

THE RUSTIC EFFECT IN CICERO'S *PRO CAELIO*:
A STUDY IN SPATIAL VALUE

By

SAMANTHA LEE MARSH

A THESIS PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

2008

© 2008 Samantha Lee Marsh

To Steve

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my parents for believing in me and challenging me to carry my education to a higher level. I thank my close friends and colleagues (Brenda Fields, Brook Rich, Kory Plockmeyer, and George Hendren) without whose help and encouragement I would not have had the endurance to come this far. I extend my gratitude to Dr. Victoria Pagán, Dr. Timothy Johnson, Dr. Lewis Sussman, and Dr. Andrew Wolpert for their constant support and guidance. Finally, I would like to thank my fiancé, Steven Adamczyk, for patiently loving and encouraging me to go after my dreams.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	4
ABSTRACT.....	6
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION.....	8
2 THE BACKGROUND OF THE <i>PRO CAELIO</i>	12
Politics and People.....	12
The Speech.....	15
Approaches to the <i>Pro Caelio</i>	20
3 SPATIAL VALUE IN ANTIQUITY	30
The Generic Rustic Figure.....	34
4 THE RUSTIC EFFECT IN THE <i>PRO CAELIO</i>	44
Arguments and Counter Arguments for the City.....	44
Anti-City / Pro-Country.....	56
Caelius the Orator.....	64
5 CONCLUSION.....	69
LIST OF REFERENCES.....	71
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH	73

Abstract of Thesis Presented to the Graduate School
of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts

THE RUSTIC EFFECT IN CICERO'S *PRO CAELIO*:
A STUDY IN SPATIAL VALUE

By

Samantha Lee Marsh

December 2008

Chair: Victoria Pagán
Major: Classical Studies

Attitudes toward space in Roman antiquity ranged across a continuum of judgments. Authors and rhetoricians capitalized on such flexibility and used both negative and positive values of city and country to attract audiences, attack opponents, and defend clients. In 56 BC, Cicero spoke on behalf of M. Caelius Rufus, who was accused of borrowing gold from Clodia Metelli in order to kill both the philosopher Dio and Clodia. As a talented orator, Cicero used an arsenal of generic and rhetorical devices to characterize his defendant in a positive light; in particular, he capitalized on his jury's assumed knowledge of a love affair between Clodia and Caelius in order to divert their attention. Above all, Cicero manipulated his jury's positive and negative associations with different spaces to characterize Caelius and Clodia. Cicero takes advantage of the spectrum of values associated with the country and the city. He directs the positive aspects of both places onto Caelius while simultaneously portraying Clodia as a city girl in a negative light.

I first examine the political background of, and recent studies on, the *Pro Caelio*. Rather than focus on Cicero's rhetorical form, comedic elements, and arguments of ethos, this thesis instead studies the speech within its broader ideological context. In the next chapter, I review the Roman evaluations of city and country as seen in comedy, pastoral poetry, and agricultural

handbooks. Both the city and the country are negative and positive, each one containing benefits that the other lacks. The rustic figure, likewise, embodies both an ignorant fool and a noble worker. Finally, I examine the *Pro Caelio* in a close reading to show how Cicero manipulates the city and country, thereby creating a positive persona for Caelius and a negative one for Clodia. Cicero takes advantage of the positive aspects of the rustic figure and channels them into Caelius to create a new type of orator who has both the authority of a farmer and the education of a gentleman.

Cicero's use of agricultural diction complements his praise of the young man Caelius. Likewise, his urbane and military diction against Clodia emphasizes her position as the negative city influence. Cicero can direct the jury's attention to the city or the country with the drop of one word, and his constantly changing diction sways them to favor Caelius and scorn Clodia. The spatial values that Cicero employs reflect the surrounding, dominant ideology at Rome. The city could be the place of social advancement or the center for corruption, and the country could be the ever-present utopia or the uncultivated wild. Cicero uses both ends of the spectrum to mould the characters of Caelius and Clodia, thereby winning his case.

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

In the year 56, Cicero spoke last in a defense for M. Caelius Rufus, accused of violating either the *Lex Plotia* or the *Lex Lutatia de vi*.¹ The year was a brief period of calm between the two civil wars, but even the respite was marred by social and political conflict. After the Social War in 91, the civil war between Marius and Sulla and Sulla's reign of terror tore apart Roman morality which, according to Sallust, had been declining since the destruction of Carthage. He depicts the morale after Sulla's reign of terror:

Postquam divitiae honori esse coepere et eas gloria, imperium, potentia sequebatur, hebescere virtus, paupertas probo haberi, innocentia pro malivolentia duci coepit. Igitur ex divitiis iuventutem luxuria atque avaritia cum superbia invasere; rapere, consumere, sua parvi pendere, aliena cupere, pudorem, pudicitiam, divina atque humana promiscua, nihil pensi neque moderati habere. (Sal. *Cat.* 12)

As soon as wealth came to be a mark of distinction and an easy way to renown, military commands, and political power, virtue began to decline. Poverty was now looked on as a disgrace and a blameless life as a sign of ill nature. Riches made the younger generation a prey to luxury, avarice, and pride. Squandering with one hand what they grabbed with the other, they set small value on their own property while they coveted that of others. Honor and modesty, all laws divine and human, were alike disregarded in a spirit of recklessness and intemperance.²

After Sulla's death in 78, Pompey, Crassus, and Caesar separately rose in power and forged an allegiance, known as the first triumvirate, in 60. Meanwhile, Cicero had ascended the *cursus honorum* and, in the summer of 64, defeated Catiline in the election for the consulship of 63. The victor, however, then had to battle the Catilinarian conspirators who attempted to overthrow the government. Although Cicero claimed to have saved the Republic by executing five Roman citizens in 63, this action gave his political enemy and tribune in 58, Clodius, a cause to exile

¹ All dates are BCE unless otherwise specified. For the date of the speech see Austin 1960: 151. For the law of violence see Butler: 1994: 121, Austin 1960: 42, and Lintott 1968:107-16. It is unclear whether Caelius was charged under the *Lex Plotia de vi* or the *Lex Lutatia*.

² Translated by Hanford 1963: 182-3.

him in 58.³ Cicero returned in September of 57, but the turmoil at Rome had not subsided. The senate was arguing over Ptolemy Auletes' right to the Egyptian throne and rioters had severely injured and even killed some members of an Alexandrian embassy. At the same time, Cicero opposed Caesar's land reform bills and the triumvirate renewed its pact at Lucca in April.

Such was the scene at Rome when Cicero spoke on behalf of Caelius. His client was more likely than not guilty of some if not all of the crimes with which he was charged, and a highly controversial political upheaval lurked in the background. In order to gain the acquittal of Caelius, Cicero had to curry the jury's favor and confuse them about the facts of the case so that he could direct their attention towards Caelius' attractive qualities. The love affair between Caelius and Clodia, a witness for the prosecution, was the perfect diversion.

Recent scholarship has focused on Cicero's use of comedy, ethos, and dilemma as rhetorical tactics to accomplish his goal.⁴ Cicero simultaneously praised Caelius and discredited Clodia and, by association, the entire prosecution. In addition to these devices, however, Cicero manipulated his audience's ethical and moral associations with geographical space in order to weave a positive ethos for Caelius and a negative one for Clodia. Although Cicero mocks the strict old-fashioned morals of the prosecution and praises Caelius for his oratorical skill, he nevertheless subtly aligns the young man with the country through his use of rustic diction and imagery. Simultaneously, he turns the opposition's own arguments against the urbane Clodia. This subtle antithesis between city and country complements a larger theme at work in the *Pro Caelio*, namely, Caelius as an orator. By blending the rustic imagery with Caelius' oratorical skill and diligence, Cicero transfers the authority of the farmer to his young defendant.⁵ Cicero

³ See Wood 1988: 42-55 for a brief review of Cicero's life.

⁴ Comedy: Geffcken 1975; ethos: May 1988; dilemma: Craig 1993.

⁵ For the authority of the farmer see Murnagahn 2006.

also creates an idyllic landscape to contrast the immediate surroundings of the jury in the Roman forum.⁶ The antithesis between city and country is more than a one-sided dichotomy. On each end of the spectrum, Caelius is the winner. As a city youth, he is the diligent orator; as a rustic, he is both the honest farmer and the bucolic herdsman who has been corrupted by the city and the *meretrix*, Clodia.

This thesis aims to reveal the continuum of spatial value that Cicero uses to obtain Caelius' acquittal. In chapter two, I establish the political background of the *Pro Caelio* and survey the different scholarly analyses of Cicero's speech. To study how Cicero manipulates his audience's associations with space it is necessary to determine how the Romans valued space and place. My third chapter, therefore, examines the philosophical and theoretical concepts of spatial value in antiquity. The positive and negative values associated with each space can exist in the same organic whole. Cicero does not employ only one association with the country and one with the city; rather, he engages in a complex web of positive and negative moral values, thereby manipulating his audience to an even larger extent than previously recognized. In chapter four, I return to the *Pro Caelio* with a close study of how Cicero employs contrasting rustic and urbane diction to characterize Caelius and Clodia. Cicero blends Caelius' status as a Roman orator with his rustic characteristics. In conclusion, the city and country antithesis gains prominence following the Ciceronian age, albeit in different ways in the Augustan poets. The ideological environment at the end of the Republic established a strong tradition for the city-country antithesis that was sustained well beyond the downfall of the Roman Republic. The picture is never black and white: country versus city is an elastic concept that can be altered to fit

⁶ For the idyllic landscape and its appeal see Gutzwiller 2006; for the explanation of Cicero's desire for a pre-Gracchian golden age see Wood 1988: 65. "Cicero wishes to establish himself as the legatee of the conservative anti-reformism of a venerable political tradition with roots in the pre-Gracchian golden age and to reveal to his struggling and anxiety-ridden contemporaries the *mos maiorum* as a preceptor of civic wisdom and virtue and a guide out of their present difficulties."

the purposes of any author because ideology itself is a cycle of constant reevaluation and tension among opposing ideas. Cicero's use of spatial antithesis is, therefore, both a contrast to and product of his own cultural environment. My study is not meant to compare Cicero's rhetorical practice with his theory or rhetorical handbooks of the day; instead, a case study of the *Pro Caelio* and its social and ideological ramifications demonstrates that, in the words of Calboi and Dominik, "rhetoric, like any other field of activity, is constructed socially, politically and cognitively in ways that reflect, express and extend... the culture that produces it."⁷

⁷ Calboi and Dominik 1997: 11.

CHAPTER 2
THE BACKGROUND OF THE *PRO CAELIO*

Politics and People

After the destruction of Carthage, the Roman people and senate argued over land and grain distribution. Military commanders wanted land to give their veterans, while wealthy equestrians developed *latifundia*, pushing out many small farmers, and leaving them without a means of livelihood, thereby increasing the economic deprivation of a large majority of the Roman population.¹ While Rome was struggling, Alexandria had been in turmoil since the death of Philometer in 145.² The king of Cyrene bequeathed his territory to Rome upon his death in 96; in 80, the king of Alexandria, Alexander II, was murdered and his will also bequeathed his kingdom to Rome. Ptolemy Auletes, an illegitimate son of the former King Soter, took control of Alexandria and held his throne for twenty years. Auletes' territory, however, could never be completely secure because the economic situation in Rome, combined with the constant need for more land and grain, threatened its appropriation at any time. In 75, Auletes' throne was threatened when the Romans exploited Cyrene to quell a riot over grain shortages, and in 74 the senate annexed Cyrene as a Roman province.³ In 59, as a measure of protection against such annexation, Auletes bribed Pompey and Caesar with 35 million denarii to recognize his legitimate rule of Alexandria. In 58, however, the Alexandrians themselves deposed the king and he fled to Rome to request that an army, preferably led by Pompey, restore him to his throne.

Soon afterwards, an embassy of one hundred Alexandrian citizens led by the philosopher Dio

¹ See Scullard 2004: 18-22 in particular for economic decline and land reform issues in Rome. See also Wood 1988: 29-41 on the troubles of the late Republic.

² See Wiseman 1985: 54-62 for a summary of the political background to the *Pro Caelio*; also see Austin 1960: 152-4 and Dorey 1958. Wiseman argues that Cicero covers up the politics, while Austin believes the politics were an excuse for the prosecution to bring a personal conflict to court. For a comparison of the two views see Craig 1995: 414-7.

³ See Scullard 2004: 89-90.

departed to plead the case of the Alexandrian citizens against Ptolemy. The embassy landed at Puteoli but never made it to Rome because it was attacked by a mob of angry locals. Dio moved to the house of Lucius Lucceius, who happened to be a close friend of Pompey, a supporter of Ptolemy. After an attempt on his life, Dio moved to the house of T. Coponius where he was later murdered. Public opinion was scandalized and a series of accusations followed. P. Asconius was charged with the murder, but was successfully defended by Cicero. The next defendant to be tried was Marcus Caelius Rufus.

Caelius, born in 82, completed his *tirocinium fori* under the tutelage of both Cicero and Crassus between the years of 66 and 63.⁴ Because of his thirst for recognition and success, he became involved with a riotous set of young men who supported Catiline in 63. There is, however, no concrete evidence that he was a conspirator.⁵ In 60, Caelius prosecuted C. Antonius Hybrida for extortion and his success against the defense, which included Cicero himself, catapulted him into a notable position within society. He moved away from his father's house and rented a house from P. Clodius on the Palatine, where he met and became involved with the latter's sister, Clodia.

In 57, Caelius brought a charge of *ambitus* against L. Calpurnius Bestia, whom he had supported only a few months before.⁶ Cicero successfully defended Bestia. Caelius made a move to bring him to court again, but before he could begin, L. Sempronius Atratinus, Bestia's son, charged Caelius on five different counts associated mainly with the Alexandrian embassy.⁷ The

⁴ See Wiseman 1985: 62-9 for Caelius' life.

⁵ See Austin 1960: 144. The only evidence for Caelius' support of Catiline is *Cael.* 9-11.

⁶ See Dorey 1958: 176 for Caelius' feud with Bestia's family. He suggests that the quarrel may relate to the property of a certain Palla who was a relative.

⁷ Austin 1960: 152-4. The formal charges were 1) *de seditionibus Neapolitanis* 2) *de Alexandrinorum pulsatione Puteolana* 3) *de bonis Pallae* 4) *de Dione* 5) *de veneno in Clodiam parato*.

Claudii, whose association with Caelius had come to an end with a split between Caelius and Clodia, hurried to support Atratinus; Caelius turned to his former patrons, Crassus and Cicero, for help. The prosecution, therefore, consisted of L. Sempronius Atratinus, P. Clodius, and L. Herennius Balbus.⁸ On the defense were M. Caelius Rufus, who spoke first for himself, M. Crassus, and M. Tullius Cicero, who spoke last and consequently on the second day of the trial, 4 April 56.

In all of this political wrangling, however, one figure stands out. Clodia Metelli, born about 97, was one of six children of Ap. Claudius Pulcher, consul in 79.⁹ Her family's nobility dated back twelve generations to the first Ap. Claudius who was consul in 212. The family trees of the Claudii intertwine with those of the Metellan and Julio-Claudian family lines but, as Wiseman notes, "the number and variety of families with whom the Claudii were connected," has no clear boundary.¹⁰ Clodia herself married Metellus Celer in approximately 79, and he died suddenly just before Caelius was brought to trial in 56. It is still unclear whether or not she is Catullus' Lesbia and Caelius is the Rufus with whom the poet becomes angry, but Clodia was a powerful person in her own right. She supported her brother's transfer to the *plebs* to become tribune against her husband's will, owned her own property, and held social, if not strictly political, influence.¹¹ It was rumored that Caelius and Clodia had been involved with each other after his move to the Palatine, but that Caelius had broken it off sometime just before his trial;

⁸ See Austin 1960: 154-7 and Wiseman 1985: 69-74 for the prosecution. Both Austin and Wiseman reject the identification of P. Clodius as Clodia's brother. Instead, Wiseman suggests that he was a freedman of the Claudii.

⁹ Based on Plutarch, Cic. 29.4, Wiseman 1985: 23 suggests that Clodia was born about 97 since she was married by the time her father had passed away, leaving only two sisters for the eldest son to support.

¹⁰ For an extensive stemma of the Claudian family, see Wiseman 1985: 19.

¹¹ On Clodia's nobility and power, see Wiseman 1985: 15-53, especially 25; Cicero's statement "*ex hac domo progressa...*" at *Cael.* 29 means that Clodia retained the house after her husband's death. For Clodia's support of her brother and social influence see Skinner 278-80. Skinner strips away the negative images of Clodia in the *Pro Caelio* and Catullus' poems and examines her instead through Cicero's letters.

Cicero capitalized on this rumor and jury's assumed knowledge of the affair to reduce the charges into a series of love quarrels.¹² Of course, Cicero had strong motivation for the invective he hurled at Clodia and her family because it was her brother, P. Clodius Pulcher, who caused his exile.¹³

The Speech

In 56, the day set for the trial, the fourth of April, was also a holiday: the first day of the *ludi Megalenses*. On this day of festivities, Cicero had to defend Caelius on two of the five charges, and the most serious ones: the attempted murder of Clodia by poison, and the borrowing of gold from Clodia herself.

In the *exordium* (1-2), Cicero begins his speech with an imagined visitor at Rome who is amazed at the present trial.¹⁴ No crimes have been committed, but on a day when the rest of Rome is at their leisure, a youth of incredible talent, hard-work, and favor (*adulescentem inlustri ingenio, industria, gratia*, 1) is attacked by a harlot's influence (*oppugnari autem opibus meretriciis*, 1). He then reminds the jury that no one would condescend to such an accusation unless he were dependent on the intolerable lust and cruel hatred of another. Cicero accomplishes three important goals in his *exordium*: 1) the immediate attention to the *ludi Megalenses*, 2) the negative characterization of Clodia and positive one of Caelius, and 3) the establishment of hatred and lust as the underlying motivations for the prosecution.

¹² On this point I agree with Craig 1993: 109 "I believe that the love affair took place, that Caelius spurned Clodia, and that there was some general knowledge of these facts."

¹³ Geffcken 1973: 58-88 examines the fragments of Cicero's *In Clodium et Curionem* to see how his use of invective against Clodius foreshadows his treatment of Clodia in the *Pro Caelio*.

¹⁴ For the divisions of the speech see Austin 1960:45. The *exordium* would naturally lead into the *narratio* but Cicero instead devotes his energy to clearing away accusations on Caelius' morality.

After insinuating each of these points in the *exordium*, Cicero progresses in the *praemunitio* (3-50) to battle the accusations made by the prosecution that Caelius had been loose with his modesty, money, and political affiliations. He begins with Caelius' *pietas* towards his father (3-4) and reputation among his townsmen (5). He argues that both parents and a group of distinguished men from his home town are present at the trial in support of his defendant. The mother's grief, therefore, and the disheveled appearance of the father ought to show the jury how they feel about their son. Then, following the appeal to the young man's parents, Cicero compares his own humble background to that of Caelius. He reminds the court that Caelius had to possess a good work ethic and upright lifestyle to come as far as he has, just as Cicero's own reputation comes from his rhetorical work and careful balance of life (*hic forensis labor vitaeque ratio*, 6).

After laying his foundations, (*videor mihi iecisse fundamenta defensionis meae*, 6), Cicero moves on to a larger issue: *pudicitia*, including Caelius' supposed familiarity with Catiline, debt, physical violence, and adulterous behavior. Cicero prefaces his refutation of all charges with a brief discussion on *maledicta* :

Accusatio crimen desiderat, rem ut definiat, hominem notet, argumento probet, teste confirmet; maledictio autem nihil habet propositi praeter contumeliam; quae si petulantius iactatur, convicium, si facetius, urbanitas nominatur. (6)

An accusation seeks a crime, in order that it define the situation, mark out the man, prove by argument, confirm by witness; slander, however, has nothing of this purpose except insult, which, if it is tossed about rashly, is called invective, if skillfully, elegance.¹⁵

Before he even begins to justify Caelius' character, then, Cicero has weakened the prosecution's arguments by pointing out their lack of substance. Next, he progresses to Caelius' familiarity with Catiline. After outlining his own patronage of the young man from the time he left his

¹⁵ All *Pro Caelio* translations are mine and are translated to reflect as closely as possible the imagery that Cicero employs. For a discussion of *urbanitas* see Austin 1960: 53 and Ramage 1973.

father's side, Cicero admits that Caelius did support the traitor, but only when Catiline ran for office the second time (11). He then further justifies Caelius' actions with a sketch of Catiline's deceiving character. Cicero depicts the positive and negative sides of Catiline in carefully balanced syntax and diction, finally ending with the excuse that many others of good backgrounds and families also supported Catiline, and that he himself was almost fooled by a man who seemed to many to be an upright citizen (10-14).

Cicero then discusses Caelius' debt and relocation away from his father to the Palatine. He dismisses the debt in one brief section (17). Caelius kept no account books when he lived with his father, and even though he did rent a house on the Palatine, it could not possibly have been as much as 30,000 sesterces. Furthermore, Caelius moved away from his father at the proper time in his career and when it was a hindrance for him to be so far away from the forum (*cum domus patris a foro longe abesset*, 18). It is a pity, however, that he did move away, for the move and that "Palatine Medea" became the source of all his evils, or at least of all the gossip (18).¹⁶

In order to dismiss the other charges, that Caelius attacked a man at the pontifical election and that he seduced other men's wives on their way home from dinner parties, Cicero merely discredits the witnesses (19-20). Afterwards, he dismisses the charge about Dio's death without even narrating the traditional scene of crime; instead he claims that Ptolemy himself admits his instigation of the crime, and that P. Asicius, accused of being an accomplice, was acquitted (23-4). If neither of these men were held accountable for such a crime, then Caelius ought to be far above suspicion. Continuing in his string of defenses, Cicero rebuffs the slander on Caelius' morality by claiming that many other men have done such things in the city, and they eventually

¹⁶ For the reference to the *Medea* see Austin 1960: 69. Earlier in the trial, Atratinus had called Caelius a *pulchellum Iasonem*, and Caelius retaliated by calling Atratinus *Pelia Cincinnatus*.

come back and bear good fruit for the Republic. Throughout the speech Cicero continues to justify Caelius' actions by showing the common follies of all men when they are in their youth.

Cicero finally turns his argument on Clodia:

Res est omnis in hac causa nobis, iudices, cum Clodia, muliere non solum nobili verum etiam nota ... (31)

The whole affair for us in this case, judges, is with Clodia, a woman not only noble, but also notorious ...

He decides that it would be unwise to address her directly and instead employs *prosopopoeia*, a figure of speech in which a deceased or absent person is represented. By way of preface, he first asks whether she prefers that he deal with her sternly, solemnly, and antiquely, or mildly and gently and urbanely (*severe et graviter et prisce agere malit, an remisse et leniter et urbane*, 33).

Without waiting for an answer, Cicero first assumes the persona of Appius Claudius Caecus, censor in 312 and consul in 307 and 295, to chastise her for her lewd behavior. Cicero then dismisses the stern and almost rustic old man (36) and deals with her more politely (*urbanius*).

Cicero summons the persona of her youngest brother, P. Clodius Pulcher, to criticize her for her desperate attempts to attract Caelius. After showing the jury that Clodia's family, both the stern ancestor and the urbane young brother, disprove of her, Cicero turns to Caelius. To the youth of hard work and natural talent, Cicero becomes both the stern and the lenient father from Roman comedy. As the stern father, he criticizes Caelius for his interaction with Clodia, and as the relaxed father, he turns his criticism on the city and Clodia:

Quotus quisque istam [famam] effugere potest, praesertim in tam maledica civitate? Vicinum eius mulieris miraris male audisse cuius frater germanus sermones iniquorum effugere non potuit? (38)

How many are able to flee that reputation, especially in such a slanderous city? Do you wonder that a neighbor of that woman has a bad reputation when her brother has not been able to flee the gossip of enemies?

Cicero follows the *prosopopoeia* with an excuse for the follies of youth and then a long accusation on Clodia's loose behavior (35).

Next, after his speech has adequately excused Caelius' morality, Cicero moves on to the *argumentatio* (51-70). In this division of the speech, Cicero deals directly with the charges of attempted murder of Dio and the gold borrowed from Clodia which Caelius was accused of using against both Dio and Clodia herself. Cicero addresses the lesser crime first. Through a complex dilemma which is based on the assumed love affair, Cicero forces Clodia to choose between two equally damaging options: if she was as close to Caelius as the prosecution claims, then she would have known why he wanted the gold and is therefore implicated in the attempted murder, if she was not as close as that then she would not have lent him the gold. (52-3).¹⁷ Next, to battle the accusation that Caelius attempted to murder Dio while he was in the house of L. Luceius, Cicero produces the testimony of the host himself (54-55). He again pins the whole trial onto the love affair and the corrupt house of Clodia (*totum crimen profertur ex inimica, ex infami, ex crudeli, ex facinerosa, ex libidinosa domo* 53). Finally, Cicero comes to the most serious crime: poison. In the last fourteen sections of the *argumentation*, Cicero shifts the focus from Caelius to Clodia and accuses her of being too intimate with her servants (57) and killing her late husband, Q. Metellus Celer (59). Then he creates a comical scene at the Senian baths, where it was said that Caelius arranged for P. Licinius to hand over the poison to Clodia's servants (61-70). He immerses the jury in insignificant details, asking where the servants hid, how they got dressed again so quickly, and why they couldn't hold onto Licinius once they attacked him. In this section, Cicero also calls Clodia the *mulier potens quadrantaria illa* (62), and characterizes her

¹⁷ For the use of the dilemma in the *Pro Caelio* see Craig 1993: 106-122. In this instance Cicero claims that Clodia would not have given the gold to Caelius unless they were intimate, and if they were intimate then surely Caelius would have told her of its purpose. She is, therefore, either implicated in the plot or she did not provide him with gold.

as an *imperatrix* (67). After creating this scene and confusing his jury, Cicero calls attention to the slaves' absence from the trial (since Clodia had already emancipated them); there can be no proof without witnesses. Cicero finishes his speech by reminding the jury of Caelius' youth and hard work by urging them to allow the young man to redeem himself (79-80).

In the end, Cicero's position on the fourth of April 56 was difficult to maneuver. He had to discredit the prosecution without discrediting his own client and without angering his friend, Bestia. Yet he was able to accomplish his goals by focusing on Clodia and concentrating his powers of negative ethos on her while depicting Caelius as a harmless and hard-working youth.

Approaches to the *Pro Caelio*

In *Comedy in the Pro Caelio*, Geffcken combines various modern and ancient comic theories with a close reading of the *Pro Caelio* to reveal how Cicero uses "inherent patterns of comic plot and character" in his speech.¹⁸ Geffcken's model of comedy derives from Bergson, Freud, and Segal.¹⁹ First, comedy is a release from every day activity, especially in Rome where comedies were performed on holidays. Second, comedy provides a release from authority. Third, three parties are necessary for comedy: the object of comic ridicule, the ridiculer, and the spectator. Finally, comedy gives the audience the experience of learning and recognition through a process of suspense and inverted expectation.

Geffcken first asserts that "Cicero immediately endeavors to win over the jury by creating a mood of sympathy for their plight in being bound to court on a holiday."²⁰ She argues that the scene of the out-of-town passerby creates a "conspiracy of understanding" with his audience and

¹⁸ Geffcken 1973: 2.

¹⁹ Geffcken 1973: 2-8.

²⁰ Geffcken 1973: 11.

assures emotional detachment from the details of the case.²¹ Next, the quote from Ennius's *Medea* which appears in section 18 "transports us to the atmosphere of drama and specifically of comic hyperbole."²² Then, Cicero's clever impersonation of Appius Claudius Caecus, Clodius, and then the two fathers from comedy in the *prosopopoeiae* would have been amusing to the audience; not only does Cicero undercut the dignity of the contemporary Clodians by mimicry, but he also contrasts the notions of urbane/modern versus rustic/old at a rapid pace.²³ Finally, Cicero's hyperbolic, mock-epic bath scene involves intrigue, drama, and incongruity which both entertained and confused the jury.

Geffcken devotes chapter five to Cicero's characterization of Clodia. According to Freud, a hostile joke serves the purpose of aggressiveness, satire, or defense and an obscene joke serves the purpose of exposure. Clodia is the target of both in the *Pro Caelio*. Geffcken methodically contrasts Clodia and the ideal woman. The ideal woman focuses on her family, speaks in a pure and elegant style, and walks with grace. Clodia is accused of murdering her husband, has libertine speech, and a gait befitting a prostitute.²⁴ In addition to these offenses, Clodia's intimacy with her slaves and her open house are more evidence of her status as a *meretrix*. The characteristics of Clodia leave her open to criticism and obscene jokes and diminish her credibility as a witness.

Finally, Geffcken examines Cicero's use of the verb *videor*, which compels the jury to focus on the Cicero's show rather than the legalities of the case. In the appendices, Geffcken analyzes the fragments of the *In Clodium et Curionem* to reveal how Cicero's invective against

²¹ Geffcken 1973: 12-13.

²² Geffcken 1973: 15.

²³ Geffcken 1973: 22.

²⁴ Geffcken 1973: 27-30. See *Cael.* 49 for Clodia's manner of speech and walk.

Clodius foreshadows that which he employs against Clodia in the *Pro Caelio*. Cicero focuses on Clodius' "lack of mature masculinity, the antithesis of the urbane and rustic and of the puritan and libidinous, and finally with a burlesque 'costume' drama."²⁵ According to Geffcken, Cicero uses Baiae as a symbol of sophisticated society pitted against the puritanical, but in other fragments, when Cicero defends himself for visiting Baiae, he depicts Clodius as stiff and prudish. In fragments 22-25, however, Cicero portrays Clodius in woman's clothing in the Bona Dea affair and he types himself and his audience as *rustici* because they would not wear such dazzling outfits. Thus, the contrast between city and country was present in the *In Curionem et Clodium* and it appears again in the *Pro Caelio* in the antithesis of Cicero's impersonations of Caecus and Clodius.

Geffcken reveals that Cicero and his rhetoric itself subsume tropes from another genre. Because her study, however, is only focused on comedy, other cross-generic themes are not traced. For instance, in the appendix Geffcken examines the costume changes and urbanity of Clodius that relate to larger cultural issues. Geffcken restricts these themes to comedy, but they are more elastic. Geffcken's analysis of characterization and in particular the antithesis of city and country is an important starting point; however, the modes of ethos do not depend directly on genre but are connected to the wider cultural understanding of spatial relations that extends beyond literature and into ideology.

In *Trials of Character: The Eloquence of Ciceronian Ethos*, May examines Cicero's modes of characterization in fifteen different speeches. May arranges the speeches in chronological order and groups them into the pre-consular speeches, consular and immediate post-consular, *post reditum*, and final years. The study demonstrates common traits of

²⁵ Geffcken 1973: 70.

Ciceronian ethos throughout Cicero's career, including the identification of client and patron, the "Romanness" of the client versus the lack of Roman qualities in the opponent, and the use of antithetical polarized terminology.

In his chapter on the *Pro Caelio*, May observes that "ethos of course supplies a major source for persuasive material."²⁶ The *exordium* introduces the different actors of the case: Caelius, the hard working, ingenious youth, Clodia, to whom a slight reference is made, and the two *patroni*, Cicero and Atratinus. In the *praemunitio*, Caelius appears as an archetypical hero and the prosecution plays the role of blocking characters. Cicero patronizes Atratinus, casts Balbus as an over-stern censor of morals, and depicts Clodia as a wanton prostitute. At the same time, he assumes the persona of the mild, indulgent father and projects Caelius as honorable and gifted.

Consistency of character justifies Caelius on two accounts. First, because he has worked at his oratorical skills he cannot also be devoted to pleasure; pleasure and hard work are all-consuming and therefore mutually exclusive. Second, because Catiline's character is inconsistent, Caelius cannot be blamed for supporting him; even Cicero himself was fooled by the contrasting characteristics of Catiline. As Cicero casts his characters he works within the contrast of two lifestyles: *severitas* versus *ludus*, age versus youth, and *disciplina* versus *voluptas*.²⁷

According to May, the *prosopopoeiae* function as the most important means of casting Clodia as the *meretrix*, because both members of the Claudian family disprove of her even though they represent opposite morals, time, and age. This characterization carries over to the

²⁶ May 1988: 106.

²⁷ May 1988: 108-9.

argumentatio in which Cicero portrays her as too familiar to both Caelius and her slaves. Then, she rises beyond the mere *meretrix* and becomes a *spoliatrix* and *imperatrix*. May concludes that of all the Ciceronian speeches, the *Pro Caelio* relies the most on characterization, and that by casting the characters of the speech as stock figures from comedy “Cicero can rely not only on his disarming wit to conciliate and ingratiate the jury to his case but also on his audience’s preconceived notions of such comic roles.”²⁸

Although May identifies these forms of ethos at work in the speech, he does not treat them as separate themes outside of oratory. Because May categorizes his study according to each speech rather than aspects of ethos, the book lacks continuity. The chapter on the *Pro Caelio*, however, does point out some useful modes of ethos: Romanness versus un-Romanness, the antithetical treatment of prosecution and defense, and the consistency of character. When these aspects of ethos are considered in light of spatial value, it is possible to see that Cicero not only capitalized on the Roman concept of character, but also on that of city and country.

In *Form as Argument in Cicero’s Speeches: A Study of Dilemma*, Craig examines Cicero’s “persuasive use of his audience’s rhetorically educated expectations.”²⁹ He argues that form of argument, that is, the word choice, syntax, repetition, and variation, can constitute a type of “extra-rational argument” in which the structure improves the viability of the argument.³⁰ In the introduction, Craig explains that he chose to study the dilemma, which he defines as “the offering to the opponent two choices such that he must choose one or the other and either choice hurts him,” because it is unambiguous, highly recognizable, and common.³¹ After outlining the

²⁸ May 1988: 115.

²⁹ Craig 1993: ix.

³⁰ Craig 1993: 7.

³¹ Craig 1993: see 8 for the selection choice and 25 for the definition of the dilemma.

history of the rhetorical form of the dilemma, Craig examines seven Ciceronian speeches to determine the function of the dilemma in Ciceronian rhetoric. He proves that rhetorical form cannot be separated from its context.

In his chapter on the *Pro Caelio*, Craig argues that the “presentational aspect of the dilemma... is integral to Cicero’s persuasive strategy, and to the remarkable effectiveness of the speech.”³² Craig outlines the context of the speech and the complicated politics behind the charges. Cicero was successful because his depiction of the love affair between Caelius and Clodia had three effects: 1) it attributed to Clodia a motive for lying, 2) it discredited Clodia’s testimony on the grounds that she was a *meretrix*, and 3) it allowed the orator to relate the entire attack on Caelius’ life to this one episode.³³ Cicero refrained, however, from directly mentioning the love affair until the *peroratio* because of its potential to reinforce the negative aspect of Caelius’ character. He used the dilemma to base his argument on the love affair without directly mentioning it.

Craig examines nine instances of the dilemma in the *Pro Caelio* (35, 50, 52, 53 three times, 58, 61, and 62).³⁴ In section 35, the passage between the two Claudian *prosopopoeiae*, Cicero tells Clodia that she must either disprove the accusations of the prosecution about debauchery and misconduct or she must confess that they are true and therefore neither her accusation nor her evidence are believable. In section 50, Cicero demands Clodia either deny her identity (and loose lifestyle), in which case she would not have been involved with Caelius, or accept it and thereby discredit herself as a witness. In section 52, Cicero presents a dilemma wherein either Caelius told Clodia why he wanted the gold, and so she becomes an accomplice in

³² Craig 1993:106.

³³ Craig 1993:108.

³⁴ Craig 1993:106.

the crime, or else he did not tell her and she surely did not lend it to him. In section 53, Cicero presents three dilemmas. First, if Clodia was as intimate with Caelius as the prosecution claims then the young man would have told her why he wanted the gold; if he was not so intimate then she never gave it. Second, if Caelius told Clodia the truth then she is an accomplice in the crime, if he did not then she did not lend the gold. Finally, he asks how Caelius met up with the slaves of Luceius to give them the poison. If he did it by himself, he was reckless; if he did it through someone else, who was it? The next dilemma appears in section 58 questioning again the intimacy of Caelius and Clodia, and then in section 61, Cicero questions the nature of Caelius' knowledge about Clodia's intimacy with her slaves. If he was as close with her as the prosecution claims, then he would have known that her slaves would betray him to her. Finally, in section 62, in the midst of the bath scene, Cicero asks how the group of men entered the baths and where they hid. They could not have been allowed in without Clodia, but she could not have held sway unless she were a *mulier potens quadrantaria* in which case again her testimony is worthless. After closely examining each of these dilemmas, Craig concludes that "the dilemma is the ideal vehicle for Cicero's argument since it 1) allows him to posit the affair without admitting it, 2) gives the illusion of exhaustive, invincible argument, and 3) contributes a unique pervasive resonance."³⁵

Craig shows that it is safe to assume that the love affair between Clodia and Caelius was common knowledge, and he reveals how Cicero acted on that assumption in his rhetoric. Cicero's rhetorical form (the dilemma) and powers of characterization (ethos) are the basis of his success in acquiring Caelius' acquittal. Yet to my mind, Craig relies too heavily on rhetorical analysis. Indeed, rhetoric extends beyond form and is a product of its own culture.

³⁵ Craig 1993: 121.

To this end, in her book *Representations: Images of the World in Ciceronian Oratory*, Vasaly aims to “force rhetorical analysis into new areas” by looking at the role of ambiance and representations of monuments and places in rhetoric.³⁶ She examines the role of, or references to, the visible world in Ciceronian oratory, and she argues that the truth about the way the Romans saw their world is found in a “spectrum of beliefs”.³⁷ Most importantly, Vasaly breaks from the typical analysis of speeches based on rhetorical handbooks and asserts that to analyze speeches from such a viewpoint inhibits our ability to understand that the formal framework is a beginning rather than an end and that the speech is not a static entity.

Vasaly takes as her starting point the first three Catilinarians, in which Cicero exploits the setting of his speech. She argues that the Temple of Jupiter Stator had strong associations with Romulus which allowed Cicero to manipulate his audience’s collective memory concerning the founding of Rome. He could easily depict Catiline as an enemy from without who had managed to penetrate the walls of the city while casting himself as a new Romulus, founder and savior of the city from the *hostis*.³⁸ In this speech, the Rostra functions similarly as a symbol of Republican Rome. Cicero again uses spatial references in the *De Signis (In Verrem 2.4)*, where he had to transform the catalogue of stolen statues into an emotionally gripping narrative. He accomplished this goal by creating a geographical progression and connecting the places to religious and patriotic themes.

Based on these case studies, Vasaly shows how Cicero “manipulates his audience’s generic and ethnic images of the Roman and non-Roman world.”³⁹ Vasaly discusses the

³⁶ Vasaly 1993: 6.

³⁷ Vasaly 1993: 7.

³⁸ Vasaly 1993: 40-59.

³⁹ Vasaly 1993: 8.

technique of creating visual imagery for the audience to see in their ‘mind’s eye’.⁴⁰ Here she argues that Cicero spoke about the world in such a way as to echo the ideas about places that he knew his audience already consciously or unconsciously held. Based on a brief survey of ethnographical accounts in the historical works of Sallust, Strabo, and Caesar, Vasaly identifies the ethnocentric view Romans held which allowed the Roman orator to capitalize on the stock *topos* of ‘them and us’. Finally, in addition to examining the positive and negative associations with space, she also briefly glances at the positive and negative aspects of chronology, asserting that there is a powerful link between space and time.

When Vasaly turns to the *Pro Roscio* and *Pro Caelio*, she reveals how Cicero manipulated his audience’s preconceptions about city and country. Cicero casts Roscius as a *rusticus bonus* whose rustic life teaches thrift, diligence, and justice. In the *Pro Caelio*, however, Cicero praises the city. Vasaly argues that while the prosecution accused Caelius of a corrupt life in the city, Cicero subtly makes fun of such old-fashioned morality and makes the city the locus of all that is stimulating and amusing.⁴¹ To support this argument, Vasaly first claims that Cicero’s impersonation of Appius Claudius Caecus and the rigid father from comedy ridicule rustic morality. She then focuses on the ideal education that a city can provide. She argues that the visiting figure in the *exordium* encourages the audience to “open their eyes and ears to the vitality, excitement, and energy of the world into which this imaginary stranger had been drawn.”⁴² Following this introduction, then, Cicero stimulates his audience’s interest with tales of intrigue, gossip, and the life of a *meretrix*. Cicero’s praises of Caelius’ *humanitas* and

⁴⁰ Vasaly 1993: 89-128.

⁴¹ Vasaly 1993: 181.

⁴² Vasaly 1993: 180.

education are in fact praises of the city life, and his constant repetition of Clodia's scandalous behavior is in fact a way to excite his audience.

Vasaly's departure from strict rhetorical theory and her attention to visual imagery and its relation to collective ideas about morality and ethnocentricity in Rome are productive ways to read the *Pro Caelio*. I disagree, however, with her interpretation of the *Pro Caelio*. Even while Cicero may make fun of the prosecution's strict morality, he still aligns Caelius with that morality through his pastoral imagery. The result is composite figure of Caelius who blends the positive aspects of both country and city. I also disagree that Cicero's constant repetition of Clodia's debauchery merely entertains or titillates his audience; it also outrages the jury and draws attention away from Caelius. The prosecution accuses Caelius of a corrupt city life, and even though Cicero excuses the city life of Caelius, he nevertheless twists and amplifies the same accusations against Clodia. In addition, I disagree that Cicero portrays the city as positively as Vasaly claims; he also depicts Rome as the center of Clodia's corruption and the place where Catiline thrived. In short, the portrayal of city and country in the *Pro Caelio* is not simple. Instead, Cicero capitalized on more than one association with city and country — the negative and positive aspects of both — to manipulate his audience.

With May's theories of ethos and Vasaly's theories of spatial representation in rhetoric we can see how Cicero characterizes Caelius as a rustic youth whose industry can influence the city for good if given a chance to reform, and Clodia as a brazen *meretrix* whose fast-paced lifestyle is a function of the immoral city. The picture of good and bad, positive and negative, is never black and white but rather a continuum of ideas that grays in the middle. In the *Pro Caelio*, the imagery of city-countryside is a product not just of rhetoric but also of culture. The next chapter explores the cultural significance of the city and countryside in Roman antiquity.

CHAPTER 3 SPATIAL VALUE IN ANTIQUITY

As human beings, dependent on our sensory-motor skills for the basis of reality, we conceptualize abstract thoughts in terms of space and time.¹ We may, for example, attach positive moral values with the home, and negative ones with the outside world. Alternatively, we may think of going forward as progress and backward as decline, or of up as positive, while down is negative. The association of positive and negative values with particular directions or spaces, however, is often dependent on our experiences as individuals and as communal societies. For my study, therefore, it is necessary to determine what collective associations the Romans had with particular spaces. In this chapter, I briefly summarize different approaches to the study of spatial value as outlined in Rosen and Sluiter's *City, Countryside, and the Spatial Organization of Value in Classical Antiquity*. The ancient concept of progress, as detailed by Dodds, also adds a dimension of understanding to how Romans conceptualized progress in terms of space. Moreover, the Romans' concept of their place in the world is also evident in ethnographical writings. In the second portion of this chapter, I review three generic representations of the farmer and how those representations are subsumed into the genre of oratory. Based on Connor's study on vegetal imagery in oratory, I suggest that oratory appropriates the language of farming as a form of authority. Ultimately, the associations with city and country as they come down through antiquity are not mutually exclusive, but are rather part of a continuum and they may be manipulated and interwoven according to need.

Throughout antiquity, the city and the countryside have served as vehicles of moral value. Both Greek and Roman authors employed the antithesis of the two locations to stress different values, whether or not such values represented reality. According to Quintilian, the question 'is

¹ Rosen and Sluiter 2006: 2.

town or country life better?’ was a common topic of debate for school boys.² The country can be the paragon of simplicity and morality or it can be the standard of vulgarity. Likewise, the city can be the center of sophistication and education, but it can also be the center for failing morality and corruption. The same author can use the opposition in different ways according to his own need. Horace *Satire*, 2.6, on the town mouse and country mouse, emphasizes the simplicity of the country and greed of the city. In *Epistles* 1.7, however, Horace relaxes in the country even though he admits that the blend of work and rest in the city is a better combination.³

Structuralist methodologies have focused on the binary opposition of the city and country, but the authors featured in the volume *City, Countryside, and the Spatial Organization of Value in Classical Antiquity* strive to liberate the city and countryside from such opposition and instead emphasize the blurring of boundaries between the two locations.⁴ The antitheses of city and country exist to an extent, but the positive and negative values affixed to each place are flexible and can be seen working with each other within the same piece of literature. The opposition, then, gives way to a continuum of value judgments in which city and country interact with each other.

Progress, as both a social phenomenon and a facet of ideological thought, affected the way Romans conceptualized spatial value.⁵ As a term that implies direction or some type of advancement, progress could not develop within ideologies that were focused on the myths of the Lost Paradise or Eternal Recurrence. Hesiod’s *Works and Days* depicts successive

² Braund 1989: 23; Quint. *Inst.* 2.4.24

³ Braund 1989: 42-4. In *Epistles* 1.7, Horace does not enjoy the country for its scenery but for the *otium* and friendship that exist there. Later in the same poem, however, he tells a story about a man whose country estate causes him too much stress and passion for gain (86), while the blend of work and labor in the city is better (56-9).

⁴ Rosen and Sluiter 2006: 4-5.

⁵ Dodds 1973: 1-25 discusses different concepts of progress throughout Greek and Roman literature.

generations as increasingly degenerate. The apex of human moral achievement has therefore already passed and the only possible movement is down.⁶ The latter myth, Eternal Recurrence, views human advancement as cyclic. While one society is increasing, another is decreasing; advancement is thus limited. The cyclic Platonic theory proposes that every good discovered already eternally exists. Therefore, instead of looking up or down, backwards or forwards, for advancement, one has only to look from the current Here to an ever-present There.⁷ The existence of two such theories allow for the creation of utopia elsewhere; paradise either existed in the past or it exists elsewhere. Either way, the present time and location are never the height of moral or technical progress. The country as the conceptualization of past simplicity and an idealized unknown therefore gains positive associations. The city, however, as the center of education and therefore technical advancement also has a place for positive values; only education and sophistication lead to civility and consequently progress. The question, as Dodds acknowledges, is by what gauge progress ought to be measured: technical or moral? Because this question defies answer, it is possible for both city and country to be the locations of social advancement.

Secondly, Roman ethnocentricity affects the value associations with country and city. Vasaly asserts that it was a “political perception rather than climate or geography that most powerfully reinforced the idea of Roman centrality,” and the political center was the area contained within the *pomerium*.⁸ The area outside the sacred city of Rome could be viewed as an idealized utopia or it could be the habitat of the dangerous Other. These associations manifested themselves in the writings of historians who included ethnographical digressions in their works.

⁶ Dodds 1973: 3.

⁷ Dodds 1973: 15-7.

⁸ Vasaly 1993: 134.

Such digressions generally include five main areas of description: 1) the physical geography, 2) climate, 3) agricultural produce and mineral resources, 4) origins and features of the inhabitants, and 5) political, social, and military organization.⁹ Behind these descriptions lie two distinct theories. Either law and custom differentiated groups of people in separate areas or else differences were merely a cause of human nature. The Hippocratic treatise *On Airs, Waters, Places* firmly established the connection between ethos and locus; the physical environment affects the way people look, think, and act.¹⁰ For example, a society that can engage in agriculture because of the fertility of its land is capable of establishing itself as civilized, whereas the more rugged an environment is, the more nomadic are its people. The link between ethos and locus allowed the Roman orator to characterize his defendant or an opponent by calling upon his place of birth or the location of their home and villas.¹¹

By the late Republic, ethnographical digressions, with their well-founded basis in Greek historians, were emerging in the works of Roman historians. Sallust's *Bellum Iurgurthinum* includes a description of both the people of Numidia and the territory itself. He depicts the descendants of the contemporary Numidians as wandering nomads who have only the resting place which night creates. The territory is impossible for harbors and the land, although good for fruit and cattle, lacks water. Such territory made the people resilient (*BI* 17-19).¹² Caesar's

⁹ Thomas 1982: 1.

¹⁰ Vasaly 1993: 144.

¹¹ For a review of ethnographical digressions see Vasaly 1993:145-55.

¹² Vasaly claims that Sallust's digression is "of limited use" because he only gives the "bare facts that he has received from his Carthaginian source and does not encourage the reader to analyze the reasons for the character traits and institutions he ascribes to the Africans." Wiedeman 1993:50, points out, however, that "the three digressions separate phases of the war which illustrate different moralities, associated with a series of Roman commanders, who are not only contrasted with one another, but also with the enemies they are fighting against." Sallust's digression, then, is an integral part of his description of the war with Jugurtha because it establishes the character of the enemy.

Bellum Gallicum also includes various sections of ethnography. In the beginning of his work, for example, he sets out to describe his enemy and relates that the Gauls who live the furthest away from the provinces are the strongest and the most savage in war (*BG* 1.1.3). Both Sallust and Caesar, then, reveal that ethnography was affected by “cultural, economic, and geographical circumstances rather than due to the inborn traits of various people.”¹³

The abiding interest in the differences between various ethnic groups, evident in these digressions, shows that the Romans in the time of the late Republic had strong preconceptions about foreigners and about the affect of location on character. Combined with the ancient concept of progress, ethnography adds another dimension to our understanding of how Romans valued particular spaces. On the one hand, any place away from Rome could be conceived of as utopia, on the other, it could represent the inferiority of uncivilized societies. These two opposing views of the areas beyond the *pomerium* find expression in comedy, pastoral, and agricultural handbooks.

The Generic Rustic Figure

The rustic figure embodies two different characterizations. He is at the same time a paradigm of virtue because of his abstinence from extreme pleasure, and an uncultivated, uneducated, and unsophisticated boor.¹⁴ The former characterization is generally seen in Roman comedy while the latter is embodied in both the pastoral tradition and the agricultural handbooks.

Roman comedy emerged as a blend of different influences, both Italian and Greek. Horace and Livy both give different accounts for the development of the genre at Rome, but both attribute its earliest roots to the Italian countryside, where gesticulation and mimicry provided

¹³ Vasaly 1993: 148-9.

¹⁴ Cullyer 2006: 182.

humor.¹⁵ In *Epistles* 2.1.139-63, Horace credits the Fescinnine verses as the earliest form of comedy. These were the rustic jests of farmers who uttered obscenities in alternate verse at the harvest festival. The Fescinnine verses eventually had to be constrained by law because their crudity had expanded into rage and open violence which ran rampant through the homes of citizens (150-5). Romans began instead to learn more sophisticated forms of literature from the Greeks (156). According to Livy's *Ab urbe condita* 7.2, early comedy involved the Roman youth performing an Etruscan dance and adding appropriate gestures; from that primal form a kind of musical medley, which Livy terms *satira*, arose. Both Horace and Livy, then, give rustic foundations for comedy. Although the rustic figure's vulgar gesticulations were comical, when they turned to outrage they were left behind and the rustic became a mark of incivility while the more educated and tame urbanites engaged in sophisticated jokes.

Cullyer relates that the rustic's inability to join in sophisticated and urbane laughter has three important results: he is laughed at by others, he does not have the wit to insult others, and he is excluded from sharing in laughter. Such exclusion types him as an outsider.¹⁶ In Plautus and Terence the rustic Latin figure flourishes, employing buffoonery, puns, jests, obscenities, and abusive slapstick humor. Such forms of comedy are hallmarks of the rustic who often becomes the butt of a joke because he is not educated enough to join in the banter of others. In addition, the rustic smells like goats and garlic and he is unfit to be a member of the urban society because he lives with animals.¹⁷ The aischrology found in both comedy and the *Priapea*, a collection of 95 poems on the subject of Priapus, provides further evidence that the obscene and indecent are

¹⁵ Duckworth 1994: 4-7.

¹⁶ Cullyer 2006: 191-6. Cullyer's analysis of the *agroikos* has proved very useful for this study.

¹⁷ Ramage 1973:27-9 compares the attitudes towards city and country life in the Plautine comedies, *Vidularia*, *Mostellaria*, and *Truculentus*.

conceptualized as rustic.¹⁸ Rosen's study on the urbanization of aischrology reveals how the urban poets Horace and Martial, as well as the authors of the *Priapea* interwove obscenities within an elegant and highly stylized form of poetry and used the excuse of rusticity for the coarse language and imagery.¹⁹ The rustic figure, then, is considered obscene, uneducated, and unsophisticated. This characterization gives the urbane city-dwellers a sense of superiority and creates a negative association with the country.

A positive characterization of the rustic figure occurs first in the pastoral genre. Theocritus' *Idylls* brought the bucolic shepherd into literary prominence. Gutzwiller's analysis of the herdsman in Greek ideology reveals that the herdsman was more than a simple country bumpkin; instead, in analogy and practice, he held a prominent place in the Greek mind.²⁰ Even before Theocritus, the figure of the herdsman in literature "communicated something about another figure of more value in society— king, warrior, poet, seer, even deity."²¹ Particular functions of the herdsman parallel those of more important members of society. Just as the shepherd orders his flock, so the king marshalls his men on the battlefield and maintains a just administration of goods at home. Again, just as the shepherd protects his flock, the general in battle protects his men. The shepherd in this respect serves as an idealized analogy for just government. In the intellectual sphere, the herdsman is also an analogy for the poet because he has the ability to guard; as the shepherd guards his sheep, so the poet guards knowledge and language. Although prominent in the pastoral genre, these analogies also appeared in earlier

¹⁸ Rosen 2006: 230.

¹⁹ Rosen 2006: 228.

²⁰ Gutzwiller 2006; 1991

²¹ Gutzwiller 1991: 24.

hexameter poetry, in Hesiod's *Theogony* and Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.²² After Theocritus, the pastoral tradition lived through Moschus and Bion and then emerged in Italy in the skillful hands of Vergil. The idealized utopia that Theocritus' shepherds share and their roles analogous to kings and poets coincide with the myth of the golden age, the lost paradise that Dodds stressed in his study on progress. The scene of pastoral provided a utopia elsewhere to compensate for the lost golden age.²³

The rustic also appears as a positive figure in agricultural handbooks. Cato's *De Agri Cultura*, a compilation of advice on farming, medicinal recipes, and food recipes champions the virtues of the farmer. Marcus Porcius Cato, who died in 149, was a *novus homo* in the Roman senate at a time when the people of Rome "remained mostly self-sufficient peasant farmers."²⁴ The pressures of the war with Carthage also began to increase the growth of the mercantile class and foreign revenue. In spite of the influx of wealth, Cato was a paragon of austerity in the midst of growing extravagance. As a protector of the *lex Oppia*, Cato sought legal restraint on luxury as a social rather than purely economic measure.²⁵ After progressing through the *cursus honorum*, Cato was elected to "the most senior, the most select, and the most prestigious-laden of the Roman magistracies," the censorship.²⁶ He exercised his authority as a censor with extreme conscientiousness and firmly thought of "the spread of luxuries as enervating, as damaging to the

²² Gutzwiller 1991: 24-41.

²³ Evans 2003: 286 follows Levitas' definition of utopia as occupying the space of unfulfilled desires. This definition "allows us to see all narratives of idealization in their historical contexts and it is within this framework that Golden Age descriptions of the past as well as fictional and geographical fantasy worlds encompass the Utopian as much as prescriptive and radically alternative systems of existence."

²⁴ Astin 1978: 4.

²⁵ Astin 1978: 25-6.

²⁶ Astin 1978: 78.

physical and moral strength of a military people.”²⁷ His praise of the farmer in the *De Agri Cultura* mirrors his own lack of luxury and honest way of life.

Because he was a man who held high public office and was a famed orator, Cato held a high level of authority in both speeches and writings. His handbook on farming does not comprehensively address agricultural production and organization but rather focuses on large farms that produced wine and oil. The style of his writing is plain and he directs his work not to the peasant farmer, but the large farm-owner who turns over the management of his production to a *vilicus*. In the preface, the censor, orator, and man of state praises the peasant farmer:

Et virum bonum quom laudabant, ita laudabant: bonum agricolam bonumque colonum; amplissime laudari existimabatur qui ita laudabatur. Mercatorem autem strenuum studiosumque rei quaerendae existimo, verum, ut supra dixi, periculosum et calamitosum. At ex agricolis et viri fortissimi et milites strenuissimi gignuntur, maximeque pius quaestus stabilissimusque consequitur minimeque invidiosus, minimeque male cogitantes sunt qui in eo studio occupati sunt. (Cat. *Agr.Praef.*)

And when they would praise a worthy man their praise took this form: “good husbandman,” “good farmer,” one so praised was thought to have received the greatest commendation. The trader I consider to be an energetic man, and one bent on making money; but, as I said above, it is a dangerous career and one subject to disaster. On the other hand, it is from the farming class that the bravest men and the sturdiest soldiers come, their calling is most highly respected, their livelihood is most assured and is looked on with the least hostility, and those who are engaged in that pursuit are least inclined to be disaffected.²⁸

Cato explicitly opposes the farmer to both the trader and the money-lender. Although a trader is hard-working and eager to acquire possessions, his is a dangerous and disaster-prone career. Out of farmers, on the other hand, come the bravest men and most energetic soldiers, and their profit is most respectable, stable, and least jealous-minded. Cato implies that a book concerning agriculture is worthy because the profession itself is most worthy. This characterization of the farmer gives him authority within society. His profession is necessary for the health of a

²⁷ Astin 1978: 98.

²⁸ Translated by Hooper 1934: 3.

community and, whether land-owner or land-worker, he earns an honest living. This is the type of character upon whom Aristotle forges his utopian society in the *Politics*; the rustic is “laughably coarse, and uneducated (relative to the urbane elite), but non-disruptive and non-appetitive (relative to the urban demos).”²⁹

It is even more interesting, however, that Cato’s statement raises the farmer to such a high reputation when, according to Plutarch (*Life of Cato* 21.5), Cato himself practiced money-lending as a business:

However, as he applied himself more strenuously to money-getting, he came to regard agriculture as more entertaining than profitable, and invested his capital in business that was safe and sure. He bought ponds, hot springs, districts given over to fullers, pitch factories, land with natural pasture and forest, all of which brought him large profits, and “could not,” to use his own phrase, “be ruined by Juppiter.” He used to loan money also in the most disreputable of all ways, namely, on ships, and his method was as follows ... (21.5)³⁰

In chapter 25, Plutarch again reminds his audience that Cato theoretically praised farming but did not practice it as a serious pursuit:

He composed speeches, then, on all sorts of subjects, and histories, and as for farming, he followed it in earnest when he was young and poor,-- indeed, he says he then had only two ways of getting money, farming and frugality,-- but in later life he was only a theoretical and fancy farmer. (25.1)³¹

Cato’s recognition of farming as an honorable career strengthens the farmer’s authority. The disparity between Cato’s written praise of the farmer and his own career reveals that the Roman

²⁹ Cullyer 2006: 215.

³⁰ Ἀπτόμενος δὲ συντονώτερον πορισμοῦ, τὴν μὲν γεωργίαν ἤγειτο μᾶλλον διαγωγὴν ἢ πρόσοδον, εἰς δ' ἀσφαλῆ πράγματα καὶ βέβαια κατατιθέμενος τὰς ἀφορμὰς, ἐκτᾶτο λίμνας, ὕδατα θερμὰ, τόπους κναφεῦσιν ἀνειμένους, ἔργα πίσσια, χώραν ἔχουσαν αὐτοφουεῖς νομᾶς καὶ ὕλας, ἀφ' ὧν αὐτῷ χρήματα προσήει πολλὰ μηδ' ὑπὸ τοῦ Διός, ὡς φησιν αὐτός, βλαβῆναι δυναμένων. trans Perrin 1914:367.

³¹ Συνετᾶττετο μὲν οὖν λόγους τε παντοδαπούς καὶ ἱστορίας· γεωργίᾳ δὲ προσεῖχε νέος μὲν ὦν ἔτι καὶ διὰ τὴν χρεῖαν – φησὶ γὰρ δυσὶ κεχρησθαι μόνοις πορισμοῖς, γεωργίᾳ καὶ φειδοῖ – , τότε δὲ διαγωγὴν καὶ θεωρίαν αὐτῷ τὰ γινόμενα κατ' ἀγρὸν παρεῖχε· trans. Perrin 1914:379.

ideology held farmers in high regard on an idealized if not realistic plane. The knowledge of farming, then, conveys more nobility and authority than the actual practice of farming. The city-dweller and the farmer can therefore merge as one being. A city figure can appropriate the authority and integrity of the farmer by merely exhibiting his knowledge of farming.

Murnaghan's study on the authority and truth-telling of a farmer has important implications for the appropriation of the language of farming in other genres.³² Murnaghan tracks the use of farming dialogues in four different works: the *Odyssey*, *Theogony*, *Works and Days*, and Xenophon's Socratic dialogue, *Oeconomicus*. In book 18 of the *Odyssey*, Eurymachus challenges Odysseus to work for him, tending his trees and collecting stones, and Odysseus responds with a proposal to an ἄγῶν in farming. By responding thus, Odysseus elevates farming to an aristocratic arena with two particular aristocratic features: landowning, and competing in contests.³³ In addition to creating an aristocratic status for himself through farming, Odysseus also makes it clear that his ability to farm means he is a truth-teller, just as Hesiod's ability to shepherd sheep made him a particularly good candidate for the inspiration of the Muses in the *Theogony*. Perhaps a more convincing portrayal of the authority of the farmer comes from Hesiod's *Works and Days*, a work about the justice and will of Zeus that is manifested in the nuts and bolts of farming. According to Hesiod, farming is the most reliable and honorable solution to the puzzle that is human existence.³⁴ Finally, in Xenophon's *Oeconomicus*, the idea of a farmer shifts from working land to owning land; the farmer no longer tends the land but owns the land and maintains adequate leisure time to devote to the *polis*. Xenophon's inclusion of a conversation between Cyrus and Lysander, in which the latter admires the trees that the former planted with

³² Murnaghan 2006

³³ Murnaghan 2006: 95-6.

³⁴ Murnaghan 2006: 102.

his own hands, reveals the central importance of farming: hands-on labor turns the possession of land and wealth into a product of merit rather than mere good fortune.³⁵ Murnaghan concludes that farming becomes a symbol of authority in society:

The mastery of this language [farming language] that these figures display does not necessarily qualify them to be farmers. Their expositions of farming practice are definitely not farming manuals and there is no reason to envision any of them actually working the land. Speaking this language qualifies them to be- not farmers- but speakers.³⁶

The authority of the language of farming carries over into different genres including rhetoric. Connors' study on vegetal imagery in Ciceronian oratory reveals that orators referred to the simplicity of the rustic in both positive and negative terms.³⁷ Orators often portrayed the rustic, uneducated farmer as inferior to the sophisticated speakers of the city. The terms *disertus* and *rusticus* are antithetical, and to characterize an opponent as a rustic is to insult him.³⁸ The language of rhetoric, however, often appears in terms of land cultivation. Good rhetorical language is associated with a good harvest and good training with the care of vines. Language that is too elaborate, however, is associated with uncultivated weeds and overgrowth while language that is inartistic recalls a dry or thorny field.³⁹ The farmer, then, is continuously kept away from the prestige of oratory, but the appropriation of agricultural language blurs the boundary between rustic and urban.

The appropriation of agricultural language increases the authority of the orator and his art. If to speak about farming is to display an understanding of *bios* which the gods have hidden, and thereby to also gain a certain social authority, it is only fitting that oratory as a genre

³⁵ Murnaghan 2006: 109.

³⁶ Murnaghan 2006: 116.

³⁷ Connors 2006.

³⁸ Connors 2006: 72.

³⁹ Connors 2006: 76.

appropriates such authority. Just as the farmer tends the fields and society benefits by the growth of crops and care of livestock, so the orator cultivates his ability to speak and guide the people into proper decisions. Society profits from both the farmer and the orator. The language of farming makes the orator, as Connors argues, less foreign and more acceptable, but it also makes him a caretaker of social well-being. By appropriating the authority of the rustic, then, the orator is also able to appropriate the authority of a poet into whom the muses have breathed the secrets of the world.

Thus far I have focused on the opposite characterizations of the rustic figure, which by default also affect the associations of values with the country as compared to the city. These characterizations are not, however, separate distinct values; moral values are rather a part of an organic whole and the positive and negative characterizations of the rustic are not on different planes but are rather different points along the same line. In an article on *agroikia* in Aristotle's *Ethics* and *Politics*, Cullyer points out that Aristotle seems to align himself with two different opinions towards the rustic. In the *Ethics*, he depicts the rustic as uneducated, not fit for political life, and the 'Other', but in the *Politics* he portrays him as a paradigm of noble labor and simple virtue. Cullyer concludes, however, that if we look at Aristotle's opinion in other works such as the *Politics*, we will see that the two seemingly opposite associations are more complex and are not mutually exclusive. It is not unreasonable to say that a rustic is hard-working, asocial, uneducated, and quiet, while at the same time noble. The occupation of a farmer is most respectable and his hard-work makes him the best soldier and man. His is the sort of nobility hindered only by the lack of education. This point will be of great importance when we come to the *exordium* of the *Pro Caelio*, where Cicero praises Caelius for his oratorical skills.

The moral and social associations with city and country, urban and rustic are important for the study of the *Pro Caelio*. It is not enough to evaluate only one aspect of the spatial value in Cicero's speech. Vasaly stresses the praise of the city; although such praise is evident in the defense of Caelius, I argue that there is also a certain praise of the country and disgust for the city. As we have seen, the negative and positive associations with each place are not mutually exclusive but rather flexible and fluid. Even though Cicero pokes fun of the prosecution's austere criticism of the city, he attempts to align his own client with their estimation of good, and rustic, morality. In addition to other allusions to the country and city, Cicero's praise of Caelius includes his approval of the young man's rhetorical abilities. Cicero's use of vegetal and agricultural diction adds to the young man's social responsibility towards the Republic and it also gives another dimension to the city-country spectrum in the speech. In the next chapter I locate and analyze the different uses of rustic and urbane imagery in the *Pro Caelio* to reveal how Cicero manipulates the complex associations with each space held among the audience.

CHAPTER 4
THE RUSTIC EFFECT IN THE *PRO CAELIO*

In the *Pro Caelio*, Cicero manipulates his audience's positive and negative attitudes toward geographical space. Neither country nor city is solely positive or negative; Cicero uses each side of the antithesis to achieve Caelius's acquittal. According to Vasaly, the city is portrayed positively, the country negatively; however, this dichotomy is not clear cut and does not account for the complexities in the *Pro Caelio*. Although the prosecution chastises Caelius for his corrupt revelries, Cicero continuously represents him as the good side of both city and country, while acting as a mirror to reflect the prosecution's own accusations against Clodia, whom Cicero always portrays as a city girl in a negative light. By combining positive and negative associations with each place, Cicero cashes in on the power of the entire spectrum of values.

Arguments and Counter Arguments for the City

Vasaly argues that Cicero calls attention to the entertainment, sophistication, and education that the city offers.¹ In the *exordium*, Cicero introduces a visitor to Rome whose wonderment at the trial and the *ludi Megalenses* marks a tone for the rest of the speech. He is first caught of guard by the splendor of the city and he doesn't understand why the jury is hard at work while the rest of the city is celebrating the holiday. After the visitor realizes that the defendant has not committed an outstanding crime, but is rather a youth of outstanding intelligence, diligence, and favor, attacked by a harlot's resources, he would consider that the jury is working too hard for a holiday, and he would also think that womanly lust which dragged the young man into court must be suppressed (*libidinem muliebrem comprimendam putet*, 1).

¹ See Vasaly 1993:175-87.

Geffcken argues that this *exordium* is modeled on the prologue of a play and creates an imaginary observer, which ropes the audience into a conspiracy with the defense against Clodia.² Vasaly, on the other hand, claims that this passage is evidence that Cicero “encouraged the listeners (as well as the readers, if only imaginatively) to open their eyes and ears to the vitality, excitement, and energy of the world into which this imaginary stranger had been drawn.”³ Both scholars stress that the *exordium* establishes the city as entertaining; however, the *exordium* also casts Caelius and Clodia in particular roles associated with space. In some ways, the visitor prefigures the characterization of Caelius; just as a simple-minded rustic figure coming to Rome for the games is astounded by the customs of the city and the trial at hand, so Caelius is amazed and confused by the accusations brought against him and the general whirl-wind of the city. Clodia, then, while in some aspects entertaining, is also cast as the negative force of the city that has disturbed the young man’s studies and diligence. Cicero immediately places Caelius and Clodia on opposite points of the city-country spectrum.

After the *exordium*, Cicero entertains his jury by hurling invective at Clodia’s loose morals and her improper actions. He describes her as an improper matron in every respect.⁴ He follows his first mention of the *libido muliebris* with another attack at Clodia in section 18, where, in the process of defending Caelius’ move out of his father’s house, he refers to her as a Palatine Medea:⁵

Nam numquam *era errans*
Hanc molestiam nobis exhiberet

² Geffcken 1995:12.

³ Vasaly 1993:180.

⁴ For a step-by-step comparison of Clodia and a proper matron, see Geffcken 1985: 29-45.

⁵ For the *Medea* quote see Austin 1956:69. Atratinus had referred to Caelius as *pulchellum Iasonem*, and Caelius had called Atratinus *Pelia Cincinnatus*. The reason for the original quotation is not clear, but Cicero was clearly remaining within an established theme.

Medea animo aegro, amore saevo saucia

Sic enim, iudices, reperietis quod, cum ad id loci venero, ostendam, hanc *Palatinam Medeam* migrationemque hanc adulescenti causam sivi malorum omnium sive potius sermonum fuisse. (18)

For the wandering mistress would never
Have given us this trouble
Medea with a sick mind, wounded by cruel love.

Thus indeed, judges, you will find, when I shall have reached that point, I shall show that this Palatine Medea and this move was the cause either of all evils or rather of all gossip for the young man.

Geffcken points out that the quotations from Ennius' *Medea* "immediately transport us into the atmosphere of drama and specifically of comic hyperbole."⁶ The quote elicits humor because it points out Clodia's trivial behavior. The comic and entertaining appeal of this quote, however, is not its whole significance. Instead, while distracting the jury, the quote also calls attention to the negative influence of the city and the Palatine Hill on Caelius. The move to the city and his interaction with Clodia are the sole causes of his downfall. Cicero, then, compels the jury, albeit through humor, to associate Clodia with the negative aspects of the city while he simultaneously casts her as the vicious wounded lover. Although the jury would have been laughing at Cicero's acting and the comic hyperbole at work, Cicero planted the seed of negative city life and its manifestation in the persona of Clodia.

Cicero continues to chastise Clodia whose instigation of the trial is a token of her domineering nature:

sunt autem duo crimina, auri et veneni; in quibus una et eadem persona versatur (30)

There are, however, two crimes, of gold and of poison, in which one and the same character is engaged.

Res est omnis in hac causa nobis, iudices, cum Clodia, muliere non solum nobili verum etiam nota (31)

⁶ Geffcken 1985: 15.

The whole affair in this case for us, judges, is with Clodia, a woman not only noble, but also notorious.

Duo sunt enim crimina una in muliere summorum facinorum, auri quod sumptum a Clodia dicitur, et veneni quod eiusdem Clodiae necandae causa parasse Caelium. (51)

There are indeed two crimes of the highest outrage in one woman; of the gold which it is said was borrowed from Clodia, and of the poison, which it is said Caelius prepared for the sake of killing the same Clodia.

In addition, Clodia is represented as an *imperatrix* (*ab imperatrice* 67), and a master mind of conspiracy, *mulier ingeniosa* (62). She is a hidden member of the prosecution, providing the weapons for attack against Caelius:

Non enim ab isdem accusatur M. Caelius a quibus oppugnatur; palam in eum tela iaciuntur, clam subministrantur. (20)

In fact Caelius is not accused by the same people by whom he is attacked; the javelins are hurled at him openly, they are supplied secretly.

Geffcken has pointed out that Clodia's role at the forefront of a political scandal is unnatural for a proper matron.⁷ In addition, her role as a counterpart to the *miles gloriosus* of comedy would have entertained the jury because it is so outrageous. Not only does this portrait of Clodia evoke laughter, but it also compels the jury to look around at the overturned morals of their surrounding city. Clodia is not just a character in a topsy-turvy play, she is a real life woman whose libertine actions are making a mockery of both the court and the young man on trial. Moreover, the diction, *oppugnatur... tela iaciuntur*, brings to mind images of battle and sharp weapons that can hardly have been attractive to the jury whose city had recently been ravaged by a civil war.

Therefore, although in some ways the scandals of Clodia and her improper behavior may have been entertaining and comical, they must also have struck a jarring note in the minds of the jury.

Vasaly argues that Cicero's invective against Clodia creates a thrill in his audience and emphasizes that the city is the location for all that is stimulating and interesting while the country

⁷ Geffcken 1985: 38.

is all that is boring and old-fashioned.⁸ Accordingly, “Cicero was not greatly dismayed by the prosecution’s references to beach parties, dinner parties, boat parties, musical concerts, trips to Baiae, and the like, for he manages to repeat the catalogue twice himself.”⁹

Accusatores quidem libidines, amores, adulteria, Baias, actas, convivia, comissiones, cantus, symphonias, navigia iactant, idemque significant nihil se te invita dicere. (35)

The prosecutors certainly toss about passions, loves, adulteries, Baiae, parties on the shore, banquets, revels, concerts, symphonies, boating parties, and likewise they indicate that they say nothing with you unwilling.

Si quae non nupta mulier domum suam patefecerit omnium cupiditati palamque sese in meretricia vita collocarit, virorum alienissimorum conviviis uti instituerit, si hoc in urbe, si in hortis, si in Baiarum illa celebritate faciat, si denique ita sese gerat non incessu solum, sed ornatu atque comitatu, non flagrantia oculorum, non libertate sermonum, sed etiam complexu, osculatione, actis, navigatione, conviviis, ut non solum meretrix, sed etiam proterva meretrix procaxque videatur: cum hac si qui adulescens forte fuerit, utrum hic tibi, L. Herenni, adulter an amator, expugnare pudicitiam an explere libidinem voluisse videatur? (49)

If some unmarried woman made her house open to the desire of all and placed herself openly in the lifestyle of a harlot, and set a precedent of enjoying banquets of the most unrelated men, if she did this in this city, if in the gardens, if in that crowd of Baiae, if furthermore she should carry herself thus not only in gait but also in attire and dress, not only with fiery eyes, not only with libertine speech, but also with embracing, kissing, beach parties, boating parties, and banquets, so that she seems not only a harlot, but also a perverse and impudent harlot, if some young man perhaps was with this woman, would he seem to you, L. Herennius, either an adulterer or a lover? Would he seem to have wanted to assault her chastity or to satisfy his lust?

Although the repetition of the catalogue of scandals does have a shocking and entertaining affect upon its audience, it also shifts the accusations of immorality from Caelius to Clodia. In section 25, Cicero recalls that L. Herennius Balbus chastised Caelius for scandalous behavior and lack of propriety:

Dixit enim multa de luxurie, multa de libidine, multa de vitiis iuventutis, multa de moribus et, qui in reliqua vita mitis esset et in hac suavitate humanitatis qua prope iam delectantur omnes versari periucunde soleret, fuit in hac causa pertristis quidam patruus, censor,

⁸ Vasaly 1993:178.

⁹ Vasaly 1993: 180.

magister; obiurgavit M. Caelium, sicut neminem umquam parens; multa de incontinentia intemperantiaque disseruit. (25)

Certainly he said a lot about luxury, a lot about lust, a lot about the vices of youth, a lot about the morals. And he, who is gentle in the rest of his life, and accustomed to engage agreeably in that pleasantness of humanity, by which nearly everyone is already delighted, was in this case a certain grim uncle, a censor, a director. He harangued Marcus Caelius, as a parent has never done to anyone; he dragged on about lack of propriety and lack of moderation.

Likewise, Cicero admits to his jury that Caelius never said no to a banquet, frequented the gardens, bought perfume, and visited Baiae (*qui nullum convivium renuerit, qui in hortis fuerit, qui unguenta sumpserit, qui Baias viderit* 27). By emphasizing Clodia's misdeeds, however, Cicero's repetition of the scandals acts as a bent mirror. It breaks the string of accusations that the prosecution hurled at Caelius and reflects them onto Clodia. The scandal and outrage of the behavior of the *mulier* probably did thrill the audience, but it also reminds them that she is the real culprit. On this level, Clodia again represents the misguided morals of the times and the city. She is, then, not only a comic persona and the butt of invective, but also the cause of Caelius's downfall.

Vasaly argues that the contrast between interesting city and boring country appears most prominently in the *prosopopoeiae* (33-38). Cicero first asks Clodia whether she wishes him to progress sternly, and gravely, and austere, or gently, and lightly, and urbanely (*severe et graviter et prisce agere malit, an remisse et leniter et urbane* 33). If the former, then he will bring forth a bearded ancestor from among her family *imagines* to chastise her. Cicero then assumes the persona of Appius Claudius Caecus. The old man questions Clodia about her familiarity with Caelius, a man not one of her blood and marriage relatives, and reminds her of the high social standards of her ancestors. His most severe criticism falls on her lack of propriety and her choice to adhere to her brothers' fast and urbane life rather than ancestral examples:

Quid igitur fuit nisi quaedam temeritas ac libido? (34)

What, therefore, was it, unless a certain rashness and licentiousness?

Cur te fraterna vitia potius quam bona paterna et avita et usque a nobis cum in viris tum etiam in feminis repetita moverunt? (34)

Why did brotherly vices affect you more than the good deeds of your father, of your grandfather, and all the way from my own time then revealed in men and also in women?

After Cicero dismisses the harsh and almost rustic old man, he brings in Clodia's younger brother, the most urbane of his kind:

ex his igitur sumam aliquem ac potissimum minimum fratrem qui est in isto genere urbanissimus; qui te amat plurimum, qui propter nescio quam, credo, timiditatem et nocturnes quosdam inanis metus tecum semper pusio cum maiore sorore cubitat. (36)

From present kinsmen, therefore, I shall take up a certain figure and in particular your youngest brother who is the most urbane in his set, who loves you the most, who on account of some cowardice, I believe, and certain unfounded fears at night always, as a little boy, sleeps with his big sister.

The young man, the one who loves Clodia the most, reprimands her for her constant preying upon Caelius. He relates that his sister goes into the gardens because she wants to be seen by him, but the young man tramples on, spits out, and rejects her (*calcitrat, respuit, repellit, non putat tua dona esse tanti* 36).

Quickly following these *prosopopoeiae*, Cicero turns to criticize Caelius, as a proper guardian should behave toward his surrogate son. He offers two models of parenting to the jury: the harsh and lenient father of comedy. As Cicero heightens the drama of the harsh father, the hyperbole of his statements is both comic and entertaining. Such a father would ask his son why he moved into the neighborhood of that woman and why he did not flee that neighborhood when he had the chance:

Diceret talis pater: 'Cur te in istam vicinitatem meretriciam contulisti? Cur inlecebris cognitis non refugisti?' (37)

Such a father would say: "why did you move yourself into that harlot's neighborhood? Why did you not flee when the temptations were recognized?"

Cicero, however, chooses instead to turn the blame on the city:

At fuit fama. Quotus quisque istam effugere potest, praesertim in tam maledica civitate? Vicinum eius mulieris miraris male audisse cuius frater germanus sermones iniquorum effugere non potuit? (38)

But there was a rumor. How few are able to escape it, especially in such a slanderous city? Do you wonder that a neighbor of that woman has a bad reputation? A woman whose own brother was not able to escape the gossip of hostile people?

Because no one could avoid a bad reputation, especially in such a slanderous city, Cicero chooses to assume the attitude of a lenient father who will forgive his son's mistakes; broken doors can be fixed and torn garments can be repaired.

According to Quintilian, Cicero mimicked the sound and carriage of the old man.¹⁰ Based on this detail, Vasaly argues that Cicero used the *prosopopoeiae* of both the ancient censor and the rigid father of comedy to “poke fun at the moral standards championed by the prosecutor.”¹¹ Although the impersonation of two such forbidding characters as well as Cicero's hyperbole is amusing, both characters nevertheless criticize Clodia and the city. While he subtly mocks such staunch morals, however, Cicero still calls into the jury's minds the age of Appius Claudius Caecus. Through the censor, Cicero transports his audience to a time before the decline of Roman morality; he places the jury in a simple and almost rustic past before many urban innovations. The past, in this instance, is also associated with simplicity and purity—a purity that in turn connects to a rural scene.¹² It is a severe contrast to the current actions of Clodia and this is why, when Cicero dismisses him later, he implies that Clodia cannot bear him, he is too rustic:

Sin autem urbanus me agere mavis, sic agam tecum. Removebo illum senem durum ac paene agrestem. (36)

¹⁰ Quint. *Inst.* 3.8.54, 12.10.61. See Austin 1965:90-91 for a discussion.

¹¹ Vasaly 1993:175.

¹² See Wood 1988:68 for the conception of a pre-Gracchian Golden Age.

However, if you prefer that I progress politely, thus I shall progress with you. I shall remove that stern and almost rustic old man.

In addition, Vasaly ignores Caecus's counterpart, Clodius. Although the impersonation of Clodius may not have been as outright comical as that of the old man, it is nevertheless a two-fold blow to the city. On one account, Cicero's depiction of the young man types him as effeminate. According to Geffcken, in the *In Curionem et Clodium*, Cicero criticized Clodius Pulcher for his ridiculous costume when he broke into the Bona Dea rites, while he adopted a puritanical persona for himself.¹³ Cicero typed Clodius as urbane, elegant and effeminate and relates that he and his audience are too rustic and therefore too upright to endure such a costume. According to Geffcken, "the *novus homo* of Arpinum destroys his enemy by undercutting his precious urbanity and by questioning his sex."¹⁴ In the *Pro Caelio*, Cicero also types Clodia's younger brother as effeminate and urbane against the staunch ancestor, Caecus, and even against moderate Romans. Clodius is not a typical man whose *urbanitas* has brought him power and prestige; instead he is an *urbanissimus pusio*. In addition to typing the young man as effeminate, the second blow to the city strikes at Clodia. Even her most urbane younger brother criticizes her for her recklessness. Thus by metonymy, both the country and the city criticize Clodia for being too urbane.

Education and sophistication are intertwining spheres of city life. When Cicero bestows praise on Caelius and other individuals in his speech, he refers to them as most humane, educated, hard-working, and sophisticated.

Sed ego Atratio, **humanissimo** atque optimo adulescenti meo necessario, ignosco... (2)

But I forgive Atratinus, the most humane and best young man, my friend...

¹³ Geffcken 1995:75-8.

¹⁴ Geffcken 1995:78.

Neque solum Caelius, sed etiam adulescentes *humanissimi* et *doctissimi, rectissimis studiis* atque *optimis artibus praediti*, Titus Gaiusque Coponii, qui ex omnibus maxime Dionis mortem doluerunt, qui cum *doctrinae studio* atque *humanitatis* tum etiam hospitio Dionis tenebantur. (24)

Not only Caelius, but also the most humane and learned young men, educated in the most upright pursuits and the best arts, Titus and Gaius Coponius, who mourned the death of Dio most out of everyone, who were at that time held in the hospitality of Dio with their pursuit of learning and humanity.

Habeo enim, iudices, quem vos socium vestrae religionis iurisque iurandi facile esse patiamini, L. Lucceium, *sanctissimum hominem* et *gravissimum testem*, qui tantum facinus in famam atque in fortunas suas neque non audisset inlatum a M. Caelio neque neglexisset neque tulisset. An ille vir *illa humanitate praeditus, illis studiis, illis artibus* atque *doctrina* illius ipsius periculum quem propter haec ipsa studia diligebat negligere potuisset et, quod facinus in alienum hominem intentum severe acciperet, id omisisset curare in hospitem? (54)

I have, indeed, judges, a man whom you easily allow to be an associate of your custom and law by swearing an oath, Lucius Lucceius, the most religious man and most heavily weighed witness, who would have at least heard that such a crime was brought against his reputation and his own fortunes by Marcus Caelius and he would have neither neglected nor tolerated it. Would that man, gifted with that humanity, with those pursuits, with those arts and that learning have been able to neglect the danger of that man himself, whom he esteemed on account of these very pursuits? And would he be remiss in taking care of a crime committed against his guest, which he would not bear if it were intended against a stranger?

Both the word *humanitas* and the concept of humanism entail “the possession of a broad literary education,” and certain characteristics of the spirit which include “tolerance, pity, and humanity.”¹⁵ The term separates man from beasts and confers a level of civilization and culture as well as humane character, kindness, and feeling.¹⁶ Craig points out that Cicero establishes a patron client relationship with Atratinus. He first identifies the *accusator* as a friend, then reveals some action that the two have in common, and finally eclipses his opponent by pointing out his

¹⁵ Vasaly 1993:183.

¹⁶ *OLD*; See also Hunt:1954:188. Cicero’s system of humanism inquired into man’s nature, his perception, his highest virtue, and the degree of freedom and its relation to the forces which control the world. Cicero’s system of humanism “was concerned with man first and foremost and with other things only in so far as they were relevant to man’s position in the world.”

superiority in the commonly shared field. Cicero outwardly praises Atratinus for his *humanitas* and oratorical skill; because he is vastly superior in the art of oratory, however, he takes the role of patron and thereby diminishes the gravity of Atratinus's complaints while increasing his own credibility.¹⁷ When he compliments the two young men, Titus and Gaius Coponius, Cicero emphasizes their closeness to Dio and therefore distance from the crime. He does not have to direct his attention towards Caelius but instead distracts the jury by associating his defendant with the best youths. Finally, he represents Luceius as a man of education to bolster the status and efficacy of his position as witness.

Although each of these examples reveals that Cicero treats the *humanitas* of individuals with respect, there is yet another example which detracts from the gravity of such praise. In section 67, Cicero finishes his description of the bath scene by asking for the participants to come forth as witnesses. Of course, though, Clodia has already freed the slaves so they cannot be put up for questioning. Cicero sneers at the men who, although there were so many, could not capture Luceius when he handed over the box with the poison. He refers to them as clever, eloquent, and typically inebriated. There is one force, however, of the forum and another of the dining room, one of the courts, and another of the couch:

Quam volent in conviviis faceti, dicaces, non numquam etiam ad vinum disertis sint, alia fori vis est, alia triclini, alia subselliorum ratio, alia lectorum; non idem iudicium commissatorumque conspectus; lux denique longe alia est solis alia lychnorum. (67)

Although they want to appear charming at banquets, talkative, even eloquent sometimes at their wine, there is one force of the forum, another of the couch, one rationale of the law benches, another of sofas; the view of the judges is not the same as that of fellow revelers; finally the light of the sun is by far different from that of the dining hall.

¹⁷ For Cicero's patronage of Atratinus see Craig 1981:34. Cicero states that both himself and Atratinus share in oratorical skill, but Cicero by far surpasses the young and inexperienced *accusator* who was about 17 or 18 years old at the time.

Here is a completely different approach to education of the city. These men have the ability to converse gaily at parties and to float among the pleasures of city life, but they have no concern for court rooms or serious matters. Cicero separates the upright education from the common city, where one learns to speak well and entertain at parties.

The city provides the best opportunity to achieve *humanitas* in terms of education and refinement, a combination which leads to *urbanitas*:

Accusatio crimen desiderat, rem ut definiat, hominem notet, argumento probet, teste confirmet; maledictio autem nihil habet propositi praeter contumeliam; quae si petulantius iactatur, convicium, si facetius, urbanitas nominatur. (6)

An accusation requires a crime, so that it can define the situation, mark a man, prove by argument, confirm by witness; slander, however, has nothing of a goal except abuse, which, if tossed about recklessly, is called invective, if eloquently, urbanity.

Vasaly argues that Cicero's definition of *urbanitas* further emphasizes his use of the city for entertainment.¹⁸ The city-dweller has the leisure to perfect his manners and elegant speech, resulting in a superior attitude towards the less refined rustic individuals. Certainly a "sophisticated humor and a careful manner of speaking... together set the urbane Roman off from those who are less refined both within and outside the city," but to read this quote as pure entertainment limits its use for Cicero.¹⁹ Although Cicero praises individuals for their *humanitas* and education, his definition of *urbanitas* unmasks its effect. It has descended from an attribute of the educated and wealthy and has become a mere turn of words with no real substance. In fact, it is one step away from the *maledictio* for which Cicero later criticizes the city life (*quisque istam effugere potest, praesertim in tam maledica civitate* 36). Although *urbanitas* entertains and amuses, it can accomplish nothing else.

¹⁸ Vasaly 1993:180.

¹⁹ Ramage 1973:56.

Thus the *humanitas, urbanitas*, and entertainment of the city have another side. The invective is only funny because it holds a grain of truth and the education of the city has slipped from a mark of high class to a mere game. Cicero concedes to the jury on one plane, praising the city and criticizing the country in word, but he also calls attention to the state of immorality that eventually troubled Sallust. He offers Caelius to the jury as a young man who has been tempted by the ways of the city and of Clodia, but who can ultimately save the Republic and return it to good fruits.

Anti-City / Pro-Country

In opposition to Clodia's wild parties and loose morals, Cicero casts Caelius as a slightly rustic youth whose industry and intelligence will benefit the Republic if he is given the chance to reform. Cicero constructs this view of the young man by associating subtle agricultural and pastoral imagery with him. This use of rustic imagery strongly contrasts to the urban and military diction that Cicero repeats against Clodia and the prosecution. The result is a framework of pro-rural and anti-urban sentiment that underscores the entire speech, even while the other end of the spectrum masks it. Caelius is not simply the witty and industrious rhetorician, but also a representation of the bucolic herdsman whose contact with the city and a sordid love affair with a beguiling *meretrix* have ruined him. Cicero's use of repeated invective against Clodia, then, not only entertains but also outrages the jury. The city life is not merely amusing but also dangerous and immoral. Young men like Caelius are needed to inspire the Republic and be a positive influence.

Throughout the speech Cicero depicts Caelius as his own protégé and dependent. The young man is not a native of Rome; he has devoted his life to careful study and reasoning, and he displays industry in all aspects of his career. Just as a simple-minded country boy whose only purpose in life is to work and provide for his family, so Caelius is an industrious man whose

purpose is to benefit the Republic. Likewise, just as the rustic farmer's ability to work hard is threatened city life, so Caelius' industry is threatened by Clodia and the city. Cicero takes his first opportunity to represent Caelius in such a favorable light when the prosecution insults the defendant's background. They accuse Caelius of dishonoring his father and of being unpopular with his own townsmen. Cicero seizes the opportunity to remind the jury of the similarities between himself and Caelius, and of their similar status as Italians who have acquired a notable reputation in the Republic by hard-work.

Equidem, ut ad me reverat, ab his fontibus profluxi ad hominum famam, et meus hic forensis labor vitaeque ratio demanavit ad existimationem hominum paulo latius commendatione ac iudicio meorum (6).

Indeed I, to return to myself, flowed forth from the same springs to fame among all men, and my public work and my plan of life has dripped down slowly, spreading to the esteem of all men from the approval and judgment of my own kinsmen.

Cicero twists the intended insult into a matter of pride, using the vivid term *fontibus*. On the fourth of April, in the heart of the city with the sun beating down, the jury would have felt uncomfortably warm. Cicero quickly transports them to a lush green setting fostered by a crystal clear spring. Although the word *fons* has a wide semantic range, its origin remains the geographical feature which both cools and satisfies thirst. With one word, Cicero compels the jury to associate Cicero and Caelius with the cool and pleasant sensation of running water; the physical attributes of the spring then come to represent the inner character in the same way as Caelius's own favorable physical appearance does.

Cicero underscores Caelius's *urbanitas* by associating fruit and floral imagery with Caelius at key points in the speech. In section 9, Cicero refutes the prosecution's *maledicta* about the young man's *pudicitia*. Cicero reminds the jury that as a young man, in his *aetatis flos*, or flower of youth, Caelius learned from both himself and Crassus. No one ever saw him without

either his father, or Cicero, or in the most chaste house of Crassus, where he was educated in the most honorable arts:

Nemo hunc M. Caelium in illo aetatis flore vidit nisi aut cum patre aut mecum aut in M. Crassi castissima domo cum artibus honestissimis erudiretur. (9)

No one saw Marcus Caelius in that flower of youth unless he was with his father, or with me, or in the most chaste house of Crassus when he was taught in the most noble arts.

Although the term '*aetatis flos*' is common, its immediate effect again brings to mind images of vegetation and it transports the jury to a location with flowers and greenery, away from the hot forum and noisy crowds. The flower is even more significant because it is embedded in a statement concerning education—one benefit of city life. The phrase mirrors Caelius's position in Rome. Just as a flower shoots forth from the soil, so Caelius can bloom from the city. If he is given the opportunity to reform, he will be able to avoid the negative aspects of the city and instead benefit the Republic. The young man's only problems arose from his naivety and interaction with the *meretrix*, Clodia. Of course as soon as he moved to the city and became involved with her, problems surfaced (18).

Cicero continues to use agricultural imagery when he asserts that many men have also slipped into the vices of the city in their youth but emerged later to bear good fruit for the Republic:

Equidem multos et vidi in hac civitate et audivi, non modo qui primoribus labris gustassent genus hoc vitae et extremis, ut dicitur, digitis attigissent sed qui totam adulescentiam voluptatibus dedidissent, emersisse aliquando et se ad frugem bonam, ut dicitur, recepisse gravisque homines atque inlustris fuisse. (28)

Indeed I have both seen and heard that many men in this city, who not only tasted that type of lifestyle with their lips and, as they say, brushed it with their finger tips, but who dedicated their entire youth to pleasures, have, in the end, emerged, redeemed themselves to good fruit, as they say, and become serious and notable men.

This imagery again links Caelius to the country and accentuates the positive values of the rustic figure. The current state of corruption in the city needs such men to unite the positive aspects of

both places: simplicity and education, industry and politics. Not only have other men tasted that type of life and lightly touched it with their fingertips, but they have immersed themselves in such pleasures. They emerged later, however, and reformed themselves to good fruit. Again the mention of fruit immediately calls to mind an organic image of natural growth, and light cultivation. Cicero induces the jury to associate this image with Caelius. Just as a flower blossoms and bears fruit, so Caelius will blossom and bear good fruit for the Republic. After relating such a pleasant image in connection with Caelius, Cicero calls the jury's attention back to the hot forum with a mention of the prosecution, who seem to want to conflate some grudge against Caelius out of a common bad repute of youth (*sed mihi videbare ex communi infamia iuventutis aliquam invidiam Caelio velle conflare*, 29). The mention of fire imagery contrasts sharply with the pleasant image of vegetation.

The most abundant use of agricultural imagery appears at the end of the speech. Cicero urges the jury to trim the temptations of youth as they would tend the grass:

quae studia in his iam aetatibus nostris contractiora esse debent, in adulescentia vero tamquam in herbis significant quae virtutis maturitas et quantae fruges industriae sint futurae (76)

Which pursuits in our age already ought to be more subdued, but in youth, just as in grass, they intimate what the ripeness of virtue and how great the crops of diligence will be.

The result of trimming will be the maturity of virtue and the fruits of industry. Finally, at the end of the speech, Cicero assures the jury that if they will preserve the young man for the father and the father for the man they will acquire the good fruits for themselves and for the Republic.

Quem si nobis, si suis, si rei publicae conservatis, addictum, deditum, obstrictum vobis ac liberis vestris habebitis omniumque huius nervorum ac laborum vos potissimum, iudices, fructus uberes diuturnosque capietis. (80)

If for us, if for his own family, if for the republic, you preserve this man, you will have him dedicated, bound to you and to your children, and you will receive, judges, to the greatest extent, the ripe and eternal fruits of his strength and labors.

Again the orator removes his audience from their hot environment and places them in a pastoral scene of green grass and fresh fruit where a minimal effort in pruning will allow them to obtain the greatest rewards. By ending with such strong imagery, Cicero leaves the jury with a simple and pleasant association with Caelius. This subtle characterization of the defendant lacks strength on its own, but when juxtaposed with the military and urbane diction used to describe Clodia it renders Caelius as a pure country boy and Clodia as a corrupted city girl.

In addition to Cicero's invective against Clodia's person, he types the city as negative because it fosters such people as Catiline and Clodia. The former appears in the first half of the speech and Cicero devotes four sections to refuting the charge that Caelius was involved in his schemes (10-4). He handles the accusation by shifting the blame from Caelius to Catiline and ultimately the city. The traitor's character vacillated between good and evil in such extremities that he fooled many young men in the city and almost even tricked Cicero himself:

Me ipsum, me, inquam, quondam paene ille decepit, cum et civis mihi bonus et optima cuiusque cupidus et firmus amicus ac fidelis videretur; cuius ego facinora oculis prius quam opinione, minibus ante quam suspicione deprendi. (14)

Once he nearly deceived me myself, me, I say, since he seemed to me a good citizen and desirous for the best of each one and a firm and trustworthy friend; I realized his crimes with my eyes before my opinion, with threats before suspicion.

The most striking contrast in Catiline's character traits is the alternating vegetal and fire imagery:

Flagrabant vitia libidinis apud illum; *vigebant* etiam studia rei militaris. Neque ego umquam fuisse tale monstrum in terris ullum puto, tam ex contrariis diversisque atque inter se pugnantibus naturae studiis cupiditatibusque conflatum. (12)

Vices of passion were on fire in him; pursuits of the military were also flourishing. I do not think that there was ever such a monstrosity on the earth, forged out of so many contrary and differing zeals and desires of nature, fighting amongst themselves.

The city provided the place for such a monstrosity to exist, flourish, and gather followers. In the city Caelius first met Catiline. By shifting the blame to Catiline, Cicero necessarily shifts it to the city.

To an even greater extent, Cicero criticizes the city by harping on the negative space surrounding Clodia. Whenever Cicero bends the prosecution's accusations back on Clodia, he refers to her gardens, Baiae, and her home (35, 49). The accusations against Clodia's home increase throughout the speech and reach their apex in section 60, when Cicero indirectly accuses Clodia of poisoning her late husband, Metellus. According to Leen, Clodia's house and household was a prominent point of invective for Cicero:

The *domus* motif supports the strategically important theme of contrasting ethical standards, in which Caelius stands on the positive side of Roman values, which equate morality with political and social stability, while Clodia has gone over the edge into the abyss of sexual license and its metonymic counterparts, public chaos and political anarchy.²⁰

Cicero repeatedly refers to the space surrounding Clodia as a breeding ground for licentiousness, beginning in section 18, when he identifies her as the 'Palatine Medea.' Not only is this the location of her *libidinosa domus*, but it is also the neighborhood where Caelius moved when he left his father's house, the place where he became implicated in political and social scandal. In addition, the Palatine was clearly visible to those in the forum. Vasaly examines how Cicero would have called the jury's attention to its surroundings; the Palatine is a perfect example of visible space in Cicero's speech. By calling attention to Clodia's neighborhood, Cicero compels his audience to perceive their surroundings negatively. Here is the start of all evil for the upstanding young man, Caelius, and it is near the forum. Cicero not only calls negative attention to the city, but also indicates a warning to his audience: the vices of the Palatine are too close for comfort. Again, in section 38, Cicero criticizes Clodia's open house and the easy avenue she provides for the desires of men to behave according to their own will. Just as Clodia makes her house open to all, so, he insinuates, she has made herself common to all.

²⁰ Leen 2000:147.

Nihil iam in istam mulierem dico; sed, si esset aliqua dissimilis istius, quae se omnibus pervolgaret, quae haberet palam decretum semper aliquem, cuius in hortos, domum, Baiae iure suo libidines omnium commearent, quae etiam aleret adulescentes et parsimoniam patrum suis sumptibus sustentaret; si vidua libere, proterva petulanter, dives effuse, libidinosa meretricio more viveret, adulterum ego putarem, si quis hanc paulo liberius salutasset? (38)

I am saying nothing against that woman now; but, if there were some woman, unlike her, who made herself common to all, who always had someone openly avowed, into whose gardens, home, Baiae the lusts of all convene by their own will, who even supported young men and took up their fatherly debt with her own wealth; if she lived freely as a widow, wantonly as a perverse woman, lavishly as a wealthy woman, and in the manner of a harlot as a lustful woman, if anyone greeted this woman a little too freely, would I consider him an adulterer?

Not only her immediate home, but even Clodia's neighborhood wafts of something suspicious and Baiae itself speaks of her lewdness:

Nihilne igitur illa vicinitas redolet nihilne hominum fama, nihil Baiae denique ipsae loquuntur? (47)

Does that neighborhood not give off a scent? Does the reputation among men, and finally Baiae itself say nothing?

Yet again, in section 49, Cicero speaks of Clodia's open house and the constant crowd around her in the city, in her gardens and at Baiae:

Si quae non nupta mulier domum suam patefecerit omnium cupiditati palamque sese in meretricia vita conlocarit, virorum alienissimorum conviviis uti instituerit, si hoc in urbe, si in hortis, si in Baiarum illa celebritate faciat... (49)

If some unmarried woman made her house open to the desire of all and placed herself openly in the lifestyle of a harlot, and set a precedent of enjoying banquets of the most unrelated men, if she did this in this city, if in the gardens, if in that crowd of Baiae...

Cicero then transfers his invective completely from Clodia to her house:

totum crimen profertur ex inimica ex infami, ex crudeli, ex facinerosa, ex libidinosa domo. (55)

The whole crime is brought forth out of a hostile, notorious, cruel, wicked, and lustful house.

He continues criticizing Clodia's house in section 57, where he announces to the jury that this *mater familias* lives with a harlot's mores even in her own house. She opens her doors and

invites in lusts, luxuries, and unheard-of crimes. She has turned a private space into a public one and thereby degraded her already unnatural position of head of household. The vices do not stop there, however, she also lives among her servants, sharing all pleasures and secrets with them. Finally, Cicero's criticism of the negative space around Clodia peaks in sections 59 and 60, where Cicero relates how Q. Metellus, who had flourished in the Republic, suddenly and unexpectedly died. Does Clodia, that despicable woman, now come forth from that very same house, daring to talk about poison (*ex hac igitur domo progressa ista mulier de veneni celeritate dicere audebit*, 60)?

By transferring his criticism from the being of Clodia to her surrounding space, Cicero can further justify Caelius and blame the city. Every aspect of Clodia's life—the space she occupies, the parties she both hosts and attends, and her constant accompaniment of young men—takes place in the city. This is why Cicero implores the jury not to judge Caelius based on the mores of the times and the urban youth:

Tantum peto ut, si qua est invidia communis hoc tempore aeris alieni, petulantiae, libidinum iuventutis, quam video esse magnam, tamen ne huic aliena peccata, ne *aetatis ac temporum vitia* noceant. (30)

I ask only that, if at this time there is any general ill-will for the debt, impudence, and passions of youth, which I see exists to a great extent, nevertheless let neither the crimes of others nor the vices of youth and the times harm this man.

Clodia has side-tracked the innocent, industrious young man whose rhetorical skill and industry impresses both Cicero and the current audience. The city fosters the both the substance of the rumors and the rumors themselves. Cicero offers his defendant, Caelius, as a reformed youth to the jury. The young man has been temporarily side tracked by the vices of the city, but his excellent speaking ability reflects that he can still use the positive aspects of the city for the benefit of both himself and the Republic.

Caelius the Orator

Cicero praises Caelius most prominently for his rhetoric. He asks the jury to consider if such a man could devote himself to pleasure and still master the complex nuances of rhetoric.

Audistis cum pro se diceret, audistis antea cum accusaret defendi haec causa, non gloriandi loquor- genus orationis, facultatem, copiam sententiarum atque verborum, quae vestra prudentia est, perspexistis. Atque in eo non solum ingenium elucere eius videbatis, quod saepe, etiam si industria non alitur, valet tamen ipsum suis viribus, sed inerat nisi me propter benivolentiam forte fallebat, ratio et bonis artibus instituta et cura et vigiliis elaborata. Atqui scitote, iudices, eas cupiditates quae obiciuntur Caelio atque haec studia de quibus disputo non facile in eodem homine esse posse. Fieri enim non potest ut animus libidini deditus, amore, desiderio, cupiditate, saepe nimia copia, inopia etiam non numquam impeditus hoc quicquid est quod nos facimus in dicendo, quoquo modo facimus, non modo agendo verum etiam cogitando posit sustinere. (45)

You heard when he spoke for himself, you heard before when he acted as prosecutor – I say this for the sake of defending, not boasting – you have seen clearly the type of rhetoric, easiness, and the abundance of opinions and words, which is to your discretion. And in him not only were you seeing his innate talent shine out, which often, even if diligence is not cultivated, nevertheless is itself strong by its own powers, but also there was in him, unless I am perchance mistaken on account of a favorable inclination, a rationale established by good arts and ministration perfected by constant guard. And recognize, judges, that these desires which are cast against Caelius and these pursuits about which I am debating are not easily able to exist within the same man. Indeed, it is not possible that a mind dedicated to passion, which is encumbered by love, desire, lust, often by too much abundance and even sometimes by poverty is able to endure this, whatever it is that we do in speaking, in whatever way we complete it, not only by acting, but also by thinking.

Caelius has an innate talent for oratory, an easiness of manner, and an abundance of opinions and words which he uses creatively. In addition to these qualities, he also has a particular reasoning which was established by good skills and brought to its height by care and constant practice. It is not possible that a mind dedicated to lust, love, desire, and passion is also able to speak with such skill. The Roman understanding of character consistency strengthens this argument. As May points out, both pleasure and work are opposite ends of a spectrum. One cannot change his character to suit particular circumstances; if he is industrious, then he is not also self-indulgent.²¹

²¹ May 1988:106.

If we look at only one side of the country-city antithesis, the rhetorical abilities of Caelius show that he is a product of city life and education, a product of *urbanitas*.²²

Cicero, however, also represents Caelius as a young man marked by talent, industry, and charm (1) who will bear good fruit for the Republic. The young man spent time in his studies while he was at the most chaste house of Crassus (9) and he continues to work hard toward his rhetorical skills:

At vero in M. Caelio—dicam enim iam confidentius de studiis eius honestis, quoniam audeo quaedam fretus vestra sapientia libere confiteri— nulla luxuries reperietur, nulli sumptus, nullum alienum, nulla conviviorum ac lustrorum libido. (44)

But truly in Marcus Caelius— indeed I shall speak more confidently about his honest pursuits, since I dare to speak certain things relying freely on your wisdom—no luxury will be discovered, no lavish expenses, no debt, no desire of banquets and games.

The rhetorical skill of Caelius is more than the *urbanitas* that Cicero describes in section 6.

Beneath the flashy and elegant speech, behind the urbane young man, is quality substance fostered by hard work and dedication. The rustic diction that Cicero associates with Caelius does not contradict the young man's rhetorical skill, it complements it. When Cicero employs subtle agricultural imagery to describe Caelius, he also implies that it is Caelius's rhetorical skill that will benefit society. These two opposite ends of the country- city spectrum represent the function of the orator. Just as a farmer cultivates the land and produces good fruit for the maintenance of his own well being and his society's, so an orator cultivates the minds of the people and bears good fruit for both himself and the Republic.

Agricultural imagery occupies an important place in the authority of an orator and three observations concerning the appropriation of language are useful to review. (1) Murnaghan has pointed out how the farmer holds a certain authority in society because of his ability to read the

²² Vasaly 1993:185 uses Caelius's rhetorical ability as one of her main arguments that the *Pro Caelio* praises the city for its education and center of civilization.

hidden signs of the gods in the earth. The ability to speak the language of farming qualifies men to be “-not farmers-but speakers.”²³ It is not unusual, then, that Cicero should use vegetal imagery to characterize his defendant – an orator. Aligning him with such imagery does not degrade his intelligence or take away from his education, it rather adds to his authority. (2) Likewise, as Cullyer has noted, the rustic is only one step away from the philosopher. He works well toward the *telos* of his work, but misses the *telos* of his life. He does, however, seem to possess two cardinal virtues: courage and justice.²⁴ (3) Finally, the authority of the rustic figure also appears in the form of the shepherd. According to Gutzwiller, the herdsman always communicates the value of other figures, such as kings, warriors, poets, and seers, to his society.²⁵ The herdsman cares for and orders his flock, and he also serves as the divine being through whom the Muses choose to communicate. By associating Caelius, even subtly, with the countryside, Cicero at once calls to mind the blended authority of both the farmer and the herdsman, and he channels it into Caelius. In addition, he melds the integrity of the farmer, which Cato praised in his prologue, with the intelligence of the orator, to create a perfect citizen to free Rome from its vices and reform the city while he reforms himself.

According to Connors, Cicero employed agricultural diction when referring to the art of oratory, but Cicero accomplishes an even greater feat in the *Pro Caelio*.²⁶ He pins only the good aspects of both the orator and the rustic on Caelius, while he completely distracts the jury with the corrupt morals of Clodia and the city. If we look again at the points of agricultural imagery

²³ Murnaghan 2006:116.

²⁴ Cullyer 2006:212.

²⁵ Gutzwiller 1991:24.

²⁶ See Connors 1997:76. “Cicero seems to have been the first to apply the noun *cultura* to intellectual pursuits when he termed philosophy ‘the cultivation of the mind’ (*cultura animi*, *Tusc.* 2.13).”

associated with Caelius, we see that each instance is embedded in some type of praise for Caelius's oratorical ability. In sections 6, when Cicero connects his own humble background to that of Caelius, he refers to them both achieving reputation through their hard work and plan of life. Cicero also makes it clear that he trained Caelius in the art of oratory. He simultaneously manages, then, to bring to mind Caelius's rhetoric and the image of a *fons* in the same passage. Similarly, in the passage concerning Caelius's education at the home of Crassus, Cicero hits the jury with two complementary ideas: the orator Caelius, and the flower, or rustic, Caelius (9).

Cicero also uses farming imagery and the phrase *frugem bonam* to reveal both sides of Caelius, the statesman and the rustic figure:

Sed ego non loquor de sapientia, quae non cadit in hanc aetatem; de impetu animi loquor, de cupiditate vincendi, de ardore mentis ad gloriam; quae studia in his iam aetatibus nostris contractiora esse debent, in adulescentia vero tamquam in herbis significant quae virtutis maturitas et quantae fruges industriae sint futurae. (76)

But I am not speaking about wisdom, which does not occur in this age; I am speaking about the motivation of the mind, about the desire of conquering, about the passion of the mind towards glory; which pursuits in our age already ought to be more subdued, but in youth, just as in grass, they intimate what the ripeness of virtue and how great the crops of diligence will be.

In this passage Cicero even confers the status of farmer to his audience, giving them the power to trim the vices of youth as one would trim the grass. From this point, then, the youth will bear great fruit and he will blossom forth (*efflorescit* 76). Cicero also refers to Caelius as a man already flourishing from his firmly planted root of virtue even though a whirlwind and a sudden storm try to uproot him:

(Nolite) hunc nunc primum floescentem firmata iam stirpe virtutis tamquam turbine aliquot aut subita tempestate prevertere. (79)

Do not allow this man now first flourishing, with the stalk of virtue made firm, to go to ruin just as some, because of a whirlwind or a sudden storm.

Finally, Cicero begs the jury to save the young man so that they can capture the ripe and lasting fruits of his labor:

Quem sin nobis, si suis, si rei republicae conservatis, addictum, deditum, obstrictum vobis ac liberis vestris habebitis omniumque huius nervorum ac laborum vos potissimum, iudices, fructus uberes diuturnosque capietis. (80)

If for us, if for his own family, if for the republic, you preserve this man, you will have him dedicated, bound to you and to your children, and you will receive, judges, to the greatest extent, the ripe and eternal fruits of his strength and labors.

Cicero blends vegetal imagery with rhetorical imagery and the rustic figure with *humanitas*. The result is the orator Caelius, an intelligent, industrious young man; his reform from both a life of city vices and his relationship with the evil Clodia will benefit the Republic.

CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSION

Cicero successfully balances the values of city and country to gain Caelius' acquittal. The young defendant appears as an industrious, intelligent, and noble orator who was briefly distracted by the negative influences of the city. Cicero directs and sways the jury's attention and emotions by an alternating use of rustic and urbane diction. While the rest of the city was busy with the *Ludi Megalenses*, the jury was hard at work. Cicero calls attention to the surrounding city, but the effect is not merely entertaining, it is also enraging. The Palatine Hill, Clodia's *vicinitas*, and her *libidinosa domus* all lurk just in the view of the forum, and Cicero repeatedly reminds the jury that Clodia is the cause of Caelius' faltering morals.

Cicero manages to strain the positive aspects of the city out of his characterization of Clodia while simultaneously blending the positive aspects of both city and country to create a pleasing persona for Caelius. Cicero's praise of the city and its facility of education and refinement is limited; the city is only as good as its citizens. Even in the midst of negative influences such as Catiline and Clodia, Caelius represents the type of serious and diligent young man who can reform both himself and the city to good fruits. The city needs young men of this caliber in order to ascend above its state of loose morals and cheap flattery. Cicero successfully transfers the authority of the rustic onto Caelius with a few simple words, *fons, flos, frux bona*. Caelius becomes a composite of farmer, shepherd, and orator; the agricultural diction, then, completes the young man's role as an orator by giving him authority and gravity.

The continuum of spatial value stretches and bends to cover different purposes in the *Pro Caelio*. The disparity between the country and the city appears at perhaps its greatest height in the Augustan Age, but the antithesis between city and country was deeply rooted in Roman ideology by the time Vergil published his *Eclogues* in 37 and then *Georgics* in 29. The themes of

spatial value also appear prominently in Horace *Epode* 2, *Satire* 2.6, and *Epistles* 1.7. If we look, however, at the continuum rather than antithesis of values, perhaps such works would not appear to be black and white but rather gray. As Cicero blends and manipulates positive and negative associations of city and country in the *Pro Caelio* so Horace blends the boundaries in his second *Epode* when he speaks from the persona of a money-lender who praises the country.¹ The complementary features of both spaces allow for them to be simultaneously ideal and deficient.

The values of space are rooted in the ideology of a society and even today we hold the same biases towards city and country. In the current presidential race both Governor Palin and Senator Biden have tried to cast themselves as small-town folk who will fight for the average “Joe six-pack.” In the vice presidential debate held on the 2 October 2008, Palin reminded the audience that she comes from the average hard-working family who struggles to pay for her children’s education. Biden fought back by recalling his conversations with members of his home town at their local Home Depot store. The small-town values are pitted against the big-city corruption of Wall Street and the politicians manipulate the assumed ideological values associated with each place. Yet, as we have seen, the antithesis of city and country is not so simple. The appropriation of rustic or, in today’s language, small-town, integrity and authority is a carefully balanced and sophisticated act. Cicero knew how to walk the line between both places and he blended the appropriate values from each space to distract the jury and win his case.

¹ See Heyworth 1988: 72. Heyworth argues that the sentiments concerning the country that Horace utters are not necessarily hollow just because they are spoken by the money-lender Alfius. Alfius’ occupation as a money-lender does not necessarily mean that his praise of the country is any less valid. This disparity between reality and speech carries back to the disparity between Cato the Elder’s occupation and his book *De Agricultura*, in which he praises the farmer.

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Astin, A.E. 1978. *Cato the Censor*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Austin, R.G., ed. 1960. *M. Tulli Ciceronis Pro M. Caelio Oratio*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Braund, S. H. 1989. "City and Country in Roman Satire." In Braund, S.H. ed. *Satire and Society in Ancient Rome*. Exeter: Exeter University Publications.
- Butler, J.L. 1994. "Cicero's Pro Caelio: Text and Context," *Classical Outlook* 121-8.
- Calboli, G. and Dominik, W.J. 1997 "Introduction: the Roman *Suada*," in Calboli G. and Dominik W.J. ed. *Roman Eloquence: Rhetoric in Society and Literature*. New York: Routledge, 3-12.
- Connors, C. 1997. "Field and forum: culture and agriculture in Roman rhetoric," in Calboli G. and Dominik W.J. ed. *Roman Eloquence: Rhetoric in Society and Literature*. New York: Routledge, 71-89.
- Craig, C.P. 1981. "Accusator as Amicus: An Original Roman Tactic of Ethical Argumentation," *TAPA* 111: 31-37.
- _____. 1993. *Form as Argument in Cicero's Speeches: A Study of Dilemma*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- _____. 1995. "Teaching Cicero's Speech for Caelius: What Enquiring Minds Want to Know," *CJ* 90: 407-22.
- Cullyer, H. 2006. "Agroikia and Pleasure in Aristotle," in Rosen M. and Sluiter I. ed. *City, Countryside, and the Spatial Organization of Value in Antiquity*. Leiden: Brill, 181-218.
- Dodds, E.R. 1973. *The Ancient Concept of Progress and Other Essays on Greek Literature and Belief*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dorey, T.A. 1958. "Cicero, Clodia, and the 'Pro Caelio'," *G&R* 5:175-80.
- Duckworth, G.E. 1994 (original publication 1952). *The Nature of Roman Comedy*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Evans, R. 2003. "Searching for Paradise: Landscape, Utopia, and Rome," *Arethusa* 36: 285-307.
- Handord, S.A. 1963. *Sallust: The Jugurthine War/The Conspiracy of Catiline*. London: Penguin Group.
- Heyworth, S.J. 1988. "Horace's Second Epode," *AJP* 109:71-85.
- Geffcken, K.A. 1995 (original publication 1973). *Comedy in the Pro Caelio*. Wauconda: Bolchazy-Carducci Publishers, Inc.

- Gutzwiller, K. 1991. *Theocritus' Pastoral Analogies*. Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press.
- _____. 2006. "The Herdsman in Greek Thought," In Fantuzzi, M., Papanghelis, T. ed. *Brill's Companion to Greek and Latin Pastoral*. Leiden: Brill. 1-24.
- Hunt, H.A. 1954. *The Humanism of Cicero*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.
- Leen, A. 2000. "The Domus Motif in Cicero's 'Pro Caelio,'" *CJ* 96: 141-62.
- Lintott, 1968. *Violence in Republican Rome*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- May, J. M. 1988. *Trials of Character: The Eloquence of Ciceronian Ethos*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Murnaghan, S. 2006. "Farming, Authority, and Truth-telling in the Greek Tradition," in Rosen M. and Sluiter I. ed. *City, Countryside, and the Spatial Organization of Value in Classical Antiquity*. Leiden: Brill, 93-118.
- Perrin, B, Trans. 1914. *Plutarch's Lives*. Classical Loeb Series Vol. II. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Ramage, E.S. 1973. *Urbanitas: Ancient Sophistication and Refinement*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Rosen, R.M and Sluiter I. 2006. "General Introduction," in Rosen M. and Sluiter I. ed. *City, Countryside, and the Spatial Organization of Value in Classical Antiquity*. Leiden: Brill, 1-12.
- Scullard, H.H. 2004 (original publication 1959). *From the Gracchi to Nero: A History of Rome 133 B.C. to A.D. 68*. London: Routledge.
- Skinner, M.B. 1983. "Clodia Metelli," *TAPA* 113: 273-87.
- Thomas. 1982. *Lands and Peoples in Roman Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society.
- Vasaly, A. 1993. *Representations: Images of the World in Ciceronian Oratory*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Wiedemann, T. 1993. "Sallust's *Jugurtha*: Concord, Discord, and the Digressions," *G&R* 40: 48-57.
- Wiseman, T.P. 1985. *Catullus and His World: A Reappraisal*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wood, N. 1988. *Cicero's Social and Political Thought*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Samantha Lee Marsh was born in 1985 in Greensboro, North Carolina. She has lived in Florida since age eight and graduated from Western High School in 2003. She began her study of Latin in fall 2003 and quickly fell in love with classical languages and culture. In 2007, Samantha graduated the University of Florida *cum laude* with a Bachelor of Arts in classics. She received a Master of Arts degree in classical studies from the University of Florida in 2008.