

CHARACTER IN SALLUST'S *HISTORIAE*: SERTORIUS, SPARTACUS, AND  
MITHRIDATES

A Thesis

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School  
of Cornell University

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of  
Master of Arts

by

Michael Joshua Dybicz

May 2009

© 2009 Michael Joshua Dybicz

## ABSTRACT

This thesis is an examination of the characters of Sertorius, Spartacus, and Mithridates in Sallust's *Historiae*. The fragmentary state of the *Historiae* and the general lack of scholarship on Sallust in English and French have left much room for study. Chapter One serves as an introduction to Sallust, his writing, and the state of Sallustian scholarship on the question at hand. Chapters Two, Three, and Four, one dedicated to each figure, attempt to reconstruct as far as possible Sallust's conception of these three men by a close reading of the fragments and then by comparing the fragments with later historians who use Sallust as a source, primarily Plutarch and Appian. The fifth chapter investigates the roles of Catiline and Jugurtha in their respective works as a basis for comparison. The Conclusion, Chapter Six, argues for the individuality of all the figures. Each person does set himself against Rome and reveals the corruption therein, but the precise nature of that role and their dominant characteristics vary. The thesis also suggests the development of Sallust as an historian, since the completely villainous figures of Catiline and Jugurtha give way to the more measured depictions of the *Historiae*.

## BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Michael Dybicz was born in Cleveland, Ohio. He grew up in Cleveland Heights where he attended St. Ann School before graduating from St. Ignatius High School in 2001. He is a 2005 graduate of the University of Notre Dame, *cum laude*. In May 2009 he received his Masters from Cornell in the field of Classics.

Optumis Parentibus

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost I would like to thank my committee: Barry Strauss and Eric Rebillard. Both made what could have been an awkward change of course into a relatively seamless transition. Their insight was also necessary for the composition of a passable end product. Special thanks to Professor Strauss, who, among many kindnesses, nudged me toward such a thoroughly satisfactory and enjoyable topic on short notice. I would also like to thank Hunter Rawlings, under whom I first discovered my love of Sallust and who provided much needed advice for my proposal. Finally, thanks to my family and friends, at home and here in Ithaca. They have been far too kind to me. Mom, Dad, Ginna, and Toby went above and beyond the call of duty by proofreading my error-ridden drafts.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Biographical Sketch	iii
Dedication	iv
Acknowledgments	v
Table of Contents	vi
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Chapter 2: Sertorius	9
Chapter 3: Spartacus	30
Chapter 4: Mithridates	43
Chapter 5: Catiline and Jugurtha	58
Chapter 6: Conclusion	69
Bibliography	75

## Chapter One: Introduction

Sallust's historical works are character-driven, though that is not to say that they are character studies. The monographs were named the *Bellum Catilinae* (or *De Coniuratione Catilinae*) and the *Bellum Jugurthinum*, not the *Catilina* and the *Jugurtha*. These two characters, while they dominate their respective works, do not serve as their point. Rather, Sallust uses them to make his point. Thus the climax of the *Bellum Catilinae* is in the speeches of Caesar and Cato and Sallust's comparison of the two figures, while Jugurtha quietly becomes a non-factor in the *Bellum Jugurthinum*, such that Sallust does not even report his death.<sup>1</sup> Although only fragments survive from the five books of the *Historiae*, the same technique appears to have been applied to them as well.<sup>2</sup>

Since the *Historiae* match the general framework of the monographs, Sallust would have assigned a similarly prominent place to Rome's enemies in this historical period: specifically, Sertorius, Spartacus, and Mithridates. The fragmentary state of the *Historiae* has resulted in a dearth of English and French scholarship on Sallust's interpretation of these three historical figures. My intention is that this thesis will begin to rectify that situation. After opening with an introductory chapter devoted to

---

<sup>1</sup> Syme regarding Caesar and Cato: "A monograph is limited in scope, and sometimes bound up with the vicissitudes of one person, according to a known theory of historiography. Sallust circumvents that theory. The subject is the *Bellum Catilinae*, and Catilina is allowed two orations. But the work rises to its culmination with Caesar and Cato. Together they engross one fifth of the monograph" (68). Levene notes the oddity of Sallust's closing of the *BI*: "Of course, the Jugurtha is a monograph about a Roman war, not a biography. However, the Romans saw the death of Jugurtha as something that mattered to the war: at Lucan ix.600 it is 'breaking the neck of Jugurtha' that is an example of the glorious deeds of the past. Nor are we even told that Jugurtha was led in Marius' triumph, though other writers treat this too as a key part of the victory. To have given such information at the end would not have made the work a biography, but it would have provided a sense of closure comparable to that found in biography" (54).

<sup>2</sup> Earl: "As the fragments of the *Historiae* show the same thought and approach to the facts recorded as are found in the *Bella*, so the speeches and letters exhibit the same features as those of the two earlier monographs. They not only characterise the speaker or writer, but also, defining the situation in Sallustian terms, they serve to illustrate his generalisations. As far as they go, the remains of the *Historiae* support the conclusions regarding Sallust's general theory and his application of it to his narrative formed from the examination of the *Bella*" (111).

Sallust, his writings, and the state of Sallustian scholarship, I will draw on the reconstructions of the *Historiae* composed by Maurenbrecher and McGushin in order to make a close reading of the fragments connected with these three antagonists of the Roman state, while also comparing and contextualizing these fragments with the later historians who used Sallust as a source. Chapters Two, Three, and Four, one dedicated to each historical figure, will serve as the main body of my thesis, as I try to reconstruct as nearly as possible Sallust's conception of these men. In Chapter Five, I will briefly describe the dominant traits of the fully realized Catiline and Jugurtha, before ending the thesis with Chapter Six, wherein I will compare the different sets of figures, which can thus serve as basis for tracing the development of Sallust as an historian.

While the time of composition for the *Bellum Catilinae* and the *Bellum Iugurthinum* is somewhat controversial with respect to specific dates, the general scholarly consensus puts them sometime in the 40s BC.<sup>3</sup> The date of Sallust's writing of the *Historiae* is more firmly settled. Its composition ended with Sallust's death in 35 BC.<sup>4</sup> In any event, all three works were written after Caesar's victory over Pompey and his Republican allies but before Octavian completed his rise to power as the sole ruler of the Roman world. This political environment, full of civil war, proscriptions, and massacres, had an obvious impact on Sallust the historian. Although the prologue to the *Historiae* is fragmentary, it appears to match, with minor modifications, the general trajectory outlined by the prologues and digressions of the two monographs.

We may roughly divide Sallust's project into two parts, though they have an obvious bearing on each other. The first is the decline of the Roman state since the sack of Carthage in the Third Punic War (146 BC) and the removal of a viable threat

---

<sup>3</sup> Kraus and Woodman 10. Dates for the Catiline vary with a scholar's view on the reason for its publication. See Syme 63-64.

<sup>4</sup> The date is from Jerome, but accurate enough (Syme 13).

to Roman preeminence.<sup>5</sup> The Rome of the two monographs acts in concord from the founding of the Republic until that moment, whereas the *Historiae's* period of civil peace occupies the period between the Second and Third Punic Wars.<sup>6</sup> The effect of Carthage's destruction, however, is the same. The Roman state falls prey first to *ambitio* and then to *avaritia*. *Ambitio*, since it still seeks *gloria* (if sometimes by unfair means), allows the successful running of the state, if not its flourishing. *Avaritia*, on the other hand, with *gloria* and high office serving only as means of personal enrichment, dooms the state to collapse.<sup>7</sup> In the *Bellum Catilinae* Sallust dates the general advent of *avaritia* in the Roman state to Sulla's loose treatment of his soldiers while campaigning against Mithridates in Asia.<sup>8</sup>

Sallust's other main concern is the functioning of the human person and his flourishing.<sup>9</sup> These subjects are directly addressed in the prologues of the two monographs, whose action then plays out according to the rules Sallust sets.<sup>10</sup> While

---

<sup>5</sup> *BC* 10; *BJ* 41.1-5.

<sup>6</sup> *H.* 1.11: *At discordia et avaritia atque ambitio et cetera secundis rebus oriri sueta mala post Carthaginis excidium maxime aucta sunt. Nam iniuriae validiorum et ob eas discessio plebis a patribus aliaque dissensiones domi fuere iam inde a principio neque amplius quam regibus exactis, dum metus a Tarquinio et bellum grave cum Etruria positum est, aequo et modesto iure agitatum. Dein servili imperio patres plebem exercere, de vita atque tergo regio more consulere, agro pellere et ceteris expertibus soli in imperio agere. Quibus saevitiis et maxime fenore oppressa plebes, cum assiduis bellis tributum et militiam simul toleraret, armata montem sacrum atque Aventinum insedit tumque tribunos plebis et alia iura sibi paravit. Discordiarum et certaminis utrimque finis fuit secundum bellum Punicum.*

<sup>7</sup> Sallust: *Ambitio multos mortalis falsos fieri subegit, aliud clausum in pectore, aliud in lingua promptum habere, amicitias inimicitiasque non ex re sed ex commodo aestumare, magisque uolunt quam ingenium bonum habere* (*BC* 10.5). Also, speaking of *avaritia* and *ambitio*, Sallust writes: *Haec primo paulatim crescere, interdum uindicari; post ubi contagio quasi pestilentia inuasit, ciuitas inmutata, imperium ex iustissimo atque optumo crudele intolerandumque factum* (*BC* 10.6). See also *BI* 41.2 and *H* 1.7.

<sup>8</sup> *BC* 11.5.

<sup>9</sup> Kraus: "Sallust's chief preoccupation throughout his works is *uirtus*" (Kraus and Woodman 11).

<sup>10</sup> Earl provides the best summary: "The passages just quoted confirm that the essential nature of *virtus* is to be found in conduct and we may now define Sallust's concept of *virtus*, the predominant idea in the prologues, as the functioning of *ingenium* to achieve *egregia facinora*, and thus to win *gloria*, through *bonae artes*. This last factor is of vital importance since the difference between the *bonus* and the *ignavus*, between the man of *virtus* and the man of *ambitio*, lies precisely in the one reaching *gloria* by the exercise of *bonae artes*, the other *dolis atque fallaciis*. Fundamentally this difference is one of *ingenium*" (11).

no fragments from a similar section of the *Historiae* survive, if such a section ever existed, the historical figures still seem to be acting according to the same rules.<sup>11</sup> Sallust divides the human person into *vis* and *animus*, roughly physical and intellectual/spiritual power, though the specific terms can vary.<sup>12</sup> Truly memorable deeds can only be achieved by the *animus*, which is the more powerful of the two and aligned with the gods, whereas the body is to be identified with the animals.<sup>13</sup> The right-ordered individual uses his *ingenium* (natural talent) to pursue *egregia facinora* especially, though not necessarily, on behalf of the state. Thus is *virtus* attained, and therein lies true nobility.

A consensus has formed around the general framework of the *Historiae*, although the placement of individual fragments can be contentious.<sup>14</sup> As I have already stated, Sallust at least started the fifth book (from which by far the fewest fragments survive) before he died. Whether this was to be his last book is a matter of debate and not directly relevant to this paper.<sup>15</sup> Starting with a short evaluation of Roman historiography, Sallust then turned to a brief summary of history from the Social War to Sulla's new constitution (91-78 BC). The *Historiae* proper start in 78 BC, with the consulship of Lepidus and Cethegus and the revolt of the former. The military and political history of Rome is then traced at least to the Gabinian law of 67 BC which gave Pompey the command against the Cilician pirates. Sallust was writing

---

<sup>11</sup> Kraus: "It is particularly character, observed in speech or action, that shows the dynamic character of *virtus*: the fact that the narratives of the monographs are clearly, and that of the *Historiae* was perhaps, focused through ambivalent figures shows Sallust's fascination with personalities that are compounded of both good and evil" (11).

<sup>12</sup> Sallust: *Sed nostra omnis uis in animo et corpore sita est* (BC 1.2).

<sup>13</sup> Sallust: *Nam uti genus hominum compositum ex corpore et anima est, ita res cunctae studiaque omnia nostra corporis alia, alia animi naturam secuntur* (BI 2.1); *animi imperio, corporis seruitio magis utimur; alterum nobis cum dis, alterum cum beluis commune est* (BC 1.2).

<sup>14</sup> McGushin (1992) offers a useful chart (11-13).

<sup>15</sup> Syme (191-192) provides a summary of the arguments, providing his own guess: "To set 51 or 50 as his goal (the breach between Pompeius and Caesar) and a history of twelve books may not have surpassed his belief in his own powers, the style having been created, and the theme irresistible in appeal. A passage in the prologue happens to register a date emphatically, by consuls. It is 51, the widest extension of Rome's empire now achieved by the subjugation of Gaul" (192).

a comprehensive history, and thus more minor events like wars in Macedonia and Antonius' command against the pirates in Crete were included (as well as political maneuvering in the capital), but the bulk of the five books dealt with the newly reorganized Rome's wars with its three greatest opponents of the period: Sertorius, Spartacus, and Mithridates. The obvious thread tying this story together was the increasing dominance of Pompey, although one can hardly call him the hero.<sup>16</sup>

Although McGushin's arrangement of the fragments is more recent and contains fragments discovered since the publication of Maurenbrecher, I have decided to use the latter's numbering system, not because his arrangement is more convincing, though he does seem a more careful scholar, but so that references will make sense when checked against the bulk of the scholarship.<sup>17</sup>

As I have already mentioned, the *Historiae* survive only in fragments—of both direct and indirect transmission. The direct transmission is primarily limited to the speeches and letters for which Sallust was famous and the chance survival of the Vatican manuscript which provides vital details. These larger fragments are invaluable for ascertaining Sallust's thematic approach, but their number is all too few. The indirect transmission comes almost completely from the scholiasts (primarily Servius) and the grammarians. Most of these fragments have a length of less than a line. Each group has its advantages and pitfalls. The scholiasts only rarely record the book number from which they drew the quote, but, while their interest is usually grammatical, they sometimes cite Sallust for confirmation of a view they hold. The grammarians (mostly Arusianus Messius and Priscianus) almost invariably record

---

<sup>16</sup> Syme on Pompey's possible role: "Sallust intended that Pompeius Magnus should develop into the principal character. The preliminary survey was conceived in scope and detail adequate to set on record the earliest actions, namely the private army levied in Picenum and the reconquest of Sicily and Africa" (201).

<sup>17</sup> McGushin includes Maurenbrecher's numbering only in the second volume (1994), which also includes a concordance (237-244) of passages for Volumes 1 and 2.

book numbers, but their usefulness ends there. Since they are interested only in grammatical constructions, they provide no context to help explain the quotation.<sup>18</sup>

Attempting to construct even the bare narrative outline thus has significant risks. The vast majority of the fragments survive for reasons other than historical interest, and there is no reason to assume that they somehow make up a representative sample of the *Historiae*. Forced to find a larger context for the fragments in hand, scholars have turned to later historians for whom we know or can guess that Sallust was the source. Though they often provide the necessary context that is lacking, the method is obviously far from perfect.

Something approaching a consensus has developed around the interpretation of the *Historiae*. Major treatments of Sallust in French and English are extremely rare, however. Earl (1961), Syme (1964), and Tiffou (1974) are the three latest authors to dedicate an entire book to the historian. We may take Laistner (1947) as representative of the previous interpretation. He discounts Sallust's ability as an historian, seeing his characterization, both in the monographs and the *Historiae*, as symptomatic of his dominant literary concerns.<sup>19</sup> In his study of the prologues, Earl points out the greater precision of Sallust's description of ancient Rome in the *Histories* (1.11), from which he goes on to make some general comments on the writings:

As far as it goes, the evidence of the fragments of the *Historiae* indicates the same general standpoint as that behind the two earlier monographs. The one substantial modification which can be detected seems to be in the interest of greater historical accuracy and may even

---

<sup>18</sup> McGushin (1992) offers a more in depth discussion on the transmission of the *Historiae* (5-10).

<sup>19</sup> Laistner: "Sallust's *ethopoiia* is both brilliant and memorable; its weakness lies in the absence of light and shade. His personalities are graphically portrayed, but they are devoid of psychological subtlety. Their treatment reminds one of the 'types' familiar in the New Comedy and its derivatives" (56).

have been introduced in response to criticism of the earlier version in the *Bella* (106).

Syme, although he appears to be of the same mind, prefers to hint rather than state his position clearly: "Yet changes and development might perhaps be allowed for, brief though the span of years be from the pioneer monograph to the mature achievement" (2).<sup>20</sup> Tiffou (1974), who also writes primarily with the prologues in mind, comes to the same conclusion as Earl regarding the great accuracy in the *Historiae*, but he also advocates for a profound shift in the *Histories*, once Sallust saw that not even Caesar could save the Republic, into a profound pessimism from the earlier hope of the monographs:

Ce renversement explique, malgré les similitudes de structure, la différence profonde qui sépare les *Histoires* des monographies. La comparaison des préfaces l'avait révélé, l'étude des œuvres la confirme. Le développement du pessimisme de Salluste l'a arraché aux premières illusions d'une retraite qui se voulait indirectement engagée (576).<sup>21</sup>

This deeper pessimism of the *Historiae*, probably centered too much on the comparison with the prologues of the two monographs, continues in the scholarship. De Blois (1988), in passing, writes: "In *Historiae* I, 11-12, we find similar statements although here Sallust is more pessimistic about earlier Roman generations" (608).

Mineo (1997) continues the trend:

---

<sup>20</sup> Some of Syme's speculation carries him beyond Earl's claims: "An author in his first essay does not always disclose his ulterior ambitions. Professing an intention to compose monographs, Sallust may none the less already have conceived the hope or design of writing the history of his own times, if he acquired skill and practice, if life were vouchsafed. He betrays no sign or hint. Normal prudence might dissuade an announcement of that order and magnitude" (64).

<sup>21</sup> Tiffou on the historical accuracy of the *Historiae*: "Avec sa dernière œuvre Salluste en arrive à une conception de l'histoire plus proche de la nôtre. Il ne faut certes pas se cacher le fossé qui les sépare l'une de l'autre" (576).

L'échec de César aboutit au pessimisme des *Historiae*; car la *uirtus* sallustéenne ne se transmet pas, et la disparition des hommes d'exception peut avoir des conséquences dramatiques pour la cité, en cela qu'elle peut hypothéquer à jamais l'espoir d'un redressement qui dépendait pour une large partie de la *uirtus* du héros (49).

Conte also continues in this vein.<sup>22</sup> Kraus (1994) is more skeptical, noting no real change in the works:

"It is particularly character, observed in speech or action that shows the dynamic quality of *uirtus*: the fact that the narratives of the monographs are clearly, and that of the *Historiae* was perhaps, focused through ambivalent figures shows Sallust's fascination with personalities that are compounded of both good and evil" (11).

Claims to a change in Sallust's historical accuracy, however, have fallen by the wayside. While the prior scholars' estimation of Sallust's pessimism seems to come from the prologue to the *Historiae* and assumptions about his political beliefs, I believe that the following chapters will show that the *Historiae* is indeed a grimmer work and, if not more historical, at least more realistic.

---

<sup>22</sup> Conte: "In general, Sallust's pessimism seems to grow deeper in his last work. After the murder of Caesar and the frustration of the hopes that reposed in the dictator, the historian no longer has a party to side with, nor does he expect any savior" (240).

## Chapter Two: Sertorius

Based on McGushin's (1992) reconstruction, the character of Sertorius appears to have dominated the first three books of the *Historiae* (11-12). The scattered surviving fragments attest to this key role, but in a less than structured way. Ninety-four fragments deal with the entirety of the Sertorius narrative, out of which I have used twenty-six in my attempt to reconstruct the character Sallust created. While this collection constitutes a substantial amount compared with the fragments dedicated to Spartacus and Mithridates, the almost complete lack of information dealing with the end of Sertorius' tragic career makes an evaluation of his role in the *Histories* very much a matter of conjecture. Syme disparages even the attempt: "Certain fragments speak warmly of Sertorius . . . But fragments will not take one very far" (203).

While Plutarch and Appian provide the fullest narratives, and thus the best checks, for all three of Sallust's characters, Plutarch is particularly beneficial in the study of Sertorius because he dedicated an entire *Life* to the subject. What is more, scholarly opinion holds that Sallust's *Historiae* served as Plutarch's main source.<sup>23</sup> Unfortunately, the *Sertorius* appears to present special problems beyond Plutarch's usual manipulation of his material. Syme rightly warns that at the end of 75 BC, "the book takes a new and different course. It abandons annalistic history, to diverge into panegyric of Sertorius. . . . One looks in vain for the sequence of events that encouraged Sertorius' officers to plot his removal and contrive the fatal banquet at Osca" (204). Plutarch's biography thus becomes least reliable, and also less reliant on Sallust, in the exact place where the fragments desert us. Konrad agrees that Plutarch exercises his biographical deformation to "perhaps a higher degree than most other lives" (xxx). Gillis adds a further caution. Sallust's well-known antipathy for Pompey

---

<sup>23</sup> Gillis 721; Konrad lxiv; Syme 203.

is completely absent from Plutarch's *Sertorius* (721). A complete moral divergence from Sallust is thus well within the realm of possibility.

Appian, on the other hand, is of far less use for our purposes. He appears to have relied primarily upon Livy for his account.<sup>24</sup> Gillis points out that Appian includes all the details from the *Periochae* of the relevant books of Livy, particularly in the matter of Sertorius becoming a degenerate in his last days (725). In any case, the differences in the characterizations are clear. While Plutarch stands accused of panegyric, Appian's account (*BM* 107-114) takes every opportunity to put the worst possible interpretation on Sertorius' actions. Thus Appian depicts Sertorius as absolutely dependent on his white fawn (*BC* 110), while Plutarch describes it as a means for controlling the superstitious Hispanians (*Sert.* 11). The degeneracy into luxury seems particularly un-Sallustian, while Sertorius' loss of respect from his Roman soldiers appears to be immediately contradicted by Appian's own account (*BC* 114).

Despite Syme's pointed warnings I believe that the remnants of the *Historiae* can tell us a great deal about the character of Sertorius. The combination of Sallust's fragments with a measured reading of Plutarch's additional information creates a fairly solid picture of the Roman general. Sertorius' distinguishing characteristics are, I would argue, fourfold: physical strength and ability, courage, mental acuity revealed by an outstanding mastery of strategy and tactics, and personal nobility.

Sertorius' physical makeup is only partially captured in the fragments, though what remains is haunting. Describing Sertorius after the Social War, Sallust writes: *quae [multa peracta] vivos facie sua ostentabat aliquot adversis cicatricibus et effosso oculo. Neque illis anxius, quin ille dehonestamento corporis maxime laetabatur, quia*

---

<sup>24</sup> Konrad li-ii; Gillis 725.

*reliqua gloriosus retinebat* (*H* 1.88).<sup>25</sup> Aulus Gellius (2.27.2) saved this fragment by recording an argument by the philosopher Titus Castricius that Philip of Macedon had the more proper attitude towards his disfigurements. Although Castricius thinks ill of Sertorius' joy, Sallust seems to be praising his subject. Sertorius' scars and lost eye are proof of the glory he had earned, and, since he was still able to bear arms, he rejoiced in his disfigurement. The inference can then reasonably be made that Sertorius fought well in receiving these wounds. Plutarch also gives a description of Sertorius' physical capabilities, comparing him to the old and feeble Metellus Pius, his initial opponent in Spain: τῶ δὲ Σερτωρίῳ συνεισπύεται πνεύματος ἀκμαίου γέμοντι καὶ κατεσκευασμένον ἔχοντι θαυμασίως τὸ σῶμα ῥώμῃ καὶ τάχει καὶ λιτότητι (*Sert.* 13.1). I quote this sentence from Plutarch because I believe that he pulls this line directly from the *Historiae*.

While the second half of the description presents no difficulties, πνεύματος ἀκμαίου γέμοντι, literally “laden with the peak of breath,” is puzzling. Perrin offers a sound but misinformed translation: “whereas his opponent, Sertorius, was full of martial vigour, and had a body which was wonderfully constituted for strength, speed and plain living (34).” Flacelière and Chamry (1973) have a similar problem: “tandis que son ennemi Sertorius était dans toute l'ardeur de la jeunesse avec un corps merveilleusement exercé, à la fois vigoureux, agile et sobre” (25). Both translations take the phrase as dealing with Sertorius' physical ability. While either choice is an acceptable rendering of the confusing Greek, neither accounts for the underlying Latin. While πνεῦμα typically means “wind,” “breath,” etc., an alternate meaning is “spirit.” Plutarch's trouble with Latin is well known.<sup>26</sup> It is possible he either

<sup>25</sup> McGushin (1992): “However, during his lifetime his face bore the record of such deeds in numerous battle-scars and an empty eye-socket. Far from being worried about them, he took the greatest delight in these disfigurements in so far as he was keeping, to his greater glory, the rest of his body intact” (39).

<sup>26</sup> Rose offers a good summary of this matter (11-19). Of particular note are Plutarch's confusion of *seco* with *sequor* (17), but more important is his misreading of a multivalent word like *corpus*: “Quintus

conflated *animus* with *anima* (a better analogue for πνεύμα), or, perhaps, read ἄνεμος for *animus*. Regardless, a mistranslation here would result in an original passage that looks remarkably similar to the descriptions of Catiline, Jugurtha, Spartacus, and Bestia.<sup>27</sup> As further confirmation, Plutarch also appears to have mistranslated a similar phrase in his *Crassus*. He describes Spartacus as: οὐ μόνον φρόνημα μέγα καὶ ῥώμην ἔχων, ἀλλὰ καὶ συνέσι καὶ πραότητι τῆς τύχης ἀμείνων (8.3). If we read φρόνημα μέγα καὶ ῥώμην ἔχων as the original Sallustian core, then it appears that Plutarch translated *animus* as φρόνημα, a normally sound move, since both words can mean “courage,” but not in respect to Sallust's peculiar use of the word. *Animus*, since it is paired with Sertorius' physical abilities, would need to be translated as “intellect” or “mental powers,” just as in Sallust's other character sketches. In both cases Plutarch should have rendered *animus* as something along the lines of νοῦς or φρόνησις.

The random preservation of the fragments prevents an explicit description of Sertorius' bravery. We are, however, told that Sertorius served with distinction:

*Magna gloria tribunus militum in Hispania T. Didio imperante . . . fuit* (H. 1.88).<sup>28</sup> I have already mentioned the wounds Sertorius suffered. The reception granted to him

---

Cicero according to his brother, during the riots of Jan. 23, 69/57 *pulsus e rostris in comitio iacuit seque seruorum et libertorum corporibus obetexit*, i.e., he was dragged from the rostra, knocked down, and escaped only through the devotion of his attendants, who guarded him with their own persons. Here Plutarch, supposing that *iacuit* was used as it so often is of a man dead or disabled, went on to take *corporibus* as meaning 'dead bodies,' a sense which it actually bears a few lines further on. Accordingly he tells us that Quintus was left for dead among the corpses in the Comitium and so escaped” (17). Glucker shows a similar problem in Plutarch's *Lucullus* 42:3-4. It appears that Plutarch etymologically translated *antiponere* as ἀντιπᾶττειν, thus changing the meaning from “preferred” to “set up against,” “set up in opposition to” (383). The mistranslation of a term with a meaning specific to Sallust makes perfect sense in this context.

<sup>27</sup> Catiline—*fuit magna vi et animi et corporis* (BC 5.1); Jugurtha—*pollens viribus, decora facie, sed multo maxime ingenio validus* (BI 6.1); Bestia—*in consule nostro multae bonaeque artes et animi et corporis quas omnis auaritia praepediebat: patiens laborum, acri ingenio, satis prouidens, belli haud ignarus, firmissimus contra pericula et invidias* (BI 28.5); Spartacus—*ingens virium atque animi* (H 3.91).

<sup>28</sup> McGushin (1992): “Under the command of Titus Didius in Spain he covered himself in glory as a military tribune” (39).

upon entering a theater after the Social War provides further evidence: *Et ei voce magna vehementer gratulabantur* (1.89).<sup>29</sup> Donatus, in his commentary on Terence's *Andria* (939), preserved this fragment, without book attribution, in order to point out the difference between *gaudeo* and *gratulor*. Maurenbrecher, however, points out the similarity between this fragment and a line from Plutarch, which makes the attribution to Sertorius fairly certain (41).<sup>30</sup> Finally, from the war in Spain, we appear to have an example of him keeping his head during a rout and trying to get others back into the fight: *neque inermos ex proelio viros quemquam agnoturum* (*H.* 2.61).<sup>31</sup> Servius (*Aen.* 4.23) is unhelpful. He quotes Sallust, without book attribution, to show another example of *agnotus* rather than *agnitus*. Maurenbrecher cites a similar passage from Plutarch and pegs the passage to the battle of the Sucro, though the general nature of the passage prevents a precise linkage with Sertorius, let alone a specific battle (85).<sup>32</sup>

We might be able to add tenacity, a refusal to be intimidated, as a subset of Sertorius' courage: *neque detrusus aliquotiens terretur* (*H.* 1.118).<sup>33</sup> Unfortunately Priscianus (15.24), while he does record the quote as coming from Book I, does not provide any other contextual information, as it is *aliquotiens* that draws his attention. The description may match what we know of Sertorius, but it could describe any number of people in the *Histories*, even Pompey or Metellus refusing to let Sertorius' guerrilla tactics wear him down. Maurenbrecher chooses this particular placement

---

<sup>29</sup> McGushin (1992): “And they were greeting him with enthusiastic shouts of congratulations” (39).

<sup>30</sup> Plutarch: ἀπέδωκε δὲ καὶ ὁ δῆμος αὐτῷ τιμὴν πρέπουσαν, εἰσελθόντα γὰρ εἰς θέατρον ἐδέξαυτό τε κρότῳ καὶ κατευφήμησαν, ὧν οὐδὲ τοῖς πάνυ προήκουσιν ἡλικία τε καὶ δόξη τυχεῖν ἦν ῥάδιον (4.5).

<sup>31</sup> McGushin (1992): “And that no one would acknowledge as men people who came away unarmed from a battlefield” (53).

<sup>32</sup> Plutarch: γενομένης δὲ τῆς μάχης ἐν χερσίν, ἔτυχε μὲν οὐ πρὸς Πομπήιον αὐτός, ἀλλὰ πρὸς Ἀφράνιον ἐν ἀρχῇ συνεστηκώς, ἔχοντα τὸ ἀριστερόν, αὐτὸς ἐπὶ τοῦ δεξιῦ τεταγμένος. ἀκούσας δὲ τῷ Πομπήϊῳ τοὺς συνεστῶτας ὑποχωρεῖν ἐγκειμένῳ καὶ κραεῖσθαι, τὸ μὲν δεξιὸν ἐπ’ ἄλλοις ἐποίησατο στρατηγοῖς, πρὸς δ’ ἐκεῖνο τὸ νικώμενον αὐτὸς ἐβοηδρόμει. καὶ τοὺς μὲν ἤδη τρεπομένους, τοὺς δ’ ἔτι μένοντας ἐν τάξει συναγαγὼν καὶ ἀναθαρρύνας, ἐξ ὑπαρχῆς ἐνέβαλε τῷ Πομπήϊῳ διώκοντι καὶ φυγὴν ἐποίησατο πολλήν (*Sert.* 19.5-7).

<sup>33</sup> McGushin (1992): “Although driven off on more than one occasion, he does not lose his confidence . . .” (43).

because he thinks the description is too close to match anyone else, with McGushin (1992) agreeing for the same reason.<sup>34</sup> Even if this particular quote does not describe Sertorius, I think it is fair to say that Sallust probably included something in this vein. Sertorius came back from too many defeats not to have had this qualifier.

If my conjecture about Plutarch's *Sertorius* 13.1 is correct and πνεύματος ἀκμαίου γέμοντι can be read as something along the lines of *animo vigente plenus*, then Sallust does explicitly describe Sertorius' mental acuity. However, aside from this reconstructed attribution of great intellectual capacity to Sertorius, even the remaining fragments make abundantly clear the military genius this man possessed. From the beginning of his career, Sallust paints Sertorius as having a flair for command: *Magna gloria tribunus militum in Hispania T. Didio imperante, magno usui bello Marsico paratu militum et armorum fuit, multaque tum ductu eius peracta primo per ignobilitatem, deinde per invidiam scriptorum incelebrata sunt* (H. 1.88).<sup>35</sup> The examples from his wars against the Roman commanders in Spain are too numerous, even in the fragments, to be cited completely. Suffice it to say that Sallust paints Sertorius as both a master of grand strategy and of tactics. In terms of strategy, he correctly sends Salinator to defend the passes of the Pyrenees as soon as he hears of Sulla's triumph (H 1.95-7.), and also realizes the importance of defending Hither Spain from Roman control by building a navy: *illum raptis forum et castra nautica Sertorius mutaverat* (H. 1.124).<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>34</sup> Maurenbrecher: *Constantiam fortitudinemque illam, quae hoc fragmento exponitur, cum nemine tam bene puto convenire, quam cum Sertorio* (49). McGushin (1992): “. . . it could refer to [Sertorius'] determination to persist with his guerrilla tactics despite the odd setback” (179).

<sup>35</sup> McGushin (1992): “Under the command of Titus Didius in Spain he covered himself in glory as a military tribune. In the Marsic War he made himself very useful in the preparation of troops and weaponry; and yet many achievements carried out under his command were left unrecorded, **at first** because he was not a noble, **then** because of the spite of historians” (39). (Words in bold are my corrections of McGushin's translation.) Plutarch gives a fuller account. Early deeds in Spain: *Sert.* 4.3-5. The Social War: *Sert.* 4.1-2.

<sup>36</sup> H. 1.95: *Calpurnius cognomento Lanarius*; H. 1.96: *Salinator in agmine occiditur*; H. 1.97: *Paucos saltum insidentis*. All of which match up with Plutarch's account: *Sert.* 7.1-2. McGushin's translation of H. 1.114: “Sertorius had transformed that pirate emporium into a naval base” (43).

Tactically, Sallust also seems to have described two masterpieces of the art of ambush. First there is the annihilation of Aquinus' force, which Metellus had sent out to forage after the failed siege of the Langobritae: *consedit in valle virgulta nemorosaque* (*H.* 1.120) and *neque se recipere aut instruere proelio quivere* (*H.* 1.121).<sup>37</sup> Servius (*ad Aen.* 3.516) provides us with the first quote, without book number, to compare Sallust's use of *virgultus* for *virgultosus* with Virgil's similar substitution. Priscianus (10.50) includes the second fragment, quoted as from the first book of the *Historiae*, as an example of syncope. Maurenbrecher compares *H.* 120 with a similar passage from Plutarch: δ' ὁ Σερτώριος καὶ προλοχίσας τὴν ὁδόν, ἐπανερχομένῳ τῷ Ἀκύνῳ τρισχιλίους ἄνδρας ἔκ τινος συσκίου χαράδρας ἐπανίστησιν, αὐτὸς δὲ κατὰ στόμα προσβαλὼν τρέπεται, καὶ τοὺς μὲν διαφθείρει, τοὺς δὲ λαμβάνει ζῶντας.<sup>38</sup> Maurenbrecher freely admits his conjectural placement of the second fragment but knows of no better place to attribute the quote in Book 1 (50).

We seem to be on firmer ground with the claim that Sallust sketched out Sertorius' decisive defeat of Pompey at Lauro: *quis a Sertorio triplices insidiae per idoneos saltus positae erant: prima, quae forte venientis exciperet* (*H.* 2.29).<sup>39</sup> Servius (*G.* 2.98) has once again preserved this fragment without book reference in the interest of exploring relative clauses and their antecedents. Maurenbrecher (71) sees hints of these *triplices insidiae* in the ambush at Lauro that Frontinus describes, though he only names Livy as a source for this anecdote: *in uicina silua nocte praedictas copias*

---

<sup>37</sup> McGushin (1992). *H.* 1.120: "He took up a position in a valley covered with brushwood and low trees" (42); *H.* 121: "and they did not have time to withdraw or to array themselves for battle" (42).

<sup>38</sup> Perrin: "But Sertorius learned of this and set an ambush of three thousand men in the road by which Aquinus was to return. These sallied forth from a shady ravine and attacked Aquinus in the rear, while Sertorius himself assailed him in front, routed him, slew some of his men, and took some of them prisoners" (37).

<sup>39</sup> McGushin (1992): "Against them Sertorius had set up three separate ambushes in narrow tracks through the forest which were ideal for the purpose: the first, it was hoped, would pick off the advancing enemy" (48).

*abscondunt, ita ut in prima parte leues Hispanos, aptissimos ad furta bellorum, ponerent, paulo interius scutatos, in remotissimo equites (Strat. 2.5.31).*<sup>40</sup> A triple ambush is so rare that the link seems a fair one to me. Of course, the whole notion of the Sertorian War fails to work unless Sertorius, hero or villain, proved himself no small matter for Metellus and Pompey to conquer.

Sallust describes another aspect of this intelligence by painting Sertorius as a canny reader of his fellow men. From what we can tell of the fragments, he alone of the Marian commanders realized how big a threat Sulla actually posed: *cui nisi pariter obviam iretur (H. 1.92)* and how detrimental to the cause was their soldiers' fraternization with Sulla's: *cuius adversa voluntate colloquio militibus permissa corruptio facta paucorum et exercitus Sullae datus est (H. 1.91).*<sup>41</sup> Donatus (*Eun. 92*) preserves this first fragment, without book attribution, as an example of a similar use of *pariter*. He is similarly unhelpful in citing the second fragment (*Eun. 467*) to show that Terence is using the *colloquium* in its meaning of treating with the enemy. McGushin (1992) makes a convincing argument that these have to do with Sertorius because of similar passages from Plutarch and Exuperantius (161).<sup>42</sup>

Sertorius shows a similar ability to read and control men during his time in Spain. We seem to have a fragment that records a speech given by Sertorius, in indirect discourse, to win over the native Hispanians: *Hispaniam sibi antiquam*

---

<sup>40</sup> C. Bennett: "they hid the above-mentioned forces by night in a neighbouring wood, posting the light-armed Spaniards in front, as best suited to stealthy warfare, the shield-bearing soldiers a little further back, and the cavalry in the rear" (153).

<sup>41</sup> McGushin (1992). *H. 1.92*: "unless counteraction were taken against him in concert" (39); *H. 191*: "when a conference was granted to the troops against his will, a few were corrupted and the army was handed over to Sulla" (40).

<sup>42</sup> Plutarch: ὁ δὲ νεανίας Μάριος ἄκοντος αὐτοῦ παρὰ νόμους ὑπατεῖαν ἔλαβε, Κάρβωνες δὲ καὶ Νωρβανοὶ καὶ Σκιπίωνες ἐπιόντι Σύλλῃ κακῶς ἐπολέμουν, καὶ τὰ μὲν ἀνανδρία καὶ μαλακία τῶν στρατηγῶν ἐφθείρετο (*Sert. 6.1*); τέλος δὲ Σύλλας Σκιπίωνι παραστρατοπεδεύσας καὶ φιλοφρονούμενος, ὡς εἰρήνης ἐσομένης, διέφθειρε τὸ στράτευμα, καὶ ταῦτα προλέγων Σκιπίωνι καὶ διδάσκων Σερτώριος οὐκ ἔπεισε (*Sert. 6.3*). Exuperantius: *parato ualidissimo exercitu processere, et uetante Sertorio colloquia consules permiserunt inter suum et Syllae exercitum; et facta proditio est omnisque exercitus Syllae traditus* (45).

*patriam esse* (*H.* 1.93).<sup>43</sup> While Servius (*ad Aen.* 1.380) does not give the book of this fragment, he does provide us with crucial information. He compares Aeneas calling Italy his *patria* with this very fragment, adding: *sed illic ad laudem pertinet, non ad veritatem*. Clearly Servius read the speaker of this line as someone calling Spain his homeland out of love for the country. Maurenbrecher also agrees that Sertorius is by far the best fit (42). Finally, Sertorius seems entirely capable of handling with exquisite skill a force composed of Hispanian, Roman, and Mauritanian soldiers.<sup>44</sup> Of course, because of the nature of his death, we can safely say that Sertorius was not a perfect judge of character (*H.* 3.83).

Sertorius' nobility is of a curious sort and seems not to be entirely Roman. Although Sallust never uses the word *virtus* in connection with Sertorius in the extant fragments, it is hard to believe that he did not do so in the *Historiae*. As I have already detailed in my introduction, Earl argues that Sallust saw *virtus* as achieved through an exceptional talent performing right-ordered deeds on behalf of the state.<sup>45</sup> Sertorius' early exploits in Spain and during the Social War have already been mentioned. More impressive still—certainly to Sallust and his contemporaries who had just lived through proscriptions at the hands of the Triumvirs—was Sertorius' forbearance during Marius and Cinna's recapture of Rome: *inter arma civilia aequi bonique famas petit* (*H.* 1.90).<sup>46</sup> Seneca (*Ep.* 114.19), unfortunately, quotes this passage only to include it in a list of examples showing good style. That this fragment

<sup>43</sup> McGushin (1992): “that Spain was his ancient motherland” (40).

<sup>44</sup> Sertorius' Mauritanians: *Ac per omnem provinciam magna atque atro<ces famae erant>, cum ex suo quisque terrore quinquaginta aut amplius hostium milia, novas immanis <formas e finibus> Oceani <ap>puls<as>, corporibus hominum vesci contenderent* (*H.* 1.107).

<sup>45</sup> Earl: “The passages just quoted confirm that the essential nature of *virtus* is to be found in conduct and we may now define Sallust's concept of *virtus*, the predominant idea in the prologues, as the functioning of *ingenium* to achieve *egregia facinora*, and thus to win *gloria*, through *bonae artes*. This last factor is of vital importance since the difference between the *bonus* and the *ignavus*, between the man of *virtus* and the man of *ambitio*, lies precisely in the one reaching *gloria* by the exercise of *bonae artes*, the other *dolis atque fallaciis*. Fundamentally this difference is one of *ingenium*” (11).

<sup>46</sup> McGushin (1992): “In the midst of civil war he seeks a reputation for justice and virtue” (39). Tiffou agrees: “Mais Salluste devait surtout apprécier son mépris pour les intrigues et sa *moderatio*” (573).

references Sertorius again rests on Plutarch.<sup>47</sup> No other historical figures present themselves as more credible candidates for showing such moderation during the period the *Historiae* cover.

It also appears that Sertorius retained this moderation in Spain. He seems to have been especially beloved by the Hispanians whom he governed: *modicoque et eleganti imperio percarus fuit* (*H.* 1.94).<sup>48</sup> Our scholiast (*Adnot. supra Luc.* 7.267), uses this passage as a gloss on *modicus*, without mentioning from which book he plucked it.<sup>49</sup> Maurenbrecher cites Plutarch and Exuperantius as reason enough to think that this passage describes Sertorius' rule in Spain (42).<sup>50</sup> Further proof of Sertorius' benevolence is that Sallust also has the Lusitanians, inveterate enemies of Rome, invite him to Spain to lead them against the Sullan governors: *transgressos omnis recipit mons †Belleia praecepta a Lusitanis* (1.105).<sup>51</sup> Plutarch's fuller account makes it clear that Sallust is talking about Sertorius here.<sup>52</sup>

Yet the Sertorius Sallust presents us with does not entirely conform to Earl's rules. *Virtus* is best earned in service to the state. Therein lies true *gloria*, and thus

---

<sup>47</sup> Plutarch: διαπολεμηθέντος δὲ τοῦ πολέμου, καὶ τῶν περὶ τὸν Κίνονα καὶ Μάριον ἐμπορουμένον ὕβρεώς τε καὶ πικρίας ἀπάσης, ὥστε χρυσὸν ἀποδείξειαι Ῥωμαίοις τὰ τοῦ πολέμου κακά, Σερτώριος λέγεται μόνος οὐτ' ἀποκτεῖναι τινα πρὸς ὄργην οὐτ' ἐνυβρίσαι κρατῶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶ Μαρίῳ δυσχεραίνειν, καὶ τὸν Κίνονα ἐντυγχάνων ἰδίᾳ καὶ δεόμενος μετριώτερον ποιεῖν (*Sert.* 5.6).

<sup>48</sup> McGushin (1992): "He was greatly loved for moderation and punctiliousness with which he exercised command" (40).

<sup>49</sup> Although the *modicus* described here is Caesar, and the parallel with Sertorius would fit nicely, grammarians so often pick an unrelated passage as evidence, as my previous examples have shown, that I am unwilling to use this parallelism as evidence.

<sup>50</sup> Plutarch: ἀνελάμβανεν ὁμιλίᾳ τε τοὺς δυνατοὺς καὶ φόρων ἀνέσει τοὺς πολλοὺς μάλιστα δὲ τῶν ἐπισταθμίων ἀπαλλάξας ἠγαπήθη (*Sert.* 6.7); διὰ χειρὸς εἶχε τὰς πόλεις, ἡμέρος μὲν ὦν ἐν ταῖς εἰρηκαῖς χρείας, φοβερὸς δὲ τῇ παρασκευῇ [κατὰ] τῶν πολεμικῶν φαινόμενος (*Sert.* 6.9). Exuperantius: *Sed ubi in provinciam uenit, ita strenue sociorum animos iam deficientes atque alia cupientes in fauorem partium suarum modeste tuendo atque blandiendo perduxit, ut et carus esset et tamen ab omnibus timeretur* (51).

<sup>51</sup> McGushin (1992): "When they had crossed, a mountain, seized in advance by the Lusitanians, gave them all shelter" (41). Plutarch 10.1.

<sup>52</sup> Plutarch: Ἐντεῦθεν ὅποι χρῆ τραπέσθαι βουλευόμενον ἐκάλουν Λυσιτανοὶ πρέσβεις πέμψαντες ἐφ' ἡγεμονίᾳ, πάντως μὲν ἄρχοντος ἀξίωμα μέγα καὶ ἐμπερίαν ἔχοντος δεόμενοι πρὸς τὸν ἀπὸ Ῥωμαίων φόβον, ἐκείνῳ δὲ πιστεύοντες αὐτοὺς μόνῳ, καὶ πυνθανόμενοι παρὰ τῶν συγγεγονότων τὸ ἦθος αὐτοῦ (*Sert.* 10.1).

Sallust's insistence in the prologue of the *Bellum Catilinae* on the utility of writing history.<sup>53</sup> There is a quality of pacifism inherent in the *moderatio* of Sertorius not entirely in keeping with either the traditional Roman aristocratic ethos, or the modified version that Sallust advocates. This quality is perhaps hinted at early in his career—*togam paludamento mutavit* (*H.* 1.87)—although the phrase absolutely removed from context could be Sertorius simply reaching the age of military service or preparing to go on any of his numerous campaigns.<sup>54</sup> Although Servius (*G.* 1.8), the scholiast to Juvenal (Schol. *In Iuv.* 6.400), and Isidore (*Etym.* 19.24.9) all preserve this fragment, only Isidore helps with the context, since he refers to the *paludamentum* as the cloak of the emperor. There is also no match with Plutarch. Maurenbrecher only thinks that the fragment fits with Sertorius' character, not that it demands identification.<sup>55</sup>

Most often cited as proof of this pacifist streak is Sertorius' desire to leave the wars and settle in the Isles of the Blessed: *traditur fugam in Oceani longinqua agitavisse* (*H.* 1.102).<sup>56</sup> Servius (*Aen.* 2.640) only quotes this passage to bring in a similar usage of *agitare*; however, he later mentions (*Aen.* 5.735): *Secundum philosophos elysium est insulae fortunatae, quas ait Sallustius inclitas esse Homeri carminibus* (*H.* 1.101).<sup>57</sup> Plutarch and Florus also speak of Sertorius' desire to settle in the Blessed Isles, making the attribution of these fragments to the Sertorius narrative almost certain.<sup>58</sup> Based on the Scholia to Horace's *Epode 16*, McGushin (1992) argues

<sup>53</sup> *Pulchrum est bene facere rei publicae, etiam bene dicere haud absurdum est; uel pace uel bello clarum fieri licet; et qui fecere et qui facta aliorum scripsere multi laudantur* (*BC* 4.1).

<sup>54</sup> McGushin (1992): “He exchanged the toga for a military cloak” (39).

<sup>55</sup> Maurenbrecher: *Ad Q. Sertorium haec apte referrri posse intellexit Dietsch* (40).

<sup>56</sup> McGushin (1992): “It is said that he had planned a flight to distant stretches of Ocean” (41).

<sup>57</sup> McGushin (1992): “According to the philosophers Elysium is the Fortunate Isles which, says Sallust, have been celebrated in the songs of Homer” (40).

<sup>58</sup> Plutarch: Ἐνταῦθα ναῦται τινες ἐντυγχάνουσιν αὐτῶ, νέον ἐκ τῶν Ἀτλαντικῶν νήσων ἀναπεπλευκότες, αἱ δύο μὲν εἰσι, λεπτῶ παντάπασι πορθμῶ διαιρούμεναι, μυρίουσ δ' ἀπέχουσαι Λιβύης σταδίουσ, καὶ ὀνομάζονται Μακάρων (*Sert.* 8.2); Ταῦθ' ὁ Σερτώριος ἀκούσας ἔρωτα θαυμαστὸν ἔσχεν οἰκῆσαι τὰς νήσους καὶ ζῆν ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ, τυραννίδος ἀπαλλαγείσ καὶ πολέμων ἀπαύστων (*Sert.* 9.1). Florus: *iam Balearibus insulis fortunam expertus usque in Oceanum Fortunatasque insulas penetravit consiliis* (2.10.2).

that Sallust most probably painted Sertorius' desire as coming from despair following his initial defeat in Spain, but he seems to have over-interpreted the scholiast. The scholiast's comment reads: *In quo sunt Insulae Fortunatae, ad quas Sallustius in historia dicit uictum uoluisse ire Sertorium* (Schol. in Hor. Epod. 16.41). While one may take the participle *victum* as causal, no overriding reason presents itself. Temporal makes equal sense. While despair may be the overriding emotion of Epode 16, it arises out of civil war, not defeat.<sup>59</sup>

Plutarch attributes Sertorius' proposed settlement of the Blessed Isles to a longing for peace, not deep dejection, and highlights this desire by contrasting it with the thoughts of the Cilician pirates:

Ταῦθ' ὁ Σερτώριος ἀκούσας ἔρωτα θαυμαστὸν ἔσχεν οἰκῆσαι  
τὰς νήσους καὶ ζῆν ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ, τυραννίδος ἀπαλλαγῆς καὶ  
πολέμων ἀπαύστων. αἰσθόμενοι δ' οἱ Κίλικες, οὐθὲν εἰρήνης  
δεόμενοι καὶ σχολῆς, ἀλλὰ πλούτου καὶ λαφύρων, εἰς Λιβύην  
ἀπέπλευσαν, Ἄσκαλιν τὸν Ἰφθα κατὰξοντες ἐπὶ τὴν  
Μαυρουσίῳ Βασιλείᾳ (Sert. 9.1-2).<sup>60</sup>

While Plutarch may be clear about his account, we cannot necessarily take him to be transmitting Sallust's description accurately. It is exactly in this kind of character-building scene that Plutarch is most likely to create original material. Plutarch's use of ἡσυχία presents a potential problem, since Sallust sees *otium* not for rest but as an

---

<sup>59</sup> McGushin (1992): "Sallust himself had acted on such feelings and his attribution of similar thoughts to Sertorius could well be simply rationalizing on his part even though the scholiast on Horace, *Epod.* 16, states that Sallust put Sertorius' decision to 'get away' in a context of dejection about his defeat" (166-167).

<sup>60</sup> Perrin: "When Sertorius heard this tale, he was seized with an amazing desire to dwell in the islands and live in quiet, freed from tyranny and wars that would never end. The Cilicians, however, who did not want peace or leisure, but wealth and spoils, when they were aware of his desire, sailed away to Africa, to restore Ascalis the son of Iphtha to the throne of Maurusia" (23).

opportunity for gainful employment.<sup>61</sup> Πολέμων ἀπαύστων, in any case, should never be the attitude of a Roman aristocrat. Despite the peril of following Plutarch, this desire for quiet would show Sertorius to be free from the stain of *ambitio*, whose presence had signaled the beginning of the end of the Republic. The key to this passage then may be that Sertorius wages war neither out of blood lust nor a desire for domination. Such an interpretation would go far in combating Sertorius' ancient detractors who would have been arguing that he set up a state hostile to Rome and intent on its destruction.

While we do not have any real measure of the character of Sertorius while he served in Spain—the most significant portion of his life—there are two extensive fragments concerning the generals against whom he fought. Sallust paints an almost laughable picture of Metellus after his triumph at Segontia, his first real victory over Sertorius. Following a list of absurd luxuries (including a statue of the goddess Victoria), accompanied by artificial thunder, putting a crown on his head, Sallust offers his judgment: *quis rebus aliquantam partem gloriae dempserat, maxime apud veteres et sanctos viros superba illa, gravia, indigna Romano imperio aestimantis* (*H.* 2.70).<sup>62</sup> Earl rightly links this condemnation with the new luxury introduced by Sulla that marked the final stage of Rome's decline (106).<sup>63</sup> Metellus, of course, was a *nobilis* of the bluest blood and a right hand man of Sulla. Even if Sallust did not draw

---

<sup>61</sup> Sallust: *Igitur ubi animus ex multis miseriis atque periculis requieuit et mihi relictam aetatem a re publica procul habendam decreui, non fuit consilium socordia atque desidia bonum otium contere, neque uero agrum colundo aut uenando, seruilibus officii intentum aetatem agere* (BC 4.1).

<sup>62</sup> McGushin (1992): “With this kind of behaviour Metellus was diminished in his glory to a considerable extent, especially in the estimation of men of the old Roman type, men of irreproachable character who judged such an attitude as arrogant, unsupportable, and unworthy of the authority of Rome” (54).

<sup>63</sup> After Sulla had corrupted his army in Asia and then sacked Rome without mercy, Sallust writes: *Postquam diuitiae honori esse coepere et eas gloria imperium potentia sequebatur, hebescere uirtu, paupertas probro haberi, innocentia pro maleuolentia duci coepit. Igitur ex diuitiis iuuentutem luxuria atque auaritia cum superbia inuasere: rapere consumere, sua parui pendere, aliena cupere, pudorem pudicitiam, diuina atque humana promiscua, nihil pensi neque moderati habere* (12.1-2).

the explicit comparison, one can easily contrast these excesses with the guerrilla leader's numerous victories with not even a remotely similar celebration.

Sallust's hatred of Pompey is well known, with even the few extant fragments making this attitude clear.<sup>64</sup> We have two fragments from what seem to be Sallust's initial character sketch. In his brief biography of Lenaeus, a freedman of Pompey and one of his personal historians, Suetonius writes (*Gram.* 15): *ut Lenaeus . . . Sallustium historicum, quod eum (scil. Pompeium) oris probri, animo inverecondo scripsisset, acerbissima satira laceraverit (H. 2.16).*<sup>65</sup> Donatus (*Ter. Phorm.* 170), providing a gloss on *moderatus*, records that the following quote is from Book 2 of the *Historiae*: *Modestus ad alia omnia, nisi ad dominationem (2.17).*<sup>66</sup> Maurenbrecher correctly states that this fragment should be read in reference to Pompey (66).<sup>67</sup> Finally, Nonius (239.3) ascribes this quote to the third book: *Sed Pompeius a prima adulescentia sermone fautorum similem fore se credens Alexandro regi, facta consultaque eius quidem aemulus erat (3.88).*<sup>68</sup> Thus both before and after the Sertorian War, Pompey showed signs of his lust for power.

For Pompey's character during the Sertorian War, we must rely on the general's famous letter to the Senate. While asking for much needed money and supplies, Pompey practically threatens the Senate openly: *Itaque meo et hostium exercitui par condicio est; namque stipendium neutri datur, victor uterque in Italiam venire potest.*

---

<sup>64</sup> Gillis: “. . . Pompey, who Sallust hated probably more than any other figure in Roman history” (714); Syme: “For malice against Pompeius, the *Historiae* offered opportunity ever and again, gladly taken” (212); McGushin is more tempered (1992): “That the historian's strong feelings led him to concentrate only on the negative side of Pompeius' activity cannot be dogmatically asserted, but it remains a strong possibility” (18).

<sup>65</sup> McGushin (1992): “so that Lenaeus . . . savaged Sallust the historian in a bitter satire because he had written of him [Pompeius] as noble of countenance, shameless in character” (47).

<sup>66</sup> McGushin (1992): “moderate in all things except in his thirst for power” (47).

<sup>67</sup> Seneca provides further help: *Nihil erat mollius ore Pompei: numquam non coram pluribus rubuit, utique in contionibus (11.4).*

<sup>68</sup> McGushin (1994): “But Pompeius from his early manhood, being influenced by the flattery of his admirers, believed that he would be the equal of king Alexander; what is more, he sought to rival his deeds and his plans” (39).

*Quod ego vos moneo quaesoque, ut animadvertatis neu cogatis necessitatibus privatim mihi consulere* (H. 2.98.7-8).<sup>69</sup> Summarizing the effect of the letter, Syme writes: “The document discloses chill ambition, boasting, menace and mendacity” (201). McGushin (1992) has similar views and details them line-by-line in his commentary (247).<sup>70</sup> Pompey also comes off very poorly in comparison to his adversary, who appears to have suffered through far more difficult straits with far more equanimity until, perhaps, the very end.

The portrait we have of Sertorius, then, is entirely positive. He was a skilled and clever soldier, shrewd in his reading of others and possessed of innate nobility with a strong desire for peace. While this reading is possible, I would argue that it is more a function of our surviving fragments than Sallust's intent. We unfortunately have not a single remaining passage from the crisis Sertorius went through as his subordinates failed and were killed, he himself lost battles outright, and then descended into tyranny, a fall which even the laudatory Plutarch captures. Sertorius' death scene presents hints that Sallust wrote something of this fall: *Igitur discubere: Sertorius inferior in medio, super eum L. Fabius Hispaniensis senator ex proscriptis, in summo Antonius et infra scriba Sertorii Versius, et alter scriba Maecenas in imo medius inter Tarquitium et dominum Perpernam* (H. 3.83).<sup>71</sup> McGushin (1994) notes that Tarquitius was very close to Sertorius, which the two secretaries must have been

---

<sup>69</sup> McGushin (1992): “Thus the situation of my army and that of the enemy is the same: for neither is being paid and either, if victorious, can march into Italy. I draw your attention to this state of affairs and ask you to take notice of it and not to force me to solve my difficulties by abandoning the interests of the state for my own” (59). Kraus notes how this threat actually compares both generals to Hannibal (37-38).

<sup>70</sup> Cf. Earl: “There seems to be no such hidden significance in the letter of Pompey. It is bold, forthright and overbearing, as would be expected from a young man of Pompey's previous history, but there appears to be no trace of the 'animus inverecundus' which Sallust saw as his chief characteristic, unless he meant to imply that Pompey's payment of his army from his own private resources was, in fact, due to *ambitio*” (109).

<sup>71</sup> McGushin (1994): “And so they took their places at the table, Sertorius on the lower side of the middle couch with L. Fabius Hispaniensis, one of the proscribed senators, above him; on the couch to the left of the middle couch were Antonius and Sertorius' secretary Versius; the other secretary, Maecenas, was on the bottom couch between Tarquitius and the master of the house, Perperna” (38).

as well. Antonius' position is unclear, but Fabius joined Sertorius on his own before Perperna arrived (128-30). Such a wide-ranging conspiracy, including intimates, would be hard to attribute solely to the jealousy of Perperna. A whole chain of events is missing from the fragments.

Since the fragments explain this key transition in Sertorius' life so poorly, the first step towards trying to get a handle on what Sallust wrote is to make a comparison with the later historians. Plutarch's treatment offers a suspiciously superficial treatment of the whole affair. Early in his *Life* Plutarch speaks briefly of the murder of the hostages but only to defend his subject.<sup>72</sup> Plutarch later chalks up the desertion of the Hispanian tribes to treasonous Romans unhappy with Sertorius' lack of noble birth, which events finally force Sertorius' hand into an evil deed.<sup>73</sup> The *Periochae* of Livy do not mention anything about hostages, but add another vice. Sertorius was a *magnus dux et adversus . . . ad ultimum et saevus and prodigus* (96).<sup>74</sup> Appian mentions the desertion only of Roman soldiers to Metellus and Sertorius' resulting harsh treatment of the remainder.<sup>75</sup> The hostages at Osca make no appearance, but Sertorius' life again ends in dissolution, anger, and cruelty.<sup>76</sup> Appian reads like an elaboration of Livy's apparent concluding remarks. Florus, Orosius, and Exuperantius mention only the treachery of Perperna; there is no untoward behavior on Sertorius' part.<sup>77</sup> Their highly compressed narratives, however, make this fact mean less than it

---

<sup>72</sup> Plutarch *Sert.* 10.5-7.

<sup>73</sup> Plutarch: οἱ δὲ πεμπόμενοι ταῦτα θεραπεύειν καὶ ἀποπραίνειν ἐπανήρχοντο πλείονας ἐχειργασμένοι πολέμους καὶ τὰς ὑπαρχούσας ἠὲ ξηρότερες ἀπειθείας, ὥστε τὸν Σερτώριον ἐκ τῆς προτέρας ἐπικαιρίας καὶ πραότητος μεταβαλόντα περὶ τοὺς ἐν Ὀσκη τρεφομένους παρανομήσαι παῖδας τῶν Ἰβηρῶν, τοὺς μὲν ἀνελόντα, τοὺς δ' ἀποδόμενον (*Sert.* 25.5-6).

<sup>74</sup> Schlesinger: "a great leader . . . but towards the end savage and prodigal" (119).

<sup>75</sup> Appian *BC* 113.

<sup>76</sup> Appian: ὁ δὲ Σερτώριος βλάπτοντος ἤδη τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν μὲν ἐπὶ τοῖς πράγμασι πόνον ἐκὼν μεθεῖ, τὰ πολλὰ δ' ἦν ἐπὶ τρυφῆς, γυναιξὶ καὶ κώμοις καὶ πότοις σχολάζων. Ὅθεν ἡσῶτο συνεχῶς. Καὶ γεγένητο ὀργὴν τε ἄκρος δι' ὑπονοίας ποικίλας καὶ ὠμότατος ἐς κόλασιν καὶ ὑπόπτῃς ἐς ἅπαντας (*BC* 113).

<sup>77</sup> Florus: 2.10. 8; Orosius: 5.23; Exuperantius: 54-55.

might, though it does make clear that these authors viewed the treachery of Perperna as the salient feature of this episode.

These accounts do not present an obvious solution to our problem. Since Plutarch does mention the killing of the hostages at Osca, we can fairly safely assume this act did take place in Sallust. The alleged sabotage of his rebellious Roman officers also looks like some kind of cover up for Sertorius' own harsh actions, though one could perhaps attribute that to the deception of Sallust rather than Plutarch.<sup>78</sup> Gillis (725-726) rightly points out that Sertorius' mistreatment of his Roman soldiers makes little sense even within Appian's own narrative, since they so quickly mourn his death and nearly turn on Perperna (*BC* 114). The sudden addiction to luxury does not seem to fit in with the rest of Sallust's reconstructed narrative, while the lack of even a rebuttal in Plutarch makes me suspect that Sertorius as *prodigus* is an example of the *invidia* of the previous historians (*H.1.88*).

Aside from looking at the later historians, we can also examine figures in Sallust who had a similar fall. Syme criticizes Plutarch for his superficial sketch of Sertorius and suggests that Jugurtha might provide a similar model.<sup>79</sup> Jugurtha, however, hardly fits. As I will explain in greater detail later, it is hard to see when Jugurtha exactly gives way to his darker nature. Sallust paints a glowing picture of Jugurtha, his deeds at Numantia, and his friendship with Scipio.<sup>80</sup> We are then told of the unscrupulous Romans, *nobiles* and *novi homines*, who tell Jugurtha that he should be king after Micipsa and that all things are available at Rome for a price. Sallust

---

<sup>78</sup> Plutarch: τοιοῦτων ἀναπιμπλάμενοι λόγων οἱ πολλοὶ φανερώς μὲν οὐκ ἀφίσταντο, δεδοικότες αὐτοῦ τὴν δύναμιν, κρύφα δὲ τὰς τε πράξεις ἐλυμαίνοντο καὶ τοὺς βαρβάρους ἐκάκουν, κολάζοντες πικρῶς καὶ δασμολογοῦντες ὡς Σερτωρίου κελεύοντος. ἐξ ὧν ἀποστάσεις ἐγίνοντο καὶ ταραχαὶ περὶ τὰς πόλεις (*Sert.* 25.4).

<sup>79</sup> Syme: "Something else is missing, the psychological penetration of Sallust. Would he not have been alert to mark the turn in Sertorius' fortunes and trace the tragic degeneration of an active and ambitious temperament (comparable to Jugurtha), impatient under defeat, exacerbated by desertion and driven to live under constant fear?" (204).

<sup>80</sup> *BI* 6-7.

shows no reaction on Jugurtha's part.<sup>81</sup> It is only after Jugurtha's return, his adoption by Micipsa, and the self-serving deathbed speech of Micipsa that we learn that Jugurtha has changed: *Ad ea Iugurtha, tametsi regem ficta locutum intellegebat et ipse longe aliter animo agitabat, tamen pro tempore benigne respondit* (11.1).<sup>82</sup> What follows is bribery, treachery, and fratricide. There is no access into Jugurtha's mind, no depiction of the process of his becoming a villain from a noble savage. It is almost as if Rome carries a contagion that infects all who come in contact with it, which cannot serve as a viable model for Sertorius. He had been part of the Roman political scene since his youth and still seems in his middle age, despite the horrors of civil war, to have preserved his virtuous character.

Marius and Sulla would seem to provide better examples, since they too served Rome honorably before resorting to civil war, mass slaughter, and tyranny. Of Marius, Sallust describes his fall from *virtus*, albeit sparingly: *Tamen is ad id locorum talis uir—nam postea ambitione praeceps datus est—consulatum adpetere non audebat* (BI 63.6).<sup>83</sup> *Ambitio*, however, as we have already discussed, is not a fault from which Sertorius seems to have suffered. If he did develop that flaw, then it was late in coming, not to mention of little sense since he was already in control of his forces. Sallust is unfortunately, if effectively, laconic on Sulla's later career: *nam postea quae fecerit, incertum habeo pudeat an pigeat magis disserere* (95.4).<sup>84</sup> The prologue to the *Historiae* almost certainly had a fuller description of the dictator's character, but that section was lost.

---

<sup>81</sup> BI 8.1.

<sup>82</sup> Rolfe: "Although Jugurtha knew that the king spoke insincerely, and though he had very different designs in his own mind, yet he returned a gracious answer, suited to the occasion" (151).

<sup>83</sup> Rolfe: "Nevertheless, although he had up to that time shown himself so admirable a man (for afterwards he was driven headlong by ambition), he did not venture to aspire to the consulship" (271-273).

<sup>84</sup> Rolfe: "As to what he did later, I know not if one should speak of it rather with shame or with sorrow" (343).

Metellus' reaction to the Roman people's decision to allot command over the Jugurthine War to the newly elected Marius might provide the best parallel to Sertorius:

Quibus rebus supra bonum aut honestum percussus neque lacrimas tenere neque moderari linguam, uir egregius in aliis artibus nimis molliter aegritudinem pati. Quam rem alii in superbiam uortebant, alii bonum ingenium contumelia ad censusum esse, multi quod iam parta uictoria ex manibus eriperetur: nobis satis cognitum est illum magis honore Mari quam iniuria sua excruciatum neque tam anxie laturum fuisse si adempta prouincia alii quam Mario traderetur (*BI* 82.2-3).<sup>85</sup>

The results, of course, vary in scale. Metellus throws a glorified temper tantrum, whereas even Plutarch admits that Sertorius kills the hostages at Osca. Still, both generals, otherwise honorable men (Metellus is *egregius in aliis artibus*), deal poorly with unexpected situations suddenly arising beyond their control. However, other differences do remain. Metellus, in Sallust's opinion, cannot handle his former subordinate, a *novus homo* no less, receiving his command. The humble-born Sertorius is unlikely to have suffered from the same defect. Anger or despair, resulting from the Hispanian tribes switching their loyalty to Pompey, presents a better alternative. Jugurtha's assassination of Hiempsal, spurred on by his insults, provides a slight parallel, though the situation, once again, lacks the severity of Sertorius'.<sup>86</sup> We

---

<sup>85</sup> Rolfe: "He was more affected by this news than was right or becoming, neither refraining from tears nor bridling his tongue; although he had the other qualities of a great man, he showed little fortitude in bearing mortification. Some attributed his conduct on this occasion to arrogance; others declared that a noble spirit had been exasperated by insult; many thought that it was due to the fact that the victory which he had already won was snatched from his grasp. Personally, I feel confident that he was tormented more by the honour done to Marius than by the affront to himself, and that he would have felt less annoyance if the province had been taken from him to be given to any other man than Marius" (305-307).

<sup>86</sup> Sallust: *Quod uerbum in pectus Iugurthae altius quam quisquam ratus erat descendit. Itaque ex eo tempore ira et metu anxius moliri, parare atque ea modo cum animo habere quibus Hiempsal per dolium caperetur. Quae ubi tardius procedunt neque lenitur animus ferox, statuit quouis modo inceptum perficere* (*BI* 11.7-9).

need not necessarily believe that Sallust's inclusion of the murder of the Oscan hostages serves as proof of hostility towards Sertorius. After taking the Numidian city of Capsa, Marius kills those whose surrender he had accepted for pragmatic reasons, which Sallust not only does not condemn, but even seems to approve.<sup>87</sup>

The scholarly consensus sees Sallust as portraying a flawed but ultimately positive Sertorius.<sup>88</sup> Gillis offers a spirited objection: “In the *Historiae* there is no indication that Sallust cooled on Sertorius as the war went on” (715). However, Gillis seems to make too much of the parallels between Sertorius and Caesar, while seeing Sallust still primarily as a partisan of Caesar, which the *Bellum Iugurthinum* seems to argue against explicitly.<sup>89</sup> Tiffou follows the general consensus but wisely warns the modern historian against reading too much into the scanty evidence from our conception of Sallust's political biases before noting what he sees as the true import of the Sertorius episode: “Après avoir écrasé Sertorius, Pompée va, d'illégalité en illégalité, préparer la fin des institutions républicaines et ruiner les quelques espoirs de retrouver une stabilité politique qui apparaît de plus en plus comme un mythe” (575).

Where Plutarch stops at the moral analysis of the individual, using Sertorius as an example of noble nature overthrown by events because of a lack of philosophical grounding (*Sert.* 10.6-7), I argue that Sallust would have carried his analysis further, using the case of Sertorius to further the tragedy befalling the Roman state. It is in this context that a fallen Sertorius makes the most sense. Sallust would have offered the picture of a great man, and also a good man, thwarted by the excesses of Sulla and his followers, driven and forced to fight against the state he loved, and finally turning to

---

<sup>87</sup> Sallust: *Id facinus contra ius belli non auaritia neque scelere consulis admissum, sed qui locus Iugurthae opportunus, nobis aditu difficilis, genus hominum mobile infidum, ante neque beneficio neque metu coercitum* (BI 91.7).

<sup>88</sup> Syme offers a good summary (204-205).

<sup>89</sup> Gillis: 714; Sallust: *Nam ui quidem regere patriam aut parentis, quamquam et possis et delicta corrigas, tamen inopportunum est, quom praesertim omnes rerum mutationes caedem, fugam aliaque hostilia portendant* (BI 3.2).

despair and violence as defeat became inevitable. We would thus have seen a mostly positive and always sympathetic portrayal of Sertorius, though Sallust would have disapproved of the actions Sertorius took towards the end of his life.

### Chapter Three: Spartacus

Just as the Sertorian War began to tilt irreversibly in favor of the Roman generals, Spartacus and his fellow slaves escaped from their master and started their revolt. Sallust seems to have allotted a major portion of the *Historiae* to the Spartacus War. According to McGushin (1994), the narratives would have taken up substantial portions of Books 3 and 4 (12). The much-mutilated Vatican Fragments (*H* 3.96, 98), which depict a relatively minor episode of the war, show just how extensive Sallust's account was. What remains is thirty-four possible fragments, of which only the two Vatican Fragments are of any length.<sup>90</sup> From these thirty-four I have found ten, most of them less than a line, relevant towards ascertaining Sallust's view of Spartacus. The speculative nature of my undertaking for this figure becomes clear.

For the Spartacus War, once again Plutarch (*Crassus* 8-11) and Appian (*BC* 116-20) provide the best narratives, while fortunately seeming to base their accounts primarily on the *Historiae* (McGushin (1994) 110). The later sources, Florus and Orosius, are less detailed and seem to have come from a different tradition, which McGushin has identified as senatorial, probably Livian, because of its hostility to Spartacus (111). Thus when looking for parallels to Sallust's fragments in later authors, I will privilege Plutarch and Appian. Stampacchia, however, notes the impracticality of relegating an author to the realm of a single tradition.<sup>91</sup> Since these two authors used more than one source in the composition of their works, aside from their own particular historiographical foibles, we cannot necessarily take even events

---

<sup>90</sup> Stampacchia conveniently collects these fragments into a single place (168-74).

<sup>91</sup> Stampacchia: "In contrasto con queste formulazioni, il nostro esame spinge a negare la possibilità di una catalogazione delle fonti in gruppi omogenei, etichettati con l'una o l'altra ascendenza. Non esistono due soli autori che combacino tra loro in tutta la relazione della guerra, anche a non tener conto di quelle differenze imputabili a confusioni o errori (parlo naturalmente dei resoconti di una certa estensione, poiché i brevissimi non offrono la base per questo discorso)" (152).

common to both Appian and Plutarch as proof that the *Historiae* also contained this information.

Despite these problems, Spartacus does come across, if not as a coherent personality, at least as having the seeds of one. By reading through the extant fragments of the *Historiae*, I have arrived at four characteristics present in the Spartacus whom Sallust presents: courage, physical strength, mental acuity, and personal nobility.

Relatively easy to establish is Spartacus' courage. Our first fragment seems to refer to Spartacus among the group of escaped gladiators: *sin vis obsistat, ferro quam fame aequius perituros* (*H* 3.93). Servius (*Aen.* 3.265) quotes this passage, without attributing the book, in order to show that Sallust also agrees with Virgil on the horrors of hunger. Maurenbrecher seems to be alluding to the slaves' escape from Vesuvius for his placement of the fragment, though he does not say so directly (148).<sup>92</sup> The later historians do not give a clear echo of the language. Frontinus, Plutarch, and Florus speak only of a siege.<sup>93</sup> An investment by Clodius' overwhelming force would put Spartacus and the gladiators into the kind of situation that this fragment describes, though that may be a slender reed on which to base the placement of this fragment.

The second example of Spartacus' courage comes from his noble death: *haud impigre neque inultus occiditur* (*H* 4.41).<sup>94</sup> Donatus (*Ter. Andr.* 205) quoted this passage, without a book reference, because of the double negative. Maurenbrecher (172) compares this fragment to Plutarch's version: τέλος δὲ φευγόντων τῶν περὶ αὐτὸν, αὐτὸς ἐστῶς καὶ κυκλωθεὶς ὑπὸ πολλῶν, ἀμυνόμενος κατεκόπη (*Crass.*

---

<sup>92</sup> Maurenbrecher: *etenim a verbis sin vis obsistat iure elicias antecessisse quaedam, quibus doli alicuius consilia continerentur.*

<sup>93</sup> Plutarch: Κλωδίου στρατηγοῦ μετὰ τισχιλίων πεμφθέντος ἐκ Ἰώμης καὶ πολιορκουῦντος αὐτοῦς (*Crass.* 9.2). Frontinus: *Idem, in Vesuio [Spartacus] obsessus* (*Strat.* 1.5.21). Florus: *Ibi cum obsiderentur a Clodio Glabro* (2.8.4).

<sup>94</sup> McGushin (1994) provides an admirable translation: “. . . if on the other hand they were to encounter resistance, they would die by the sword rather than by starvation” (34).

11.10).<sup>95</sup> Each passage describes a man fighting to the last, but there are no precise verbal echoes. Since Appian and Florus also include heroic death scenes, it does not seem too far a stretch to argue, regardless of whether these precise words describe Spartacus, that Sallust did include him dying bravely in the final battle against Crassus.<sup>96</sup>

Physical strength is, of course, necessary for a gladiator. One might also argue that the previous two fragments indicate a certain amount of strength, especially *impigre neque inultus*. Arusianus Messius has preserved a fragment he references as from Book 3 of Sallust's *Historiae: ingens virium atque animi* (H 3.91).<sup>97</sup> However, since Arusianus was interested only in the genitives depending on *ingens*, he provides no other hint to the correct attribution of these words. Maurenbrecher (147-8) argues from the lack of other people suitable for this description but more from a similar passage by Plutarch that this fragment refers to Spartacus: ὦν ἦν Σπάρτακος, ἀνήρ Θραῦ τοῦ Μαιδικοῦ γένους, οὐ μόνον φρόνημα μέγα καὶ ῥώμην ἔχων, ἀλλὰ καὶ συνέσι καὶ πραότητι τῆς τύχης ἀμείνων καὶ τοῦ γένους Ἑλληνικώτερος (*Crass.* 8.3).<sup>98</sup> McGushin (1994) also agrees for the same reason (114). The close correlation between φρόνημα μέγα καὶ ῥώμην ἔχων and *ingens virium atque animi* makes this

---

<sup>95</sup> Perrin: “Finally, after his companions had taken to flight, he stood alone, surrounded by a multitude of foes, and was still defending himself when he was cut down” (349).

<sup>96</sup> Appian: τιτρώσεται ἐς τὸν μηρὸν ὁ Σπάρτακος δορατιῶ καὶ συγκάμψας τὸ γόνυ καὶ προβαλὼν τὴν ἀσπίδα πρὸς τοὺς ἐπιόντας ἀπεμάχετο, μέχρι καὶ αὐτὸς καὶ πολὺ πλῆθος ἀμφ’ αὐτὸν κυκλωθέντες ἔπεσον (120). Florus: *Spartacus ipse in primo agmine fortissime dimicans quasi imperator occisus est* (2.8.14).

<sup>97</sup> *Vires* appears in the Sallustian corpus eight times: *BC* 1.3; *BI* 1.4, 6.1; *H* 1.18, 3.17, 3.23, 3.48.19, 3.91 (Bennett 277). If we leave aside the fragment in question (*H* 3.91) *vires* clearly means “strength” five times. The other two uses are metaphorical, although *H* 1.18 (*Et relatus inconditae olim vitae mos, ut omne ius in viribus esset.*) is more clearly related to physical force than *H* 3.17 (*Male iam adsuetum ad omnis vis controversiarum.*). The lack of context and pairing of *virium* with *animi* would seem to place fragment *H* 3.91 firmly in the literal meaning of the word. It is important to note that while *vis* can mean violence, though Sallust also uses it to just mean “force” (*BC* 1.2), *vires* in his works appears to be neutral, e.g. *At illi, quibus vires aderant, cuncti ruere ad portas, inconditi tendere* (*H*. 3.23).

<sup>98</sup> Shaw: “Spartacus was a Thracian born from the people called the Maudi. He not only possessed a great spirit and bodily strength, but he was more intelligent and nobler than his fate, and he was more Greek than his [Thracian] background might indicate” (131-132).

connection especially strong. Also, as I have already shown (and will do again shortly below), Sallust constantly refers to the opposition between mind and body in his character sketches.

Regarding Spartacus' intellectual power, there are far more examples. First, we turn again to the passage which was probably part of Sallust's initial character sketch: *ingens virium atque animi* (*H.* 3.91). McGushin (1994), contrary to all expectation, translates it as: “He was endowed with an outstanding measure of strength and courage” (34). While *animus* can mean courage, when Sallust pairs the term with some kind of word denoting physicality, he is using it more in the sense of “intellect.”<sup>99</sup> Aside from this introductory material, there is only one other instance where Spartacus is directly mentioned with regard to superior thinking. Sallust tells us that regarding Spartacus' plan of leaving quickly after sacking a village: *pauci prudentes probare* as opposed to the *pars sto<lide copi>is adfluenti<bus ferocique inge>nio fides, ali<i inhones>te patriae immem<ores, at plur>imi servili <indole nihil> ultra prae<dam et crudelit>atem <appetere>* (*H.* 3.98).<sup>100</sup> The wise, then, side with Spartacus. We might also add that Spartacus was able to move his force in such away that: *pervenit ad Anni forum ignaris cultoribus* (*H.* 3.98).<sup>101</sup> Fragment *H.* 3.98 is the second the two Vatican fragments, whose length easily shows that they deal with the Spartacus narrative.

The other examples of strategic ability are not explicitly attributed to any particular man. We are told in the first Vatican Fragment (*H.* 3.96) that the escaped

---

<sup>99</sup> General opposition of mind and body: *nostra omnis vis in animo et corpore* (BC 1.2); *ne per otium torpescerent manus aut animus* (BC 16.3); *genus hominum compositum ex corpore et animo est* (BI 2.1). In specific personages: Catiline—*fuit magna vi et animi et corporis* (BC 5.1); Jugurtha—*pollens viribus, decora facie, sed multo maxime ingenio validus* (BI 6.1); Bestia—*in consule nostro multae bonaque artes et animi et corporis quas omnis auaritia praepediebat: patiens laborum, acri ingenio, satis prouidens, belli haud ignarus, firmissimus contra pericula et invidias* (BI 28.5).

<sup>100</sup> McGushin (1994): “Others, however, stupidly relying on the reinforcements pouring in and on their own fighting spirit, some dishonourably unmindful of their country, but the majority, induced by their servile nature, looked for nothing more than booty and the opportunity to indulge their cruelty” (36).

<sup>101</sup> McGushin (1994): “He reached Forum Anni at dawn, unknown to the rural inhabitants” (36).

slaves make spears out of fire-hardened wood and trick the praetor Varinius by putting dummies in their camp to afford them the opportunity to escape.<sup>102</sup> As their leader, it is hard to believe that Spartacus would not have been responsible for, if not the originator of, at least the second of these two actions. Finally, there are two more fragmentary examples. First is the rather ambiguous sentence: *Cossinius in proxima villa fonte lavabatur* (*H* 3.94).<sup>103</sup> Plutarch provides the context for this fragment: Spartacus almost caught the praetor Cossinius as he was bathing.<sup>104</sup> The story is so odd and the correspondence so close that it hard to believe that that we are not dealing with the same event, even though Cledonius does not cite the book and quotes the passage to show that *lavare* has the same meaning in both its active and passive forms (383.18).

The final possible example of Spartacus' military acumen consists of two fragments that appear to part of the passage describing his breakout from Crassus' siege in Bruttium: *frigida nocte* (*H* 4.35) and *infrequentem stationem nostram incuriosamque tum ab armis* (*H* 4.36).<sup>105</sup> The Bern Scholiast (*G*. 4.104) quotes Sallust, without book attribution, to compare his use of *frigida nocte* to Virgil's *frigida tecta*. Maurenbrecher's placement of the fragment here is logical but conjectural. There were undoubtedly many cold nights during the period the *Historiae* cover. Arusianus (330) provides us with the second of the two fragments and reports that it is from Book IV but offers no other information. His interest was piqued by the ablative of separation depending on *incuriosus*. Maurenbrecher desires this placement of the fragment for lack of a similar situation in Book 4 (171). Both passages, if they are

---

<sup>102</sup> Sallust: *<hastas ig>ni torrere, quibus praeter speciem bello necessariam haud multo secus, quam ferro, noceri poterat* (*H*. 3.96).

<sup>103</sup> McGushin (1994): "Cossinius was washing himself in spring water at the nearest villa" (34).

<sup>104</sup> ἔπειτα σύμβουλον αὐτῶ καὶ συνάρχοντα Κοσσίνιον ἀποσταλέντα μετὰ πολλῆς δυνάμεως ἐπιτηρήσας ὁ Σπάρτακος λουόμενον περὶ Σαλίνας μικρὸν ἐδέησε συναρπάσαι (*Crass.* 9.5).

<sup>105</sup> McGushin (1994). *H*. 4.35: "On a cold night . . ." (44); *H*. 4.36: "a military garrison of ours that was below strength and at that time off its guard" (44).

indeed relevant, point towards Spartacus making sure to pick both the exactly right time and place to break through Crassus' circumvallation.

A secondary part of Spartacus' intelligence, examples of which have been purely strategic and tactical, is the simple military competence which Sallust provides the slave leader. The passage above about wooden spears belongs in this category. The escaped slaves, even from the earliest, took typical military precautions: *soliti m<ore mi>litiae vigiliis stat<iones>que et alia munia ex<equi>* (H. 3.96).<sup>106</sup> We also find Spartacus directly finding a guide: *propere nactum idoneum ex captivis ducem Picentinis* (H 3.98) and implicitly doing so: *unus constitit in agro Lucano gnarus loci, nomine Publipor* (H 3.99).<sup>107</sup> Priscianus (7.48) tells us that this second quote comes from Book 3, and the location of Lucania makes the attribution to the Spartacus narrative as good as certain. *Exuant armis equisque* (H. 3.101) would also seem to belong to this category; however, not only is there no pressing reason to assign this fragment to the Spartacus storyline, but it has a clear funerary connection.<sup>108</sup>

McGushin (1994) includes *exuant armis equisque* (3.101) as part of the Spartacus storyline and explains the fragment as an example of Spartacus providing his men with the matériel necessary for a proper army (134). He cites Florus' example of Spartacus' men taming wild horses for their cavalry as further proof (Florus 2.8.7). Servius' scholia to the *Aeneid*, from which this fragment was found, makes this otherwise plausible interpretation untenable: *ad Pallantem volunt tantum pertinere,*

---

<sup>106</sup> McGushin (1994): "Since they made a practice of mounting in military fashion sentries, patrols, and other precautions . . ." (34-5).

<sup>107</sup> McGushin (1994). H. 3.98: "Hastily acquiring a suitable guide from the Picentine captives" (36); H. 3.99: "in all the territory of Lucania there was only one man, Publipor by name, who had knowledge of the place" (37).

<sup>108</sup> I should also add that McGushin again errs in his translation: ". . . that they should deprive them of their weapons and their horses" (1994 McGushin 39). *Exuere* most regularly means "to strip." Rather than depriving the Romans of their weapons and horses, the fugitive slaves are taking them from the dead.

*quia in antiquis disciplinis relatum est, quae quisque virtute ornamenta consecutus esset, ut ea mortuum eum condecorarent: Sallustius exuant armis equisque (Aen. 11.80).* The scholiast quotes Sallust as describing funeral practices, not the equipping of an army. Maurenbrecher, although including the fragment in its previous place, correctly marked it as uncertain, while noting that one's interpretation of the passage *e scholiastae interpretatione efficitur* (154).

The presence of the subjunctive *exuant* means that a case could be made for McGushin's reading. The reasoning would be that the fugitive slaves *should* or *would rather* have been stripping the Roman dead to bury the gathered trophies with their dead comrades who slew them. It is possible that Sallust could have been saying that traditional Gallic, German, or Thracian burial practices mirrored ancient Roman ones. Thus the funerary context would satisfy the scholiast's decision to quote Sallust, while keeping alive the possibility of Spartacus' army getting supplies from the dead. Plutarch records the taking of arms from the dead: καὶ πρῶτον μὲν τοὺς ἐκ Καπύης ἐλθόντας ὡσάμενοι καὶ πολλῶν ὀπλῶν ἐπιλαβόμενοι πολεμιστηρίων, ἄσμενοι ταῦτα μετελάμβανον, ἀπορρίψαντες ὡς ἄτιμα καὶ βάρβαρα τὰ τῶν μονομάχων (9.1).<sup>109</sup> The horses, wild rather than stolen, we leave to Florus: *ac ne quod decus iusto desset exercitui, domitis obuiis etiam gregibus paratur equitatus* (2.8.7).<sup>110</sup> However, I must stress that I am only speculating. Our only certainty is that the ancient commentator, who presumably had the complete *Historiae* before him, understood this passage as applying to burial customs. Without further evidence we would be best advised to accept Servius' reading.

---

<sup>109</sup> Perrin: "To begin with, the gladiators repulsed the soldiers who came against them from Capua, and getting hold of many arms of real warfare, they gladly took these in exchange for their own, casting away their gladiatorial weapons as dishonourable and barbarous" (337).

<sup>110</sup> Forster: "That nothing might be lacking which was proper to a regular army, cavalry was procured by breaking in herds of horses which they encountered" (243).

The final trait of Spartacus, already partially revealed, is his personal nobility. This quality comes to the fore most clearly in the second Vatican fragment: *h>aud aliam f<ugae rationem c>apiendam <sibi esse pauci> prudentes p<robare, liberi ani>mi nobiles<que ceteri> . . . laudantque* (3.98).<sup>111</sup> Not only do the *prudentes* agree with Spartacus' plans, but also the *liberi animi nobilesque*. *Nobiles* certainly seems to be an unexpected qualifier for fugitive slaves. Matching this passage with Spartacus' name, Strauss theorizes that these were actually men of noble blood in their homelands.<sup>112</sup> *Liberi animi* appears to be another way of saying *prudentes*, or at least a requirement for that quality.<sup>113</sup> While these adjectives modify his followers rather than Spartacus himself, it would be hard to argue that the followers somehow outpaced their leader in virtue. Later in the passage we have Spartacus explicitly acting magnanimously. At Forum Anni Sallust tells us that Spartacus' followers: *ac statim fugitivi co<n>tra praeceptum ducis rapere ad stuprum virg<i>nes matr<ona>sque*, and then again: *quae Spartacus nequiens prohibere, multis precibus cum oraret, celeritate praeverterent . . . nuntios . . .* (3.98).<sup>114</sup> The contrast could not be clearer between the noble, prudent leader and the cutthroats he leads.

---

<sup>111</sup> McGushin (1994): "A few men of foresight and good sense felt that it was necessary to retire in the way Spartacus advised . . . and those who were liberal of mind and noble in character . . . approved of his plan" (36). Maurenbrecher was particularly daring in his reconstruction of the fragment. Compare Reynolds' far more cautious reading of the same sentence: . . . . . *aud aliam f. . . . . capiendam . . . . . prudentes . . . . . mi nobiles . . . . . laudantque*.

<sup>112</sup> Strauss: "The name Spartacus is found in a Thracian royal family; the ancient sources say that there were a few 'nobles' among the insurgents, which probably means slaves of noble birth or descent; two contemporary Roman writers admired Spartacus, which would have been easier for them if he were a patrician. Even among gladiators, the glamour of a noble name might have helped Spartacus to draw in supporters" (25-26).

<sup>113</sup> Sallust justifies his own suitability for writing history: *eo magis quod mihi a spe metu partibus rei publicae animus liber erat* (BC 4.2); Cato catalogs the greatness of the ancestors: *Sed alia fuere quae illos magnos fecere, quae nobis nulla sunt: domi industria, foris iustum imperium, animus in consulendo liber, neque delicto neque lubrico obnoxius* (BC 52.21). "Detached" might be an adequate translation.

<sup>114</sup> McGushin (1994): "And straightaway the fugitives disobeyed the orders of their leader and raped the girls and the women," and "Spartacus, being completely powerless to prevent these excesses, when he begged them repeatedly to make haste and forestall . . . the reports . . ." (36).

I would now like to offer the possibility that Sallust may be going further than just showing the remarkable restraint of the leader of slave war.<sup>115</sup> While the word *virtus*, so crucial in Sallust's writings, is never connected with Spartacus in the extant fragments, I would argue that the picture drawn from these fragments shows all the signs of fitting Sallust's criteria to lay claim to that rare quality.<sup>116</sup> Earl, once again, provides an admirable summary of Sallust's thought, culled from the prologues of the two monographs:

the essential nature of *virtus* is to be found in conduct and we may now define Sallust's concept of *virtus*, the predominant idea in the prologues, as the functioning of *ingenium* to achieve *egregia facinora*, and thus to win *gloria*, through *bonae artes*. This last factor is of vital importance since the difference between the *bonus* and the *ignavus*, between the man of *virtus* and the man of *ambitio*, lies precisely in the one reaching *gloria* by the exercise of *bonae artes*, the other *dolis atque fallaciis*. Fundamentally this difference is one of *ingenium* (11).<sup>117</sup>

It seems incontrovertible that Spartacus had an *ingenium* capable of extraordinary deeds. I hope I have shown that he also seems to have had an *ingenium* dedicated to the *bonae artes*, chiefly because of his conduct towards the citizens of Forum Anni.

There are, however, two other Sallustian ideas about *virtus* that Spartacus also meets. First, *virtus* wholly depends on the actions of the individual, not on his

---

<sup>115</sup> Although Tiffou rightly emphasizes this quality of Spartacus (568-9).

<sup>116</sup> BC 53.4-6: *Ac mihi uirtutem cuncta patrauisse, eoque factum uit diuitias paupertas, multitudinem paucitas superaret. Sed postquam luxu atque desidia ciuitas corrupta est, rursus res publica magnitudine sui imperatorum atque magistratum uitia sustentabat ac, sicuti ¶effeta parentum¶, multis tempestatibus haud sane quisquam Romae uirtute magnus fuit. Sed memoria mea ingenti uirtute, diuorsis moribus fuere uiri duo, M. Cato et C. Caesar.*

<sup>117</sup> Tiffou agrees with the definition (153).

heritage.<sup>118</sup> Second, *virtus* can best be achieved in service to the state.<sup>119</sup> The Romans must seek *gloria* in the service of the *res publica*, but Jugurtha also attains *virtus* by excelling in the native traditions of Numidia.<sup>120</sup> The applicability to Spartacus is more shaky, but Sallust in his own voice explicitly condemns the slaves who prefer to stay in Italy as *inhoneste patriae immemores* (3.98). As I have already shown, Sallust draws a sharp contrast between the small noble band of slaves and the larger mob. The implication is that those slaves who are *liberi animi nobilesque* are *honeste patriae memores*. The leader of a band of wandering plunderers could hardly lay claim to the quality of *virtus*, but one who fights honorably in order to return to his own country would seem to be acting completely in accordance with Sallust's political and moral ideology.

The picture of Spartacus, then, is overwhelmingly positive.<sup>121</sup> There is no hint of Sallust's typical moral condemnation. In the passages available Spartacus only fails in anything even approaching the moral plane when he cannot control his followers who turn to rape and pillage (3.98). While Sallust may have shades of the *popularis*

---

<sup>118</sup> “In other words, *nobilitas* was founded on *virtus*, on the *egregia facinora* and *gloria* of the individual. In such a state any hereditary principle in *nobilitas* would be unimportant, for each individual in each generation by emulating his ancestors, by achieving through *egregia facinora* and *gloria* the necessary standard of *virtus*, provided for himself the basis of true *nobilitas*” (Earl 33).

<sup>119</sup> “Similarly, from his initial broad generalisation, Sallust narrows down the particular field of activity with which he is concerned. His concept of *virtus* is, in itself, applicable to each every human occupation. This wide field is restricted first to government in general and then to the government of the Roman state in particular. Indeed in one passage Sallust comes near to identifying his concept with that of the Roman aristocratic ideal, while *ambitio* and *avaritia* appear only within the framework of the history of the Roman Republic” (Earl 16-17).

<sup>120</sup> “Here the phrase ‘uti mos gentis illius est’ is of the first importance. Jugurtha, in pursuing the activities traditional for a young Numidian, was comparable to the young Roman pleading in the courts. The different traditions prescribed different activities for their youth, but for Sallust success in either was *virtus* . . . In many ways Jugurtha recalls the Roman youth of the early Republic, the period when ‘virtus omnia domuerat’. Like them he avoided *luxus* and *inertia*, like them he was unsparing in the struggle for renown and pre-eminence, to be the first to commit some brave deed, like them he preferred action to words” (Earl 62).

<sup>121</sup> McGushin (1994): “There is no doubt about Sallust's admiration of the character and military talent of Spartacus” (112). Tiffou: “Salluste consacrait un long développement à la révolte du Spartacus. La présentation de ce personnage ne semble pas avoir été aussi défavorable qu'on aurait pu s'y attendre . . .” (568).

about him, this respect did not extend *en masse* to barbarians and slaves: *multique ex loco servi, quos ingenium socios dabat, abdita a dominis aut ipsos trahebant ex occulto; neque sanctum aut nefandum quicquam fuit irae barbarorum et servili ingenio* (3.98).<sup>122</sup> We must, however, be tempered in our analysis. That Sallust thought highly of Spartacus seems clear from our reading of the fragments, and is further highlighted by the narrative of Plutarch. Appian, however, includes several unsavory details: human sacrifice and the mass execution of prisoners chief among them (117). Still, since none of Spartacus' defeats in the *Historiae* have been preserved, we are unable to tell, although there is no sign in the two later historians, if the resulting stress from his defeats affected Spartacus in any way.

A noble Spartacus, who remains so until his heroic death, although not typical of Roman historiography or Sallust himself, would nonetheless fit well within Sallust's moral project. As I have previously stated, even in his more nuanced prologue of the *Historiae*, Sallust still saw the fall of Carthage as the turning point in Roman history, with *ambitio* paving the way for *avaritia* and the doom of the state. Tiffou does a marvelous job of explaining the particular punch that a noble Spartacus would have packed:

. . . la cité croit lutter pour sa vie et non pour la gloire. Néanmoins cette crainte n'arrive pas à susciter les sentiments qu'on est en droit d'attendre de soldats qui vont combattre pour le salut de leur patrie. Ainsi qu'on le notait dans l'étude de la lettre de Mithridate, le *metus hostilis* est impuissant à restaurer un état d'équilibre et un climat d'entente (569).

---

<sup>122</sup> McGushin (1994): “and many slaves from the place, whose natural temperament made them their allies, dragged out from hiding the treasures hidden by their masters, or their masters themselves; in short, nothing seemed inviolate or sacrilegious to the fury and slave mentality of the foreigners” (36).

The Roman state has fallen so far that not even a new Hannibal at the gates can return the state to *concordia*.

I would also like to posit another possible purpose Spartacus may have served in the *Historiae*. The careers of Spartacus and Sertorius, admittedly based on the narratives provided by Plutarch and Appian, share the same general outline. Both are placed in hostile environments by powers beyond their control, create armies from scratch, inflict numerous defeats on apparently superior Roman forces, are let down by inferior subordinates, and then ultimately suffer defeats themselves that lead to their deaths. I would argue that there are two crucial differences. First, while even the eulogistic Plutarch is forced to describe the tyrannical bent that the despairing Sertorius takes, Appian, although not chary of portraying unfavorable aspects of Spartacus' character, provides nothing similar during the final stages of the slave war. Second, of course, is their station in life: Roman *propraetor* and Thracian gladiator. Again, it would be entirely in keeping with Sallust's moral and political program for Rome's corrupt state to be too strong even for so noble a soul as Sertorius, while Spartacus, never a part of the city, would remain pure.<sup>123</sup> There need not be any special reason why Jugurtha should so easily fall while Spartacus holds out. I do not think Sallust was so rigorously dedicated to his system. Should an explanation be required, differing strengths of character seems sufficient. Still, it is Jugurtha's close association with the corrupt *nobiles* and *novi homines*, an intimacy perhaps denied to Spartacus, that does the Numidian in.<sup>124</sup>

---

<sup>123</sup> Kraus notes Sallust's frequent use of this kind of comparison: "A structure of which he was particularly fond, on both a large and a small scale, is antithesis, the opposition of contraries: at heart a rhetorical device (e.g. *militiae et domi*) it has been identified as the fundamental organizing principle of Sallust's thought. Antithesis on the level of diction or syntax enables him to make subtle connections, often forcing the reader to work hard to tease out his meaning; on the level of thought, it structures his analysis of the opposition between body and soul, energy and inertia, good and evil" (13).

<sup>124</sup> Jugurtha, once the model of *virtus* (*BI* 6.1), seems to fall upon his first contact with corrupt leaders from Rome: *Ea tempestate in exercitu nostro fuere complures noui atque nobiles quibus diuitiae bono honestoque potiores erant, factiosi domi, potentes apud socios, clari magis quam honesti, qui Iugurthae non mediocrim animum pollicitando adcendebant: si Micipsa rex occidisset, fore uti solus imperi*

I would like to close by making two conjectures about Sallust's Spartacus. His military competence and tactical brilliance, although the latter is only faintly represented in the actual fragments, seem to point to some kind of formal training. Jugurtha takes similar steps with the Gaetulians as the slaves will take against the Romans.<sup>125</sup> Service in the Roman legions seems like the natural place for him to have received this education, to which both Appian and Florus attest.<sup>126</sup> Second, Sallust's scorn for slaves who would betray their masters' treasure or, worse yet, their masters themselves, as well as his scorn for *servile ingenium* in general, would seem to demand that Spartacus suffered under unusual circumstances, either enslaved unfairly, as Plutarch records, or perhaps brutally treated after being enslaved.<sup>127</sup>

---

*Numidiae potiretur; in ipso maxumam uirtutem, Romae omnia uenalia esse (BI).* Marius also falls from grace: *Tamen is ad id locorum—nam postea ambitione praeceps datus est—consulatum adpetere non audebat* (63.6).

<sup>125</sup> *BI 80.2: Eorum multitudinem in unum cogit ac paulatim consuefacit ordines habere, signa sequi, imperium obseruare, item alia militaria facere.*

<sup>126</sup> Appian: Σπάρτακος Θράξ ἀνὴρ, ἐστρατευμένος ποτὲ Ῥωμαίοις, ἐκ δὲ αἰχμαλωσίας καὶ πράσεως ἐν τοῖς μονομάχοις ὦν (539). Florus: *Nec [insignia et fasces] abnuit ille de stipendario Thrace miles, de milite desertor, inde latro, deinde in honorem uirium gladiator* (2.8.8). There is no easy solution to tie together these passages. Αἰχμαλωσία is properly the state of being a prisoner of war, not the correct status for a captured *latro*. We may have the faint echoes of two different traditions, with Appian following Sallust.

<sup>127</sup> Λέντλου τινὸς Βατιάτου μονομάχους ἐν Καπύη τρέφοντος, ὧν οἱ πολλοὶ Γαλάται καὶ Θράκες ἦσαν, ἐξ αἰτῶν οὐ πονηρῶν, ἀλλ' ἀδικία τοῦ πριαμένου συνειρχθέντες ὑπ' ἀνάγκης ἐπὶ τῶ μονομαχεῖν (8.2). Strauss offers a good summary of the situation (18).

## Chapter Four: Mithridates

An analysis of the character of Mithridates suffers from the same difficulties as that of Sertorius and Spartacus: a random preservation of genuine Sallustian fragments and a reliance upon later historians, mostly Plutarch and Appian again, for a successful placement of these fragments within the *Historiae*. While Plutarch's *Sertorius* had Sallust almost exclusively as his main source, the case is not so clear for *Lucullus* and Appian's *Mithridatica*. For the *Life of Lucullus* Tröster goes through the list of sources, noting that Sallust and Livy are the two candidates for providing the bulk of the narrative (22-25). Flacelière and Chambry (1972), however, in their introduction include and translate two important points made by Reinach first, that: “on chercherait vainement la moindre trace de contradiction entre Plutarque et les débris du texte de Salluste” (50) and that “on peut faire observer que Plutarque contredit nettement Tite-Live sur quelques détails essentiels” (51).<sup>128</sup> However, it is still important to keep in mind Plutarch's tendency to use an author for facts but draw his own interpretations.

Regarding Appian's *Mithridatica*, we have a similarly frustrating situation. Carter, echoing Stampacchia, argues that in general the search for sources in Appian is self-defeating, since Appian was enough of a historian to not just follow a single source uncritically. He had his own historical views and used the sources available to defend them (xxxii-xxxiii). McGing advances the same argument specifically for the *Mithridatica*, though he is more disparaging of Appian as an accurate recounter of the past. While he praises Reinach's argument that Nicolaus of Damascus was the primary source for Mithridates' clash with Lucullus, with some undetermined help

---

<sup>128</sup> Reinach also includes a plausible, though less trustworthy argument: “Quand Plutarque se sépare de son guide habituel, il prend soin de l'indiquer, comme dans la question des chameaux aperçus pour la première fois à Cyzique (11, 6) : son observation n'aurait même guère de sens si elle ne sousentendait qu'en général il a suivi Salluste ; c'est le cas de dire : l'exception confirme la règle” (51).

from Sallust, he regards the results as inconclusive, writing of the process: “what is on the whole a fruitless search for lost sources” (McGing 177).

These tangled sources create a situation where we can only use the later historians when there is a close correlation with an actual fragment from the *Historiae*, absent some obvious Sallustian language or ideology. Thus while valuable for adding context, Plutarch and Appian cannot provide new information. The first step in ascertaining Sallust's characterization of Mithridates is to look at the fragments themselves. From the remnants of the *Historiae* I have found five dominant traits given to Mithridates: cruelty, a weakness for flattery, physical strength, courage, and mental acuity.

One of the first images of Mithridates that Sallust provides seems to be a dominant characteristic. In his prologue, where Sallust sets the historical stage for his starting point of the consulship of Lepidus and Catulus, he writes of the end of the First Mithridatic War and the Peace of Dardanus: *quis rebus Sulla suspectis maximeque ferocia regis Mithridatis in tempore bellaturi* (*H.* 1.32).<sup>129</sup> Arusianus Messius (324) preserves this fragment as from the first book in order to define *in tempore* as *opportune*. Noting the future participle *bellaturi*, Maurenbrecher argues that this fragment describes the situation after the Peace of Dardanus in 84 BC, i.e. Mithridates is not currently waging war, but rather planning to (15). There is similar description from the second book of the *Historiae*: *ipse animi atrox* (*H.* 2.74).<sup>130</sup> Arusianus Messius (53) again serves as our source, this time citing the second book of the histories to show *atrox* taking a genitive. Maurenbrecher, however, remarks both on the lack of other possible figures matching this description in Book 2 and the

---

<sup>129</sup> McGushin (1992): “Sulla, having suspicions concerning these matters and especially concerning the ferocious temperament of King Mithridates, who would renew the war at the opportune time . . .” (26).

<sup>130</sup> McGushin (1992): “he himself was of a cruel disposition” (60).

parallel with Appian: φονικὸς δὲ καὶ ὤμῳς ἐς πάντας ἦν (*BM* 113).<sup>131</sup> The later example is especially illuminating, in that Sallust appears to be writing in his own voice, not describing the beliefs of Sulla, and includes the critical term *animus*, which would imply not just a momentary lapse, but a permanent state.

This general *ferocitas* and *atrocitas* receive concrete examples in the following two fragments: Mithridates' murder of his own family members. Sallust has him killing not only his mother: *sed Mithridates extrema pueritia regnum ingressus matre sua veneno interfecta* (2.75), but also a brother and a sister: *et fratrem et sororem occidit* (2.76).<sup>132</sup> Servius (*Aen.* 5.295) provides the first fragment, without book attribution, to provide a parallel to Virgil's *viridi iuventa*. Regarding the second passage, the scholiast here (*Gronov. Pomp.* 22) quotes Sallust in defense of Cicero's analogy of Mithridates with Medea, among their shared traits: murder of family. Mithridates' kinslaying seems almost proverbial among his historians. In his final character sketch Appian includes the murder of his mother, along with seven other family members (although there is no mention of a sister), while Plutarch describes a massacre of sisters and wives after Lucullus had driven Mithridates from Pontus.<sup>133</sup>

Mithridates' relationship with his subordinates might have a great deal to do with his savagery. Regardless, Sallust attributes to the king a certain weakness for flattery: *ibi Fimbriana e seditione, qui regi per obsequentiam orationis et maxime odium Sullae graves carique erant* (2.78).<sup>134</sup> Nonius (215.33) cites this passage from

---

<sup>131</sup> White: "He was bloodthirsty and cruel to all" (459).

<sup>132</sup> McGushin (1992). *H.* 2.75: "But Mithridates at the end of his boyhood entered into his rule after removing his mother by poison" (60); *H.* 2.76: "[he] killed both a brother and a sister" (60).

<sup>133</sup> Appian: καὶ τὴν μητέρα ἔκτεινε καὶ τὸν ἀδελφὸν καὶ τῶν παιδῶν τρεῖς υἱοὺς καὶ τρεῖς θυγατέρας (112); Plutarch: ἑάλω δὲ καὶ ἀδελφὴ τοῦ Μιθριδάτου Νύσσα σωτήριον ἄλωσιν· αἱ δ' ἀπωτάτω τοῦ κινδύνου καὶ καθ' ἡσυχίαν ἀποκεῖσθαι δοκοῦσαι περὶ Φαρνάκειαν ἀδελφαὶ καὶ γυναῖκες οἰκτρῶς ἀπώλοντο, Μιθριδάτου πέμψαντος ἐπ' αὐτὰς ἐκ τῆς φυγῆς Βακχίδην εὐνοῦχον (18.2).

<sup>134</sup> McGushin (1992): "As a result of the Fimbrian revolt there were present at the court men who, because of their compliance in discussions, and particularly their hatred of Sulla, were respected and favoured by the king" (61).

Sallust as coming from Book 2 in order to show another example of a feminine form of *obsequium*. Although Mithridates is not named, the *rex* can hardly be anyone else. The Roman deserters are not respected and prized for their valor or strategic insight but because of their fawning words and deep hatred of Sulla. This Roman flattery again appears in describing one of the Fimbrian deserters: *Metrophanes promeruit gratiam Mithridatis obsequendo* (3.22).<sup>135</sup> Isidore (*Etym.* 2.11.1) quotes this passage of the *Historiae* in order to show the difference between a *sententia* and a *chreia*. Even without context, the effect is the same. Flattery is an effective tool regarding Mithridates.

Unfortunately, while we do have fragments describing Mithridates' disastrous siege of Cyzicus, Sallust's rendition of the end of the siege did not survive. While Appian describes Mithridates as being personally involved for the duration, Plutarch's Mithridates continues the siege despite the horrible suffering of his soldiers out a lack of information:

Μιθριδάτην δέ, ἄχρι μὲν ὑπὸ τῶν ἑαυτοῦ στρατηγῶν  
 φενακιζόμενος ἠγνόει τὸν ἐν τῷ στρατοπέδῳ λιμόν, ἠνίων  
 Κυζικηνοὶ διαφεύγοντες τὴν πολιορκίαν. ταχὺ δ' ἐξερρήτη τὸ  
 φιλότιμον αὐτοῦ καὶ φιλόνηκον ἐν αἰσθήσει γενομένου τῶν  
 ἀποριῶν, αἷς οἱ στρατιῶται συνέιχοντο, καὶ τῶν  
 ἀνθρωποφαγιῶν (*Luc.* 11.1-2).<sup>136</sup>

<sup>135</sup> McGushin (1994): “Metrophanes won the favour of Mithridates by humouring him” (56).

<sup>136</sup> Perrin: “Mithridates, as long as his generals deceived him into ignorance of the famine in his army, was vexed that the Cyzicenes should successfully withstand his siege. But his eager ambition quickly ebbed away when he perceived the straits in which his soldiers were involved, and their actual cannibalism” (503). Appian on the end of the siege: ὡς δὲ καὶ ταῦθ' ὑπεσύροντο οἱ Κυζικηνοί, καὶ τὰς ἐπ' αὐτῶν μηχανὰς ἐπίμπρασαν, καὶ αἰσθήσει τοῦ λιμοῦ πολλάκις ἐπεκθέοντες τοῖς πολεμίοις ἀσθενεστάτοις γεγονόσιν ἐπετίθεντο, δρασμὸν ὁ Μιθριδάτης ἐβούλευε, καὶ ἔφευγε νυκτὸς (*MB* 76).

Sallust would have had to pick one of the two options, either of which would have had important implications for how he portrayed Mithridates. Sallust seems to have described the horrors of the siege in great detail: *Et morbi graves ob inediam insolita vescentibus* (*H.* 3.38).<sup>137</sup> A plague also seems to have been present in Sallust's version.<sup>138</sup> Donatus (*Hecyr.* 337) includes this quote, though he does not cite from which book, to compare Sallust's *morbi graves* with Terrence's *morbus adgravescat*. McGushin (1994) correctly cites Appian for the attribution of this fragment: εἰσὶ δ' οἱ καὶ σπλάγχων ἐγεύοντο βαρβαρικῶς· οἱ δ' ἄλλοι ποηφαγοῦντες ἐνόσουν (*BM* 76).<sup>139</sup>

If Appian broadly follows Sallust's narrative, then the Mithridates of the *Historiae* would seem not tenacious, but perverse. Even though the Cyzican resistance was not expected to be heroic, a good general would have retreated before the army resorted to cannibalism. We would thus seem to have a Mithridates who let pride and hatred cloud his judgment, who was willing to sacrifice his men in a horrific way for an unattainable goal. If, however, Plutarch bases his account on Sallust, then the characterization shifts. Mithridates retains his military acumen, but the terror he causes in his subordinates must surely increase. The only reason his generals would refrain from reporting the true situation concerning the siege would have been because they feared that their lives would be the price for failure. Plutarch's version does present some difficulties though, since he has Mithridates present at the siege but unaware of the sufferings of his men. One would assume that plague, famine, and cannibalism are difficult to hide from even a remotely interested general.

---

<sup>137</sup> McGushin (1994): “and serious illness in the case of those who, because of the lack of food, were feeding themselves on unusual fare” (26).

<sup>138</sup> Servius: *Ordinem secutus est (scil. Vergilius), quem et Lucretius tenuit, et Sallustius primo aerem, inde aquam, post pabula esse corrupta* (*G.* 3.481).

<sup>139</sup> White: “There were some who even after the fashion of the barbarians ate the entrails. Others were made sick by subsisting on herbs” (381).

Although both Appian and Plutarch used Sallust as a source for their accounts of the war between Mithridates and Lucullus, they do not seem to have followed him very closely for the siege of Cyzicus. Neither records the amazing story of Lucullus' messenger to the beleaguered city (*H.* 3.37).<sup>140</sup> The possible defection of the Fimbrian legions also goes unmentioned (*H.* 3.33).<sup>141</sup> Appian, however, matches better with the surviving fragments. He and Sallust both describe the siege towers mounted on ships.<sup>142</sup> There is also the eating of unnatural foods that I have already mentioned above. These parallels between Appian and Sallust are slight though, and the scanty nature of the fragments makes it entirely possible that similar correlations between Plutarch and Sallust are lost rather than nonexistent. Since both characterizations of Mithridates fit with the other fragments, the choice between them is not obvious. However, Plutarch's more miraculous version, not a common feature in Sallust, shows he used as least one other source and the slightly higher parallels in the *Mithridateios* make me incline towards Appian.<sup>143</sup>

Sallust also writes of the marvelous physical ability of Mithridates, although the traditional Sallustian description of a man impressive in terms of both his physical and mental powers does not still exist, if it was ever written. He is not merely strong, like the previous characters, but was large enough to require special weapons and armor: *Mithridates corpore ingenti, perinde armatus* (2.77).<sup>144</sup> Quintillian quotes this passage as model for true brevity, while failing to leave a book number. This feature of Mithridates appears to have marked him as heroic rather than grotesque. Appian, at

---

<sup>140</sup> Sallust: *Duos quam maximos utris levi tabulae subiecit, qua super omni corpore quietus invicem tracto pede quasi gubernator existeret; ea inter molem atque insulam mari vitabundus classem hostium ad oppidum pervenit.* Told in full by Frontinus (*Str.* 3.13.6), Florus (1.40.16), and Orosius (6.2.4).

<sup>141</sup> Sallust: *Quarum unam epistulam forte cum servo nacti praedatores Valeriani scorpione in castra misere.*

<sup>142</sup> Sallust: *Et onere turrium incertis navibus* (*H.* 3.34); Appian: κατά δὲ τοὺς λιμένας δύο πεντήρεις ἐξευγμέναι πύργων ἕτερον ἔφερον, ἐξ οὗ γέφυρα, ὅποτε προσπελάσειαν ἐς τὸ τεῖχος, ὑπὸ μηχανῆς ἐξήλλετο (*BM* 73).

<sup>143</sup> Plutarch *Luc.* 10. Persephone, her sacred cow, and Athena all do their part to save the city.

<sup>144</sup> McGushin (1992): "Mithridates being of huge stature bore weapons of a comparable size" (89).

least, paints him in this way in his final character sketch.<sup>145</sup> The lack of context prevents us from directly ascertaining Sallust's thought on the matter.

Not only does Mithridates apparently enjoy fantastic strength, but he appears to have enjoyed a large part of that strength late into his life. Mithridates was already an old man when fighting Lucullus, a fact which, however, did not prevent him from taking an active role in the campaigns: *peractis septuaginta armis armatus equom insilire* (*H.* 5.5).<sup>146</sup> He even receives a wound fighting in the battle against Fabius, Lucullus' legate: *luxo pede* (*H.* 5.6).<sup>147</sup> Arusianus Messius (341) preserves the first fragment, noting it comes from the fifth book of the *Historiae*, in order provide an example of *insilire* taking an object. The attributes in the passage by themselves would be enough to make Mithridates the likely candidate of Sallust's description, but a line from Cassius Dio confirms the match.<sup>148</sup> Probus (31.15) provides the second fragment without attribution as an example of *luxus, luxus, m.* having a second declension termination. Appian provides a somewhat similar circumstance: μέχρι τὸν Μιθριδάτην, πληγέντα λίθῳ τε ἐς τὸ γόνυ καὶ ὑπὸ τὸν ὀφθαλμὸν βέλει, κατὰ σπουδὴν ἀποκομισθῆναι (*BM* 88).<sup>149</sup> *Pes* and *γόνυ* are different parts of the body, and Appian has nothing to say about sprains, but the identification is not a bad one. Cassius Dio in the above passage also has Mithridates wounded by a stone, but he neglects to mention where. Although his courage is never explicitly described, the two previous fragments make Mithridates' bravery clear.

---

<sup>145</sup> Appian: τὸ σῶμα δ' ἦν μέγας μὲν, ὡς ὑποδεικνύουσιν ὅσα ὄπλα αὐτὸς ἔπεμψεν ἐς Νεμέαν τε καὶ Δελφοὺς, εὐρωστος δέ, ὡς μέχρι τέλους ἵππευσαί τε καὶ ἀκοντίσαι καὶ χίλια στάδια τῆς ἡμέρας, περιμενόντων αὐτὸν ἐκ διαστημάτων ἵππων, δραμεῖν. καὶ ἄρμα ἤλαυνεν ἑκκαίδεκα ἵππων ὁμοῦ (*BM* 112).

<sup>146</sup> McGushin (1994): "and even when he was over 70 years old he was able, armed, to leap on to his horse" (53).

<sup>147</sup> McGushin (1994): "With a dislocated foot" (53).

<sup>148</sup> Cassius Dio: εἰ μὴ ὁ Μιθριδάτης . . . τοῖς πολεμίοις ἀναστρεφόμενος (καὶ γὰρ καὶ ὑπὲρ τὰ ἑβδομήκοντα ἔτη γεγωνῶς ἐμάχετο) λίθῳ τε ἐπλήγη καὶ δέος τοῖς βαρβάροις μὴ καὶ ἀποθάνη παρέσχευεν (36.9.5).

<sup>149</sup> White: ". . . until Mithridates was struck by a stone on the knee and wounded by a dart under the eye, and was hastily carried out of the fight" (407).

Like Spartacus and Sertorius, Mithridates' intellect also reveals itself in his ability to wage war. On a tactical level, the best example of Mithridates' success in his defeat of Cotta in 74 BC at Chalcedon: *At illi, quibus vires aderant, cuncti ruere ad portas, inconditi tendere* (3.23) and *dedecores inultique terga ab hostibus caedebantur* (H. 3.24).<sup>150</sup> Servius (*Ecl.* 2.4) quotes this fragment with book attribution to show Sallust's use of *inconditus* as “disorganized.” Priscianus (6.47), for the following fragment, also includes the book number but is concerned with Sallust's use of *dedecus, dedecoris* instead of *dedecus, dedeca, dedecum*. Maurenbrecher notes the parallels with Appian for the placement of these passages.<sup>151</sup> While the *portae* (H. 3.23) match Appian's πύλαι, the second passage need not be from the same incident, as the line could describe any number of battle routes.

Mithridates combined strategy and tactics to good effect in the Cabeira campaign (71 BC), where he tried to force Lucullus' withdrawal by cavalry strikes on his supply convoys. Although ultimately failing, the king's plan initially had some success: *at Lucullum regis cura machinata fames brevi fatigabat* (4.8).<sup>152</sup> Priscianus (8.16) drew this fragment from Book 3 for the deponent verb *machinor*.

Maurenbrecher citing Appian draws the connection between the two passages:

[Lucullus] ἀπορῶν δ' ἀγορᾶς ἐς Καππαδοκίαν ἔπεμπεν ἐπὶ σῖτον . . . καὶ ὁ Μιθριδάτης . . . ἐλπίζων ἐν ἀπορίᾳ τροφῶν αὐτὸν γενόμενον πείσεσθαι οἶον

<sup>150</sup> McGushin (1994). *H.* 3.23: “But those who had the strength to do so all ran towards the gates and advanced in a disorganized way” (24); *H.* 3.24: “stripped of all dignity and showing no resistance, they were being struck on the back by the enemy” (25). Plutarch *Luc.* 8.1-2 and App. *Mith.* 71.

<sup>151</sup> Appian: Νοῦδος δὲ ὁ ναύαρχος αὐτοῦ [Cotta], σύν μέρει τινὶ στρατοῦ τὰ ὀχυρώτατα τοῦ πεδίου καταλαβὼν καὶ ἐξελαθεὶς, ἔφυγεν ἐπὶ τὰς πύλας τῆς Χαλκηδόνης διὰ θριγκίων πολλῶν πάνυ δυσχερῶς. ἀμφὶ τε τὰς πύλας ὠθισμὸς ἦν ἐσπηδώντων ὁμοῦ· ὅθεν οὐδὲν τοῖς διώκουσιν αὐτοῦς βέλος ἠτύχει (*BM* 71).

<sup>152</sup> McGushin (1994): “Within a brief space of time the shortage of food which the king had cunningly contrived was worrying Lucullus” (41).

αὐτὸς ἔπαθε περὶ Κύζικον (*BM* 80).<sup>153</sup> Also, already mentioned above, Mithridates had Fabius all but beat before getting wounded.<sup>154</sup>

Aside from his tactical ability, Mithridates also possesses an ability to adapt and change the way he fights wars. McGushin links the fragments: *equis et armis decoribus cultus* (3.20) with a passage from Plutarch which describes the king switching his army's fancy but impractical armament for Roman armor.<sup>155</sup>

Unfortunately Priscianus only quotes this passage, while noting it comes from Book 3, in order to show Sallust's use of *decus, decoris* for *decorus, decora, decorum*, which prevents further confirmation. Finding that his typical way of doing battle failed against Sulla, Mithridates completely reorganized his army for the war he knew was coming. This switch shows an impressive capacity for self-correction in the king of Pontus.

Mithridates' letter to Arsaces, king of Parthia, (*H.* 4.69) is by far the longest passage from the Mithridates narrative, and, since it captures Sallust speaking in the king's own voice, the letter should offer an unparalleled chance to analyze Mithridates' temperament. Unfortunately, we cannot be sure that this letter was written according to the character that Sallust created. McGushin (1994) shows that the letter serves as textbook example of a piece of persuasive writing.<sup>156</sup> Thus, if the king is present in the

---

<sup>153</sup> White: "As [Lucullus] was short of supplies he sent to Cappadocia for corn . . . Mithridates . . . hoping to bring upon him the same scarcity of provisions from which he had himself suffered at Cyzicus (391).

<sup>154</sup> Appian: φθάσας δ' αὐτὸν [Lucullus] ὁ Μιθριδάτης ἐπέθετο Φαβίῳ τῷ δεῦρο ἐκ Λευκόλλου στρατηγεῖν ὑπολειμμένῳ, καὶ τρεψάμενος αὐτὸν ἔκτεινε πεντακοσίους, ἐλευθερώσαντος δὲ τοῦ Φαβίου θεράποντας ὅσοι ἦσαν ἐν τῷ στρατοπέδῳ, καὶ δι' ὅλης ἡμέρας αὐθις ἀγωνιζομένου, παλίντροπος ἦν ὁ ἀγὼν (*BM* 88).

<sup>155</sup> McGushin (1994): "equipped with horses and splendid weaponry" (24). Plutarch: ἀφελὼν γὰρ τὰ παντοδαπὰ πλήθη καὶ τὰς πολυγλώσσους ἀπειλὰς τῶν βαρβάρων, ὅπλων τε διαχρύσων καὶ διαλίθων κατασκευάς, ὡς λάφυρα τῶν κρατούντων, οὐκ ἀλκίην τινα τῶν κεκτημένων ὄντα, ξίφη μὲν ἠλαύνετο Ῥωμαϊκά, καὶ θυρεοὺς ἐμβριθεῖς ἐπήγνυτο, καὶ γεγυμνασμένους μᾶλλον ἢ κεκοσμημένους ἤθροιζεν ἵππους, πεζῶν δὲ μυριάδας δώδεκα κατασκευασμένων εἰς φάλαγγα Ῥωμαϊκὴν, ἵππεῖς δὲ πρὸς μυρίους ἑξακισχιλίους ἄνευ τῶν δρεπανηφόρων τεθρίππων· ταῦτα δ' ἦν ἑκατόν (*Luc.* 7.5).

<sup>156</sup> McGushin (1994): "The letter is an extremely skillful exercise by Sallust in the genre of deliberative oratory. Made up of prologue (§§1-4), *narratio* = a statement of the facts related to the basic objectives

letter, and we are not just reading a *virtuoso* display by Sallust, then it would appear that Mithridates was a cultured man and well acquainted with Greek education, which need not be implausible, since Appian does record a relationship between the king and Greek education: καὶ παιδείας ἐπεμέλετο Ἑλληνικῆς (112).<sup>157</sup> The character revealed in the letter is thus the objectively perfect orator, who puts the best possible spin on Mithridates' failures (*H. 4.69.10-15*) along with the worst possible spin on Roman actions in the East (*H. 4.69.5-10*). Because Sallust tends to let so much of his own views and style bleed into the speeches of his characters, I am inclined to think that this letter reveals very little of Mithridates or his thoughts.<sup>158</sup> The context of the letter could have revealed much exposing Mithridates' stretching of the truth for what it was, or allowing it to pass as Sallust's version of the past, but only the letter has been passed down to us.

The letter, however, does bear a certain resemblance to Jugurtha's short speech (in indirect discourse) to Bocchus, which has possible ramifications on the individuality of the figures:

Romanos iniustos, profunda auaritia, communis omnium hostis esse; eandem illos causam belli cum Boccho habere quam secum et cum aliis gentibus, lubidinem imperitandi, quis omnia regna aduorsa sint; tum sese, paulo ante Carthaginiensis, item regem Persen, post uti quisque opulentissimus uideatur, ita Romanis hostem fore (81.1).<sup>159</sup>

---

stated in the prologue, (§§5-15), an *argumentatio* = the presentation of supporting arguments, (§§16-22), and a short concluding passage (§23), the letter conforms to the principles of ancient rhetorical theory" (174). See pp. 174-199 for analysis of each individual section.

<sup>157</sup> White: "He cultivated Greek learning" (459).

<sup>158</sup> e.g. Catiline's first oration (*BC 20.2-17*) and Adherbal's address to the senate (*BI 14.1-25*).

<sup>159</sup> Rolfe: "The Romans, he said, were unjust, of boundless greed, and the common foes of all mankind. They had the same motive for war with Bocchus as for one with himself and other nations, namely, the lust for dominion, and their hatred of all monarchies. Just now Jugurtha was their enemy, a short time before it had been the Carthaginians and King Perses; in the future it would be whoever seemed to them most powerful" (303-305).

Mithridates also stresses the insatiable Roman greed: *Namque Romanis cum nationibus, populis, regibus cunctis una et ea vetus causa bellandi est, cupido profunda imperii et divitiarum* (4.69.5).<sup>160</sup> *Cupido profunda imperii* mirrors *lubidinem imperitandi*. After presenting his own version of his conflict with the Romans, Mithridates again, like Jugurtha, returns to this theme, telling Arsaces: *Tu vero, qui Seleucea, maxima urbium, regnumque Persidis inclitis divitiis est, quid ab illis nisi dolum in praesens et postea bellum expectas?* (4.69.19).<sup>161</sup> Both also share the accusation that Rome is naturally inimical to monarchy: *omniaque non serva et maxime regna hostilia ducant* (4.69.17).<sup>162</sup> These parallels should not be entirely unexpected. Both characters are kings asking for aid from another king; however, it seems that Sallust is much more interested in providing his own indictment of Roman policy than accurately portraying Mithridates' actual thoughts.<sup>163</sup>

The natural desire is to match Mithridates with Jugurtha. Although he does not treat the character of Mithridates at any length, Syme asserts the connection: “In Sallust's narration political issues at Rome interlocked with warfare abroad, first through Sertorius and then through Mithridates (the latter variously recalling Jugurtha)” (192). “Variously” is the key word here. Jugurtha may be *pollens*, but he does not require over-sized arms. Mithridates' cruelty, perhaps his defining characteristic, appears to have no analogue in Jugurtha. The Numidian does kill Adherbal by torture after promising to spare his life, and he is harsh in putting down Bomilcar's conspiracy, but the defining emotional characteristic of Jugurtha is

<sup>160</sup> McGushin (1994): “The Romans have an inveterate motive for making war on all nations, peoples, and kings; namely, an insatiable desire for dominion and riches” (48).

<sup>161</sup> McGushin (1994): “But you, who possess Seleucia, greatest of cities, and the realm of Persis famed for its riches, what can you expect from them except treachery now and war later?” (50).

<sup>162</sup> McGushin (1994): “[considering] every government which is not subject to them, especially monarchies, as their enemies” (50).

<sup>163</sup> Mithridates' references to Roman legends, even if he had known them himself, would hardly have made sense to Arsaces: *Neque quicquam a principio nisi raptum habere, domum, coniuges, agros, imperium?* (4.69.17). Romulus and Remus' killing of Amulius and the rape of the Sabine women would not have been common knowledge east of the Euphrates.

*timens*.<sup>164</sup> Flattery plays no part in the *Bellum Iugurthinum*. Finally, Jugurtha's skill as a general, especially considering the scant resources at his command, far out shadows the successes of Mithridates against Lucullus.

The two kings are similar, however, in the hardships they cause the Romans, though Mithridates was far more of an actual threat. His offensive into Greece outmatches anything Jugurtha could have attempted. They also share a habit of kinslaying, but both seem to have been actual historical facts and are a recurring feature of monarchies. Their tenacity in the face of defeat, a trait shared with Sertorius, is another mark of similarity. There is also Mithridates' reliance on Tigranes and Jugurtha's similar relationship with Bocchus, although this seems another result of a chance parallel. The comparison between Jugurtha's speech and Mithridates' letter does show that Sallust was involved in some schematizing of their situations, but their shared characteristics seem more due to similar historical circumstances than any desire on Sallust's part to paint the same portrait twice.

I would argue that these murders place Mithridates on a level beyond those of the other characters in this study. True Jugurtha kills two brothers, but he was adopted into their family (*BI* 9.3), grossly insulted by one (*BI* 11.3, 6), and knew that his adoption was only a means by which to control him (*BI* 11.1). Catiline, on the other hand, did kill a blood relative, his own son, perhaps the most heinous crime besides killing one's father, but his crime had an effect which is nowhere present in Sallust's Mithridates, or that of Plutarch or Appian.<sup>165</sup> These murders were, undoubtedly,

---

<sup>164</sup> Mithridates is also once described somewhat similarly, but it is doubt rather than fear overcoming him and seems to refer only to a specific situation: *Qua nocte ipse fiebat anceps* (4.9).

<sup>165</sup> *Quae quidem res mihi in primis uidetur causa fuisse facinus maturandi; namque animus impurus, dis hominibusque infestus, neque uigiliis neque quietibus sedari poterat: ita conscientia mentem excitam uastabat. Igitur colos exsanguis, foedi oculi, citus modo, modo tardus incessus: prorsus in facie uoltuque uecordia inerat* (BC 15.3-5).

political murders, as in the case of Jugurtha, but the number and relationships of those involved make them extraordinary.

However, before we condemn Mithridates to the seventh circle, Seneca (*De Ben.* 4.1.1) provides perhaps the most important fragment regarding this section: *potest videri nihil tam necessarium aut magis, ut ait Sallustius, cum cura dicendum, quam quod in manibus est.*<sup>166</sup> As McGushin (1994) describes, Wölfflin noted two similar phrases also in Seneca: *vir cum cura dicendus* (*De Prov.* 5.9) and *magnus vir et cum cura dicendus* (*De Tran.* 14.10), which also happened to match Velleius Paterculus' initial sketch of Mithridates:

Per ea tempora Mithridates, Ponticus rex, vir neque silendus neque dicendus sine cura, bello acerrimus, virtute eximius, aliquando fortuna, semper animo maximus, consiliis dux, miles manu, odio in Romanos Hannibal, occupata Asia necatisque in ea omnibus civibus Romanis (2.18.1).<sup>167</sup>

From this passage we can draw two important conclusions: first, that this fragment probably does refer to Mithridates, as Maurenbrecher (90-91) and McGushin (1994) (251-252) both accept; second, that Sallust had a complicated view of the king. We need not believe that Velleius quotes Sallust word for word to accept that *cura* implies a characterization of the sort Velleius provides. That Velleius describes Mithridates as *virtutis eximius* shows that he was not following Sallust blindly. Appian sketches out a similarly mixed assessment of the king as the conclusion to the king's role in the

---

<sup>166</sup> Basore: "None can seem so essential, or to need, as Sallust puts it, such careful treatment, as the one that is now before us" (205).

<sup>167</sup> Shipley: "It was about this time that Mithridates, king of Pontus, seized Asia and put to death all Roman citizens in it. He was a man about whom one cannot speak except with concern not yet pass by in silence; he was ever eager for war, of exceptional bravery, always great in spirit and sometimes in achievement, in strategy a general, in bodily prowess as soldier, in hatred to the Romans a Hannibal" (86).

*Mithridatica*. He describes Mithridates' heroic attributes and unparalleled resistance to Rome as well as his inveterate cruelty (*BM* 112).

This single fragment has the potential to completely change one's estimation of Sallust's characterization of Mithridates. He is not, it appears, the almost cardboard villain that Jugurtha suddenly becomes but perhaps a figure of three dimensions. Stories reflecting well on Mithridates, common to both Plutarch and Appian, should be strongly considered to have first been written by Sallust, e.g., Mithridates' appreciation of Pomponius' bravery.<sup>168</sup> It is equally important not to take this reevaluation too far, however. We have clear proof of Mithridates' cruelty in the fragments (kinslaying), and Sallust would hardly have looked kindly on Mithridates' simultaneous murder of all the Italians in Asia.

A further question to explore is just how Mithridates fit into Sallust's underlying purpose. While Mithridates did face incompetent and venal generals who served as models of everything Sallust deplored in the Roman system, these confrontations occurred before the starting point of the *Historiae*.<sup>169</sup> Mithridates' primary opponent in this work was Lucullus, who, although a favorite of Sulla, was a brilliant general and firm defender of the provincials in his care against the depredations of other Romans.<sup>170</sup> Syme sees little bias in Sallust's treatment of his general.<sup>171</sup> Thus far, then, Mithridates differs from Spartacus and Sertorius in his role. These two figures exposed the incompetence and corruption of the ruling class in

---

<sup>168</sup> Plutarch: Πομπώνιος δ' ἀνὴρ οὐκ ἄδοξος ἕάλω τετραμένος καὶ πρὸς τὸν Μιθριδάτην ἀνήχθη κακῶς ὑπὸ τραυμάτων διακείμενος. πνθομένου δὲ τοῦ βασιλέως, εἰ σωθεὶς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ γενήσεται φίλος, “Ἄν γε δὴ,” ἔφη, “Ῥωμαίοις διαλλαγῆς· εἰ δὲ μή, πολέμιος.” τοῦτον μὲν θαυμάσας ὁ Μιθριδάτης οὐκ ἠδίκησε (*Luc.* 15.2); Appian: καὶ αὐτὸν τῶν βαρβάρων κτείνειν ἀξιούντων, ὁ βασιλεὺς εἶπεν οὐκ ἐξυβριεῖν ἐς ἀτυχοῦσαν ἀρετὴν (*BM* 79).

<sup>169</sup> Manius and Cassius urge Nicomedes of Bithynia to break the peace treaty, promising Rome's report. All three are quickly defeated (*BM* 11).

<sup>170</sup> Lucullus' later descent in decadence might have supplied a foil for Mithridates, providing that Sallust shared Appian's appraisal of the king's personal habits: καὶ σώφρων ἐς πολλὰ καὶ φερέπονος ὦν περιμόνας ἡττάτο τὰς τῶν γυναικῶν ἡδόνας (*BM* 112).

<sup>171</sup> Syme: “Towards Lucullus, the historian is more or less equitable” (203).

Rome. The letter to Arsaces confronts this difficulty. By narrating Roman history in his own words, Mithridates is able to bypass his honorable opponent and expose the Roman state for what it really was. Despite his many admirable qualities it is still best to look at Mithridates as a villain. He would not have shared the same pathos as Spartacus or Sertorius. He was an enemy of the state and needed to be conquered and killed for the security of Rome.

## Chapter Five: Catiline and Jugurtha

Now that I have reconstructed the portraits of the three main antagonists of the Roman state from the *Historiae*, I would like to compare my speculative portraits with the more easily comprehensible adversaries from Sallust's two completely extant monographs: Catiline and Jugurtha. The ambiguous character of Catiline poses an interesting problem for the reader of Sallust. Thus I will analyze the figure as he appears in the progressing narrative, rather than with the thematic approach I have employed previously.

Sallust introduces Catiline as a man who, though capable of accomplishing the greatest good for the *res publica*, possesses a thoroughly corrupt nature: *L. Catilina, nobili genere natus, fuit magna vi et animi et corporis, sed ingenio malo prauoque* (BC 5.1).<sup>172</sup> As Earl has shown, Catiline's *ingenium malum pravumque* necessitates his separation from *virtus*.<sup>173</sup> Sallust then goes on to record Catiline's great endurance, as well as listing the full catalog of his crimes, almost too great to be believed. He contains an unmatched mix of talent and depravity. Following Sulla's example, Catiline was motivated by poverty and guilt, all the while enabled by the corruption of the state.<sup>174</sup> Sallust then digresses on how the *res publica* came to such a pass before returning to Catiline. The rest is more of the same: acquisition of criminal followers, enticement of the innocent into crime (and perhaps more), seduction of a vestal virgin, and the murder of his own son out of lust for a new wife. Guilt from this last crime

---

<sup>172</sup> Rolfe: "Lucius Catiline, scion of a noble family, had great vigour both of mind and body, but an evil and depraved nature" (9).

<sup>173</sup> Earl: "*Ingenium* is the natural talent, good or bad, of the *animus* which distinguishes men from the brutes. Therefore Sallust insists that man must rely on his *ingenium* rather than on his *vis corporis*. If he has any *vis animi* which gives him *ingenium*, he must use it and this exercise of *ingenium* is *virtus animi*. But *ingenium* may be *malum*, as Catiline's was, and if it is used *male*, it will not result in *virtus* in conduct" (11).

<sup>174</sup> Sallust: *Hunc post dominationem L. Sullae libido maxuma inuaserat rei publicae capiundae, neque id quibus modis adsequeretur, dum sibi regnum pararet, quicquam pensi habebat. Agitabur magis magisque in dies animus ferox inopia rei familiaris et conscientia scelerum, quae utraque iis artibus auxerat quas supra memorauit. Incitabant praeterea corrupti ciuitatis mores, quos pessuma ac diuorsa inter se mala, luxuria atque auaritia, uexabant* (BC 5.6-8).

was the immediate cause of the conspiracy. We then have the initial description of Catiline's plans and the meeting in his house, interrupted by an account of the earlier Pisonian conspiracy, thwarted only by Catiline's haste.

Following this catalog of depravity, Catiline's speech comes as something of a shock. It is full of noble sentiment, calling for liberty and a return to the *mos maiorum*. He even uses Sallust the narrator's own terms and specific arguments to show the wickedness of the *nobiles*.<sup>175</sup> Only the desire for riches mars its pure intentions.<sup>176</sup> Yet Catiline's own words, both at the beginning and end, puncture the illusion. Syme rightly notes the absurdity of the proem:

There are four orations: two from Catilina, one each from Caesar and Cato. Here the author illustrates his favourite ideas, linked to the digressions . . . Also indirectly, and almost in parody: Catilina in preface to the harangue inciting the conspirators makes appeal to their "virtus" and "fides," and in both speeches he arraigns the "potentia paucorum (68).

*Virtus* in men such as these is nonsense.<sup>177</sup> Immediately following the grand oration, Catiline's men demand more than rhetoric. Catiline answers with specifics: *Tum Catilina polliceri tabulas novas, proscriptionem locupletium, magistratus sacerdotia*

---

<sup>175</sup> Sallust: *Nam quid ea memorem quae nisi iis qui uidere nemini credibilia sunt, a priuatis compluribus subuorsos montis, maria constrata esse?* (BC 13.1) – Catiline: *Etenim quis mortalium quoui uirile ingenium est tolerare potest illis diuitias superare quas profundant in extruendo mari et montibus coaequandis, nobis rem familiarem etiam ad necessaria deesse?* (BC 20.11). Sallust: *ibi primum insueuit exercitus populi Romani amare potare, signa tabulas pictas uasa caelata mirari, ea priuatim et publice rapere* (BC 11.6) – Catiline: *Quom tabulas signa toreumata emunt . . .* (BC 20.12).

<sup>176</sup> Sallust: *En illa, illa quam saepe optastis libertas, praeterea diuitiae decus gloria in oculis sita sunt: fortuna omnia ea uictoribus praemia posuit* (BC 21.14).

<sup>177</sup> Although arguing for a more gray Catiline, Woodman also shows why his first speech cannot be taken at face value: "If Catiline echoes an admirable sentiment of Sallust, that is no doubt an illustration for limitless simulation (5.4 *quouis rei lubet simulator*). If he shares vigilance and toil with Caesar, we should remember the implication (5.2-3) that he displayed these qualities from adolescence in civil wars which he had welcomed and that, while in Sallust's view Caesar (20) desired conventional arenas in which to demonstrate his *uirtus* (54.4), Catiline lusted at taking over the state (5.6 *lubido maxima . . . rei publicae capiundae*)" (Kraus and Woodman 19-20).

*rapinas, alia omnia quae bellum atque libido uictorum fert* (BC 21.2).<sup>178</sup> As Earl notes, there is an obvious twisting of vocabulary: “Catiline meant by *libertas* nothing more than ‘*gratia auctoritas potentia honos divitiae*’ for himself and his immediate associates.”<sup>179</sup> Catiline completes the meeting with more words of encouragement. Sallust mentions the drinking of human blood, but attributes it to rumor and as a late invention to vindicate Cicero's harsh treatment of the conspirators (BC 22.3).

After his defeat in the elections for 63 BC by Cicero and Antonius, Catiline begins collecting arms and men in Etruria and plans the burning of the city. He also planned to run again for consul the next year, while many times failing to assassinate Cicero. Angry with his followers' lack of dedication, he again summons them to say that only the assassination of Cicero prevented him from joining the army in Etruria. Faced down by Cicero before the senate, Catiline lets pride get the best of him as he warns the angry Senate: *quoniam quidem circumuentus . . . ab inimicis praeceps agor, incendium meum ruina restinguam* (31.9).<sup>180</sup> He departs the city for Etruria and his army, leaving letters announcing his departure for Massilia and exile, though a fuller letter to Catulus serves as an epitome of his previous speech, both in its rhetoric and true meaning (BC 35). Catiline leaves the narrative for the next twenty-one chapters.

In this first section Sallust has created a thoroughly, unambiguously evil character. His talents—intelligence, planning, bodily strength, eloquence, and the reading of human nature—serve only as tools for his crimes. Even the apparently noble speech and letter only reveal Catiline to be a *simulator ac dissimulator*, as he had already been described (BC 5.4). The next section seems more ambiguous (BC 56-61). While the conspirators were discovered and executed in Rome, Catiline was

---

<sup>178</sup> Rolfe: “Thereupon Catiline promised abolition of debts, the proscription of the rich, offices, priesthoods, plunder, and all the other spoils that war and the license of victors can offer (39).

<sup>179</sup> Wilkins (40) also notices the punch of these lines.

<sup>180</sup> Rolfe: “Since I am brought to bay by my enemies and driven desperate, I will put out my fire by general devastation” (55).

busy enrolling men his army, though he refused to include slaves (*BC* 56.5). When he learned of the failure of Lentulus, he tried to march to Gaul but was trapped between two Roman armies. He then decided to face the consul Antonius, his former ally in conspiracy (*BC* 21.3), at Pistoria.

Catiline's pre-battle speech serves as another example of model rhetoric (*BC* 58). He calls on his men to fight for their freedom against those serving the power of a few. This oration is also full of the typical rhetoric of safety in courage and danger in flight, while Catiline's conclusion actually parallels Sallust the narrator's opening sentence of the monograph.<sup>181</sup> The battle matches the speech. Catiline serves superlatively as general and soldier, and his men die in their place, facing forward. At the last, Catiline rushes into the thick of the fight, but Sallust refuses to show him die: *Catilina uero longe a suis inter hostium cadauera repertus est, paululum etiam spirans ferociamque animi quam habuerat uiuos in uoltu retinens* (*BC* 61.4).<sup>182</sup> The conclusion to the battle, and the *Bellum Catilinae*, proves equally confusing:

Neque tamen exercitus populi Romani laetam aut incruentam uictoriam adeptus erat; nam strenuissimus quisque aut occiderat in proelio aut grauiter uulneratus discesserat. Multi atuem, qui e castris uisundi aut spoliandi gratia processerant, uolentes hostilia cadauera amicum alii, pars hospitem aut cognatum reperiebant; fuere item qui inimicos suos cognoscerent. Ita uarie per omnem exercitum laetitia maeror, luctus atque gaudia

---

<sup>181</sup> Sallust: *Omnis homines qui sese student praestare ceteris animalibus summa ope niti decet ne uitam silentio transerant, ueluti pecora quae natura prona atque uentri oboedientia finxit* (*BC* 1.1) – Catiline: *Quod si uirtuti uostrae fortuna inuiderit, caute inulti animam amittatis, neu capti potius sicuti pecora trucidemini quam uirorum more pugnantem cruentam atque luctuosam uictoriam hostibus relinquatis* (*BC* 58.21).

<sup>182</sup> Sallust: “But Catiline was found far in advance of his men amid a heap of slain foemen, still breathing slightly, and showing in his face the indomitable spirit which had animated him when alive” (127).

agitabantur (BC 61.7-9).<sup>183</sup>

Sallust's second section on Catiline thus presents a completely different character. The only sign of his previously described habits is the *ferocia animi* etched on his still living face. To all effect Sallust describes a man giving a speech full of Roman values before heroically dying with his equally brave men while fighting against impossible odds. Catiline especially raises his stock in comparison with the senatorial commander, the corrupt and useless Antonius, who cannot even take part in the battle because of gout. Woodman reads these scenes as a sign for a reappraisal of the character:

Yet, given the ways in which the reader's sympathies have been manipulated in favour of Catiline in these final pages, we seem to be far removed from the defiant spirit (*animus ferox*) which, in the introductory character sketch, was encouraged by the consciousness of his crimes (5.7 *conscientia scelerum*). Whatever interpretation we place upon Catiline earlier in the narrative, there seems no doubt that at the very end he has become 'a tragic hero' (Kraus and Woodman 20).<sup>184</sup>

---

<sup>183</sup> Rolfe: "But the army of the Roman people gained no joyful nor bloodless victory, for all the most valiant had either fallen in the fight or come off with severe wounds. Many, too, who had gone from the camp to visit the field or to pillage, on turning over the body of the rebels found now a friend, now a guest or kinsman; some also recognized their personal enemies. Thus the whole army was variously affected with sorrow and grief, rejoicing and lamentation" (129).

<sup>184</sup> Wilkins agrees, but takes her conclusion beyond credibility: "It is my contention that Sallust's overall opinion of Catiline, his associates, and the Roman political situation is deliberately complex. To provide an outright defense for the attempted revolution would be unacceptable. It would be far too strong to say that Sallust sympathizes with the revolutionary movement, but he does interpret the conspiracy as a serious attempt at reforming an already troubled government. Ultimately, the revolutionaries and their opposition are all Romans. Their ambitions, hopes, and desires vary little, as the verbal repetitions illustrate. Only the strained political, economic, and social conditions place the two sides in opposing camps. The equations of good versus bad and traditional Roman versus revolutionary are too simple: Sallust is too subtle and politically perceptive to succumb to such categorization" (139).

While this view is respectable and takes a straightforward approach to the passages, it is not necessarily the best possible interpretation.

The first objection comes from the *Bellum Catilinae* itself. It is difficult not to read Catiline's final speech in light of Cato's admonition to the senate:

Hic mihi quisquam mansuetudinem et misericordiam nominat? Iam pridem equidem nos uera uocabula rerum amisimus: qui bona aliena largiri liberalitas, malarum rerum audacia fortitudo uocatur, eo res publica in extremo sita est (*BC* 52.11).<sup>185</sup>

Cato's references to *mansuetudo* and *miser cordia* target Caesar; however, his lament over the redefinition of *liberalitas* and *fortitudo* takes aim at the present state of the *res publica*. Earl sums up the situation well: "Once more Sallust shows his borrowing from Thucydides to be entirely relevant. The perversion and debasement of noble sentiments to personal and party ends, typical of the age, remain the keynotes of Catiline's propaganda to the end" (95). By clever writing Sallust may be manipulating us into identifying Catiline's *audacia* as *fortitudo*, but his essential characteristics remain unchanged. Syme agrees: "The book ends, to be sure, with Catilina and the battle near Pistoria—a sombre anticlimax of desperation and futility, a fierce and fraudulent oration, a useless and murderous battle" (68). McGushin (1977) attacks the tragic Catiline from the other end, arguing that the scene is a topos, nothing more.<sup>186</sup>

I do not mean to dismiss the tragic aspects of these final chapters of the *Bellum Catilinae*. McGushin assuredly goes to far; an inspiring speech, however, and a brave

---

<sup>185</sup> Rolfe: "At this point (save the mark!) someone hints at gentleness and long-suffering! But in very truth we have long since lost the true names for things. It is precisely because squandering the goods of others is called generosity, and recklessness in wrong doing is called courage, that the republic is reduced to extremities" (103).

<sup>186</sup> McGushin (1977): "To assume that Catiline is here portrayed as a tragic hero . . . is to demand far too pregnant a meaning from language which was almost stereotyped for a description such as this. For the traditional elements cf. especially Livy's treatment of the death of Hadsdrubal; Virgil, *Aen.* 9.400; *Rhet. ad Her.* 4.57" (287).

death cannot make up for the catalog of sins and depravity that Sallust attaches to Catiline. A talented villain is still a villain. The tragedy is for the Republic, not for Catiline. At one point Sallust interrupts his characterization of Catiline to describe the degeneration of the Roman state (*BC* 5.9-14.7). Wilkins rightly notices the correlation between the two.<sup>187</sup> To this identification we can also add Cato's speech on the changing meanings of words. Catiline is a creature born of the degradation of Rome, its natural and inevitable result. It may be a sad story and sorry waste of talent, but his essential nature remains evil.

The figure of Jugurtha differs from Catiline in his ease of characterization and his narrative path. While Jugurtha actually has character development, he is a far less ambiguous figure. My analysis of Jugurtha will broadly follow Jugurtha's path through the *Bellum Iugurthinum*; however, the length of the monograph will make it more thematic in approach than my section on Catiline.

Sallust at first presents a glowing portrait of the Numidian prince. His initial description depicts the perfect “noble savage”:

Qui ubi adoleuit, pollens uiribus, decora facie, sed multo maxime ingenio ualidus, nos se luxu neque inertiae corrumpendum dedit, sed, uti mos gentis illius est, equitare iaculari, cursu cum aequalibus certare, et quom omnis gloria anteiret, omnibus tamen carus esse (*BI* 6.1).<sup>188</sup>

---

<sup>187</sup> Wilkins: “The character sketch of Catiline is closely related to this digression. The phrase *conrupti civitatis mores* (5.8) anticipates *de moribus civitatis* (5.9), which introduces and is the subject of the digression. Thus Sallust introduces Catiline immediately before the digression and integrates him well into the decadent environment depicted at its end” (34). Earl: “This is made the occasion of a long digression showing how Rome ceased to be the noblest and best city and became the worst and most vicious. Theoretically this digression consists in exposition in the history of the Republic of Sallust's scheme of *virtus* and its decline. In its immediate context it puts Catiline in his setting as a child of his age, the typical product of the process of degeneration which began with the destruction of Carthage” (85).

<sup>188</sup> Rolfe: “As soon as Jugurtha grew up, endowed as he was with physical strength, a handsome person, but above all with a vigorous intellect, he did not allow himself to be spoiled by luxury or idleness, but following the custom of that nation, he rode, he hurled the javelin, he contended with his fellows in

Sallust also says that Jugurtha was the best in the hunt and preferred action to words. Earl notes the import of this passage relative to Sallust's overarching schema: by blamelessly excelling in the traditional Numidian arts, Jugurtha was practicing *virtus*.<sup>189</sup> Micipsa first delights in Jugurtha's *virtus* before realizing the threat such a man might pose to his kingdom. He thus ships him off to Numantia, but Jugurtha excels there even more, becoming the first man in Scipio's army.<sup>190</sup> It is at Numantia that Jugurtha's curious turn of character occurs. Sallust sees Jugurtha's interaction with the Romans as the catalyst:

Ea tempestate in exercitu nostro fuere complures noui atque nobiles quibus diuitiae bono honestoque potiores erant, factiosi domi, potentes apud socios, clari magis quam honesti, qui Iugurthae non mediocrem animum pollicitando adcendebant: si Micipsa rex occidisset, fore uti solus imperi Numidiae potiretur; in ipso maxumam uirtutem, Romae omnia uenalia esse (*BI* 8.1).<sup>191</sup>

Scipio warns Jugurtha against bribing and commends him to Micipsa, praising his *virtus* (*BI* 9.2). Micipsa then adopts his bastard nephew, putting him on the same level as his sons Adherbal and Hiempsal. On his deathbed Micipsa makes a speech (*BI* 10)

---

foot-races; and although he surpassed them all in renown, he nevertheless won the love of all” (141-143).

<sup>189</sup> Earl: “Here the phrase 'uti mos gentis illius est' is of the first importance. Jugurtha, in pursuing the activities traditional for a young Numidian, was comparable to the young Roman pleading in the courts. The different traditions prescribed different activities for their youth, but for Sallust success in either was *virtus* . . . In many ways Jugurtha recalls the Roman youth of the early Republic, the period when 'virtus omnia domuerat'. Like them he avoided *luxus* and *inertia*, like them he was unsparing in the struggle for renown and pre-eminence, to be the first to commit some brave deed, like them he preferred action to words” (62).

<sup>190</sup> Sallust: *multo labore multaque cura, praeterea modestissime parendo et saepe obuiam eundo periculis in tantam claritudinem breui preuenerat ut nostris uehementer carus, Numantinis maximo terrori esset. At sane, quod difficillimum in primis est, et proelio strenuus erat et bonus consilio* (*BI* 7.4-5).

<sup>191</sup> Rolfe: “At that time there were a great many in our army, both new men and nobles, who cared more for riches than for virtue and self-respect; they were intriguers at home, influential with our allies, rather notorious than respected. These men fired Jugurtha's ambitious spirit by holding out hopes that if king Micipsa should die, he might gain the sole power in Numidia, since he himself stood first in merit, while at Rome anything could be bought” (145).

where he entrusts his sons to Jugurtha's care and claims that he always viewed Jugurtha as his son. The first hint of Jugurtha's change reveals itself in his reaction: *Ad ea Iugurtha, tametsi regem ficta locutum intellegebat et ipse longe aliter animo agitabat, tamen pro tempore benigne respondit (BI 11.1).*<sup>192</sup> Stung by Hiempsal's insults when the three princes meet to divide the kingdom, Jugurtha turns to treachery and murder, bribing Hiempsal's host for the keys and having his men bring him Hiempsal's head.<sup>193</sup> The Numidians then split between Jugurtha and Adherbal. Jugurtha's better soldiers win the day, and Adherbal flees to Africa Province and then to Rome.

Jugurtha now becomes the consummate villain. Conte notes the totality of the change: "Once his character is corrupted, Jugurtha is only a petty, treacherous tyrant, ambitious and unscrupulous. He is certainly not the hero of Numidian independence that some interpreters have imagined" (240). Bribery at Rome, through surrogates, follows. Then a second war with Adherbal followed by a treacherous treaty resulting in Adherbal's execution and torture paired with the massacre of his Italian supporters.<sup>194</sup> War with Rome ensues, but Jugurtha bribes the consul Bestia and Scaurus into an extremely favorable peace. Jugurtha is then brought to Rome to testify against his Roman collaborators, where he bribes on an even larger scale and also procures yet another assassination of a rival to the throne. This last outrage is too much, and war never completely ends until Jugurtha's capture.

---

<sup>192</sup> Rolfe: "Although Jugurtha knew that the king spoke insincerely, and though he had very different designs in his own mind, yet he returned a gracious answer, suited to the occasion" (151).

<sup>193</sup> Jugurtha's reaction to Hiempsal: *Quod uerbum in pectus Iugurthae altius quam quisquam ratus erat descendit. Itaque ex eo tempore ira et metu anxius moliri, parare atque ea modo cum animo habere quibus Hiempsal per dolum caperetur. Quae ubi tardius procedunt neque lenitur animus ferox, statuit quouis modo inceptum perficere (BI 11.7-9).*

<sup>194</sup> Sallust: *Iugurtha in primis Adherbalem excrutiatum necat, deinde omnis puberes Numidas atque negotiatores promiscue, uti quisque armatus obuius fuerat, interficit (BI 26.3).*

Rather than recount the rest of the *Bellum Iugurthinum*, during which Jugurtha's character remains static, I will now turn to a thematic analysis. Jugurtha is so skillful at the art of command and such a mighty warrior in his own right, that it is hard not to see a modicum of approval emanating from Sallust. Jugurtha's physical feats drift into the heroic, such as in the last battle against Marius: *At Iugurtha, dum sustentare suos et prope iam adeptam uictoriam retinere cupit, circumuentus ab equitibus, dextra sinistra omnibus occisis, solus inter tela hostium uitabundus erumpit* (BI 101.9).<sup>195</sup> On a similarly legendary scale is Sallust's account of Jugurtha shadowing Metellus' and Marius' columns after the battle at the River Muthul: *modo se Metello interdum Mario ostendere, postremos in agmine temptare ac statim in collis regredi, rursus aliis, post allis minitari, neque proelium facere neque otium pati, tantum modo hostem ab incepto retinere* (BI 55.8).<sup>196</sup> However, it is important to remember that these positive qualities are more skills than proof of character. Jugurtha remains corrupted to the end, bribing Bocchus' courtiers (BI 103.2) and urging the king to betray Sulla (BI 112.3).

Jugurtha's final dominant characteristic is fear.<sup>197</sup> This emotion marks the last stage in his character development. *Metus* bears partial responsibility for his murder of Hiempsal (BI 11.8), but it is not until Jugurtha decides to surrender that fear starts drastically changing his behavior. After he has already paid concessions of gold, elephants, arms, and supplies to Metellus, Jugurtha begins to fear his just deserts:

*Igitur Iugurtha, ubi armis uirisque et pecunia spoliatus est, quom ipse ad imperandum*

---

<sup>195</sup> Rolfe: "As for Jugurtha, while he was trying to hold his men and grasp the victory which he had all but won, he was surrounded by the cavalry; but though all on his right and left were slain, he broke through alone, escaping amid a shower of hostile weapons" (357).

<sup>196</sup> Rolfe: "[Jugurtha] showed himself now to Metellus, again to Marius; made an attempt on the hindmost in the line and at once retreated to the hills; again threatened others and afterwards others, neither gave battle nor let the enemy rest, but merely prevented them from carrying out their plans" (255-257).

<sup>197</sup> By my count, using Bennett as a reference, fear motivates Jugurtha fifteen times in the *Bellum Iugurthinum*: *formido* (72.2); *metuere* (25.10, 72.2); *metus* (11.8, 25.6, 70.1); *pavescere* (72.2); *terrere* (54.7); *timeo* (13.5, 25.7, 62.8, 76.1); *timidus* (20.1, 32.5); *verere* (35.9).

*Tisidium uocaretur, rursus coepit flectere animum suum et ex mala conscientia digna timere* (BI 62.8).<sup>198</sup> While this example is only momentary, fear later comes to rule Jugurtha's life after the betrayal of Bomilcar and Metellus' arrival at remote Thala.<sup>199</sup> I should note that this fear never seems to impact his decisions in battle or skill in tactics. Jugurtha nearly wins two more battles against Marius after nearly having degenerated into madness.<sup>200</sup> His terror seems more to lessen the reader's regard for him than to hamper Jugurtha's efficacy in waging war.

Regarding Jugurtha's literary function, Sallust gives him a twofold purpose. His blameless youth is described only to be corrupted by his first contact with the Roman state. It is, as I have already said, almost as if corrupt *nobiles* and *novi homines* at Numantia carried a virus that overwhelmed Jugurtha upon contact. The then-fallen prince exposes the corruption and ineffectiveness of the nobility through his continuously effective bribery. While Bestia and Albinus make an incredible mess of the war, nearly losing an army, even the *nobilitas'* greatest general, Metellus, cannot bring Jugurtha to bay and finish the conflict. Even though Jugurtha could never hope to overcome a Rome set on his defeat, Sallust fixes on him as the catalyst that brings Marius to power, and provides Sulla with a scope for action, setting him on his own path towards office and glory. In addition, although it goes unmentioned, the circumstances of Jugurtha's capture create the first bone of contention between Marius and Sulla. Jugurtha is thus indirectly responsible for the civil war between Marius and Sulla and the end of the Republic.

---

<sup>198</sup> Rolfe: "Now, when Jugurtha, after being stripped of arms, men, and money, was himself summoned to Tisidium to receive his orders, he began once more to waver in his purpose, and prompted by a guilty conscience, to dread the punishment due to his crimes" (269).

<sup>199</sup> Jugurtha after Bomilcar: *ciuis hostisque iuxta metuere, circumspectare omnia et omni strepitu pauscescere, alio <alioque alio> loco, saepe contra decus regium, noctu requiescere, interdum somno excitus adreptis armis tumultum facere: ita formidine quasi uecordia exagitari* (BI 72.2); After Metellus' arrival at Thala: *Neque postea in ullo loco amplius uno die aut una nocte moratus, simulabat sese negoti gratia properare, ceterum proditionem timebat, quam uitare posse celeritate putabat* (BI 76.1).

<sup>200</sup> BI 97-99, 101.

## Chapter Six: Conclusion

In charting the path of the figures Sallust set against the Roman state, I hope have made some small contribution to the body of scholarship. First and foremost, I hope I have shown that Sallust took the time to draw individual characters. While each of these figures had the same basic function in that they were talented men who fought the Roman state, men whom Sallust used to expose in some way or another the corruption therein, each also displays his own individual characteristics. Only Spartacus seems lacking in a coherent, unique personality, but I would attribute this state of affairs more to the scanty number of fragments bearing on him than any failure on Sallust's part. Jugurtha's fear is unique, as is Sertorius' desire for peace, Catiline's drowning in guilt, and Mithridates' blend of hero and tyrant. However, I would now like to make some larger claims by comparing the characters of the *Historiae* among themselves and also as a set against Catiline and Jugurtha.

It is clear, then, that the characters of Catiline and Jugurtha do share a certain amount of the traits of their counterparts in the *Historiae*. Like Sertorius, Spartacus, and Mithridates, each one possesses incredible physical and mental powers, though Catiline's power of body seems to belong with Mithridates in the almost superhuman camp, whereas Jugurtha's strength and stamina belong among the merely amazing quality of Sertorius and Spartacus. The comparison of these figures' *vis animi* is difficult and, on a certain level, fruitless. Catiline's lone battle ending in defeat would seem to single him out from the other characters, all of whom faced similarly hopeless situations and still managed to triumph, at least in the short term. Mithridates' military success, while superior to Catiline's, also fails in comparison with Jugurtha, Sertorius, and Spartacus. Catiline is also marked in that the proof of the greatness of his *animus* lies primarily in a non-martial field. His ability for seduction and devising new crimes are his primary fields of endeavor. Also to be included in the mental realm should be

these figures' remarkable power of perseverance. Aside from Spartacus, each of them spent decades pursuing his stated aim. It is enough to say that each figure had these two traits. Thus far they would appear schematized, though anyone who fought the Roman state with some measure of success must have been gifted with superior mental powers.

All five characters also share the same basic place in Sallust's political and moral framework, though they differ in their precise roles. Catiline and Jugurtha straightforwardly serve as foils for Rome. Catiline, in that he is a Roman, can act on a grander scale than Jugurtha, serving as a kind of stand in for the city itself. Jugurtha's innocence and *virtus*, swift fall, and then resulting perfidy expose Rome both in its corruption and incompetence. Both of them, however, are real enemies. Spartacus similarly exposes the incompetence of the *nobiles*, but he does not pick his fight with Rome. It would appear, rather, that the war is forced upon him. Thus he cannot be a true enemy of the state. Sallust's ideal Rome would not have to wage war against a man like Spartacus. Likewise with respect to Sertorius, who should have been given the opportunity to serve his homeland. The apparent change from erstwhile settler of the Blessed Isles to tyrant would have heightened this tragedy.

Mithridates, in a certain sense, stands alone from the other figures. During the *Historiae* he faces an honorable and competent opponent in Lucullus. His letter to Arsaces has him having to go back into the time before Sallust's account starts for examples of Roman perfidy. Another possibility is that his doggedness and perseverance exposed the infighting at Rome between greedy *equites* and *nobiles* that resulted in the dismissal of Lucullus.<sup>201</sup> He also gave himself time to show the insubordination of Lucullus' soldiers, which Sallust may very well have compared to

---

<sup>201</sup> Plutarch, *Luc.* 20, 33.

Sulla's men in Asia Minor, who, as I have already stated, marked the beginning of *luxuria's* rule in Rome.<sup>202</sup>

These have all been differences in degree rather than kind though. As I have already hinted at in my discussion of literary function, the figures from the *Historiae* all seem to be more well rounded and plausible figures, though the danger of misinterpreting from fragments is always present. As I have argued, Catiline may be complicated, but any mitigating factors are a function of his symbolic value rather than the role he plays. The unmatched depravity of his career, the almost comprehensive list of evils attached to him, ineluctably cast him as villain. Jugurtha, though his blameless youth followed the path of *virtus*, descends into a caricature, losing all claim to nobility. The only complicating factor is his amazing ability to keep fighting the Romans. After Numantia he remains treacherous, murderous, and venal for the rest of the work. Rome may be corrupt and the corrupter of others, but her enemies are worse and worthy of defeat at her hands.

These easy readings are not the case for the figures from the *Historiae*. Spartacus, from the few fragments that survive and from the version Plutarch gives us, appears blameless. Appian's descriptions of human sacrifice and the slaughter of prisoners do not fit the evidence, especially from the Vatican manuscript. He is writing from a different tradition. Paradoxically, Spartacus' lack of character seems to be proof of Sallust's growth. Appian's account shows that Sallust need not have portrayed Spartacus in such glowing terms, whatever the historical reality. The contrast of Spartacus with the *servile ingenium* of his followers is of prime importance. By all accounts Spartacus should have had a similar *ingenium*. A Catilinarian or Jugurthine figure would be entirely in keeping with expectation. Sallust most likely gave Crassus his due as a general, as he clearly did for Pompey and

---

<sup>202</sup> Plutarch, *Luc.* 34.

Lucullus; however, the reader's sympathy would have lain with the rebel slave, shocking to a Roman, rather than in the duly appointed servants of the Republic. Whereas Caesar and Cato, the enemies of Catiline, each had *ingens virtus*, and Metellus and Marius could also make a claim to that virtue during the time they were fighting Jugurtha, something has changed with Spartacus. Of the men involved in the slave war, he has the best claim to this Roman virtue.

Sertorius also served as more than just a foil to the Roman generals he fought. He stands in stark contrast to Metellus' ridiculous victory celebrations after Segovia and Pompey's threatening letter to the Senate, but his claim to *virtus* is also far stronger. Pompey, according to Sallust, had aimed at domination since he was a young man, while Metellus was a creature of Sulla, from whose war Sertorius alone seemed to have survived untainted. His desire to settle in the Isles of the Blessed would probably have been more than just a refuge sought in despair. It would make sense that he longed for the peace and *concordia* that was the proper birthright of a Roman. His fall, which Sallust most likely would have portrayed, probably would have needed to have been psychological in way that Jugurtha's was not. Sertorius was too mature and too enmeshed within the structure of Roman politics not to have this switch in temperament fully explained.

Mithridates, as I have already explained, differs from the previous two characters in his status *vis a vis* Rome. He is not the insider like Sertorius or even the forced *quasi*-insider like Spartacus. He has his own imperial ambitions that Rome stands in the way of. He thus serves as a worthy adversary. All the more extraordinary is his difference from Jugurtha, whom he appears to so closely resemble. If my reading of the fragment *uir cum dicendus cura* and the comparisons with Plutarch and Appian are correct, then Mithridates' cruelty which seems to be on a level with Catiline was tempered by a magnanimity and sense of honor that never appears in

the two characters from the monographs. His cruelty would not be canceled out, and, like them, he most likely played the villain to the end, but with an added dimension to his character.

I would again like to stress that only Sertorius, because of Sallust's political and moral leanings, necessitated a well-drawn character. Their politics were too close and the similarities matched too well for Sallust to have just cast him off as a traitor to the state.<sup>203</sup> While Spartacus does fit neatly into the “noble savage” paradigm with, say, Viriathus or the Germans of Tacitus, Jugurtha most emphatically does not. Spartacus had just as much contact with Romans as the Numidian king, but he manages to preserve his *virtus* intact. Sallust also had every opportunity to paint Mithridates as the villain on the grand scale. He could have gone only with the cruel, calculating tyrant with a veneer of Hellenistic culture, but instead he appeared to soften the image.

Whereas men like Antonius in the *Catiline*, and Marius, Metellus, and Sulla in the *Jugurtha* play well-rounded roles and receive ambivalent personalities, these qualities are transferred to Rome's enemies in the *Historiae*. Like Tiffou *et al.*, one can easily read this transfer as a sign of Sallust's growing pessimism. As the Republic becomes more hopelessly corrupt, its enemies become that much more noble. However, it is important to note that Sallust does not turn the Roman generals, servants of the new Sullan order, which Sallust heavily condemned, into gross caricatures. Unfortunately nothing remains of Sallust's account of Crassus' campaign

---

<sup>203</sup> Gillis: “Perhaps the most pressing reason that Sallust felt he should write about Sertorius was precisely this unfairness. Someone had to rescue this leader of the *populares* from the oblivion planned for him by pro-Sullan and later pro-Pompeian writers. But there were other important reasons for Sallust's devotion to Sertorius, and for his desire to commemorate him in the *Historiae*. Both men were from the Sabine country, that 'land of hardy democrats' where patriot feeling ran high . . . As Sallust grew older and developed his animosity toward the *optimates*, in his earlier two monographs, he was surely offended at Roman writers' mistreatment of this man from Nursia who had fought so long and so well against the very forces he himself loathed so much” (713).

against Spartacus, but Metellus and Pompey get their due against Sertorius, as does Lucullus against Mithridates. The *Historiae*, then, show a uniformly gray world, whereas the monographs illuminated a world in white, gray, and black. In that all the major characters of the *Historiae* appear more plausible, Sallust appears to have more accurately portrayed his subjects. I do not mean to say that Sallust has completely freed himself from his political and moral concerns. They still dominate his writing and subvert the narrative to their demands. However, the figures in the *Historiae* seem to have been less subverted. The crude figures of Catiline and Jugurtha could not have functioned as real persons. Sertorius, Spartacus, and Mithridates, with their combination of vices and virtues, read more plausibly. Since this thesis is historiographical in nature, I cannot make any final claims on the historical authenticity of the portraits Sallust provides. I do hope, however, that, because of the individual, more realistic portrayal of these three figures, the historian may breathe a little easier in using Sallust's *Historiae*.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Basore, J. 1935. *Seneca: Moral Essays, Volume III*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Bennett, A. 1970. *Index Verborum Sallustianus*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag.
- Bennett, C. 1925. *Frontinus: Stratagems and the Aqueducts of Rome*. London: W. Heinemann.
- Carter, J. 1996. *Appian: The Civil Wars*. London: Penguin Books.
- Conte, G. 1999. "Sallust," in *Latin Literature: A History*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- De Blois, L. 1988. "The Perception of Expansion in the Works of Sallust," in *Latomus: Revue D'Études Latines* 47, No. 3. 604-619.
- Della Casa, Adriana. 1977. *Arusianus Messius: Exempla Elocutionum*. Milano: Marzorati.
- Earl, D. 1961. *The Political Thought of Sallust*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Endt, J. 1909. *Adnotationes super Lucanum*. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner.
- Flacelière, R. and E. Chambry. 1973. *Plutarque Vies Tome VIII: Sertorius-Eumène – Agésilas-Pompée*. Paris: Société D'Édition "Les Belles Lettres."
- , 1972. *Plutarque Vies Tome VII: Cimon-Lucullus – Nicias-Crassus*. Paris: Société D'Édition « Les Belles Lettres ».
- Gillis, D. 1969. "Quintus Sertorius," in *Rendiconti dell'Istituto Lombardo*. 711-27.
- Glucker, J. 1978. *Antiochus and the Late Academy*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Hagen, H. 1867. *Scholia Bernensi ad Vergili Bucolica atque Gerogica*. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner.
- Ireland, R. 1990. *Iuli Frontini Strategemata*. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner.

- Keil, H. 1868. *Artium Scriptores Minores (Grammatici Latini Vol. 5)*. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner.
- Keller, O. 1902. *Pseudacronis Scholia in Horatium Vetusiora. Schol. AV in Carmina et Epodos*. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner.
- Konrad, C. 1994. *Plutarch's Sertorius: A Historical Commentary*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Kraus, C. and A. Woodman. 1996. "Sallust," in *Latin Historians*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Laistner, M. 1947. *The Greater Roman Historians*. Berkley: University of California Press.
- Levene, D. 1992. "Sallust's Jugurtha: An 'Historical Fragment,'" in *The Journal of Roman Studies* 82. 53-70.
- Lindsay, W. 1903. *Nonii Marcelli De Conpeniosa Doctrina Libros XX, Volumen II*. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner.
- Maurenbrecher, B. 1893. *C. Sallusti Crispi: Historiarum Reliquae*. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner.
- McGing, B. 1986. *The Foreign Policy of Mithridates VI Eupator King of Pontus*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- McGushin, P. 1994. *Sallust: The Histories. Translated with Introduction and Commentary. Volume 2*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- , 1992. *Sallust: The Histories. Translated with Introduction and Commentary. Volume 1*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- , 1977. *C. Sallustius Crispus Bellum Catilinae: A Commentary*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Mineo, B. 1997. "Philosophie de l'histoire chez Salluste et Tite-Live," in R. Poignault's (ed.) *Présence de Salluste*. Tours: Centre de Recherches A.

- Piganiol.
- Perrin, B. 1919. *Plutarch's Lives VII: Sertorius and Eumenes, Phocion and Cato the Younger*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Reynolds, L. 1991. *C. Sallusti Crispi: Catilina, Iugurtha, Historiarum Fragmenta Selecta, Appendix Sallustiana*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- , 1965. *L. Annaei Senecae Ad Lucilium Epistulae Morales*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rodríguez-Pantoja, M. 1995. *Isodorus Hispalensis Etymologiae XIX*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Rolfe, J. 1928. *Sallust*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Rose, H. 1924. *The Roman Questions of Plutarch: A New Translation with Introductory Essays & a Running Commentary*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.
- Schlesinger, A. 1959. *Livy with an English Translation. XIV. Summaries, Fragments, and Obsequens*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Shaw, B. 2001. *Spartacus and the Slave Wars: A Brief History with Documents*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's.
- Shipley, F. 1955. *Compendium of Roman History; Res Gestae Divi Augusti*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Spann, P. 1987. *Quintus Sertorius and the Legacy of Sulla*. Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press.
- Stampacchia, G. 1976. *La Tradizione della Guerra di Spartaco da Sallustio a Orosio*. Pisa: Giardini.
- Syme, R. 1964. *Sallust*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Thilo, G. 1887. *Servii Grammatici Qui Feruntur in Vergili Bucolica et Georgica Comentarii*. B. G. Teubner.

- , 1884. *Servii Grammatici Qui Feruntur in Vergilii Carmina Commentarii*.  
Leipzig: B. G. Teubner.
- Tiffou, E. 1974. *Essai sur la Pensée Morale de Salluste à la Lumière de Ses Prologues*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Tröster, M. 2008. *Themes, Character, and Politics in Plutarch's Life of Lucullus: The Construction of a Roman Aristocrat*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- White, H. 1912. *Appian's Roman History, Volume II*. London: William Heinemann.
- Wilkins, A. 1994. *Villain or Hero: Sallust's Portrayal of Catiline*. American University Studies, Series XVII, Classical Languages and Literature: Vol. 15.
- Wessner, P. 1902. *Aelii Donati Qoud Fertur Commentum Terenti Vol. 1*. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner.
- Zorzetti, N. 1982. *Iulii Exuperantii Opusculum*. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner.