

R. G. LEWIS

INSCRIPTIONS OF AMITERNUM AND CATILINA'S LAST STAND

aus: Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 74 (1988) 31–42

© Dr. Rudolf Habelt GmbH, Bonn



INSCRIPTIONS OF AMITERNUM AND CATILINA'S LAST STAND<sup>1</sup>

Notoriously, prosopographic investigations can be inconclusive, and the same is true of searches for the lost sources of extant authors. To attempt a study which combines both might be thought risky, to say the least. Yet in this case - as I hope to show - the evidence and the questions which it poses are well worth the effort of exposition for their own sake, even if the answers remain problematic.

Enquiry into the sources of Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae* is of course no novelty, and some results are generally agreed. He read much of Cicero's published material - demonstrably the speeches *In Catilinam*, presumably also the Greek memoir or a Latin version of it, perhaps the Latin poem, the record of evidence which Cicero collected and made public and conceivably the posthumously released *de consiliis suis*, if it appeared in time. Another possibility was M.Brutus' *laudatio Catonis*, though it cannot have been very informative.<sup>2</sup> Sallust<sup>3</sup> could be credulous, but does not seem to have accepted all of Cicero's account without question. Once, for a disputed point of fact, he cites an oral witness, M.Crassus - a reminiscence of youth, for Crassus left Rome late in 55 for Syria and his death at Carrhae. Others might at any time before Sallust's final revision have given first-hand testimony about Catilina and his enterprises, whether to contradict, supplement or confirm 'official' versions. Inevitably then questions arise. Is there reason to think that he did in fact consult such persons and use their material, whether oral or conveyed privately in writing? And, amid scores of theoretical possibilities, can any such source be identified?

One approach, promising if somewhat neglected, is to look for supporters and associates of Catilina who somehow, whether by luck or timely desertion, survived suppression of unrest and rebellion in 63/2. This was achieved in essence by destruction of its leadership, and left numerous but unimportant remnants, no longer dangerous, to seek some new focus of loyalty, new patronage and protection. Cicero protested loudly and often that P.Clodius Pulcher had inherited from Catilina a retinue of troublemakers and leaders for his gangs of street terrorists.<sup>4</sup> They excite curiosity.

---

<sup>1</sup> Comments on an earlier draft by Dr T.J.Cadoux and the late Martin Frederiksen prompted improvements in exposition, and I have recently been encouraged in conversation with Professor J.S.Richardson. Remaining faults, of course, are not theirs.

<sup>2</sup> For these results it may suffice to cite R.Syme, *Sallust*, 71f., with literature there mentioned; P.McGushin, *Commentary on Sallust's Bellum Catilinae*, (1977), 7-8. The existence of a Latin commentarius is left in doubt by *Cic.Att. i. 19.10*.

<sup>3</sup> *Sall. BC 48.9; MRR ii,215*.

<sup>4</sup> *Cic. Pis. 11; 15-16; 23; Mil.37; cf. dom. 72; 75; Sest. 28; 95. Clo-*

Cicero's assertions about enemies commonly provoke scepticism, but in this one at least there appears to be some truth. In Rome Catilina had befriended various disreputable young aristocrats, several of whom remained unscathed after the fighting and purges were over. So did some of the organisers through whom he had sought (with only limited success) to control the urban plebs.<sup>5</sup> Cicero can name at least one ex-Catilinarian rabble-rouser leading operae Clodianae,<sup>6</sup> and these appear, as early as 61 in letters to Atticus (whom Cicero had no reason to deceive) featuring *barbatuli iuvenes, totus ille grex Catilinae*.<sup>7</sup> Among them might easily have been M.Caelius Rufus, who as Cicero later had to admit in his defence was attracted for a time first to Catilina, then to Clodius.<sup>8</sup> Caelius came from Interamna Praetuttiorum (Teramo) - an opportune reminder that Catilina's chief support had been in the country-side and municipia, where his agents were to organise voters and rioters for use in Rome, and in due course forces for sedition and rebellion in regional Italy.<sup>9</sup> There, too, significant numbers of his followers, both *miseri* and *domi nobiles*, survived and some of them at least, like Caelius, very likely turned to Clodius.

He is best known of course for his ruthlessly efficient mobilisation of a major following among the plebs living in Rome - a revival of family tradition.<sup>10</sup> The Claudii however had for generations past also enjoyed influence in important areas and townships of regional Italy through clients and hospites

---

dius' participation in Catilina's schemes of 63 however cannot be inferred from Schol.Bob. 172St. or from the curiously mistaken rumour ap. Ascon. 50C, misinterpreting Cic. Mil.55 (cf. 26; 50; 74; 87; 98), which may perhaps go back to Cicero's propaganda against Clodius issued under the title *Edictum L.Racili* (Schol.Bob. 166St.). There is still a possibility that these passages can be referred to Clodius use for his own purposes of bands of Catilinarians in Etruria (T.P.Wiseman, *New men in the Roman Senate, 139 B.C.-A.D. 14,27, n.*).

<sup>5</sup> Z.Yavetz, *Historia* 12,1963,438ff.

<sup>6</sup> Cic. dom.13 etc. on Sergius. Probably add at least Gellius. On both see further below, pp.35, 37.

<sup>7</sup> Cic. Att. i.1 4.5; cf. 13.3.

<sup>8</sup> Cic. Cael. 1; 3; 7; 10-16 (cf. ILS 9461). RE IIA, col. 1366f.

<sup>9</sup> They include M.Caeparius of Tarracina (who, however, was to operate in Apulia in the wake of C.Iulius); C.Flaminius, landowner near Arretium; P. Furius and C.Manlius of Faesulae; Septimius of Camerinum; T.Volturcius of Croton (if not a double agent); perhaps Minucius - if a Basilus, then from Cupra Maritima; conceivably P.Sittius of Nuceria. Cf. Sall. BC 17.4 on *domi nobiles* in the plot and consider also the names of P.Autronius and L. Tarquinius (probably Etruscans); L.Vargunteius; L.Vettius (both Italic); P.Gabinus Capito (Campanian) and Gellius (q.v. below, p. 3, also of Campanian extraction). On electoral significance, Cic. Mur. 49; Sall. BC 26.5-27.1 and in general T.P.Wiseman, *New Men* ... 135f; on military significance, P.A.Brunt, *JRS* 52,1962,67f., esp. 73; 85.

<sup>10</sup> A.W.Lintott, *Violence in Republican Rome*, esp. 74f.; id., *Greece and Rome*, 2nd ser. 14, 1967,157f.; E.S.Gruen, *Phoenix* 20,1966,170f. One recalls in particular Ap.Claudius Caecus and later Ap.Pulcher, cos. 143 B.C.

among the local gentry, and perhaps also lower down the social scale<sup>11</sup> - interest which Clodius will certainly have conserved and perhaps enlarged. His friends, agents and thugs included C.Causinius Schola of Interamna Nahars (Terni), one Menulla of Anagnia, a Titius from Reate, a Marsic Scato and the persons of Fidulius, Firmidius, Lentidius, Lollius and Plaguleius - names all suggesting Italic rather than Roman origin.<sup>12</sup>

How many, if any, of these were former Catilinarians we do not know,<sup>13</sup> but there is no doubting their value. Such extra-urban connections had always been important, but were very much more so after the Social War and mass enfranchisement of Italians, which obliged the aspiring politician at Rome to court municipal support and if necessary to compete for it. Cicero's own electioneering shows acute awareness of the fact, and so do Catilina's activities.<sup>14</sup> These Clodiani appear mostly in urban contexts, but for some of them at least a dual role involving them in their local communities as well as at Rome must be considered extremely likely. Among many others, most notably C.Manlius is said to have served Catilina for such a purpose, and Cicero too, like Clodius, had himself recruited muscle-men from Reate for use in Rome.<sup>15</sup>

There in the Sabine country an easy pass leads from Reate to Amiternum, home-town of C.Sallustius Crispus and another suitable starting-point for a convergent line of enquiry in seeking persons of his acquaintance who might know something at first hand about the Catilinarian affair. Local inscriptions

---

<sup>11</sup> E.Albertini, *Mél. Arch. et hist.* 24,1904,247f.; E.Rawson, *Historia* 22, 1973,219ff., citing fairly plentiful evidence for Campania and the south. Other areas might be added. Even in the third century Claudius Russus (cos. 268) allegedly *Italiam per clientelas occupare temptavit* (Suet. Tib. 2.2, doubtless an exaggeration, but worth noting - on which see now T.P.Wiseman, in *Past Perspectives*, ed. A.G.Woodman, J.D.Smart, I.S.Moxon, pp.90-99, esp. 94f). For Clodius and other nobiles - most of whom, of course, were just as active in the same pursuits, see also Wiseman, *New Men* .... esp. ch.3.

<sup>12</sup> Cic. dom. 13; 21; 79; 81; 89; 116; Sest. 80; 112; har.resp. 59; Mil. 46 with Ascon. 31C. Rawson, art.cit. [n.11] suggests Oscan origin for Lentidius and Firmidius, and also for two other Clodian satellites among the tribunes of 57, Sex.Atilius Serranus Gavianus and Q.? Numerius Rufus. The latter, however, may have been Picentine (L.R.Taylor, *VDRR*, 238). For Clodius' interests in Etruria, below, p. 37, n.30.

<sup>13</sup> Scato should be a Vettius (Wiseman, *New Men*..., 273; cf. Cic. Att. iv. 5.2; vi. 1.15. Identification with the Catilinarian L.Vettius (comm. pet. 10; Dio xxxvii. 41.2) is unlikely, for the latter turned informer and would probably be detested by other ex-Catilinarians who joined Clodius.

<sup>14</sup> The most useful discussion and collection of material is still that of Wiseman, *New Men*..., esp. 135-142. For Cicero's electioneering, Cic. Att. i. 1.2; Phil. ii. 76; cf. Planc. 97; leg. ii. 15; comm. pet., passim; on Catilina's range of activities, cf. n.9 above, covering Latium, Picenum, the Praetuttii, Cisalpine Gaul, the ager Gallicus, at least parts of Umbria and Etruria, Apulia and Campania [Sallust, BC], the Paeligni and Bruttium [Oros. vi. 6.7; Dio xxxvii. 41.1).

<sup>15</sup> Cic. Cat. iii. 5; for Manlius Mur. 49; Sall. BC 24.2;26.5-27.1.

of late Republican or triumviral date offer items of great interest - though not without difficulties and frustrations - of which one awkward tangle of data may be sufficient illustration.

Late in 57 B.C. a meeting of the senate was dispersed when P.Clodius' ruffians began a demonstration. Their targets, Cicero surmised, were one Q.Sextilius and the friends of Milo. Q.Sextilius, then, was perhaps something of an agitator himself, Milonian or not.<sup>16</sup> He is difficult to identify. Near Amiternum a tombstone thought to be a Republican date but now lost records one Q.Sextilius L.l., with his wife Pilia L.f.<sup>17</sup> If neither stonecutter nor transcribers made an error, his nomenclature is unusual. Among various possible explanations one could choose to think that he had been a slave of a Q.Sextilius but was manumitted by his heir. While Sextilius are not uncommon, especially in this period, the name Pilius is rare.<sup>18</sup> One notes a L.Sextilius Q.f. Taurus, locally censor at Setia on the fringes of the Volscian hills; and a generation or two later a Q.Sextilius, possibly a maternal ancestor of the emperor Vitellius, not far away on the coast at Antium. Also in the Volscian hills lies Cora, where there was another local censor datable within a generation or so of this L.Taurus, a man called P.Pilius L.f.<sup>19</sup> Whether he was connected with Pomponius Atticus' wife Pilia and her relative (probably brother) L.Pilius there is no telling.<sup>20</sup> If the freedman and his wife had anything to do with these gentry of Latium, what are they doing at Amiternum? Perhaps the family had property there - or they acquired it themselves. Another Republican inscription, to judge from the lettering, records another Sextilius at Amiternum - C.Sextilius L.f. Quir., whose tribe may reveal local origin, or at the very least a local estate.<sup>21</sup> A certain C.Sextilius figures in Cicero's defence of L.Flaccus in 59 - honourably enough, considering his testimony for the prosecution. He was nephew to M.Aufidius Lurco, tribunician author in 61 of a particularly inept *lex de ambitu* which largely copied similar gestures by M.Cato and L.Ahenobarbus that were ostentatious but not much more practical. Cicero indulged in acid comment on the ineffectuality of such legislation against Clodius and his like, but that cannot be used to infer Lurco's hostility towards Clodius in particular - still less that of his nephew C.Sextilius.<sup>22</sup> Nor is that man necessarily the one from Amiter-

---

<sup>16</sup> Cic. Qf. ii. 1.3 - clamorem satis magnum sustulerunt, opinor, in Q. Sextilium et amicos Milonis incitatae (sc. operae Clodianae).

<sup>17</sup> CIL i<sup>2</sup>. 1884.

<sup>18</sup> In PW a score of Republican Sextilii, four Pili.

<sup>19</sup> CIL i<sup>2</sup>. 1509 (Cora); 1518 (Setia); x.6661 (Antium).

<sup>20</sup> PW nos.2; 3.

<sup>21</sup> CIL i<sup>2</sup>. 1883.

<sup>22</sup> Cic. Flacc. 89; Att. i. 16.13 (cf. 18.3). Lurco, who did well out of luxury trade in peacocks (Varro, RR iii. 6.1), makes a fitting companion for L.Lucullus, who by 61 like L.Ahenobarbus was Cato's ally and *adfinis*, and

num: he might just as easily C.Sextilius Rufus, quaestor in Cyprus some time between 50 and 47, and perhaps not Lurco's nephew, but maybe brother to a contemporary L.Sextilius Rufus - or he may be neither<sup>23</sup> Clearly here or hereabouts the trail ends and there is no point in exhuming further Sextilii of the period. While among these persons some identifications could be made or connexions supposed - and doubtless there were at least some - the complexities preclude certainty and enjoin cautious scepticism.

It probably helps little with this particular problem to note that marriage between a libertus and a ingenua (the couple at Amiternum) is extremely rarely attested in the Republic, but a phenomenon that might be rather less unexpected in the social milieu of Clodius' gangs or those of his rivals in Rome. Republican evidence for marriage between ingenui and libertae is not much more plentiful,<sup>24</sup> but one of Clodius' lieutenants, one Gellius L.f. Poplicola, an eques and brother of the consul of 72 and step-brother to L.Philippus, cos. 56, defied all convention by abjuring a senatorial career and set a scandalous example by marrying a libertina. According to Cicero relatives thought him unfit to assume guardianship of children, and indeed he seems to have exerted a powerful influence over his nephew, who could well have been one of Catilina's dissolute young followers and is even said to have been guilty of incest and intended parricide. The wicked uncle, anyhow, is alleged to have been a Catilinarian before his later allegiance to Clodius.<sup>25</sup> That may be irrelevant for locating the Amiternine freedman Q.Sextilius and his freeborn wife Pilia in any wider context, but it is certainly of interest for what follows. As it happens one of the very few contemporary parallels for this type of marriage (that is, libertus/ingenua) is also from S.Vittorino, site of ancient Amiternum. One would not readily think this Sabine municipium a centre of social permissiveness likely to encourage a crop of such marriages. This second case occurs on a tombstone in lettering which allows a date near the end of the Republic or possibly under the triumvirate and commemorates one L.Sergius L.l. and his wife Rutila Fulcinia P.f.<sup>26</sup>

---

no friend of Clodius, whose sister he had divorced with contumely (Plut. Lucull. 38). But the point can bear very little weight.

<sup>23</sup> MRR i, 287; 356 and Suppl. 60 on PW nos. 23; 24.

<sup>24</sup> For marriage liberti/ingenuae I have found for the Republic only four certain and three possible epigraphic parallels for the two at Amiternum; for marriage ingenui/libertae only ten certainties or strong possibilities, but a number of other inscriptions might be taken to reveal either marriage or concubinage, which was probably the commoner relationship. S.Treggiari, *Roman Freedmen in the Late Republic*, 15; 82f.; 208f.; 220 offers some useful discussion of the topic: cf. ead., *CW* 64, 1971, 198.

<sup>25</sup> On this man (?Marcus - cf. Plut. Cic. 27) and his nephew, Cic. *Sest.* 110-111; Val. Max. v. 9,1 (cf. Sall. *BC* 14.3; 43.2); Catullus 74; 80; 88-91.

<sup>26</sup> CIL i<sup>2</sup>. 1882. The Sabines were a by-word for moral rectitude - unmatched by some other Italian communities. Larinum, for example, acquired a bad reputation, and so did Capua. In CIL i<sup>2</sup>, 'mixed' marriages of this type occur

From this point coincidences multiply and obtrude. The name Fulcinus is Etruscan by origin, attested in the Republic at Caere and Tarquinii, probably also at Perugia and certainly - presumably by marriage and consequent migration - at Arpinum, for the mother of C.Marius, who later enjoyed support in coastal Etruria.<sup>27</sup> In the principate Fulcinii appear much further afield, in Spain and Africa as well as at Rome, Ariminum and south Italy. At Amiternum however, and near Rutula and her husband we have another inscription, fairly close also in time, erected by two freed slaves to one C.Fulcinus. From Augustan Amiternum there is a dedication for Fortuna pro reditu Imp. Caesaris Augusti by local magistrates, who include Q.Orfius Fulcinus, and not far away at Foruli, possibly slightly earlier, appears a Fulcinia L.l.Dionysia.<sup>28</sup> In the present state of the evidence one could easily enough postulate migration into the neighbourhood at or about the end of the Republic of at least Gaius, Rutula and her husband, perhaps her father Publius and possibly also of a Lucius. The gens is not attested there earlier. It does however appear in Rome in 52 B.C., when after Milo's condemnation one L.Fulcinus C.f. was subscriptor to the indictment for leading the murderous attack on Clodius at Bovillae of M. Saufeius, a leading Milonian gangster. Such accusers were generally young men. L.Cassius, who led this prosecution, was monetalis at or about the same time.<sup>29</sup> As far as age goes, identification of this L. Fulcinus and his father Gaius with the L. and C. Fulcinus at Amiternum is certainly permissible. Perhaps L.Fulcinus attacked Saufeius purely for love

---

only at Rome (four cases at most, maybe only two - 1250; 1289; 1348; ?1351a), to which can be added two at most from Capua (x. 4198; ?3939) - probably Republican, as argued by M.W.Frederiksen, PBR 27,1959,74-107, esp. 97-102 [now updated as ch.13 of his posthumous *Campania* (ed. N.Purcell)] and possibly a curiosity from Lucania (i<sup>2</sup>. 1584 - a Greek doctor, who may not be a freedman at all). Note that the stone at Amiternum (1882) proclaims (or protests) the moral probity of Rutula Fulcinia (frugi). The same feature occurs on other tombstones for one partner or the other in relationships similarly exposed to criticism from the socially more orthodox, though there are attested two or three marriages in which both partners were libertine or both freeborn and enjoy or claim such approbation (CIL i<sup>2</sup>, 1259; ?1406 (both concubinage); 1684; ?1349. Cf. 1408; 1220). For comparable social sensitivity, CIL x. 3939: the partners constructed a tomb in their own lifetime on private ground and insisted on the worth and rank of the freedman husband (licitor IIviralis at Capua). On i<sup>2</sup>. 1882, however, the letters P. F. are clearly a filiation and not some abbreviation (e.g. for pia femina or the like, as CIL has it): cf. Pilia L.f. in 1884.

<sup>27</sup> Cic. Caec. 10; CIL i<sup>2</sup>. 1950; 1951; 2057; Plut. Mar. 2. On Marian sympathies in coastal Etruria, W.V.Harris, *Rome in Etruria and Umbria*, 251-259. For Etruscan-speaking Fulcinii at Tarquinii and Orvieto, M.Cristofani, *MAL* 8,1969,253, citing CIE 5357; 5385; 5388; 4966; 5004. Cf. id., *St.Etr.* 30,147; M.Torelli, *DdA* 3,1969,313f.; *PW* vii.1, 211-213, esp. no.4, a banker of Tarquinii in 69 (Cic. Caec. hf.; 17). There had however been Fulcinii with Roman citizenship - and office - as early as 438, and a quaestor in 148, (nos. 1-2). Nor can one suppress the existence in 88 B.C. of a (Marian) Sextilius at Tarquinii (Val. Max. v. 3.3; Cic. de orat. iii.10), though his relevance cannot be established.

<sup>28</sup> CIL i<sup>2</sup>. 1862; ix. 4182; 4418 litteris pulchris antiquioribus.

<sup>29</sup> *Ascon.* 55C; on L.Cassius, *ibid.* and *MRR* ii, 435.



of law and order, or simple ambition. Or he may have been in sympathy with Clodius, who himself had not inconsiderable interests in coastal Etruria and doubtless also a following there.<sup>30</sup> Nevertheless, taken in isolation (and perhaps anyhow) these data, however suggestive, do not prove this man's connexion either with Clodius or with Amiternum. Other facts, however, can now be deployed.

Rutila's husband, L.Sergius L.l., of course immediately conjures up the shade of Catilina. The praenomen *Lucius*, for the Republic, is confined among *Sergii* to his family, and no other L.Sergius is on record who might be this freedman's patronus. Of course there might always have been one of whom all trace has vanished, but that is pure hypothesis. Further, one cannot forget how emphatically and often Cicero declares that Catilina's gangs were taken over by P.Clodius and selects for attack amongst their leaders in particular one L.Sergius - *armiger Catilinae, stipator tui (sc. Clodi) corporis, signifer seditionum, concitator tabernariorum, damnatus iniuriarum, percussor, lapidator, fori depopulator, obsessor curiae* - whose freedman status can hardly be doubted. The freeborn associates, apparently in a wide social spectrum, as we have seen, included numerous Italians, as well as the disgraced Gellius and his libertine wife. In such company<sup>31</sup> for L.Catilina's freedman to have achieved marriage with an *ingenua* would be neither impossible nor even very surprising.

Leaving aside the *Sextilii*, then, we still have a L.Fulcinius C.f., subscriptor to the prosecution of Clodius' murderer and very possibly a Clodian partisan; *Fulcinii* in or near Amiternum, including a Gaius and a Lucitis, with one of their womenfolk married to L.Sergius L.l., a Clodian hoodlum of that name, allegedly and probably in fact a former henchman of Catilina. One cannot avoid entertaining the possibility that Rutila's husband and Clodius' *fori depopulator* are one and the same man. At the very least the L.Sergius of Amiternum is likely to have been familiar with the Clodian activist as a *conlibertus*, but it can be urged that although Catilina's freedmen were numerous and all known as L.Sergius L.l.,<sup>32</sup> Rutila's marriage and Fulcinius' link with Clodius, if it holds good, do at least help to individuate and make the identification certainly the more economical and on the whole more probable hypothesis. On this view, something had drawn him from the capital, whether some variation of his usual employment or retirement into a

---

<sup>30</sup> For his eagerness to develop interests there, by violence and seizure if need be, Cic. Mil. 26; 50-55; 74; 87; 98; Phil. xii. 23. Note also Clodius' friend C.Causinius Schola from Interamna (Umbrian - Cic. Mil. 46) and the lavish tomb of his freedman erected by his wife, also libertine (CIL i<sup>2</sup>. 1274). Nothing, unfortunately, will prove the relevance of a Clodia (Sex. f.?) at Caere (CIL i<sup>2</sup>. 2731) or Scribonius L.f. Clodianus at Perugia (2078).

<sup>31</sup> Cic. dom. 1 3 and see above, p.33, and n.12.

<sup>32</sup> One could suggest the mime Sergius, companion of M.Antonius the triumvir - who eventually married Clodius' widow Fulvia (Cic. Phil.ii. 62; Plut. Ant. 9).

quieter and perhaps more law-abiding life, to the home-town of the historian C.Sallustius Crispus. Clearly however more support for the theory would be, welcome.

As tribune of the plebs for 52 Sallust himself joined in protests at Clodius' murder and in mounting pressure for Milo's political extinction. That alone will not incontrovertibly make him a previous partisan of Clodius, any more than prosecution of M.Saufeius quite proves as much for L.Fulcinus C.f. - but perhaps it will help to note that not only were their attitudes towards those responsible for the killing overtly similar, but also the two tribunician colleagues whom Sallust joined in this outcry were undoubtedly close to the victim.<sup>33</sup> Clodius' mother-in-law Sempronia, with his widow Fulvia, also played an effective part in the reaction against Milo: if she has anything to do with the Sempronia so vividly portrayed by Sallust as a follower of the Catilinarians, it seems likely that he had at least had the opportunity to observe some of this circle closely.<sup>34</sup> Further, just as he should have known L.Fulcinus C.f. in Rome, so too he should have known Rutila Fulcinia and her relatives in Amiternum. Besides her, in his Satires Horace mentions a Sallustius who although no adulterer of matronae was overfond of freedwomen. The allusion is almost certainly to the historian, probably dead by the time of publication (35-33 B.C.), but in any case more probably for his conduct as a young man some twenty years earlier than for recent indiscretions.<sup>35</sup>

How much could the L.Sergius L.l. buried at Amiternum have told Sallust about Catilina? There are items for which a private and direct source is at least possible. For some of them certainly, we can just as easily suppose derivation from non-extant writings of Cicero, whether founded on good evidence available to him or his own rhetorical invention - or even postulate Sallust's own literary elaboration. For other material, even though there can be no strictly cogent demonstration to exclude alternatives, on balance direct oral contribution from the Catilinarian side is the easiest explanation. There are no very clear indications from passages where the writer's authorities conflicted or left him in doubt - for example, about Catilina's murder of his own son; homosexuality among his young followers; the origins,

---

<sup>33</sup> Ascon. 43; 44C; Cic. Fam. vii. 2.3; R.Syme, Sallust 31f.

<sup>34</sup> So too Syme, *o.c.*, 133-5, who suggests that they might be sisters, daughters of C.Tuditanus (Ascon. 35C). Note also in Clodius' circle the Atratini, a daughter of whom married L.Gellius the younger (cos. 36.). Or did the Tuditani usurp (or revive) this ancient cognomen? There might well be also a connexion (hardly identity) between Clodius' widow and the Fulvia who betrayed Catilinarian secrets to Cicero, and conceivably a link with the Catilinarian M.Fulvius Nobilior.

<sup>35</sup> Hor. Sat. i. 2.47ff., with Syme's masterly discussion (Sallust, 280f.). One cannot rely on the story in Ps.-Acron that Sallust owed his expulsion from the senate in 50 to having offered as a defence against charges of adultery with matronae the claim that he preferred pursuit of libertinae, but Horace's allusions do best suit a younger man.

motivation and truth of the story that the conspirators joined drinking human blood; Catilina's recruitment of women to incite the city slaves and either to kill or win over their husbands - all instances of a lurid sensationalism<sup>36</sup> against which Sallust's own good sense may as easily have induced caution as any pro-Catilinarian information. Of that, in any case, no one person need have had a monopoly.

From Sallust's account of Catilina's last stand in the ager Pistoriensis,<sup>37</sup> however, it is possible to construct a more positive view, even if that too in the last analysis is not perhaps quite beyond dispute. For one thing, even before the battle Sallust displays remarkable knowledge of Catilina's forces and their organisation, his plans and movements - that having recruited troops since leaving Rome,<sup>38</sup> he joined C.Manlius at Faesulae and organised the resulting aggregate manpower into two legions, initially well under strength (2000 in all), but later a full complement, though only a quarter were properly armed. On the approach of the consul C.Antonius he manoeuvred in the hills, avoiding battle and hoping for reinforcements when the revolutionaries struck in Rome. Meantime he refused to recruit slaves, who volunteered in large numbers, since he relied on the conspirators' own resources and judged it detrimental to his cause to let runaway slaves be seen to share in a citizen movement. On news of failure in Rome many slipped away. Catilina tried to contrive escape through the mountains to Transalpine Gaul, but was cut off by the intelligent anticipation of Q.Metellus Celer, operating from Picenum and aided by deserters' information. Antonius, marching fast over much easier terrain, was able to stay within range. Catilina was forced to turn and fight: there was no escape or cover, and supplies were failing. Victory in battle was the only remedy, as he explained to his remaining men<sup>39</sup>

Now it is conceivable that this account goes back to official reports of magistrates commanding against the insurgents and the intelligence they collected. It is not easy to see why they should have included Catilina's refusal to recruit slaves, still less his reasons. Alleged readiness to arm servile manpower was standard propaganda against enemies in civil war, and if either Antonius or Metellus wished to claim greater glory by denying that their enemies were slaves it is odd that either of them should have revealed that only a quarter of the opposition was effectively armed. Unofficial letters from these commanders, or other persons having information on the government side, with or without official dispatches, remain a possible source - if

---

<sup>36</sup> Sall. BC 14.7; 15.2; 22.1-3; 24.3-4; Cic. Mur. 49; Cat. ii.6; i.24.

<sup>37</sup> Sall. BC 56-61.

<sup>38</sup> Ibid. 56.1; cf. 32.1; 36.1.

<sup>39</sup> Ibid. 56-57; 58.6 and 9. The speech is mostly standard rhetoric, but the lack of supplies seems a circumstantial touch.

Sallust himself had access to them or to a digest of material of this kind, such as Cicero could have prepared to substantiate at least one of his accounts of his own consular *res gestae*. Yet it would still be odd for Cicero to include Catilina's rejection of servile help, for although he nowhere (to our knowledge) claimed the contrary regarding rural slaves, he did allege that not only P.Lentulus Sura but also earlier Catilina himself had tried to make use of urban slaves, and went out of his way to indicate clearly the risks that (at Lentulus' bidding, certainly) the insurrection might become a *bellum servile*.<sup>40</sup> To explain Sallust's text it is easier to eliminate hypothetical intermediaries and postulate a direct informant from Catilina's camp.

For the battle itself, Sallust's account undoubtedly depends on an eye-witness. The site and Catilina's dispositions are described with detailed care - a field protected by natural features on the flanks, with only a narrow front covered by eight cohorts, the rest in reserve, but with picked troops from them in the first line, C.Manlius on the right, Catilina himself in the centre. The informant could not remember (if he ever knew) the name of the man from Faesulae who commanded his left, but did recall that Catilina, to give his infantry heart, dispensed with all horses, including his own, by contrast with the government's commander of the day, M.Petreius, who reviewed his troops mounted. These are curious features if the original version originated on the government side, even if anyone there could see enough to record all that we have. We are told very little of Petreius' dispositions: his actions and speech are mere clichés, requiring no more information than perfunctory knowledge of the man's career and a little standard rhetoric - and that his front line consisted of veterans.<sup>41</sup> Even more interesting - while Petreius had a *cohors praetoria* which eventually broke the rebels' stand,

---

<sup>40</sup> Cic. Cat. i.27; iii. 8; 12. Cf. for Catilina's attitude, Sall. BC 56.5 - (Catilina manoeuvres to avoid battle in expectation of major reinforcements from Rome on the success of the conspirators there) - *interea servitia repudiabat, quouis initio ad eum magnae copiae concurrebant, opibus coniurationis fretus, simul alienum suis rationibus existumans videri causam civium cum servis fugitivis communicavisse* (Cf. 44.6). Cassius Dio xxxvii. 32.2 has Catilina recruiting first free men, but in my view (contra McGushin ad loc.) there is no hint of that in Sallust's *interea*, which is fully explained by Sallust's own preceding context. A better guess might be that Dio or his source has produced an uneasy compromise between the view of Sallust (no slaves) and what might be inflationary inference from Cicero - or may even have been alleged by him in lost writings, here discounted by Sallust, who thought he had better information (and probably did).

<sup>41</sup> Sall. BC 59.3. Note *Faesulanum quendam*, unidentified (cf. 60.6). A writer on the government side had little enough reason to record the fact, and less if he failed to discover the name. An oral Catilinarian source would have better reason to offer all the information he could but almost certainly any such source for this item would not himself have come from Faesulae but would have been either recruited elsewhere in Etruria or else, far more probably, have been one of Catilina's small retinue with which he left Rome (Sall. BC 32.1; 36.1; cf. 56.1).

Catilina had about him his *liberti* and *coloni*, we are told.<sup>42</sup> How could an observer from Petreius' side possibly have recognised them as such, either before or during the battle? How could he have located Catilina among them, since he fought on foot, and was found dying far from his own line?<sup>43</sup> And if he could have discovered these facts by interrogating surviving prisoners later, why should he trouble to record them? They could have been of no great importance to him.

In his final chapter, to cap an demonstration of the desperate ferocity of the Catilinarians' resistance, Sallust declares that no freeborn citizen was taken prisoner either in battle or in the pursuit - *postremo ex omni copia neque in proelio neque in fuga quis quam civis ingenuus captus est: ita cuncti suae hostiumque vitae iuxta pepercerant*.<sup>44</sup> Now that is curious indeed, and tantalisingly enigmatic. It is difficult to believe that *ingenuus* is a mere pleonastic gloss on *civis*: in using it Sallust seems to have intended to make a point, and the minimum implication is that at least one person of citizen status but servile origin was taken alive and survived the battle. The only persons present in Sallust's account of the engagement who fit that description are the freedmen of Catilina who formed part of his bodyguard, and, very likely, also of the small remnant left with him after his line was broken and before his last desperate charge into the thick of the enemy alone.<sup>45</sup> At that, the surrender of all or most of the survivors - including, perhaps, a man whom Cicero may have had some reason to call *armiger Catilinae* - would not be in the least surprising. How would such persons be treated on capture? Already in 62 a strong political reaction had set in against Cicero's brusque execution of the chief conspirators in Rome. He was no longer consul, and the present authorities had reason to be extremely sensitive to the public opinion that had since been evident. With the leaders of the revolt suppressed and all danger dispelled it would have been possible, politic or even necessary to leave men of no importance alone, especially if they had friends in the urban plebs (and its exploiters) - and especially if they could plead in self-defence their obligations to their patron.<sup>46</sup> Whether by such a plea or by simple escape (if he was among the captured at all), it seems virtually certain that at least one L.Sergius

---

<sup>42</sup> Sall. BC 59.3.

<sup>43</sup> Ibid. 59.1; 61.4.

<sup>44</sup> Ibid. 61.6.

<sup>45</sup> Ibid. 60.7; cf. 59.3. Probably no slaves, pace Dio xxxvii. 33.2 (above, n.40). That Sallust should not have indicated plainly that such a person was his informant is no surprise: for Roman readers of his day it would not have enhanced credibility.

<sup>46</sup> Interesting considerations showing Cicero's sympathies with such a doctrine in D.Daube, *The Defence of Superior Orders in Roman Law* (Oxford Inaugural Lecture, 1956). For the political position early in 62, Plut. Cic. 23; Cic. Sull. 31; Sest. 11, etc.

L.1. survived to tell the tale and extremely likely that it is the basis of Sallust's account of the battle - if so, most plausibly through the freedman of that name buried at Amiternum, whether he was the original eyewitness or an intermediary, and perhaps non-combatant.<sup>47</sup>

The theory cannot be proven, however suggestive the circumstantial evidence. On the other hand to reject it casts adrift an alarming number of coincidences. It might fairly be asked whether it is not altogether too large a coincidence to be true that so many persons connected with Catilina, Clodius or Sallust at Rome in the literary evidence should so strangely recur in inscriptions at Amiternum. Any answer must necessarily be further hypothesis, but it could reasonably be urged that it would be nothing extraordinary for persons closely associated in various activities in Rome to say together in retirement to enjoy a less hectic environment in later years. Choice of locality might depend on many considerations, but if after loss of one patron by murder they found another who despite a rough passage managed to stay in politics and even enjoy modest importance for a while under Caesar, for them that might be a powerful influence.<sup>48</sup>

That possibility however suggests another. We return to the fact that after the Social War Roman magnates were increasingly obliged to pay attention to the votes of Italian municipia and coloniae, the organisation of which might be worth considerable trouble and might even require methods similar to those used in Rome, especially if rivalries developed. There were sufficient men of substance and influence in parts of rural Italy - the Sabine lands around Amiternum among them - to make their cultivation rewarding,<sup>49</sup> and there, even if violence should not be necessary, the Clodian gang-leader, whether of local origin or not, would have administrative and other talents and experience for which there was need and scope. Under Caesar and the triumvirate, both Italian and urban votes lost importance, but the organisation of opinion and aggregation of support counted, if anything, for more. Clodius' agents might have made themselves useful in Amiternum even before his death, and perhaps for a time after it.

Edinburgh

R.G.Lewis

---

<sup>47</sup> There is a possibility that such freedmen escaped before capture, but Sallust (at all events) seems to have good information right up to the last stages of the battle, and after it.

<sup>48</sup> If Sallust had usurped patronage over his brother's former protégés, Ap. Claudius' reasons for expelling him from the senate in 50 would have been enhanced - indeed, for one of Appius' temper it might be sufficient reason of itself. But this is speculation.

<sup>49</sup> Syme, Sallust, 8f. For Clodius' interests elsewhere, above pp.33, 37.