising the question of appointment of a successor to Caesar in Gaul (*Marcellus idem illud de provinciis urget et necque adhuc frequentem senatum efficere potuit*),¹⁹⁷ as could his discussion of Caesar’s eventual ally and tribune-designate, C. Scribonius Curio (RE 11) (*hoc sic praeterito anno Curio tribunus erit, eadem actio de provinciis introibit*).¹⁹⁸ The use of *introibit*, and the inherent association with the theatre notably demonstrates his disdain for the current status quo.¹⁹⁹ He concludes the letter by going on to speak badly of Caesar and his allies (*et quam Caesar iique qui sua causa rem publicam non curent sperent*),²⁰⁰ as they would have continued to use their vetoes, predicting, again, further blocking tactics.

It should be obvious that this is a pessimistic letter. Caelius paints a bleak picture of Rome’s political scene, though equally he expresses great concern for his friend in Cilicia. Absent are the usual epistolary tropes such as reporting on small miscellaneous items,²⁰¹ or any kind of requests and discussion of his own problems, something which would detract from the attention he feels Cicero deserves. He has adopted a style of

¹⁹⁵ The repeated use of the subjunctive serves to emphasise he would have fulfilled his obligations as a friend *if* it were necessary.

¹⁹⁶ Hutchinson, 1998 p. 143.

¹⁹⁷ On Marcellus’ attempts to have Caesar replaced as commander in Gaul, see Broughton, *MRR* 2.241.

¹⁹⁸ Under Curio, the same state of affairs will continue, which is hardly a good outcome for Cicero. At this point, Caelius is not expecting Curio to side with the Caesarians, as he eventually does. That development took him by surprise later on. He is still firmly anti-Caesarian in *ad fam.* VIII.8.10 (SB 84). See Shackleton Bailey, 1977 Commentary v. 1 p. 397 for further details. For Curio’s tribunate, see Broughton, *MRR* 2.249.

¹⁹⁹ Shackleton Bailey, 1977 Commentary v. 1 p. 397 identifies this usage as a metaphor for the stage. cf. *OLD* “introeo” 1.c.

²⁰⁰ *et quam Caesar iique qui sua causa rem publicam non curent sperent*; this, of course, assumes that Shackleton Bailey’s restoration is correct.

²⁰¹ Trapp 2003, p. 36.

writing commensurate with the circumstances at hand,²⁰² and maintains one central theme of concern. So, Caelius shows himself as a loyal friend who is deeply concerned for Cicero. He is extremely dissatisfied with the current state of politics in Rome, for which he attributes blame to Caesar and his allies who have no concern for the state of the commonwealth (*causa rempublicam non curent*). He also appears to be quite frustrated by delay, as seen by the repeated discussion of how matters will continue, unchanged.

²⁰² Akin to the use of a situationally appropriate register described by Hall (2009, p. 10).

In section 1, Caelius employs a standard opening, which prefaces what is to come (news of public affairs), and refers to his and Cicero's epistolary relationship. However, instead of writing about these public matters, he gleefully details the misfortunes of C. Sempronius Rufus (RE 79). These details are given pride of place, because Caelius suspects Cicero will take the most pleasure in them. He himself appears to relish the gossip, as he delivers the line quite conversationally (*tamen nihil quod magis gavisurum te putem habeo quam hoc*).²⁰³ This conversational style continues with the imperative, *scito*, and his enjoyment can be plainly seen in the obviously sarcastic manner in which he refers to Sempronius: "your heart's darling" (SB trans.),²⁰⁴ and the emphasis he places on the outcome received, which is most welcome (*maximo plausu*). *Quaeris* then follows up the use of *scito* to introduce the reasons for the conviction, as Caelius relays that Sempronius had brought his case against Tuccius because he knew that otherwise, he would be convicted immediately.²⁰⁵ The line itself employs pleonasm, suggesting Caelius' pleasure as he knows the man's efforts are futile. The next statement continues to denigrate, as Caelius refers to Sempronius' actions as "a small gift" to his opponent (*nemini hoc deferre munusculum maluit quam suo accusatori*).²⁰⁶ The use of *munusculum* clearly trivialises Sempronius' actions, as does the emphasis on giving that 'gift' to his accuser, showing Caelius' incredulity. He switches to his own active involvement in the affair, demonstrating his keenness and emphasising his accomplishment against Sempronius:

*simul atque audivi, invocatus ad subsellia rei occurro; surgo,
neque verbum de re facio, totum Sempronium usque eo
perago ut Vestorium quoque interponam et illam fabulam*

²⁰³ Note particularly the comparative, *gavisurum*, and the use of *putem*.

²⁰⁴ As Shackleton Bailey (2001 v. 1 p. 372) says, "this man was in Cicero's bad books". See *ad Att.* V.2 (SB 95), where Cicero employs the "contemptuous diminutive" *Rufio*.

²⁰⁵ *dubium porro illi non erat quid futurum esset*; this analysis is provided by Shackleton Bailey (1977 Commentary v. 1 p. 398).

²⁰⁶ "He chose to give away this small gift to no-one other than his accuser" (my trans.).

*narrem, quem ad modum tibi pro beneficio dederit †si quod
iniuriis suis esset ut Vestorius teneret†.*²⁰⁷

In section 2, Caelius emphasises the size of a new struggle in the forum (*haec quoque magna nunc contentio forum tenet*),²⁰⁸ which was the trial of M. Servilius (*RE* 20 or 21).²⁰⁹ Caelius describes the poor state of Servilius' affairs and his previous conduct, and comes across as quite unimpressed with the man, clearly communicating to Cicero that he (Caelius) is somewhat handicapped in acting as Servilius legal advocate.²¹⁰ He reports that the praetor, M. Iuventius Laterensis (*RE* 16), would not continue with the case, despite the efforts of Pausanius (*RE* 13) for the prosecution, before Caelius shifts to Q. Pilius Celer (*RE* 2), through whom Caelius claims a connection with Cicero's friend Atticus (*Q. Pilius, necessarius Attici nostri*).²¹¹ Pilius, he reports, subsequently prosecuted Servilius for extortion.²¹² He emphasises the reaction to the prosecution,²¹³ and employs the poetic phrase *quo vento proicitur Appius minor* to introduce Appius Claudius Pulcher (*RE* 299). Caelius reports that Appius unwisely testified about money being given over in bribes by his father, before closing out the section discussing how foolish the younger Appius' admissions in court were, both with regard to himself and his father, framed by

²⁰⁷ a. "As soon as I hear of it, I hurry unsummoned up to the defence benches. I get on my hind legs and without a syllable on the matter in hand, I make a thorough job of Sempronius, even including Vestorius and the story of how he claimed to have done you a favour in letting Vestorius keep * * *" (SB trans.). It should be noted that the text at the end is corrupt, though what remains of the text clearly demonstrates what Caelius is projecting as his fervent involvement. Shackleton Bailey (1977 Commentary v. 1 p. 398) notes particularly in his Cambridge commentary that the use of *totum* "suggests a colloquialism". b. Alexander, (*Trials* p. 163 [no. 335]) suggests that Caelius acted as either advocate or a character witness for Tuccius. See *ad Att.* VI.2.10 (SB 116) where Cicero later reports (possibly in the latter part of April 50) that he has learned of Sempronius Rufus' naïveté and that he envies the *potentia* of Vestorius. c. On the Servilius/Vestorius affair and Servilius' social standing, see D'Arms, 1981, pp. 48–55.

²⁰⁸ Note particularly the use of *magna*.

²⁰⁹ For the details of the trial, including scholarly views as to whether *RE* 20 and 21 are the same person, see Alexander, *Trials* pp. 163–164 (no. 337).

²¹⁰ *M. Servilius postquam, ut coeperat, omnibus in rebus turbarat nec quod non venderet cuiquam reliquerat maximeque nobis traditus erat Invidia*; "Servilius, having completed a career of general derangement and left nobody anything to sell, was handed over to me—a most unpopular defendant" (SB trans.).

²¹¹ Pilius is likely Atticus' brother in law, the brother of his wife, Pilia (see Shackleton Bailey, 1995, p. 78). Note particularly the use of *nostri* with the proper pronoun (Abbott, 1897 p. lxx).

²¹² For further details of the case, see Alexander, *Trials* p. 164 (no. 338).

²¹³ *magno ilico fama surrexit et de damnatione ferventer loqui est coeptum*; "It became at once a *cause célèbre* and a verdict of guilty was eagerly canvassed" (SB trans.).

Caelius' expectation about how Cicero would find such admissions.²¹⁴ Notably, Caelius begins with "you may wonder at the madness" (my trans.), before elaborating on that madness as most stupid concerning Appius (*stultissimas ... de se*), and shocking concerning his father (*nefarias de patre*).

In section 3, Caelius reports that Appius sent the jury to consider the verdict,²¹⁵ and that they returned an evenly divided vote, but that Laterensis was ignorant of the law, with the result that, "as they are accustomed", he would not call in the debt (*Laterensis leges ignorans pronuntiavit ... ut solent, "non redigam."*). He continues to report simply that the praetor left and then read Clause 101 of the relevant law,²¹⁶ which he quotes to Cicero (*'quod eorum iudicium maior pars iudicavit id ius ratumque esto'*), presumably to provide him with the information he would need to make his own judgement on the matter. Caelius underlines that Laterensis did not write "acquitted" in the records, contrasting *non rettulit* with *perscripsit*, demonstrating that the outcome was not what was expected (*in tabulas absolutum non rettulit, in ordinem iudicia perscripsit*).²¹⁷ Subtle hyperbaton, where the qualifying adjective is highlighted by being separated from the subject, and alliterative anaphora in the repetition of *nunc neque ... neque*, suggests emphasis in reporting Servilius' damaged state going forward (*sic nunc neque absolutus neque damnatus Servilius de repetundis saucius Pilio tradetur*).²¹⁸ Caelius continues by reporting that Appius did not have what it took in the *divinatio*, so he yielded to Pilius.²¹⁹ Further, he relates that Appius was himself charged for extortion by the Servilii,²²⁰ as well

²¹⁴ *admiraris amentiam; immo, si actionem stultissimasque de se, nefarias de patre confessiones audisses.*

²¹⁵ Shackleton Bailey (1977 Commentary v. 1 p. 401) notes this instance of prosecuting counsel sending the jury to consider its verdict and provides further evidence for this practice.

²¹⁶ *postquam discessit et pro absolute Servilius haberi coeptus legisque unum et centesimum capit legit.*

²¹⁷ Note particularly the emphasising compound with *per-* (Abbott, 1897 lxiv). Following this, is another corruption in the text, obscuring Laterensis' reaction to Appius charging Servilius again, but as Shackleton Bailey writes, "whatever it [Laterensis' reaction] was it resulted in the lapse of Appius' charge" (Shackleton Bailey, 2001 Loeb, v.1 p. 375 n.9). Alexander, *Trials* p. 165 (no. 339) suggests there was confusion as to whether Servilius was actually acquitted, or whether there simply was not a decision at all.

²¹⁸ He was handed to Pilius "the worse for wear, to be tried for extortion" (SB trans.).

²¹⁹ *nam de divinatione Appius, cum calumniam iurasset, contendere ausus non est Pilioque cessit.*

²²⁰ For details, see Alexander, *Trials* p. 165 (no. 340).

as for *vis* by a man whom Shackleton Bailey describes as “a satellite of his” (i.e. Appius’).²²¹ The final sentence of the section lumps Appius and Servilius in the same boat and highlights the limited sympathy Caelius has for either (*recte hoc par habet*).²²²

In section 4, Caelius turns away from this melange of legal cases to public affairs, in this case, those regarding the Gallic provinces. To begin, he reports that nothing was being done regarding the *respublica* (*actum nihil est*), and this is contrasted by the emphasis Caelius then employs, highlighting the gravity of the situation and that at long last, something *has* happened (*aliquando tamen, saepe re dilata et graviter acta et plane perspecta Cn. Pompei*). Caelius states that he is sending Cicero a copy of the relevant senatorial decree and the recorded *auctoritates*. By enclosing the resolutions of the Senate, Caelius is providing Cicero with the information to make his own deductions, allowing for him to see all the developments and who is involved. Caelius does, however, directly report to Cicero that Pompey’s wishes were finally made clear about the question of the Gallic provinces, namely that a senatorial decree should be passed that after March 1st 50 BCE, Caesar should be recalled to Rome.

In section 5 Caelius provides the senatorial decree that the consular provinces should be discussed.²²³ In section 8, Cicero’s province of Cilicia is expressly mentioned as one of the provinces to be governed by an ex-praetor in 50 BCE. The inclusion of these senate resolutions (sections 5–8) and the registration of the vetoing of three of them by Caesarian tribunes (including that resolution pertaining to Cicero’s particular interest, the governorship of Cilicia) allows Caelius to demonstrate the impasse on the topic of Caesar,

²²¹ *et ipse de pecuniis repetundis a Serviliis est postulatus et praeterea de vi reus a quodam suo emissario, †stetio†, factus*. For details, see Alexander, *Trials* p. 165 (no. 341). The identity of the prosecutor is unknown, as the name is corrupted in the text.

²²² a. Tyrrell and Purser (1914 Commentary v. 3 p. 112) identify the connection to a pair of gladiators, casting Appius and his accuser with the sarcastic and dismissive reference. Williams (1965 Loeb v. 2 p. 132) identifies the pair as referring to Appius and his “satellite”, in this case, one Tettius. In any event, casting Appius as a gladiator is insulting, regardless of which man he is paired with. b. For a discussion of the name of Appius’ assault victim, which here is obscured by manuscript corruption, see Shackleton Bailey, 1977 Commentary v. 1 p. 401.

²²³ Note that these senate resolutions will not be analysed as they are not strictly relevant to the focus of this study.

and to suggest that there was unlikely to be a replacement governor in Cilicia any time soon.²²⁴

Section 9 continues on the same theme of the provinces—though the focus is now squarely on Gaul and Caesar. Caelius relates the remarks of Pompey, as well as his own assessment of the alternatives facing Caesar. The section starts off with brevity, leaving it to be understood that Pompey’s remarks were the topic (*illa praeterea Cn. Pompei sunt animadversa*), and Caelius emphasises that these remarks “greatly raised public confidence” (SB trans.).²²⁵ He reports that Pompey had said he could not decide about the provinces without *iniuria*, though after the Kalends of March, he would not be uncertain (*non dubitaturum*). He continues, reporting what Pompey was asked, and what his answers were, first indirectly then directly:

*cum interrogaretur quid si qui tum intercederent, dixit hoc
nihil interesse utrum C. Caesar senatui dicto audiens futurus
non esset an pararet qui senatum discernere non pateretur.
“quid si” inquit alius “et consul esse et exercitum habere
volet?”*

The last was the really important question, the one which everyone wanted to know the answer to and which foreshadowed the outbreak of civil war. The fact that Caelius provides it as a direct quotation shows the importance both he and Cicero attach to it. There is a progression evident here, as Caelius proceeds from indirect to direct speech. The direct questions produce a sense of rising tension, particularly as the final answer is framed by the punchy line: *at ille quam clementer*. The last question, which is poignantly rhetorical, answer Caelius quotes in full (“*quid si filius meus fustem mihi impingere volet?*”), because he knows it is suggestive. The direct quotations in this letter, and particularly in the manner demonstrated here, allow Cicero to ‘hear’ what is being said.²²⁶

²²⁴ Lintott, 2008, p. 269.

²²⁵ *quae maxime confidentiam attulerunt*.

²²⁶ Morello, 2013, p. 198.

The rhetorical question is, of course, an example of Pompey demeaning Caesar, as he appeals to the traditional power of the *paterfamilias*.²²⁷ Caelius provides his own interpretation that Caesar has two options: to either give up his command and be consul, or to forgo the candidature and retain it. This appears not to have been the general consensus within the Senate, as suggested by Lintott.²²⁸ The circulating opinion in Rome was that he wanted both,²²⁹ but Caelius believed Caesar would settle for one or the other. Interestingly, Caelius does not express concern about the possibility of the situation spiralling out of control here.

In section 10, Caelius continues on the same topic, but this time focusses on C. Scribonius Curio (*RE* 11). He emphasises that Curio is preparing against Caesar totally (*Curio se contra eum **totum** parat*),²³⁰ though he implies that Curio's actions may be futile.²³¹ To round out the letter, Caelius switches to a lighter topic: that of Curio's behaviour towards him, and to favours. He makes himself the focus, and is quite pleased with his treatment from Curio (***me** tractat liberaliter et Curio*).²³² He references the panthers which Curio had been given, now provided to Caelius himself, with the added line emphasising that without these panthers, he would be in an unenviable position.²³³ The charge here being that *Curio* is helping him out with panthers, while Cicero was doing nothing. He references the previous requests he had made, before making them again, insistently (*velim tibi curae sit, quod a te semper petii, ut aliquid istinc bestiarum habeamus*).²³⁴ Making requests was an inherently face-threatening act, and employing strategies of polite communication helped to smooth over any face-threat and appease the requestee.²³⁵ Caelius appears to employ almost no politeness, attempting again to

²²⁷ Lintott, 2008 p. 269.

²²⁸ Lintott, 2008 p. 270.

²²⁹ Lintott, 2008 p. 269–270.

²³⁰ This is interesting given the mercurial Curio switches sides in the end and becomes an agent of Caesar's as tribune in 50 BCE (allegedly bribed). See Broughton, *MRR* 2.249.

²³¹ *quid adsequi possit nescio; illud video, bene sentientem, etsi nihil effecerit, cadere non posse.*

²³² *me* is advanced to the start of the sentence for emphasis.

²³³ *nam si mihi non dedisset eas, quae ad ludos ei advectae erant Africanæ, potuit supersederi.*

²³⁴ Note particularly the use of the subjunctives, "I would wish" and "we might have", and the importunate use of *quod a te semper petii*. cf. *ad fam.* VIII.9.3 (SB 82) for Caelius' previous request for panthers.

²³⁵ Hall, 2009, pp. 6–7.

basically shame Cicero into action, by comparing Curio's accommodation with Cicero's lack thereof. Caelius refers the Sittian bond (*Sittianamque syngrapham tibi commendo*), though passes over it much quicker than the panthers,²³⁶ and identifies the carriers of the letter he has sent, commending them also to Cicero's attention, while again asking for his requests to be fulfilled, emphasising his eagerness.²³⁷

Therefore, Caelius displays keen *Schadenfreude* as he takes pleasure in the downturns of Sempronius Rufus and Appius the younger,²³⁸ and clearly enjoys sharing the gossip. He is incredulous at the whole affair, including the management of the case by Laterensis (who did not know his laws). He is clearly concerned with supplying Cicero with everything he needs to form a clear picture of the situation in Rome, quoting him the law and enclosing senatorial resolutions in full. One of these directly relates to Cicero's province of Cilicia, and the whole enclosure pertains to the question of Caesar and the Gallic provinces. The rising tension Caelius sees in Rome is clearly conveyed, though he himself is not overly concerned. Indeed, of a more immediate concern is his lack of panthers. The relationship Caelius has with Cicero he again thinks as strong enough to withstand basically shaming the Cilician governor for not accommodating the repeated requests, directly compared to Curio who was saving his aedileship.

²³⁶ He does not make mention of the previous times he referred the matter of Sittius' bond to Cicero's attention. Compared to the request for panthers, this is almost glossed over as an afterthought. It is a matter he is still eager to see taken care of, to be sure, but the most pressing concern is the panthers.

²³⁷ *nam quam vehementer ad me pertineat in iis quas tibi illi reddent litteris perscripsi.*

²³⁸ Particularly with regard to his shocking admissions in court about both himself and his father.

In section 1, Caelius stresses that “we were completely shaken” (my trans.) by the dispatches being received about the Parthians.²³⁹ Emphasis is achieved using the adverb, *sane*, at the start of the sentence, and its separation through hyperbaton from the verbal form, *sumus commoti*. He reports what the news was according to C. Cassius Longinus (*RE* 59) and Deiotarus, tetrarch of Galatia (*RE* 2), employing a measured tone and plainly reporting what was said.²⁴⁰ This is similar to SB 77.4, which shows Caelius’ lingering worry concerning the Gallic threat through his measured, no-nonsense tone.²⁴¹ He regards reports of an external threat as quite serious.²⁴² We can see in this whole section restraint on Caelius’ part, as he employs linguistic formality in order to reflect the seriousness of the situation and his concern for Cicero, while also highlighting the worry he himself felt through the use of *ego* as the first word of the sentence in conjunction with the adverb *quidem* (*ego quidem praecipuum metum ...*). The major reason for his worry appears to be the weakness of Cicero’s forces. He makes repeated references to them and frames any actions Cicero might take as due to their inadequacy, attributing the blame for any failures to the soldiers, rather than Cicero himself.²⁴³ He demonstrates concern for Cicero’s personal safety, but also concern, as he himself states, for his reputation (*dignitati tuae*). Caelius is being careful to attribute the cause of his apprehension to the lack of military resources in order to avoid giving any insult to Cicero and his abilities. And, if we accept Shackleton Bailey’s recommendations, he emphasises the fear he feels on Cicero’s behalf with repetition and adverbs (***verebar, et vereor etiam nunc neque prius desinam formidare quam tetigisse te Italiam audiero***). Caelius expresses a wish for Cicero’s

²³⁹ *sane quam litteris C. Cassi et Deiotari sumus commoti*.

²⁴⁰ *nam Cassius cis Euphraten copias Parthorum esse scripsit, Deiotarus profectus per Commagenen in provinciam nostram*; in this sentence, the only notable feature seems to be the ellipsis of a verb in *Deiotarus profectus per Commagenen in provinciam nostram*, where Caelius employs the participle only. (Hall, 2009, pp. 9–10). Though the use of *in provinciam nostram* should also be registered (see Abbott, 1897 p. lxx), which in this case creates a sense of shared danger.

²⁴¹ This was in response to reports that Caesar’s troops had “taken a beating”.

²⁴² See Bellen, *Metus Gallicus-Metus Punicus: Zum Furchtmotiv in der römischen Republik*, Stuttgart 1985.

²⁴³ ... *praecipuum metum, quod ad te attinebat, habui, qui scirem quam paratus ab exercitu esses, ne quod hic tumultus dignitari tuae periculum adferret. nam de vita, si paratior ab exercitu esses, timuissem; nunc haec exiguitas copiarum recessum, non dimicationem mihi quam praesagiebat;*

company, writing that his fear will not cease until Cicero has set foot on Italian soil again.²⁴⁴ Displaying an awareness of the distance between correspondents and a wish for its shortening is a distinct epistolary theme,²⁴⁵ and as such, Caelius shows his concern for Cicero and pins his happiness on the resumption of their face to face friendship.

In section 2, talk of the Parthians continues, but it is framed by what is happening at Rome in response. In the second sentence, Caelius elides all verbs of wanting when reporting what course of action people were advocating, perhaps adding an urgency to his tone.²⁴⁶ He reports on the reasons for the consuls' worries, employing the standard phrase *ut paludati exeant*,²⁴⁷ and keeps the style fairly typical.²⁴⁸ Caelius then provides a somewhat dim view of the consuls (*sed honeste sive neglegentia sive inertia est sive ille quem proposui metus latet sub hac temperantiae existimatione, nolle provinciam*);²⁴⁹ according to Shackleton Bailey, it is unusual for a consul to not want a province, so Caelius is not buying it. Rather, he simply believes they suffer from inertia, carelessness, or fear that they will be passed over for a 'private citizen'.²⁵⁰ Caelius makes mention of Cicero's lack of communication,²⁵¹ particularly pertinent in this instance not just for maintaining their epistolary relationship, but because people were thinking the war was a fabrication; only Deiotarus' report was clarifying the state of affairs. Ultimately, the end of section 2 is concerned again with Cicero's standing in Rome, hence Caelius' urging of Cicero to write an account "of whatever is out there", lest Cicero be suspected of fabricating the war along with Cassius.²⁵²

²⁴⁴ *quam tetigisse te Italiam audiero*.

²⁴⁵ Trapp, 2003, pp. 38–39.

²⁴⁶ *alius enim Pompeium mittendum, alius ab urbe exercitu, alius consules, nemo tamen ex senatus consulto privatos*.

²⁴⁷ i.e. in a *senatus consultum* (Shackleton Bailey, 1977 commentary v.1 p. 412).

²⁴⁸ This is contrasted to the previous sentence where multiple verbs are left to be understood.

²⁴⁹ The consuls for this year were Servius Sulpicius Rufus and M. Claudius Marcellus (Broughton *MRR* 2.240–241).

²⁵⁰ For further details, see, Shackleton Bailey 1977 commentary v.1 pp. 411–412. Indeed, White describes this as uninhibited gossip on Caelius' part (White, 2010, pp. 83–84).

²⁵¹ It had been about six weeks since Cicero sent SB 85, though he has just sent SB 86 three days before this was written. Obviously, it was yet to arrive.

²⁵² *qua re tibi suadeo, quicumque est istic status rerum, diligenter et caute perscribas, ne aut velificatus alicui dicaris aut aliquid quod referret scire reticuisse*.

In section 3, Caelius again refers to his and Cicero's epistolary relationship and his task to keep Cicero informed, and more specifically, to act in his interests.²⁵³ He continues to speak badly of the consuls, writing that they are inefficient and slow (*nosti Marcellum, quam tardus et parum efficax sit, itemque Servium, quam cunctator*), and somewhat ostentatiously points out how they act 'coldly' on the matters they do care for (i.e. potential command against the Parthians), posing the somewhat rhetorical question: how will they act on issues *not* important to them (namely replacing Caesar in Gaul)?²⁵⁴ Caelius says that the tribune-elect Curio (*RE* 11) will make his political manoeuvres, but only if there is no Parthian war, or if it is on a scale that Cicero and Bibulus can handle.²⁵⁵ These manoeuvres, Caelius predicts, would involve depriving Caesar of something and bestowing something else on Pompey—in Pompey's case, any small gift.²⁵⁶ Caelius gives his opinion on L. Aemilius Lepidus Paullus (*RE* 81),²⁵⁷ who wanted a province so soon after his consulship, and so appears firmly against this contravention of the *lex Pompeia* (*Paullus porro non humane de provincia loquitur*).²⁵⁸ Interestingly, while Caelius shows himself aghast at Paullus' conduct, Cicero rather sees a potential opportunity: Paullus can have Cilicia as his province, facilitating his (Cicero's) return to Rome.²⁵⁹ Caelius reinforces his disapproval of Paullus' plans by mentioning that *our* Furnius (*Furnius noster*) means to oppose him (i.e. Paullus).²⁶⁰ By displaying a camaraderie with Furnius, Caelius shows his support for opposing Paullus and his less-than-pleased opinion of him wanting a province.

²⁵³ *nam ego has litteras a.d. XIII Kal. Dec. scripsi. plane nihil video ante Kal. Ian. agi posse*; "For I wrote these letters ..." "Plainly I see nothing ..." (my trans.).

²⁵⁴ *cuius modi putas hos esse aut quam id quod nolint conficere posse qui quae cupiunt tamen ita frigide agunt ut nolle existimentur?*

²⁵⁵ *sin autem aut non erit istic bellum aut tantum erit ut vos aut successores parvis additis copiis sustinere possint, Curionem video se dupliciter iactaturum.*

²⁵⁶ *primum ut aliquid Caesari adimat, inde ut aliquid Pompeio tribuat, quodvis quamlibet tenue munusculum*; the use of *munusculum* here is worth noting. Caelius employed this same word previously in *ad fam.* VIII.8.1 (SB 84) to describe the absurd actions of C. Sempronius Rufus (*RE* 79). It was not meant as a compliment.

²⁵⁷ The consul-elect for 50 BCE

²⁵⁸ A law requiring a five-year interval between consulship and provincial command.

²⁵⁹ See *ad Att.* VI.7.7 (SB 115); Shackleton Bailey 2001 Loeb v.1 p. 396 n. 4.

²⁶⁰ This reference to the plans of Curio and Furnius are also described, as those regarding the consuls previously, as uninhibited gossip by White (2010 pp. 83–84).

The section is closed with Caelius again referring to his perceptions—or rather, their limits (*plura suspicari non possum*) in regards to keeping Cicero informed.

In section 4, Caelius signals the end of the letter (*haec novi*). This short clause shows that he is going to be wrapping up and flags the previous sections as the most important (*alia quae possunt accidere non cerno*). Caelius offers an addendum to Curio's tribunician plans, adding (*addo*) the tribune-elect's proposal regarding the Campanian land.²⁶¹ This comment would have particularly resonated with Cicero who had proposed that Caesar's agrarian legislation should be revisited as early as 56 BCE.²⁶² This section is notable because Caelius appears to be reflecting and communicating to Cicero the perceived tension between Pompey and Caesar.

In section 5, Caelius again turns to the matter of Cicero's governorship. Disappointingly for Cicero, Caelius writes that he is unable to promise the appointment of his successor.²⁶³ All the same, he is quick to forestall any loss of face with what he *can* promise. He guarantees that at least there will be no extension of Cicero's command (*illud certe praestabo, ne amplius prorogetur*). This is an example of redressive facework. Caelius appears conscious of the reaction Cicero would have to him having written that he is unable to provide the service which he (Cicero) wants, so he emphasises that he *is* in fact still working towards Cicero's interests.²⁶⁴ Interestingly, he throws the ball to Cicero, suggesting that he makes up his own mind in the event that he and Caelius cannot *honourably* refuse undesirable decisions by the Senate.²⁶⁵ Finally, he closes the letter by reminding Cicero that he has not forgotten the charge (*officium*) to make sure his return to Rome is not delayed.²⁶⁶ By ending this way, Caelius shows his awareness of Cicero's difficult situation. He refers to their last face-to-face meeting while Cicero took his leave

²⁶¹ According to Shackleton Bailey, "Curio, still, at any rate ostensibly, playing an optimate game, was now proposing to interfere with Caesar's agrarian legislation ..." (Shackleton Bailey, p. 414).

²⁶² *ad fam.* I.9.8; cf. *ad Quint. frat.* II.6.1. Cicero had been forced to "make his peace" with Caesar and composed a 'palinode' to make up for his past misbehaviour (*ad Att.* IV.5.2).

²⁶³ *quod ad tuum decessum attinet, illud tibi non possum polliceri.*

²⁶⁴ For details on these facework strategies, see Hall, 2009 "Redressive Politeness" pp. 111–117.

²⁶⁵ *tui consili est, si tempus, si senatus coget, si honeste a nobis recusari non poterit, velisne perseverare.*

²⁶⁶ *mei officii est meminisse qua obtestatione decedens mihi ne paterer fieri mandaris.*

(*decedens*), along with Caelius' mention of duty to Cicero, which conveys a wish for his correspondent's physical presence. This is a form of 'consolation', namely, the expression of a personal responsibility to a friend.²⁶⁷ Caelius is attempting to offer some measure of understanding and reassurance to Cicero in light of the circumstances.

So, Caelius appears primarily concerned with Cicero's physical safety and his political interests. He shows his concern by carefully making excuses for Cicero in light of insufficient military resources, and creates a sense of seriousness and urgency when discussing the Parthians. He does not speak highly of political figures in Rome, but his focus does not stray far from Cicero's situation. Caelius makes sure Cicero knows he has not forgotten him and that he will do his best to produce the most desirable outcome with regard to Cicero's governorship. A notable absence from this letter is that of any miscellaneous small items.²⁶⁸ There appears to be a consistent theme of concern for Cicero, and a sense from Caelius that introducing trivialities would not be appropriate, given the circumstances. And in keeping with his theme, namely the focus on Cicero and his situation, he expresses his own desire for Cicero's return, and yet again, for a closing of the distance between them.

²⁶⁷ See Hutchinson, 1998, p. 50: "consolation was also conceived as a personal responsibility on a friend; the letters are designed for particular people and circumstances. Part of the interest in them is to see how they are shaped by and for the specific moment".

²⁶⁸ Trapp, 2003 p. 36.

ad fam. VIII.6 (SB 88) – Rome, February 50

This letter was written some weeks after the last extant example (SB 87), and after Cicero has written in SB 86, introducing himself as *imperator* in the opening formula. Assuming the letter would have reached Rome by now, and that it arrived at all, it is interesting that Caelius does not change his greeting formula to reflect Cicero's new honorific.

In section 1, Caelius introduces a matter in which he hopes to enlist Cicero's support: Appius Claudius Pulcher (RE 297) had been impeached by P. Cornelius Dolabella (RE 141) on a charge of *maiestas*.²⁶⁹ He is highly complimentary to Appius (*neque enim stulte Appius*), underlying the fact that Appius had reacted to the charge quickly and decisively,²⁷⁰ which showed him to be far more prepared than his accuser could have imagined (*quam speraverat accusator*). Thus, he imputes a degree of ineptitude on Dolabella's part. Caelius then emphasises, particularly with *nunc* and the redundant use of *is*, that Appius now had the greatest hope in Cicero (*is nunc in te maximam spem habet*). As Appius had been the previous governor of Cilicia,²⁷¹ Cicero could be in possession of damaging evidence concerning his mismanagement of the province,²⁷² which now, he may have felt was an opportune moment to use.²⁷³ Caelius, however, is keen to persuade Cicero not to use it. He writes that he *knows* Cicero doesn't *really* dislike Appius (*scio tibi eum non esse odio*), as he attempts to manoeuvre Cicero into supporting the man. However, he cannot afford to press Cicero too hard, given their previous relations,²⁷⁴ and

²⁶⁹ See *ad fam.* III.11.1–3 (SB 74), a letter written by Cicero to Appius after the event. This seems sufficient to dismiss the idea that the charge was one concerning extortion in the province (see *de viris illustribus* 82.4; cf. Alexander, *Trials* p. 166 [344]).

²⁷⁰ By foregoing his claim to a triumph and entering the city immediately (*introierat in urbem triumphique postulationem abiecerat*).

²⁷¹ See Broughton *MRR* 2.237.

²⁷² See *ad Att.* III.7.2 for mention of special taxes Appius had imposed, which Cicero, to an extent, countermands. For a discussion of the "criminal activity" of Appius and his associates, see Morrell, 2017, p. 154.

²⁷³ Particularly, given the bitter history between Cicero and the Claudii Pulchri, due to matters such as Cicero's conflict with Clodius, and the way he attacked the Claudii Pulchri in the *pro Caelio*.

²⁷⁴ White, 2010, p. 120. On Cicero's troubled relationship with Appius, as revealed by the letters, see Constans, 1921.

diffidently suggests the reward of Appius being obliged to Cicero if he helped, while tacitly leaving the degree of help up to Cicero to decide.²⁷⁵ Caelius presents various options and consequences for Cicero to consider in deciding how to act:

*cum quo si similtas tibi non fuisset, liberius tibi de tota re
esset; nunc, si ad illam summam veritatem legitimum ius
exegeris, cavendum tibi erit ne parum simpliciter et candide
posuisse inimicitias videaris*

The end result appears to have been compliance from Cicero, as he actually sends evidence to Rome to *strengthen* Appius' case.²⁷⁶ At this stage, however, Caelius appears still unconvinced that Cicero will not act against his predecessor: after all, the new governor was making a particular point out of doing everything by the book.²⁷⁷ He adds a line to bridge this topic with the next, writing that it had just occurred to him as a result of discussing this case, that Dolabella's wife has left him.²⁷⁸

In section 2, Caelius turns to a particular "matter" which Cicero had charged him on leaving for Cilicia (*quid mihi discedens mandar is memini*). With the benefit of hindsight, this appears to have been to look out for a potential husband for Cicero's daughter, Tullia.²⁷⁹ He plays coy throughout the entire section, never explicitly stating what the matter was, and remaining vague. He goes so far as to state "now is not the time to enter

²⁷⁵ *quam velis eum obligare in tua manu est*; leaving the choice to Cicero almost certainly serves as a piece of facework. Rather than giving a direction, giving a choice serves to encourage Cicero's cooperation by acknowledging his autonomy (White, 2010 pp. 120–121).

²⁷⁶ White, 2010, p. 26. For Cicero's response to Caelius writing on Appius, see *ad fam.* II.13 (SB 93), about which White theorises that the letter may have been written to share with Appius to increase Cicero's standing with the man in pursuit of more friendly relations, despite what he acknowledges as "different philosophies of government" (White, op. cit. pp. 93–94).

²⁷⁷ For examples of this and Cicero's reaction to Appius' governorship, see *ad Att.* V.15.2 (SB 108) and V.16.2 (SB 109). For modern scholarship that takes very seriously Cicero's profession of integrity and his concern for the provincial weal, see Morrell, 2017, pp. 240–241.

²⁷⁸ *illud mihi occurrit, quod inter postulationem et nominis delationem uxor a Dolabella discessit.*

²⁷⁹ As the precise nature of the matter is not stated by Caelius, and with Cicero claiming the news of their engagement to be a surprise (SB 73.5), we cannot be certain that the request was more than general, as Shackleton Bailey puts it, for Caelius to keep an eye open for an eligible match (Shackleton Bailey 1977 Commentary v. 1 p. 415).

into further details" (SB trans.),²⁸⁰ though remaining vague does not preclude him offering advice.²⁸¹ That advice was to wait so that potential damage to Cicero's reputation could be avoided.²⁸² The potential for damage is emphasised by his observation of Dolabella as being someone unable to keep quiet (*neque ille tacere eam rem poterit ... cum praesertim is sit qui, si perniciosum sciret esse loqui de hac re, vix tamen se contineret*). Interestingly, he does not put forward a stellar view of Dolabella here. Hutchinson describes Caelius writing of Dolabella "with impartial adroitness".²⁸³ This almost certainly relates back to Appius' trial, as Caelius attempts to guide Cicero into not damaging the former governor, particularly given the way in which Caelius returns to Dolabella with fulsome praise after the marriage is announced.²⁸⁴

In section 3, Caelius returns to Appius, this time in relation to Pompey. It is possible he is again attempting to convince Cicero to support Appius, as Pompey is, reportedly, strongly on his side (*Pompeius dicitur valde pro Appio laborare*). He relays that Pompey is considering sending one of his sons out to Cicero,²⁸⁵ so if Cicero was interested in another way of maintaining friendly relations with Pompey, he ought to consider supporting Appius and so receive one of Pompey's sons. Caelius then shifts tone, showing a dissatisfied air with regard to matters in Rome. He writes that "here we are acquitting everybody" (SB trans.),²⁸⁶ almost certainly not a positive statement. This is followed by the

²⁸⁰ The author of a letter should generally remain aware that their contents may become public knowledge (Ebbeler, 2010, p. 471). This fear of prying eyes would naturally extend to the letter bearer. For further details, see the article by Nicholson (1994), who makes the observation that "Cicero also had to worry about over-curious *tabellarii* opening his mail in route", and discusses tactics used to forestall this, such as writing in Greek.

²⁸¹ That advice being to remain patient and see how matters develop; *tamen hoc tempore nihil de tua voluntate ostendas et expectes quem ad modum exeat ex hac causa denique*; note the emphasis on waiting with the two verbs.

²⁸² *porro, si significatio ulla intercesserit, clarius quam deceat aut expediat fiat.*

²⁸³ Hutchinson, 1998, p. 142; it is curious that he gives such a dim view of Dolabella, if indeed he is suggesting he should marry Tullia. This certainly does very little to extol the man's credentials, as would be expected; cf. the list of virtues sought in a potential husband, for example, in Pliny the Younger's letter 1.14.

²⁸⁴ cf. *ad fam.* VIII.13.1 (SB 94). For the hypocrisy involved in these transactions, see Carcopino, 1951, v. 1 pp. 160-161, who takes a relatively dim view of the evidence: "Caelius took it for granted that this curious father was a man who would subordinate the question of his daughter's marriage to the momentary exigencies of his own convenience and career ..."

²⁸⁵ *ut etiam putent alterum utrum de filiis ad te missurum.*

²⁸⁶ *hic nos omnis absolvimus.*

use of *et hercules*, expressing his shock at the actions of the consuls hiding “dirty scandals” (SB trans.) (*et hercules consaepta omnia foeda et inhonesta sunt*), and he refers sarcastically to those consuls, writing that they are “highly diligent” (*consules autem habemus summa diligentia*).²⁸⁷ His negative view continues in his observation that all they have done is set a date for the Latin Festival.²⁸⁸

Caelius had originally planned the end of the letter to be section 4, before section 5 was added in a different hand before sending.²⁸⁹ As such, it appears as a typical closing, reporting on matters of less import in a colloquial manner. He begins with “our tribune Curio” being “frozen” (*Curioni nostro tribunatus congelat*),²⁹⁰ making the tone familiar, and claims an inability to describe what he views as dire stagnation in Rome (*sed dici non potest quo modo hic omnia iaceant*). This is contrasted with what he views as a saving grace, his “fight” with the *tabernarii* and *aquarii*, the only event of *any* interest (*nisi ego cum tabernariis et aquariis pugnarem, veternus civitatem occupasset*).²⁹¹ Note the redundant *ego* for emphasising his own involvement, and the metaphorical use of *pugnarem*. He is playing up his own cases, but knows they are of little importance. He seems to think of this as just a day to day happening.²⁹² He makes a sarcastic wish for war with the Parthians, with repeated use of the heat/cold metaphors (*si Parthi vos nihil calfaciunt, nos nihil frigore frigescimus*), and gives his report on M. Calpurnius Bibulus (*RE* 28), expressing his inability to comprehend how (*nescio quid*) he has lost forces without the Parthians’ involvement.²⁹³ The manner in which he writes about this loss of soldiers is in sharp contrast to how he has previously written, first with regard to Caesar “taking a

²⁸⁷ Note also the absence of a verb in this clause.

²⁸⁸ *adhuc senatus consultum nisi de feriis Latinis nullum facere potuerunt*; a matter of no political consequence (Shackleton Bailey 2001 Loeb v. 1 p. 400).

²⁸⁹ a. Cicero attests to the hand being that of Caelius himself (*ad fam.* II.13.3 [SB 93]). b. It is possible that information was withheld from the main letter for dramatic effect, though this is not convincing to Shackleton Bailey (1977 Commentary v. 1 p. 414).

²⁹⁰ For the use of the hot/cold metaphor, see Abbott 1897 p. lxxiii–lxxiv.

²⁹¹ For details on this incident, and others preserved in non-epistolary sources, see the attached Appendix.

²⁹² This is echoed by Hutchinson (1998, p. 144), who writes that Caelius is presenting himself as an exception, as his fervent activity is contrasted with the happenings (or perceived lack thereof) in Rome as a form of satire.

²⁹³ *tamen, quoquo modo hic omnia iaceant potuit, sine Parthis Bibulus in Amano nescio quid cohorticularum amisit*.

beating” in Gaul (letter 77), and then in the previous letter some weeks ago where he exhibits real concern about the Parthian threat (letter 87).

In section 5, he includes an addendum to the rest of the letter, written after further developments with Curio which Caelius deemed important enough to add to the end before sending. Indeed, he himself writes that it was being written subsequent to the rest of the letter,²⁹⁴ drawing attention to the significance of Curio’s actions. He again employs the heat/cold metaphor (*frigere*), this time emphasised with the use of *valde*, and contrasted with *iam calet*. This is then followed by, *nam ferventissime concerpitur*: he is clearly employing quite figurative, conversational language.²⁹⁵ He declares Curio “fleeing” to the people and to Caesar a bad thing (*levissime enim*), and takes this opportunity to say more on the matter of Appius, further encouraging Cicero to act on his behalf, this time, explicitly, for Caelius’ own benefit.²⁹⁶ He returns again to the possible arrangement with Dolabella,²⁹⁷ and finally, one quick line to close the letter off at last: he is still concerned with Cicero’s reputation, though this time in regards to panthers.²⁹⁸ This is the fourth time we have Caelius asking for panthers, and the last. He does not appear to be pushing his luck, as in SB 82. He attempts to just remind Cicero of the request, with some negative encouragement (i.e. “it will be bad for you”), and to convey his displeasure without making further undue demands.

So, Caelius shows himself wanting something from both Cicero and Appius, encouraging friendship between the two. He mentions the benefits to Cicero, though it is clear his motivation is rather for himself. Awkwardly, he is forced to balance his own hopes for favour with Appius, against playing matchmaker with Cicero’s daughter and

²⁹⁴ *hoc nondum fecerat cum priorem partem epistulae scripsi.*

²⁹⁵ The use of *concerpitur* is particularly rare, occurring only twice in the Ciceronian corpus (Abbott, Oldfather & Canter, 1965, p. 164).

²⁹⁶ Caelius will ‘love’ him, and asks to be put in Appius’ favour: *amabo te, si quid quod opus fuerit Appio facies, ponito me in gratia.*

²⁹⁷ He appears to offer more explicit advice (*suadeo*), perhaps now that he has had time to think further on the matter. It appears as if he found his previous treatment of the subject wanting, though still professes his concern for Cicero’s reputation (*dignitati tuae aequitatisque opinioni*).

²⁹⁸ *turpe tibi erit pantheras Graecas me non habere.*

Dolabella, Appius' prosecutor. He shows a concern with Cicero's reputation in discussing the matter, refusing to give any concrete details, and again, shows himself as a man who savours action. He laments the complete calm in Rome, clearly contrasted with his own minor "fights", as the only saving grace in a period he finds deathly boring. Life has, however, clearly livened up enough when he includes the addendum, section 5, writing animatedly about Curio, and again returning to Appius and Dolabella. His request for panthers shows some consideration for his relationship with Cicero—having already made the request, almost rudely in some instances, he does not push Cicero too hard, while still finding the matter pressing enough to mention it again regardless.

ad fam. VIII.11 (SB 91) – Rome, mid (?) April 50

In section 1, Caelius writes about the work which he and others have done regarding a *supplicatio* for Cicero.²⁹⁹ He employs several colloquial and conversational features. For example, his first sentence uses metaphorical and extravagant language (***non diu sed acriter nos tuae supplicationes torserunt***). Caelius emphasises here not the length, but the severity of the headache with which he has had to deal. The use of *torserunt*, in particular, is noteworthy, as Cicero himself uses *torqueo* and its forms a number of times in letters to Atticus, while Caelius provides this example, which is the only other usage in the Ciceronian corpus.³⁰⁰ Caelius continues further with metaphor, writing “for we had fallen into a difficult knot” (my trans.).³⁰¹ This opening fits perfectly in Abbott’s descriptions of communications between friends, who utilise extravagant expressions and figurative language.³⁰² Caelius speaks encouragingly of the tribune C. Scribonius Curio (*RE* 11) and his desire to oblige Cicero with regard to the *supplicationes* (*nam Curio, tui cupidissimus*), particularly with the use of *tui cupidissimus*. According to Abbott,³⁰³ adjectives expressing affection are frequently joined to proper names in colloquial Latin, and the use of possessives appear with people through whom a disagreeable subject is about to be introduced. As such, Caelius goes on to report that Curio would, however, not oblige Cicero, since doing so would involve sacrificing comitial days with which to pursue his political plans.³⁰⁴ Curio had lost comitial days already due to the consul Lucius Aemilius Lepidus Paullus (*RE* 81), who was acting in Caesar’s interests and deferring the question of the Gallic provinces.³⁰⁵ By reporting this and Paullus’ apparent support for Caesar, Caelius reveals his own thoughts on the political situation. He characterises Paullus’ actions as

²⁹⁹ Cicero had written to the Senate in April asking for a *supplicatio* in honour of his military achievements (see *ad fam.* III.9.4).

³⁰⁰ It is a rather rare usage of the verb in Cicero’s *Letters* (see Oldfather, Canter, Abbott, 1965, p. 535).

³⁰¹ *incideramus enim in difficilem nodum*.

³⁰² Abbott, 1897, pp. lxxiii–lxxiv.

³⁰³ Abbott, 1897, p. lxx.

³⁰⁴ Shackleton Bailey, Loeb, p. 406 n. 2.

³⁰⁵ According to Williams (1943 Loeb v. 2 p. 154 n. b), Paullus was urging the use of comitial days for religious purposes. Broughton (*MRR* 2.247) writes that Paullus had received financial aid from Caesar and so supported him while restraining his colleague, C. Claudius Marcellus (*RE* 216).

“madness” (*furore Paulli*),³⁰⁶ editorialising and suggesting that he is against Paullus’ support of Caesar, as he knew Cicero would be. Despite this, he writes of Paullus positively as he switches to the most important part of the section, informing Cicero that he should thank Paullus for his positive sentiments, as he implied that the *supplicationes* would take place in the future, while Marcellus gave no such implication.³⁰⁷

In section 2, Caelius details actions taken on Cicero’s behalf and whom he must thank as a result. He writes at length that C. Lucilius Hirrus (*RE* 25) was going to attempt to delay the question of Cicero’s *supplicationes*, though did not:

*renuntiatum nobis erat Hirrum diutius dicturum. prendimus eum; non modo non fecit sed, cum de hostiis ageretur et posset rem impedire si ut numeraretur postularet, tacuit.*³⁰⁸

He reports that Cato, while speaking well of Cicero, would not support the *supplicationes*. He did, however, do nothing to hinder them, and similarly with M. Favonius (*RE* 1).³⁰⁹ These reports seem fairly standard, simply reporting the political movements of those not firmly on Cicero’s side and listing whom he must thank. Caelius emphasises that greater thanks ought to be given to Curio,³¹⁰ and embraces C. Furnius (*RE* 3) and P. Cornelius

³⁰⁶ According to Shackleton Bailey (1977 Commentary v. 1 p. 419–420), Paullus’ pro-Caesarian stance, denying his own *optimatus* past, might be termed *furor*, a word which Cicero often used to describe political behaviour which he considered seditious. For example, see *ad Att.* IV.3.4 (SB 75).

³⁰⁷ *plane quod utrisque consulibus gratias agas est, Paullo magis certe; nam Marcellus sic respondit ei, spem in istis supplicationibus non haberem Paullus se omnino in hunc annum non edicturum.*

³⁰⁸ Shackleton Bailey (1977 Commentary v. 1 p. 420) points out that the *nobis* here, in light of Caelius’ relationship with Hirrus (he had recently defeated the man in the elections for the curule aedileship: see Broughton, *Also-Rans* p. 52), likely points to the involvement of third parties, e.g. Furnius and Lentulus (see below). I believe Caelius is sincere in writing that Cicero must thank the man “according to [his] ... habits of conduct” (SB trans.). That thanks, however, need not be excessive, merely proportionate, as Caelius does not go overboard, even restricting himself to the usual use of the man’s *cognomen* only (*Hirrus*: cf. Shackleton Bailey, 1995, p. 64).

³⁰⁹ *tantum Catoni adsensus est, qui de te locutus honorifice non decrevit supplicationes. tertius ad hos Favonius accessit. qua re pro cuiusque natura et instituto gratiae sunt agenda, his quod tantum voluntatem ostenderunt, pro sententia, cum impedire possent non pugnarunt;* Favonius was an unsuccessful candidate for the praetorship in 50 BCE, who was rejected, according to Caelius, when both the *columnarii* and the *optimates* refused to vote for him (cf. *ad fam.* VIII.9.5 [SB 82] and Broughton, *Also-Rans* p. 37).

³¹⁰ *Curioni vero quod de suarum actionum cursu tua causa deflexit;* as a tribune, Curio could have certainly worked against Cicero, yet he eventually even turned away from his own program for Cicero’s sake. Also note the use of *vero* to draw attention to the significance of Curio’s actions.

Lentulus Spinther (*RE* 238) as working diligently “with us”.³¹¹ He also commends Cornelius Balbus (*RE* 69),³¹² who had spoken to Curio *vehementer* and convinced him that had he acted otherwise than he had done in coming to a compromise, he would be working against Caesar, calling Curio’s *fides* into question.³¹³ Tyrrell suggests that Curio’s good faith towards Cicero is being referred to here, but Shackleton Bailey is no doubt correct that Caelius is referring to Caesar, whom Curio was now supporting.³¹⁴ Finally, Caelius reports on Domitius Ahenobarbus (*RE* 27) and Q. Caecilius Metellus Scipio (*RE* 99) who were seemingly acting in bad faith. Curio reportedly handled them most pleasingly:

*decrerant quidem qui neque transigi volebant Domitii,
Scipiones. quibus hac re ad intercessionem evocandum
interpellantibus venustissime Curio respondit se eo libentius
non intercedere quod quosdam qui decernerent videret
confici nolle.*

According to Shackleton Bailey,³¹⁵ their motive was ill-will and jealousy of Cicero, and they voted in favour of the *supplicationes* because they were trying to provoke a veto, causing further drama.

³¹¹ *nam Furnius et Lentulus, ut debuerunt, quasi eorum res esset una nobiscum circumierunt et laborarunt*; in 50 BCE, Cicero relied on the tribune, C. Furnius, to prevent the extension of his provincial command (for details, see Broughton, *MRR* 2.249) He and P. Cornelius Lentulus Spinther (cos. 57) were apparently working as hard as Caelius himself, and so were definitely worthy of thanks.

³¹² Caelius again reverses the order of the names, placing the *cognomen* before the *nomen*. Shackleton Bailey (1977 Commentary v. 1 p. 420) rejects the statement of Tyrrell and Purser that Cicero always places the *cognomen* before the *nomen* when he omits the *praenomen*. As previously registered by Adams (1978, pp. 165–166), this was likely a transitional period for such naming conventions which were becoming increasingly popular.

³¹³ *Balbi quoque Corneli operam et sedulitatem laudare possum; nam cum Curione vehementer locutus est et eum, si aliter fecisset, iniuriam Caesari facturum dixit, tum eius fidem in suspicionem adduxit*; on the clause *si aliter fecisset*, see Shackleton Bailey 1977 Commentary v. 1 p. 420.

³¹⁴ Tyrrell’s view is registered by Williams (1943 Loeb v. 2 p. 156 n. g) but not favoured. For Shackleton Bailey’s view, see Shackleton Bailey 1977 Commentary v. 1 p. 420 and Shackleton Bailey 2001 Loeb v. 1 p. 408 n. 6.

³¹⁵ Shackleton Bailey, 1977, pp. 420–421. Note that Ahenobarbus and Scipio, the consuls of 54 and 52 BCE, are listed first and second respectively as witnesses in the two senatorial decrees at *ad fam.* 8.8.5 and 8.8.6 (SB 84). Scipio is generally referred to as “Scipio”, his pre-adoption *cognomen*, in the Ciceronian corpus (see Shackleton Bailey, 1995, p. 25).

In section 3, Caelius turns from the primary concern of this letter (i.e. *supplicationes*) to the next most important: Caesar and the Gallic provinces. He explains Curio's clear opposition to the will of Pompey and the Senate, and demonstrates the tribune's readiness by reporting that he has thrown out the rest of his legislative plans.³¹⁶ He then refers to a common bond between himself and Cicero through certain friends (the *optimates*),³¹⁷ who do not want to push the matter too firmly (*nostri porro, quos tu bene nosti, ad extremum certamen rem deducere non audebant*). The summary to follow uses the metaphor of a theatre stage (*scaena rei totius haec*), showing disdain for Pompey's actions, which is emphasised with the following use of *tamquam, non impugnet*, and *putet* (*Pompeius, tamquam Caesarem non impugnet sed quod illi aequum putet constituat, ait Curionem quaerere discordias*). This disdain is further reinforced by expressing his contrasted approval for Curio dealing with him "properly" (*accipitur satis male a Curione et totus eius tertius consulatus exagitur*), which appears to suggest that Caelius is on Curio's side, or at least against Pompey. He offers his final appraisal of the situation (*hoc tibi dico*): Caesar will defend Curio, or act as he pleases. With this, he is foreshadowing trouble. Because both options which Caelius sees Caesar having are beneficial to him, he shows that he believes the *optimates* are making a mistake.

In section 4, Caelius includes the smaller miscellaneous items which are typical features in closing a letter.³¹⁸ He gives a rundown of what is in the attached packet of news and why it is there, such as the hissing at the games and the number of funerals, because it is "better you should hear what doesn't interest you than that some matter of consequence be left out" (SB trans.).³¹⁹ Finally, he turns to Sittius' bond, which he has finally had a response to.³²⁰ He rejoices, expressing his pleasure and thankfulness (*tibi*

³¹⁶ *quod ad rem publicam attinet, in unam causam omnis contentio coniecta est, de provinciis; in quam, ut adhuc est, incubuisse cum senatu Pompeius videtur ut Caesar id. Nov. decedat. Curio omnia potius subire constituit quam id pati; ceteras suas abiecit actiones.*

³¹⁷ Shackleton Bailey, 1977 Commentary v. 1 p. 421.

³¹⁸ Trapp, 2003, p. 36.

³¹⁹ *Quam quisque sententiam dixerit in commentario est rerum urbanarum ... denique malo in hanc partem errare ut quae non desideres audias quam quicquam quid opus est praetermittatur.*

³²⁰ This response is, however, no longer extant.

curae fuisse de Sittiano negotio gaudeo), and, as he has gotten what he wanted,³²¹ he now pays Cicero a compliment. He defers to the elder man regarding how to handle the business going forward, trusting Cicero's judgement over his own.³²² It is possible that Caelius could even be self-deprecatory here as Cicero has declared his wisdom lacking in hiring the men he had send out to take care of the matter. Caelius is showing his respect for Cicero and affirming his "face".³²³

So, Caelius shows himself giving priority to the matter of Cicero's supplications. He is generally pleased with his own efforts, allowing him to write in a conversational tone when discussing those who were generally favourable to Cicero. When he turns to those who could have been opposed, he becomes more serious and reserved, as befitting talk of important matters,³²⁴ and then he again reverts to being more conversational when discussing those he worked closely with and the shameful behaviour of Cicero's detractors.³²⁵ When he turns to Caesar and the Gallic provinces, he appears somewhat formal, until he reveals his disdain for Pompey's actions. Finally, he appears conscientious and deferential upon getting what he wants, in this case, for Cicero to look into the matter of Sittius' bond.

³²¹ i.e. for Cicero to attend to the matter.

³²² *sed quoniam suspicaris minus certa fide eos esse quos tibi misi, tamquam procurator sic agas rogo.*

³²³ Possibly in light of his previous *repeated* requests (Hall, 2009, p. 7).

³²⁴ Hall, 2009, p. 10.

³²⁵ Such as Domitius and Scipio.

ad fam. VIII.7 (SB 92) – Rome, the day after the preceeding

Caelius begins section 1 by contrasting Cicero's desire to leave the province with his own desire for the proconsul to return, and affects a conversational and light-hearted tone (*quam cito tu istinc decedere cupias nescio; ego quidem eo magis quo adhuc felicius res gessisti*). He emphasises both Cicero and himself with the redundant use of *tu* and *ego*, while also eliding the words *eo magis*.³²⁶ He again references the threat of a Parthian war as "torture" (*periculo cruciabor*), though it would seem far less seriously in this instance, as Caelius does not want this fear to disturb his "laughter" (*dum istic eris, de belli Parthici periculo cruciabor, ne hunc risum meum metus aliqui perturbet*). This is directly contrasted with what Caelius wrote in SB 83.1,³²⁷ and the extended sequence of SB 87.1 which he dedicates to the subject. The use of *cruciabor*, a relatively rare word,³²⁸ is a good example of metaphorical language which here adds to Caelius' sarcasm. According to Tyrrell and Purser, the laughter which Caelius fears losing could be in reference to C. Lucilius Hirrus (*RE* 25), or to "the general laugh he is perpetually indulging in against the mad world".³²⁹ While laughter at the world has potential, laughter at Hirrus seems unlikely given Caelius wrote to Cicero just the day before (in SB 91.2) that he must thank Hirrus for not obstructing proceedings regarding supplications. A more fitting explanation seems to be laughter at the gossip he is about to relay. Before getting into the letter proper, Caelius makes his excuses for writing so briefly and so soon after the previous letter, making sure that Cicero knows he has already sent another, of a more appropriate length.³³⁰ He shows

³²⁶ Shackleton Bailey (1977 Commentary p. 422) writes that with *eo magis* "understand *cupio ut cito decedas*. No doubt *citius* would have been neater than *magis*, but slipshod writing is quite in Caelius' manner". The reference to Cicero's successful military campaign here (as identified by Tyrrell & Purser [1914, v. 3 p. 167]) will be discussed momentarily.

³²⁷ *ego quidem vehementer animi pendeo*.

³²⁸ *crucio* and its forms appear only twice in the *ad familiares* and only seven times throughout Cicero's *Letters*; Oldfather, Canter, Abbott, 1965, p. 177.

³²⁹ Tyrrell & Purser 1914 v. 3 p. 168. For an example, according to Shackleton Bailey (1977 Commentary, p. 422), see *ad fam.* VIII.14.4 (SB 97).

³³⁰ *breuiores has litteras properanti publicanorum tabellario subito dedi. tuo liberto pluribus verbis scriptas pridie dederam*.

an awareness here, that on its own, a letter such as this would not be appropriate due to its length and content, and picks an appropriate place in the letter to give his apologies.³³¹

In section 2, Caelius writes that he has nothing to justify a letter, except for pure gossip, which he claims Cicero *definitely* wants (*res autem novae nullae sane acciderunt, nisi haec vis tibi scribi—quae certe vis*). There is a sense of real sarcasm here. Even if Cicero would find the information interesting or entertaining, Caelius is flagging it as unimportant. He includes the simple report of a marriage engagement (Q. Cornificius [RE 8] to the daughter of Aurelia Orestilla [RE 261]),³³² and adds the editorialising report of a divorce *sine causa* involving Paulla Valeria, sister of one Triarius.³³³ This, alongside Caelius' attendant report that the divorce of her husband occurred on the day of his return from his province, her immediate engagement to D. Iunius Brutus Albinus (RE 55a, Supb. 5), and a subsequent description of the whole affair as *incredibilia*, shows Caelius' disapproving opinion. In addition, Caelius relates the unbelievable affair of Servius Ocella,³³⁴ being caught twice in three days where he ought not to be (*multa in hoc genere incredibilia te absente acciderunt. Servius Ocella nemini persuasisset se moechum esse nisi triduo bis deprehensus esset*). He leaves further details for Cicero to find for himself. Cicero's enquiries, he says, he will find entertaining, because he is titillated by the idea of an *imperator* looking into this trivial gossip (*quaeres ubi. ubi hercules ego minime vellem. relinquo tibi quod ab aliis quaeras; neque enim displicet mihi imperatorem singulos percontari cum qua sit aliqui deprehensus*). The use of *hercules* here and the double negative in *neque enim displicet* are tools to convey a conversational tone and emphasise Caelius' enjoyment in the gossip. Interestingly, this is the first (extant) acknowledgement

³³¹ Trapp, 2003, p. 36.

³³² It should be noted that Aurelia Orestilla was previously married to Catiline (Shackleton Bailey 1977 Commentary p. 422). On Aurelia Orestilla, see Shackleton Bailey, 1995, 21. Orestilla appears in a later letter of Cicero to Papirius Paetus in a discussion regarding obscenities (*ad fam.* IX.22.4 [SB 189]). According to Shackleton Bailey (1977 Commentary v. 2 p. 333), Tyrrell and Purser had identified the name as chosen at random, though Münzer's (RE XIII, 1394, 2) identification with the wife of Catiline is doubtless correct. For further reference to Q. Cornificius in the Ciceronian corpus, see Shackleton Bailey, 1995, p. 42.

³³³ The identity of Triarius is not certain (see Shackleton Bailey 1977 Commentary p. 422).

³³⁴ His identity is not certain, according to Shackleton Bailey (1977 Commentary v. 1 p. 423). See also Shackleton Bailey 1995 p. 73.

of Cicero's new title, *imperator*.³³⁵ It is curious that Cicero writes to the younger man as *aedile*, yet Caelius makes no apparent acknowledgement nor extends his congratulations, as one might expect, particularly given the high degree of importance attributed to forms of address. It might be noted in this context, that Cicero acknowledges and congratulates Caelius in *ad fam.* II.9 (SB 85) after learning of the younger man's election as curule aedile; *M. CICERO PRO COS. S. D. M. CAELIO AEDILI CURULI DESIGNATO*.³³⁶ Since relationships and social context affect address usage,³³⁷ it would appear that Caelius feels no need to stroke Cicero's ego here.

So, Caelius appears as a man revelling in gossip. His fear of the Parthians, expressed playfully in this instance, can only affect his pleasure in reporting the latest scandals, a sequence of "incredible" events (engagements, divorces and affairs) which he knows and acknowledges are of no real importance. He seems incredulous of the behaviour of those he reports on, and is content to use Cicero's honour as *imperator* as a source of greater entertainment, rather than offer the deference or due congratulations one might expect.

³³⁵ Cicero first uses the title as part of his address in *ad fam.* II.10 (SB 86) in November 51, again in *ad fam.* II.14 (SB 89) the following March, and yet again in *ad fam.* II.11 (SB 90) early April.

³³⁶ Dickey, 2002, p. 2.

³³⁷ Dickey, 2002, p. 7.

Section 1 begins with Caelius congratulating Cicero on his daughter Tullia's engagement to P. Cornelius Dolabella (*RE* 141). He heavily emphasises his own positive opinion of the man by using the standard phrase *me dius fidius* and by the redundant use of *ego* (*gratulor tibi adfinitatem viri me dius fidius optimi; nam hoc ego de illo existimo*). He sings Dolabella's praises as a man who is amenable to the positive influences of both Cicero and his daughter (*consuetudine atque auctoritate tua, pudore Tulliae, si qua restabunt, confido celeriter sublatum iri*), and in so doing, he also pays a compliment to Cicero's *consuetudo* and *auctoritas*, and to Tullia's *pudor*.³³⁸ It should be noted that, as pointed out by Shackleton Bailey, Cicero did not take most positively to Caelius' use of *pudore*, substituting *prudencia* instead in his reply.³³⁹ So Caelius may appear too loose in his register, misjudging Cicero's receptivity when it came to discussing Tullia. This letter, so far, appears quite the contrast to that previous letter (SB 88.2), when Caelius spoke so coyly of the potential match. Now it is out in the open and the match is made, he appears much more comfortable extolling Dolabella's virtues and selling him positively to Cicero, now without fear of what it might mean for the Cilician governor's reputation.³⁴⁰ His opinion of Dolabella is brought up again in closing out the section, as he emphasises his own good judgement, including again the redundant use of *ego*, and the intensifying adverb *valde* (*deinde, quod maximum est, ego illum valde amo*).

In section 2, Caelius now turns to the recurrent and pressing matter of Caesar's provincial command, firstly with regard to C. Scribonius Curio (*RE* 11). He refers to the man as "our Curio", with the possessive adjective showing a sense of admiration as the man has successfully utilised his tribunician veto (*voles scire Curionem nostrum lautum intercessionis de provinciis exitum habuisse*).³⁴¹ Caelius is pleased with the defeat of the

³³⁸ See Shackleton Bailey 1977 Commentary pp. 424–425.

³³⁹ *ad fam.* II.15.2 (SB 96).

³⁴⁰ Now, Caelius' words appear much more in line with those of Pliny in letter 1.14. Caelius is going to great lengths to sell Dolabella as Pliny would sell Minucius Acilianus.

³⁴¹ Madsen, 1981, pp. 131–132.

proposal of the consul M. Marcellus (*RE* 216) that the tribunes ought to be dealt with.³⁴² Caelius must have been seriously relieved.³⁴³ Furthermore, as Caelius continues to relate, the senate resolved that Caesar can stand for the consulship while keeping his army and provinces—a resolution certain to cause serious tension, about which Caelius shows no concern. He turns to the state of Pompey’s health, possibly in a metaphorically poor state as a result of the current situation (*stomacho est scilicet Pompeius Magnus nunc ita languenti ut vix id quod sibi placeat reperiat*), which, along with his sarcastic use of *Magnus*,³⁴⁴ points towards Caelius’ flippant attitude and his general approval of the outcome of Curio’s actions. He mentions further epistolary communication to come while comfortable enough to employ ellipsis (*quem ad modum hoc Pompeius laturus sit, cum cognoscam*: “to what extent Pompey would bear this, when I know [I will tell you]” [my trans.]), and follows up writing that the impending conflict is no concern to him (*quidnam rei publicae futurum sit, si aut non curet aut armis resistat vos senes divites videritis*), possibly as a form of self-deprecation regarding his own lack of funds to lose in the war or after it.³⁴⁵

So, Caelius presents as a man concerned with Cicero’s making useful connections, singing Dolabella’s praises and complimenting both Cicero and Tullia’s good qualities, emphasising his own sound judgement, while also appearing a little *too* comfortable when talking of Cicero’s beloved daughter. Indeed, the whole letter has a carefree tone, as he continues to display a flippant attitude to serious political developments in Rome, showing

³⁴² Shackleton Bailey is surely right to suggest that Marcellus was threatening their suspension from office or more serious coercive action on the part of the Senate. Shackleton Bailey 2001 Loeb p. 418 n. 2; cf. Lacey, 1961, pp. 328–329.

³⁴³ Gruen (1974, pp. 482–483) provides an excellent summary of the situation. Marcellus was effectively forced to act against Curio, which the Senate overwhelmingly voted against in the interests of preserving peace.

³⁴⁴ Shackleton Bailey (1977 Commentary v. 1 p. 425) writes “Caelius uses Pompey’s honorific cognomen nowhere else and evidently uses it here in irony”. For other sarcastic reactions to the *cognomen*, see Plut. *Crass.* 7.1. It should be noted, of course, that Pompey was seriously ill at about this time (Shackleton Bailey 1977 Commentary p. 425).

³⁴⁵ See Tyrrell & Purser, 1914 p. 251.

he is happy about what has eventually transpired, and an offhand attitude towards Pompey, Cicero, and the *senes dives*.

In section 1, Caelius begins with obvious hyperbole, comparing the capture of the Parthian King Arsaces, and the storming of Seleucia as *nothing* in comparison to the joy of seeing L. Domitius Ahenobarbus (RE 27) defeated in the augural elections (*tanti non fuit Arsacen capere et Seleuceam expugnare ut earum rerum quae hic gestae sunt spectaculo careres*).³⁴⁶ Caelius repeatedly emphasises the pleasure he himself feels at the situation, evidenced by the aforementioned hyperbole, followed by his talk of eyes never suffering again (*numquam tibi oculi doluissent si in repulsa Domiti vultum vidisses*), and the report of Domitius now hating him (*itaque mihi est Domitius inimicissimus, ut ne familiarem quidem suum quemquam tam oderit quam me*). He shows no concern for Domitius' animosity, and even goes further, revelling in his own actions, showing his support for M. Antonius (RE 30), the victor, in helping to secure his election and denying Domitius by so narrow a margin (*atque eo magis quod per iniuriam sibi * putat ereptum cuius ego auctor fuerim. nunc furit tam gavisos homines suum dolorem unumque me Curionem studiosiorem Antoni*).³⁴⁷ He continues with the theme of Domitius, reporting that one Cn. Sentius Saturninus has been charged by Domitius' son, Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus (RE 23).³⁴⁸ However, Caelius does not allow this development to dampen his spirits, as he remains optimistic, since one Sextus Peducaeus had recently been acquitted on, presumably, a similar charge.³⁴⁹

³⁴⁶ For details of the electoral defeat, see Broughton, *Also-Rans* p. 51.

³⁴⁷ Note that Shackleton Bailey (1977 Commentary v. 1 pp. 429–430) would supply in the lacuna (*quod per iniuriam sibi ... ereptum*) the word *pontificatum* instead of the usual *auguratum*. If accepted, this would mean that Domitius had failed earlier to win a place as pontifex and was now doubly frustrated in failing to win one as an augur. For further discussion, see Shackleton Bailey, "The Grievance of L. Domitius Ahenobarbus" in *Illinois Classical Studies* 2 (1977) pp. 224–228.

³⁴⁸ Shackleton Bailey (1977 Commentary v. 1 p. 2) suggests he was a friend of Curio convicted of *vis* in support of Antony (Cic. *Phil.* 2.4). Shackleton Bailey also identifies him with the ill-reputed *nobilis puer Saturninus* of Val. Max. 9.1.8. For further details on the prosecution, see Alexander, *Trials* p. 167 (no. 346).

³⁴⁹ *quod iudicium nunc in expectatione est, etiam in bona spe post Sex. Peducaei absolutionem*; according to Shackleton Bailey, the details of this trial are unknown, and the identity of the defendant is not certain, though he is certain that this man is different to Cicero's friend Sextus Peducaeus, praetor in 77, and his son (Shackleton Bailey 1977 Commentary p. 431). On the trial, see Alexander, *Trials* p. 168 (no. 350).

In section 2, Caelius' shifts the tone of his letter. He calls to mind the previous letters he has written regarding the looming conflict between Pompey and Caesar, and recounts the issue at hand, forestalling any ambiguity:

*de summa re publica saepe tibi scripsi me in annum pacem
non videre ... propositum hoc est de quo qui rerum potiuntur
sunt dimicaturi, quod Cn. Pompeius constituit non pati C.
Caesarem consulem aliter fieri nisi exercitum et provincias
tradiderit, Caesari autem persuasum est se salvum esse non
posse si ab exercitu recesserit.*³⁵⁰

He then reports the alternative being put forward by Caesar,³⁵¹ that *both* Caesar and Pompey surrender their armies,³⁵² which Caelius appears to think is a good idea, particularly given how he continues with the rather striking line, "So this is what their love affair, their scandalous union, has come to—not covert backbiting, but outright war!" (SB trans.).³⁵³ The implication here is that Caelius thinks very little of the history between the two dynasts, and of the men themselves. He is quite unimpressed, and so writes of them in a derogatory fashion. He is obviously concerned with what this upcoming conflict will mean for him personally, and by writing that he is unsure what course to take (*neque mearum rerum quid consili capiam reperio*) after expressing his unhappiness, Caelius suggests that he resents the choice he sees himself having to make, and what this could mean for his relationship with Cicero (*quod non dubito quin te quoque haec deliberatio sit perturbatura*). His thoughts are neatly summed up in the last sentence of the section: "I have ties of obligation and friendship with these people. On the other side, I love the cause but hate the men" (SB trans.). One can discern here a resemblance to deliberative

³⁵⁰ The language of this passage, and the section at large, gives a moderate tone. Gone is Caelius' excitement from section 1.

³⁵¹ See also Caesar, *Bellum Civile* 1.9.3: *cum litteras ad senatum miserit, ut omnes ab exercitibus discederent.*

³⁵² *fert illam tamen condicionem, ut ambo exercitus tradant.*

³⁵³ *sic illi amores et invidiosa coniunctio non ad occultam recidit obtrectationem sed ad bellum se erumpit.*

oratory, alongside “the Academic notion of setting out both sides of a case to enable the probable view to emerge”.³⁵⁴

In section 3, Caelius ruminates and philosophises on what course of action he ought to take, weighing up the considerations. He contrasts the honour of standing up for ‘what is right’ when the situation is safe, in an ideal world, with opting for personal safety at the expense of principles, given the danger of physical violence.³⁵⁵ It should be noted that in this section Caelius does credit Cicero with the faculties to have worked this out for himself, as a way to persuade Cicero to take the implied advice he is passing on. Caelius is not simply musing to himself but trying to persuade his correspondent towards the same way of thinking. This can be seen as a reaffirmation of Cicero’s “face”. Caelius builds up to a point here, suggesting which direction he is leaning, particularly after repeatedly foreshadowing war in some of his previous letters, and by providing the facts as he sees them (*exercitum conferendum non esse*): Caesar is the safer option. The last line suggests, however, that he still remains undecided, even if leaning towards Caesar.³⁵⁶ Caelius weighing up and discussing the pros and cons of his choices shows him largely concerned with his own personal situation and how he and his safety will be affected.³⁵⁷

In section 4, Caelius returns to a lighter tone, similar to that employed at the beginning of the letter. He writes that the gossip he is about to share is the best reason he has for writing (*prope oblitus sum quod maxime fuit scribendum*), an obviously tongue-in-cheek statement, as the gossip hardly registers when compared to the grave issues discussed in sections 2 and 3. He mocks Appius Claudius Pulcher (*RE* 297) for his actions as censor, describing them as “wonders” (*scis Appium censorem hic ostenta facere*).³⁵⁸ He

³⁵⁴ *nam mihi cum hominibus his et gratia et necessitudines; cum causam illam amo unde homines odi*; for further detail and other examples from the Ciceronian corpus, see Hutchinson, 1998, p. 148.

³⁵⁵ *illud te non arbitror fugere, quin homines in dissensione domestica debeant, quam diu civiliter sine armis certetur, honestiorem sequi partem; ubi ad bellum et castra ventum sit, firmiorem, et id melius statuere quod tutius sit*; see Hall, 2009, pp. 6–7.

³⁵⁶ *omnino satis spati est ad considerandas utriusque copias et eligendas utriusque copias et eligendam partem*.

³⁵⁷ This idea of self-interest is also identified by Hutchinson (Hutchinson, *op. cit.* p. 142).

³⁵⁸ On Pulcher’s rigorous censorship, see Broughton, *MRR* 2.247–248.

goes on to list what these wonders looked like, repeatedly employing *de* to emphatically spell out Appius' targets (*de signis et tabulis, de agri modo, de aere alieno acerrime agere?*). This gossip appears interesting enough to Cicero as he later requests further detail on the matter from Atticus.³⁵⁹ Heavily metaphorical language follows (*persuasum est ei censuram lomentum aut nitrum esse*), and so entertaining does he find Appius' actions that he urges Cicero to return as soon as possible that he might share in the laughter (*curre, per deos atque homines, et quam primum haec risum veni*).³⁶⁰ The target of their laughter will be the apparent hypocrisy of M. Livius Drusus Claudianus (*RE* 19) who is trying offences under the *lex Scantinia*.³⁶¹ Caelius goes on to give the censor a second lashing (*Appium de tabulis et signis agere*). The repetition (and inversion of the order) of *de tabulis et signis* obviously serves to emphasise Caelius' fixation on the hypocrisy of Appius' actions regarding works of art. This must have particularly resonated with Cicero who had accused Appius of looting the artworks of Greece in 57 BCE (*omnia signa, tabulas, ornamentorum ... deportavit*). Again, Caelius calls on Cicero to make haste (*crede mihi, est properandum*), twice in the one section, betraying a clear desire to see the man again, expressing a wish for his company. Caelius appears to be expressing the sentiment here that a letter is not adequate for sharing and conveying the pleasure of events in Rome, so Cicero must experience them for himself.³⁶² The connection between Caelius and Cicero is suggested again through the use of *Curio noster* as Caelius reports the man's good sense in not opposing the payment of Pompey's troops (*Curio noster sapienter id*

³⁵⁹ *ad Att.* VI.9.5 (SB 123)—though note that Cicero avoids mentioning Caelius as his source (see White, 2010 p. 84). Shackleton Bailey puts it quite nicely in his commentary on the letter to Atticus: "Appius was harrying art collectors among others" (Shackleton Bailey 1977 Commentary v. 3 p. 276).

³⁶⁰ Note also the striking use of *per deos atque homines*, calling on both gods and men.

³⁶¹ According to the interpretation of Shackleton Bailey, Drusus appears to be a notorious offender under the *lex Scantinia* (1977 Commentary p. 433). Alexander (*Trials* p. 168, n. 2) points out that the phrase *apud Drusum fieri* could refer to Drusus being either a praetor or a juror, preferring the former. For sources on the *lex Scantinia* which Giovanni Rotondi dates tentatively to 149 BCE (but which Shackleton Bailey [1977 Commentary v. 1 p. 433] prefers to leave as of uncertain date) and an adumbrated discussion of its provisions, see Rotondi, 1966, p. 293.

³⁶² Expressing a desire for a physical meeting in the last section of the letter is certainly an appropriate place for it. This desire is often expressed as epistolary communication but is something of an inferior substitute (no matter how earnestly the correspondents attempt to close the distance); see further Trapp 2003, p. 36.

quod remisit de stipendio Pompei fecisse existimatur).³⁶³ Finally, the importance of sections 2 and 3 is again demonstrated as Caelius sums up.³⁶⁴ He cannot resist returning to the looming conflict again, and makes further mention of the impending use of violence as the ultimate factor to be considered (*quas ferrum et vis iudicabit*). The physical violence is his greatest concern, and he laments this facet of the conflict in his closing statement. He would enjoy the ‘fight’ and find it extremely interesting, provided his life were not threatened (*si sine suo periculo fieri posset, magnum et iucundum tibi Fortuna spectaculum parabat*).³⁶⁵

Caelius can be seen in this letter juxtaposing gossip that he relishes with serious worry for the future. The misfortune of Domitius, which Caelius is pleased to say he had a hand in, clearly brings him joy, and he is all too happy to share this with Cicero. The man’s hatred and having inflamed an enemy elicits no fear in Caelius. What *does* elicit fear, however, is the looming conflict between Pompey and Caesar. Most of all, Caelius appears to care for his personal safety and betrays his leaning towards Caesar, the safer option, though he clearly resents the necessity of the choice and would much rather enjoy watching the conflict play out. One gets the impression that without a physical threat to his safety, Caelius would be more than content to report the details of the conflict as gossip, just as he does regarding Appius. He pulls no punches against the censor, highlighting how little he thought of the man’s actions, an opinion he knows all too well Cicero shares, finding them and those of Drusus to be highly hypocritical.

³⁶³ According to Shackleton Bailey (1977 Commentary v. 1 p. 433), Curio had either used or threatened to use his tribunician veto against a measure authorizing pay for Pompey’s troops.

³⁶⁴ *ad summam, quaeris quid putem futurum*.

³⁶⁵ Shackleton Bailey writes that the use of *suo* in this instance, is “an extreme example of Caelius’ careless writing” (Shackleton Bailey Commentary v. 1 p. 433). Indeed, he translates *suo* as “personal” in his Loeb edition. There is some scholarly debate regarding this word, with emendations including *summo* and *tuo* being suggested. Pinkster accepts *suo*, though not Shackleton Bailey’s interpretation, preferring to take *suo* with *Fortuna* rather than *periculo* to render the clause as “without the risk that is typically involved when Fate does its work.” Though this makes no great difference, Pinkster identifies this as a “unique expression” rather than accepting Shackleton Bailey’s charge of extreme carelessness on Caelius’ part (Pinkster, 2010, pp. 193–195).

ad fam. VIII.12 (SB 98) – Rome, ca. 19 September (with postscript added later) 50

This letter was written over a month after the previous letter (SB 97). Caelius was using the same courier, Acastus, who as he discovered to his chagrin, had not yet set out. There is one central theme to this epistle: Caelius' run in with the censor, Appius Claudius Pulcher (*RE* 297), whose time in office he had ridiculed in the previous correspondence.³⁶⁶

In section 1, Caelius begins quite forcefully, writing of the shame he feels to communicate and complain to Cicero about Appius, whom he characterises as “a most disagreeable man” (my trans.).³⁶⁷ Caelius is clearly upset that Appius is now working against him in light of his previous services on behalf of the censor.³⁶⁸ He denigrates Appius, accusing him of waging a “secret war”, though not being competent enough to keep Caelius from finding out and *easily* observing him (*occultum bellum mihi indixit, ita occultum tamen ut multi mihi renuntiarent et ipse facile animadverterem male eum de me cogitare*). To create tension, Caelius builds an image of who is arrayed against him in addition to the censor, mentioning both L. Domitius Ahenobarbus (*RE* 27), another “hostile man”, and Pompey himself (*cum L. Domitio, ut nunc est, mihi inimicissimo homine, deliberare, velle hoc munusculum deferre Cn. Pompeio*). The report of Domitius and Appius working together against Caelius as “a small gift” to Pompey suggests that Caelius was not popular with the dynast, and as a result he finds three important figures arrayed in hostility against him. He conveys his sense of injustice at the situation, writing that he could not lower himself to ask a man whom he thought already under an obligation, to leave him be.³⁶⁹

Section 2 begins with a rhetorical question (*quid ergo est?*), which Caelius employs here, signalling a change in tone. He now takes action in the narrative and explains how he

³⁶⁶ *ad fam.* VIII.14.4 (SB 97). See Shackleton Bailey, 1977 Commentary v. 1 p. 434 on the chronology and the courier, and below.

³⁶⁷ *pudet me tibi confiteri et queri de Appi, hominis ingratisissimi, iniuriis*; as Shackleton Bailey says, this is “in view of earlier sentiments and behaviours favourable to Appius” (Shackleton Bailey 1977 Commentary p. 434), such as those expressed in *ad fam.* VIII.6 (SB 88).

³⁶⁸ (Tyrrell & Purser 1914, v. 3 p. 266).

³⁶⁹ *ipsum reprehenderem et ab eo deprecarer iniuriam quem vitam mihi debere putaram impetrare a me non potui*.

has acted in response. Caelius reports that he began making enquiries, but these are sure to revolve around those services he has performed for Appius,³⁷⁰ and he also approaches Appius' censorial colleague, L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus (*RE* 90), a man whom he did not know and who did not like him, on account of his friendship with Cicero (*homini alienissimo mihi et propter amicitiam tuam non aequissimo*),³⁷¹ so Caelius has had to put himself out as a direct result of Appius' actions. The annoyance he feels is firmly driven home as he refers to the problematic censor as a monkey,³⁷² and he is so offended by the man's ingratitude that anything would be preferable to seeing him face to face in supplication (*me obligare quam illius simiae vultum subire*). Appius is characterised as overreacting upon learning of Caelius' actions: "he flew into a rage and went on bawling" (SB trans.),³⁷³ particularly given Caelius' statement that the issue related to a *small* matter of money (*si mihi in pecunia minus satis fecisset*). In the final sentence of the section, Caelius mentions that Appius went to such drastic measures as to hire a 'professional prosecutor' (*postea non destitit accersere Polam Servium accusatorem*). The implication being that this man, Pola Servius (*RE* 5), was a particularly unpleasant fellow and hardly a good reflection on Appius.³⁷⁴

In section 3, the topic shifts to what Appius and his allies hoped to accomplish, which was to bring a charge against Caelius. He continues that when they could not find one, they summoned him under the *lex Scantinia*, a law which dealt with improper sexual

³⁷⁰ *qui testes erant meorum in illum meritorum*.

³⁷¹ And indeed, Shackleton Bailey writes that the "enmity between L. Piso and Cicero which began in 59 was evidently still in being" (Shackleton Bailey Commentary p. 434).

³⁷² Why Appius is labelled as a monkey (and the precise force of that description, clearly unfavourable) is not immediately clear. They could be regarded as ugly (e.g. see Martial, *Epigrams* 7.87.4) (which would create an interesting contrast with Pulcher), as caricatures of a man, or even as an imitator. For references to these animals in Rome, usually as pets or performers, see Toynbee, 1973, pp. 55–60.

³⁷³ ***excanduit et me causam inimicitiarum quaerere clamitavit***.

³⁷⁴ cf. Cicero *Brut* 130–131, where Cicero writes quite disparagingly regarding two *accusatores*. The *OLD* ("accusator" 2) gives "professional" as one of the meanings for this word, though in this case it may not be a literal profession, rather just an insult. Douglas (1966, p. 106) writes regarding the use of *accusator* as "almost an occupational title" (my emphasis).

practices. To add insult to injury, he relates that he has been summoned at the height of his very own aedilician games in the Circus.³⁷⁵

*quibus cum parum procederet ut illa lege mihi ponerent
accusatorem, compellari ea lege me voluerunt qua dicere
non poterant: insolentissimi homines summis Circensibus
ludis meis postulandum me lege Scantinia curant.*

Caelius' response is sudden, emphasised with the use of *vix*. He emphasises himself with the use of *ego* while sarcastically employing Appius' official title to show the gravity of what he (Caelius) had done, namely to counter-charge Appius under the same law (*vix hoc erat Pola elocutus cum ego Appium censorem eadem lege postulavi*).³⁷⁶ According to Caelius, the reaction to this was better than any sight he had seen before (*quod melius caderet nihil vidi*), so bringing his narrative to a crescendo. His achievement is duly emphasised, as he writes that all people, not merely the lowest orders, approve of his manoeuvre (*nam sic est a populo et non infimo quoque approbatum*), and he details the fallout, namely that Appius was more upset with the scandal than the charge itself.³⁷⁷ He continues with the cherry on the cake, another charge he has brought against the censor regarding a public shrine in his house (*praeterea coepi sacellum, in domo quod est, ab eo petere*).³⁷⁸

That would have been the end of the letter as Caelius intended, but section 4, a postscript, was added, possibly in Caelius' own hand when he discovered SB 97 had not yet left Rome.³⁷⁹ The first line clearly demonstrates Caelius' displeasure with Acastus,

³⁷⁵ It seems that the *lex Scantinia*, a law concerned with sexual activity involving an *ingenuus*, that is, a freeborn male, was (at least in this instance) open to abuse as a tool for political harassment and malicious prosecution (Fantham, 1991, pp. 286–287). For a discussion of the nuances of this law and its interpretation, see Walters, 1997, pp. 33–35. On the trial, see Alexander, *Trial*s pp. 167–168 (no. 347).

³⁷⁶ See Alexander, *Trial*s p. 168 (no. 348).

³⁷⁷ *ut maiorem Appio dolorem fama quam postulatio attulerit.*

³⁷⁸ "That a censor should be found to have appropriated public property—a censor who ought to have vindicated the rights of the State in any such case of appropriation—was especially disgraceful" (Tyrrell & Purser 1914. v. 3 p. 268). On the case, see Alexander, *Trial*s p. 169 (no. 351).

³⁷⁹ Shackleton Bailey's introductory comment to this letter bears reproducing in full: "The fact that the messenger (Acastus) who carried this letter left Rome on 23 September (see previous letter, intr. note)

Cicero's slave and the courier (*conturbat me mora servi huius qui tibi litteras attulit; nam acceptis prioribus litteris amplius dies quadraginta mansit*), while interestingly, showing no concern that the man may have read it before completing the delivery.³⁸⁰ In mentioning the courier's inaction as the cause for the delay between letters, Caelius also absolves himself of guilt, lest Cicero think he has not taken as much care as would be expected in their epistolary relationship: Cicero may have expected a letter, and one was duly written and would have been in the governor's hands, but for this bearer's unacceptable delay.³⁸¹ Caelius admits that he does not know what else to write,³⁸² and indeed, a significant portion of what he *does* write is in doubt.³⁸³ What remains is a clear and insistent desire to see Cicero and resume their face-to-face relationship (*te exspecto valde et quam primum videre cupio*).³⁸⁴ This need for Cicero's physical presence is followed up by a wish for Cicero's support, probably in relation to the matters discussed in sections 1 to 3 of this letter. This can be seen as an appeal for mutual support, as Caelius closes by reminding Cicero how he has similarly supported him and his interests.³⁸⁵ Absolving himself of epistolary guilt while earnestly wishing to see Cicero in Rome again serves to reduce the distance between the two correspondents and to further cultivate their political and social relationship.³⁸⁶

Examining this letter shows Caelius as a man strongly incensed, not at censorial attention from Appius, but at censorial attention from a man whom he believed owed him

supplies a *terminus ante quem*. Section 4 being evidently a postscript added after a considerable interval (n.b. *quid tibi scribam nescio*), Caelius must be supposed to have kept it by him for two or three days before he 'posted' it. Only then did he discover that Acastus, whom he had supposed to have left with his previous letter six weeks previously, was still in Rome. He therefore reopened the letter and added section 4" (Shackleton Bailey 1977 Commentary p. 98).

³⁸⁰ It is well established that who, apart from the addressee, might see the content of a letter was of particular concern to correspondents, and these concerns extended to letter bearers (see White, 2010, pp. 13–14).

³⁸¹ This slave's failure is particularly striking, given the important and integral role slaves and secretaries had in epistolary communication (White, 2010 pp. 15–16).

³⁸² *quid tibi scribam nescio*.

³⁸³ For details on possible emendations and interpretations of the text at this point, see Shackleton Bailey 1977 Commentary pp. 335–336.

³⁸⁴ He both eagerly awaits, and desires to see Cicero as soon as possible,

³⁸⁵ As he does, for example, with C. Lucilius Hirrus (*RE* 25); see *ad fam.* VIII.9 (SB 82).

³⁸⁶ Hall, 2009, p. 14.

a debt, either monetary or in terms of favours, and who unjustly attempted to prosecute him on a charge that would bring scandal. Caelius displays quite a different way of thinking when Appius' hostile gaze is turned to him personally, given that he had viewed the censor's role roughly six weeks previously as a source of immense entertainment. Now, the situation is patently more serious, and he paints quite a worried picture of what is arrayed against him, and his clearly passionate anger at the man comes through very strongly. His own legal achievements, roundly hailed by those in Rome, however, appear to end the rising tension he builds, demonstrating clearly his own accomplishments. Caelius shows himself as supremely concerned with his epistolary relationship with Cicero, going so far as to add a postscript explaining any perceived laxity in his letter-writing obligations, and seeks to reinforce his political and social relationship with his friend in order to guarantee his support.

Conclusion

In conclusion, what have we learnt about M. Caelius Rufus? What have the letters revealed of his social and/or political thought?

First, he appears legitimately concerned with maintaining his relationship with Cicero. Throughout Caelius' letters there are numerous wishes for Cicero to be back in Rome where they might share in experiences, and he is keen to not disappoint Cicero, as evidenced by how he writes concerning the packets of news prepared for the Cilician governor. He is also keen that these do the job of keeping Cicero informed, and similarly, as the episode with Acastus shows, he cares deeply for what Cicero thinks of his efforts. He does not, for instance, want to get the blame for a tardily dispatched letter. And, he shows a fairly consistent concern with Cicero's safety in Cilicia and his reputation at home. For example, he is careful to protect Cicero from scandal involving the potential engagement to Dolabella by remaining coy and tight-lipped in the first instance, though when the upcoming marriage to Tullia becomes public knowledge, Caelius employs superlatives and extravagant expressions aplenty.

The relationship Caelius has with Cicero appears quite strong, or at least Caelius *thinks* it is. He often uses an extravagant and conversational tone, employing rare, evocative words and sometimes coining his own (for example, his reference to the *subrostrani* in SB 77). He sometimes glosses over important political developments and matters of particular interest to Cicero, such as the reception of the *de Republica*, believing they are close enough that he need not praise Cicero excessively and can instead write about gossip and his own political concerns (i.e. his battle for the aedileship with Hirrus). Most tellingly, however, is the way in which Caelius asks for favours. Originally, he is quite insistent, almost rude, in requesting panthers for his games. He rarely employs facework tactics to mollify Cicero in order to make up for the way in which he almost shames the man, particularly when he compares Cicero's lack of accommodation with the assistance Curio duly provided with regard to the supply of panthers.

Caelius, however, can definitely misjudge their relationship. Most obviously, he gets no panthers from Cicero in the end (with notably different reasons provided to Caelius and Atticus when Cicero deigns to respond). Interestingly, in the final request he makes for the beasts, Caelius tones down his desire when it becomes apparent his previous tactics are not working. Gone are features such as the double negative comparing how many panthers Curio sends him with how few (zero) he has had from Cicero. He also appears to make a miscalculation with regard to Tullia, speaking perhaps a little too casually regarding Cicero's daughter.

It is clear that Caelius recognises serious situations and threatening developments both in, and outside, Rome. There is a marked difference in his regular epistolary style and how he discusses the threat of both Gauls and Parthians (except for the notable exception when he wishes for war with Parthia to alleviate his boredom—an example of ghoulish overkill). Oftentimes, there is an absence of pleonasm and syncopation/brevity, and the use of vivid metaphorical imagery (e.g. *pendeo*) only serves to emphasise the sense of worry. Caelius adopts a sober and restrained tone as Rome spirals closer to civil war, though not universally. In many instances he is more likely to denigrate many of the major players and let his contempt for the whole situation shine through, as in SB 94 when he mentions “the digestion of Pompey the Great”. He is clearly sarcastic in his use of the *cognomen*. Ultimately, Caelius resents that he will be forced to choose sides in a conflict he despises. In a moment of striking flippancy, he even claims the forthcoming civil war would be an entertaining prospect, were it not for the threat to his personal safety.

Regarding politics, Caelius' thoughts appear far from one-dimensional. As he himself deliberates to Cicero, he loves the cause of the *optimates*, but despises the men. He is genuinely impressed with the conduct of Curio and values the man's friendship (see for example, the repeated use of *noster*), though he is disapproving of the actions of both Pompey and Caesar which brought them here—*illi amores et invidiosa coniunctio* (SB 97.2). Ultimately, safety and ties of friendship appear to lead him towards the Caesarians.

Contrasting with his general sobriety about the serious political situation, is Caelius' glee at the misfortunes of others and the genuine pleasure he takes in sharing gossip. He is far from humble in victory as he happily celebrates his election over Hirrus, and again, in the final letter with regard to Appius after a successful and scandalous outmanoeuvre. Ostensibly, he even writes one whole (albeit short) letter for the sole purpose of sharing with Cicero the details of scandalous affairs and divorces in Rome—matters of no real consequence, especially given the looming prospect of civil war.

Finally, what I find to be the most intriguing observation, is that Caelius appears to have despised delay and stagnation. He is frustrated and cynical about obstruction in the Senate and repeatedly laments the 'frozen' and lethargic state of affairs in Rome, only to come alive when something unexpected and interesting eventuates, such as Curio's sudden change of sides. His own minor day-to-day conflicts with the likes of the "water men" he frames as his sole relief at one point. The following item preserved by Seneca in his *De Ira* has a particular resonance in this respect, an anecdote with which I will bring this study to a close:

*Caelium oratorem fuisse iracundissimum constat. cum quo, ut aiunt, cenabat in cubiculo lectae patientiae cliens, sed difficile erat illi in copulam coniecto rixam eius cum quo cohaerebat effugere; optimum iudicavit quidquid dixisset sequi et secundas agere. non tulit Caelius adsentientem et exclamavit: "dic aliquid contra, ut duo simus!" sed ille quoque, quod non irasceretur, iratus cito sine adversario desit.*³⁸⁷

—Seneca *De Ira* III.viii.6

³⁸⁷ "It is well known that Caelius, the orator, was very hot-tempered. A client of rare forbearance was, as the story goes, once dining with Caelius in his chamber, but it was difficult for him, having got into a quarrel with the companion at his side; so he decided that it was best to agree with whatever Caelius said and to play up to him. Caelius, however, could not endure his compliant attitude, and cried out, "contradict me, that there may be two of us!" But even he, angry because he was not angered, quickly subsided when he had no antagonist" (Basore trans.).

Bibliography

- Abbott, F.F. (ed.), *Selected Letters of Cicero*, Norman 1897.
- Adams, J.N., “Conventions of Naming in Cicero” in *The Classical Quarterly*, 28.1 (1978), p. 145–166.
- Adams, J.N., “Female Speech in Latin Comedy” in *Antichthon* 18 (1984), pp. 43–77.
- Adams, J.N., *Bilingualism in the Latin Language*, Cambridge 2003.
- Alexander, M.C., *Trials in the Late Roman Republic, 149 BC to 50 BC*, Toronto 1990.
- Alexander, M.C., *The Case for the Prosecution in the Ciceronian Era*, Ann Arbor 2002.
- Austin, R.G., *M. Tulli Ciceronis: Pro M. Caelio Oratio*, Oxford 1960.
- Basore, J.W. (trans.), *Seneca: Moral Essays*, v. 1 Loeb 1928.
- Beard, M., “Ciceronian correspondences: making a book out of letters” Wiseman, T.P. (ed.), in *Classics in progress: Essays on ancient Greece and Rome*, Oxford 2002.
- Bellen, H., *Metus Gallicus-Metus Punicus: Zum Furchtmotiv in der römischen Republik*, Stuttgart 1985.
- Broughton, T.R.S., “Candidates Defeated in Roman Elections: Some Ancient Roman “Also-Rans” in *Transactions of the American Philological Society*, vol. 81.4 (1991), pp. 1–64.
- Broughton, T.R.S., *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic*, 3 vols Atlanta 1984.
- Butler, H.E. (trans.), *The Institutio Oratoria of Quintilian*, 4 vols Loeb 1969.
- Butler, S., “Principles of Sound Reading” in Butler, S. & S. Nooter (eds), *Sound and the Ancient Senses*, Abingdon 2019.
- Carcopino, J., *Cicero. The Secrets of his Correspondence*, trans. Lorimer, E.O., v. 1 London 1951.
- Carter, J. (trans.), *Caesar: The Civil War*, Oxford 2008.
- Cary, E. (trans.), *Dio’s Roman History*, 9 vols Loeb 1970.
- Constans, L.A., *Un Correspondant de Cicéron, Ap. Claudius Pulcher*, Paris 1921.
- Corbett, E., *Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student*, Oxford.

- D'Arms, J., *Commerce and Social Standing in Ancient Rome*, Cambridge 1981.
- Dickey E., *Latin Forms of Address*, Oxford 2002.
- Douglas A.E., *M. Tulli Ciceronis Brutus*, Loeb 1966.
- Ebbeler, J., "Letters" in Barchiesi, A. & Scheidel, W. (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Roman Studies*, Oxford 2010.
- Eckstein, A.M., "Review of Heinz Bellen, *Metus Gallicus-Metus Punicus: Zum Furchtmotiv in der römischen Republik*" in *The Classical Journal*, 82.4 (1987), pp. 335–338.
- Fabre, G., *Libertus. Patrons et Affranchis à Rom. Recherches sur les rapports patron-Affranchi à la fin de République romaine*, Rome 1981.
- Fantham E., "Stuprum: Public Attitudes and Penalties for Sexual Offences in Republican Rome" in *Echos du Monde Classique/Classical Views* 35.10 [1991], pp. 267–291.
- Foster, B.O. (trans.), *Livy*, 14 vols Loeb 1967.
- Fuller, Major-General J.F.C., *Julius Caesar: Man, Soldier, and Tyrant*, London 1965.
- Gardner, R. (trans.), *Cicero: The Speeches: Pro Caelio—De Provinciis Consularibus—Pro Balbo*, Loeb 1965.
- Gelzer, M., *Caesar: Politician and Statesman*, trans. Needham, P., Oxford 1969.
- Gillett, A., "Communication in Late Antiquity: Use and Reuse" in Johnson, S.F. (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Late Antiquity*, Oxford 2012.
- Glare, P.G.W. (ed.), *Oxford Latin Dictionary* 2nd ed. Oxford 2012.
- Gorostidi, D., "Rescatando a Baiter: A Propósito de la *Origo* de Marco Celio Rufo (Cic. Cael. 5)" in *Anuari de Filologia. Antiqua et Mediaevalia*, 4 (2014), pp. 45–54.
- Gruen, E.S., *The Last Generation of the Roman Republic*, Berkeley 1974.
- Hall, J., *Politeness and Politics in Cicero's Letters*, Oxford 2009.
- Hammond, C. (trans.), *Caesar: The Gallic War*, Oxford 1996.
- Hillard, T., "*in triclinio Coam, in cubiculo Nolam*: Lesbia and the other Clodia" in *Liverpool Classical Monthly*, 6.6 (1981), pp. 149–154.

- Hoffer, S.E., “Cicero’s ‘Stomach’: Political Indignation and the Use of Repeated Allusive Expressions in Cicero, *ad Qfr.* 3.1” in Morello, R. & Morrison, A.D. (eds), *Ancient Letters: Classical and Late Antique Epistolography*, Oxford 2007.
- Hutchinson, G.O., *Cicero’s Correspondence*, Oxford 1998.
- Jackson, S.B., “Marcus Caelius Rufus” in *Hermathena*, 126 (1979), pp. 55–67.
- Kennedy, B.H., *The Revised Latin Primer*, Cambridge 1888.
- Lacey W. K., “The Tribunate of Curio” in *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, 10.3 (1961), pp. 318–329.
- Lewis, R.G. (ed.), *Asconius: Commentaries on Speeches of Cicero*, Oxford 2006.
- Lintott, A., *Cicero as Evidence: A Historian’s Companion*, Oxford 2008.
- Madsen, D.W., *The Life and Political Career of Marcus Caelius Rufus*, (thesis) Ann Arbor 1981.
- Malherbe, A.J., *Ancient Epistolary Theorists*, Atlanta 1988.
- Meier, C., *Caesar*, trans. D. McLintock, New York 1995.
- Morello, R., “Writer and addressee in Cicero’s letters” in Steel, C. (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Cicero*, Cambridge 2013.
- Morrell, K., *Pompey, Cato, and the Governance of the Roman Empire*, Oxford 2017.
- Nicholson, J., “The Delivery and Confidentiality of Cicero’s Letters” in *The Classical Journal*, 90.1 (1994) pp. 33–63.
- Oldfather, W.A., Canter, H.V. & Abbott, K.M., *Index Verborum Ciceronis Epistularum*, Hildesheim 1965.
- Pinkster, H., “Notes on the language of Marcus Caelius Rufus” in Dickey, E. & Chahoud, A. (eds), *Colloquial and Literary Latin*, Cambridge 2010.
- Rackham, H. (trans.), *Pliny: Natural History*, 10 vols Loeb 1949.
- Rawson, B., *The Politics of Friendship: Pompey and Cicero*, Sydney 1978.
- Rawson, E., *Intellectual Life in the Late Roman Republic*, London 1985.
- Rolfe, J.C. (trans.), *Cornelius Nepos*, Loeb 1966.
- Rolfe, J.C. (trans.), *Suetonius*, v. 2 Loeb 1920.

- Rosillo-López, C., “I Said, He Said” in Gray, C., Balbo, A., Marshall, R.M.A. & Steel, C.E.W. (eds), *Reading Republican Oratory: Reconstructions, Contexts, Receptions*, Oxford 2018.
- Rosillo-López, C., *Public Opinion and Politics in the Late Roman Republic*, Cambridge 2017.
- Rotondi G., *Leges publicae populi Romani*, Hildesheim 1966.
- Shackleton Bailey, D.R. (ed.), *Cicero’s Letters to Atticus*, 6 vols Cambridge 1965.
- Shackleton Bailey, D.R., *Cicero*, London 1971.
- Shackleton Bailey, D.R. (ed.), *Cicero: Epistulae ad Familiares*, 2 vols Cambridge 1977.
- Shackleton Bailey, D.R., “The Grievance of L. Domitius Ahenobarbus” in *Illinois Classical Studies* 2 (1977) pp. 224–228.
- Shackleton Bailey, *Onomasticon to Cicero’s Letters*, Stuttgart 1995.
- Shackleton Bailey, D.R. (ed.), *Valerius Maximus: Memorable Doings and Sayings*, 2 vols Loeb 2000.
- Shackleton Bailey, D.R. (ed.), *Cicero: Letters to Friends*, 3 vols Loeb 2001.
- Shackleton Bailey, D.R. (ed.), *Cicero: Letters to Quintus and Brutus, Letter Fragments, Letter to Octavian, Handbook of Electioneering*, Loeb 2002.
- Shatzman, I., *Senatorial Wealth and Roman Politics*, Brussels 1975.
- Shipley, F.W. (trans.), *Velleius Paterculus: Compendium of Roman History*, Loeb 1967.
- Skinner, M.B., *Clodia Metelli: The Tribune’s Sister*, Oxford 2011.
- Stowers, S.K., *Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity*, Philadelphia 1986.
- Sumner, G.V., *The Orators in Cicero’s Brutus: Prosopography and Chronology*, Toronto 1973.
- Swain, S., “Bilingualism in Cicero? The Evidence of Code-Switching” in Adams, J.N., Janse, M. & Swain, S. (eds), *Bilingualism in Ancient Society*, Oxford 2002.
- Taylor, L.R., *The Voting Districts of the Roman Republic*, Ann Arbor 2013.
- Toynbee J., *Animals in Roman Life and Art*, London 1973.

- Trapp, M. (ed.), *Greek and Latin Letters*, Cambridge 2003.
- Treggiari, S., *Roman Freedmen during the Late Republic*, Oxford 1969.
- Tyrrell, R.Y. & Purser, L.C. (eds), *the Correspondence of M. Tullius Cicero*, 2nd ed., vols 1 & 3 Dublin 1885–1914.
- Walters, J., “Invading the Roman Body: Manliness and Impenetrability in Roman Thought” in Hallet, J.P. & M.B. Skinner (eds.) in *Roman Sexualities*, Princeton 1997.
- Warmington, E.H. (ed.), *Remains of Old Latin*, v. 2 Loeb 1967.
- White, H. (trans.), *Appian’s Roman History*, 4 vols. Loeb 1912.
- White, P., *Cicero in Letters: Epistolary Relations of the Late Republic*, Oxford 2010.
- Willi, A., *The Language of Aristophanes: Aspects of Linguistic Variation in Classical Attic Greek*, Oxford 2003.
- Williams, W.G. (ed.), *Cicero: The Letters to his Friends*, 4 vols Loeb 1943.
- Wiseman, T.P., *Cinna the Poet: and other Roman Essays*, Leicester 1974.

Appendix: M. Caelius Rufus: A Biography

Marcus Caelius Rufus (*RE* 35) appears as something of a minor character in the history of the first century BCE. A significant portion of our information concerning his life comes from his letters to and from Cicero, and a speech delivered by the same in his defense, the *pro Caelio*. He receives little more than brief mentions in the other ancient works concerning this period.

According to Pliny the Elder, Caelius was born during the consulship of C. Marius (*RE* 15) and Cn. Papirius Carbo (*RE* 38) (82 BCE) on May 28.³⁸⁸ This date has, however, been the subject of considerable academic debate, with years as far back as 88 BCE being proposed as alternatives. Tyrrell and Purser called the date given by Pliny uncertain, agreeing with Nipperday's contention that 85 BCE was the latest he could have been born if he was to hold the quaestorship in 57 or 56 BCE.³⁸⁹ The earlier alternative of 88/87 BCE is proposed by scholars such as Wegehaupt at the beginning of the twentieth century,³⁹⁰ a suggested date supported by later scholars such as Sumner,³⁹¹ and accepted by Shackleton Bailey.³⁹² However, Austin argues in his edition of the *pro Caelio* that Pliny is correct,³⁹³ and this is echoed by Jackson.³⁹⁴ I find the arguments of Austin and Jackson persuasive due to the

³⁸⁸ Pliny, *NH*, VII.49.165.

³⁸⁹ Tyrrell & Purser, 1914 v. 3 p. xxxviii; Broughton does not list Caelius as quaestor in either 57 or 56 BCE. For his discussion of this anomaly, see Broughton, T.R.S., *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic*, vol. 3, Atlanta 1986, p. 44.

³⁹⁰ Austin, 1960, p. 144, n. 3.

³⁹¹ Sumner, 1973, pp. 146–147.

³⁹² 88 BCE is given in the front matter of Shackleton Bailey's *ad familiares* Loeb edition (v. 1 p. 23), and in his Cambridge commentary on *ad fam.* 77 (VIII.I), he states that Caelius was in his late thirties at the time of writing (which was 51 BCE), favouring Sumner's arguments over those of Austin (Shackleton Bailey, 1977Commentary p. 382).

³⁹³ Austin, 1960, pp. 144–146.

³⁹⁴ Jackson, 1979, pp. 55–67.

complete lack of evidence for Caelius holding a quaestorship,³⁹⁵ and the circumstances surrounding his praetorship in 48 BCE.³⁹⁶

There has also been some scholarly debate concerning the location of Caelius' birthplace. This stems from uncertainty regarding the manuscripts of the *pro Caelio*, which typically read:

*nam quod est obiectum municipibus esse adolescentem non
probatum suis, nemini umquam praesenti †praetoriani†
maiores honores habuerunt quam absenti M. Caelio;*

The †*praetoriani*† reading has been revised a number of times based on an erasure in the manuscript (*P*), with alternatives such as 'Puteolani' and 'Tusculani' being proposed.³⁹⁷ 'Tusculani' was proposed by Baiter, and this reading was accepted by Tyrrell and Purser. It was not, however, accepted by Austin, who along with other scholars, such as Lily Ross Taylor in *The Voting Districts of the Roman Republic*, Ann Arbor 2013, pp. 199–200, was convinced by the reading in Σ of 'Praestutiani', referring to *Praetuttiana regio*, where was found the town Interamnia.³⁹⁸ A recent article by Diana Gorostidi has, however, made some convincing arguments in favour of Baiter's emendation. The consideration of new epigraphical evidence³⁹⁹ lends weight to the possibility of the Caelii being present in Tusculum, even if a connection to the Marcus Caelius of the *pro Caelio* remains beyond our grasp.⁴⁰⁰ Furthermore, according to Gorostidi, Tusculum was less than a day's journey from Rome, and Cicero had property there which would have allowed for a relationship to

³⁹⁵ It seems unthinkable that, if Caelius did indeed hold a quaestorship in 57/56 BCE, Cicero would make no mention of this fact anywhere in the *pro Caelio*. It must be acknowledged, however, that "this office, almost without exception, was the beginning of a senatorial career in the first century" (Broughton, *MRR* 3.44). Though, Broughton does grant that the possibility of an exemption remains.

³⁹⁶ This was the year of Caesar's second dictatorship (Broughton, *MRR* 2.272). During this time, he made decisions and appointed individuals to public offices. Cf. Dio, who says that Caelius was appointed praetor, and Trebonius appointed *praetor urbanus* by Caesar, rather than by lot (*Roman History*, XLII.22). So, it is possible that Caelius was appointed to the praetorship without being the required age.

³⁹⁷ Austin, 1960, p. 147. Austin lists a further selection of examples in loc. cit. n. 4.

³⁹⁸ Modern Teramo (Austin, 1980 p. 46).

³⁹⁹ In addition to other inscriptions already known, such as those cited by Tyrrell and Purser (*CIL* xiv. 2622, 2624, 2647. Tyrrell and Purser, 1914 v.3 p. xxxviii).

⁴⁰⁰ Gorostidi, 2014, pp. 50–51.

develop between M. Caelius Rufus Senior (*RE* 34) and his son's eventual tutor.⁴⁰¹ So in light of this evidence, it seems to me that Marcus Caelius Rufus was born in 82 BCE in Tusculum.

According to Cicero, Caelius was born to an *eques Romanus*⁴⁰² of a somewhat frugal nature,⁴⁰³ who, according to Cicero, provided an upbringing to his son characterized by carefulness and training (*diligentia disciplinaque*), until he assumed the *toga virilis* and placed in the care of Cicero and Crassus in 66 BCE,⁴⁰⁴ at around the age of sixteen. Caelius remained in Cicero's care for three years from the time of the latter's praetorship to the year he campaigned for the consulship (64 BCE), after which Caelius split from his mentor and began his association with Catiline during his second candidacy for the office (in 63 BCE).⁴⁰⁵ Then followed the upheaval of the so-called Catilinarian Conspiracy,⁴⁰⁶ after which Caelius took himself to Africa as *contubernalis* to Q. Pompeius Rufus (*RE* 42), the then governor. It is thought that he was influenced in this choice of province because his father owned property there;⁴⁰⁷ regardless, Cicero reports it to be a successful adventure, and Caelius returned to Rome in 60 BCE held highly in Pompeius' regard.⁴⁰⁸

With his return to Rome, it was time for Caelius to begin his public career, which he did in 60/59 BCE by bringing C. Antonius Hibrida (*RE* 19), Cicero's consular colleague, to trial.⁴⁰⁹ He was successful, securing Antonius' conviction and exile, despite Cicero himself

⁴⁰¹ For evidence of Cicero's property at Tusculum, see Shatzman, 1975, pp. 404–405. Gorostidi also claims that M. Licinius Crassus (*RE* 68), Caelius' other tutor, likewise had property at Tusculum, yet there is, unfortunately, no evidence of this. She cites the *RE* entry of George McCracken (col. 1487), but the evidence cited by McCracken (*ad Att.* IV.16.3 [SB 89] and *de Oratore* 1.24–27) actually refers to L. Licinius Crassus (*RE* 55). Gorostidi is, however, correct in writing that there is no evidence for either man holding property at Interamnia, which it should be noted, is considerably further from the capital (Gorostidi, 2014, pp. 51 – 52). Shatzman, 1975 finds no mention of either Cicero or Crassus owning property at Interamnia.

⁴⁰² Cicero, *pro Caelio* 3–5.

⁴⁰³ Cicero, *pro Caelio* 36.

⁴⁰⁴ Cicero, *pro Caelio* 9.

⁴⁰⁵ Cicero, *pro Caelio* 10–11. Catiline had formerly campaigned for the consulship in 64 BCE and lost to Cicero. See Broughton, *Also-Rans* pp. 16–17, for details on Catiline's various attempts at gaining the consulship previously.

⁴⁰⁶ Austin (1960 p. v) points out, however, that there is no evidence to suggest that Caelius actually joined the conspiracy. It is more probable that he was simply taken in by Catiline, as Cicero points out that many others were, himself almost among them (Cicero, *pro Caelio* iv–vi).

⁴⁰⁷ Shatzman, *Senatorial Wealth*, 105.

⁴⁰⁸ At least according to Cicero: *pro Caelio* 73.

⁴⁰⁹ For details of the trial, see Alexander, *Trials* pp. 119–120 (no. 241).

speaking for the defense. The charge is thought to have been in relation to *maiestas* (treason), influenced by suspicions of involvement in the Catilinarian Conspiracy and by the mismanagement of the province of Macedonia, though the treason charge is thought to be a side issue.⁴¹⁰ Indeed, this appears evident from Cicero who says “the suspicion of an intended crime (i.e. the Catilinarian Conspiracy) did him great harm.”⁴¹¹ Furthermore, it is certain that Antonius’ management of Macedonia was a feature of the trial due to the preserved fragment of Caelius’ speech found in Quintilian, which paints a rather vivid picture of the man in the throes of hedonism before battle.⁴¹²

Caelius’ next move, according to Cicero, was to separate from his father and rent a house on the Palatine from Clodius in order to facilitate the development of his political career following his breakthrough court case and the fame that came with it.⁴¹³ This made Caelius a neighbour to Clodia,⁴¹⁴ and so, according to Cicero, resulted in an affair lasting approximately two years⁴¹⁵ until they had a falling out.⁴¹⁶ Following this, Caelius brought a charge against Lucius Calpurnius Bestia (*RE* 25), who was successfully defended by Cicero on 11 February BCE.⁴¹⁷ Even though Bestia was acquitted, Caelius charged him a second time,⁴¹⁸ and was in turn prosecuted by Bestia’s young son, Lucius Sempronius Atratinus (*RE* 26) on a charge of violence.⁴¹⁹ Despite Cicero’s previous efforts on Bestia’s behalf, he spoke in defense of Caelius, delivering the *pro Caelio* on 4 April 56 BCE.⁴²⁰ He was joined in the

⁴¹⁰ For details of Antonius’ proconsulship, see Broughton, *MRR* 2.175–176, 180, 184.

⁴¹¹ Cicero, *pro Caelio* 74.

⁴¹² Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria* IV.II.123–124.

⁴¹³ Cicero, *pro Caelio* 17–18.

⁴¹⁴ Cicero, *pro Caelio* 36.

⁴¹⁵ According to Gardner, 1965, p. 400; Austin, op. cit. p. vi.

⁴¹⁶ Tyrrell and Purser (1914 v.3 p.xliii) suggest that Caelius tired of her and “probably said smart things about her,” citing the passage from Quintilian VIII.53, in which he called her “a Coan in the dining-room and a Nolan in the bedroom.” This alienation from Clodia appears to be echoed by Cicero who suggests that Caelius rebelled against her and rejected her gifts (*pro Caelio* 36).

⁴¹⁷ Cicero, *ad Quint. Frat.* II.3.6 (SB 7.6).

⁴¹⁸ This, against Cicero’s wishes (Cicero, *pro Caelio* 76). The reason for the renewal of the charge is not known, though both Austin (1960 p. vii) and Gardner (1965 p. 400) suggest it was because Bestia had begun canvassing again for office.

⁴¹⁹ Cicero, *pro Caelio* 1.

⁴²⁰ Austin, 1960 Appendix IV, p. 151.

defense by Crassus,⁴²¹ and by Caelius himself.⁴²² The end result was that Caelius was acquitted, and Austin believes that the trial would have been mentioned by Cicero to his brother in a letter that he sent, but which has not been preserved.⁴²³

It should be acknowledged that there has been some scholarly effort expended to identify the Caelius and the Rufus mentioned in Catullus (poems 58 and 100 feature a Caelius, and 69 and 77 feature a Rufus) with Marcus Caelius Rufus, and Lesbia with Clodia Metelli. Austin, for example, says that neither proposition can be proved, “but both are highly probable.”⁴²⁴ Wiseman argues quite convincingly against these propositions, however, pointing out that Catullus’ Rufus suffered from gout, which M. Caelius certainly did not, and his Caelius “was a young Veronese who helped Catullus in the torments of his infatuation with Lesbia.”⁴²⁵ Wiseman further demonstrates that Catullus was not with Lesbia until the summer of 56 BCE,⁴²⁶ after Caelius’ trial, meaning that she cannot be conflated with Clodia Metelli, with whom Caelius had already had the affair.⁴²⁷

After the trial, little is known of Caelius for some time. It is generally thought that the trial against Bestia did not go ahead, with Austin suggesting that Caelius “dropped it out of respect for Cicero”,⁴²⁸ and Madsen concluding that he was deferring to the wishes of Crassus as well.⁴²⁹ Cicero briefly mentions that Caelius is again facing prosecution in 54 BCE by the Clodii,⁴³⁰ though there is no information regarding the nature of the accusation, nor its outcome.⁴³¹ Caelius next appears as tribune of the plebs in 52 BCE,⁴³² and is said to have been a champion of T. Annius Milo’s (*RE* 67) cause following the death of Clodius. According

⁴²¹ Cicero, *pro Caelio* 18.

⁴²² Quintilian, *Institutio Oratio* IV.II.27. For details on the cases against Bestia, see Alexander, *Trials* pp. 130–131 (no. 268–269), and for a thorough analysis of the *pro Caelio*, see Alexander, 2002, pp. 218–243.

⁴²³ Alexander Appendix IV, p. 151.

⁴²⁴ Alexander Appendix III, p. 148.

⁴²⁵ Wiseman, 1974, pp. 106–107.

⁴²⁶ Wiseman, 1974, pp. 109–110.

⁴²⁷ For a further discussion on the identity of Catullus’ Lesbia, see Skinner, 2011, pp. 121–144.

⁴²⁸ Austin, 1960, p. viii. Indeed, Alexander, *Trials* pp. 130–131 (no. 269) lists the outcome as either dropped or convicted.

⁴²⁹ Madsen, 1981, p. 89.

⁴³⁰ Cicero, *ad Quintum fratrem* II.12 (SB 12).

⁴³¹ See Alexander, *Trials* p. 137 (no. 282).

⁴³² Broughton, *MRR* 2.235.

to Appian, Caelius facilitated Milo's speaking in the forum before the occasion was broken up by force, requiring both men to flee while disguised as slaves.⁴³³ Subsequently, when Pompey had been appointed sole consul in the intercalary month of 52 BCE,⁴³⁴ Caelius, as tribune, attempted to resist proposed laws which he said were personal attacks directed at Milo over his role in Clodius' death. He was, however, unsuccessful after Pompey threatened the use of force.⁴³⁵ During his tribunate he also took a slave of Milo, Galata, who was being held in the house of a *triumvir capitalis* and returned him to his master, despite the tribunes T. Munatius Plancus Bursa (*RE* 32) and Q. Pompeius Rufus (*RE* 9), ordering him to be kept there.⁴³⁶ Following the conviction of Milo, according to Asconius, Caelius, in conjunction with Cicero, successfully defended M. Saufeius who had led the "gang" that killed Clodius.⁴³⁷ After Caelius' time as tribune had come to an end, he successfully prosecuted his fellow tribune, the aforementioned Pompeius Rufus,⁴³⁸ though interestingly, Valerius Maximus says that he took pity on Pompeius and acted on his behalf to secure properties which Cornelia (Rufus' mother) was withholding.⁴³⁹

During the year of these prosecutions (51 BCE), Cicero was dispatched as governor of Cilicia, and charged Caelius to keep him apprised of goings on in Rome.⁴⁴⁰ Madsen has concluded that the shared experience of the Clodius and Milo affair had brought Caelius and Cicero together, and that at the very least, Cicero had been convinced of Caelius' "political acumen".⁴⁴¹ According to Shackleton Bailey (Loeb, v. 1 p. 344), Caelius accompanied Cicero as he left Rome as far as Pompeii before returning to the city, where he commissioned two large packages containing all news from Rome, including decrees, edicts, gossip and rumours, which he sent to Cicero along with his accompanying letters (SB

⁴³³ Appian, *Bella civilia* II.22.

⁴³⁴ Broughton, *MRR* 2.234.

⁴³⁵ Asconius, *pro Milone* 36.

⁴³⁶ Asconius, *pro Milone* 37. For further references to the tribunician activity of Munatius Plancus and Pompeius Rufus, see Broughton, *MRR* 2.235–236.

⁴³⁷ Alexander, *Trials* p. 154 (no. 313).

⁴³⁸ Alexander, *Trials* p. 190 (no. 328).

⁴³⁹ Valerius Maximus, *Memorable Doings and Sayings* IV.2.7.

⁴⁴⁰ Cicero, *ad fam.* VIII.1 (SB 77).

⁴⁴¹ Madsen, 1981, p. 108.

77, 78), before receiving a reply stating that rather than give Cicero the news, he wanted Caelius to give him an *interpretation* of the news.⁴⁴² There are two repeatedly occurring themes of Caelius' letters; the question of money owed to a certain Sittius,⁴⁴³ on whose behalf he hoped Cicero would act, and the matter of panthers, which he requests Cicero to acquire.⁴⁴⁴ This request was in relation to the next step in Caelius' political career, namely, his campaign for the curule aedileship in 51 BCE, which he duly secured.⁴⁴⁵ He earnestly desired panthers from Cilicia for the holding of games in Rome, yet to his regret, never received them.⁴⁴⁶ During this time Caelius also busied himself speaking about Rome's water supply,⁴⁴⁷ in addition to political matters such as Cicero's recall from Cilicia, and the latter's hopes for a triumph upon that return.⁴⁴⁸ In a letter written in August 50 BCE, Caelius (correctly) predicts to Cicero that peace will not last, and he mulls over the question of which side to pick in the forthcoming conflict.⁴⁴⁹ In September, Caelius was charged under the *lex Scantinia* by the censor, Appius Claudius Pulcher, whose time in office can be described as "vigorous."⁴⁵⁰ Rather smartly, however, Caelius deflected the accusation by immediately charging Appius under the same law, which was concerned with homosexual acts between males, or adult males and youths.⁴⁵¹ As Madsen points out, the outcome of both cases is unknown, yet Caelius had gotten the desired outcome by "shifting the attention from himself and ... blunt[ing] the censoriousness of Appius."⁴⁵²

Austin suggests that this quarrel with Appius contributed to driving Caelius into the Caesarian camp, particularly in light of him seeking support from the other censor, L.

⁴⁴² Cicero, *ad fam.* VIII.1 (SB 77) and VIII.2 (SB 78) contained an attached news package, and II.8 (SB 80) contained a rebuke and clarification on what Cicero actually wanted.

⁴⁴³ For a discussion regarding the identity of this individual, see Shackleton Bailey, 1977 Commentary v.1 p. 387.

⁴⁴⁴ SB 78.2, 81.5, 82.3, 88.5.

⁴⁴⁵ Broughton, *MRR* 2.248.

⁴⁴⁶ At least, he did not receive any from Cicero (SB 90.2). He did, however, receive some from C. Scribonius Curio (*RE* 11) (SB 82.3).

⁴⁴⁷ This is evidenced in *ad fam.* VIII.6.4 (SB 88) and also by Front. *Aq.* II.76.

⁴⁴⁸ Cicero, *ad fam.* VIII.10.5 (SB 87); VIII.11.2 (SB 91).

⁴⁴⁹ Cicero, *ad fam.* VIII.14.2 (SB 97).

⁴⁵⁰ See Shackleton Bailey, 1977 Commentary v.1 p. 432, who writes "Appius' Censorship was something of a reign of terror, with wholesale degradation of Senators and Knights".

⁴⁵¹ J. Walters, 1997, pp. 33–35. For details of the trials, see Alexander, *Trials* pp. 167–168 (no. 347–348).

⁴⁵² Madsen, 1981, p. 135.

Calpurnius Piso Caesonius (*RE* 90).⁴⁵³ Regardless of the reasons, however, he acted with Curio in support of Caesar, and when their efforts came to naught, they left Rome with the Caesarian tribunes and headed to meet Caesar at Ravenna.⁴⁵⁴ After an interval of some months since he last wrote, Caelius sends a letter to Cicero before setting out for Liguria to deal with an insurrection of the Intimilii, in which he expresses his disillusionment with the Caesarians,⁴⁵⁵ though despite his disappointment, he nevertheless writes to Cicero again, urging him not to follow Pompey, and subsequently follows Caesar into Spain.⁴⁵⁶ Austin suggests that the trip to Spain did little to convince him of the cause, and made him “more and more dissatisfied”,⁴⁵⁷ and this certainly seems to be borne out on the Caesarians’ return to Rome. Caelius was made *praetor peregrinus* for the year 48 BCE, either through appointment by Caesar or through election, despite his age.⁴⁵⁸ During his time in office, Caelius caused no small amount of trouble in the city. It is generally agreed that he stirred up riots and clashed with other politicians, including his colleague, the *praetor urbanus*, C. Trebonius (*RE* 6), whom Caesar had appointed, and the consul, P. Servilius Isauricus (*RE* 67).⁴⁵⁹ However, when his efforts came to naught, Caelius left the city and became involved with T. Annius Milo in trying to stir up armed rebellion in the country.⁴⁶⁰ The attempt, however, was short lived. Madsen suggests that the date would have been towards the end of March,⁴⁶¹ when Caelius was finally killed at Thurii by Caesar’s soldiers.⁴⁶²

⁴⁵³ Austin, 1960, p. xii.

⁴⁵⁴ Dio, *Roman History* XLI.3; Caesar, *Civil War* 1.5.

⁴⁵⁵ Cicero, *ad fam.* VIII.15 (SB 149).

⁴⁵⁶ Cicero, *ad fam.* VIII.16 (SB 153).

⁴⁵⁷ Austin, 1960 p. xiii.

⁴⁵⁸ Caesar (*BC* III.20), Livy (*Per.* CXI), and Velleius Paterculus (*History of Rome*, II.LXVIII) all mention Caelius’ election to the praetorship, but Dio claims that he was *appointed* praetor (*Roman History*, XLII.22).

⁴⁵⁹ Caesar, *Bellum civile* III.20–21; Dio *Roman History*, XLII.22–23. Caelius was proposing legislation for the cancellation of debt and for remission from rental payments.

⁴⁶⁰ Livy, *Per.* CXI; Velleius Paterculus, *History of Rome*, II.lxvii.2; Caesar, *Bellum civile* III.21; Dio, *Roman History*, XLII.24. Livy and Velleius Paterculus state that Caelius was driven from the city, while Dio and Caesar say that he left under the pretext of putting his case before Caesar. Furthermore, Caesar and Velleius Paterculus claim that Caelius wrote to Milo and summoned him back to Italy, while Livy and Dio say he joined Milo after he had already come to Italy.

⁴⁶¹ Madsen, 1981 p. 163.

⁴⁶² Caesar, *Bellum civile* III.22; Velleius Paterculus, *History of Rome*, II.lxviii.2.

With regards to Caelius' character, the sources⁴⁶³ we have referring to Caelius paint an interesting picture. The conclusions drawn by Austin, I think, bear repeating at length;

"passionate, vivacious, with a strong if sometimes schoolboyish sense of humour, a handsome young man and a dandy, one of the three most skilled dancers of his time. As a politician he was an opportunist and a cynic, too impetuous for any really consistent and far-sighted policy in spite of his singular sensitiveness to the current trend of politics, too egoistic ever to be dependable, and too independent ever to satisfy his egoism. As an orator he ranked among the first by universal consent; he spoke with much power, though he was better at attack than defense, and was capable of a vitriolic invective notable even in that age when abuse was a part of polite education ... In him is to be seen a clear picture of a brilliant young Roman whose exceptional talents were forced by the very decadence of the period to do him a disservice; possibly, according to modern standards of morality, he is an unscrupulous, unattractive, and even dangerous figure ..."⁴⁶⁴

Various episodes from his life certainly show Caelius' sense of humour and his wit. He refers quite wittily to Clodia as "Coan in the dining room and a Nolan in the bedroom" (*in triclinio coam, in cubiculo nolam*);⁴⁶⁵ when defending himself against Atratinus, Caelius refers to the young man's teacher as a "barley-bread rhetorician" (*hordearius*) mocking at him as "puffy, light, and coarse" (*inflatus, levis, and sordidus*);⁴⁶⁶ and according to Quintilian, when the

⁴⁶³ Non-epistolic sources.

⁴⁶⁴ Austin, 1960 p. xiv–xv.

⁴⁶⁵ Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria* VIII.53. [For a convincing explanation on the meaning of Nolan see Hillard, T., "in triclinio Coam, in cubiculo Nolam: Lesbia and the other Clodia" in *Liverpool Classical Monthly*, 6.6 (1981), pp. 149–154, which convincingly argues that, given familial connections of the Claudii with the tough fortress of Nola, this describes her demeanor as "mere window-dressing" as she offered stubborn resistance in the bedroom after appearing so enticing.

⁴⁶⁶ Suetonius, *On Rhetoricians*, II (Rolfe, J.C. trans, 1920).

consul of 48 BCE, P. Servilius Isauricus (*RE* 67), broke Caelius' curule chair, he replaced it with a chair of leather straps, a reference to the consul reportedly being beaten by his father.⁴⁶⁷ It is easy to see how authors such as Tacitus can see him as *amarior*;⁴⁶⁸ and he can be thought of as witty, unafraid to denigrate and offend.⁴⁶⁹ He certainly seems passionate and perhaps impetuous, as can be seen from his affair with Clodia and its fallout, and his dogged prosecutions and political agendas, such as those against Bestia, his actions on behalf of Milo, and his attempted reforms during his praetorship. Yet, he could appear inconsistent and mercurial. His supposed dropping of the charges against Bestia, finally in line with Cicero's wishes could be seen as evidence of this, as could the incident reported by Valerius Maximus, who says that he acted staunchly on behalf of Q. Pompeius after having already struck him down in a trial in 51 BCE.⁴⁷⁰ He is, however, described as "hot-tempered" (*iracundissimus*) by Seneca, and as a man who desired a robust conversation with his companion at the table, and was disappointed when it was denied to him.⁴⁷¹ This, combined with his affair, prosecutions and political actions seems to paint a picture of a man who desires mental stimulation. One gets the impression that he would rebel in stagnation and needed to test himself, not just for the advancement of his political career, but for his own satisfaction.

⁴⁶⁷ *Institutio Oratoria*, VI.25.

⁴⁶⁸ *A Dialogue on Oratory*, 25.4

⁴⁶⁹ Indeed, even Quintilian (*Institutio Oratoria*, VI.25), who speaks quite highly of Caelius, says that he could occasionally say things that no respectable man ought to.

⁴⁷⁰ Valerius Maximus, *Memorable Doings and Sayings*, IV.2.7.

⁴⁷¹ Seneca, *de Ira*, III.viii.6.