

Žarko Petković, 94(37)“-0043/-0034”
University of Belgrade, 93/94 Салустије Крисп Г.
Faculty of Philosophy 32:929 Марко Антоније
zarkopetkovic@gmail.com COBISS.SR-ID 280493836 CIP - 8

Sallust on Mark Antony

Abstract: It was previously postulated and convincingly shown that Sallust was not a friend of Octavian, Mark Antony and Lepidus' regime, although there is no information that he openly opposed the Triumvirs. Sallust's retirement from public office after Caesar's death and more than one allusion to contemporary politics in his monographs leave no space for any other conclusion. The aim of this contribution is to show that Sallust's hidden critique – which was the only possible at the time when the memories of recent sufferings during the Civil War and proscriptions were still strong – was specially aimed against Mark Antony. Concluding argument – but not the only one – could be found in Sallust's (so far) unclear remark on hunting as *servilium officium* (*Cat.* 4.1): in fact, well known scandalous behaviour of Mark Antony and Cleopatra included hunting (*Plut. Ant.* 29.1).

Key words: Sallust, Mark Antony, Octavian, Second Triumvirate, proscriptions, Plutarch, hunting.

The lack of references to the Triumvirs in Sallust's *oeuvres*, quite an understandable phenomenon in the period of Civil War and the proscriptions, allows investigation only if the hidden critique of the Triumvirs and their regime can be traced. But, this approach could be misleading: even the presumption of an existing hidden critique is hard to demonstrate. Nevertheless, the picture of Sallust's works, especially after the important results that were attained with this method, would be quite different if the presumption had not been made. So, the main object of this paper would be to demonstrate that Sallust disapproved not only of the Triumvirs' regime, but also of Mark Antony's personal political power. It must have been more transparent to the contemporary readers than we could now imagine.

1. Sallust on the Triumvirs in general

1.1 Sallust's *potentia paucorum* (*Iug.* 3.4) implies that the power of the three new rulers of Rome directly opposed to what Cicero would call *consensus omnium bonorum*, and it does not resemble that what the *nobiles* considered as freedom either. Although *pauci* is Sallust's frequent choice of words when negatively labelling the rule of the old Republican oligarchy, *potentia paucorum*

rum should be interpreted as a negative judgement on the Triumvirs' reign.¹

1.2 To proceed with another Sallust's statement in the Prologue of *Bellum Catilinae*, it seems that *superbia* and *lubido* (*Cat.* 2.5) might address Antony, as *desidia* and *optumus* (*Cat.* 2.6) might apostrophize Lepidus and Octavian, respectively.² The picture of Antony as *superbus* and *homo libidosus* is consistent with the key accusation made by his main enemy that he planned to re-establish a *regnum* or *dominatio* in Rome.³ If that is true, it should be stressed that Sallust separates the young Caesar from the undesirable, even detrimental company of the other Triumvirs. *Optumus* might have been used superficially or semi-ironically of course, as it seems to have been the case in Sallust's notorious phrase *consul optimus* (*Cat.* 43.1).⁴ But even so, the young Caesar is contrasted to Lepidus and, particularly, to Mark Antony. After all, it is impossible to demonstrate with full confidence that Sallust's notions *superbia*, *desidia* and *lubido* were attached to the Triumvirs or to any particular person. However, it is still more than just a mere conjuncture.

1.3 The result of the *synkrisis* between Cato and Caesar implies a critique against the Triumvirs.⁵ Cato's portrait in *Bellum Catilinae* (54) fits the presumptive ideal of the old Republic, which could not serve as a model for the Triumvirs. Some virtues of Cato (*nihil largiri*, *virtus*, *pudor*, *abstinentia*) were those that Sallust declared as the ruling ones in the Rome of his youth (3.3); Cato's *constantia* was present in Sallust's idealized picture of the glorious past (2.3), while the opposite of Cato's *modestia* was characteristic of Sulla's soldiers after the Civil War (11.4), or it was exactly what both parties were lacking during the civil strife (38.4). On the other hand, Caesar's *beneficia* and *munificentia* do not necessarily have to be interpreted as favourable for him.⁶ After all, Cato was the winner over Caesar in *synkrisis*, or at least the picture of his deeds

¹ SYME 1964, 123; 216–218. *Potentia paucorum* must have a contemporary meaning here: STEIDLE 1958, 108; PAUL 1984, 14.

² VRETSKA 1976, 70, *comm. ad loc.*, citing K. (= M.) Büdinger, *Poesie und Urkunden bei Thukydides*, Wien 1891 (Denkschriften der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien. Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, Band XXXIX), without reference on the page(s). I could not find the cited passage (in neither of the parts (Dritte [1890] and Fünfte [Zweiter Theil, 1891] Abhandlungen) of the monograph); Sallust is not even mentioned in the Büdinger's comprehensive index.

³ E.g. *RGDA* 1; *Cic. Phil.* 1.33–35; 2.34–36; 2.108; 5.17; 8.12; 13.6–7; 13.17–18; cf. Appian's (*BCiv.* 3.111) translation βασιλεία for Cicero's *regnum*.

⁴ Cf. *Cic. Sest.* 110; Cicero was annoyed when Brutus addressed him with this superficial phrase, frigid eulogy (*Att.* 12.21.1). However, the phrase could also mean a sincere appraisal as in *Cic. Phil.* 7.6; *Sulla* 11.

⁵ Even though " ... when he [Sallust] matches Cato with Caesar, he strikes a deadly blow against the Triumvirs" (SYME 1964, 123) might be exaggerated.

⁶ VRETSKA 1976, 626–628.

and motivations painted by Sallust was favourable.⁷ As Antony and Octavian claimed that they had inherited Caesar's cause and ideas, the memory of Cato's deeds and life "mit einem symbolischen Gestalt epochenscheidender Bedeutung"⁸ was dangerous to them. It could not be easily forgotten that Cato decided to die rather than to look upon the face of Caesar, the tyrant⁹, and that Antony and Octavian inherited his power and his party. Therefore, it might be concluded that Sallust's *synkrisis* was implausible to the regime.

2. Proscriptions

2.1 The mention of the inexorable proscriptions carried out by Sulla inevitably brings to memory the recent proscriptions by the Triumvirs. It seems that Caesar's allusion to Sulla's atrocities during his proscriptions could be related to Sallust's own disappointment, even disgust, with the proscriptions carried out by the Triumvirs, which abounded in barbarity comparable to Sulla's.¹⁰ Additionally, Sallust's implicit critique of the Triumvirs could be traced in the references to Sulla's soldiers, who, having squandered their property, were eagerly thinking of plundering and, therefore, wanted to start the Civil War (*Cat.* 16.4).¹¹ It is, thus, almost inevitable to conclude that the Triumvirs could not be exculpated personally or politically, especially not by Sallust, whose general judgment of Sulla's after-war political methods was devastating for the dictator.¹²

2.2 Further, Sallust's remark (*Iug.* 3.2: *nam vi quidem regere patriam aut parentis*) that the use of force to rule over one's country and parents¹³, which leads to slaughter and exile, fits into the overall impression of the political circumstances of 43 B.C. It especially echoes the proscriptions,¹⁴ although it would not be wise to insist too much on this statement,¹⁵ considering that *parentes* might have another meaning.¹⁶ However, if we take into consideration the fate of another almost-to-become-victim of proscription, Lucius Iulius

⁷ SYME 1964, 112; 115–116; 123; EARL 1966, 98–102.

⁸ GELZER 1934, 90–91.

⁹ *Cic. Off.* 1.112; cf. FRIGO DNP 10(2001), col. 160, with further literature.

¹⁰ *Sall. Cat.* 51.32–36; cf. SYME 1964, 122 sqq. Sallust's harsh judgment of Sulla might be influenced by personal motives, SYME 1964, 125.

¹¹ HAVAS 1990, 221 sq; SHIMRON 1967, 335 sqq. Cf. also *Sall. Cat.* 5.6; 11.5–6.

¹² *Sall. Cat.* 5.2 cf. MCGUSHIN 1978, 61 (but, when Sallust mentions *caedes, fuage, rapinae* in *Hist.* 1.23M [=1.20 McG] it refers to *Bellum Italicum*, not Sullan atrocities, as indicated by McGushin); *Cat.* 11.4 (cf. RAMSEY 2007, 68–69; 88).

¹³ For *parentes* as parents cf. PAUL 1984, 13–14 and RAMSEY 2013, 168–169, *com. ad loc.*

¹⁴ KOESTERMANN 1971, 35; VRETSKA 1955, 21.

¹⁵ PAUL 1984, 14.

¹⁶ Subjects, as in BATSTONE 2010, 53, with the note on p. 179.

Caesar (cos. 64), Antony's maternal uncle,¹⁷ and thus one of his *parentes*,¹⁸ the statement by Sallust begins to reveal its full meaning: Mark Antony could find words *vi regere parentis* to be a heavy burden, despite the fact that his uncle was spared at the end.

3 Sallust on Lucius Antonius?

Additionally, it was supposed that Sallust's words *Potest alio tempore, alio consule, quoi item exercitus in manu sit Ubi hoc exemplo per senatus decretum consul gladium eduxerit* (*Cat.* 51.36) might also allude to Octavian's command in August 43 B.C.,¹⁹ when he as a *privatus* marched with an army on Rome to demand consulship.²⁰ It seems beyond dispute that Sallust's phraseology leads to the conclusion that he is referring to a certain event: *his temporibus ... alio tempore, alio consule*.²¹ But, bearing in mind that Octavian was not a favourite of the *patres* at that moment – moreover, the Senate was in fact the main victim of Octavian's actions, and it would hardly be possible to connect *senatus decretus* with Octavian's recruiting of the army on his own initiative – a different explanation of the mentioned phrase would be welcome.

The political circumstances of the period when *Bellum Catilinae* was written (42–41 B.C.)²² could provide an answer.²³ According to Dio (48.13.4–5), Lucius Antonius, who was effectively a sole consul at the beginning of 41 (Sall. ... *alio consule*), entered Rome with troops (Sall. *quoi item exercitus in manu sit*), thus starting a short-term rebellion. But, when he learned that Octavian was approaching Rome, Lucius Antonius changed his plans and withdrew from the city, having had a vote passed authorizing him to leave the city in order to begin the war (...διαπραξάμενος ψηφισθῆναι οἱ ὡς ἐπὶ πολέμῳ τινὶ ἐκστρατεῦσαι; Dio, 48.13.5). That event seems to fit rather fairly with the circumstances described by Sallust in *Cat.* 51.36: Dio's ψήφισμα seems to be *senatus decretum*,²⁴ and Sallust's *gladium eduxerit* corresponds fairly to πολέμῳ

¹⁷ Dio, 47.6.3; App. 4.7; Plut. *Ant.* 19; 20; *Comp. Demetr. Ant.* 5.1; *Cic.* 46; *Liv. Per.* 120; *Vell.* 2.67.3; *Flor.* 2.16.4; *Oros.* 6.18.11; *Sen. Suas.* 6.7; cf. DRUMMAN / GROEBE 1906, 3².120.

¹⁸ Cf. *OLD* s.v. *parens*, 2 (usu. pl.), 1295–1296.

¹⁹ SYME 1964, 122; PÖSCHL 2007, 385; VRETSKA 1976, 552; RAMSEY 2007, 202.

²⁰ DRUMMOND 1995, 34–35; Levene 2000, 189–190.

²¹ LEVENE 2000, 189; Nevertheless, Drummond 1995, 35, is arguing that Sallust's words should be attached to the violent atmosphere of 44–43 B.C., rather than to a certain event, such as the proscriptions.

²² RAMSEY 2013, xxxiii.

²³ It is more plausible to attach Caesar's allusion to specific circumstances and political/military events close to the period when *Bellum Catilinae* was written than to the previous events (of 48 B.C., as LEVENE (l.c.) argues), which were less relevant at the time.

²⁴ For Dio's use of notion ψήφισμα for *senatus decretum*: 46.23.4; 48.16.1; 37.16.1. Cf. *Dion Hal.* 9.37 with MOMMSEN 1887–1888, 3.997, note 1 and App. *BCiv.* 3.1.2; 3.5; 3.16; 3.22, although δόγμα τῆς

... ἐκστρατεῦσαι. So, Sallust's/Caesar's *consul alius* should be interpreted as Sallust's attack on Lucius Antonius, who, according to a contemporary widespread belief, had started the rebellion with the consent of his powerful brother. Sallust is in fact attacking Lucius Antonius' powerful brother.²⁵

4 Sallust on Octavian

One should not rush to the conclusion that Octavian was exculpated by Sallust. It seems that his expression (*quoniam M. Lepidus exercitum privato consilio paratum cum pessimis et hostibus rei publicae contra huius ordinis auctoritatem ad urbem ducit ...* (1.77.22 M)) replicates Octavian's famous words that he had raised an army *privato consilio* (RGDA 1.1). Since Philippus' speech presents a powerful condemnation of Lepidus who had raised a private army in 77 B.C., it seems that he is alluding – in a way which is not favourable to Octavian – to the actions of Caesar's heir during the crisis of late 44 / early 43 B.C.²⁶ Of course, the text of *Res Gestae* was not written when Sallust composed *Histories*, but young Caesar could have already formulated some of his later catchwords.

It seems that Sallust criticized *potentia paucorum*, which could be interpreted as the political power of Mark Antony, young Caesar and Lepidus (1.1). Even more, there is a possibility that Sallust had Antony in mind when he wrote that *superbia, desidia, libido* were characteristic of the Roman attitude after the decline of ancient virtues (1.2), and that the certain connotations of *synkrisis* were unfavourable to the main leaders of the Caesarians (1.3). It is only to be expected that Sallust along with many of his contemporaries and later authors was terrified of the proscriptions (2). It seems that one expression in *Bellum Catilinae* targeted Lucius Antonius (3), who could not be separated from his powerful brother. Even if *privato consilio*, used in an unfavourable context in the *Historiae*, has nothing to do with the famous Octavian Augustus' expression (4), the cumulative weight of the arguments that Sallust was ill-disposed toward the Triumvirate (1.3, 2) and that he could have specially aimed at Mark Antony (1.1, 1.2, 3), allows us to proceed with the investiga-

βουλῆς (e.g. 4.59) is quite common.

²⁵ HAVAS 1990, 220–221 also concludes that *Cat.* 51.36 is aimed against Antony, but based on different arguments than the ones set out here. Havas thinks that Antony, being the consul with the army, was ready to start a war against *patria* by the end of 44.

²⁶ PERL 1969, 213–215; MCGUSHIN I, 1992, 146.

tion regarding whether Sallust inserted hidden personal critique of the man whose power (cf. Plut. *Ant.* 77.4) could hardly be challenged at the time.

5. Sallust on Antony's friends and allies

A brief analysis of Sallust's treatment of Antony's relatives and friends (for Lucius Iulius Caesar, cf. above, 2.2) might be advantageous. Nevertheless, it should not be forgotten that *Bellum Catilinae*, due to its topic, inevitably offers a predominantly negative picture of human nature.

Publius Cornelius Lentulus Sura, Mark Antony's stepfather, was labelled by Sallust as one of the leaders of Catiline's conspiracy.²⁷ This Sallust's judgement was clearly endorsed by Cicero.²⁸ It is obvious that he was partial to Marcus Antonius, the biological father of Mark Antony. Sallust's words *no-cent<ior> piratis* underline the (elder) Antonius' lack of ability and reputation²⁹ and refer clearly to his fruitless campaign against the pirates, for which he was taunted by Cicero as Creticus.³⁰ And, of course, the portrait of Creticus' brother, C. Antonius Hybrida, cos. 63, drawn up by Sallust, especially when contrasted with his energetic and righteous colleague, is a portrait of a corrupt, noble and incapable personality (the theme is stunningly exploited in *Bellum Jugurthinum*) that Catiline »hoped to use as he wished«. ³¹ L. Calpurnius Bestia is portrayed as one of the chief protagonists of the *coup d'état* – his name is among the principal conspirators. Later on, according to Sallust, Bestia, as a plebeian tribune, fiercely attacked Cicero on the eve of *Saturnalia* (mid-December 63) in order to give the signal to the other conspirators to set fires to Rome.³² It might be concluded that Sallust »cannot be acquitted of

²⁷ *Cat.* 43.1; cf. MÜNZER RE 4 (1901), col. 1400: ... der vornehmste Genosse des L. Catilina.

²⁸ *Cic. Cat.* 4. 11; 22.

²⁹ *Sall. Hist.* 3.2 M, R, McG; cf. 3.3 M, R, McG; *Perdendae pecuniae genitus* ... and 3.5–6 M = 3.6–7 R, McG. Even ... *ibi triennio frustra trito* (3.16 M = 3.54 R = 3.76 McG)... might also refer to Creticus' unsuccessful campaign (cf. MAURENBRECHER 1891, 2.114–115; RAMSEY 2015, 277; MCGUSHIN, 1992, 2.125, *comm. ad loc.*). Sallust's unfavorable opinion of Creticus might have influenced his relations with Mark Antony (SYME 1964, 223, n. 29), or it might be an indication – at least – that Sallust did not begin *Historiae* before 39 B.C, when Antony left Italy (MAURENBRECHER 1891, 1.1, note 2, dutifully mentioned by ALLEN 1954, 13, note 39). For more indisposed judgments upon Creticus' command against the pirates (74–72 B.C.) cf. *Cic. Verr.* 2.8; 3.213–218 and Ps-Asc. 239; 259 St (identifying Antonius [in Cicero's *Verr.* 2.31.2–3] as Creticus).

³⁰ BROUGHTON 1952, 2.101–102; 111, 117, 123.

³¹ *Sall. Cat.* 23.3; 26.1, 3–4; 59.4. Cf. DRUMMAN / GROEBE 1899, 1².393–394.

³² *Sall. Cat.* 17.3; 43.1–2; cf. *Cic. Cat.* 3.10; Plut. *Cic.* 18; App. *BCiv.* 2.3. Cf. BROUGHTON 1986, 3.46; AUSTIN 1960, 154–157 and SYME 1964, 132; *pace* MÜNZER RE 3 (1899), col. 1367.

malice against Bestia«. ³³ The reason for such an attitude towards Bestia Sallust could have found in his close relationship with Mark Antony. Bestia, who was engaged in the Mutina campaign and as an *aedilicius*, had hoped, relying on Mark Antony's support to become a consul in 43 B.C. ³⁴

These negative comments on the characters and actions of Mark Antony's close relatives and friends might have been inevitable and were characteristic of Sallust. These judgments were not without precedents: Cicero's verdicts on Sura, Creticus, Bestia and Hybrida were similar and, occasionally, even harsher. It is, therefore, not possible to prove Sallust's deliberate ill-treatment of Mark Antony by relying simply on these comments. Still, under the political circumstances of the early Triumvirate regime, some instances of his critique of certain individuals could be regarded as ungracious to Antony.

6. What else could remind Sallust's readers on Mark Antony?

There were other details in *Bellum Catilinae* which could remind the readers of Antony – in a way that is unfavourable for him and the present history: mysterious Sempronia from ch. 25 seems to be a sister of *Sempronia, Tuditani filia*; she was the niece of the energetic and powerful Fulvia, ³⁵ whose influence was at its peak in 41 (Dio, 48.4.1–4) and who even dared to start the Perusine war in order to help her (nominal) husband, Mark Antony. The father of another participant (on Mark Antony's side) of the War of Perugia is mentioned by Sallust at the point where overlooking his role was quite possible (*Cat.* 50.4): Ti. Claudius Nero's proposal in the Senate was relatively favourable (in comparison to Cicero's motion) to the conspirators of 63. It is hard to believe that the young Caesar (or anyone else, for that matter), while reading *Bellum Catilinae*, could have forgotten that the homonymous son of Nero, a friend and ally of Mark Antony, had proposed public honours for the tyrannicides (Brutus, Cassius and others) some ten years earlier. ³⁶ Sallust's fair treatment of Cicero should also be mentioned. ³⁷ The recollection of Cicero's illustrious achievements for the *res publica* could naturally remind the reader of his brutal death, and who had ordered it.

³³ SYME 1964, 133.

³⁴ Cic. *Brut.* 1,17,1; *Phil.* 11.11; 12.20; 13.2. Cf. HAVAS 1990, 219.

³⁵ SYME 1964, 134–135. Or, Sallust's Sempronia was Fulvia's grandmother, daughter of *Sempronia, Tuditani filia*: MÜNZER RE 2A (1921), col. 1446. Cf. WELCH 1995, 197, note 38.

³⁶ Older Nero: Sall. *Cat.* 50.4; cf. RAMSEY 2007, 192–193. Younger Nero: Suet. *Tib.* 4.1; cf. MÜNZER RE 3 (1899), col. 2778.

³⁷ SYME 1964, 105–111; BROUGHTON 1936, 34–46.

7. Hunting

In pursuit of the concluding argument for Sallust's ill treatment of Mark Antony, we should turn our attention to one of his most enigmatic parenthetical remarks regarding *Bellum Catilinae*. At the end of the Prologue, Sallust memorably claims that he will spend the remainder of his life far from public world (4.1) and adds that *neque vero agrum colundo aut venando servilibus officiis intentum aetatem*.³⁸ This odd statement has been a puzzle for scholars from antiquity till today³⁹, since neither hunting nor farming had been considered as slavish activities according to the Roman value system. On the contrary, farming and hunting were activities worthy of free people, and agriculture had especially been cherished for generations as one of the most dignified occupations of free men.⁴⁰ Nevertheless, some explanations of that statement were offered. Sallust could have felt that the farm-loving (Elder) Cato from Cicero's treatise (written a few years before *Bellum Catilinae* was published⁴¹) did not fit the model of a retired statesman. Or, he may have thought that agriculture was praised and exploited by the wrong people. However, even if Sallust's mention of farming could be interpreted as a critique of the good old times, or even as an answer to Cicero's treatise *Cato Major*⁴² – the statement in *Cat.* 4.1 is still unconventional and surprising.

Further analysis will be based on similar grounds: Sallust is in fact distancing himself from Cato's recommendations on how to uphold virtue, as he also did by arguing that the destruction of Carthage, famously advocated by Cato, had in fact dealt a significant blow to the traditional moral values in Rome.⁴³

When it comes to »slavish occupation of ... hunting«, the anti-Catonian viewpoint is somewhat harder to demonstrate. Hunting was not the foremost preoccupation of Cato, as agriculture demonstratively was. Additionally, *agri colundo* could actually comprise a slavish overtone.⁴⁴ Hunting, on the other hand, was reserved strictly for leisure, as stressed by Cicero in *Cato Major*⁴⁵. It

³⁸ ... nor yet to spend my life by devoting myself to the slavish employment of turning the soil or hunting (cf. Ramsey 2013, 25).

³⁹ Cf. SYME 1964, 44 citing Sym. *Ep.* 5.68.2 and VRETSKA 1976, 108: diese ... Ausage hat besonders schockiert.

⁴⁰ Cic. *Off.* 1.151: *Omnium autem rerum ... nihil est agri cultura melius, nihil uberius, nihil dulcius, nihil homine libero dignius.*

⁴¹ Cicero revised *Cato Major* in July 44 (*Att.* 16.3), although it was already written at the beginning of May that year (*Att.* 14.21.3). Cf. GELZER 1969, 322 sq.

⁴² Cf. VRETSKA 1976, 109; SYME 1964, 45–46.

⁴³ LEVENE 2000, 174–175; 178–180, with further references.

⁴⁴ VRETSKA 1976, 109, with references.

⁴⁵ 56: *Conditiora facit haec supervacaneis etiam operis aucupium atque venatio.*

is therefore an aristocratic sport, with no flavour of *servilium officium*,⁴⁶ especially not for a retired magistrate, as Sallust was at the time. Yet, the context of political and social circumstances of 41/40 B.C. might offer some explanation for Sallust's puzzling statement.

At that time, according to Plutarch, Mark Antony was famously enjoying the company of Cleopatra. In addition to the Shakespearean scenes of ship sailings down the river Cydnus,⁴⁷ Cleopatra was memorably partaking in other unwomanly activities with Antony, such as playing dice or drinking. She even participated in hunting with him: ... συνεθήρευε... (Plut. *Ant.* 29.1). They went around together at night, continues Plutarch (29.2), and on those occasions she wore the garb of a serving maiden (συνήλυε θεραπαινιδίου στολήν λαμβάνουσα), and Antony was dressed alike (καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖνος οὕτως ἐπειρᾶτο σκευάζειν ἑαυτόν).

Thus, the aristocratic leisure activity of hunting could be seen as turning into a servile one. The eccentric behaviour of a quasi-royal loving couple must have been interpreted as scandalous in Rome. It gave opportunity to Sallust to hint at Antony in a way which was degrading for a Roman *imperator*. The hint must have hit even closer to home with Roman audiences, given the fact that Mark Antony was imitating his alleged forefather, Hercules⁴⁸. Namely, around that time, Antony was publicly posing as an offspring of Hercules,⁴⁹ a famous hunter himself who, among his other manifestations, took on the image of a slave while serving at the court of the Lydian queen Omphale.⁵⁰

The parallel between the image of Mark Antony as Hercules and Cleopatra as Omphale was not unnoticed by Plutarch. According to him (*Comp. Ant. Demetr.* 3.3), it was Cleopatra who disarmed Antony and subdued him to her spells, as Omphale had done with Hercules. Moreover, Plutarch's evidence that Antony and Cleopatra were dressing alike in garbs of serving maidens (*Ant.* 29.1) brings to mind the scene in which Omphale took away Hercules' club and stripped him of his lion skin.⁵¹ Such analogies with Hercules must

⁴⁶ So, Nutzjagd (to use Vretska's expression) from Sen. *Dial.* 2.2.2 is not relevant for the context of Sall. *Cat.* 4.1.

⁴⁷ *Antony and Cleopatra* II, 2, 192–206, cf. Plut. *Ant.* 26.

⁴⁸ Plut. *Ant.* 4, 36, 60; App. *BCiv.* 16, 19. It seems that another Antony's Herculean pose was in the chariots led by lions (Plin. *HN* 8.55; Plut. *Ant.* 9; Cic. *Att.* 10.13.1).

⁴⁹ CRAWFORD 1974, 1.502–503, no. 494, 2a–b.

⁵⁰ SIEVEKING 1897–1902, 870–899; SCHAUBURG 1960, 57–76; FOWLER 2013, 319–321.

⁵¹ *Comp. Demetr. Ant.* 3.3: Ἀντωνίως δὲ ὡσπερ ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς ὀρμῶμεν τοῦ Ἡρακλέους τὴν Ὀμφάλην ὑφαιροῦσαν τὸ ῥόπαλον καὶ τὴν λεοτὴν ἀποδύουσιν. Cf. e.g. imperial coins from the Lydian town Maionia (BMC Lydia p. 129, nos. 17–21; RIC 3.2419, 2421; SNG München, 303): on the reverse a bearded head of Hercules, on the front a figure of Omphale holding a lion's skin and club across her shoulder.

have been devastating to Antony's *autoritas*. Therefore, it is not surprising that Ovid (*Fasti*, 2.319–26) and Propertius (4.9.47–50) insisted on degrading Hercules, in scenes where he is made to do jobs normally done by women – which are comical and full of political and personal points. Propertius' verses about the power of women (3.11.30) are almost explicit in the association they establish between Antony and Cleopatra, and Hercules and Omphale.⁵²

To finish with a brief analysis of the hypothesis that Sallust was well-disposed towards the Antonians (not to Mark Antony, however). According to Fronto (122.19 vdH), Sallust, as the »ghost-writer« of the triumphal speech delivered by P. Ventidius,⁵³ »was on good terms with the Antonians of the time [38 B.C.], since Ventidius was an Antonian.«⁵⁴ Even if the Triumvir and his legate did not part ways or become estranged after Ventidius had achieved a victory over Parthians (which might have been a hard challenge for Antony's self-respect⁵⁵), Sallust's ties to Ventidius could have been autonomous and unrelated to his position on Antony. Instructive might be the fact that Antony had put Varro on the proscription list, but Fufius Calenus saved his life.⁵⁶ So, despite their friendship, Fufius Calenus acted autonomously from Mark Antony's wishes, as Ventidius might have done as well.

In another aspect, the information derived from Fronto (122.19 VdH) might be of interest. Marius and Sulla's speeches in *Bellum Jugurthinum* could have recommended Sallust for the task of composing the triumphal speech, which makes Fronto's testimony proof that *Bellum Jugurthinum* was published at the time. This conclusion corroborates the widely accepted assessment of the date of *Bellum Jugurthinum*.⁵⁷

It could be argued with reasonable certainty that Sallust's allusions to the Triumvirs and their regime must have generally been transparent to the

⁵² This propaganda point is not without precedents: Pericles is said to have played Hercules to Aspasia's Omphale: Plut. *Per.* 24.9. Cf. STADTER 1989, 240, *comm. ad loc.* and FOWLER 2013, 320, with further references.

⁵³ It is usually accepted that Sallust was the real author of Ventidius' speech. But, it is possible that Ventidius' planned address was composed under Sallust's influence: cf. HOUT 1999, 292, *comm. ad loc.*

⁵⁴ ALLEN 1954, 10–13.

⁵⁵ Plut. *Ant.* 34; Dio, 49.21.1; cf. SYME 1964, 223–224.

⁵⁶ DRUMMOND 2013, 415, with further references.

⁵⁷ RAMSEY 2013, xxxiii.

contemporary readers. It looks like that Octavian was criticized by Sallust in *Historiae*, 1.77.22 M. Sallust's negative personal bias against Mark Antony can also be traced, apart from the indirect critique of his attitude during the proscriptions, or, apart from the attack upon his brother, L. Antonius. Namely, the *Cat.* 4.1, reference to hunting as one of the *servilia officia* could have been inspired by the contemporary leisure activities of Antony and Cleopatra, which, according to Plutarch, explicitly included hunting. In Sallust's malicious allusion, Antony as Hercules' descendent was posing as the hunter and the slave of the opulent oriental queen Cleopatra, the new Omphale. Still, it is not surprising that the theme of Antony's enslavement to a woman was later used by Propertius, whose ideas could reflect some of Octavian's politically influenced moralizing preoccupations. That indicates that the construction of Antony's enslavement was not Plutarch's, but of a contemporary.

Bibliography:

- ALLEN 1954 = W. Allen, »Sallust's Political Career«, *Studies in Philology* 51/1, 1–14.
- AUSTIN 1960 = R. G. Austin (ed.), *Cicero, Pro Caelio*, 3rd ed. Oxford.
- BATSTONE 2010 = W. W. Batstone (ed.), *Sallust. Catiline's Conspiracy, The Jugurthine War, Histories*, Oxford.
- BMC Lydia = B. V. Head (ed.), *Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Lydia*. British Museum. Department of Coins and Medals, vol. 22, London 1901.
- BROUGHTON 1952–1986 = T. R. S. Broughton, *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic*, I–III. New York / Atlanta.
- BROUGHTON 1936 = T. R. S. Broughton, »Was Sallust Fair to Cicero«, *Transactions of American Philological Association* 67, 34–46.
- CRAWFORD 1974 = M. Crawford, *Roman Republican Coinage*, I–II, Cambridge.
- DNP = *Der Neue Pauly. Enzyklopädie der Antike*. Hrsg. von H. Cancik und H. Schneider, Stuttgart / Weimar 1996–2003.
- DRUMMAN / GROEBE 1899–1929 = W. Drumman / P. Groebe, *Geschichte Roms in seinem Übergange von der republikanischen zur monarchischen Verfassung oder Pompeius, Caesar, Cicero und ihre Zeitgenossen*, I–VI, 2nd ed. Leipzig.
- DRUMMOND 1995 = A. Drummond, *Law, Politics and Power. Sallust and the Executions of Catilinarian Conspirators*, Stuttgart.

- DRUMMOND 2013 = A. Drummond, M. Terrentius Varro, in: *The Fragments of Roman Historians*, T. J. Cornell (gen. ed.), I, Oxford, 412–423.
- EARL 1966 = D. C. Earl, *The Political Thought of Sallust*. Amsterdam.
- FOWLER 2013 = R. L. Fowler *Early Greek Mythography*, II. *Commentary*, Oxford.
- GELZER 1934 = M. Gelzer, Cato Uticensis, *Die Antike* 10, 59–91.
- GELZER 1969 = M. Gelzer, *Cicero. Ein biographischer Versuch*, Wiesbaden.
- GOLTZ HUZAR 1978 = E. Goltz Huzar, *Mark Antony. A Biography*, Minneapolis.
- HAVAS 1990 = L. Havas, »Schemata und Wahrheit in der Darstellung der spätrepublikanischen politischen Ereignisse« *Klio* 72/1, 216–224.
- HOUT 1999 = M. P. J. Hout, *A Commentary on the Letters of M. Cornelius Fronto*, Leiden / Boston / Köln.
- KOESTERMANN 1971 = E. Koestermann (ed.), *C. Sallustius Crispus. Bellum Iugurthinum*, Heidelberg 1971.
- LEVENE 2000 = D. S. Levene, »Sallust 'Catiline' and Cato the Censor«, *Classical Quarterly* 50/1, 170–191.
- MAURENBRECHER 1891 = B. Maurenbrecher (ed. comm.), *C. Sallusti Crispi Historiarum Reliquae*, I–II, Lipsiae.
- MCGUSHIN 1978 = P. McGushin (ed. comm.), *C. Sallustius Crispus, Bellum Catilinae. A Commentary*, Leiden 1978.
- MCGUSHIN, 1992 = P. McGushin (ed. comm.), *Sallust. The Histories*, I–II, Oxford.
- MOMMSEN 1887–1888 = Th. Mommsen, *Römisches Staatsrecht*, I–III, Leipzig.
- OLD = P.G. W. Glare (ed.), *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, Oxford 1982.
- PAUL 1984 = G. M. Paul, *A Historical Commentary on Sallust's Bellum Iugurthinum*, Liverpool.
- PERL 1969 = G. Perl, »Sallust und die Krise der Römischen Republik«, *Philologus* 113, 201–216.
- PÖSCHL 1970 = V. Pöschl, »Die Reden Caesars und Cato in Sallusts *Catilina*«, in: V. Pöschl (ed.), *Sallust*, Darmstadt, 368–397.
- RAMSEY 2007 = J. T. Ramsey (ed.), *Sallust's Bellum Catilinae*, New York / Oxford.

- RAMSEY 2013 = J. T. Ramsey, General Introduction, in: *Sallust. The war with Catiline. The War with Jugurtha*, J. C. Rolfe (ed.), J. T. Ramsey (rev.), Cambridge (Mass) / London, ix–lxii.
- RAMSEY 2015 = J. T. Ramsey (ed.), *Sallust. Fragments of the Histories. Letters to Caesar*, Cambridge(Mass) / London.
- RAMSEY / ROLFE 2013 = J. T. Ramsey / J. C. Rolfe (edd. comm.), *Sallust. The war with Catiline. The War with Jugurtha*. Cambridge (Mass) / London.
- RE = *Paulys Realencyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft*. Neue Bearbeitung begonnen von G. Wissowa, fortgeführt von W. Kroll und K. Mittelhaus. Unter Mitwirkung zahlreicher Fachgenossen herausgegeben von K. Ziegler und Walter John, Stuttgart 1896–
- RIC = *The Roman Imperial Coinage*, (ed.) H. Mattingly, E.A. Sydenham et alii, vol. I–XIII, London 1923–1996.
- SCHAUENBURG 1960 = K. Schauenburg, »Herakles und Omphale«, *Rheinisches Museum* 103, 57–76.
- SHIRMON 1967 = B. Shimron, »Caesar's Place in Sallust's political Thought«, *Athenaeum* 45, 335–345.
- SIEVEKING 1897–1902 = J. Sieveking, s.v. Omphale, in: *Ausführliches Lexicon der griechischen und Römischen Mythologie*, W.H. Roscher (hrsg.), vol. 3.1, Leipzig, 870–899.
- SNG = *Sylloge nummorum Graecorum, Deutschland. Staatliche Münzsammlung München*. Im Auftrage des DAI und der Staatlichen Münzsammlung München, bearb. von P.B. Franke und H. Küthmann, München 1968.
- STADTER 1989 = P. A. Stadter, *Commentary on Plutarch's Pericles*, Chapel Hill / London.
- STEIDLE 1958 = W. Steidle, *Sallusts Historische Monographien. Themenwahl und Geschichtsbild*, Wiesbaden.
- SYME 1964 = R. Syme, *Sallust*, Berkeley / Los Angeles / London.
- VRETSKA 1955 = K. Vretska, »Studien zu Sallusts Bellum Iugurthinum«, *Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Wien, Phil.-hist. Kl.*, 229.4, 1–50.
- VRETSKA 1976 = K. Vretska, *C. Sallustius Crispus. De Catilinae Coniuratione*, Heidelberg.

WELCH 1995 = K. Welch, »Anotony, Fulvia and Ghost of Clodius in 47 B.C.«,
Greece & Rome 40/2, 182–201.

Žarko Petković,
University of Belgrade,
Faculty of Philosophy
zarkopetkovic@gmail.com

Салустије о Марку Антонију

Апстракт: Иако се са извесношћу може рећи да Салустије Крисп није био присталица режима Другог Тријумвирата, нема директних сведочанстава да је он наступао против режима који су успоставили Октавијан, Марко Антоније и Лепид. Упркос томе, низ индиција, чија укупна вредност има снагу доказа, говори да је Салустије био незадовољан или разочаран политичком ситуацијом у Риму после убиства Цезара. Циљ овог рада је да се покаже како је та скривена и опрезна критика уперена и против Марка Антонија лично. На пример, Салустије, између осталог, изобличава поступак Луција Антонија, Марковог брата (*Cat.* 51.36) и представља низ људи блиских Марку Антонију у крајње неповољном светлу. Коначно, верујем да Салустијева (за античка схватања изненађујућа) примедба о лову као ропском послу (*serviliium officium*, *Cat.* 4.1) јесте алузија на понашање Марка Антонија, који се у часу настанка *Катилинине завере* (како је тврдила њему непријатељска пропаганда) у друштву краљице Клеопатре облачио као роб, али се и бавио ловом (*Plut. Ant.* 29.1).

Кључне речи: Салустије Крисп, Марко Антоније, Октавијан, Други тријумвират, проскрипције, Плутарх, лов.