Virtually every alert reader of Sallust will readily concede that the historian delights in denigration. Thus, most persons who play a role in his works receive negative treatment. I trust, e.g., that few believe Pompey a Sallustian favourite (cf. Sall. Hist. II, 17M)! What of Metellus (Numidicus, cos. 109), however? He is praised very highly (BJ 43, 1–5; 45, 1; 64, 1). Clearly, Sallust believed that Metellus was a model general, an embodiment of 'virtus' (BJ 64, 1). Sallust's very favourable portrait of such a staunch optimate as Metellus seems surprising, even if the old notion of Sallust as a 'popularis' pamphleteer has, rightly, been discarded. Nevertheless, Metellus is also criticized, sharply (BJ 64, 1: 'quoi... inerat contemptor animus et superbia, commune nobilitatis malum'). Hence, Metellus must be excluded.

Marius, however, was no optimate. The BJ ends with his re-election to the consulship (of 104), and his triumph (BJ 114, 4). Accompanying his glorification, though, is substantial criticism. E.g., BJ 63, 6 reports that Marius 'postea ambitione praeceps datus est'. As for Marius's military expertise, Sallust goes out of his way to stress that his success owed much to good luck: 'sic forte correcta Mari temeritas gloriam ex culpa invenit' (BJ 94, 7). Moreover, Sallust's classic portrait of Sulla contains the assertion that he 'neque interim, quod prava
ambitio solet, consulis aut quoisquam boni famam laedere' (BJ 96, 3). This apparent compliment in fact constitutes a doubly ironic blast, for Marius, then consul, had gained that office through malicious criticism of his commander, the proconsul Metellus (BJ 64, 4–6), while Sulla himself was to reap full benefit from his own opposition to his former commander, Marius, to the point of claiming credit for the victory over Jugurtha (Plut. Sulla 6, 1–2; cf. 3, 7–4, 3 and Mar. 10, 7–9), and even that Marius’s military renown was ill-founded (Plut. Mar. 25, 6–8, 26, 5–27, 10)! Due to this denunciation of Marius, he must be excluded.

Another potential candidate is L. Marcius Philippus. Sallust manifestly took an interest in this ‘censorius’, for the historian assigned him an oration (Hist. I, 77M). Though Philippus plays a rather statesmanlike rôle, Syme has acutely noted that Philippus's words brim with irony, to the detriment of his own reputation. Sallust had no illusions as to Philippus’s true character.

So, too, C. Cotta, cos. 75, delivers an oration (Hist. II, 47M), seemingly urging moderate reform. However, he is also described as ‘ambitione tum ingenita largitione cupiens gratiam singulorum’ (II, 42M). Moreover, Macer, in his oration (to be discussed below), refers to Cotta as ‘ex factione media consul’ (III, 48, 8M). No need to detail the negative connotations of the word ‘factio’ (see BJ 31, 16). Cotta was no Sallustian favourite either.

The next candidate is not so clearcut: Gabinius. Syme argues that Sallust sought to rehabilitate the reputation of this long-time ‘amicus’ of Pompey who, dumped by Pompey, had ultimately turned to Caesar. This may be; the possibility that Sallust himself had travelled that political route should be recalled. In fact, Gabinius’s reported refusal to participate in revelry at a banquet held by Mithridates upon conclusion of the Second Mithridatic War (App. Mith. 66) reminds one of the behaviour of Sallust’s favourite Sertorius on his last day (Plut. Sert. 26, 7–9); cf. Sall. Hist. III, 83M). This exemplary ‘gravitas’ would have appealed to Sallust, just as the opposite behaviour attributed to Metellus Pius repelled the historian (Sall. Hist. II, 70M). Moreover, Gabinius had been the first military commander of Marc Antony (Plut. Aut. 3; cf. Cic. II Phil. 48), with whom Sallust had ties through both Antony’s marshal Venüdius (Fronto p. 117 Van den Hout) and, it appears, his own great-nephew (Sen. De Clem. I, 10, 1).

Nevertheless, the only explicit evidence concerning Gabinius is Hist. V, 21–22M. Maurenbrecher believes that these two fragments belong to a Sallustian speech of Gabinius. The point, especially with regard to V, 22M, might well be questioned, but no need. Even apart from the uncertainty as to the speaker, they provide no evidence of the historian’s attitude towards Gabinius.

To play devil’s advocate, one might plausibly argue that Sallust frowned upon Gabinius as one who had (probably) followed Sulla, played a key role in advancing Pompey’s career, had apparently been a close friend of Catiline, and subsequently enriched himself by restoring Ptolemy Auletes to his throne. What is more, Gabinius had been an extreme ‘popularis’, a species of which Sallust disapproved. Even his having been ‘dumped’ by Pompey has been
persuasively questioned. Pompey apparently did what he could. As for Gabinius’s ‘gravitas’, it is possible that the charges of lewd dancing contained elements of truth. Two other potential choices present different problems. Sallust certainly had high regard for Scipio Aemilianus (BJ 8,2; 22,2; cf. 7,4). I would contend, however, that Scipio’s position as a paradigmatic Roman hero of an earlier age was largely taken for granted; the focus was on others. Scipio does not belong on our list. Similarly, I exclude Cato the Censor, despite Sallust’s manifest emulation of the Censor’s style, explicit assertion of admiration (Hist. 1, 4M), and the strong improbability, in my judgment, that the criticism in Hist. 1, 5M (‘...plura de bonis falsa in deterius composuit’) was aimed at old Cato. The list to be composed should, I contend, consist of persons contemporary with the events being analysed by Sallust.

The next candidate is controversial: Cicero. No doubt, Sallust does regard Cicero’s overall performance in 63 with favour. So, e.g., he refers to Cicero’s First Catilinarian as ‘luculentam atque utilem rei publicae’ (BC 31, 6). Still, one does detect dubitation. Thus, BC 22 mentions the story that Catiline had his fellow conspirators drink human blood mixed with wine in order to prevent their revealing secrets. Sallust adds the following: ‘Nonnulli ficta et haec et multa praeterea existimabat ab iis, qui Ciceronis invidiam qua postea orta est leniri credebant atrocitate sceleris eorum, qui poenas dederant. Nobis ea res pro magnitudine parum comperita est’ (BC 22,3). Even the general assertion seems vaguely uncomplimentary to Cicero. The use of ‘comperio’, despite Sallust’s frequent use of the verb, no doubt constitutes an ironic reference to Cicero’s claim, concerning the conspiracy, that ‘comperi omnia’ (Cic. In Cat. I, 10). Nevertheless, I agree with Broughton and McGushin that the irony was not aimed only at Cicero.

Of course, the basic rejection of Cicero’s style (recognized by almost all modern students), plus Sall. Hist. I, 4M (‘Romani generis disertissimus paucis absolvit’) in reference to Cato the Censor, constitute, do they not, a slap at Cicero? Surely, the word ‘disertissimus’ would have immediately suggested Cicero to the audience of c. 40 BC, even if Catullus 49 had not been addressed to that orator as ‘disertissime Romuli nepotum’. Less clearcut, perhaps, is Sall. BC 23, 5–24, 1:


Granted that Cicero is portrayed as a victim of aristocratic ‘invidia’, Sallust also emphasizes that the orator gained the consulship due to the fear caused by danger from Catiline. This was largely true, but it was a far cry from Cicero’s
view of his election.

As a further point, Sallust’s reference to Cicero as ‘optumus consul’ (BC 43,1) calls to mind Cicero’s expressed annoyance (ad Att. XII, 21,1 [SB No. 260], of 45 BC) at Brutus’s referring to him thus in his Cato. Cicero felt that Brutus had favoured Cato at his, Cicero’s, expense. Does not the same, in fact, apply to the BC as a whole? Cicero found the phrase disappointingly scanty praise: ‘Quis enim ieiunius dixit inimicus?’ It is possible that Sallust did not know Cicero’s complaint, but, if so, the passage constitutes a striking coincidence. After all, Cicero’s strong feeling on the point could readily have become known long before publication of his Letters to Atticus.

A third point involves Sallust’s inserting Cicero’s famous phrase ‘quo usque tandem [. . . patientia]’ (In Cat. I, 20,9) into the mouth of Catiline (BC 20,9): ‘Quae quo usque tandem patieniti, O fortissumi viri?’! It has been suggested that the phrase may rather ‘have been derived from earlier historiography’. Syme at least eschews the incredible argument that no reference to Cicero’s usage is intended. If modern readers spot the phrase, would not the contemporaries of Sallust have noted it? Were they not intended to?

Recently, D.C. Innes, in a provocative note (op. cit. n. 20), has accepted a Sallustian allusion to Cicero’s Catilinarian, but maintains that Sallust was complimenting Cicero! The analogy noted by Innes with Cleon’s ‘misuse of Periclean phrases’ is of limited aptness. I believe that, although partly revealing Catiline’s perversion of Cicero’s phraseology, Sallust was also parodying Cicero’s grandiloquent tone.

An analogous pair of allusions occur in Sall. Hist. I, 55,9M (‘otium cum libertate’) and I, 55,25M (‘otium cum servitio’). Sallust has altered Cicero’s familiar phrase ‘otium cum dignitate’ and placed the words into the mouth of the demagogue Lepidus. Once again, this text may evidence more scorn for Lepidus than ridicule of Cicero, but it does constitute a perversion of a beloved Ciceronian expression and concept.

In short, the specific points noted, plus the basic fact of Sallust’s rejection of Cicero’s style and of his paramount role in crushing Catiline, lead to the conclusion of a mildly critical attitude toward the great orator, enough to exclude Cicero from our list.

II

The next candidate deserves, indeed demands, extended treatment: Julius Caesar. On the positive side, Sall. BC 53,6 (‘Sed memoria mea ingenti virtute, diversis moribus fuere viri duo, M. Cato et C. Caesar.’) is certainly high praise, as is the entire stress upon Caesar’s importance implicit in the central debate of the BC. Moreover, BC 49 implies that Caesar was innocent of the conspiracy, for his ‘inimici’ Catulus and Piso sought to have a false charge raised against him, we are told. Further, Caesar is said to be vulnerable to attack, ‘quod is privatim egregia liberalitate, publice maxumis muneribus grandem pecuniam debebat’
In other words, Sallust provides a very positive, friendly interpretation of Caesar's heavy debt. 24

Sallust had turned to Caesar after being expelled from the Senate in 50. (Whether Sallust had been a Caesarian before his expulsion is not known, and dubious.) As a Caesarian commander during the Civil War, Sallust had gained from Caesar praetorian rank, readmission to the Senate, and the lucrative governorship of Africa Nova, a mark of signal favour. Even when the provincials complained of Sallust's corruption, Caesar, whatever else he did (cf. Dio XLIII, 9; Inv. in Sall. 7.19–20), prevented his proconsul's prosecution. Thus, Sallust had no small reason to be grateful toward Caesar (see, however, n. 24, above), while the latter's manifest talents naturally elicited praise from the historian.

However, the question, discussed at excruciating length, is whether, in the central debate and synkrisis (of the BC), Cato or Caesar comes off best, if the two are not equally praised or both subtly disparaged. 25 I believe that Sallust, although expressing admiration for Caesar—note, e.g., the historian's omission of Cato's explicitly charging Caesar with complicity in the conspiracy (Vell. II, 35.3 and App. BC II, 6)—reveals a preference for Cato, combined with an element of criticism of Caesar.

To be specific, Sallust's statement in the synkrisis (BC 54.4) that Caesar 'sibi magnum imperium, exercitum, bellum novum exoptabat, ubi virtus enitescere posset', is a virtual admission that Caesar provoked war there. 26 This view of Sallust is surely contrary to Caesar's own account of his actions, a point overlooked by St. August. CD V, 12. Let us not forget that some, at least, of Caesar's actions in Gaul were subject to bitter criticism at home. 27 Then, too, Caesar's planned expedition against Parthia (and Germany) must be recalled. Sall. BC 2.2 ('... lubidinem dominandi causam belli habere, maxumam gloriam in maxumo imperio putare, ...'), from his preface, provides more explicit evidence for Sallustian disapproval of rampant Roman imperialism for personal gain, like that of Caesar. 28 Moreover, when, as in the synkrisis (54), one man, Caesar, is said to seek renown, and another, Cato, is said to be pursued by it, is not the former individual receiving less favourable treatment? As Pliny the Younger was to write, 'Sequi enim gloria, non adpeti debet, ...' (I, 8.14).

Note also BC 38.1 (before the central debate):

'Nam postquam ... tribunicia potestas restituta est, homines adulescentes summam potestatem nacti, quibus aetas animusque ferox erat, coepten; senatum criminaude plebem exagitare, dein largiundo atque pollicitando magis incendere, ita ipsi clari potentissque fieri.'

This passage, together with the following sections (38.2–4) on the insincerity and selfishness of both 'optimates' and 'populares', surely implies an element of criticism for Caesar, the premier 'popularis' of the recent past. More specifically, the words 'Caesar dando sublevando ignoscundo, Cato nihil largiundo gloriam adeptus est (BC 54.3, the synkrisis) provide an intentional echo of the words 'largiundo atque pollicitando' in the negative context just noted.
In addition, Sallust, I contend, focuses upon the theme of a defensive war, waged by a man of peace, by portraying Sertorius in precisely this manner in his Historiae. As Sallust doubtless perceived, Caesar could have prevented the Civil War by placing less emphasis upon his own ‘dignitas’. Sertorius, as Sallust seems to have maintained, had been willing to efface himself (Plut. Sert. 22,7–8, derived, I believe, from Sallust). Caesar was most unwilling (as, to be sure, Pompey had also been). What reader of the early thirties BC, finding that Sertorius had offered to withdraw to private life in Italy rather than to continue his (then successful) military struggle in Spain, would have failed to remember that unwillingness of Caesar? The latter’s alleged comment concerning Sulla’s surrendering of the dictatorship is highly pertinent here: ‘Sullam nescisse litteras, qui dictaturam deposuerat’ (Suet. Jul. 77)! Syme has noted that, in the synkrisis, Sallust applies the word ‘dignitas’ to Cato, not to Caesar.

As a further, negative contrast with Sertorius’s selflessness, recall the tale of Caesar’s insistence, when he was passing through a village in the Alps, that he would rather be first there than second in Rome (Plut. Caes. 11,4). This contrasts sharply with Sertorius’s reported claim that he would rather live in Rome, even as a private citizen, than be ruler of all the rest of the world combined. Granted that we are not certain that the tale is historical, or that it was known to Sallust. However, if Sallust did know of it, then the words which he apparently placed in the mouth of Sertorius constituted criticism of Caesar.

In conclusion, although further details will be provided below, sufficient material is now in evidence, I trust, to establish that Caesar was not the recipient of unconditional praise from Sallust.

III

We now turn to the short list of men who, mirabile dictu, do receive Sallust’s unqualified praise. The first is Cato the Younger. Renehan (op. cit. n. 20, 97ff.) has convincingly maintained that Sallust’s report that Cato ‘esse quam videri bonus malebat’ (54,6) not merely echoes Aeschylus’s description of Amphiaraus (Sept. 592), but artistically likens Cato to that Greek prophet, a ‘just man who came to ruin because of his association with unjust fellow citizens,’ ‘a Greek tragic hero’ (p. 99). Seneca Ep. Mor. CIV, 32, stresses that Cato faced suicide if Caesar won, exile if Pompey prevailed. Indeed, during 73 BC, the Senate officially confirmed that Amphiaraus was a god. Both 54,3 (above) and the entire thrust of the synkrisis, culminating in 54,6, emphasize that Caesar sought ‘gloria’, but that Cato was sought by it. Surely, then, Sallust portrays Cato more favourably, as St. August. CD V, 12, maintains.

Cato, in my judgment, urged a sounder policy toward the captured conspirators (compare BC 52,18 with 57,1). Contrary to some claims, no significant criticism of Cato can be detected in his speech or in the synkrisis. The echoes of Sallust’s own expressed views within Cato’s speech further demonstrate that the historian identifies very closely with Cato. Thus, Cato does belong
on our list.

The second individual on that list is M. Petreius. Sallust goes out of his way to stress Petreius's fine record: 'homo militaris, quod amplius annos triginta tribunus aut praefectus aut legatus aut praetor cum magna gloria in exercitu fuerat, plerosque ipsos factaque eorum fortia noverat: ...' (BC 59,6). His role is a key one, for he directly commanded the government force which crushed Catiline's revolt. No criticism of Petreius is to be found.

The third listee plays a role in the BJ: Gaius Memmius, tr. pl. of 111. Sallust introduces him as a 'vir acer et infestus potentiae nobilitatis' (BJ 27,2), who revealed to the people the corrupt tactics of Jugurtha and his Roman partisans. Sallust even presents a speech of Memmius, of whom he declares that 'Memmi facundia clara pollensque fuit' (BJ 30,4). Interestingly, Cicero also, in his history of Roman orators, the Brutus (136), speaks of Memmius and his brother as 'oratores mediocres, accusatores acres atque acerbi'. Note also Cic. De Orat. II, 240 and 267, for negative anecdotes concerning Memmius.

It may be noteworthy that Memmius is generally believed to have been present at Numantia as military tribune under Scipio Aemilianus (Front. Strat. IV, 1,1). M. Aemilius Scaurus (cf. Vir. Ill. 72,3), Sempronius Asellio (Gell. II, 13,3), and Rutilius Rufus had also served there (see MRR II, 491) along with Marius and Jugurtha. The literary works of Scaurus, Asellio, and Rutilius may all have mentioned Memmius, no doubt unfavourably, as the acerbic Scipionic quotation in Frontinus suggests ('mihi paulisper, tibi et rei publicae semper nequam eris' [IV, 1,1]). With the likelihood of so much unfavourable attention to Memmius, Sallust may well have reacted against this optimate consensus.

Some have seen Memmius's speech in the BJ (31) as Sallust's attempt to reproduce irresponsible demagogy. Syme is closer to the mark in noting that the historian composed it with obvious delight and relish. It is significant that Memmius's assertion that he 'obviam ire factionis potentiae' (BJ 31,4) is a clear echo of Sallust's own asserted reasons for choosing the Jugurthine War as his theme: 'Bellum scripturus sum, ... primum quia magnum et atrox variaque victoria fuit, dein quia tunc primum superbiae nobilitatis obviam itum est; ...' (BJ 5,1).

In fact, the role of Memmius is fundamentally constructive and in accord with Sallust's own views, for later Memmius is portrayed as showing restraint and concern for propriety (BJ 33,3), a significant point in the case of a man charged with violent demagogy. Just as Sallust viewed Cato, the arch-optimate, as an honourable figure, so also he considered Memmius, the 'popularis', as a sincere advocate. If Memmius was unsuccessful, that was because the 'plebs' was too apathetic.

The fourth individual to receive Sallust's unqualified praise is L. Cassius Longinus, the future colleague of Marius in the latter's first consulship (of 107). Cassius is, to a degree, associated with Memmius (BJ 31,1–32,5). Sallust stresses Cassius's great reputation for personal 'fides' at the time of his praetorship (BJ 32,5). Only Sallust refers to this fine reputation.
The fifth figure admired by Sallust is C. Licinius Macer. Without doubt, Sallust possessed a special interest in this man, since he is assigned a speech (Hist. III, 48M). The oration bears no small similarity to that of Memmius, for both were, in Sallust’s eyes, sincere ‘populares’; both criticize the ‘plebes’ for not asserting its rights. Macer, as befits an historian, makes reference to the Struggle of the Orders. In fact, as one of the few ‘popularis’ annalists, Macer is likely to have possessed Sallust as an attentive reader.

Macer’s speech is orderly and logical. It reflects Sallust’s own preoccupations, such as sharp criticism of Catulus, Caesar’s old ‘inimicus’ (Hist. III, 48, 10M; cf. BC 49, and passim, omitting the fact that Catulus had refrained from endorsing Caesar’s proposal regarding the conspirators, even before Cato spoke [Plut. Cic. 21,4, Caes. 8,1]). Then, too, the ironic, though characteristically Roman, personal tie between Catiline and the staunch optimate Catulus is emphasized by inclusion of the former’s letter to the latter (BC 35). Moreover, Macer even stresses the distinction between names and reality (III, 48,13M), a Thucydidean pastime much favoured by Sallust (BC 52,11-12; BJ 31,15; Hist. I, 12M).

Further, the fact that Sallust has Macer refer approvingly to Pompey (Hist. III, 48M) does not contradict my point, for, as Macer predicted, Pompey did restore the full ‘tribunicia potestas’ in 70 BC. Thus, I find no criticism of Macer, rather the contrary.

IV

Sallust’s presentation of Q. Sertorius has been a matter of controversy. To be sure, Hist. I, 88M and Plutarch’s Sertorius, dependent on Sallust’s Historiae, both point to high Sallustian admiration for Sertorius. Indeed, it is likely that, in portraying the latter, Sallust drew a partial self-portrait. Moreover, as we learn from Gellius (II, 27), Sallust composed Hist. I, 88M ‘aemulari volens’ Demos. De Cor. 67, a passage lauding Philip for his willingness to sacrifice every part of his body (he had already lost an eye) in his struggle for ‘time’ and ‘doxe’. As with Cato Uticensis (see Section III, above), it is not merely the passage, but the original context of the parallel which is significant.

Nevertheless, K. Büchner, in particular, has argued that Sallust did criticize Sertorius. First, Büchner notes that Sallust has the tribune Macer list Sertorius together with the ‘hostis’ Mithridates (Hist. III, 48,18M). Second, the German scholar interprets Hist. I, 116M (“Sanctus alia et ingenio validus”) as referring to Sertorius and as embodying criticism. Third, Büchner argues that, when Plutarch defends Sertorius against charges of ‘crudelitas’ and ‘iracundia’ (Sert. 10), the biographer has in mind Sallust’s charges. Fourth, Hist. I, 90M (‘Inter arma civilia aequi bonique famas petit’) is, in Büchner’s view, negative in tone, for Sertorius is said to have sought the reputation, rather than the reality, of equity. Four arguments.

Recently, P.O. Spann has, in my judgment, convincingly refuted these
arguments. Concerning the first point, the passage from Macer's speech is as follows: "Gerant habeantque suo modo imperia, quaerant triumphos, Mithridatem, Sertorium et reliquias exulum perseuentur cum imaginibus suis, absit periculum et labos, quibus nulla pars fructus est" (Hist. III, 48, 18M). Although Bächner believes that the passage shows that Sallust viewed Sertorius as an enemy of Rome, in fact, the text merely states that the aristocrats profit from war against Sertorius, while the 'plebs' receives no benefit from its military service and should abstain. Macer's point is an old one, but it does not signify that Sallust, or even Macer, viewed Sertorius negatively.

The second argument, based on interpreting Hist. I, 116M as referring to Sertorius, is purely speculative, for we simply do not know whom Sallust is describing. Maurenbrecher favoured Metellus Pius. Opinions have varied. No firm foundation there for any interpretation.

Third, the charge that Plutarch's defence of Sertorius is a reply to derogation by Sallust constitutes an assumption of the question at issue. Although I agree that Sallust's Historiae was, most likely, the biographer's chief source for his Sertorius, we must not forget that the Chaeroneian had read Livy, Poseidonius, and others. Poseidonius, as Spann does well to note (op. cit. n. 40, pp. 225f.), not only wrote of the Sertorian War, but probably arraigned Sertorius on precisely the charges against which Plutarch defends him.

As for the final claim concerning Sertorius, Hist. I, 90M is a positive, not negative assertion, as the parallel and positive BC 2.9 ('Verum enim vero is demum mihi vivere atque frui anima videtur, qui aliquo negotio intentu praecellit facinoris aut artis bona famam quaerit.') clearly demonstrates. The notion that Hist. I, 88M is in any way critical of Sertorius is most unsound (cf. Spann, op. cit. n. 40, 224f.). No, Sertorius, as I, 88M with its Demosthenic echo indicates, was a special favourite of the historian.

V

Cato Uticensis (pr. 54)
M. Petreius (pr. 64?)
C. Memmius (pr. 104?)
L. Cassius Longinus (cos. 107)
C. Licinius Macer (pr. 68?)
Q. Sertorius (pr. 83?)

Thus, we have found six individuals who, within the parameters established, receive praise alone, free from the historian's malice. Why these six? What do they have in common?

First, let us determine what they do not share. For one, they do not share the same political views, even in a general way. Cato Uticensis was a staunch optimate, while Sertorius was opposed to the Sullan oligarchy, as to Sulla
himself, Petreius seems to have been a staunch Republican, an admirer of Cato (Dio XXXVIII, 3.2–3), and a ‘Pompeianus’. Macer was manifestly a ‘popularis’. No, the six men certainly held widely divergent political views. So, too, the six were not all ‘novi homines’: Cato Uticensis was the direct descendant of Cato the Censor, and Cassius (cos. 107) was the son of the consul of 127. 48

Similarly, personal acquaintance was not the common factor. Sallust had presumably met Cato, while Sertorius was at least a fellow Sabine. Memmius and Cassius, however, both died years before Sallust was born. Syme does well to note that Sallust had known the grandson of our Memmius, a pr. 58. Very likely, but not necessarily pertinent. As for the fact that Memmius (pr. 58) had preceded Milo as husband of Fausta, that point is not apt to have endeared the man to Sallust (see Gell. XVII, 18). So, too, his apparent lack of reverence for the memory of Epicurus. 49 Actually, we have no explicit evidence that Sallust knew personally any of the four men whose lives overlapped his own. An apparent deadend.

Then, what do they have in common? As the list reveals, five of the six became praetors (the question marks concern only the year of office); only one of the six, Cassius, reached a consulship. In view of the enormous importance of the consulship, indeed the fact that the ‘consulares’, in general, dominated the ‘Res Publica’, 50 Sallust’s preference for praetorians is extremely noteworthy (cf. BJ4). This is doubly the case, since the one ‘exception’, Cassius, died during his consulship; he never sat in the Senate as an ex-consul.

Since we appear to have found a significant, shared point, let us pursue it further. Cato actually sought the consulship (for 51: Plut. Cato Min. 49–50; cf. Sen. Ep. CIV, 33), but failed to gain election because of his unwillingness to kowtow to the electorate. He was not even upset at his defeat, we are told. Unquestionably, however, Cato, if anyone, deserved to be elected consul. I maintain that we have found a common characteristic of all six, at least from Sallust’s viewpoint. They deserved much better than they received; life shortchanged them.

Let us see whether this formula fits the other five. Sertorius reached the praetorship, of 83, I believe. 51 If ever a Roman deserved a consulship, it surely was Sertorius (no need to mention Mommsen’s panegyric). Yet, for whatever reason (age and the ‘leges annales’, probably), he did not achieve it under the Mario-Cinnan regime in the eighties. He was not allowed to return to Rome, in any capacity, by the Sullan oligarchy of the seventies (Plut. Sert. 22,7–8). Sallust, I believe, saw Sertorius as having been denied his due. So, to a great extent, he was!

What of Macer, another praetorian? As is well-known, he underwent trial ‘de repetundis’ in 66, with Cicero as presiding judge. 52 That Cicero did not particularly care for this ‘popularis’ annalist is clear from Cic. Brutus 238 and De Leg. I, 7. Although Cicero may well have acted fairly as judge, 53 Sallust may well have thought otherwise, since the court condemned Macer. Moreover, Val. Max. IX, 12,7 tells us that Macer committed suicide, by hanging, in order to
protect his patrimony. 54 Let us also note the apparent delay in Macer's career caused by Sulla's ban on tribunes' advancing to higher offices. 55 No surprise, then, if Sallust, himself the victim (as he no doubt thought) of criminal charges, thought that Macer deserved better. Macer probably did.

Petreius also had been a praetorian. This 'vir militaris' had himself, like Cato, committed suicide, but jointly with King Juba. Caesar made a point of smearing Petreius's staunch opposition in Spain (Caes. BC I, 53, 75–6). 56 Caesar clearly had not changed his mind by the time of his four triumphs in 45, for he pointedly included a 'float' picturing Petreius's suicide. 27 Sallust, in contrast, manifestly admired the man.

Though Petreius's fellow 'legatus' in Spain (from 55 to 49), Afranius, had been favoured by Pompey with a consulate (of 60), only to make a sad spectacle of himself—he reportedly excelled only at dancing! (Dio XXXVII, 49,3)—, Petreius, the son, it may be, of a 'primipilus' of Marius (Pliny NH XVII, 11; cf. Val. Max. II, 4,6), had not been so blessed by his 'imperator'. Perhaps he was too principled, too much the 'vir militaris', and too little inclined to dance to Pompey's tune! Although one cannot be certain of Sallust's motivation, it is certain that Petreius died in a mutual suicide pact, after the most persistent opposition to Caesar, by whom he was maligned. These circumstances could readily have induced the thought that here was a man who deserved a consulate, who, but for his 'novitas' and/or his principles, would have achieved it. A reasonable thought.

As for Memmius, we have already seen that Sallust's judgment of his oratory and character was more favourable than that of Cicero. More significant, however, is the fact that this praetorian, overall a moderate 'popularis', was murdered by agents of Glaucia, the ally of Saturninus, who was seeking a consulate of 99 (MRR I, 574 and 576). Sallust probably considered Saturninus and Glaucia as true 'seditiones' (cf. Hist. I, 77,7M). Surely, Sallust disapproved of murdering a candidate for a consulate, an act which implies, does it not, that Memmius was a strong candidate? Thus, Memmius, if any man, provides a classic example of an individual whose career, indeed life, was cut short by violence.

Cassius appears to violate the principle, for he did secure election to the consulate as colleague of Marius for 107. In fact, Cassius proves the point, as he perished during his year of office, along with his army, in an ambush by the Gauls (MRR I, 550). This ambush was remembered by Caesar (BGI, 7,4, 12,5–7, 14,3; cf. 13,2), for reasons both propagandistic and personal (1, 12,7). Sallust, too, therefore, knew of it. Is it not likely that he believed that Cassius was cut down before his time, that he deserved much better than he received? Thus, we find that five of the six men were prevented from reaching the consulate, while the sixth was slain in an ambush during his consulate. All six could readily appear as victims, men to be pitied, men who deserved much better. This, I maintain, is what the six have in common. I, of course, am not arguing that this is the only reason for Sallust's favouring each man. Doubtless,
various other factors, political, personal, and literary, were also involved. E.g., Sallust probably considered all six as sincere political figures. Yet, this factor, unlike the objective facts of their careers, is subjective. Also, to a great extent, it begs the question of why he thought of them thus and spared them his customary abuse. The objective factors common to all six merit emphasis.

The pertinence of all this to Sallust is clear from the latter's own life and unfortunate career. In brief, Sallust was one of several 'seditiosi tribuni' in 52, though, unlike his two comrades Pompeius Rufus and Plancus Bursa, he managed to escape prosecution and condemnation after his tribunate; he did succumb in the year 50. The Censor Appius Claudius expelled him from the Senate that year, on a charge, it appears, of immorality, although political and/or personal factors are apt to have been decisive. Whatever Sallust's behaviour had been, was it really any worse than that of Appius? Sallust may well have served as a scapegoat to establish a reputation for Appius (so M. Caelius, apud Cic. ad Fam. VIII, 14,4 [SB No. 97]). Sallust no doubt thought that he deserved better.

Joining Caesar, Sallust sided with his (new?) patron during the Civil War. Though failing several times, Sallust finally succeeded during the African War. Rewarding him, Caesar appointed the future historian governor of the province of Africa Nova. Regrettably, Sallust appears to have exploited his position to enrich himself at the provincials' expense, so they seem to have charged. Caesar apparently cancelled the prosecution, but he also seems to have ended Sallust's hopes for a consulship. All because Sallust had acted no worse than many other provincial governors. Two strikes, and Sallust was out! Note that Sall BJ 4,4 refers with manifest sadness to the inability of worthy men to achieve his own level of success (praetorian rank and a proconsulship). What did he think of the inability of a man such as Cato to gain a consulship, i.e. without sacrificing his principles? Further, how did Sallust feel about his own failure to reach the consulship, especially when unworthy persons were gaining that 'honos'?

Does the present study not answer these queries? Sallust turned to historiography because his political career had reached a deadend (BC 4,2: '... mihi a spe, metu, partibus rei publicae animus liber erat'). His malicious censoriousness provides powerful evidence that Sallust was motivated by 'dolor', resentment at what he considered—with some justification—shabby treatment. His 'invidia', or ill will, toward many 'principes'(e.g., Pompey) is well-known.

What is new and noteworthy is the finding that Sallust sympathised with, perhaps even identified with, notable failures who, like himself he no doubt believed, deserved better. Presumably, the historian derived a vicarious pleasure from portraying these 'failures' so positively, from, e.g., presenting Sertorius as a great hero, with feelings strikingly similar to his own. Not just a malicious politician 'manqué', then, Sallust also exhibits 'misericordia', compassion for those who, like himself, he felt, had received less than their due. Amidst all the unpleasant behaviour and qualities attributed to Sallust, what a pleasure to find in the man at least one quality so decent!
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