

THE QUAESTOR †CANINI SALUSTIUS

The man serving as proquaestor to Bibulus in Syria in mid-July 50 B. C. is named only in the heading of a letter of Cicero (Fam. 2.17): *M. CICERO IMP. S.D. CANINI SALUSTIO PRO Q.* The letter appears to be addressed to “Caninius Sallustius” – an impossible collocation of nomina. A satisfactory solution has yet to be proposed.

Orelli-Baiter cautiously identified the proquaestor with an old friend of Cicero, Cn. Sallustius¹). Syme has already made unanswerable objections to this disposition of the problem: the letter shows that Cicero was not eager to return to Rome from his province in the company of the proquaestor, and Cn. Sallustius, apparently no callow youth when mentioned in two letters of 67 (Att. 1.3.3, 11.1), would have been well above the normal quaestorian age by 51²). Mommsen confidently maintained that the proquaestor was none other than the historian C. Sallustius Crispus³). Willems replied that Sallust was in Rome in 50 at the moment of his expulsion from the senate. As counterargument, unpersuasive: the sources which attest his presence (Ps.-Cic. Inv. in Sall. 16, Ps.-Acr. ad Hor. Serm. 1.2.49) are not unimpeachable, and in any event Cicero’s letter reveals that the proquaestor planned to be back in Rome in 50. More cogent reasons for rejecting Mommsen’s view are not lacking. Since the historian Sallust had been tribune in 52, he could not have become proquaestor through an extension of

1) J. C. Orelli and J. G. Baiter, *Onomasticon Tullianum*, vol. 7 of *M. Tullii Ciceronis Opera quae supersunt omnia*, Zurich 1838, 521. The emendation *Cn. Sal(l)ustio* was adopted in the editions of Tyrrell-Purser (Dublin/London 1890), Sjögren (Leipzig 1925), and Constans-Bayet (Paris 1950). The proquaestor shows up as “Cn. Sallustius (?)” in the fasti compiled by M. Büzl, *De provinciarum Romanarum quaestoribus, qui fuerunt ab a. u. c. DCLXXII usque ad a. u. c. DCCX*, Chemnitz 1893, 68–69, and as “Cn. (C.) Sallustius (Sallustianus)” in the fasti of F. Sobeck, *Die Quästoren der Römischen Republik*, Trebnitz 1909, 62. He is also called “Cn. Sallustius” by L. A. Thompson, *The Relationship between Provincial Quaestors and their Commanders-in-Chief*, *Historia* 11 (1962) 348.

2) R. Syme, *Sallust*, Berkeley/Los Angeles 1964, 11 and n. 23.

3) Th. Mommsen, *Die Scipionenprozesse*, *Hermes* 1 (1866) 171 n. 3 = *Römische Forschungen* 2, Berlin 1879, 434 n. 42. With some hesitation Mommsen was followed by F. Münzer, *Sallustius* (6), *RE I A* (1920) 1913, and by G. Funaioli, *Sallustius* (10), *ibid.* 1919.

the term of his quaestorship, but must have been a legate of Bibulus; and as Shackleton Bailey has pointed out, Bibulus would not have chosen as a legate a man who had been a partisan of Clodius during his tribunate. Moreover, we can be certain that the proquaestor of 50 had gone to Syria as a quaestor: as Syme noted, the proquaestor of the superscription was termed a quaestor by Cicero in the body of another letter of 50 (Att. 6.5.3, composed on 26 June⁴). The most recent entrant in the sweepstakes is C. Annius Luscius, “the son, perhaps, of C. Annius . . . proconsul in Spain in 81”⁵). The emendation cannot be rejected on paleographic grounds, since it requires only slight changes in the paradosis. But it is hard to believe that a Luscius lurks in the letterhead. The man is not otherwise attested, but then a lowly proquaestor might not be. More seriously, Annii Lusci are absent from the late Republic. The proconsul of 81 is thought to be the son of an Annius Rufus⁶). For the Annii of the republican period, the cognomen “Luscius” is attested only for the men classified as Annius 63 and Annius 64 in the Realencyclopädie of Pauly-Wissowa: formerly thought to be two individuals, father and son, but now considered one, the con-

4) Willems, *Le Sénat de la République romaine* 1, Louvain 1878, 562 n. 1, 572 and n. 4; D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Cicero: Epistulae ad Familiares*, Cambridge 1977, 1.457; Syme, *op. cit.* 11 and n.22. The proquaestor of 50 was deemed a quaestor of 51 by Willems, Büzl, Ribbeck, Sobeck and Syme; this was also the opinion of T. R. S. Broughton, *MRR* 2.242. T. P. Wiseman, *New Men in the Roman Senate*, 139 B.C.–A.D. 14, Oxford 1971, 258, lists our proquaestor as “q.52/51”; we might just as well say “q. by 51”. He could not be a quaestor of 52 if C. Cassius Longinus was serving *pro quaestore* then (so Broughton, *MRR* 3.51), but one suspects that Cassius was actually serving *pro quaestore pro praetore*. Cassius was addressed as *pro quaestore* in 51 in the superscription of *Cic. Fam.* 15.14, but then Cicero (Att. 9.1.4) in 49 referred to Faustus Sulla as *pro quaestore* when he was actually *pro quaestore pro praetore* (ILS 8778: ἀ[ντιπαιάν] και ἀ[ντιπαιάν]).

5) D. C. Earl, *The Early Career of Sallust*, *Historia* 15 (1966) 305.

6) Broughton sometimes gave the proconsul of 81 the cognomen “Luscius”: it is omitted under the year 108, included parenthetically under the year 81, and queried in the index (*MRR* 1.550; 2.77, 529); the cognomen is back, in parentheses but without query, at *MRR* 3.15. E. Klebs, *Annius* (9), *RE* I (1894) 2262, suggested that the proconsul C. Annius T.f.T.n. was the son of the consul of 128, T. Annius – f. – n. Rufus. This filiation of the proconsul of 81 is supported by an inscription which suggests that the consul of 128 was the son of a Titus; the inscription (ILLRP 454a) records the praetorship of a T. Annius T.f., and has been taken to attest the praetorship of the consul of 128 (cf. Broughton, *MRR* 3.16). Badian now considers it practically certain that the proconsul of 81 is the son of the consul of 128, and that “he should not be given the *cognomen* Luscius”. Cf. E. Badian, *The Consuls*, 179–49 BC, *Chiron* 20 (1990) 382.

sul of 153⁷). It seems that our proquaestor had two good eyes after all.

Since the arguments against “Cn. Sallustius” and “C. Sallustius” seem decisive, recent scholars have been attracted by the suggestion that the proquaestor is an otherwise unknown “Caninius Sallustianus”. Syme, Wiseman, and Broughton agree that this solution is possible⁸). All attribute the suggestion to Münzer, but it is in fact much older⁹). The adjectival form of this nomen gentilicium is quite rare¹⁰), and we have no other evidence which indicates that a Sallustius was adopted by a Caninius¹¹). “Caninius Sallustianus” is not much better than “C. Annius Luscus”, since neither family is known to have existed at the time. I think it is possible to assign the proquaestor to a family which is known to have existed in the late Republic, though identification with a known member of that family is more difficult.

The emendation “Caninius Gallus” will not meet with objection on paleographic grounds. It also works well on historical grounds. Strangely, although the proquaestor was planning to leave Syria as soon as his successor arrived (Fam. 2.17.1), he had asked Cicero for a letter of recommendation to Bibulus, the governor he had been serving and was about to leave (Cic. Fam. 2.17.6: *petis a me ut Bibulo te quam diligentissime commendem*). We

7) Cf. I. Kajanto, *The Latin Cognomina*, Helsinki 1965, 238; Broughton, MRR 3.16. The consul of 153, T. Annius T.f. Luscus, is presumed to be the father of the consul of 128; cf. Badian, *op. cit.* 382. The consul of 153 is wrongly given the filiation “L. f.” at MRR 3.16.

8) Syme, *op. cit.* 11 n. 20; Wiseman, *op. cit.* 258; Broughton, MRR 3.184. It so happens that neither Wiseman nor Broughton noticed Earl’s proposal. I should also state for the sake of completeness that I do not know of any scholar who has maintained that the proquaestor is an otherwise unknown homonym of the known Cn. Sallustius or the known C. Sallustius.

9) F. Münzer, *Caninius* (14), RE III (1899) 1479; Münzer was aware of Mommsen’s treatment at this time, but had not yet accepted it as fact. W. Drumann, *Geschichte Roms* 2, Königsberg 1836, 110, was confident that the proquaestor was named “Caninius Sallustianus”, and his confidence was shared by Willems, *op. cit.* 572; the name is recorded in the same way, though with a query, by P. Ribbeck, *Senatores Romani qui fuerint Idibus Martiis anni a.u.c. 710*, Berlin 1899, 65.

10) “Sallustianus” is borne by nine free men in CIL; cf. Kajanto, *op. cit.* 154. Since this agnomen does not appear “in den Handschriften”, P. Groebe believed that the proquaestor was probably a Sallustius; cf. Drumann-Groebe, *Geschichte Roms* II, Leipzig ²1902, 92 n. 2.

11) Our proquaestor has not been included in the “Register of Adoptions” (which does list in brackets “very doubtful or improbable items”) compiled by D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Two Studies in Roman Nomenclature*, Atlanta ²1991.

could not assume that Bibulus and his quaestor were acquainted before their provincial service, since the quaestor was probably assigned to Bibulus by the lot. But Bibulus' hostility for or indifference to his quaestor needs to be explained. It cannot be explained with certainty: the quaestor might have said something which gave offense, or might have been incompetent in the discharge of his duties, or perceived as such. But it is possible to explain the apparent disdain of Bibulus on the ground that his quaestor was a Caninius Gallus. One clash between Bibulus and a Caninius Gallus is recorded in the sources. In 56 Bibulus had proposed that three *legati* restore the Egyptian king (Cic. Fam. 1.2.1), while the tribune L. Caninius Gallus promulgated a bill which entrusted the task to Pompey (Plut. Pomp. 49.10). When L. Caninius Gallus died in 44, Cicero (Att. 16.14.4) remembered him as *hominem, quod ad me attinet, non ingratum*. Geiger pointed out that this notice suggests that L. Caninius "was ungrateful towards somebody, though not to Cicero". Geiger himself believed that the *Κανίδιος/Κανίνιος* who served under Cato in Cyprus in 58–57 was L. Caninius Gallus, serving in the capacity of legate before his tribunate, and that the man to whom he was ungrateful was Cato¹²). If Geiger is correct, so much the better: Bibulus then had twice the reason to distance himself from our proquaestor, a close relation (*ex hypothesi*) of the tribune.

Just how close a relation? The consul of 37, L. Caninius L. f. Gallus, has long been presumed a son of the tribune of 56¹³). A quaestorship in 51 and a consulship in 37, just fourteen years apart, would be altogether unremarkable in normal circumstances. But as the *lex Villia annalis* was often flouted after 49, we cannot be confident that a consul of 37 was old enough to be quaestor in 51. Doubt is increased by the supposition that the tribune of 56 was his father: he would have to be tribune past his floruit and father at a very early age to have a son born by 82 and so old enough for the quaestorship of 51. (He could on the other hand easily be the father of an underage consul of 37). If our proquaestor was not the son of the tribune of 56, he might have been a younger brother. Since the tribune of 56 is now given the filiation "C.f." (AE 1928, 43), we may award the younger brother the praenomen "Gaius", and suppose that the tribune had an older brother Gaius who had

12) J. Geiger, Canidius or Caninius?, CQ 66 (1972) 130–34.

13) So Drumann, op. cit. 110 (with no objections from Groebe, op. cit. 91); Willems, op. cit. 494; Ribbeck, op. cit. 27; F. Münzer, Caninius (4), RE III (1899) 1477; E. Groag, PIR² C 389; Geiger, op. cit. 133.

perished or been adopted into another family¹⁴). The loss of the initial for the praenomen in the superscription is then easily explained as haplography.

To me the otherwise unknown "C. Caninius Gallus" seems preferable to the otherwise known L. Caninius L. f. Gallus, and both seem preferable to "Caninius Sallustianus", which is less radical paleographically but less satisfying historically. But I do not demand that we cease to regard the quaestor of 51 as †Canini Salustius. Certainty lingers.

Princeton

F. X. Ryan

14) A legate of Caesar in 48 is no longer considered to have borne the cognomen "Caninianus"; cf. MRR 2.280, 3.1.