

#### 4G(i)

If Verres' father were here himself here and were now judging, by the immortal gods, what could he do? What would he say? If he heard that that Roman citizens had been executed with the axe by you, that by you the chief pirate had been freed, that through your negligence a Roman fleet had been captured and burned and finally, that by you Gavius had been crucified, would you be able to seek forgiveness from him, would you be able to ask him to pardon you?

How sweet is the name of liberty! How outstanding our rights as citizens!<sup>1</sup> Was it the case<sup>2</sup> that a Roman citizen in a province belonging to the Roman people was beaten with rods<sup>3</sup> in the forum by a man who was<sup>4</sup> a Roman praetor? What? Did you dare to crucify a man who said<sup>5</sup> he was a Roman citizen? But you may say<sup>6</sup> that Gavius was a spy

---

<sup>1</sup> These first two phrases addressing abstractions are hard to translate. Cicero means to apostrophize (address), and hence call to witness, the outstanding privileges that Roman citizens deserve. *civitas* is the abstract noun from *civis*, and refers to citizenship; as the state is the collection of citizens, it often is most handily translated by "state."

<sup>2</sup> *acciditne ut* . . . "Happen" sometimes makes it sound like the event is some sort of mistake, which of course isn't what Cicero wants here.

<sup>3</sup> Cicero presumably keeps mentioning the damn rods because they are the official gear of the lictors and thus emphasize that this wasn't just some private brawl but a misuse of official power.

<sup>4</sup> *esset* is a subjunctive in a generic relative clause (see **GVE 140**). See the note below. "Although he was a Roman praetor" is a slight over-translation.

<sup>5</sup> Subjunctive in a generic relative clause (see **GVE 140**). This sort of thing one can either over- or under-translate. "A man . . . who" is perhaps the best under-translation; it gets fairly close to the force of this. (Contrast "the man . . . who".) Or overtranslate this as a concessive clause (something not explicitly covered in **GVE 140**, alas): "a man, despite the fact that he was a Roman citizen". We aren't simply identifying who Gavius was, but explaining something about him relevant to the rest of the sentence; who he was explains something about what happened to him. Here it explains why his being beaten was so egregious.

<sup>6</sup> *at enim* is often used to introduce something presented as an objection. In such cases *at* ("but") introduces the objection, and *enim* can be understood to introduce an unspoken "for (one may object)" clause. Here the "one" is Verres. "May" here is my attempt to indicate that Cicero is raising a possible objection, not describing something Verres is actually saying. *Dicis* is a regular old present indicative, however.

and that he kept calling out that he was a Roman citizen because he was seeking a delay to his death.<sup>7</sup> This *you* say, Verres, this you confess: he kept calling out that he was a Roman citizen.

This is what I cling to, this is where I take my stand, gentlemen; I am content with this one thing, I pass by and leave the rest alone. He said he was a Roman citizen. If you, Verres, were being led to punishment among the Persians or in most distant part of India, what else would you cry out, if not that you were a Roman citizen? If you were to say that you were a Roman citizen, wouldn't you think that you'd gain either escape or a delay to your death? Humble men, born from obscure origins,<sup>8</sup> take voyages, visit places which they have never seen before, thinking that they will be safe and this thing will serve to protect them. If you were to take away this expectation, if you were to take away this protection from Roman citizens, if you were to decide that there was no power in this cry "I am a Roman citizen", you'd now<sup>9</sup> shut off every province, now every kingdom, now every free state, now every land on earth,<sup>10</sup> from Roman citizens.

---

<sup>7</sup> The dative in *moram morti* is a bit odd (the original has *moram supplicio*, which presents the same problem). Here the delay is viewed as an obstacle or obstruction standing in the way of the punishment, and the dative is akin to a dative of disadvantage: delay is disadvantageous to death. In line 321 below, we get *moram mortis* (which is also present in the original). The genitive is easier, as it explains what sort of delay, a delay from death. The basic function of the genitive, after all, is to define, describe or classify other nouns.

<sup>8</sup> The "place" in *obscuro loco nati* is one's place in society, rather than a geographical location. In the original Cicero explains that such people are unlikely to have a network of friends & acquaintances they could count on abroad, as Roman aristocrats could. Ablative of origin.

<sup>9</sup> The repeated *iam* is hard to translate here. Time isn't really relevant here, so what the *iam* seems to mark is a new stage of development, and so its repetition marks each new clause as a further horrible consequence of Verres' misdeed. A more idiomatic way of doing this in English might be to put an emphatic "and" before each clause: "you'd be shutting off every province, *and* every kingdom, *and* every free state, *and* every land on earth". This at least mimics the repetition in the Latin.

<sup>10</sup> *orbem terrarum* is fairly normal Latin for "the world," i.e., the surface of the earth, but something more fulsome ("every land on earth") seemed to be called for to match the wordier Latin phrase and avoid an anticlimax.

## 4G(ii)

What? When Gavius named Lucius Raecius, a Roman knight who was<sup>11</sup> then in Sicily, as his *cognitor*,<sup>12</sup> why didn't you send him a letter? If Raecius knew the man,<sup>13</sup> you would have let up a bit from the supreme punishment; if he didn't know him, then, if it seemed right to you, you would have established a new law, and crucified a man, although he was a Roman citizen, because<sup>14</sup> he didn't provide a *cognitor*.

But why should I say<sup>15</sup> more about Gavius? You weren't only hostile to Gavius, but even to the name, the nation, and the rights of the Roman people; you were an enemy not to that man but to the common cause of liberty. For it is an outrage to bind a Roman citizen, a crime to beat a Roman citizen, all but treason to kill one—what am I to call crucifying one? There's no word strong enough to name such an unspeakable thing. Were I to want to complain about and denounce these things not to Roman citizens, not to friends of our society, not to men, but to beasts, still all mute and inanimate things would be moved . . .<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Note the indicative in this relative clause, and it simply describes Lucius Raecius. He isn't the sort of guy who was in Sicily (generic subjunctive). He just happened to be there.

<sup>12</sup> There's no English equivalent of the Latin legal term, one who guarantees someone else's identity.

<sup>13</sup> This long sentence gives us multiple examples (*cognosceret . . . remitteres . . . ignoraret . . . videretur . . . constitueres . . . tolleres*) of something fairly rare in classical Latin: the imperfect subjunctive used to describe something that did not take place in the **past**. The more usual Latin usage here is the **pluperfect subjunctive**. In the original passage, Cicero begins normally enough with a pluperfect subjunctive in a past contra-factual ("You would have locked up Gavius. . .), then switches, again normally, to the imperfect in a *dum* clause ("until Lucius arrived"—a construction we haven't covered yet). Once Cicero gets into the imperfect subjunctive he stays there; perhaps this is simply because of the momentum of the first imperfect. Something similar happens in the Jones & Sidwell passage, as the imperfect subjunctive appears first in the *cum* clause (*cum . . . nominaret*, lines 328-329).

<sup>14</sup> *qui . . . daret* is best taken as a *causal relative clause*; it does not merely describe or identify Gavius (as the indicative would do) but give Verres' excuse for killing him. See **GVE 140**.

<sup>15</sup> *Dicam* is actually a subjunctive; see the note atop of page 290.

<sup>16</sup> In the original Cicero gets to inanimate objects a bit more clearly. "If I were to choose to make these complaints and to utter these lamentations, not to Roman citizens, not to

---

any friends of our city, not to men who had heard of the name of the Roman people, if I uttered them not to men, but to beasts, or even, to go further, if I uttered them in some most desolate wilderness to the stones and rocks, still all things, mute and inanimate as they might be, would be moved by such excessive, by such scandalous and atrocious conduct."