



ἘΠΕΚΕΙΝΑ

International Journal of Ontology
History and Critics

AARON M. SEIDER

Time's Path and The Historian's Agency
Morality and Memory in Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae*

EPEKEINA, vol. 4, n. 1-2 (2014), pp. 141-175

ISSN: 2281-3209

DOI: 10.7408/epkn.v4i1-2.82

Published on-line by:

CRF – CENTRO INTERNAZIONALE PER LA RICERCA FILOSOFICA
PALERMO (ITALY)

www.ricercafilosofica.it/epekeina



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons
Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0 Unported License.

Time's Path and The Historian's Agency Morality and Memory in Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae**

Aaron M. Seider

Writing some twenty years after Catiline's death,¹ Sallust closes his monograph with a troubling description of the Romans' reactions to their victory over the conspirators: «Thus, throughout the entire army, delight, sorrow, grief and joy were variously experienced»² (*ita varie per omnem exercitum laetitia, maeror, luctus atque gaudia agitabantur*, BC 61.9).³ Looking at the corpses of their fellow citizens, the Romans suffer a variety of emotions, passions that are disconcerting both because no single reaction to civil war can easily be termed proper and because each feeling here is so strongly linked with its opposite. The clause's elegant aesthetic features accentuate this turmoil: even as these emotions threaten to splinter the surviving Romans, the passions themselves are bound together by their chiasmic structure, with the two negative feelings enclosed by their positive counterparts, and alliteration links *laetitia* and *luctus*, a pair whose meaning is most diametrically opposed.⁴ This fragmentation of the victors' responses

* Many people have generously offered their constructive feedback on this paper. In particular, I am grateful to Sarah McCallum, who greatly improved the paper with her thorough comments on an earlier draft; to Tim Joseph, who discussed several specific points of the argument at length and invited me to present the paper to his Sallust seminar in Spring 2014; and to the anonymous reader for his/her perceptive suggestions. I delivered earlier versions of the paper at a Fall 2013 Junior Classics Conference at Harvard University and at the 2014 meeting of the Classical Association of New England at St. Anselm College, and I thank both audiences for their helpful feedback. Lastly, I am grateful to Rosa Rita Marchese and Fabio Tutrone for their perceptive suggestions and timely guidance in their role as editors of this volume of *EPEKEINA*.

1. Although it is impossible to date the *Bellum Catilinae* with absolute certainty, it can most likely be placed within the years immediately following Caesar's death. The most convincing evidence comes from Sallust's reference to Caesar and Cato with the perfect tense at 53.6 (*fuere viri duo*); on this topic, see LAST 1948, 360-361; BATSTONE 1988, p. 5, n. 16; RAMSEY 2007, 6; PAGÁN 2012, 76.

2. English translations are adapted from WOODMAN 2007.

3. The Latin text is from RAMSEY 2007. RAMSEY 2007, 14-15 offers an overview of the textual tradition of the *Bellum Catilinae*; more detailed information may be found in REYNOLDS 1986, 341-349.

4. RAMSEY 2007, ad loc. points out also how the *-ia* homeoteleuton of *laetitia*

hints at the moral difficulties of first reacting to and later commemorating an internecine battle.⁵ The pessimism of this final sentence is brought out even more distinctly by a comparison with the beginning of the *Bellum Catilinae*. Here, Sallust considers how humans strive for glory (*BC* 1-3.2),⁶ a passage that acts as an entrée to his description of early Rome's extraordinary achievements (*BC* 6-9). These differences between the beginning and end of the *Bellum Catilinae* reify what the passages' structural opposition already implies: the version of Rome that suffered Catiline's conspiracy and witnessed his downfall is far removed from the society that once flourished because of its virtuous appetite for glory.

Sallust's monograph explores moral progress and decline from often-contradictory perspectives, and as our glance at the work's book-ends has shown, the most blatant contrasts are between the unpolluted morality of early Rome and the depravity permeating Catiline's society. Yet the oppositions between such passages are not as clear as they seem. Scholars have recently argued that Sallust's work, in its capacity to engender multiple-readings and prompt reflection about the relationship between its various parts, disturbs any attempt to understand it as a straightforward tale of Rome's fall from upstanding origins. Moreover, when a link is found between sections of the *Bellum Catilinae* focusing on an earlier, more virtuous Rome and passages describing its present turpitude,⁷ these strong surface contradictions make the likeness all the more disconcerting. Just such an association comes right before this final tableau of bloody corpses and confounded victors. Here, Sallust describes how Catiline rushed into the midst of battle «mindful of his lineage and own old-time status» (*memor generis atque pristinae suae dignitatis*, *BC* 60.6). When Sallust marks Catiline as cognizant of his *dignitas* as well as his family background, he ascribes decidedly Roman characteristics to a villain who would set fire to Rome and

and *gaudia* also links these two words together.

5. MCGUSHIN 1987, ad loc. suggests that the «inconclusiveness» of this ending «is meant to underline the inconclusiveness of fratricidal strife.»

6. See VRETSKA 1976, 26-27 for a helpful schema of the concepts in this passage and EARL 1972 on its philosophical overtones.

7. See, for instance, BATSTONE 1988, GUNDERSON 2000, LEVENE 2000, and FELDHERR 2013.

slaughter its politicians.⁸ While no single word here directly recalls Sallust's description of early Rome, these values linked with Catiline are congruent with those found in the monograph's opening sections.⁹

This article focuses on two interrelated themes that structure and fracture much of Sallust's monograph: time and morality. Driven by a strong narrative voice, vivid representations of its characters' speeches, and an innovative historiographical structure, the *Bellum Catilinae* imagines moral progress and decline from often-contradictory perspectives, with its narrative riven by the same asymmetry and variation that characterizes the author's Latin.¹⁰ Here, by considering several elements of Sallust's Preface¹¹ and subsequent narrative of the conspiracy,¹² I argue that Sallust challenges his readers' expectations about temporal structures and ultimately creates an atmosphere akin to that of a temporal civil war, where the moral value of memory loses its mooring and time's movement threatens to become meaningless. No longer, in other words, does the memory of earlier events prompt the performance of similarly virtuous actions in the present, and no

8. For more on *dignitas* and its value in Rome, see GRETHLEIN 2014, 281-284.

9. See LEVENE 2000, 175 on the positive qualities adumbrated in the early sections of the *Bellum Catilinae*. Moreover, this link between Catiline and outstanding Roman qualities is reinforced by Sallust's description of Catiline's Roman opponents just moments before as «mindful of their old-time prowess» (*pristinæ virtutis memores*, *BC* 60.3), an echo that specifically associates Catiline with *virtus*, Rome, and the city's history. This description, in fact, even alludes back to Catiline's earlier words in a speech to his followers at 58.12, where he urged them to fight «mindful of your old-time prowess» (*mores pristinae virtutis*). This use of the same language by Catiline and his opponents only further underscores the tension between the beginning and ending passages of the work. VRETSKA 1976, 683 also remarks on the implications of the link between 58.12 and 60.3. Also, GUNDERSON 2000, 86, who focuses on the interrelationship between the *Bellum Catilinae*'s Preface and its narrative, finds that «spirit, mind, and memory (*animus, ingenium, memoria*) are rendered unstable and unsuitable as foundations for cognition and remembering.» For more on this topic, see GUNDERSON 2000, 88-90, 94-97, and 115-116.

10. On these stylistic aspects of the *BC*, see SYME 1964, 67; RAMSEY 2007, 12-14; MCGUSHIN 1987, 4-9; and WILKINS 1994, 17-22. KRAUS and WOODMAN 1997, 13 comment on how antithesis is «the fundamental organizing principle of Sallust's thought.»

11. Here I use the term Preface to indicate *BC* 1-13.

12. BÜCHNER 1960, 93-105 and 320; EARL 1961, 13-17; CONLEY 1981a and CONLEY 1981b take up some of these themes with special reference to Sallust's early paragraphs on virtue and Rome, both in the proem (*BC* 1-4) and the Archeology (*BC* 6-13).

longer can Rome's path be imagined to proceed upwards from the valorous deeds of its current citizens.

Divided into two main sections, the paper considers first how Sallust offers a tentative hope for Rome's future in his Preface and early depictions of Catiline's conspiracy and then how those glimpses of optimism are utterly undone as the narrative proceeds. In Sallust's descriptions of Rome's origins, his own reasons for writings, and Catiline's impact on the Romans, he portrays both the conspiracy and his own record of it as the kind of forces that could prompt Rome to return to its earlier glory. In the second half of the paper, I claim that this possibility is destroyed in Sallust's construction of the speeches of Catiline, Caesar, and Cato. Each of these figures exploits the rhetorical power inherent in examples from the past, but they do so in strikingly different ways and for strikingly different reasons. The juxtaposition of their speeches shows the essentially malleable nature of memory, both in terms of its moral impact and its relationship to past events.

Many of this article's arguments about Sallust's characterization of time and morality involve the role of memory. In considering how Sallust and his characters remember and commemorate the past, I draw upon the concepts of social memory and entangled memory to evaluate the interaction between an individual's memory and his or her social and political context.¹³ These concepts from the field of memory studies are important not so much for their names, but rather for the framework they offer for analyzing how a specific event, particularly in regard to its moral impact, can be remembered from a variety of perspectives. The term social memory helps to distill a related set of ideas about recollection and its context. Social memory is most often used to denote a memory that is voiced by an individual but at the same time, is influenced by that individual's place within a group.¹⁴ This framework proves useful for the analysis of Sallust's work, where the author and his characters draw attention to how events from the past

13. For two recent consideration of the state of memory studies, see ERLI 2011 and FEINDT *et al.* 2014. A collection of pieces in ERLI and NÜNNING 2010 discusses some of the key concepts in the field, and OLICK *et al.* 2011 present a compilation of excerpts from significant works from a range of times and disciplines.

14. FENTRESS and WICKHAM 1992, ix. ASSMANN 2011 offers an in-depth treatment of this topic.

may be remembered in different ways by different groups of people, depending on their perspective.

While the term social memory reflects many of the main strands of thought that have developed in memory studies over the last several decades, the notion of entangled memory is a relatively new one.¹⁵ The name itself implies a complex intertwining of memory with several other factors, and the ideas associated with the term largely concentrate on the relationship between memory, time, and social groups. Building on the social nature of recollection, these ideas help to parse out the complex and contradictory ways individual relate to the past and think about how the future will remember the present. Most fundamentally, entangled memory shifts away from thinking of groups as homogenous and static, a movement that proves useful for analyzing, for instance, Catiline's speeches to his followers, a varying group of people inhabiting, to different degrees, the identities of both Romans and revolutionaries. Entangled memory also explores the possibility that one event may be remembered in varying ways, with each of these recollections offering its own interpretation of the past, not an «allegedly real reproduction» of it.¹⁶ These ideas will have special value for the evaluation of Caesar's remarks about memory, as he speaks explicitly about how future generations will think of the senate's current decision.

Catiline's Context: Rome's Origins and Sallust's Writing

The first thirteen chapters of Sallust's work stand as an unusually long entrée to the narrative that follows.¹⁷ Often termed the work's Preface by scholars, the reader is compelled to think about the rest of the *Bellum Catilinae* from the perspective of BC 1-13, and here Sallust set Catiline within two contexts.¹⁸ The historian first mentions Catiline

15. The term entangled memory is coined by FEINDT *et al.* 2014, and a movement toward the recognition of the potential for a collective memory to fracture within a society has also been recognized by other scholars such as OLICK 2010, 158-159.

16. FEINDT *et al.* 2014, 26-27.

17. On the remarkable nature of this Preface, see KRAUS and WOODMAN 1997, 13.

18. SYME 1964, 67 is correct that, over the course of the BC, Sallust «wrecks the narrative order», but rather than terming these intrusions «digressions» as Syme does, it is more productive to consider their impact on the rest of the narrative. Sallust's

at *BC* 4.3 and offers a vivid sketch of his character in *BC* 5, but he does not begin the narrative of the conspiracy until *BC* 14.¹⁹ With this structure, Sallust constructs two interrelated frames through which the reader views the rest of his work: Rome's history and the author's own decision to write history. Through this structuring of his work, Sallust situates his first description of Catiline within the larger contexts of his decision to write historiography and his record of Rome's lofty origins and eventual downfall. By doing so, Sallust can create a narrative that offers several glimmers of hope that Rome's descent is not final and that the conspiracy itself, as well as his own treatment of it, may reverse his city's course.

Sallust's portrayal of Rome's origins has significant implications for the understanding of the city's present situation. Soon after the historian first describes Catiline at length, he writes that this man cannot be understood without setting him within the arc of Rome's history. Sallust begins this section (*BC* 6-13), often termed the Archeology, with the story of Aeneas:

*urbem Romam, sicuti ego accepi, condidere atque habuere initio Troiani qui, Aenea duce profugi, sedibus incertis vagabantur, cumque his Aborigines, genus hominum agreste, sine legibus, sine imperio, liberum atque solutum. hi postquam in una moenia convenere, dispari genere, dissimili lingua, alii alio more viventes, incredibile memoratu est quam facile coaluerint: <ita brevi multitudo diversa atque vaga concordia civitas facta erat.>*²⁰

The city of Rome, on my understanding, was founded and held initially by the Trojans, who as fugitives under the leadership of Aeneas had been wandering with no fixed abode; and with them were the Aborigines, a rustic race, without laws, without command, free and unrestricted. After they had come together behind a single wall, it is incredible to recall how easily – despite the difference in race, their separate languages and disparate life-styles – they merged: < so short was the time in which, owing to harmony, the diverse and wandering

departures from the main narrative, after all, are so frequent and pointed that it would be difficult to approach that narrative without considering them.

19. RAMSEY 2007, 22-23 offers a particularly useful schematic representation of the structure of the *BC*, with excurses and authorial comments marked off distinctly from the main narrative.

20. *BC* 6.1-2.

multitude had become a community.>

Several different stories of Rome's origins existed in Sallust's time, and the phrase «on my understanding» (*sicuti ego accepi*) hints at the decision he had to make in presenting one variant over the other.²¹ By selecting a story that emphasizes a peaceful union between remarkably dissimilar native and external populations, Sallust composes a foundation story that sets «harmony» (*concordia*) at the center of Roman civilization.²²

For the first several hundred years of its existence, Rome was marked by prosperity and internal stability, as the Romans' desire for glory and fame resulted not in selfish individual actions, but in the desire to increase the state's power through one's own deeds. As Sallust notes, «It is incredible to recall how much the city grew in a brief time after it became free [of the kings]; so great a desire for glory had arisen» (*civitas incredibile memoratu est adepta libertate quantum brevi creverit: tanta cupido gloriae incesserat, BC 7.3*). Sallust's mention of «glory» (*gloriae*) as an object of desire recalls the opening of his work, where he wrote on this topic from a more general perspective. Humans, according to Sallust, should «seek glory» (*gloriam quarere, BC 1.3*) so that they do not go through life unremembered. The programmatic link here between *gloria* and *memoria* casts the early Romans' «great desire for glory» (*tanta cupido gloriae, BC 7.3*) as a yearning to be remembered. Moreover, Sallust brings himself and his own times into the picture by using the phrase «It is incredible to recall» (*incredibile memoratu est*) at 7.3, an emphatic repetition from 6.2. This posture of amazement sets just as much emphasis on the Romans' remarkable early rise as on the terrible conditions in the present, where the city's former valor is difficult to believe. Sallust holds out this sort of behavior as a positive model for his readers, and in his role as historian he fulfills the early Romans' wish for commemoration.

Sallust soon shows how this desire to be remembered benefitted Rome. This appetite for glory led to a singular goal:

21. See VRETSKA 1976, ad loc. and RAMSEY 2007, ad loc. on the significance of this phrase.

22. See RAMSEY 2007, ad loc. on the authenticity of this passage. Even if we understand the last sentence as a later gloss on the text, the general characterization of Rome's origins still stands.

*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.*²³

But the greatest competition for glory was among themselves: each hurried to be the one to strike an enemy, to scale a wall and to be observed while doing such deeds. They considered this to be their wealth, this to be a good reputation and great nobility.

Instead of thinking that wealth can only belong to them and must be measured in grand villas or fine attire, the early Romans' desire for glory profited the state.

Up to this point, Sallust has drafted a picture of early Rome that is peaceful and productive, with virtuous actions motivated by a desire to be remembered in the future. Now, the historian moves to Rome's downfall.²⁴ He writes how when Carthage was conquered and no threats stood in Rome's way, «fortune began to turn savage and confound everything» (*saevire fortuna ac miscere omnia coepit*, BC 10.1).²⁵ Although Sallust does not spell out the precise relationship between Carthage's destruction in 146 BCE and Rome's descent, the implication is clear:²⁶ with no need to be concerned about external enemies, morals become corrupt, the desire for ambition turns toward individual gain, and an insatiable desire for personal wealth and leisure arise.²⁷ Sallust offers a picture of rectitude and propriety overturned, as Roman society redefines its core values: «Afterwards riches began to be a source of honor and to be attended by glory, command, and power, prowess

23. BC 7.6.

24. On mnemonic traditions of decline in general, see ZERUBAVEL 2003, 16-18.

25. See DAVIES in this volume for a nuanced consideration of the treatment of the significance of 146 BCE in Roman historiography.

26. LEVENE 2000, 179 argues persuasively that «fear of the enemy» (*metus hostilis*) was «a standard explanatory mode in antiquity» and, therefore, even though no direct link is made between Carthage's destruction and Rome's subsequent moral decline, «some connection along the general lines of the moral danger of unchallenged success after the fall of Carthage would be assumed.» On this point, see also EARL 1961, 47-49 and HELDMANN 1993, 93-117. GUNDERSON 2000, 96 also notes how «the sack of Carthage devastated Roman morals.» From a different perspective, GRETHLEIN 2014, 283 argues that this contextualization of the Catilinarian conspiracy within a larger view of Roman history helps to make the conspiracy itself appear as «the *telos* of earlier events.»

27. See also *Bj* 41.1 on the significance for Rome of Carthage's destruction.

began to dull, poverty to be considered a disgrace and blamelessness to be regarded as malice» (*postquam divitiae honori esse coepere et eas gloria, imperium, potentia sequebatur, hebescere virtus, paupertas probro haberi, innocentia pro malevolentia duci coepit, BC 12.1*).

This is the atmosphere, Sallust writes, in which Catiline comes of age and flourishes, a link made explicit when Sallust returns to Catiline: «In so great and so corrupt a community Catiline ...» (*in tanta tamque corrupta civitate Catilina ... BC 14.1*). The sound patterns of this phrase draw the readers' attention to the intersection between Catiline and this society. The strident alliteration of *tanta tamque* underscores the wretchedness of Rome's current state, and when that same sound is picked up by the four «t»'s in *corrupta civitate Catilina*, Catiline is wedded to that society. At the same time, these three words, each starting with a «c», begin a new alliterative movement of their own, a strident repetition revealing the tremendous energy Catiline brings into this milieu. Having constructed his story of moral decline, Sallust now (re)introduces the character who occasioned this excursus into the city's history and is the perfect avatar for the city at its nadir.

The link between Catiline and Rome's history invites reflection on Sallust's decision to set the conspiracy within this context. Several factors reveal that Sallust's history of Rome offers hope that the current situation may yet be ameliorated. Perhaps most significantly, Sallust makes Rome's foundation peaceful and its descent contingent on an external factor, Carthage's downfall. This represents a departure from other authors' treatments of the city's origins, where Rome's foundation is linked with Romulus' killing of Remus, an instance of the internecine warfare that later plagues the city. While there is no definitive evidence for this negative view of Romulus' foundation in the earliest fragments of Roman historiography, he is associated with the foundation of Rome by both Fabius Pictor and L. Cassius Hemina, and a fragment of Ennius shows one man threatening another with death, words that could easily be spoken by Romulus to Remus.²⁸ The

28. While no fragments from these three authors describe the actual foundation of Rome by Romulus, the evidence that remains strongly implies that this foundation story was included in their texts. Servius ad *Aen.* 1.273 claims that Ennius and Naevius include Romulus in the story of Rome's foundation, but evidence can only be found for Romulus' presence in Ennius. Ennius *A.* 1.94-95 offers a fragment from a speech

first explicit mention of Remus' death comes in a fragment from C. Licinius Macer (F3 in CORNELL 2013), likely written at least 20 years before Sallust's monograph.²⁹ No mention is made of Remus' killer here, though, and it is uncertain to what extent Romulus was shown to be responsible for his brother's death.³⁰

Romulus' responsibility and its moral consequences become more evident in texts written around the same time or a bit later than the *Bellum Catilinae*. As Cynthia Bannon notes, «the earliest explicit evidence for the vilification of Romulus is found in Cicero's *De Officiis*,»³¹ a text composed at about the same time as Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae*.³² At *Off.* 3.41, Cicero charges Romulus with a disregard for *pietas* and *humanitas* in the slaughter of his own brother. Later authors were ready to see Romulus' fratricide as the seed of Rome's civil wars. Horace, in particular, strikes this chord, as he writes that the Romans must fight each other time and again because of the «crime of a brother's death» (*scelus ... fraternae necis*, *Ep.* 7.18).³³ Livy, too, includes the story of Romulus, and although he does not fashion an explicit link between

threatening death, likely spoken by Romulus to Remus (see BANNON 1997, 110-116). As far as Naevius is concerned, it is known that he wrote a *praetexta* titled Romulus, but its precise contents are unknown and it may or may not be the same play as his *praetexta* titled *Lupus* (GOLDSCHMIDT 2013, 164). The story of the boys' birth and killing of Amulius is found in Fabius Pictor (F4 in CORNELL 2013); while this fragment does not go on to narrate Romulus' foundation of Rome, that event would be the natural next chapter of the story. Mention is made of a joint rule between Romulus and Remus before the foundation of Rome in a fragment of L. Cassius Hemina (F14 in CORNELL 2013, and for the context of this fragment see CORNELL 2013, III p. 167). There is the possibility that the story of Romulus may have existed in Cato's *Origines*, but while the later author including this fragment (F3 in CORNELL 2013) mentions Romulus, it is unlikely that any mention of Romulus was made in Cato (for this argument, see CORNELL 2013, III, p. 64-65). For a discussion of the origins of the Romulus and Remus myth see GRUEN 2010, 460-463; WISEMAN 1995, 76; and BANNON 1997, 159.

29. The precise date of Macer's composition is hard to ascertain, but his death can be set at 66 BCE. (see CORNELL 2013, I 321-322).

30. On the issue of Romulus' culpability, see CORNELL 2013, III p. 421.

31. BANNON 1997, 162.

32. See Cicero, *Off.* 3.41 and BANNON 1997, 162-164 and DYCK 1996, ad loc. on this passage. Cicero's work was written in late 44 BCE (see DYCK 1996, 8-9), shortly before Sallust's monograph. For the date of the *Bellum Catilinae*, see n. 2.

33. WATSON 2003, ad loc. remarks on how this phrase recalls the guilt of civil war and Remus' death at Romulus' hands.

this bloody foundation and Rome's later civil wars, there are often darker tones just beneath the text's surface.³⁴

By leaving out the story of Romulus and Remus and making Aeneas the founder of Rome, Sallust excludes any intimations of civil war arising from the city's foundation. When Romulus' killing of Remus stands as the city's foundational act, civil strife is made an inextricable part of Rome's fate. Instead of portraying Rome as tainted by the potential for civil war, Sallust moves toward the opposite conclusion. Words such as *concordia* (BC 6.2) and *libertas* (BC 7.3) characterize early Rome as the embodiment of the sort of values it lacks in Sallust's time.³⁵ By erasing the stain of fratricide and tying Rome's downfall with Carthage's destruction, Sallust graces Rome with a peaceful origin and makes its descent into civil war a result of an external factor, rather than the inevitable return of an ordinary flaw.

Alongside this description of Rome's history, Sallust describes his own reasons for writing. Here, he portrays himself as one who can positively impact Rome by describing Catiline's conspiracy and, perhaps, prod the city back toward its peaceful and morally upright beginnings. As he narrates his early adult years, Sallust first describes how he himself, having entered politics, was gripped by the same corruption and ambition that had tainted so many of his age.³⁶ At this point, he made the decision to leave politics:

igitur, ubi animus ex multis miseriis atque periculis requievit et mihi relicuam aetatem a re publica procul habendam decrevi, non fuit consilium socordia atque desidia bonum otium contere, neque vero agrum colundo aut venando, servilibus officiis, intentum aetatem agere; 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. igitur de Catilinae coniuratione quam verisime potero paucis absolvam; nam id facinus in primis ego memorabile

34. See SEIDER 2012, 270-272.

35. See VALENTINA 2012 on *libertas* in the Late Republic and specifically pp. 87, 100-101, 112, 114-116, 148, and 246 on *concordantia*.

36. KRAUS and WOODMAN 1997, 14-15 note how Sallust almost entirely glosses over his own expulsion from the senate in 50 BCE and the extortion charges he faced in 46-46 BCE after his governorship of Africa Nova. SYME 1964, 29-42 offers a narrative of Sallust's political career.

*existumo sceleris atque periculi novitate.*³⁷

Therefore, when my mind sought repose from the many miseries and dangers, and I determined that the remainder of my life must be kept far away from politics, it was not my intention to waste the good of my leisure time in agriculture or hunting, concentrating on the duties of slaves; but, returning to a project and enthusiasm from which my wicked ambition had detained me, I decided to write of the affairs of the Roman people – selectively, according as each subject seemed worthy of recollection, and with the additional reason that my mind was free from hope, dread, and political partisanship. Therefore I shall dispatch, in a few words, the conspiracy of Catiline as truthfully as I am able: for I think his deed especially deserving of recollection owing to the newness of the crime and its danger.

After first defining what he will *not* be doing in his post-political life,³⁸ Sallust claims that he will return to a project that his ambition had kept him from: writing the Romans' affairs.

By stating that he will write about the Romans' doings «selectively, according as each subject seemed worthy of recollection» (*carptim, ut quaeque memoria digna videbantur*), Sallust makes a crucial point about his practice of historiography. The adverb *carptim* establishes that he will not treat the entirety of Roman history in an annalistic form, but will rather write a monograph on a particular topic. In his elaboration immediately following, Sallust establishes *memoria* as an arbitrator of the worthiness of potential subjects. It is a vague measure: Sallust does not specify why or by whom events are worthy to be remembered. Just as the larger context, though, could prompt Sallust's readers to draw upon Roman values and attach the notion of *metus hostilis* to Carthage's downfall and its impact on Rome, here traditional Roman ideas about memory bring out the implications of Sallust's statement. Evidence from ancient literature and culture demonstrates the Romans' belief in the importance of memory for a well-functioning society, where they should look to the past for examples of behavior to guide their actions.³⁹ This aspect of Roman life was thought to be failing during the Late

37. BC 4.1-4.

38. See VRETSKA 1976, ad loc.; MCGUSHIN 1987, ad loc.; and RAMSEY 2007, ad loc. on some of the questions raised by Sallust's rejection of agriculture and hunting as servile activities.

39. See, for instance, Ennius SKUTSCH 1985 156, Cic. *Rep.* 5.1.1, and Polybius 6.54.3,

Republic,⁴⁰ and Sallust's repeated citation of memory as a criterion for writing implies that his readers ought to remember the events about which he writes and that these memories should influence their reactions. Viewed from this perspective, Sallust's next sentence, where he explains his reasons for writing about Catiline, gains additional clarity. Sallust writes about Catiline's conspiracy because he judges it «especially deserving of recollection owing to the newness of the crime and its danger» (*id facinus in primis ego memorabile existumo sceleris atque periculi novitiate*). The adjective «deserving of recollection» (*memorable*) recalls the reason Sallust stated earlier for writing, and it implies that Catiline's actions, due to their uniqueness, are something that the Romans ought to remember and react to accordingly.

Sallust uses the words *memoria* and *memorable* in his description of why he writes, and this sets him as the judge of what the Romans ought to remember. Since Catiline's conspiracy is worthy of being commemorated, it should in some way influence his readers' behavior and beliefs. Rome's turn for the worse came about because of the lack of any serious threat, and perhaps the danger of Catiline, if properly commemorated and understood, can function as the sort of force necessary to change the Romans' behavior for the better. This argument is strengthened by the links Sallust constructs around various concepts of memory in the Preface. In addition to the memory-words cited immediately above, the phrase «incredible to remember» (*incredibile memoratu*) is used at both *BC* 6.2 and 7.3 to bring out the remarkable nature of the positive attributes of early Roman society. Now, similar words associate Sallust's own explanation of why he writes with Catiline and the early Romans, as he relays information about two very different types of people. Utterly opposed in their morality but linked by the fact that they exist as distant outposts of imaginable behavior, both Catiline and the early Romans deserve to be remembered and, presumably, remembered in such a way that they influence the readers'

as well as the comments on Cicero in MEBAN 2009, 101-2 and on Ennius and Polybius in GALINSKY 1996, 58-59.

40. For evidence of this concern, see Cicero *Brut.*, and *Rep.* 5.1.2, Sallust *Jug.* 3.1, and Livy *praef.* GOWING 2000 comments on Cicero *Brut.*, STEM 2007 435-436 treats Livy; MEBAN 2009, 103-106 discusses Cicero *Rep.*, Sallust *Jug.*, and Liv. *praef.*, and SEIDER 2013, 18-19 comments on Cicero *Rep.*

behavior.⁴¹

One other aspect of Sallust's Preface implies that his writing should impact his readers. This comes when the historian discusses the difference between those who act on behalf of the state and those who write of others' deeds:

*ac mihi quidem, tametsi haudquaquam par gloria sequitur scriptorem et auctorem rerum, tamen in primis arduum videtur res gestas scribere.*⁴²

And, even though it is by no means an equal glory which attends the writer of affairs and their author, it nevertheless seems, to me at least, especially difficult to write about the conduct of affairs.

Although Sallust portrays his decision to write history as a movement «far away from politics» (*a re publica procul*, BC 4.1), he here blurs the lines between writing and doing. The meaning of *scriptorem* is unambiguous, but *auctorem* could just as easily denote a writer⁴³ as it could the person responsible for an action.⁴⁴ The significance here must be the latter, as the word is contrasted with *scriptorem*, but, nonetheless, the literary significance of *auctorem* temporarily erases the boundary being doing and writing, implying that Sallust too can effect change.⁴⁵

41. Writing decades later, Livy will make explicit many of these connections between audience, memory, and history in the preface to his work. For that passage, see Liv. *praef.* 10 and CHAPLIN 2000 1-5 and KRAUS and WOODMAN 1997, 54-56.

42. BC 3.2

43. OLD 9.

44. OLD 12 and 13.

45. Although Sallust here speaks in general terms and does not specify himself as an historian, the implications are clear. The only other uses of the phrase *res gestae* in Sallust's work describe the contents of historical works, whether written by himself (BC 4.2) or by Athenian historians (BC 8.2). EARL 1961, 9 argues that Sallust, since he can no longer seek glory through political means, now promotes the memory of other's glory so that he might excite «men to follow their example.» KREBS 2008, 586-589 argues that Sallust's use of *arduum* makes a claim for the virtuous nature of historiography. Within the context of Sallust's Preface, where virtue is often associated with service to the state, this claim also further associates Sallust's writing with the public sphere, where it could be expected to have an impact on his readers' public and political behavior. FELDHERR 2013, 55 writes that Sallust's use of these words makes a «writer appear at least comparable to a political agent;» and see also FELDHERR 2013, 63 for further blurring of this boundary.

Having positioned his history of Catiline's conspiracy within the contexts of Rome's origins and his own decision to write this monograph, Sallust begins his narrative. Through his depiction of Rome's history he has left open the possibility that his society's decline is not utterly irreversible. Furthermore, in his own description of his reasons for writing, Sallust has linked his authorship with events that ought to be remembered for their exceptional nature and he has implied that, even though he is no longer directly involved in politics, his writing still impacts the public sphere. As he starts his narrative of Catiline's conspiracy, Sallust chooses the phrase «corrupt community» (*corrupta civitate*, 14.1) to limpidly summarize the sort of environment in which Catiline thrives.⁴⁶ This phrase recalls the historian's last mention of Catiline, directly before he began his Archeology, when he wrote that Catiline was incited by the «community's corrupt morals» (*corrupti civitatis mores*, BC 5.8). This echo sets up a ring composition, with the depiction of Catiline standing on both sides of Sallust's Archeology, and it implies that Catiline must be evaluated within this larger temporal scale.

This structure sets up the Catilinarian conspiracy as a potential moment of inflection in Roman history, and Sallust now introduces two examples where the Romans change their behavior due to their realization of Catiline's danger. The first instance concerns Cicero's candidacy for the consulship. As the conspiracy grows, one of its members, Q. Curius, speaks of its existence to Fulvia, an upper-class woman who is his lover. Having become disenchanted with their relationship, Fulvia no longer keeps the conspiracy a secret. Once the Romans learn of Catiline's plans, they change their attitude towards Cicero:

*ea res in primis studia hominum accendit ad consulatum mandandum M. Tullio Ciceroni. namque antea pleraque nobilitas invidia aestuabat, et quasi pollui consulatum credebant, si eum quamvis egregius homo novus adeptus foret. sed ubi periculum advenit, invidia atque superbia post fuere.*⁴⁷

That circumstance in particular inflamed people's enthusiasm for

46. See MACQUEEN 1982, 69 for a Platonic interpretation of the relationship between Catiline and Rome.

47. BC 23.5-6.

entrusting the consulship to M. Tullius Cicero. For previously many of the nobility had been seething with resentment, believing that the consulship would be (as it were) polluted if a new man, however exceptional, acquired it. But, at the approach of danger, resentment and pride took second place.

The Romans regarded Cicero as a new man since he lacked any senatorial ancestors, and their deep prejudice against such newcomers hurt his chances of reaching the consulship.⁴⁸ According to Sallust, the threat of Catiline, though, is so great that it compels the Romans to set aside their deep-seated resentment in favor of more practical considerations. It is more likely that a variety of factors (such as fear of Crassus' influence and Cicero's support from Pompey and the *equites*) contributed to Cicero's election,⁴⁹ but Sallust casts Catiline's conspiracy as the pivotal detail. This change in the Romans' behavior may be a small one amidst the rampant self-concern and moral depravity of the Late Republic, but it is a change nonetheless and one that demonstrates the ability of external forces to influence how the Romans act. If Rome's downfall began because of the lack of any fear of an external foe, now Catiline has the potential to be the sort of enemy that can prod the Romans towards a more virtuous and productive existence.⁵⁰

This potential for change is picked up a bit later when Sallust describes how the Romans behave once they learn more about the conspirators' plans. While the example above concerning Cicero is fairly straightforward, here the situation is more complex:

ex summa laetitia atque lascivia, quae diuturna quies pepererat, repente omnis tristitia invasit: festinare, trepidare, neque loco nec homini cuiquam satis credere, neque bellum gerere neque pacem habere, suo quisque metu pericula metiri. ad hoc mulieres, quibus rei publicae magnitudine belli timor insolitus incesserat, adflictare sese, manus supplicis ad caelum tendere, miserari parvos liberos, rogitare omnia, <omni

48. GRUEN 1994, 137 details the sort of challenges Cicero would have faced in his attempt to be elected consul, and WISEMAN 1971, 1 discusses the definition of *novus homo* as one whose ancestors were all equestrians and had not been members of the senate.

49. See RAMSEY 2007, ad loc.

50. LEVENE 2000, 190 also considers the potential that Catiline could offer the same sort of threat to Rome as an external enemy.

*rumore> pavere, <adripere omnia,> superbia atque deliciis omissis sibi patriaeque diffidere.*⁵¹

Instead of the mirth and merriment that the lasting calm had produced, there was suddenly an assault from every form of sadness. People hurried and trembled; they did not quite trust any place or any individual; they were neither waging war nor experiencing peace; and each was gauging the dangers by his own dread. In addition, women – overcome by a fear of war which, given the magnitude of their commonwealth, was unfamiliar to them – beat their breasts, held out their hands to heaven in supplication, expressed pity for their children, questioned everything, panicked <at every rumor,> <seized upon everything,> and, forgoing their haughtiness and delights, distrusted themselves and their fatherland.

As news of the conspiracy and the measures taken against it spread, the Romans are forced out of their everyday routines. Indeed, it is the indeterminate and unusual nature of the threat that troubles them: they neither know what they should term these occurrences nor how they should react to their experience. Sallust shows the physical manifestations of their worry in their supplications, their verbal fear in their questioning, and their mental concern in their distrust of themselves and their country.⁵² Not every change here is a positive one, but certain new behaviors, such as the prayers to heaven and the pity for one's children, show a return to earlier, more morally upright actions. And even the problematic shifts, such as people's lack of trust, at least reveal that the Romans are finally reacting to a new threat and, from a larger perspective, validate the notion that Catiline represents the sort of enemy that could shake Rome from its deleterious torpor.

This potential for positive movement contrasts with the results that Sallust imagines could have followed Catiline's victory. The historian writes:

*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 exsanguibus qui plus posset imperium atque libertatem extorqueret.*⁵³

51. BC 31.1-3.

52. In his analysis of this passage, VRETSKA 1976, ad loc. notes these effects as well as the antitheses which structure Sallust's description.

53. BC 39.4.

And, if Catiline had come away from that first battle the stronger (or at least on equal terms), assuredly a great catastrophe and calamity would have overwhelmed the commonwealth, and those achieving victory would not have been able to enjoy it for too long before someone still more powerful extorted command and freedom from them, exhausted and debilitated as they would have been.

The potential aftermath of a Catilinarian victory is chilling. Such a conquest would not bring about Catiline's lengthy rule but would instead lead only to another revolution. A new Catiline would arise to seize power, with the unwritten implication being that this revolutionary would himself then be thrown down by another. It is a cyclical view of the future, as revolution after revolution threatens, with each group, exhausted in its triumph, only to be conquered by another uprising.⁵⁴

Compared to this spiral of bloodshed, the changes in the Romans brought about by the threat of Catiline are a positive development. And, if Catiline's crimes can act as a spur to cast aside some of the baser emotions that plague the Republic, then perhaps Sallust's monograph, focusing as it does on «the newness of the crime and its danger» (*sceleris atque periculi novitate*, *BC* 4.3), may have a salutary impact on its own readers as they consider the dreadful results that almost occurred. Set within the larger context of Rome's praiseworthy origins and subsequent decline, Sallust's depiction of these aspects of the Catilinarian conspiracy offers a hope for moral progress.

Speech and Time: Moral Chaos

As part of Sallust's narrative of Catiline's conspiracy, the historian includes four lengthy speeches in direct discourse: one by Caesar,

54. For a sophisticated and sensitive treatment of the construction of time in *BC* and *Bj*, see PAPAIOANNOU in this volume. See GUNDERSON 2000, 102 and 114 notes that a similar view of history is already implied by the inclusion of a first Catilinarian conspiracy in Sallust's work as well as in its early sections' narrative stops and starts, where certain historical changes are told again and again, with proper names added in later retellings. FEENEY 2007 analyses the rich and varied ways that Romans could conceive of time, with no one view of time (be it cyclical or linear or some combination of the two) dominating.

one by Cato, and two by Catiline.⁵⁵ Sallust's juxtaposition of these characters' words with his Preface and narrative shatter any hope for a positive change in Rome's future and in fact, create a far darker picture of moral and temporal chaos. Sallust's rendition of their words casts doubt in varied and significant ways on how memory can guide the present or help the future,⁵⁶ something which in turn destabilizes certain passages about early Rome and Sallust's reasons for writing.

Much of this pessimism comes, surprisingly, from the paired speeches of Caesar and Cato, two men whom Sallust singles out as examples of «great virtue» (*ingenti virtute*, BC 53.6) in the midst of dissolute times.⁵⁷ Delivered on December 5, 63 BCE to the Roman senate, their speeches discuss the fate of the suspected conspirators who are now in Rome's custody.⁵⁸ Caesar attempts to persuade the Romans that the conspirators should be permanently held in prisons around Italy; Cato urges that they be killed. What is significant for this article is not the aims of their arguments but the way each imagines the relationship between morality and time. Both speakers appeal to the past and future in ways that undermine the notion that earlier events have a stable meaning that can influence future generations to act in a particular way.

Caesar speaks first, and he stresses the impossibility of controlling the impact of one's actions in the future, even as he appeals to the past in order to buttress his own goals. Caesar begins his speech with a pronouncement that examples of earlier Romans in similar situations should guide the senate's current decision. After warning his audience of the danger of allowing emotions to influence their decision, Caesar claims:

magna mihi copia est memorandi, patres conscripti, quae reges atque populi, ira aut misericordia impulsī, male consuluerint; sed ea malo dicere quae maiores nostri contra lubidinem animi sui recte atque ordine

55. For a list of all direct quotations, whether they are of speech or letters, in the *Bellum Catilinae*, see KRAUS and WOODMAN 1997, p. 44 n. 61.

56. KRAUS and WOODMAN 1997, p. 44 n. 61 note how in each of the four speeches the speaker casts «doubt on the effectiveness of words» at 20.15, 51.10, 52.35, and 58.1.

57. See BATSTONE 1988 on the complexities of this passage.

58. For treatments of these speeches, see, LÄMMLI 1946; LAST 1948, 361-365; EARL 1961, 96-98; SYME 1964, 103-120; SKLENÁŘ 1998; and TANNENBAUM 2005.

fecere.⁵⁹

I have a large supply of recollections, conscript fathers, of the occasions when kings and peoples, induced by anger or pity, deliberated wrongly; but I prefer to speak of what our ancestors did rightly and properly in spite of the whims in their minds.

In a quintessentially Roman manner, Caesar turns to the past as a repository of examples that could guide present behavior. He remembers earlier deliberations that both were and were not influenced by emotions, and he chooses to speak of the sort of actions the Romans should imitate instead of the negative *exempla* they should avoid. Caesar's representation of his engagement with the past portrays him as being in firm control of a vast store of memories from which he can choose. Furthermore, he can make rational selections from this collection, based on his predictions about how his audience will respond.

As Caesar builds his argument against making an emotional decision, he repeatedly turns to the past. When he approaches the close of his speech, he avails himself of the power of the past by reminding his audience that «Naturally those who created so great an empire from small resources had better prowess and wisdom than there is in us, who scarcely retain what has been so well acquired» (*profecto virtus atque sapientia maior illis fuit, qui ex parvis opibus tantum imperium fecere, quam in nobis, qui ea bene parta vix retinemus*, BC 51.42). This remark adds force to Caesar's previous citation of an earlier generation's actions (BC 51.4); Caesar implies that the past is continuous with the present⁶⁰ but yet so much better than it that the early Romans are a mark that Caesar's contemporaries should aspire to reach. Caesar portrays himself as fully in control of both remembering and presenting earlier events, and he also assumes that his audience can evaluate the events he commemorates and then make proper decisions based upon their contemplation of the past.

In between Caesar's claims of his ability to effectively control the representation of examples from a morally superior past, he argues that present-day Romans cannot predict how future generations will

59. BC 51.4.

60. GRETHLEIN 2014, 291 and 293 notes how Caesar's characterization of the past imagines it being continuous with the present, not separated from it by a rupture.

interpret their current actions. He introduces this idea by proposing that the larger context of any event strongly influences what is remembered. Even though the conspirators' deeds are worthy of the most severe punishment, «many mortals remember what only comes last, and, in the case of heinous individuals, they forget their crime and talk only of their punishment, if it was a little too severe» (*plerique mortales postrema meminere, et, in hominibus impiis sceleris eorum obliti, de poena disserunt, si ea paulo severior fuit*, BC 51.15). The memory of any specific event becomes entangled in any larger number of deeds; what is done last overshadows what came before and those performing the deeds have little or no control over this process. In a paper considering the future of memory studies, Astrid Erll argues that memory is fundamentally “traveling” in the sense that «it lives in and through its movements» through contexts such as geography, culture, and time.⁶¹ From Caesar's perspective, the memory of this event will be constructed by its travels through different social and temporal contexts. No longer will the fear inspired by the conspiracy be the dominant emotion, but instead the Romans will only look at the severity of the punishment.⁶² In other words, even if the senate decides upon a punishment appropriate to the crime's magnitude, the deserved strength of that punishment will overshadow the conspirators' deeds and begin to be viewed in a negative light itself.

Caesar soon voices a more specific worry about how the senators' decision may be used in the future. Calling upon his audience to think about how their action today will impact future generations,⁶³ Caesar proclaims: «When command passes to those ignorant of the original circumstance or to the less good, any new precedent is transferred from the deserving and appropriate to the undeserving and inappropriate» (*ubi imperium ad ignaros eius aut minus bonos pervenit, novom illud exemplum ab dignis et idoneis ad indignos et non idoneos transfertur*,

61. ERL 2011, 11. As ERL 2011, 11 goes on to say, «mnemonic forms and contents are filled with new life and new meaning in changing social, temporal and local contexts.

62. See FEINDT *et al.* 2014, 33-34 for more on how the social setting changes how a past event is remembered.

63. GRETHLEIN 2014, 294-296 also notes how Caesar «envisages the present as if it were a past.»

BC 51.27). Hence, Caesar asks, when some future consul is granted final authority by the senate and incorrectly believes a false accusation, «Who will decide the ending for him, who will restrain him?» (*quis illi finem statuet aut quis moderabitur?* BC 51.36). With these questions, Caesar casts doubt on the ability of his fellow senators to control how future generations will remember what they decide to do now. For the future Romans imagined by Caesar, it is not the reality of the past that holds sway, but rather the motivation of those who construct its representation.

Caesar offers two distinctly different appeals to memory: one where he sets himself as a figure who can correctly pick out earlier *exempla* for the Romans to follow, and the other where he imagines that, even if the senate decides correctly today, future generations can fashion their memory of that decision to fit morally dubious purposes. Barry Schwartz, who analyzes the role of social memory in politics, provides a framework for approaching these alternate views. As Schwartz writes:

The past is matched to the present as a model *of* society and a model *for* society. As a model *of* society, collective memory reflects past events in terms of the needs, interests, fears, and aspirations of the present. As a model *for* society, collective memory performs two functions: it embodies a *template* that organizes and animates behavior and a *frame* within which people locate and find meaning for their present experience. Collective memory affects social reality by *reflecting, shaping, and framing* it.⁶⁴

In his statements to the senate about how he selects examples from the past, Caesar portrays the past as a model *for* society. This sort of characterization plays down how the past can be molded for present purposes. Instead, it portrays the past as a paradigm for guiding the Romans' decisions and a repository to which they can turn in order to evaluate their current quandary. When Caesar speaks of how future generations will evaluate present actions, though, he presents the past as a model *of* society. From this perspective, future Romans will reconstruct the past in terms of their present needs and fears. In other words, the past will be a much more malleable object. By applying these distinct models to different situations, Caesar characterizes himself as

64. SCHWARTZ 2000, 18; emphases original.

someone who, through remembering the past in an unprejudiced manner, presents relevant and persuasive *exempla* to his fellow senators, even as he provokes his audience's fear about how their actions will be perceived and judged in the future. In both cases, of course, Caesar manipulates his characterization of the interaction between present and past according to his own rhetorical strategy.

By casting doubt on the ability of his peers to control how their actions will be remembered, Caesar implies that the Romans' future engagement with examples from the past will fail and Rome's descent will continue. Sallust's construction of Caesar's speech also casts doubt on the historian's earlier implied claims about the potentially salutary effect of his commemoration of the Catilinarian conspiracy. If Sallust writes of the conspiracy's terrible and new danger in the hope that it might inspire action in the present, Caesar's words show how unlikely it is that someone looking back to this monograph would remember and react in the way Sallust might hope. There are new contextual frames of remembrance and new demands that will arise in the future, rendering Sallust's control over the impact of his monograph unreliable.

Cato's use of the past in his response to Caesar further undermines the notion that earlier deeds can provide guidance in the future. Selecting his examples from the same body of history as Caesar, Cato cites instances where the Romans put men to death for actions that threatened the state or its authority. He begins by recalling a famous example of a capital sentence imposed by a father on his son:

*apud maiores nostros A. Manlius Torquatus bello Gallico filium suum, quod is contra imperium in hostem pugnaverat, necari iussit, atque ille egregius adulescens immoderatae fortitudinis morte poenas dedit; vos de crudelissimis parricidis quid statuatis cunctamini?*⁶⁵

In the time of our ancestors, A. Manlius Torquatus during the Gallic War ordered his own son to be executed because he had fought against the enemy contrary to command; and that exceptional young man paid the penalty for his unrestrained courage by death. Do you hesitate over what to decide concerning the cruelest of parricides?

Citing the extreme instance of a consul who ordered his son's death because he attacked the enemy against his orders, Cato draws a com-

65. BC 52.30-31

parison with the present, when the senators hesitate to kill those who had aspired to destroy the state. He reaffirms the past's support for capital punishment in the final words of his speech, which encapsulate what he sees as the relationship between past and present: «punishment must be exacted, according to the custom of our ancestors» (*more maiorum supplicium sumundum*, BC 52.36). The forceful alliteration of «m» and «s» adds weight to Cato's argument that the past ought to be used as a guide for the present. Coming so soon, though, after Caesar finds evidence for a merciful action in the same body of history, Cato's citation opens up the idea that he is changing the past according to his present circumstances, which is precisely what Caesar feared future Romans would do.

From another perspective, Cato's *exemplum* of Torquatus undermines the use of memory even more. Closer inspection shows that there are several questions raised by the particular incident he cites. First, as numerous scholars have noted, Cato is mistaken in identifying the consular father as Aulus Manlius Torquatus. His *praenomem* is Titus and furthermore, according to other ancient authors, this incident took place in the Latin War (340 BCE), not, as Cato implies, the Gallic War (361 BCE).⁶⁶ These minor mistakes call into question the veracity and impact of Cato's recollection and add weight to the notion that Cato reconstructs the past according to his present needs.⁶⁷ What is more consequential in terms of Sallust's monograph is that the Romans often cited this very punishment as an instance of excessive cruelty, an action from the past that should influence them to spare people now.⁶⁸ The unintentional implications of Cato's reference to this event echo all

66. On this confusion of names and wars, see VRETSKA 1976, ad loc. and MCGUSHIN 1987, ad loc. For the ancient evidence, see Cicero *Off.* 3.112; *Fin.* 1.23; and Livy 8.7.

67. It can of course be debated whether this mistake is Sallust or if he knows the information and puts the mistake in Cato's mouth. In his commentary, MCGUSHIN 1987, ad loc. implies the former. The other uncomfortable ramifications of Cato's use of this *exemplum*, analyzed above, leave open the possibility that this error in the name and the war ought to be laid at Cato's feet. In regard to similarly problematic details in Caesar's speech, TANNENBAUM 2005, 213 argues that they are most likely the purposeful work of Sallust.

68. For this point, see LEVENE 2000, 176-177 and 185. Also, LEVENE 2000 points out numerous other points where Cato's words recall incidents from the past that actually would undermine his arguments. GRETHLEIN 2014, 290 also points toward several problems occasioned by Cato's citation of Torquatus.

the way back to Sallust's Archeology, where Sallust alluded to this sort of punishment as evidence of the remarkable moral tenor of the early Romans.⁶⁹ Beyond impacting the readers' evaluation of his speech and validating Caesar's concerns about the future, Cato's citation of Torquatus calls into question Sallust's portrait of the past as entirely virtuous. For, if Torquatus' punishment of his son could be judged «at best morally complex and at worst entirely unacceptable,»⁷⁰ how can a past that contains it truly be a repository of unambiguously virtuous deeds?

While Caesar's and Cato's speeches undercut some of Sallust's arguments about the potential for Roman morality to rebound, Catiline's speeches interact with their context in a different way. In his construction of these speeches, Sallust further destabilizes the notion that memory can halt Rome's decline by having Catiline appeal to the same positive tropes of memory as the very Romans against whom he rebels. What is most discomfiting about Catiline's remarks is that he manipulates his men by using concepts and vocabulary similar to those voiced by Cato, Caesar and Sallust.⁷¹ As Catiline does so, the idea that the past can help to secure Rome's present is lost, for he harnesses the past in order to destroy the city that Caesar and Cato wish to save. To compound these paradoxes further, Sallust also repeatedly links Catiline with some of the supposedly pure virtues of early Rome.

Perhaps what is most remarkable about Sallust's portrayal of Catiline is how clearly the revolutionary recalls Sallust's ruminations at the beginning of the *Bellum Catilinae*. Before evaluating the historian's depiction of Catiline, it will be helpful first to consider a few key

69. See *BC* 9.3 and LEVENE 2000, 176-177.

70. LEVENE 2000, 177. See GRETHLEIN 2014, 270 for other «grim images of Rome's decline» within the Archeology.

71. In certain ways, this can be seen as an example of what MORSTEIN-MARX 2004, 240 has termed «ideological monotony», when politicians with different hopes and plans «each pledged their allegiance to the same principles and goals». Yet while the audiences of conditional speeches in ancient Rome, without any insight into a speaker's actual motivations, would be unable to identify his true aims, the emphasis in Sallust is not on any sort of audience confusion. Instead, by revealing the speakers' true positions via his narrative and authorial comments, Sallust shines the spotlight on how similar tropes of memory can be put to entirely different moral purposes. For more on the idea of «ideological monotony,» see MORSTEIN-MARX 2004, 204-240.

themes from the opening chapters of Sallust's monograph, in particular the historian's remarks about glory and the mind/body divide. In his work's very first sentence, Sallust muses:

*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. sed nostra omnis vis in animo et corpore sita est; animi imperio, corporis servitio magis utimur; alterum nobis cum dis, alterum cum beluis commune est. quo mihi rectius videtur ingeni quam virium opibus gloriam quaerere et, quoniam vita ipsa qua fruimur brevis est, memoriam nostri quam maxime longam efficere.*⁷²

All persons who are enthusiastic that they should transcend the other animals ought to strive with the utmost effort not to pass through a life of silence, like cattle, which nature has fashioned to be prone and obedient to their stomachs. Our entire power resides in the mind as well as in the body: we use the mind to command, the body to serve; the former we share with the gods, the latter with the beasts. Therefore it seems to me more correct to seek glory with our intellectual rather than with our physical resources, and, because the very life that we enjoy is short, to ensure that a recollection of ourselves lasts as long as possible.

As he opens his work, Sallust concentrates on how men can attain glory and win for themselves a long memory. If the result to be avoided is a life of silence, namely an existence where one neither speaks nor is spoken about by others,⁷³ then the solution is to seek glory with the mind and the body, with a preference given to the former.

Soon thereafter, Sallust confirms this mind/body divide and implicitly praises those who use both these aspects of themselves together. Considering the Romans' early achievements in light of other civilizations, Sallust writes that the Athenians, for instance, enjoy too much credit for their accomplishments since they were touted by such outstanding writers. For the early Romans, this was not the case:

at populo Romano numquam ea copia fuit, quia prudentissimus quisque

72. BC 1.1-3.

73. The ablative *silentio* denotes both the absence of one's own speech as well as the absence of being spoken about by others; for this interpretation of *silentio*, see WOODMAN 1973, 310.

*maxume negotiosus erat; ingenium nemo sine corpore exercebat; optumus quisque facere quam dicere, sua ab aliis bene facta laudari quam ipse aliorum narrare malebat.*⁷⁴

But such a possibility was never open to the Roman people, because all their cleverest men were the most enterprising in action: no one exercised his intellectual talent without his body; all the best men preferred to do rather than to speak and that their own good deeds should be praised by others rather than that they themselves should narrate those of others.

Here Sallust particularizes the theme of glory with which he opened his work. The Romans preferred to use their mind in concert with their body, thus leaving their deeds to be recorded by others.

Sallust's portrait of Catiline is far from simple, but it is clear from the very first description that Catiline, like the early Romans, also uses his mind and body to strive for glory. In his first description of Catiline, Sallust writes: «L. Catilina, born of a noble line, had great strength of both mind and body, but a wicked and crooked disposition» (*L. Catilina, nobili genere natus, fuit magna vi et animi et corporis, sed ingenio malo pravoque*, BC 5.1). Catiline, like those who wish for glory in BC 1.1 and the early Romans in BC 8.5, has a similar prowess in both mind and body; unlike his counterparts, though, he puts these capabilities to a terrible use because of his wicked nature.⁷⁵

Catiline's speeches soon elaborate this idea. Appearing in BC 20 and 58, Catiline's words bookend the monograph's main narrative and give him ample opportunity to define himself, his morals, and his followers. In the first of his two speeches he appeals to his mind and his body. Having called together potential supporters, Catiline finishes his address with an appeal to his different strengths:

*vel imperatore vel milite me utimini; neque animus neque corpus a vobis aberit. haec ipsa, ut spero, vobiscum una consul agam, nisi forte me animus fallit et vos servire magis quam imperare parati estis.*⁷⁶

74. BC 8.5.

75. WILKINS 1994, 33 notes that Sallust recalls the mind/body theme in BC 5.1-8; she is right that this passage overall has a «condemnatory tone,» but the very first words describing Catiline are entirely positive. GRETHLEIN 2014, 272-273 notes that in general not all aspects of Catiline's character are negative in Sallust's representation.

76. BC 20.16-17.

Use me as either commander or soldier: neither my mind nor my body will fail you. These are the very things, I hope, that I shall be discussing with you when I am consul, unless perchance my mind deceives me and you are prepared for servitude rather than for command.

In language strikingly reminiscent of Sallust's division of body and mind at *BC* 1.1 and 8.5, Catiline calls attention to the vigor and power of his physical and intellectual resources. Catiline's repetition of Sallust's language has a disorienting effect, for he uses his mind and body to accomplish a goal opposed to what the early Romans had worked for. Yet, in Catiline's representation, that goal is a praiseworthy one.

This appeal to mind and body amplifies the impact of some of Catiline's previous statements. A bit earlier, Catiline asks his followers what they can win by fighting: «Is it not better to die with prowess than to lose in disgrace a life which is pitiable and dishonorable, once you have become a plaything of the haughtiness of others?» (*nonne emori per virtutem praestat quam vitam miseram atque inhonestam, ubi alienae superbiae ludibrio fueris, per dedecus amittere?* *BC* 20.9). Catiline turns to the word *virtus*, the same word that Sallust uses at the opening of his work: «The glory of riches and appearance is fleeting and fragile, but to have prowess is something distinguished and everlasting» (*nam divitiarum et formae gloria fluxa atque fragilis est, virtus clara aeternaque habetur*, *BC* 1.4). When Catiline uses *virtus* in his speech, it shows how the value attached to the word can easily be transferred into different situations. Furthermore, this undermines any hope about the positive moral impact of memory. The lure of future commemoration, which was the goal Sallust elucidated at the beginning of his work, is also the goal for Catiline's followers. Near the end of his speech, Catiline affirms this once more: «Why not, therefore, rouse yourselves? Here, stretching before your eyes, lies that freedom which you have often craved, as well as riches, respect, and glory» (*quin igitur expergiscimini? en illa, illa, quam saepe optastis, libertas, praeterea divitiae, decus, gloria in oculis sita sunt*, *BC* 20.14). Coupled with a value that Sallust extols (*libertas*),⁷⁷ *gloria* is included

77. For Sallust's attribution of this value to early Rome, see *BC* 6.5, 6.7, 7.3. The

as a positive outcome for Catiline and his men, mirroring its function (*gloria*, BC 1.3) as one of the goals Sallust set out in his Preface.⁷⁸

In the last instance of direct speech in Sallust's monograph, Catiline encourages his followers as they prepare to battle the Roman armies surrounding them. Availing himself of many of the same tropes that Caesar and Cato used in their speeches, Catiline spurs his men to action with the recollection of earlier deeds. Standing before his assembled followers, he says «Therefore attack all the more daringly, mindful of your old-time prowess» (*quo audacius adgredimini, memores pristinae virtutis*, BC 58.12). As Catiline urges his men to remember earlier success, his use of *pristinae* implies that they could remember both their own earlier *virtus* as well as the *virtus* of previous generations of Romans.⁷⁹ This ancestral *virtus* provided the object for Caesar's and Cato's targeted memories, and when Catiline uses it here he further destabilizes the word's positive connotations. Roman morality is no longer a solid object, but has become a malleable tool of rhetoric, something that can be used to justify any sort of action.

As if Catiline's mimicry of the language and rhetorical tactics of Cato, Caesar, and Sallust is not destabilize the relationship between morality and time, Sallust draws attention to it further by detailing how M. Petreius, a Roman legate, rallies his troops right before battle with Catiline. Almost directly after he finishes recording Catiline's speech, Sallust notes how Petreius fires his men's ardor «by reminding» (*commemorando*) them of their earlier deeds (BC 59.6). His veteran soldiers, «mindful of their old-time prowess» (*pristinae virtutis memores*, BC 60.3), then proceed to fight fiercely in battle. Then, returning to Catiline, Sallust describes how the revolutionaries' leader fights on after most of his men have died, «mindful of his lineage and his own old-time status» (*memor generis atque pristinae suae dignitatis*, BC 60.7). This last mention, shortly before Catiline is killed and the victorious Romans survey the bloody battlefield with a mixture of grief and joy,

only other use of *libertas* before 20.14 also occurs in Catiline's speech (BC 20.6).

78. SKLENÁŘ 1998, 207 remarks how Sallust's treatment of the pursuit of glory in 1.3 characterizes this activity «as the true human enterprise.» GRETHLEIN 2014, 288 notes how this final speech uses many of the same terms as Sallust's Archeology.

79. See OLD *pristinus* 1 and 2 for examples of the adjective used to mark events and people both within the recent past and from far before one's lifetime.

further obscures any difference between the moral rhetoric used by the two opposing sides. Words used by or associated with Petreius and his soldiers (*commemorando*, BC 59.6; *pristinæ ... memores*, BC 60.3) are picked up in this final description of Catiline (*memor ... pristinae*, BC 60.7), a repetition that demonstrates how Catiline and his opponents share the same value system but harness it for completely different ends.

Catiline's End and Rome's Future

If Sallust's description of early Rome and his own reasons for writing leave open the possibility that the Romans may be able to cast aside some of the baser emotions that have brought their state to ruin, his portraits of Caesar, Cato, and Catiline imply a terrifying annihilation of the meaning of temporal and moral categories. More chilling than the revelation that Rome's decline cannot be reversed, a pattern that, for all its depressing qualities, is at least understandable, a new concept arises at the end of Sallust's monograph: the idea that society is so fractured that not only are patterns of time now meaningless, but even basic ideas about moral progress and devolution divide Roman citizens.

Sallust captures this feeling in his description of the aftermath of the battle. After the fighting is done, Sallust ends his monograph by describing how the Romans react to the battlefield:

*multi autem, qui e castris visundi aut spoliandi gratia processerant, volventes hostilia cadavera, amicū alii, pars hospitem aut cognatum reperiebant; fuere item qui inimicos suos cognoscerent. ita varie per omnem exercitum laetitia, maeror, luctus atque gaudia agitabantur.*⁸⁰

As for the many who had emerged from the camp for the purposes of viewing or plundering and were turning over enemy corpses, some discovered a friend, others a guest or a relative; likewise there were those who recognized their own personal antagonists. Thus, throughout the entire army, delight, sorrow, grief, and joy were variously experienced.

The soldiers' various reactions reflect the differences in how this event will be interpreted, depending on the particular characteristics of

80. BC 61.8-9.

the one who looks upon the corpses.⁸¹ The lack of any explicit authorial comment at the end of the *Bellum Catilinae* stands out, particularly as Sallust begins the work with a substantial Preface and does not hesitate to add his own voice and views throughout.⁸² Here, the reader is left with only the reactions of the Romans. These reactions, due to their position as the final word in the monograph, take on a heightened importance, almost as if the soldiers stand in for Sallust's audience. This builds on the other fractures that Sallust has created over the course of the *Bellum Catilinae*.⁸³ Now, Caesar's prediction about the impossibility of controlling how the future remembers the present comes true as Sallust's work moves to its close. No one single moral impact or memory will arise from these events, but each man will depart from the battlefield with his own idea of what happened and what it means for Rome's future.

It is a decidedly pessimistic end to a work that in its early sections advances the notion that Catiline's conspiracy and Sallust's history could move the Romans back to their erstwhile virtues. Yet, just as dark undertones exist in the work's Preface, this ending may serve as Sallust's final effort to prod the Romans to return to their earlier ways. Over the course of his monograph, Sallust engages his audience in an exploration of the fragile yet consequential power of temporal patterns and future expectations, often calling attention to his own authorial voice in doing so. By ending the *Bellum Catilinae* without a single comment of his own, he elides the difference between an author of words (*scriptor*) and of deeds (*auctor*), a gap he earlier narrowed in his description of his motivations to write.⁸⁴ Now, by providing a seemingly straightforward narrative of the aftermath of Catiline's defeat, Sallust vanishes behind his portrait of a divergent group of

81. GRETHLEIN 2014, 301 remarks on the "cacophonous note" that marks the end of Sallust's work.

82. One example among many is the *synkrisis* of Caesar and Cato in *BC* 54.

83. BATSTONE 1988, 6 argues in general that Sallust does not offer the reader a «closed and satisfying composition» and, more specifically, (p. 29) that the comparison of Caesar and Cato (the so-called *synkrisis* in *BC* 53-54), which has no resolution, «becomes an image or emblem of this crisis in the Late Republic» (p. 3). LEVENE 2000, 182 also notes the «fragmented» representation of *virtus* in the *synkrisis*.

84. See *BC* 3.2.

reactions, abandoning his audiences with their own uncertainty.⁸⁵ Sallust leaves his audience immersed in despair; and just as Carthage's power and Catiline's plans impacted the Romans before, this feeling may move them to attempt to mend some of the fractures that nearly shatter the *Bellum Catilinae* and are close to destroying their own society.

Aaron M. Seider
College of The Holy Cross
aseider@holycross.edu

References

- ASSMANN, A. 2011, *Cultural Memory and Western Civilization: Arts of Memory*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- BANNON, C. J. 1997, *The Brothers of Romulus: Fraternal Pietas in Roman Law, Literature, and Society*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- BATSTONE, W. W. 1988, "The Antithesis of Virtue: Sallust's *Synkrisis* and the Crisis of the Late Republic", in *Classical Antiquity*, 7, 1, pp. 1–29.
- BÜCHNER, K. 1960, *Sallust*, Universitätsverlag, Heidelberg.
- CHAPLIN, J. D. 2000, *Livy's Exemplary History*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- CONLEY, D. F. 1981a, "The Interpretation of Sallust *Catiline* 10.1–11.3", in *Classical Philology*, 76, 2, pp. 121–5.
- 1981b, "The Stages of Rome's Decline in Sallust's Historical Theory", in *Hermes*, 109, 3, pp. 379–82.
- CORNELL, T. 2013, *The Fragments of the Roman Historians*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- DYCK, A. R. 1996, *A Commentary on Cicero, De Officiis*, University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor.
- EARL, D. C. 1961, *The Political Thought of Sallust*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- 1972, "Prologue-Form in Ancient Historiography", in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt*, 1, 2, pp. 842–56.
- ERLL, A. 2011, "Travelling memory", in *Parallax*, 17, 4, pp. 4–18.
- ERLL, A. and A. NÜNNING 2010, *A Companion to Cultural Memory Studies*, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin.

85. GUNDERSON 2000, 115 notes how this last scene «of Roman uncertainty» makes Sallust's audience "similarly uncertain" about how to react.

- FEENEY, D. 2007, *Caesar's Calendar: Ancient Time and the Beginnings of History*, University of California Press, Berkeley.
- FEINDT, G. *et al.* 2014, "Entangled Memory: Toward a Third Wave in Memory Studies", in *History and Theory*, 53, pp. 24–44.
- FELDHERR, A. 2013, "Free Spirits: Sallust and the Citation of Catiline", in *American Journal of Philology*, 134, 1, pp. 49–66.
- FENTRESS, J. and C. WICKHAM 1992, *Social Memory*, Blackwell, Oxford.
- GALINSKY, K. 1996, *Augustan Culture*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- GOLDSCHMIDT, N. 2013, *Shaggy Crowns: Ennius' Annales and Virgil's Aeneid*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- GOWING, A. M. 2000, "Memory and Silence in Cicero's Brutus", in *Eranos*, 98, pp. 39–64.
- GRETHLEIN, J. 2014, *Experience and Teleology in Ancient Historiography: Future's Past' from Herodotus to Augustine*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- GRUEN, E. 1994, *The Last Generation of the Roman Republic*, University of California Press, Berkeley.
- 2010, "Romans and Others", in *A Companion to the Roman Republic*, ed. by N. ROSENSTEIN and R. MORSTEIN-MARX, Blackwell, Malden, pp. 459–77.
- GUNDERSON, E. 2000, "The History of Mind and the Philosophy of History in Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae*", in *Ramus*, 29, pp. 85–126.
- HELDMANN, K. 1993, *Sallust über Die Römische Weltherrschaft: Ein Geschichtsmodell im Catilina und Seine Tradition in Der Hellenistischen*, B.G. Teubner, Stuttgart.
- KRAUS, C. S. and A. J. WOODMAN 1997, *Latin Historians*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- KREBS, C. 2008, "The Imagery of "The Way" in the Proem to Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae* (1-4)", in *American Journal of Philology*, 129, 4, pp. 581–594.
- LÄMMLI, F. 1946, "Sallusts Stellung zu Cato, Caesar, Cicero", in *Museum Helveticum*, 3, pp. 94–117.
- LAST, H. 1948, "Sallust and Caesar in the *Bellum Catilinae*", in *Mélanges de Philologie, de Littérature et d'Histoire Anciennes Offerts à J. Marouzeau par Ses Collègues et Élèves Étrangers*, ed. by J. ERNST, Les Belles Lettres, Paris, pp. 355–69.
- LEVENE, D. S. 2000, "Sallust's Catiline and Cato the Censor", in *Classical Quarterly*, 50, 1, pp. 170–191.
- MACQUEEN, B. D. 1982, *Plato's Republic in the Monographs of Sallust*, Bolchazy Carducci, Chicago.
- MCGUSHIN, P. 1987, *Sallust: Bellum Catilinae*, Bristol Classical Press, Bristol.
- MEBAN, D. 2009, "Virgil's *Eclogues* and Social Memory", in *American Journal of Philology*, 130, 1, pp. 99–130.

- MORSTEIN-MARX, R. 2004, *Mass Oratory and Political Power in the Late Roman Republic*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- OLICK, J. K. 2010, "From Collective Memory to the Sociology of Mnemonic Practices and Products", in *A Companion to Cultural Memory Studies*, ed. by A. ERLI and A. NÜNNING, De Gruyter, Berlin.
- OLICK, J. K. *et al.* 2011, *The Collective Memory Reader*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- PAGÁN, V. E. 2012, *Conspiracy Theory in Latin Literature*, University of Texas Press, Austin.
- RAMSEY, J. T. 2007, *Sallust's Bellum Catilinae*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- REYNOLDS, L. D. 1986, *Texts and Transmission: A Survey of Latin Classics*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- SCHWARTZ, B. 2000, *Abraham Lincoln and the Forge of National Memory*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- SEIDER, A. M. 2012, "The Boundaries of Violence in Horatius' Battles (Livy 1.22-26)", in *New England Classical Journal*, 39, 4, pp. 259-275.
- 2013, *Memory in Vergil's Aeneid: Creating the Past*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- SKLENÁŘ, R. 1998, "La République des Signes: Caesar, Cato, and the Language of Sallustian Morality", in *Transactions of the American Philological Foundation*, 128, pp. 205-220.
- SKUTSCH, O. 1985, *The Annals of Q. Ennius*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- STEM, R. 2007, "The Exemplary Lessons of Livy's Romulus", in *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 137, 2, pp. 435-471.
- SYME, R. 1964, *Sallust*, University of California Press, Berkeley.
- TANNENBAUM, R. F. 2005, "What Caesar Said: Rhetoric and History in Sallust's *Coniuratio Catilinae* 51", in *Roman Crossings: Theory and Practice in the Roman Republic*, ed. by K. WELCH and T. HILLARD, Classical Press of Wales, Swansea, pp. 209-23.
- VALENTINA, A. 2012, *Libertas and the Practice of Politics in the Late Roman Republic*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- VRETSKA, K. 1976, *C. Sallustius Crispus: De Catilinae Coniuratione*, Universitätsverlag, Heidelberg.
- WATSON, L. C. 2003, *A Commentary on Horace's Epodes*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- WILKINS, A. T. 1994, *Villain or Hero: Sallust's Portrayal of Catiline*, Peter Lang, New York.
- WISEMAN, T. P. 1971, *New Men in the Roman Senate: 139 B.C. - A.D. 14*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- 1995, *Remus: A Roman Myth*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

- WOODMAN, A. J. 1973, "A Note on Sallust, *Catalina* 1.1", in *Classical Quarterly*, 23, 2, p. 310.
- 2007, *Sallust: Catiline's War, The Jugurthine War, Histories*, Penguin Books, London.
- ZERUBAVEL, E. 2003, *Time Maps: Collective Memory and the Social Shape of the Past*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.