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I. TEXTS AND COMMENTARIES


II. BOOKS AND ARTICLES

Adkin, N. “The Prologue of Sallust’s Bellum Catilinae and Jerome.” Hermes 125 (1997), 240-41. (In Epist. 22.10.2, Jerome borrowed the expression ventri oboediens from Cat. 1.1.)
———-. “Hieronymus Sallustianus.” GB 24 (2005), 93-110. (Sallustian expressions and turns of phrase that can be detected in Jerome’s translation of the Bible may result more from the nature of the text that Jerome was translating than from conscious borrowing from S.)

—. “The Role of Torquatus the Younger in the *ambitus* Prosecution of Sulla in 66 BC, and Cicero, *De Finibus* 2.62.” *CPh* 94 (1999), 65-9. (The evidence is inconclusive: either the elder Torquatus (cos. 65) or the younger could have been the chief prosecutor.)

Allen, W. Jr. “Catullus XLIX and Sallust’s *Bellum Catilinae*.” *CJ* 32 (1937), 298. (S.’s appraisal of Cic. may contain an allusion to Catullus 49.)

—. “In Defense of Catiline.” *CJ* 34 (1938), 70–85. (Catiline and his followers were committed to a serious program of reform.)

—. “Cicero’s Provincial Governorship in 63 B.C.,” *TAPA* 83 (1952), 233-41. (Prior to the consular elections in 63, Cic. renounced his proconsular assignment to govern Cisalpine Gaul in favor of Metellus Celer, who promised Cic. his support vs Catiline.)

—. “The Acting Governor of Cisalpine Gaul in 63.” *CP* 48 (1953), 176–77. (*Cat.* 42.3 shows that L. Licinius Murena was governor of both Gauls in 64–63.)

—. “Caesar’s regnum (Suet. *Iul.* 9.2.).” *TAPA* 84 (1953), 227–36. (Cic.’s comment about Caes. aiming at a *regnum* in 65 is not to be connected with the so-called first conspiracy.)

—. “Cicero’s *salutatio* (*In Catilinam* 1.9).” In G. E. Mylonas and D. Raymond (edd.), *Studies Presented to D. M. Robinson*. St Louis, 1953. 707-10. (Reviews the evidence for mourning callers to be received in the bedchamber.)


Badian, E. “The Early Career of A. Gabinius (cos. 58 B.C.).” *Philologus* 103 (1959), 87–99. (Gabinius formed ties with Catiline and Pompey when all three served with Sulla.)


—. “Notes on *Provinicia Gallia* in the Late Republic.” *Mélanges Piganiol* (Paris 1966) vol. 2.901–18 (pp. 913–18, contra Allen, *CP* 1953, Murena governed only Transalpine Gaul; *Cat*. 42.3 *citeriore* is an error for *ulteriore*.)


—. “Lucius Sulla, the Deadly Reformer.” In A. J. Dunston (ed.), *Essays on Roman Culture: The Todd Memorial Lectures*. Toronto, 1976. 35–74. (Traces Sulla’s rise to power and how his political reforms fared.)

Baker, R. J. “Sallustian Silence.” *Latomus* 41 (1982), 801-802. (*Silentium* at *Cat*. 1.1 and 53.6 has both an active and passive meaning.)
Balsdon, J. P. V. D. “Roman History, 65-60 B.C.: Five Problems.” *JRS* 52 (1962), 134-41. (The appointment of Cn. Piso as governor of Nearer Spain in 65 as “quaestor pro praetore” was perfectly normal.)

Batstone, W. “*Incerta pro certis*. An Interpretation of Sallust’s *Bellum Catilinae* 48.4–49.4.” *Ramus* 15 (1986), 105–21. (S. captures in his reports the uncertainties of the time.)

———. “*Quantum ingenio possum*. On Sallust’s use of *ingenium* in *Bellum Catilinae* 53.6.” *CJ* 83 (1988), 301–6. (= “to the extent which my rhetorical talent allows me to be effective”)


———. “Intellectual Conflict and Mimesis in Sallust’s *Bellum Catilinae*.” In J. W. Allison (ed.), *Conflict, Antithesis and the Ancient Historian*. Columbus, 1990. 112–32 (text), 189–94 (notes). (S. conveys the uncertainty of the times by the elusiveness of his narrative, using style as a mimetic device.)

———. Cicero’s Construction of Consular Ethos in the First Catilinarian.” *TAPA* 124 (1994), 211-66. (Cicero’s aim in Cat. 1 is not chiefly to advocate a course of action or to attack Catiline, but rather to establish his consular ethos.)

———. “Catiline’s Speeches in Sallust’s *Bellum Catilinae*.” In D. H. Berry and Andrew Erskine (eds), *Form and Function in Roman Oratory*. Cambridge, 2010. 227-46. (Primarily concerns the relationship between Catiline’s speeches and Sallust’s purpose in writing)


Benson, J. M. “Catiline and the Date of the Consular Elections of 63 B.C.” In Carl Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History IV. Collection Latomus*, 196. Brussels, 1986. 234-46. (Postponed elections were held in July.)


Boissier, G. “Les Prologues de Salluste.” *Journal des Savants n.s.* 1 (1903), 59–66. (Prologues hold key to understanding S.’s psyche.)


Bois, A. G. “I proemi delle monografie di Sallustio.” *Athenaeum* 16 (1938), 128–57. (The philosophy in the prefaces, grounded in Plato with borrowings from Thucydides, the Middle Stoa, and Roman ideas, is in harmony with concepts found in the philosophic digressions in the monographs.)

Boyd, B. “*Virtus Effeminata* and Sallust’s Sempronia.” *TAPA* 177 (1987), 183–201. (Sempronia strategically placed at end of list of conspirators; S. employs a topos, making her appear treacherous because removed from woman’s proper domestic sphere.)

Bradley, K. R. “Slaves and the Conspiracy of Catiline.” *CP* 73 (1978), 329–36. (Some slaves, mainly runaways, joined Catiline but were not actively recruited.)

Brock, R. W. “Versions, ‘Inversions’ and Evasions: Classical Historiography and the ‘Published’ Speech.” *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar* 8 (1995), 209-24 (Published orations are rarely reported in direct speech by ancient historians; pp. 212-13 discuss the historicity of the speeches attributed by Sallust to Caesar and Cato in the Catilinarian debate.)

Broughton, T. R. S. “Was Sallust Fair to Cicero?” *TAPA* 67 (1936), 34–46. (S. was not deliberately unfair to Cic. but was writing under the Triumvirs, when it would have been dangerous to magnify the achievements of Cicero)

———. “More Notes on Roman Magistrates.” *TAPA* 79 (1948), 63–78 (Pp. 76–78 concerns S.’s praetorship.)


Bruggisser P. “Audacia in Sallusts Verschwörung des Catilina.” *Hermes* 130 (2002), 265–87. (In S.’s day, audacia no longer conveyed the positive overtone that the term once had in earlier times.)

Brunt, P. A. “Three Passages from Asconius.” *CR* n.s. 7 (1957), 193–95 (Passages bearing on the first conspiracy of Catiline.)

———. “The Army and the Land in the Roman Revolution.” *JRS* 52 (1962), 69–86. Reprinted in *Fall of Roman Republic* (1988), 240–80. (The rural population from which soldiers were recruited had no political allegiances of their own, but difficult economic conditions made them susceptible to the influence of politic leaders.)

———. “The Conspiracy of Catilina.” *History Today* 13 (1963), 14–21. (Catiline was not a genuine reformer but exploited discontent in the countryside and among the restless mob in the city.)

———. “The Equites in the Late Republic.” *Second International Conference of Economic History*, 1962 (Paris 1965), vol. 1.117–37. (The political role played by equites is not to be explained solely as being driven by economic considerations.)


———. “The Roman Mob.” *Past and Present* 35 (1966), 3–27. (Examines conditions that produced violence; discusses the composition and goals of the Roman mob.)


Butler, S. *The Hand of Cicero*. London, 2002. (Chapt. 6 treats Cicero’s writings on the arrest and interrogation of the conspirators in the senate on 3 Dec., drawing some contrasts with S.’s account.)

Cadoux, T. J. “Sallust and Sempronia.” In B. Marshall (ed.), *Vindex Humanitatis: Essays in Honour of John Huntly Bishop*. Armidale, 1980. 93–122. (S. chose to include the portrait of Sempronia not because of who she was but because it rounded out his description of this society by providing a female counterpart for Catiline and because S. knew her.)
“Catiline and the Vestal Virgins.” *Historia* 54 (2005), 162–79. (Catiline was tried and acquitted in 73 on the charge of incest with a Vestal Virgin.)

“The Absent Senator of 5 December 63 B.C.” *CQ* 56 (2006), 612-18. (Challenges the doubt expressed by Drummond [1995, 14-15] that Crassus was the absent senator referred to by Cicero at Cat. 4.10.)

“The Roman *Carcer* and its Adjuncts.” *G & R* 55 (2008), 202-21. (Discussion, with diagrams, of the physical structure of the carcer and Tullianum, as well as the Saxum Tarpeium, Scalae Gemoniae, and *robur*.)

Cape, R. W. “The Rhetoric of Politics in Cicero’s *Fourth Catilinarian*.” *AJP* 116 (1995), 255-77. (In *Cat* 4, Cicero outwardly intervenes from a neutral standpoint after Caesar’s speech on 5 December and consequent wavering by the senate; his overt purpose is merely to summarize the state of the question, but he subtly argues for a stiffening of resolve.)

———. “Cicero’s Consular Speeches.” In J. May (ed.) *Brill’s Companion to Cicero.* Leiden, 2002. 113-58. (Discusses the formation of the corpus of Cicero’s consular speeches according to the principle enunciated in *Att.* 2.1, and considers how each is to be read in context.)

Conley, D. F. “The Interpretation of Sallust, *Catiline* 10.1–11.3.” *CP* 76 (1981), 121–25. (The origin of *avaritia* and *ambitio* not fully explained in 10.3; 10.3 gives only one of multiple causes assigned by S. to *ambitio*.)


Craig, C. P. “Three Simple Questions for Teaching Cicero’s *First Catilinarian*.” *CJ* 88 (1993), 255-67 (What impelled Cicero to speak? What is he trying to persuade his hearers to feel or to do? What problems stand in the way of achieving his persuasive goals?)

———. “Self-restraint, Invective, and Credibility in Cicero’s *First Catilinarian Oration*.” *AJP* 128 (2007), 335-39. (Cicero’s *First Catilinarian* is relatively sparse in its use of the *topoi* of invective because Cicero wanted to carry conviction.)

Crane, T. “Times of the Night in Cicero’s *First Catilinarian*.” *CJ* 61 (1965-66), 264-67. (Cicero’s *First Catilinarian* was delivered on the day the attempt had been made on Cicero’s life, 7 Nov.)


Crook, J. A. “Was there a Doctrine of Manifest Guilt in the Roman Criminal Law?” *PCPS* n.s. 33 (1987), 38-52 (Concerning *Cat.* 52.36 *de confessis*: argues that Roman citizens were entitled to a trial, even if caught in *flagrante delicto*.)


———. “Furorem incredibilem biennio ante conceptum (Cicero, *Pro Sulla 67*).” *RhM* 142 (1999), 296-308. (Examines the historical context of Cicero’s *Sull.* And his rhetorical strategy to determine what was the *furor*, in which Cicero’s client was implicated.)
———. “Tribunes and Tribunician Programs in 63 B.C.” *Athenaeum* 87 (1999), 136-47. (The crisis in 63 was not primarily a credit crisis.)


Eagle, E. D. “Catiline and the *Concordia Ordinum.*” *Phoenix* 3 (1949), 15–30. (Seeks to explain events of 63 in context of social and economic interest groups.)


———. “The Early Career of Sallust.” *Historia* 15 (1966), 302–11. (S. most likely absent from Rome on military service at the time of Catiline’s conspiracy.)

Ernout, A. “Salluste et Caton,” *Information Litteraire* 1 (1949), 61–65. (S. admired Cato the Elder not only as a prose stylist but also as a politician; this figure has left a stamp on Sallustian thought.)

Evans, R. J. “Catiline’s Wife.” *AClass* 30 (1987), 69-72. (Aurelia Orestilla’s family was most likely wealthy and well-connected, which explains why Catiline sought to marry her.)

Feeney, D. “Beginning Sallust’s *Catiline.*” *Prudentia* 26 (1994), 139–46. (S. was self-conscious about his novel approach to writing up conspiracy; this explains oddities and the strain in his preface.)


Fletcher, G. B. A. “On Sallust’s *Bellum Catilinae.*” *Latomus* 40 (1981), 580-88. (Supplements to, and disagreements with, the commentaries of Vretska and McGushin.)

Forsythe, G. “The Municipal Origo of the Catilinian T. Volturcius.” *AJP* 113 (1992), 407-12. (Proposes the emendation “Cortonense” for “Crotoniensem” at Sall. *Cat.* 44.3, thus making T. Volturcius a native of Cortona in Etruria, not Croton in S. Italy.)

Frank, Tenney. “The Tullianum and Sallust’s *Catiline.*” *CJ* 19 (1923–24), 495–98. (The interpretation of *Cat.* 55.3–4 must take into account significant modifications to the Tullianum since S.’s day.)

Frazer, R. M., Jr. “Nam-clauses in Sallust,” *CPh* 56 (1961), 251-52. (Examples of *nam* with assertive meaning, = “indeed,” “indeed,” “indeed,” not “for,” e.g., 40.5; 58.20; *nam quid* virtually = *quidnam,* 13.1, 52.34; and parenthetical *nam,* e.g., 2.1, 47.4)

Frederiksen, M. W. “Caesar, Cicero, and the Problem of Debt.” *JRS* 56 (1966), 128–41. (Examines the problem of debt mainly in 49 B.C., with some discussion of prior decades.)

Frisch, H. “The First Catilinarian Conspiracy: A Study in Historical Conjecture.” *Cl Med* 9 (1948), 10–36. (Tradition of conspiracy in 66/65 grew out of threats made by Autronius and Sulla against their rivals, with backing of gang collected by Catiline; M. Crassus was a friend and supporter of Catiline in 66 and 63 but not in sympathy with the conspiracy in 63.)

Gaertner, H. A. “Erzählformen bei Sallust.” *Historia* 35 (1986), 449–73. (Explores the methods of presentation by using reflection and dramatic narrative, esp. in the account of the recruitment and arrest of the Allobroges.)

Gejrot, C. “The Letter from Lentulus.” *Eranos* 103 (2005), 20-25. (S.’s version of Lentulus’ letter [44.5] is closer to the original than Cicero’s [*Cat.* 3.12].)


Genovese, E. N. “Cicero and Sallust. Catiline’s *ruina*, *CW* 68 (1974) 171-77. (S. moves the threat attributed to Catiline in Cic. *Mur.* 51 [viz., that he will resort to general destruction to quell any ‘blaze’ raised against him] to a context where it better conveys desperation on Catiline’s part.)


Grethlein, J. “The Unthucydidean Voice of Sallust.” *TAPA* 136 (2006), 299-327. (S. is at times more Herodotean than Thucydidean, e.g., by making his role as narrator more prominent through first-person interventions into his account and in expressing doubt and uncertainty as to the truth of particular details.)

Gruen, E. S. ‘Notes on the ‘First Catilinarian Conspiracy’.” *CP* 64 (1969), 20–24. (A demonstration by the convicted consuls-elect in 66 against their rivals may have given rise to the tradition of a conspiracy in 66/65.)

———. “Some Criminal Trials of the Late Republic: Political and Prosopographical Problems.” *Athenaeum* 49 (1971), 54–69. (p. 59f trial of Catiline in 65 B. C.; pp. 67-69 L. Bestia, tr. pl. 62, is to be distinguished from Cicero’s homonymous client in 56 who later turned up in Mark Antony’s camp in 43.)


Gunderson, E. “The History of Mind and the Philosophy of History in Sallust’s *Bellum Catilinae*.” *Ramus* 29 (2000), 85–126. (The concepts of *animus*, *ingenium*, and *memoria*, which are introduced in the preface, turn out to be unstable quantities as the presentation of the conspiracy unfolds.)

Gwatkin, W. E., Jr. “Cicero in *Catilinam* 1.19—Catiline’s attempt to place himself in *libera custodia*.” *TAPA* 65 (1934), 271-81. (Proposes to read [M.] Metellum at Cicero [Cat. 1.19 and identify this figure with Q. Metellus Nepos, tr. pl. designate for 62.)


Harris, W. V. *Rome in Etruria and Umbria*. Oxford, 1971. (Chapter 8, especially, pp. 271-94, discusses the Sullan colonists and the dispossessed.)

Harrison, I. “Catiline, Clodius, and Popular Politics at Rome during the 60s and 50s BCE.” *BICS* 51 (2008), 95-118. (The supposed urban following of Catiline is an ancient and modern myth. S’s assertion that Catiline at first enjoyed wide support among the *plebs* [48.1] is false.)


Heyworth, S. J. and A. J. Woodman. “Sallust, Bellum Catilinae 50.3–5,” LCM 11 (1986), 11–12. (Two debates, not one, described at 50.3–5, retaining the paradoxis dixerat at 50.4.)

Hock, R. P. “The role of Fortuna in Sallust’s Bellum Catilinae.” Gerión 3 (1985), 141-51. (S. employs Fortune more as a literary device than as an agent of history.)

———. “Servile Behavior in Sallust’s Bellum Catilinae.” CW 82.1 (1988), 13–24. (S. explains the failure of the conspiracy with reference to slavish behavior on the part of the participants.)

Holmes, T. Rice. “Three Catilinarian Dates.” JRS 8 (1918), 15–25. (Date of consular elections in 63, of attempted assassination of Cic. and of Cic.’s Cat. 1.)


Horsfall, N. “Some Problems of Titulature in Roman Literary History.” BICS 28 (1981), 103–12 (p. 107, argues for a version of the title De Coniuratione Catilinae.)

———. “Sallustian Politicians and Virgilian Villains.” SCI 21 (2002), 79-81. (Sallustian influence may be detected in Virgil’s portrait of Drances in Aen. 11.)

Innes, D. C. “Quo usque tandem patiemini?” CQ 27 (1977), 468. (At 20.9 S. imitates opening of Cic.s Cat. 1 as a tribute to Cic. and to show how Catiline perverted language.)

John, C. “Die Entstehungsgeschichte der catilinarischen Verschwörung: Ein Beitrag zur Kritik des Sallustius.” Jahrbücher für cl. Phil. Supp. 8 (1876), 703–819. (Accepts reality of a conspiracy in 66/65 B.C., in which Caesar and Crassus sought power; puts formation of later conspiracy after Catiline’s defeat in 63, not in 64 as S. does.)

———. “Sallust über Catilinas Candidatur in Jahren 688.” RhM 31 (1876), 401–31. (In discussing Catiline’s failed candidacy in 66, argues that a candidate facing criminal prosecution was not disqualified from standing at an election until after a jury had been constituted.)

Katz, B. R. “Did Sallust have a Guilty Conscience?” Eranos 81 (1983), 101-11. (Remorse is to be detected in the frequency of conscientia/conscius in Cat. 3.3–4.2.)

Keitel, E. “The Influence of Thucydides 7.61–71 on Sallust, Cat. 20–21.” CJ 82 (1987), 293–300. (S. drew attention to the first important developments in the plot by using the Thycidean technique of repeating different forms of speech.)

Konrad, C. F. “A Note on the Stemma of the Gabinii Capitones.” Klio 66 (1984), 151-56. (The conspirator P. Gabinius Capito was most likely the brother of an A. Gabinius attested by CIL I.2.2500, both descended in a line collateral to that of the consul of 58 A. Gabinius. App. BCiv. 2.2 suggests that Cethegus may already have been a praetor in 63.)

Konstan, D. “Rhetoric and the Crisis of Legitimacy in Cicero’s Catilinarian Orations.” in T. Poulakos (ed.), Rethinking the History of Rhetoric: Multidisciplinary Essays on the Rhetorical Tradition. Boulder, 1993. 11-30. (Cic. aims to portray himself and his policies as grounded on virtue, while Catiline and his supporters represent pure evil.)

Kraggerud, Egil “Critica (III): Another Interpolation in Sallust’s Bellum Catilinae?” SO 77 (2002), 110-113. (Sense is improved if “honoris cupido” is bracketed at Cat. 3.5.)
“Grammar and interpretation at Sallust, Cat. 57.4” SO 82 (2007), 55-59. (Upote has its usual meaning at 57.4 [“naturally enough since”], Sallust’s point being that Antonius’ army could make good time by marching over more level terrain than the terrain that was retarding the flight of Catiline and his forces.)

Krebs, C. “The Imagery of ‘The Way’ in the Proem to Sallust’s Bellum Catilinae (1-4).” AJP 129 (2008), 581-94. (S. uses the image of “the way” to distinguish the choices present in life, including his own decision to turn away from politics to write history.)

———. “Catilina’s Ravaged Mind: vastus animus (Sall. Cat. 5.5).” CQ 58 (2008), 682-86. (Vastus expresses desolation rather than dimension: = “ravaged,” rather than “insatiable.”)

———. ‘hebescere virtus’ (Sall. Cat. 12.1): Metaphorical Ambiguity.” HSCP 104 (2008), 231-36. (Brevity makes the metaphor ambiguous; it is quite likely inspired by the metaphor in Cic. Cat. 1.4.)


La Penna, A. Sallustio e la “rivoluzione romana”. Milan, 1968.

Last, H. M. “Sallust and Caesar in the Bellum Catilinae.” Mélanges offerts à J. Marouzeau (Paris, 1948), 355–69. (S. aimed to exculpate Caesar from any suspicion of involvement in the conspiracy by portraying him as a model of virtue while blackening the character of the conspirators.)

Latta, B. “Der Wandel im Sallusts Geschichtsauffassung vom Bellum Catilinae zum Bellum Iugurthinum.” Maia 40 (1988), 271–88. (Traces an evolution in S.’s thinking about the role played in history by fortuna and metus hostilis.)

Levene, D. “Sallust’s Catilina and Cato the Censor.” CQ 50 (2000), 170–91. (S. adopts C. the Censor’s moral tone, using it to bring out the paradox that preservation of the state and a moral society are incompatible.)

Lewis, R. G. “Inscriptions of Amiternum and Catiline’s Last Stand.” ZPE 74 (1988), 31–42. (Names on inscriptions from Amiternum recall Catiline’s followers and suggest that S. may have drawn upon evidence from his hometown in constructing his account of Catiline’s final battle.)

———. “Catilina and the Vestal.” CQ 51 (2001), 141-49. (Catiline received no formal verdict of acquittal in the trial of the Vestal Fabia in 73 but by her acquittal was released by Catulus, who presided over the trial.)


Linderski, J. “Cicero and Sallust on Vargunteius.” Historia 12 (1963), 511–512. (Vargunteius was most likely a senator in 66, but not in 63, pace S.)

———. “Effete Rome: Sallust, Cat. 53.5.” Mnemosyne 52 (1999), 257–65. (Read “sicuti <esset> effeta partu”.)

Lowrance, W. D. “The Use of *forem* and *essem*.” *TAPA* 62 (1931), 169–91. (*Forem* for *essem* in S. is a deliberate archaism and usually has overtones of a future meaning.)

McDermott, W. C. “Vettius ille, ille noster index.” *TAPA* 80 (1949), 351-67. (Caesar instructed Vettius to join Catiline’s conspiracy as a spy and caused V. to accuse Caes. in 62 to force Cicero to clear his name.)

———. “M. Petreius and Juba.” *Latomus* 28 (1969), 858-62. (Examines the conflicting accounts of the suicide pact between Petreius and Juba after the Battle of Thapsus in 46.)

———. “Cato the Younger: *loquax* or *eloquens*.” *Cl. Bull.* 46 (1970), 65–75. (Cato the Younger was an indefatigable rather than an eloquent speaker.)

———. “Cicero’s Publication of his Consular Orations.” *Philologus* 116 (1972), 277-84. (Discusses the preparation in 61 of the corpus of 12 speeches delivered in 63.)

McDonald, A. H. “Theme and Style in Roman Historiography.” *JRS* 65 (1975), 1–10. (Examines how rhetorical elaboration was used by historians to convey their outlook.)


MacKay, L. A. “Sallust’s *Catilina*, Date and Purpose.” *Phoenix* 16 (1962), 181–94. (First draft of *Catilina* was in 50, to help Caesar in his impending bid for a second consulship by exculpating him from any suspicion of having been in sympathy with the conspirators.)

Madden, J. D. Review of C. MacDonald (1977, above). *CW* 71 (1977-78), 276-78. (21 Oct. = original date of consular elections in 63; Cic.’s *Cat.* 1 delivered on 7 Nov.; Cic. delayed calling the apprehended conspirators before the senate until 4 Dec.)

Malcolm, D. A. “*Quo Usque Tandem . . . ?*” *CQ* 29 (1979), 219–20. (Cic. borrowed a favorite turn of phrase used by Catiline to form the opening words of *Cat.* 1.)

March, D. A. “Cicero and the ‘Gang of Five’.” *CW* 82 (1989), 225–34. (Cic. *Cat.* 3–4, *pro Sulla*, and S. *Cat.* show that Cic. prudently limited his arrest and punishment to the 5 conspirators who were in Rome on 3 Dec. and against whom he had solid evidence.)

Marshall, B. A. “Cicero and Sallust on Crassus and Catiline.” *Latomus* 33 (1974), 804–813. (Cic. portrays Crassus’ dealings with Catiline as being driven by his hatred of Pompey, and S. follows this line.)
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