

SALLUST ON THE EIGHTIES?*

In Lucan's second book, an old man looks back to the atrocities perpetrated in the civil strife of the eighties, chiefly on the return of Marius and Cinna to Rome in late 87 and on that of Sulla in 82 (lines 70–233). The episodes that Lucan briefly refers to are all otherwise known, and there seems no particular reason to assume that he is not drawing on Livy as his principal source, as he does for the events of his main narrative, the civil war between Pompey and Caesar.¹ The scholia to the passage may be a different matter.

The tradition of the scholia to Lucan is extremely complex. In brief, Usener identified two main collections as existing in the tenth century, one of which he published in 1869 as *Commenta Bernensia*; and another which had to wait for Endt to publish it, not very satisfactorily, in 1909, as *Adnotationes super Lucanum*.² Endt believed, and B. M. Marti later proved, that *Adn.* drew heavily on a commentary to Lucan, regarded as highly authoritative, by one Vacca, whom various later mediaeval scholia, unrelated to our two collections, quote by name.³ Jerome already knew, or knew of, a commentary to Lucan used in schools,⁴ and Marti shows that Vacca may well have been as early as Jerome's time; she notes 'the use of as good an authority as Livy [rather than the inferior authors employed at a later date] and the care with which technical terms, and especially legal words, are defined'. Vacca certainly provided geographical and historical information. Some of the material explicitly attributed to him in the late scholia also appears in very similar form in *Comm.*, though much of it does not appear there at all. Naturally the statements ascribed by the mediaeval sources to Vacca often reach us in very corrupt form, and Marti argues that a few glosses differing in character from the rest (all concerned with the supernatural except for one which makes the gross historical error of saying that D. Brutus destroyed Massilia in 49 B.C.) are falsely attributed to him.

Now, for comment in both collections of early scholia on the passage in Book 2 dealing with the eighties (and for a couple of other notes concerning the same years) I would like to suggest that much of the material may go back ultimately, probably via Vacca, not to Livy but to the first book of Sallust's *Histories*. *Adn.* actually quotes Sallust explicitly three times on this passage of Lucan (see below), as also on 1.75, 2.548 and 2.64, dealing with the same period. Sallust is also quoted at 1.552, 3.227,

* I am grateful to Dr N. Horsfall for reading and commenting on this paper.

¹ R. Pichon, *Les Sources de Lucain* (Paris, 1912); for recent slight modifications to the thesis see W. Rutz, 'Lucan's "Pharsalia" im Lichte der neuesten Forschung', *ANRW* 32.3 (1985), 1457, esp. 1460ff. (Some influence from Sallust has been seen, but only where the poet's general ideas are concerned; Rutz thinks it unproved.)

² *Comm.* (Leipzig) 1869, repr. (Hildesheim) 1967; *Adn.* (Leipzig) 1909, repr. 1969; see also *Supplementum Adnotationum* 1–v, ed. G. A. Cavajoni (Milan, 1979) which contains the scholia in aADRV (of virtually no interest for this article); there are still MSS to explore. For the history of the scholia see H. C. Gotoff, *The Transmission of the Text of Lucan in the Ninth Century* (Cambridge, Mass., 1971); also J. E. G. Zetzel, *Latin Textual Criticism in Antiquity* (New York, 1981).

³ B. M. Marti, 'Vacca in Lucanum', *Speculum* 50 (1950), 198. Note that the MS evidence for Vacca's authorship of the life of Lucan attributed to him by modern scholars is weak. For the revival of interest in Lucan in the fourth century, see P. Wessner, 'Lucan, Statius und Juvenal bei den römischen Grammatikern', *BPhW* 49 (1929), 296, 328.

⁴ Jerome, *ad Rufin.* 1.16.

7.272 and 9.960, probably from later books of the *Histories*, and at 6.104 from an unknown part of the work (all these fragments are of course in Maurenbrecher's edition of the remains of the *Historiae*). The *Catilinarian* and *Jugurthine Wars* were also used a number of times, and the grand total of definite Sallustian quotations in the entire *Adnotationes* is 18, third to Virgil (*facile princeps*) and Cicero (who has 53). Livy is adduced only three times, always for the civil war of Caesar and Pompey, and Velleius twice; no other historians are mentioned. The *Commenta* are less given to open quotation, though even fonder of historical explanation; they only produce a passage explicitly from Sallust's *Histories* at 2.173 (and probably 1.478, where Sallust is named but the work is not), but there are several references to the two monographs, and Usener notes a couple of passages that seem to draw on him without mentioning his name.

Maurenbrecher, no doubt rightly, scouted the idea that the confused and ignorant scholiasts themselves used Sallust.⁵ But a source they drew on might well have done so; the *Histories* were still known in late antiquity, for example to Augustine and Ausonius, and to the *grammatici* from whom our numerous fragments mostly come. Did the scholiasts' source use them for more than their actual quotations? H. Szelest, in an article on the quotations in general in C and W, two of the manuscripts used by Endt, stresses the connection between these quotations and the informative comment: 'die Zitate sind für unseren Scholiasten die Quelle aus der er den Stoff zu seinen Erläuterungen schöpft...sehr oft beruht die Rolle der angeführten Zitate darauf, dass sie die Wahrheit der Erläuterungen des Scholiasten bestätigen'.⁶ They are certainly used for factual information, not only stylistic points. It thus seems likely that even when one of the scholiasts' favourite authors is not named, he may be being drawn upon. Unfortunately, the material has been so compressed and rewritten in passing through the two or more hands we must postulate (those of the original commentary and at least one later scholiast) that traces of Sallustian style are very difficult to find; while the question of the sources of Livy, and of extant accounts of the period, is so complicated and uncertain that it is rarely possible to say what variants are or are not likely to have been in Sallust's work. Not all the historical material in *Comm.* and *Adn.* need go back to the same source, of course; but it will be seen that while the two collections are themselves closely related, many of their notices are linked by striking animus against Marius.

The often circumstantial details on the age of Marius and Sulla which these scholia provide, though not seldom in confused and corrupt form, can be exploited to throw a few beams of light on the period, as well as perhaps to recover Sallust's views. The material is not totally unknown to historians; in particular it was treated with respect by Münzer in a number of his outstandingly complete and accurate prosopographical articles in Pauly-Wissowa; but the passages not used by Münzer seem very often to be unfamiliar to historians, while as far as I can discover neither he nor anyone else has considered this class of evidence as a whole.⁷ Even if the case for the use of Sallust is thought not to have been made out, there are some interesting notices here that need discussion.

⁵ Ap. Usener, op. cit. 334 (*scriptorum indiculus*). But for the popularity of Sallust in late antiquity see H. Hagendahl, *Augustine and the Latin Classics* II (Gothenburg, 1967), 631 and *Von Tertullian zu Cassiodor* (Gothenburg, 1983), 80.

⁶ H. Szelest, 'Römische Autoren in den Handschriften C und W der "Adnotationes super Lucanum"', *Eos* 66 (1978), 159.

⁷ A bibliography of Münzer's work by H.-J. Drexhage is in A. Kneppel and J. Wiesehöfer, *Friedrich Münzer: Ein Althistoriker zwischen Kaiserreich und Nationalsozialismus* (Bonn, 1983), 159.

76 FRUSTRAQUE HOSTI C(oncessa) P(otestas). Cimbrum lictorem dicit, cui data est potestas, ut Marium in carcere interimeret.

79 VIDERAT id est Cimber lictor. (*Adn.*)

Comm. at line 70 has a lengthy and not very accurate outline of the events of 88–7 (especially in error in thinking Marius got his command against Mithridates from the Senate not the People) and here mentions a *carnifex Gallus genere*.

A lictor might indeed be the proper officer to oversee the execution of the fugitive Marius, which had been formally decided by the town councillors of Minturnae.⁸ However, the man who felt unable to kill the victor over the Cimbri and Teutones is described as a *servus publicus* in three sources, and slave executioners were the rule in Rome and elsewhere. In Rome at least, as at Urso in Spain, lictors were free, though often freedmen, and like *apparitores* in general persons of some standing (note also Orbilius at Beneventum), but we have slave *apparitores* in the *Tabula Irnitana* later.⁹ Given the general confusion between Cimbri and Gauls, *Adn.* and *Comm.* need not go back to different accounts, though they might do so.

88 IDEM P(elago) D(elatus) I(niquo) Marius enim a Fannia, cum eidem commissus in fidem esset custodiae, ad fugam dimissus est. (*Adn.*)

Plutarch tells us that Fannia treated Marius hospitably in spite of his earlier judgement against her in a legal case; that she approved his escape when the authorities at Minturnae decided to assist his departure to exile is highly probable, though Plutarch hardly leaves time for her to intervene as they hurry him off from her house.¹⁰

114 OSCULA POLLUTAE F(ixisse) T(rementia) D(extrae) Marius hoc signum dederat fugitivis, ut ille servaretur, qui manus osculatus fuisset. Sic autem occidit Euanthium amicum suum, dum ei osculandam non porrigit manum. (*Adn.*)

114 OSCULA POLLUTAE F.T.D. (ut) cui osculandam praeberet dexteram servaretur, praeceperat Marius suis. (*Comm.*)

Marius and Cinna have now returned to capture Rome and have initiated a reign of terror.

The name Euanthius (also in *Suppl.*) is highly implausible for a man of standing in Rome in this period and clearly reflects a late-antique confusion. The person meant is probably the ex-praetor Q. Ancharius, mentioned by Appian, Plutarch and Florus,¹¹ as not greeted by Marius and so killed by the fugitive slaves [whom he had recruited and used as a bodyguard] to whom this omission afterwards became an accepted signal. The slightly different chronology of the scholiasts, which perhaps makes Marius appear even more coldblooded, may as we shall see be not due to mere carelessness, but based on a rooted hostility to Marius at this period of his life. Other sources refer to Marius as generally greeting, or as stretching out his hand;¹² the explicit kissing may merely be carried over from Lucan. We do not know whether Ancharius was a friend of Marius, as ‘Euanthius’ is said to be; the Ancharii were probably of Italian

⁸ See Kübler, *PW* XIII.507ff. s.v. lictor.

⁹ Livy, *Ep.* 77; Val. Max. 2.10. 6; Vell. Pat. 2.19.3, Plut. *Mar.* 39.1 oddly calls him a *ἱππεύς*; perhaps he had been so once. FIRA 21.LXII, Suet. *Gramm.* 9; *Lex Irnitana*, *JRS* 76 (1986) 153 (lines 17, 31).

¹⁰ Plut. *Mar.* 38–9.

¹¹ App. *BC* 1.73: when Marius was about to sacrifice on the Capitol, as Ancharius thought this was a suitable occasion for reconciliation; cf. Plut. *Mar.* 43.3, Florus 2.9.16 (without *praenomen*). *Suppl.* (see n. 2 above) also has Euanthius.

¹² Dio 30–35.102.10. Marius stretches out his hand; Aug. *CD* 3.27, *quibus salutantibus dexteram porrigere noluisse*.

origin, perhaps with connections in Umbria, where Marius had many dependants.¹³ But the friendship stressed by the scholiast again makes Marius appear particularly heartless.

120 INTER CARPENTES M(embra) C(oronae) Terentius histrio circumventus a fugitivis promisit se ostensurum [se] eis inimicum Marii, qui multa in senatu contra Marium decrevisset. Misit ergo ad hunc Baebium fugitivum, quem raptum et discerptum Mario obtulerat. (Adn.)

119 VIX TE SPARSVM PER VISCERA BAEBI Tamphilus Syllanus a Terentio quodam proditus per milites iussu Mari de domo extractus est et discerptus. nam cum ei deessent vires ad sequendum – senex enim erat – rapto celerius trahebatur potius quam quod ibat. quare consumptus inter manus, cum alii oculos effodissent alii brachia, ultimi caput avellerent, periit. (*Comm.*; there is clearly something wrong with the text between rapto and ibat)

If Terentius was really a *histrio*, as *Adn.* states, he should be added to the list of republican actors in Garton's book.¹⁴ But one might be tempted to read Hispo – Cicero knew a Terentius Hispo in the service of the *publicani* in Asia.¹⁵ In any event our Terentius is not in *PW*.

The Baebii of this period are various. The man torn to pieces by the *fugitivi* is given the praenomen Marcus by Appian and appears as such in *PW*.¹⁶ If that is right he doubtless really is a Baebius Tamphilus, as *Comm.* asserts – no office-holding M. Baebii of the republican period are known who are not. Here is a first sign that our scholia can be valuable. If really a *senex* could he even be the monetal M. Baebius Q. f. Tamphilus dated to 137 B.C. by Crawford – fifty years earlier?¹⁷ But monetales in the second century were not normally as young as they were later, so this man may have been dead by 87.¹⁸ An obviously optimate C. Baebius as tribune in 111 vetoed Memmius' attempt to question Jugurtha in public, and another Baebius, tribune in 103, tried to veto Saturninus' bill to give land to Marius' veterans; Niccolini identifies this latter with the M. Baebius killed in 87.¹⁹ Keaveney cautiously refrains from pressing the description in *Comm.* of Baebius as *Syllanus*, on the grounds that this is a very late source.²⁰ It is certainly true that an ignorant writer, faced with someone about whom little was recorded, might assume that anti-Marian meant Sullan, though in fact at this date Sulla probably had few personal adherents, except the officers in his army; of the better-known victims, who certainly ought not to be termed Syllani, one, Catulus, is so called by *Comm.* (see below). Florus states that a Baebius perished in the Sullan proscriptions of the late eighties, but as he says he was torn apart, is probably producing a doublet of our M. Baebius (whom he has briefly mentioned in his right place, though only as dragged through the Forum on the executioners' hooks).² A Baebius, spoken of with respect by Cicero, was a senator in 74.²² The senatorial Baebii were thus probably all optimates.

¹³ Cic. *pro Vareno* frag. 5 Puccioni: C. Ancharius Rufus fuit e municipio Fulginate. It will be recalled that Marius enfranchised a cohort from Camerinum and individuals from Iguvium and Spoletium. See, however, T. P. Wiseman, *New Men in the Roman Senate* (Oxford, 1971), 212.

¹⁴ C. Garton, *Personal Aspects of the Roman Theatre* (Toronto, 1972), App. 1.

¹⁵ Cic. *ad fam.* 13.65, *ad Att.* 11.10.1. *Histrio* as a *cognomen* is not registered by I. Kajanto, *The Latin Cognomina* (Helsinki, 1965) though *Hister* and *Histria* are.

¹⁶ App. *BC* 1.72, Flor. 2.9.14 = Aug. *CD* 3.27, Klebs *PW* II 2730 no. 17.

¹⁷ M. Crawford, *RRC*, no. 236.

¹⁸ Wiseman, *op. cit.* n. 13, 204 notes for example *ILS* 45, where the office is held between the quaestorship and the aedileship.

¹⁹ Sall. *BJ* 33–4; *de vir. ill.* 73.1; G. Niccolini, *I Fasti dei Trib. della Plebe* (Milan, 1934). *MRR* tentatively gives him the *cognomen* Tamphilus and refers to the scholiasts.

²⁰ A. Keaveney, 'Who were the Sullani?', *Klio* 66 (1984), 114.

²¹ Florus 2.9.26; H. Bulst, 'Cinnanum Tempus', *Hist.* 13 (1964), 307 hesitantly accepts the victim of Sulla, as does Keaveney, *op. cit.* n. 20.

²² Cic. *pro Clu.* 47, 53. A mistaken attempt to show a sister of Marius married to a Q. Baebius

121 PRAESAGE M(alorum) A(ntoni) Antonius praesagus malorum hic est, qui Metello dixit, ni mature adduxisset exercitum, hoc passurum p.R., quod Senones iam fecerunt; hunc occidi Marius iussit cumque ad eum caput Antoni esset allatum, in mensa poni iussit et occisorem accumbere; postea caput Antonii conto fixum pro rostris posuit. (*Adn.*)

121 AVT TE PRAESAGE MALORUM ANTONI Marcus Antonius censorius et augur in senatu suadebat ut Marius et Silla arma deponerent, sentiens itaque se posse interfici Antonius in cuiusdam pauperulae cella delituit. qui per puerum cauponi proditur, per cauponem vero militibus. quo cum pergerent milites, oratione ad eos magnifica usus est adeo ut imperfecto negotio discederent. reliqui vero expertes eius orationis ascenderunt et caput eius in convivium Marii pertulerunt. cuius linguam fertur Marius grafio idemtidem vulnerasse. hic est Antonius Antoniorum pater magister Ciceronis. (*Comm.*)

123 FESTE MENSE quoniam kalendis ianuariis occisus est. (*Comm.*)

We knew from Granius Licinianus that the great orator Antonius and both Catuli, father and son (the consuls of 101 and 78), went as *legati senatus* to Metellus Pius (who was still trying to cope with the Samnites and so finish the Social War – see below for his whereabouts) in order to recall him to the defence of Rome against Cinna and Marius.²³ It seems possible that we have here in *Adn.* a last echo of Antonius' oratory, which is not registered in Malcovati's *ORF* or elsewhere that I can see (not of Sallust's oratory, as he will not have put a formal speech in Antonius' mouth in what was a fairly brief introduction to his main narrative, which began in 78 B.C.). One can see that a Roman orator would find it irresistible to contrast Marius the saviour of Rome from the northern barbarians with Marius now about to sack Rome as the Gauls had once done; and Antonius is known to have been deeply pessimistic about what Marius' and Cinna's return would mean.²⁴ The Senones, alone or with other tribes, are indeed commonly regarded as the Gauls responsible for the Sack.²⁵

Florus agrees with *Adn.* that Antonius' head was put on Marius' table. Other sources talk of Marius embracing the slayer.²⁶ If this man was the military tribune P. Annius (so some sources) he would certainly be of suitable rank to dine with Marius as *Adn.* claims.²⁷ The final exposure of the head on the Rostra is well attested.²⁸ The dating of the feast to the first day of Marius' consulship seems to be a unique notice and is perhaps overdramatic. But it may not be wild invention by the scholiast, but related to Florus' assertion, usually disbelieved, that all the murders of senators following the return of Cinna and Marius took place between the Kalends and Ides of January.²⁹ Appian's reference to the murder of Ancharius occurring while Marius was sacrificing on the Capitol dates that event too to 1 January, since the sacrifice will be that usual on entry to the consulship; Ancharius, says Appian, hoped this occasion would be suitable for a reconciliation (cf. what *Adn.* says below à propos of Sex. Lucilius about it as an event at which everything should be well-omened).

As for Antonius' proposal in the Senate that both Marius and Sulla should lay down their arms (*Comm.*), this might rest on a confusion with the famous s.c. of 50 B.C. that

in T. F. Carney, *A Biography of C. Marius* (1961), 8 n. 41, whence Wiseman, op. cit. n. 13, 31; but the couple on a N. Italian inscription (*CIL* v 2462), *pace* J. Zennari, 'I vercelli dei Celti nella valle padana e l'invasione Cimbrica della Venezia', *Ann. Bull. Gov. e Libr. civ. di Cremona* 4 (1952), fasc. 3, 1–78 (worthless), are locals of Gallic descent: see W. Schulze, *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen* (Berlin, 1933) 11, with overwhelming evidence for 'das bekannte Keltische Adjektivsuffix -akos'.

²³ Gran. Licin. 35.23.

²⁴ Cic. *ad fam.* 6.2.2.

²⁵ Livy 5.35.3, Florus 1.13.1, 2.21.7 (comparing Sulla's capture of Rome in 87) and various other sources.

²⁶ Val. Max. 9.2.2. Florus 2.21.14 has the head put on the table.

²⁷ App. *BC* 1.72 notes the rank, Val. Max. 8.9.2 and Plut. *Mar.* 44.3–4 the name.

²⁸ Esp. Cic. *de Or.* 3.10.

²⁹ Florus 2.21.17.

both Caesar and Pompey should do the like; in late 87 such a suggestion might not have seemed appropriate, for Sulla was already in the East by the time Marius appeared in arms in Italy. Antonius' augurate is unattested elsewhere but plausible and accepted by Münzer, Scholtz, Broughton in *MRR* and others;³⁰ it would be over-sceptical to think the scholiast had invented it from Lucan's very general address to Antonius as *praesage malorum*, for he seems well-informed here; *censorius* is right (and anyway augurs did not really foresee the future).

Comm. continues by referring to the well-known story of the way in which Antonius' hiding-place was discovered through a slave sent to buy better wine than usual from a *caupo*; the near-success of Antonius' final oration is also familiar.³¹ The sex of Antonius' protector is exceptional; Appian talks of a *γεωργός* and Plutarch of an *ἄνθρωπος πένης καὶ δημοτικός*.³² The gruesome detail of Marius' own mutilation of the head is also unique, and to be noted. Antonius' role in the period just before Marius' entry into Rome is quite enough to explain why Marius (or Cinna) wanted him dead, and it is not absolutely necessary to suppose as Badian does that Antonius was regarded by Marius as a former friend who had turned his coat.³³

He was in fact the grandfather of Mark Antony and his two brothers, not the father; but it is not entirely wrong to call him Cicero's *magister*, as the *De Oratore* shows.

124 LACERAVIT F(imbria) C(rassos) Fimbria legatus fuit Marii, cum prope Minturnas civitatem Crassos deprehendisset, occidit eos et capita misit ad Marium. (*Adn.*)

124 TRUNCOS LACERAVIT FIMBRIA CRASSOS lacerando truncos fecit. FIMBRIA Flavius Fimbria Cinnanus a Gaio Mario missus Crassos patrem et filium eius a viculo Volaterris quo confugerant retraxit et occidit. (*Comm.*)

The first words of *Adn.* raise the problem of Fimbria's status in 86. Most sources say he was legate to the *cos. suff.* Valerius Flaccus, Marius' successor, on his Eastern expedition (which is perhaps only formally incompatible with Velleius' calling him *praefectus equitum*; a legate could be put in command of the cavalry).³⁴ But his attempt before he left Rome, after Marius' death early in 86, to prosecute Scaevola Pontifex before the people (Cicero uses the technical term *diem dixit*)³⁵ suggests that he was a magistrate, and that Strabo may be right in calling him Flaccus' quaestor – though Appian records a quarrel between Fimbria and the *ταμίης* of the expedition and thinks Fimbria a *privatus* accompanying Flaccus as a volunteer.³⁶ *Adn.*, for what it is worth, agrees with the usual tradition, and suggests that Marius had already made him his legate; or if we are not yet quite in January 86 yet he might have held the rank of *legatus* in 87 (but could Marius appoint such?) and a magistracy in 86.

Cicero and other sources report that P. Crassus committed suicide (Appian that he killed his son and then was killed); Cicero bears out that his head if not his son's too was cut off,³⁷ and indeed it seems that all the heads of those killed were sent to the

³⁰ U. W. Scholz, *Der Redner M. Antonius* (Diss. Erlangen-Nürnberg, 1962) is the only special study since the early *PW* article by Klebs.

³¹ See next note and other sources.

³² App. *BC* 1.72, Plut. *Mar.* 44.1.

³³ E. Badian, 'Caepio and Norbanus', *Hist.* 6 (1957), 318 (= *Studies in Gk. and R. Hist.* [Oxford, 1964], 34); recently reasserted in 'The Death of Saturninus', *Chiron* 14 (1984), 122; Scholz and others, e.g. E. S. Gruen, *JRS* 55 (1965), 67, disagree.

³⁴ See A. W. Lintott, 'The Offices of C. Flavius Fimbria in 86–5 B.C.', *Hist.* 20 (1971), 696, and E. J. Weinrib, 'The Prosecution of Roman Magistrates', *Phoenix* 22 (1968), esp. 43.

³⁵ Cic. *pro Rosc. Am.* 33; cf. Val. Max. 9.11.2, *accusare apud populum instituit*.

³⁶ Strabo 13.1.27, App. *Mithr.* 52.

³⁷ Cic. *de Or.* 3.10, and ap. Asc. 25 St.; App. *BC* 1.72.1; see Münzer, *PW* xiii.290, who prefers Livy, *Ep.* 80, the son killed by Fimbria's horsemen, and the father kills himself. Cic. *Tusc.* 5.55, the latter's decapitation.

men who had ordered the deaths. Whether Minturnae has crept in from Marius' own story may be wondered; Volaterrae may have done so from the history of the late eighties, though C. Caesar Strabo's flight to Tarquinii does not suggest that Etruria was solid for Marius and thus an impossible place of refuge for his enemies.³⁸ But lordly Volaterrae, which held out against Sulla for so long, is also no *viculus*, and the name is probably corrupt. The Crassi had connections in Lucania³⁹ and doubtless elsewhere. Since a Crassus, probably the father, had been prominent in the defence of Rome his fate is not surprising.⁴⁰

125 SEVA TRIBVNICIO MADVERVNT SANGVINE T(abo) Marius Caelium tribunum plebi Sillanum de Tarpeio saxo praecipitavit, cum sit ipsis tribunis plebi permissum quosque merentes illo saxo praecipitare. Sextus Lucilius anni superioris tribunus plebi qui petulanter in Marium invecus erat, post a sodalitate fili eius in simulatam amicitiam receptus est. qui iussus kalendis ianuariis in Capitolium venire quo die auspicato laeta omnia ominari et precari fas est, iussu Marii patris de robore praecipitatus est. Est autem 'robur' tigillum defixum saxo Tarpeio ac rupi Capitolinae uncinis ferreis infixum quo praecipitatorum corpora excipiuntur. (*Comm.*)

Nothing is known of Caelius, who is not in *PW* or *MRR*.⁴¹ (For comment on the description *Sillanus* see above.) But Usener rightly adduces a fragment of Dio,⁴² which tells us that on January 1st Marius' son killed two tribunes, slaying one with his own hands and throwing one off the Tarpeian rock, an unparalleled event (he also deprived two praetors of fire and water).⁴³ We may perhaps accept that a tribune and an ex-tribune both perished. Sex. Lucilius is probably the right name for the second man; this is the form given by Velleius, who only records the one death and misdates it to the time just before Sulla's return, but who agrees that Lucilius had been tribune the year before his death;⁴⁴ Sex. Lucinus (Plutarch) and Sex. Licinius (Livy Ep.) are inferior versions – there is only one uncertain Sex. Licinius in the Republican period, while there was a Sex. Lucilius trib. mil. in Syria with Bibulus in 51, perhaps a son of our man, and slaves of a Sex. Lucilius (perhaps the man himself) at Minturnae in the early first century B.C.⁴⁵ One wonders if, like several other senatorial Lucilii (though none known to have been called Sextus) the tribune of 87 was a relative of Pompey's, of the family from Suessa Aurunca, not far from Minturnae.

If constitutional propriety was preserved to the extent of using a tribune to carry out the precipitation, the choice lies between P. Popillius Laenas, mentioned by Velleius as responsible for Lucilius' death while himself tribune (and as instituting a prosecution of Lucilius' colleagues, the other tribunes of the preceding year, to avoid which they fled to Sulla) – Münzer and *MRR* date him to 86, *pace* Velleius himself; and M. Marius Gratidianus – see below for the date of his tribunate, possibly in 86; Dio might well have confused him with the younger C. Marius (as Appian once does) who was too young to be tribune himself; if he had been so illegally we might have heard.⁴⁶ Or both Laenas and Gratidianus might have been involved.

³⁸ Cic. *de Or.* 3.10.

³⁹ E. Rawson, 'Crassorum Funera', *Latomus* 41 (1982), 540.

⁴⁰ Gran. Licin. 35.22.

⁴¹ Possibly Coelius, if so still unknown.

⁴² Dio 30–35.102.12.

⁴³ Perhaps Ap. Claudius Pulcher, probably *legatus pro praetore* at Nola (see *MRR*), who was certainly exiled at this time, and Metellus Pius, surely also banished.

⁴⁴ Vell. Pat. 2.24.2, though he dates the event later in the eighties, perhaps because Laenas and his colleagues were indicted, as he says, *sub adventu Sullae*.

⁴⁵ Plut. *Mar.* 45.1, Livy, *Ep.* 80, Cic. *ad Att.* 5.20.4 (perhaps son of our man and stepson not son of the *eques* T. Gavius Caepio, Münzer, *PW* xiii.1639), *ILLRP* 732, 745. Keaveney, *op. cit.* n. 20, misguidedly accepts both Sex. Licinius and Sex. Lucilius. Badian notes a Sex. Licinius in Livy, *Ep. Oxy.* 55 (*Studies*, 69 n. 17).

⁴⁶ App. *BC* 1.65: Γάιος Μάρκος ἑτερος must be M. Marius Gratidianus, see *MRR*.

The detail that Lucilius was the younger Marius' *sodalis* is unique, and is calculated to make the elder Marius' behaviour more repulsive. Perhaps we should take it that the first two belonged to some pious *sodalitas*; they cannot have been contemporaries if Lucilius held his tribunate at the proper age.

For the perhaps mistaken explanation of *robur* see the modern commentaries to Lucan.

126 SCAEVOLA DEXTRAE Lucius Mucius Scaevola, pontifex maximus, sacerdos Vestae, inimicus C. Mario adulescenti fuit, qui cum per Damasippum fugere vellet, a Marianis occisus est in templo Vestae; qui cum manum sanguine implesset, simulacrum Vestae aspersit, ut maius percussoris crimen esset. (*Adn.*)

126 TE QVOQ(ue) NECLECTVM VIOLATAE SC(aevola) D(extrae) Mucium Scaevolam pontificem milites iussu Marii in templo Vestae interfecerunt. (*Comm.*)

The fate of Q. Mucius Scaevola Pontifex, in fact only murdered in 82, after Sulla's return to Italy, has been transferred by Lucan to the period before the death of Marius (at whose funeral it is true Fimbria tried to kill him). *Adn.* has got pardonably confused – also because it was faced with a wrong reading, *dextrae*, for *Vestae*, in Lucan's text, and thus (in a passage I have not quoted) is led to adduce the story of the first Mucius Scaevola and even to confuse him with the Pontifex. It was indeed believed that the latter was murdered in the Temple of Vesta; on the orders of the younger Marius, who was already besieged in Praeneste, the urban praetor L. Junius Brutus Damasippus killed four leading men still in Rome, P. Antistius and C. Carbo Arvina in the Curia; L. Ahenobarbus (cos. 94) got as far as the door, and Scaevola according to Diodorus almost reached the holy of holies in the temple of Vesta, where he would have extinguished the fire with his blood (Lucan says the old man had too little of this to do so). Livy, *Ep.*, less dramatically, speaks of the *vestibulum*.⁴⁷ *Adn.* gets Scaevola's *praenomen* wrong (it should be Q.) but is right in mentioning the younger Marius; *per Damasippum effugere vellet* is confused (to expunge *per* would restore historical accuracy). The notice that Scaevola smeared the statue of the goddess with blood from his hand is obviously a desperate attempt to make sense of the corrupt reading in Lucan; Cicero, in a highly rhetorical passage, does say that he spattered the statue with his blood.⁴⁸

We now move to the period of Sulla's return to Italy and final campaign against the Marians.

134 SACRI PORTUM Laurentum dicit, qui sic appellatur; hic Sylla de Asia regressus pugnavit cum Mario adulescente, qui victus Praeneste fugit. Hic est Marius, qui invita matre Iulia adeptus est consulatum, de quo Sallustius meminit. (*Adn.*, *Hist.* 1.35 Maur.)

134 IAM QVOD APVT SACRI C(ecidere) C(adavera) P(ortum) Sacri portum locus inter Circeium et Laurentinum agrum in quo Silla Marium adulescentem proelio superavit et in fugam Praeneste conpulit eumque obsideri iussit et ipse urbem occupavit.

134 SACRI CECIDERE CADAVERA PORTVM Sacri portum dicunt quidem fuisse Laurentum.

Sacri portus locus est in urbe ubi Gaius Marius superatus a Quinto Lucretio Afella confugit et vulneratus a Pontio Tullo per caniculum effugit Praeneste. (*Comm.*)

These are the only explicit attempts in what one might at a pinch call ancient literature to locate Sacriportus, the site of Sulla's victory over the younger Marius, but seem to be ignored by all who have tried to do so in modern times. Sacriportus is unanimously put by these in the valley of the Sacco (Trerus) on the Via Latina,

⁴⁷ Diod. Sic. 38/9.17.1; Livy, *Ep.* 86; Florus 2.21.21, *amplexus aras*, cf. Aug. *CD* 3.28.

⁴⁸ Cic. *de Or.* 3.10: cf. *de nat. deor.* 3.80, *ante simulacrum Vestae*.

the inland route from Latium to Campania, not far from Praeneste; perhaps at the castle of Piombinara near Colferro. This is based on Plutarch's description of the battle as *περὶ Σίγνιον* and the assumption of other sources that it took place quite near Praeneste, in which the younger Marius took refuge, hotly pursued.⁴⁹ Since we know Sulla had reached Teanum Sidicinum on the Via Latina the previous autumn, to press on up this route might seem sensible; and Plutarch's description of the battle has a good chance of coming from Sulla's own memoirs, though the proper form of the name is *Σίγνία* not *Σίγνιον*.⁵⁰

However, Appian says that shortly before the battle Sulla had taken Setia, near which Marius' forces were encamped; they then retired some way.⁵¹ Now Setia is of course on the seaward, or marshward, side of the Monti Lepini, and its capture would indicate that Sulla was coming up the Via Appia; the route along the foot of the hills and through Setia was probably still used, as by the poet Lucilius a little earlier, in preference to that through the Pomptine marshes.⁵² It is not inconceivable that, after being defeated somewhere north of Setia, Marius should have fled to the great fortress of Praeneste, which he had already garrisoned, and where he had deposited his treasury⁵³ (he would presumably have followed the road from Velletri to Praeneste, in the gap between the Alban hills and the Monti Lepini). He will have realized that Rome was unholdable, but that Marian forces elsewhere in Italy would try to relieve Praeneste. A long pursuit is not impossible; Lucullus' men pursued Tigranes' army for over 120 stades (more than 15 miles), killing all the way.⁵⁴ And come to that, Plutarch's Signia is 20 km from Praeneste, not so very much closer than a battle near the Via Appia could be. It might be that Sulla, hearing that the narrows of the Sacco valley were strongly held, preferred to try to bypass them; very shortly after, when his troops were holding the same passage, several desperate attempts by the Marians to relieve Praeneste all failed. Some modern scholars have tried in various ways to combine the capture of Setia with a battle near Signia;⁵⁵ but if there is anything behind the scholiasts at all, the main battle at Sacriportus must have been west of the mountains.

Unfortunately their notices, obviously related to each other, do not create much trust. The first notice in *Comm.* looks better than that in *Adn.* (there is no evidence

⁴⁹ Plut. *Sulla* 28.4; App. *BC* 1.87 – though this could be a deduction from the fact Marius took refuge there.

⁵⁰ Plutarch's account is very vivid, with detail on the weather, etc., and though vividness need not be a sign of truth in ancient historians, he did use Sulla's memoirs much in this *Life*.

⁵¹ App. *BC* 1.87.

⁵² M. Hofmann, *PW Suppl.* viii.1175 s.v. *Pomptinae paludes*, Lucilius 110 Marx complains of the climb to Setia, but probably took the road to avoid an *iter labosum atque lutosum*, 109.

⁵³ Vell. Pat. 2.26, Pliny, *HN* 33.16 – surely he was not carting the treasure around with him as L. Pareti, *Storia di Roma* iii.603 (Turin, 1953) supposes. He may have tried to block the Appia – note the bitter resistance of Norba to the Sullans later; perhaps a garrison as well as the locals were involved (App. *BC* 1.94). For other fighting in the area see Hofmann, art. cit., n. 52.

⁵⁴ App. *Mithr.* 85.

⁵⁵ W. Schur, *Das Zeitalter des Marius und Sulla* (Leipzig, 1942), 168 has Sulla come up the Appia and then follow Marius to Sacriportus 'am Südeingang der Trerusenge'; C. Lanzani, *Mario e Silla* (Catania, 1915) is the only scholar to place Sacriportus near Setia, but assumes a second battle near Signia (there is no evidence there were two); L. Pareti, loc. cit., n. 51, has Marius advance down the Latina to the *bivio* to Segni and then cross the Monti Lepini by the route to Privernum and Setia (south of the Velitrae–Praeneste road) but finally retreat again. A. Keaveney, 'Four Puzzling Passages in Appian', *GIF* 12 (1981), 247–9, and *Sulla. The Last Republican* (London, 1982), 137 thinks Sulla's lieutenant Dolabella came up the Appia and took Setia, intending to rendezvous with Sulla near Signia; Plutarch does say that Sulla had difficulty joining up with Dolabella, who was encamped at some distance, as the Mariani held the roads.

that Lavinium, the town in the *ager Laurens*, was called Sacriportus – the idea is probably inspired by knowledge of its importance in legend – and the place is too near Rome and too far from Praeneste); but ‘between Circeium and the *ager Laurentinus*’ is vague in the extreme; there were various quite important places intervening, notably Antium. Lucan clearly thought Sacriportus was a port, as his tmesis indicates,⁵⁶ and it is possible that the scholiasts go back to a source which wrongly thought it must therefore be on the sea; *dicunt quidem* suggests that there was a problem. But the sea is too far from Praeneste, and from any route Sulla was likely to take, though there was a coast road. The etymology of Sacriportus has been declared obscure (though one might think of the Sacrani, a half-forgotten people of early Latium, who are connected in two sources with Ardea, which is roughly in the right area);⁵⁷ but if it was some sort of port – and Lucan may still have known what and where it was – then somewhere on one of the rivers or canals of the Pomptine marshes is perhaps more likely than a place on the Sacco, hardly a navigable river. There seem to be possible waterways beyond Setia, though their exact course has probably changed many times since antiquity. And the story that Marius was sleeping an exhausted sleep through the battle is perhaps more easily explained if he had been organizing a march from the Via Latina to catch Sulla on the Appia rather than waiting quietly for him on the Latina;⁵⁸ though this is a weak argument. Setia and Signia of course could be confused in the sources,⁵⁹ though this cuts both ways; one could argue for Setia as the *lectio difficilior*. At all events, the statements of the scholiasts deserve to be noticed – as does Marti’s observation that Vacca’s geographical information is correct when not vitiated by later corruptions, while the scholiasts when left to themselves are usually quite helpless in this field, with little more to say than can be deduced from Lucan’s text (e.g. ‘a river in Gaul’). One could imagine what we have being ultimately based on a narrative that did mention Circeii and the *ager Laurens*, perhaps in connection with troop movements.

The last notice in *Comm.* is hopelessly confused. In reality Marius was besieged in Praeneste by Afella,⁶⁰ and on its fall hid in, or tried to escape by, a *cuniculus*, where he is said either to have killed himself, or to have been assisted by a slave, or by the brother of the Samnite leader Pontius Telesinus, or both, to do so.⁶¹ But Münzer is willing to believe that Pontius Tullus, or rather Tullus Pontius (with Tullus as a *praenomen*) was the name of the brother. This is tempting, if a little optimistic.⁶²

135 AUT COLLINA TULIT S(tratas quot) P(orta) Damasippus, Samnitium dux, Marii fautor, apud Collinam portam cum suis confluxit at victus cum militibus suis occubuit. (*Adn.*)

Properly Pontius Telesinus, not Damasippus, was the leader of the Samnites, but as urban praetor Damasippus was superior at least in *auctoritas* to Carrinas (also praetor) and so the supreme commander of the whole army. As for Pontius and the

⁵⁶ So, less significantly, did Appian, translating it as *Ἱερός Λιμὴν* (*BC* 1.87).

⁵⁷ Virgil, *Aen.* 7.796, with Servius *ad loc.*, quoting *alii*; Festus 424 L brings them to Rome from Sabine territory. The antiquarian sources try to equate the name with *sacراتي*, but Dr N. Horsfall agrees that it is likely to derive from a place-name.

⁵⁸ Plut. *Sulla* 28.7 (from Fenestella and perhaps others).

⁵⁹ Mommsen, *CIL* x.591 thinks Dion. Hal. 5.61 confuses them. It must be admitted that Appian, *BC* 1.85, on Sulla’s camp, confuses Canusium with, perhaps, Casilinum.

⁶⁰ Usener, *ad loc.* noted that all Latin authors use the form Afella, which is what the MSS. of *Comm.* clearly go back to, as against the Ofella of the Greek sources. Badian had to repeat the demonstration in *JRS* 57 (1967), 227. Contra, C. Nicolet, *L’Ordre Equestre* II (Paris, 1974), 930.

⁶¹ Münzer, *PW* xiv.1814 for different versions.

⁶² Münzer, *PW* xxii.1.37 (Pontius no. 21), cf. viia.1340 s.v. Tullus.

other Italian leaders, they and their troops were presumably recognized as Roman citizens by the Marians and so they may have been formally legates (at best).

136 TVNC CVM PENE CAPVT MVNDI R(erum)Q(ue) P(otestas) M(utavit) T(ranslata) L(ocum) cum Cinna triperitito agmine urbem invasisset, suo Marii et Ponti Telesini Samnitis, Telesinus promittebat civibus suis cum quibus in auxilium venerat, quo fortius dimicaret, se imperium Romanorum ad illos translaturum. hic cum vellet portam Collinam effringere, ictu saxi periit. (*Comm.*)

137 Pontius Telesinus ex partibus C. Marii iunioris iactabat tunc quod Romanum imperium transferri potuit in Galliam. (*Adn.*)

Comm. continue to be confused. Cinna was dead, and the younger Marius shut up in Praeneste, though a *tripertitum agmen* is not inconceivable.⁶³ But Pontius Telesinus is notoriously credited by Velleius with urging the extirpation of *raptore Italiae libertatis lupos* and the destruction of their lair;⁶⁴ so his promise here to his fellow Samnites is plausible. (The version of *Adn.* is an obvious corruption.) Münzer would like to believe on the basis of *Comm.* that Pontius really perished *ictu saxi*, noting an imaginary Telesinus in Silius' *Punica* who meets the same fate.⁶⁵

137 VLTRA CAVDINAS S(peravit) V(olnera) F(urcas) Caudium oppidum Samnitum. quod ibi victi Romani sub iugum missi et exuti armis cum singulis tunicis dimissi a Pontio duce Samnitum, a quo hic originem trahebat. (*Comm.*)

This connection between the Samnite leaders of the fourth and first centuries has been noted and accepted by Münzer and Salmon,⁶⁶ and if not true was surely claimed in the eighties. Though no other source asserts it openly, some give the earlier man the *cognomen*, or better the ethnic, Telesinus.⁶⁷

139 ULTOR ut Sallustius ait, 'Ut Syllae dominatio, quam ultum ierat, desideraretur' (*Adn.*; *Hist.* 1.31 Maur.)

This as it stands takes us back to the actions of Marius and Cinna in 87–6 (or possibly of Cinna later) and might bear out that a very hostile picture of these was indeed to be found in Sallust's work. But it has been strongly argued that the quotation is corrupt, and *Syllae* an insertion; and that the avenger is rather Sulla himself, as in a closely parallel passage of Exuperantius, who is probably based on Sallust, and in a number of other authors, including Lucan here.⁶⁸ (Since one of these is Cicero, the *topos* was not invented by Sallust.) In fact Sulla's first march on Rome did not really result in a *dominatio*.

140 ILLE potest hic Domitius Ahenobarbus accipi. (*Adn.*)

Actually it is obviously Sulla; the scholiast has perhaps been confused by the reference his source more reasonably saw to Ahenobarbus a few lines down.

149 EXEGIT FAMULUS potest generaliter accipi, potest et specialiter, ut de Mario iunior dictum sit, qui a servo occisus est, cum per cuniculum de Praenestina civitate vellet evadere. (*Adn.*; *Comm.* says almost word for word the same thing.)

⁶³ Not a confusion with Cinna and Marius in 87, if Florus 2.21.13 is right that they entered Rome *quadruplici agmine* (dubious). Livy, *Ep.* 79 speaks of *quattuor exercitus* in 87, involving Sertorius and Carbo.

⁶⁴ Vell. Pat. 2.27 (being of Campanian/Samnite origin he should have known). It is unlikely that the violently anti-Roman Pontius had become a senator, as F. Hinard, *Les Proscriptions de la Rome Républicaine* (Rome, 1985), 394 holds. ⁶⁵ Sil. Ital. *Punica* 10.148.

⁶⁶ *PW* xxii.1.36; E. T. Salmon, *Samnium and the Samnites* (Cambridge, 1967), 9 n. 2.

⁶⁷ Eutrop. 10.17.2, Ampel. 20.10, 28.2, *de vir. ill.* 30.1. A Pontia at Telesia, *ILS* 6510.

⁶⁸ E. Figari, 'Sul frammento di Sallustio *Hist.* 1.31 Maur.', *Maia* 18 (1966), 167; Exup. 32, Cic. *Cat.* 3.24, Aug. *CD* 3.27.

The Livian account of the way Marius was wounded by Pontius Telesinus' brother in a suicide pact and a slave finished him off shows that the scholiast here does not necessarily, *pace* Münzer, go back to a separate source from the one so inaccurately quoted at line 136.⁶⁹

151 IN FRATRVM CECIDERUNT P(raemia) FRATRES praemia illa dicit quae Sulla se daturum promiserat pro relatis sibi capitibus proscriptorum. significat autem Domitium qui occiso fratre Domitio agros eius pro praemio invasit. (*Comm.*)

This must mean that the estates of the Marian Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus, killed in Sicily by Pompey, were granted by Sulla to his young brother Lucius (born by 98 according to Sumner⁷⁰). This is a nice notice; Münzer seems to have missed it, and though he made it appear likely that Cn. and L. (cos. 54) were brothers, found no explicit evidence that it was so; later scholars have assumed it, without Münzer's own caution. As we see there is evidence, of a sort. Münzer also refused to believe Dio's statement that Lucius' estates were swollen by the proscriptions, holding that the Marian attitude of the family, and Lucius' own youth, made it improbable.⁷¹ But families could be split, and Lucius' father had been killed by the Marian Damasippus (see above). Aged about 17, Lucius could have made himself acceptable to Sulla; C. Caesar, only a little older at most, made himself unacceptable and was proscribed. Dio and the scholiast support each other pleasingly. Cicero says that Lucius gave evidence of his contempt for *popularis* ways from his *adulescentia*, but Asconius and Schol. Bob. are perhaps right in explaining this as a reference to his activities against the tribune Manilius in 66, when he could certainly still be called *adulescens*, though probably quaestor.⁷² The family's estates, at least partly near Cosa, are mentioned at the outbreak of the civil war between Pompey and Caesar.⁷³ It is not known whether Lucius had any active part in his brother's death; this may be an exaggeration.

160 COLLA DVCVM cum congesta essent ad Servilianum lacum capita peremptorum, haec iussit Sylla proponi (*Adn.*)

The piling up of the heads of those killed in Rome by the Sullans is perhaps only carried over from Lucan. *Adn.* goes on to quote Cicero (*pro Rosc. Am.* 89) on the dead bodies to be seen here; but Sallust did mention the *Servilianus lacus* in this context, if Firm. Mat. *Math.* 1.3 is based on his work, as Usener and Maurenbrecher thought.⁷⁴

174 PLACATOS CATVLI R(eferam). Lutatium Catulum tangit, cui cum Marius Gratidianus diem diceret, qui sciebat se non evasurum, fumo se calcis occidit et sic fugit inimicum; post Catuli filius regressus victor ex Asia petit a Sylla, ut sibi Marius daretur ad poenam; quem datum per singula membra cruciavit, ut ait Sallustius 'Ut in M. Mario cui fractus prius crura brachiaque et oculi effossi, scilicet ut per singulos artus expiraret.' (*Adn.*; *Hist.* 1.44 Maur.)

174 QVID SANGVINE MANIS PLACATOS C(atuli) R(eferam) Marcus Marius Gratidianus filius sororis Gaii Marii a Mario mortem inimici Catuli postulavit. Catulus ne in manus Marii veniret fumo se necavit. post Catulus minor eius filius a Silla petiit, ut mortem patris de

⁶⁹ Livy, *Ep.* 88, Oros. 5.21.8–9, Val Max. 6.8.2.

⁷⁰ G. Sumner, *The Orators in Cicero's Brutus* (Toronto, 1973), 140. Hinard, *op. cit.* (n. 64), 349 refuses to identify our Domitius with L. Ahenobarbus, as the latter's hostility to Pompey may be due to resentment at his brother's death; but he does not note Dio's words, see next n.

⁷¹ *PW* v.1334; Dio 41.11.2, accepted by E. S. Gruen, *The Last Generation of the Roman Republic* (Berkeley, 1974), 56.

⁷² Cic. *pro Mil.* 22, Asc. 39 St., Schol. Bob. 119 St.; Cic. *de Rep.* 1.18 uses *adulescentes* of quaestorii, cf. Val. Max. 7.5.2. If Cicero had been thinking of the 80s he would probably have said *adulescentulus* or *admodum adulescens*.

⁷³ Caes. *BC* 1.17, cf. Dio, *loc. cit.*, Cic. *ad Att.* 9.6.2, 9.3, *ILLRP* 915.

⁷⁴ Maurenbrecher, *Praef.* xv.

Mari vindicaret interitu. abductus ad tumulum Catuli Marius Gratidianus trans Tiberim interfectus est membratimque discerptus. de quo Salustius historiarum libro primo ita locutus est 'qui per singulos artus expiraret'.

QVID SANGVINE MANES PLACATOS C.R. Quintius Catulus partium Sillanarum fuit, vir Claudiae. cum illi a Mario Gratidiano tribuno plebi Cinnano dies dicta esset ut eum cruci fige(ret), voluntaria morte obiit. huius filius permittente Silla Mar)ium interfecit. Sunt qui dicunt Catilinam iussu Sillae hunc Marium Gratidianum uxoris sui fratrem ad tumulum Catuli occidisse. quasi sic placaret. (*Comm.*)

The role of Gratidianus in the proposed prosecution of the elder Catulus after the return of Marius and Cinna is accepted by Münzer from our scholiasts and hence generally. *Comm.* here says he was tribune, and Diodorus in fact reports that it was a tribune who initiated the case.⁷⁵ Gratidianus is generally supposed to have been trib. 87, elected at the *comitia* after Sulla's first capture of the city, but in which candidates hostile to him were successful; he then had to flee from Rome with Cinna. But is 86 perhaps a better date? For could the prosecution of Catulus be initiated, let alone designed to run its full course, before 10 December 87? Appian shows that proper procedure for a popular trial was followed (and note *dies dicta*, *diem diceret* in the scholiasts – though late sources can use the phrase inaccurately);⁷⁶ this meant notice being given, three investigations subsequently being held before the people, not on consecutive days, and then the interval of a *trinundinum* before the final proceedings and vote. Unless the accused was willing to abbreviate the affair, as he sometimes was, all this would take over a month; the prosecution of Milo by Clodius for *vis* in 56 took three and a half.⁷⁷ We do not know exactly when Marius and Cinna entered Rome (Merula was made to resign his consulship, so before the end of December) but even if we do not accept Florus' dating of all the murders to the first half of January, we get the impression that the reign of terror was not a very long one. And Appian, though quite possibly wrongly, places the formal trials after the other murders, and so pretty clearly in January.⁷⁸ (Of course it is conceivable that there was never an intention to carry the trial right through to the end.) A tribunate in 86 would mean that Gratidianus' two praetorships must be dated to 85 and 84, but so they often are anyway, and to follow the tribunate, which was not a true magistracy, immediately with another office would be a minor irregularity in a period of great ones.⁷⁹

Ought *Comm.*'s *inimici* to mean that Catulus was Gratidianus' personal enemy? There is plenty of evidence that C. Marius saw him as one of his. Perhaps there is confusion here. Catulus' death by suffocation is widely attested. The mention of a *crux* by *Comm.* is interesting but problematic; it suggests that the charge was *perduellio*, as we should expect (opposing or urging others to oppose the consul Cinna in arms?).⁸⁰ But tribunes did not, it seems, have the right to inflict the traditional punishment of death by scourging while tied with hands bound and head covered to a *furca* or *palus* (originally it appears a dead tree), which Cicero rather emotively calls a *crux* in the *pro Rabirio* in order to suggest the slave's death, crucifixion proper.⁸¹ What

⁷⁵ *PW* xiii.2079, xiv.1826, Diod. Sic. 38/9 4.2.

⁷⁶ App. *BC* 1.74, cf. Diod. Sic. loc. cit., prosecuted ἐν τῷ δῆμῳ.

⁷⁷ A. H. M. Jones, *The Criminal Courts of the Roman Republic and Principate* (Oxford, 1972), chap. 1.

⁷⁸ App. *BC* 1.74.1.

⁷⁹ See *MRR* ii.52 and 59 for Gratidianus' *cursus*.

⁸⁰ So E. S. Gruen, *Roman Politics and the Criminal Courts* (Cambridge, Mass., 1968), 233, referring to the scholiast but not discussing the penalty; 'the charge, if formal charge there was, must have been *perduellio*.'

⁸¹ W. A. Oldfather, 'Livy I 26 and the *Supplicium de More Maiorum*', *TAPA* 39 (1908), 49; K. Latte, *PW* Suppl. vii 1599 s.v. Todesstrafe; M. Hengel, *Crucifixion in the Ancient World* (London, 1977), 39. The tribunes had no lictors to oversee the punishment.

the tribunes could do was hurl one from the Tarpeian rock. And it seems most unlikely that the archaic procedure dredged up for the trial of Rabirius in 63, with the appointment of *Ilviri perduellionis*, was followed in 87–6; Cicero would have told us in the *pro Rabirio*. In fact he claims that the savage ancient punishment had not been heard of in living memory;⁸² true, it had no doubt not been carried out in that time, and he might simply be exaggerating. Appian shows that the two men accused in 87–6, Catulus and Merula, were secretly watched, no doubt to prevent flight into the exile which Cicero says Catulus begged C. Marius for in vain.⁸³ No wonder they committed suicide, if such a death was in prospect. Or was real crucifixion, even more improperly, in question? Some scholars think the old punishment had now been equated with this. Or is the scholiast simply wrong, in spite of the other probably good information in the note? We may recall that Marti has stressed Vacca's precision in legal matters, but he could have misinterpreted a phrase such as *summum supplicium*, perhaps, or *supplicium de more maiorum*, taken in the imperial period to mean the ancient punishment in question.⁸⁴

The notice in *Adn.* that Catulus' son had returned from Asia with or after the victorious Sulla is enticing. Badian at one time at least believed that the younger Catulus stayed in Rome, and made this one of his chief arguments for the respectability of Cinna's régime.⁸⁵ In fact we know from a scholiast to Cicero that both Catuli were 'proscribed': the word is inaccurate but the fact may be accepted⁸⁶ – the younger man had also been on the embassy to Metellus Pius, and could not anyway have decently countenanced the régime that had hounded his father to death. Münzer thought that he probably went to Greece; there is an inscription from Athens honouring him, but date and occasion are uncertain and the idea that he had intervened to save Athens from Sulla's wrath is gratuitous.⁸⁷ The scholiast to Lucan provides the best evidence for his activities.

Comm. rightly identifies Gratidianus as the son of Marius' sister; and rightly places the tomb of the elder Catulus across the Tiber, as Orosius does, who calls it the family tomb; Cicero specifies the Janiculum.⁸⁸ Conceivably *membratim* could be a Sallustian echo; Sallust was fond of adverbs with this ending. *Comm.* and *Adn.* then both quote what was in fact a famous passage from the *Histories*.⁸⁹

Sunt qui dicunt... in the second *Comm.* note might be from Sallust too, if Maurenbrecher was right in seeing a fragment of his (I.45) as referring to Gratidianus as the brother-in-law of Catiline – a relationship which has been doubted by modern scholars.⁹⁰ Conceivably Sallust himself doubted it, and gave only as a variant the version inculpating Catiline and exculpating Catulus. At all events it is the version

⁸² Cic. *pro Rab. perd. reo* 15.

⁸³ App. *BC* 1.74; cf. Cic. *de Or.* 3.9 (*Tusc.* 5.56 his *necessarii* plead for him).

⁸⁴ Oldfather, *op. cit.*, n. 81.

⁸⁵ E. Badian, 'Waiting for Sulla', *JRS* 52 (1962), 47 (= *Studies* 216).

⁸⁶ Schol. Bob. to *pro Arch.*, 176 St.; cf. Cic. *post red. in sen.* 9; Schol. Gronov. D 286 St. even thinks both Catuli were killed!

⁸⁷ *PW* xiii.2083; Merritt, *Hesp.* 23 (1954), 254 (no. 36). Sumner's date of 84 for the younger Catulus' aedileship (*op. cit.* [n. 70], 116) cannot stand.

⁸⁸ Oros. 5.21.7, Cic. *In Tog. Cand.* ap. Asc. 69 St.

⁸⁹ See Maur. 1.44.; these words are echoed by Justin 21.4.7, Sen. *de Ira* 3.18, Florus 2.21.26 etc.

⁹⁰ There is no evidence that Catiline was married to a Gratidia, and confusion may be due to the fact that he is said elsewhere to have killed a brother or brother-in-law whom *Comm. Pet.* 9 calls Q. Caecilius. See C. Nicolet, 'Arpinum, Aemilius Scaurus et les Tullii Cicerones', *RÉL* 45 (1967), 290; B. Marshall, 'Catiline and the Execution of Marius Gratidianus', *CQ* 35 (1985), 14. But Münzer and others accept the relationship.

which makes Catulus responsible to which the Sallustian quotation seems to be attached. Though Marshall suggests that Catiline had in reality no part in the event, possibly both men were involved; Catulus was later a friend and protector of Catiline.⁹¹ One would not expect the polished Catulus actually to preside over the torture, and carry the head to Sulla, as Catiline is said to have done;⁹² but note, though probably careless:

192 OSTENSA PLACERET a filio scilicet Catuli ostensa Syllae (*Comm.*)

As for *Comm.*'s claim that the elder Catulus was husband to a Claudia, Münzer rejects it, pointing out that we know he was married to a Servilia (not a Domitia as well).⁹³ But of course a second marriage is not impossible, the first having ended in divorce – Servilia was still alive in 70. There were probably suitable Claudiae available, especially in the patrician family, which was traditionally prolific. If Claudia was a close relative of Ap. Claudius Pulcher, who was exiled in 87–6, there might have been a good reason for mentioning her.

In its note on 194 *Adn.* says that *Sylla commotus iussit octo milia hominum de ea civitate occidi*. This figure for the Praenestines executed is more moderate than that of some sources.⁹⁴

197 MISERE MACVLAVIT O(vilia) R(omae) Silla cum legiones Marianas ad ovilia convocasset, qui locus est in Campo Martio, iussit (omnes) occidi variis sortibus poenarum, extructo sibi in campo tribunali. (*Comm.*)

cf. Book 7 **306 SEPTORVMQVE NEFAS** septa in urbe locus est ubi inclusas sex legiones Sylla iussit occidi. (*Adn.*)

SEPTORVMQVE NEFAS locus est in Campo ubi Sylla legiones hostiles interfici voluit id est Marianas. (*Comm.*)

In other notes on 197 both collections observe that Lucan is using Ovilia for Saepta (the proper term for the voting area on the Campus Martius). Most sources say that the prisoners taken after the battle at the Colline Gate were killed at Sulla's order in the Villa Publica near the Saepta; Lucan may have found the latter a less prosaic concept. The prisoners were mainly Samnites. Should we take seriously the claim that six legions are involved? The figures given by our sources, from 3000 to 8000, would imply they were desperately under strength, but they will have suffered heavy losses in the battle and some men no doubt escaped. According to Appian Damasippus had two legions, Carrinas and Marcius *ἐτέρα* and there were also the Samnites.⁹⁵ One might suggest that the unusual identification of the prisoners as 'Marian legions' makes Sulla's action even more horrific than a massacre of Samnites, Rome's old and hated enemies.

Finally, two further passages from Lucan Bk. 2.

545 MAGNISQ(ue) VELIM MISCERE METELLIS Metellus quo tempore Marius et Cinna urbem expugnabant, per legatos * * ad liberandam patriam cum exercitibus a Lucania properavit. (*Comm.*)

The *legati* must be Antonius and the Catuli, whose embassy to Metellus Pius has

⁹¹ Sall. *BC* 35, Oros. 6.3.1; cf. Cic. *pro Sull.* 81.

⁹² Cic. *In Tog. Cand.* ap. Asc. 65, 69 St., Plut. *Sulla* 32.2.

⁹³ Münzer, *PW* xiii.2073, correcting v.1326 from Cic. ap. Asc. *Corn.* ii.62 St. (the younger Catulus' *avunculus* Domitius can be his aunt's husband). Servilia in 70, Cic. *Verr.* 2.2.24.

⁹⁴ Plut. *Sulla* 32.1 has 12,000.

⁹⁵ Strabo 5.4.11 249C, 3–4000, App. *BC* 1.93, Plut. *Sulla* 30.2 8000 (Salmon, op. cit. [n. 66], 386 thinks 8000 may be a confusion with the prisoners taken at Sacriportus, for whom the same number is given).

already been referred to. It may seem improbable that Metellus was in Lucania, since his task was to contain or defeat the Samnites. In fact, he could be in northern Lucania, for the Samnites, who still held Nola, are said to have been raiding beyond the limits of Campania.⁹⁶

548 PASSUS SICANIO T(egitur). ordo: passus Carbo, qui tegitur. Carbonem enim Pompeius occidit in Melita insula. Ideo dictum 'Sicanio sepulchro'. Hoc Sallustius ait 'Carbo turpi formidine exercitum atque Italiam deseruit'. (*Adn.*; *Hist.* 1.38 Maur.)

Cicero makes it clear that Carbo, the Marian consul of 85, was actually executed by Pompey at Lilybaeum in Sicily, not at Melita (Malta).⁹⁷ It is usually held that he was captured at the island of Cossyra (Pantellaria), which several sources mention. But all Appian actually says is that he had fled to Cossyra after he was expelled from Africa: Livy, *Ep.* also shows him there. Greenhalgh is prudently uncertain as to the actual place of capture.⁹⁸ In fact *Adn.* fits well enough with Orosius' statement that Pompey killed *Carbonem a Cossura insula in Aegyptum fugere conantem in Siciliam ad se retractum*.⁹⁹ Melita would be on the route from Cossyra to Egypt, and Carbo could have been taken, though not actually killed there.

I hope it has been shown that, in spite of serious confusions, patent or only possible, the scholiasts do preserve a good deal of material that fits with and supplements too neatly what other sources say to be pure invention on their own late and incompetent part. How true any of it may be is of course another matter; and admittedly none of it is of major importance. But it should be taken into consideration.

Let us assume that much or all of this material does indeed come from Sallust. It is generally recognized that he had in Book I a comparatively extensive preliminary account of the eighties, after a preface in which he revealed a yet deeper pessimism than that shown in his earlier monographs.¹⁰⁰ Rome, he now thought, had never been truly virtuous; certainly neither side in the struggle was so in the eighties.¹⁰¹ After the Gracchi *simultates* had got out of hand, there was at some point, perhaps precisely the eighties, a regression to primitive savagery and the rule of force.¹⁰² Though the commentary on Lucan necessarily concentrated on what could be found in the *Histories* to throw light on atrocities mentioned by the poet, it is likely that to highlight horrors was indeed one of Sallust's purposes; he will also have included a number of well-known examples which Lucan does not choose to mention – the deaths of the consuls Octavius and Merula in 87, and those of the Caesares in 87–6, for instance; there was a detailed account of Marius' flight,¹⁰³ and so surely also of his return. If Exuperantius, as was unanimously believed till recently,¹⁰⁴ is closely following Sallust, the role of the *fugitivi* with Marius and Cinna was brought out (as it is in the scholiasts

⁹⁶ Dio 30–35.102.7. Salmon, op. cit. (n. 66), 373 has Metellus perhaps fighting the Lucani before coming up to Nola, but does not say where he gets the idea. The *legati* might not wish to traipse too far south; they were needed in Rome. ⁹⁷ Cic. *ad fam.* 9.21.3.

⁹⁸ App. *BC* 1.96; cf. Livy, *Ep.* 89, *Cossyra quam appulerat*; P. Greenhalgh, *Pompey, the Roman Alexander* (London, 1980), 22. ⁹⁹ Oros. 5.21.11.

¹⁰⁰ See esp. A. La Penna, 'Per la Ricostruzione delle *Historiae* di Sallustio', *SIFC* 35 (1963), 5 and *Sallustio e la 'Rivoluzione' Romana* (Milan, 1968), 247ff.

¹⁰¹ Frags. 1.11, 13 Maur. For advancing pessimism, F. Klingner, 'Über die Einleitung der *Historien* Sallusts', *Hermes* 63 (1928), 165 (but there was rest from discord between the Second Punic War and the Gracchi). ¹⁰² Frags. 1.12, 18 Maur. ¹⁰³ Frags. 1.24, 25 Maur.

¹⁰⁴ N. Zorzetti, pref. to his ed. (Leipzig, 1982), holds Exuperantius' errors to be so gross he must have worked from an epitome, perhaps of Livy. But Sallust is once quoted (and no one else) and the style is mock-Sallustian. *Hist.* 1.29 Maur., *libertatis insueti*, probably refers to the *fugitivi*.

with the episodes of 'Euanthius' and Baebius), and indeed this could have served, for Sallust, as a foreshadowing of the *bellum servile* of Spartacus, which he was to include in his work. The account of the civil wars themselves was no doubt relevant to that of what Asconius, describing Sallust's *Histories* and perhaps drawing on them, called the 'half-civil' war against Sertorius.¹⁰⁵

Sallust had declared in the *Jugurthine War* that he would not write about Sulla since Sisenna had done so in detail;¹⁰⁶ but he changed his mind – the crimes of Sulla served as the climax to the horrors of the eighties, and in fact, Augustine got the impression that Sallust said a lot about Sulla in the *Histories*.¹⁰⁷ I suggested some years ago that Sallust came to feel that the historian Sisenna, an easy-going and successful optimiate of the seventies, had had far too little about the murders perpetrated by Sulla and his friends; Sisenna is certainly likely to have spared Catiline,¹⁰⁸ and *a fortiori* the *de facto* leader of the Senate, Catulus. Moreover, as Marshall observes,¹⁰⁹ Sallust may have taken pleasure in discrediting the latter, whom Cicero had so much admired – one might compare his hostile treatment of Cicero's hero Scourus in the *Jugurthine War*. But, with his even-handed pessimism, Sallust allowed the Mariani, and Marius in particular (though doubtless not Sertorius) to come off almost as badly; he may even have used a source so hostile to them as Sulla's memoirs, though this might be to rate his historical scrupulousness rather too low. According to the scholia, Marius specifically orders the death of his friend 'Euanthius'; he has clearly ordered those of Antonius, whose head is brought directly to him, and of the Crassi, who are pursued by his own legate Fimbria; he profanes the ceremonies of the first day of the year on the Capitol, probably by the death of 'Euanthius', certainly by his responsibility for the casting of Caelius and Lucilius from the Tarpeian rock, the latter in circumstances of disgusting dissimulation (and we know how Sallust detested dissimulation).¹¹⁰ And he profanes the subsequent feast by welcoming Antonius' head and Antonius' slayer to his table, even mutilating the head himself in the most ghastly fashion. Modern scholars have often tried to blame the *fugitivi*, the probably somewhat unbalanced Fimbria, and Popillius Laenas and young Marius (sometimes even Cinna, when he is not seen as a moderate) for these various murders, rather than the saviour of Rome from the barbarians; it does not look as if Sallust left any room for that – not that his account should be treated as gospel.¹¹¹

Sisenna had doubtless deplored civil war; we know he told the tale of a probably unnamed common soldier who found he had killed his brother and so threw himself on the funeral pyre.¹¹² That story broke no bones; but Sallust did not spare individuals, even the fathers of those still alive, as were Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus

¹⁰⁵ Auson. *Ep.* 22 *ad Nepotem Ausonium* 64: *civili mixtum mavorte duellum*.

¹⁰⁶ Sall. *BJ* 95.2.

¹⁰⁷ Aug. *CD* 2.18, after quoting the *Historiae* (1.16 Maur.) says *dicit deinde plura Sallustius de Sulla et vitiis ceteraque foeditate rei publicae*; cf. 22, *cuius vitam, mores, facta describente Sallustius*. It is possible that Aug. is also reflecting Sallust in his immediately preceding reference to the wars of Marius, Cinna and Carbo, *crudeliter gesta crudeliusque finita*. Cf. 2.23, which calls Marius *cruentissimum auctorem bellorum civilium atque gestorem*, etc.

¹⁰⁸ E. Rawson, 'L. Cornelius Sisenna and the Early First Century B.C.', *CQ* 29 (1979), 327.

¹⁰⁹ *Op. cit.* n. 90.

¹¹⁰ A. R. Hands, 'Sallust and *Dissimulatio*', *JRS* 49 (1959), 56.

¹¹¹ See esp. H. Bennett, *Cinna and his Times* (Diss. Chicago, 1923); Carney, *op. cit.* (n. 22), 66–8. For Livy's harsh judgement of Marius in the eighties, H. M. Hine, 'Livy's Judgement on Marius', *LCM* 3 (1978), 83.

¹¹² H. Peter, *HRR* 1 Sisenna frag. 129 (in the battle between Cinna and Pompeius Strabo on the Janiculum in 87). Frag. 138 *vitam cum dolore et insigni cruciatu carnificatus amisit* clearly refers to an individual atrocity – but the *fugitivi* might be to blame.

(son of Lucius), the children of Catulus, and possibly one of the sons of the Marian Damasippus.¹¹³ It is hard to believe that Sallust was not influenced by his experience of the proscriptions of 43, about which so many dramatic tales were collected.¹¹⁴ Indeed, he may have been the first to add to his Thucydidean discussion of *stasis* in the abstract a list of horrific *exempla*, such as Roman historians became so fond of; I do not think we know of any earlier Greek historian who did such a thing. The details, which vary so much in our sources, may of course have been improved or even invented; but sceptical modern historians sometimes suffer from a happy failure of imagination in refusing to envisage the horrors which we all ought to know occur too often in civil war.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford

ELIZABETH RAWSON

¹¹³ Cn. Domitius was Antony's friend; the senator Licinius Damasippus who perished in Africa in 46 (*BAfr.* 89) but whose children were pardoned by Caesar may be a son of the pr. 82 (adopted by a Licinius and so able to enter political life in spite of Sulla's rules about the sons of his enemies), while the art dealer and land speculator (probably Junius, i.e. retaining his family name) Damasippus could be another son, forced to take up a dubious profession; see E. Rawson, in *Studies in Roman Property*, ed. M. I. Finley (Cambridge, 1976), 101, against D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Two Studies in Roman Nomenclature* (New York, 1976), 46.

¹¹⁴ But R. Syme, *Sallust* (Cambridge, 1964), probably exaggerates the influence of the Triumviral period on Sallust's work.