



Ἐπέκεινα

International Journal of Ontology
History and Critics

SOPHIA PAPAIOANNOU

Matrices of Time and the Recycling of Evil in Sallust's Historiography

EPEKEINA, vol. 4, n. 1-2 (2014), pp. 113-139

ISSN: 2281-3209

DOI: 10.7408/epkn.v4i1-2.88

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.

Matrices of Time and the Recycling of Evil in Sallust's Historiography

Sophia Papaioannou

It is generally agreed upon today that there is no definite narrative of the past, especially of the era before the development of the historical science, given the subjectivity of the narrative construction process. According to Reinhart Koselleck, a leading theorist of history and historiography in the second half of the twentieth century, historical process is distinguished by a special kind of temporality different from that found in nature and experienced by the various historical subjects. This temporality is not linear but «multileveled and subject to different rates of acceleration and deceleration, and functions not only as a matrix within which historical events happen but also as a causal force in the determination of social reality in its own right».¹ The historiographical process observes a similar course of multileveled development but from a specific, conditioned perspective, which determines, by means of varied repetition, the speed of progression of time and the nature of causality involved in bringing about this progression.

Repetition inserts circular time, a more nature-oriented understanding of time, in the 'scientific' historical process, and infuses it with a sense of predeterminism, but also with the suggestion that the historical process may be predicted and controlled. In many respects, this circularity is highly desirable: we desire to know the past not only because of the fascination it exercises upon the present and the affirmation of our existence it offers, when we situate our lives in a wider, complex context as a result of which they acquire significance, but also because it enables the rational contextualization of the past inside the much wider frame of comprehensive time which includes past, present and future. As a result of this contextualization we (the present) may attribute the development of certain past events to individual agency but irrespectively of specific agents, and discern an impact on our present, a realization that may allow us to foreshadow the future, both our own future and the more distant future that extends beyond our lifetime. In the former case, we quell our subconscious fears about the

1. KOSELLECK 2002, xii.

unpredictability of life's course; in the latter, we reap the satisfaction that we can have access to the history of humanity beyond the reach of our own mortal lifespan. The concept of circularity of historiographical time is particularly suited to this a-historical understanding of the past and the definition of progression of time as something predictable and familiar—something we may not live to experience biologically but we can “experience” mentally.

Repetition may apply also to the process of the so-called “narrative sentences” – the concept of appreciating the earlier of two events separated from each other by a segment of time – from the standpoint of an interpreter who lives in the time of the later event. Danto, further, notes that an event that took place at a time (t) may not be fully appreciated at the very time (t) it takes place. Temporal distance often brings a more knowledgeable, less emotional and more objective appreciation. At the same time, the later narrators of an earlier event do not share the same vantage point. This means that past events and times are dynamic, and that the happenings that put together each of these events are not necessarily the same for each narrator. It also suggests that the longer the time intervening between original event time (t) and narrative time (t1), the more information about this original event time (t) is extracted.² Counter to this dynamic understanding of a past event at a given time, is the fact that regardless of the many later re-descriptions of the past, there exists only one real past event. Still, the immutable reality status of this one and only real past usually is difficult to recover—the time intervening since, has encouraged the formation of more than one description of this past, and each of these descriptions (=each new past or new narrative time) is the product of negotiation of information exchange with one or more earlier descriptions, which in turn leads to the re-production of many pasts.³

Be it one or many, the pasts to be recoverable at a later time, all re-presentations of an earlier event, serve a certain, main objective (and often several less important ones). For ancient historiography, the main objective is spelled out clearly, and is prominently inserted in

2. The concept of ‘narrative sentences’ was introduced by analytic philosopher Arthur Danto (in DANTO 1962).

3. ROTH 2012.

the programmatic section to the work, a section present in all major works of literary historiography following Thucydides and his key programmatic statement at 1.22.4, which directs the prospective of history-writing for all major historians thereafter. This objective, because it is introduced through the voice of the historiographer himself, shows, among other things, the perspective through which the historiographers understand the past and discloses a methodology behind its revival. For Thucydides, this objective is the procuring of sound political education for future civic leaders. Thucydides notes that it will be sufficient for him (that is, he will take it as a proof that his mission as historiographer has been accomplished) to know that his text is judged useful by those inquirers who desire an exact knowledge of the past as an aid to the interpretation of the future. (ὅσοι δὲ βουλήσονται τῶν τε γενομένων τὸ σαφὲς σκοπεῖν καὶ τῶν μελλόντων ποτὲ αὖθις κατὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον τοιούτων καὶ παραπλησίων ἔσεσθαι, ὠφέλιμα κρίνειν αὐτὰ ἀρκούντως ἔξει.) The text sets out to offer «a precise account of the past» (τῶν τε γενομένων τὸ σαφές), yet not in order, for instance, to preserve the memory of the past and the deeds of the past for their own sake, to ensure that they receive the due *kleos* (as Herodotus set out to do), but rather in order to direct action in the future, to offer knowledge such as expected to be contained in a political treatise which is meant to be used as a textbook for political action in the future.⁴ Sallust's programmatic narratives similarly are intended to be used as manuals for political action, specifically in cases of crises threatening the *Respublica*.

Apart from this programmatic *telos*, however, a historiographical work integrates other perspectives-interpretative parameters, introduced through the eyes of the agents of the historical narrative represented, who also may happen to be historical figures with substantial authority and ability to influence the turn of the events narrated. These additional perspectives have been identified and acknowledged by the historiographer, and infuse the overarching and a-temporal understanding of reviving a narrative event and the usefulness of this revival for the future, with a complementary, esoteric and limited in its temporal scope, evaluation of narrative time, initiated by certain lead-

4. OBER 1993, 85.

ing characters in the narrative. These characters usually are more than one, and their respective assessments of the situation are dissonant; as a result, they offer different evaluations of the given situation—different scripts for writing the future (past, present and/or future, for the reader of the particular historiographical work).

In the present paper I shall study the understanding of temporality, at once linear and circular,⁵ alike from the perspective of the historiographer and from those of the agents of his narrative, as observed in Sallust's two major and complete historiographical works. The *War against Catiline* (Lat. *Bellum Catilinae*, hence *BC*) and the *Jugurthine War* (Lat. *Bellum Iugurthinum*, hence *BI*) relate events that are different but Sallust's perspective encourages his readers to discern in the two texts notable similarities, which will substantiate the circularity of historical time. The circularity is established by the presence in both narratives of units thematically similar. Circularity is diffused through progression which in turn is not one-dimensional because it is subject to more than one perspective, and this multi-perspectivity encourages multiple possible reconstructions of understanding historical time. In the *BC* and in the *BI*, the reconstructions belong to different temporal realities, for the contemporary to the narrated events assessments of the historical agents (the protagonists of the narrated events) are not necessarily congruent with the posterior, more knowledgeable perspective of the omniscient narrator Sallust. Finally, as we come to evaluate synchronic and diachronic reconstructions of historical time, and assess the reconstruction of historical time in the later of the two works, the *BI*, we will discuss the meaning of temporality through intertextuality, since the *BI* refers to an event that took place prior to the events revived in the earlier *BC*. In doing so, it will be suggested that in Roman historiography, which is governed by the ideology of paradigm, the introduction of imitable *exempla virorum*, even the recoverable past, may be constructed as to reflect upon, instruct towards,

5. The distinction between linear time and circular time is parallel to Foucault's distinction between «history of ideas» and «history of discourse». The history of ideas advances the continuity between past and present by showing the way in which founding ideas reappear in new historical context. The latter, by contrast, reveals historical discontinuities, as images are continually being appropriated and redeployed to convey unrelated thoughts. Foucault's theory is summarized in HUTTON 1993, 5.

and anticipate the future.⁶

In order to understand better the concept of circularity of historical time in Sallust, we need to study the process of recovering historical time in each of the works under study. The composition of history necessitates the tackling of the fundamental philosophical problem of reconstruction or rather, re-presentation, in the literal sense of the term. The reconstruction of something that occurred in the past, especially in the remote past beyond the personal experience of the individual interested in re-calling it, is dependent on the same parameters that condition the reconstructive “memory” of the historiographer.⁷ Sallust’s historiographical perspective, both in the *BC* and in the *BI*, is not concerned so much with the history of politics, the revival of the two political events in exact detail, as with the politics of culture, which is common in both treatises and concerns of course the Republican culture of the last generation of the Late Republic.⁸ Since the politics of culture in both works is similar, for the works were composed in close succession, the *BC* and the *BI* are texts that *deliberately* share

6. In suggesting so, I follow Hayden White’s thesis that often the past is fully constructed once the future is already known, noted epigraphically in his statement that «we choose our past in the same way we choose our future» (WHITE 1966, 123).

7. SEIDER (this volume), which also discusses time and morality in Sallust (focusing on the *BC*), sees them in intimate relation to the role of memory; SEIDER argues that the peculiar and unique memory of an individual, which influences his social status, is largely influenced by “social” memory, i.e. the memory of an individual, which «has been influenced by the individual’s place within a group», and what he calls “entangled” memory, «a complex intertwining of memory with several other factors»; leading among these factors is time: individuals (and entire social groups) revisit and redefine their memories depending on the moment in time these memories are set and the circumstances attached. Entangled memory, SEIDER further argues, explains best the different descriptions of the Catilinarian affair by Caesar, Cato, and Catiline himself (who actually delivers two speeches); all three speakers assess differently the same event because they appeal to different memories—each develops around different moments/events of a common yet very broad and aptly vague past—and officer divergent interpretations of what it seems to be the same events.

8. MINK 1987a, 182-203. In Mink’s words: «Even histories that are synchronic studies of the culture of an epoch inevitably take in account the larger process of development or change in which that epoch was a stage... The most “analytic” historical monograph, one may say and could show, presupposes the historian’s more general understanding, narrative in form, of patterns of change, and is a contribution to the correction of elaboration of that narrative understanding» (p. 184).

many similarities in structure and objective, even though these texts record narratives of two different historical events. This intertextual relationship is obviously inspired by the paradigmatic mission of Roman historiography, but extends clearly beyond the teleology of historical literary narrative, to comment on the predictability of history and so, on the controllability of time. Sallust suggests that the development of historical time and the composition of Roman history during and after the *BI* in a specific way prefigured, and even have influenced, the course of the events as recorded in the *BC*. In doing so, Sallust seems to have designed the interaction of his two war narratives, to have built a diptych narrative on a leading premise not just of literary historiography but of the philosophy of recording the past in antiquity (Roman and Greek)—namely that history tends to repeat itself deliberately, because the boundaries that separate past and present in reality do not exist.⁹

The re-presentation of the events of the years 66-62 BCE relies foremost on two sources, Sallust and Cicero's speeches *In Catilinam*. In this respect the war against Catiline is unique, in that it is reconstructed by two narrative memories not only contemporary but also by narrators intimately familiar with the events that constitute these memories. Both Sallust and Cicero attribute the rise of Catiline to the concentration of wealth in the hands of too few aristocrats, which gradually led to the polarization within the aristocracy, and to the rise of the powerful individual generals who on account of the great wealth they had amassed strove to establish sole supremacy. Catiline's failed conspiracy is articulated against this political background and in a way stands as an allegory for the collapsing *Respublica*. This situation of increasingly relentless aristocratic competition resulting to grave financial losses for those who failed to win the popular vote (and the chance to recuperate financially during their tenure as magistrates) was particularly

9. On the way the thematic similarities between a text referring to events that happened earlier in time than the events recorded in another, later text, are interpreted as anticipatory of the thematically later but chronologically earlier narrative, see O'GORMAN 2009; CLAUSS 1997, esp. 180-182. The collapsing of time was viewed as natural for it made the account of the more recent events seem more likely to have happened so, as a result of the similarity to narratives of events that had happened in the past; cf. MARINCOLA 2009, 21-22; id. 2010, 261-262.

accelerated in the aftermath of the events of the Jugurthine war, and largely because of it: in order to win the Jugurthine war, Gaius Marius, the rising general of the Roman troops against Jugurtha, allowed all free-born Romans who wished to volunteer for military service to do so, regardless of landed property ownership. Of course the *BI* took place fifty-odd years before the *BC*, but, as it will be argued presently, the narrative of the events, the characterization of the protagonists, and especially the history of culture that both treatises share (the declining *Respublica*) are decidedly inspired by the *BC*. In this respect, the temporality of the *BI* is manipulated by the representation of the *BC*. This repetition, which records the progressive disintegration of the *Respublica* in the course of linear time, and marks linearity through the recurrence of a set of signs (standardization of *avaritia* and *superbia* as character traits, and the corrosion of *virtus* as a result), operates along the lines of the cyclical conception of time. Cyclical and linear time entwine and inform one another.

The *BC* provides a template that affects the composition and the reading of the *BI*, as it determines both the similarities and the differences between the two texts, and for the purposes of the present study, a common approach to the rise and spread of evil. Sallust claimed in both works that a reason for the decline of the *mos maiorum* in Rome was the desire for (individual) power (cf. *BC* 10-13; *BI* 41-42). Similarly, in both treatises he identified as cause for this desire for power the destruction of Carthage, which led to arrogance in light of the elimination of the *metus hostilis* (cf. *BC* 10.1; *BI* 41.2). In both works, Sallust considers history a logical sequence of events, which operates as a timeless force, narrating the past, written in the present, and relevant to the future. Sallust wrote during times of extreme political instability: both the *BC* and the *BI* were composed between 44 and 40,¹⁰ in the turbulent period that followed the assassination of Julius Caesar, which was marked first with the war between Caesar's heirs and Caesar's murderers, and subsequently with the break-up between Antony and Octavian. Both historiographical accounts treat

10. On the date of Sallust's works, see, e.g., MACKAY 1962; MCGUSHIN 1977, 6-7; WOODMAN and KRAUS 1997, 10; RAMSEY 2007, 6.

essentially the same topic, a major crisis in the Late Republic, and can be used as a point of reference for a comprehensive assessment of the decline-of-the-*Respublica* theme in its many dimensions. Also, they can be read as sequential. Indeed, even though the *BI* is primarily about an external war, there are key references therein to civil strife, in marked vocabulary, in order to encourage consideration of the story of the war against Jugurtha as comparable to a civic strife not unlike the one recorded in the *BC*.

This analogy is underscored in a notable way. In the *BI* Sallust uses the expression *dissensio civilis* for the one and only time in his extant writings, in a programmatically colored digression, which, further, shares obvious points of proximity in theme and structure with the similarly programmatic diatribe of the *BC* prologue. Both parts are set to contextualize and justify along visibly common lines of political ideology the progressive transformation of Republican politics after the fall of Carthage in 146,¹¹ and as economic and social forces redrew the political map in Rome. In the passage in question (*BI* 41.10) Sallust justifies the rising of “civil dissension” as follows:

nam ubi primum ex nobilitate reperti sunt qui veram gloriae iniustae potentiae anteponerent, moveri civitas et dissensio civilis quasi permixtio terrae oriri coepit.

For as soon as nobles were found who preferred true glory to unjust power, the state began to be disturbed and civil dissension to arise like an upheaval of the earth.¹²

This statement recycles in crucial parts the introduction to the work at *BI* 5.1-2:

Bellum scripturus sum quod populus Romanus cum Iugurtha rege Numidarum gessit, primum quia magnum et atrox variaque victoria fuit,

11. DAVIES (this volume) discusses the two-fold significance of the year 146 BCE (and the fall of Carthage primarily associated with it) as the starting point both of Rome’s grandeur and of an irreversible process of Roman moral decay. Particularly valuable is her consideration of the diptych military prowess/moral decay in Sallust in comparison, or rather, in relation to, and even in agreement with, Polybius’ earlier appreciation of the radical change in Roman foreign policy and morality at home, in the aftermath and as a result of the fall of Carthage.

12. Sallust, *BI* 41.10. Trans. ROLFE 1931, 225.

*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 propose to write of the war which the people of Rome waged with Jugurtha, king of the Numidians: first, because it was long, sanguinary and of varying fortune; and secondly, because then for the first time resistance was offered to the insolence of the nobles—the beginning of a struggle which threw everything, human and divine, into confusion, and rose to such a pitch of frenzy that civil discord ended in war and the devastation of Italy.¹³

The recurrence of the same concept in the beginning and midway of the Jugurthine narrative means to advance not just the view that the precipitous decline of Republican politics in the aftermath of the fall of Carthage was inevitable since it followed a process that already had begun to unravel earlier,¹⁴ but it may also be seen to contain a positive development in political leadership, namely that the arrogance of the nobility faced serious challenge for the first time. This idea is recorded in both passages noted above, but it is verbalized differently. In *BI* 5.1, the earlier of the two, Sallust tersely notes that during the Jugurthine war the senatorial nobility, which he describes as ridden with arrogance (*superbia*), was seriously challenged for the first time. The identity of the challenger is not disclosed, even though the reader is led by the immediate context to identify this challenge with Jugurtha. In 41.10, however, Sallust is a bit more explicit in observing that certain individuals from the ranks of the nobility rose against what must have been the norm by then, 'unjust power' (*iniusta potentia*), and actively attempted to slow down the decline of the body politic. Even though Sallust does not really identify the agents of this norm of *iniusta potentia*, from what follows immediately afterwards in the text becomes clear that the *iniusti* were the rest of the senatorial nobility. On the basis

13. Sallust, *BI* 5.1-2. Trans. ROLFE 1931, 139.

14. As is the uncontested *communis opinio*, aptly summarized in WIEDEMANN 1993, 50: «Whatever our view of the historical Sallust's political affiliation, the passage explicitly advises the reader that the monograph he is about to read discusses the beginning of the sequence of events that led to the devastation of Italy: the civil wars between Sulla and the Marians in the 80s, but for Sallust's contemporaries perhaps more immediately those of the 40s B.C.»

of the preceding narrative the arrogance of the nobility is represented, firstly, by the aristocratic Bestia and Albinus, who commanded the Roman army in the early phase of the war against Jugurtha, but were thoroughly corrupt by the vices of *avaritia* and *imperitia*,¹⁵ and as a result suffered catastrophic losses; and secondly, by Metellus, the general appointed to succeed Bestia and Albinus. Metellus conducts the second phase of the war, but he, too, is not victorious, because even though he is a competent military leader, he is, like nearly everybody else in the Senate according to Sallust, *superbus*¹⁶:

BI 64.1: Cui quamquam virtus, gloria atque alia optanda bonis superabant, tamen inerat contemptor animus et superbia, commune nobilitatis malum.

Now, although he [Metellus] possessed in abundance valour, renown, and other qualities to be desired by good men, yet he had a disdainful and arrogant spirit, a common defect in the nobles.¹⁷

This vice, along with his desire to advance the career of his own son, prevents him from acknowledging the merit of Gaius Marius, who at the time served as Metellus' lieutenant (64.2).

At *BI 42.1* these nobles who sought true glory and consequently clashed against the senatorial establishment and caused the civil "dissension" are identified: they are the Gracchi. Sallust embraces, one could say, the perspective of the Gracchi at *BI 41.10*, when he speaks of the rise of virtuous leaders simultaneously with the decline of the political *mores*. The reminiscence of the Gracchi is the natural stepping stone to Marius. The same perspective directs Sallust's assessment of the true motives of Gaius Marius and contextualizes him inside the historiographer's political culture, the corrupt ethics of the collapsing *Respublica*. For Sallust, Marius' victory against Jugurtha takes the

15. Cf. 32.2 on Bestia's *avaritia*; 44.1 describes Albinus' *imperitia*, or more correctly, the state of the Roman army under Albinus command, at the time Metellus took over the proconsulship of Numidia and the lead of the war against Jugurtha. Along with *superbia*, *avaritia* and *imperitia* are the vices of the *nobilitas*, so designated by Marius himself in his speech to the Quirites (ch. 85).

16. *Superbia* features six times in Marius' speech to the Roman people at ch. 85, and in at least four of them it is an attribute of the senatorial aristocracy.

17. Trans. ROLFE 1931, 273.

back seat to the general's extension of the levy by abolishing the minimum property qualification that entitled a free-born Roman citizen for military service. This initiative, aside from the considerable popular support it might have won for Marius, resulted to the transference of the *capite censi*, the property-less Romans, from the patronage of the Senate to that of Marius, which, assessed on the basis of our knowledge of later events, laid the foundations for the organization of the first in a series of quasi-private armies, soldiers who owed everything to their leader.¹⁸ Sallust actually interprets Marius' initiative *ex post facto*, in light of Marius' impressive career afterwards and his six successive consulships, as he states that Marius' motives were *per ambitionem consulis* (BI 86.4). At the time, however, the extension of the levy, bold and unprecedented no doubt, may be better qualified as the inevitable conclusion to a process that was developing for more than a century,¹⁹ rather than a scheme aiming at political revolution. Marius desired to stand for the consulship of 107 (which he later won) only in order to ask for Numidia as his province the next year and succeed Metellus in the post of the general of the war against Jugurtha.

No less important is Sallust's emphasis on the crucial role of Sulla, the lieutenant of Marius, in securing the Roman victory. Sulla is the true protagonist of the last section of the BI (chapters 95-113), and it is he who actually hunts down and captures Jugurtha. As a matter of fact, it is likely that the list of the anonymous nobles who at 41.10 reportedly sought *vera gloria* may extend beyond the Gracchi and Marius, to include Sulla as well, who according to Sallust was *gloriae cupidior* (BI 35.2). WIEDEMANN (1993, 50) is certainly correct when he proposes to read the collaboration of Marius, a *novus homo*, and Sulla, an elite aristocrat, as the ideal expression of what Cicero would half a century later define as *concordia ordinum*, and identify this as the foundation of the stable *Respublica*:

The reader cannot ignore the moral: the best noble commander cannot succeed if he ignores the talent of a *novus homo*; but a talented *novus homo* can only succeed in co-operation with a talented aristocrat. Marius and Sulla together brought success for Roman arms

18. For an overview of the political and financial context that favored Marius' groundbreaking reforms in 104 BCE, see, e.g., KEPPIE 1998.

19. GABBA 1997, 14.

against the external threat; contrast the ‘*bellum atque vastitas Italiae*’ later brought about by their discord, which “I am not sure whether I would be more ashamed or more disgusted to narrate” (*incertum habeo pudeat anpigeat magis disserere*, 95.4).

The *BI*, according to Wiedemann’s reasoning, is not so much about the conquest of an external evil as about the opinion of a leading Roman political thinker of the last generation of the Late Republic on the way evil infiltrated the commonwealth and the cure the *Respublica* could have applied to stop it. Jugurtha is just one expression of evil, the one the Romans are eager to see. Sallust’s mission is to show the corrupting results of evil at home, its growing influence among the members of ruling class, and its damning effect ultimately for the survival of the traditional Roman political establishment. The war against Jugurtha, in this respect, is misleading as a title, in that the actual fight is against the perilous consequences of the vices that have taken over the leading class of the Roman state. The leaders’ ambition for sole rule is the most detrimental of these vices for the future of the *Respublica*. In Jugurtha and his actions Sallust’s contemporary readers are invited to see a reflection of their own leaders, both those who led the war against Jugurtha, none of whom was free from vice, and those of the later decades as the *Respublica* was beginning its precipitous decline that led to its essential demise.

In the *BI* the Romans eventually won only when *concordia* among the diverse social and political forces²⁰ of the *Respublica* had been achieved, and personal ambition was pushed aside for the sake of the common interest. The victory for the Romans over Jugurtha ultimately came when Gaius Marius, the *novus homo* (a senator without senatorial ancestors), and his *quaestor*, the aristocrat Cornelius Sulla, took over the administration of the war. The beginning to this victorious closure actually dated several years earlier when Marius and Quintus Caecilius Metellus, the commander of the Roman army against Jugurtha prior to Marius, reconciled in 108, several years after Marius, who had begun his

20. SEIDER (this volume) notes that *concordia* has directed Sallust’s decision to choose the particular version of Roman prehistory (among a number of different stories on the same subject): the story of his choice emphasizes the peaceful coexistence between numerous nations and peoples that had little in common, it is «a foundation story that sets «harmony» (*concordia*) at the center of Roman civilization.»

political career as a protégé of the Metelli family, had alienated them in 119. Then, though Metellus—his stance on this occasion reflecting the opinion of the senatorial aristocracy towards Marius—was not eager to support Marius' candidacy for the consulship of 107—as a matter of fact, he was scornful and condescending—, the lower class took up his cause when a considerable number of letters in support of Marius, from soldiers and merchants in Africa, was sent to the leaders of the business community in Rome (the *equites*), who in their majority were members of the aristocracy as well, but not interested in pursuing political careers. Due to the pressure of the *equites*, Marius won; what is more, by the intervention of a friendly *tribunus plebis* he received Numidia and the Jugurthine war as his command, even though the particular province earlier had been assigned to another ex-magistrate.

In the *BI* the term *concordia* is not mentioned explicitly but is clearly present, in the description of the coming together of diverse groups of soldiers to fight Jugurtha under Marius' lead, in *BI* 87.3: *sic brevi spatio novi veteresque coaluere, et virtus omnium aequalis facta*, «thus in a short space new and old came together, and the virtue of all became equal». The passage may be set two-thirds into the treatise but it is in a programmatic section, the beginning of the third and final part of the war, which now is led by Marius. In the *BC* *concordia* is emphatically placed as part of the theoretical moralizing prologue: set at 6.2, it is used to define the coming together of the Trojan immigrants and the native Italians to found the city that would later become Rome: *incredibile memoratu est quam facile coaluerint; ita brevi multitudo divorsa atque vaga concordia civitas facta erat*, «it is incredible to recall the memory of how easily they came together; in such a short time a diverse and wandering crowd had become a city in concord».²¹ In Sallust's understanding of Roman history, *concordia* belongs among the original qualities of the early Roman character, and is regularly present when a Roman victory is accomplished. And yet, this most fundamental of the prerequisites for the stability of the *Respublica* may be distorted: a distorted '*concordia*' comes forth from the description of the conspirators who joined Catiline's cause. In *BC* 15-17, Sallust talks in considerable detail about the variant communities and classes

21. Sallust, *BC* 6.2. Trans. ROLFE 1931, 11.

represented among Catiline's supporters when the young aristocrat was candidate for the consulship of 63. In this campaign, Catiline declared himself champion of debtors, a category that brought under his banner members of the aristocracy who had squandered their inheritances, both senatorial *nobiles* and *equites*, residents of the city (several of them veterans of Sulla who were eager for new spoils), and farmers whose fortunes continued to deteriorate. In a way, Catiline's image, despite the morally damning background against which is cast, is suggestively similar to that of the Gracchi, the first nobles to propose agrarian reforms and cancellation of debts. Then again, in the *BC* the advent of *avaritia* in Rome dates to Sulla's loose treatment of his troops during the war against Mithridates in Asia (*BC* 11.5).

Catiline's conspiracy gained popular support not only because it appealed to bankrupt aristocrats but because it sought to empower the poorest urban *plebs* and peasants who lived in ever-worsening economic circumstances, since the control of the Senate over landownership and the finances of the *plebs* was becoming increasingly tighter and the subject of fierce competition among the members of the nobility who nourished aspirations for political careers.²² In other words, Catiline in the *BC* is cast as a counterpart to Marius in the *BI*: both appear as imitators of the Gracchi paradigm against the arrogance of the nobility. This relationship was likely promoted by Catiline himself: near the end of his *BC*, at 59.3, when he describes the final battle against the conspirators and the death of Catiline, Sallust notes that Catiline fought next to an eagle-standard, which previously 'had been in the army of Gaius Marius during the war with the Cimbri'.

How Catiline came to possess a standard that belonged to Marius is not clear, especially since he had himself sided with Sulla in the civil conflict between the two great leaders.²³ Still, the same information

22. On the association of the Catilinarian conspiracy with the issue of agrarian reform which was brought up to the political forefront a few years earlier by the tribune Publius Servilius Rullus (in a bill that was defeated by Cicero, who misrepresented its content and thus misled the people to vote it down), see e.g. CAH v. 9, 1994, 353; WOOD 1991, 49-50.

23. For Catiline and Sulla, see SYME 1964, 123-124; Catiline's imitation of Sulla was an imitation of Marius as well, for both Sulla and Catiline employed (Sulla effectively, Catiline in theory, for he never had the opportunity to realize his promises) Marius' military reforms, and more specifically the payment of pensions to the soldiers who

is recorded in Cicero as well (*Cat.* 2.13), and an intention on Sallust's part to design the portrait of Catiline against that of Marius is likely, given that Marius united the Roman classes under his standards, while his rise to the consulship was seen as a victory over the *superbia* of Metellus and the senatorial aristocracy. Affirming the above reasoning, Batstone argues that Catiline saw in his keeping the eagle and fighting next to it «a sign of legitimacy» evidently to Roman leadership.²⁴ The same critic elsewhere rightly points out that the language and overall sentiment of Catiline's speech to his conspirators in *BC* 20 recants Sallust's language in the moralizing preface to the *BC*: both speak of *virtus* (cf. *BC* 1.4) as supreme ideal²⁵ and contrast it to *dedecus*, describe the life of the majority as miserable (*BC* 4.1), condemn *superbia* (*BC* 6.7, 10.4, 12.2) and the evils associated with it, and refer to the examples of the great men of the past (*BC* 12.5).²⁶ Also, in the speech Catiline makes before the final battle, a speech recorded in *BC* 58, the desideratum offered is the winning of *gloria* (58.8—along with *decus*, again, *liberatas*, and *patria*, but also *divitias*), the virtue which happens to be what Sallust believe should be the leading preoccupation for every man who wishes to distinguish himself and leave behind a remembrance of his passage from life (*BC*. 1.1-4).²⁷ What is more, Catiline's concluding speech, Batstone convincingly proves, recycles Cato's speech earlier in the treatise, by which he defended his proposition to execute Catiline's conspirators: «[t]his means that the *Bellum Catilinae* ends with its "hero" fulfilling the role that according to Sallust traditionally marked

volunteered to serve in the army, as a political weapon against their enemies to gain the control of the State.

24. BATSTONE 2010, 179.

25. WOODMAN and KRAUS 1997, 11: «Sallust's chief preoccupation throughout his works is *uirtus*».

26. BATSTONE 2013, 233. In his analysis of both of Catiline's speech in the *BC*, Batstone argues that the hero is made to echo systematically the language of Cato and Sallust himself, in order to prove that Catiline strategically employed typical vocabulary of political oratory (specifically the vocabulary recording Sallust's «own diagnosis of moral and political decline» [p. 236]) to sound familiar, ethically and ideologically proper and ultimately persuasive.

27. SEIDER (this volume) points out that the virtuous Roman past is foremost determined by the fact that it was the desire for *gloria*, the accomplishment of glorious deeds that influence the construction of *memoria*, the version of the past to be remembered by future generations.

the great Romans of the past... This is Catiline exercising his rhetorical talent, his strategic abilities and his physical strength. He may not be earning praise, but his words are effective in producing the *egregia facinora* which others will narrate». ²⁸

The recurrence of *concordia* endorses the circular understanding of historical time in Sallust, whose perspective of the political situation in this respect coincides in many ways with Cicero's assessment, ²⁹ and this congruence of opinion is manifested in his embracing the opinion of Cicero in the *BC*, not only in the defense of Republican politics via Cato the Younger, but more subtly in the description of Catiline's character, about which he is drawing on Cicero. Cicero, for whom Catiline is the ultimate personification of evil, admits in his portrayal of the great villain that evil is most effective when it is mixed with great virtues, because then it may hide or deceive. This idea Cicero elaborated in the *Pro Caelio*, where at 12-14 he offers a small dissertation on the paradoxical, yet frequently detectable among the elites, mixture of virtues and vices. And in the Catilinarian orations Cicero repeatedly stresses the great physical endurance of his opponent (*Cat.* 1.26, 2.9, 3.16) – a quality much admired in the context of traditional ideology. The same characteristics distinguish Jugurtha, and the echoes of Catiline's characterization in Jugurtha's portrayal is so unmistakable that critics have talked about a "fascination" on Sallust's part with characters that «are compounded of both good and evil». ³⁰

BC 5.1-4 (Catiline): L. Catilina, nobili genere natus, fuit magna vi et animi et corporis, sed ingenio malo pravoque. Huic ab adolescentia bella intestina, caedes, rapinae, discoria civilis grata fuere, ibique iuventutem suam exercuit. Corpus patiens inediae algoris vigiliae, supra quam

28. BATSTONE 2013, 243. SEIDER (this volume) offers a different reading of the end of the *BC* in terms of understanding *memoria*, or the way one remembers of the past; he argues that in the end Sallust abstains from any explicit authorial comment that would govern the construction of the *memoria* of the war with Catiline for his future readers; in doing so, each of the historiographer's readers ideally will «depart from the battlefield with his own idea of what happened and what it means for Rome's future».

29. Sallust has been heavily influenced by Cicero's Catilinarians; the most thorough study of this reception is still, to this day, HARDY 1924.

30. WOODMAN and KRAUS 1997, 11.

quoiquam credibile est. Animus audax subdolus varius, quocius rei lubet simulator ac dissimulator, alieni adpetens sui profusus, ardens in cupiditatibus; satis eloquentiae, sapientiae parum.

Lucius Catilina, scion of a noble family, had great vigour both of mind and of body, but an evil and depraved nature. From youth up he revelled in civil wars, murder, pillage, and political dissension, and amid these he spent his early manhood. His body could endure hunger, cold and want of sleep to an incredible degree; his mind was reckless, cunning, treacherous, capable of any form of pretence or concealment. Covetous of others' possessions, he was prodigal of his own; he was violent in his passions. He possessed a certain amount of eloquence, but little discretion.³¹

BI 6.1 (Jugurtha): qui ubi primum adolevit, pollens viribus, decora facie, sed multo maxume ingenio validus, non se luxu neque inertiae corrumperendum dedit, sed, uti mos gentis illius est, equitare iaculari, cursu cum aequalibus certare, et quom omnis gloria anteiret, omnibus tamen carus esse... plurimum facere, minimum ipse de se loqui.

As soon as Jugurtha grew up, endowed as he was with physical strength, a handsome person, but above all with a vigorous intellect, he did not allow himself to be spoiled by luxury or idleness, but following the custom of that nation, he rode, he hurled the javelin, he contended with his fellows in footraces; and although he surpassed them all in renown, he nevertheless won the love of all. ... he distinguished himself greatly, but spoke little of his own exploits.³²

also *BI 7.4-5: nam Iugurtha, ut erat inpigro atque acri ingenio, ubi naturam P. Scipionis, qui tum Romanis imperator erat, et morem hostium cognovits, multo labore multaque cura, praeterea modestissime parendo et saepe obviam eundo periculis in tantam claritudinem brevi pervenerat, ut nostris vehementer carus, Numantinis maximo terrori esset. Ac sane, quod difficillimum in primis est, et proelio strenuos erat et bonus consilio.*

For Jugurtha, who had an active and keen intellect, soon became acquainted with the character of Publius Scipio, who then commanded the Romans, and with the tactics of the enemy. Then by hard labour and attention to duty, at the same time by showing strict obedience and often courting dangers, he shortly acquired such a reputation

31. Sallust, *BC* 5.1-4. Trans. ROLFE 1931, 9

32. Sallust, *BI* 6.1. Trans. ROLFE 1931, 141-143.

that he became very popular with our soldiers and a great terror to the Numantians.³³

Still, the strikingly similar portrayals of the two heroes recorded above, dissent a little later: Catiline is corrupted from the very beginning in Sallust's narrative;³⁴ Jugurtha, however, becomes corrupted when he first comes into contact with the Roman state. In this way the corrupt Roman *nobiles* and *novi homines* at Numantia infect Jugurtha who becomes a paradigmatic case, a reflection of this corruption.³⁵ A model student of such 'teachers' he triumphs over them: aware of their greed, he conquers them by rampant bribery. Even at Rome where he was summoned for the death of his brother, Jugurtha succeeds to bribe several senators who would plead for him to be acquitted. Initially he would win over «by many gifts and promises» Opimius, consul of 121 and leading figure in the events that led to the death of Gaius Gracchus, who was sent out by the Senate to head the commission that were allegedly to restore Adherbal to the throne of Numidia, but instead ended up awarding Jugurtha the better part of the country (*BI* 16). Subsequently, Jugurtha would buy out the *avari* Bestia and Albinus, the generals appointed to conquer him after Jugurtha murdered his other brother and a number of Italian merchants (*BI* 26). Bestia and Albinus are conquered by massive bribery (especially Bestia; cf. *BI* 29) and prove disastrous to the point of nearly losing an army. Summoned for a second time at Rome for interrogation, Jugurtha used bribery again, and the interrogation before the *comitia tributa* never took place;

33. Sallust, *BI* 7.4-5. Trans. ROLFE 1931, 143-145.

34. SEIDER (this volume) commenting upon this crucial paragraph, Sallust's first portrayal of Catiline in *BC* 5, argues that this is done in order to distinguish Rome's history from his decision to write history; that Catiline's portrayal is part of an individual "memory" of early Roman history, but also an interpretation of Rome's past, which is viewed as a course of progressive, yet reversible decline.

35. The presentation of the foreign enemy Jugurtha as product of domestic (Roman) corruption, which subsequently turns against and nearly destroys Rome, may be read as an alternative expression of the erasure of boundaries between the ideological opposites *domi militiaque* (i.e. Roman mores - foreigners), which served as leading principles for the definition of Romanness. On how this fundamental dualism in Sallust becomes complicated and then breaks down, causing the outlines of the *Respublica* to crumble along, see DAVIES (this volume), which traces this collapse throughout Sallust's corpus, and the relations between the Romans and all the foreigners they have to confront in the last century of the Republic.

and while in the city Jugurtha orchestrated the assassination of a pretender to his throne (*BI* 30-35).³⁶ Sallust's emphasis on the two-way contagious interaction between Rome and Jugurtha serves ideally the perspective of those who see the beginning of the end of the *Respublica* in the rise of Marius and Sulla: Jugurtha is introduced as the catalyst that brings Marius and Sulla to power. Also, Sallust leaves the readers uneasy about the future of the Roman state when he points out that the defeat of Jugurtha came only through a distinctly non-Roman practice, treachery, organized by Sulla. What is more, the very circumstances of Jugurtha's capture become the first occasion to cause friction between Marius and Sulla, though Sallust does not really mention this. Sallust's Jugurtha, in short, even though overcome, ultimately causes the destruction of the *Respublica* by anticipating the civil war between Marius and Sulla. In this respect Jugurtha is drawn next to Catiline, for both incarnate the vices of the Roman character³⁷ that nearly destroyed the Republican constitution, but the Romans failed to observe a pattern in this to their inevitable demise. The recycling of Jugurtha in Catiline may justify the fragmentary structure of the Jugurthine narrative, best evidenced in the absence of a proper closure from the *BI*, as rightly observed and discussed in detail in LEVENE 1992.³⁸ Even though the *BI* was composed after the *BC*, the precedence in time of the events narrated in the *BI* allows the two works to be considered as a single treatise consisting of two parts arranged in reverse order.

36. Notably, Sallust makes Jugurtha refer to Rome as a city for sale (*BI* 35.10), an assessment given by Sallust himself already in the introduction to the same work (*BI* 8.1; also at 20.1).

37. The portraits of Catilina and Jugurtha are in close discussion with rhetorical practices of Sallust's era; they may be taken as an example of *evidentia*, the ability of the orator to re-present the image of an object (or a person, or a situation) in front of the audience's eyes (cf. *Rhet. ad Her.* 4.51).

38. Levene observes that the fragmentary structure of the *BI* is best illustrated in the way Sallust chooses to close the treatise: «Of course, the *Jugurtha* is a monograph about a Roman war, not a biography. However, the Romans saw the death of Jugurtha as something that mattered to the war: at Lucan ix.600 it is 'breaking the neck of Jugurtha' that is an example of the glorious deeds of the past. Nor are we even told that Jugurtha was led in Marius' triumph, though other writers treat this too as a key part of the victory. To have given such information at the end would not have made the work a biography, but it would have provided a sense of closure comparable to that found in biography» (LEVENE 1992, 54).

From a narrative perspective, the closure-less *BI* allows the bi-partite sequence of Sallust's pathology of corruption of Roman morality to operate as an open text, welcoming continuation. Along these lines we may consider Livy's portrait of Hannibal, and not least the corruption of Hannibal's troops after subjected themselves to the leading Roman vice of *luxuria*. Like the portraits of Catiline and Jugurtha, the portrait of Hannibal appears in 21.4.3-9, very close to the opening of the Hannibalic war narrative which covers *AUC* 21, and, like the Sallustian heroes, he has superior physical endurance and unmatched courage in battle:

Nunquam ingenium idem ad res diuersissimas, parendum atque imparandum, habilis fuit. Itaque haud facile discerneres utrum imperatori an exercitui carior esset; neque Hasdrubal alium quemquam praeficere malle ubi quid fortiter ac strenue agendum esset, neque milites alio duce plus confidere aut audere. Plurimum audaciae ad pericula capessenda, plurimum consilii inter ipsa pericula erat. Nullo labore aut corpus fatigari aut animus uinci poterat. Caloris ac frigoris patientia par; cibi potionisque desiderio naturali, non uoluptate modus finitus; uigiliarum somnique nec die nec nocte discriminata tempora; id quod gerendis rebus superesset quieti datum; ea neque molli strato neque silentio accersita; multi saepe militari sagulo opertum humi iacentem inter custodias stationesque militum conspexerunt. Vestitus nihil inter aequales excellens: arma atque equi conspiciebantur. Equitum peditemque idem longe primus erat; princeps in proelium ibat, ultimus conserto proelio excedebat. Has tantas uiri uirtutes ingentia uitia aequabant, inhumana crudelitas, perfidia plus quam Punica, nihil ueri, nihil sancti, nullus deum metus, nullum ius iurandum, nulla religio.

Never was one character so amenable to the two extremes of obedience and command, and as a result one would have found it hard to tell whether he was better liked by the commander or by the army. There was no one whom Hasdrubal preferred to put in command when a gallant or enterprising feat was called for, while there was no other officer under whom the rank and file had more confidence and enterprise. Hannibal was possessed of enormous daring in facing dangers. He could be physically exhausted or mentally cowed by no hardship. He had the ability to withstand heat and cold alike; his eating and drinking depended on the requirements of nature, not pleasure. His times for being awake and asleep were not determined by day or night. Only the time which he had left from discharging his duties was given to sleep, and it was not brought on by a soft bed

or silence—many often observed him lying on the ground, amidst the sentry-posts and pickets, wrapped in a soldier's cloak. His dress was no better than that of his comrades, but his weapons and horses marked him out. On horse or foot he was by far the best soldier; the first to enter battle, he was the last to leave once battle was joined. The man's great virtues were matched by his enormous vices: pitiless cruelty, a treachery worse than Punic, no regard for truth, and no integrity, no fear of the gods or respect for an oath, and no scruples.³⁹

The proximity of the Livian passage to the portraits of Sallust's Catiline and Jugurtha, both in style (use of historic infinitives, brief, paratactic sentences, abrupt sentences) and in themes, is obvious and the motives behind it have been recently revisited.⁴⁰ Briefly, apart from an obvious great military threat, Hannibal also poses a grave moral threat for the Romans, similar to those of Catiline and Jugurtha, and this because the Romans have to follow Hannibal's war practices and way of thinking in order to defeat him. The temporary incorporation of Hannibal's behavior, however, runs the risk to become a permanent habit—which is exactly what will become for the Romans. For, even though Livy's Hannibal came to life after Sallust's Catiline and Jugurtha, the historical Hannibal preceded Jugurtha by a century.⁴¹

Further, Livy's intertextual reading of Sallust, especially Catiline, produces a clearly fictionalized portrait and conduct of Hannibal (Hannibal is a historical character, but having lived two centuries prior to Livy is known to the historiographer only through literary sources), modeled on a character as portrayed in a historical source by a contemporary of his, who had lived through the same events and likely had personal knowledge of the character in question. The two speeches of Catiline aside (Sallust's own compositions), the information on Catiline's personality and political movements offered by Sallust agree considerably with that offered by Cicero,⁴² and it is fairly safe to assume that to a reasonable degree it reflects historical reality. Besides, several of Sallust's readers probably had personal experience of the

39. Livy, *AUC* 21.4.3-9. Trans. YARDLEY 2006, 5-6.

40. LEVENE 2010, 99-106; I summarize here Levene's relevant discussion.

41. LEVENE 2010, 103: «In imitating Sallust Livy suggests Hannibal is not merely like Catiline and Jugurtha, but specifically is prefiguring them».

42. See n. 15 above.

same events of the conspiracy, and could have detected possible falsification of objective and provable information. On the contrary, Jugurtha's portrait likely, just as the portrait of Livy's Hannibal, is a primarily literary one, a conscious imitation of Catiline, and composed immediately after the *BC*, intending at inviting Sallust's readers to consider the two *Bella* and their two respective villains along parallel interpretative lines. Livy, then, does not encourage his readers to think that the connection between the literary Hannibal and the portraits of Catiline and Jugurtha in combination reflects reality. Rather, he proposes to assess his Hannibal in comparison to Jugurtha, and both against the archetype of Catiline; to think that, hypothetically, all historical characters revived are more credible and thus more realistic and life-like when they engage in activities that have been actually exhibited and witnessed already. The many and obvious linguistic parallels that all three portraits share are deliberate and aim at emphasizing the interaction of the texts, the fact that they allude to each other: that Sallust's Jugurtha alludes specifically to Catiline, and that Livy's Hannibal alludes clearly to Jugurtha and Catiline at once (and in doing so, strengthens the interaction of those two as well).⁴³ The establishment of the allusion directs the way the readers should think about the temporal relationship developed among those texts that are interrelated by markers of allusion.

Truly, in light of the close and deliberate interaction between Livy and Sallust as outlined above, it becomes obvious that temporality is closely connected with intertextual allusion and is fundamentally defined by it. In discussing the deliberately allusive evocation of a certain text into another text, and the two levels of interpretation entailed in this process of negotiation between the texts involved in this intertextual relationship, Barchiesi points out that the particular case of allusion has a double direction in terms of the chronology: the text that alludes refers to a previous event, and the reader moves backwards in time, aspiring to re-present the original event and see how this may be revived as to acquire relevance into the text. This process may be especially difficult to trace and describe when the alluding author

43. Cf. Danto's «narrative sentences» (see n. 2 above)—sentences that mention events standing in a determinate relation in time but that utilize a later event to describe the earlier.

activates an allusion by means other than vocabulary/diction or narrative/thematic similarity.⁴⁴ But in the case of Sallust's Jugurtha looking back to Catiline (a case affirmed by the composition of Livy's Hannibal looking back to both of Sallust's heroes) we have a unique case of the past being designed after the future; and that this designing is embraced because its contextualization is familiar for the reader/interpreter, alluding to events and even experiences this reader might have lived through, or heard of by others who had lived through them; and that this revival of the past modeled after the future suggests a process of constructing not just isolated moments in a people's past, but a whole national past.⁴⁵ The past is literally re-lived, re-lived, while the future, looking so much like the past (which it actually inspired), substantiates the theory about cyclical time and history repeating itself.⁴⁶

The above theory is meaningful along the principles of historical realism—the theory of temporality that treats «the historical past on the model of the experienced present; it is an extension of our everyday attitudes to the world of past events»,⁴⁷ where in the Sallustian

44. BARCHIESI 2001, 105.

45. For a similar observation about the effect of intertextuality in historiography, see O'GORMAN 2009, 239: «Intertextuality as an event, in other words, disrupts ordinary temporality by challenging our sense of what is temporally prior and inviting us to consider the authority implicit in temporal priority». Discussing specifically the influence of Sallust's Catiline on Livy's Hannibal (and also on Tacitus' Sejanus), O'Gorman in the same study (on p. 238) admits that: «The presence of Hannibal as a Catiline *avant la lettre*... promotes a historical vision in which the guilt of Catiline is sealed; forever to be seen in figural relationship to Hannibal, his enmity to the state remains beyond question. Intertextuality here determines how we interpret the historical significance of these figures».

46. «Whatever else we say about the value of intertextuality in historical narrative, we should not lose sight of that simple truth: a narrative is simply more plausible if it already maps on to a pattern that its audience finds familiar, if the fighting in the Great Harbour at Syracuse echoes that in the straits of Salamis or if Cleon has something of the Thersites about him. Such things happen and such people happen; this is the way they happened before; why be surprised if they happen again?» Thus, PELLING 2013, 2.

47. Definition offered by Leon Goldstein, in GOLDSTEIN 1976, 38. Realists comprehend the past as a reality identical to the present, wherein one just happens at this very time not to be. Goldstein's antirealist approach, however, has its own serious weakness, namely the failure to account for historical failure: according to Roth (ROTH 2012, 323), he «leaves unclear just how, on his account, any activity of historical knowing *could fail* to produce knowledge. Since ... [the] antirealist constitutes the past, how

context the so-called «experienced present» is the Catilinarian conspiracy, an event to some degree *actually* experienced by Sallust and by a considerable number of his reading audience. Danto's analysis of narrative sentences that demonstrates why exact descriptions of the past – including each and every event of this past in exact detail – are impossible, essentially aids an ancient historiographer's re-construction of past time. And it helps one understand why there exists no standard description of past time notwithstanding the evidence: «The salient features of a situation often emerge only retrospectively, so one cannot state (timelessly) what (for a particular time) will be of significance». ⁴⁸

Even when lived, a past, which can be defined as a sequence of events, is a construction when reported. It is somebody's construction which may not agree with somebody else's experience of it. Given that alternative perspectives govern the construction of what happens, it follows that different perceptions or experiences lead to different descriptions, and this changes relations among the parts of an event and among a series of events-components of a past. The result of this process is a plurality of subjectively constructed pasts, which in turn affects how one prepares the future. In the case of Sallust's historiography we have the opportunity to observe the construction of two different segments of the Roman past, one closer to the day of the author than the other. In Sallust's reconstruction of these two narrative instances, the reconstruction of the closer past (Catiline) which has been influenced by personal experience and thus strong personal perspective, is used as the mode for the restoration of a more remote past (Jugurtha). Sallust intervenes and deploys a description of a past (and along with it a theory for accepting the universal value of this description—its proximity to a close, mnemonically accessible

can there be any error in representation?». Goldstein tries to resolve the problem by asserting that all historical knowledge stands as *prototypical* of empirical knowledge: «The description is historically true not because it corresponds to an actual event as a witness may have observed it, but rather because given the evidence in hand and the ways in which historians deal with and think about such evidence it is reasonable to believe that some part of the human past had such-and-such characteristics». (GOLDSTEIN 1996, 117-118, discussed in ROTH 2012, 322-324).

48. ROTH 2012, 337, siding with Mink's criticism (in MINK 1987b, 139) of Danto's views why a lack of a definite and permanent description will make historical events unpredictable, and so, impossible to interpret.

past), and in doing so, he tries if not to content the process of incessant past restoration at least to offer a morally sound and convincing model on the basis of which a single narrative of any given past may be accomplished. Livy's Hannibal (and later on, Tacitus' Sejanus—not discussed in this paper), by looking back to Catiline, seem to affirm Sallust's theory of circular time over that of multiple time.

Sophia Papaioannou

National and Kapodistrian University of Athens
spapaioan@phil.uoa.gr

References

- BARCHIESI, A. 1993, "Future reflexive: two modes of 'allusion' and Ovid's *Heroides*", in *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 95, pp. 333–365.
- 2001, *Speaking Volumes: Narrative and Intertext in Ovid and Other Latin Poets*, Duckworth, London, pp. 105–127; original edition: "Future reflexive: two modes of 'allusion' and Ovid's *Heroides*", in *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 95, pp. 333–365.
- BATSTONE, W. W. 2010, *Sallust: Catiline's Conspiracy, The Jugurthine War, Histories. A new translation*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- 2013, "Catiline Speeches in Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae*", in *Form and Function in Roman Oratory*, ed. by E. H. BERRY and A. ERSKINE, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 227–246.
- CLAUSS, J. J. 1997, "'Domestici hostes': The Nausicaa in Medea, the Catiline in Hannibal", in *Materiali e Discussioni*, 39, pp. 165–185.
- CROOK, J. A. *et al.* (eds.) 1994, *Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. 9, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. [CAH].
- DANTO, A. 1962, "Narrative Sentences", in *History and Theory*, 2, pp. 146–179; also published as "Narrative Sentence", in *Analytical Philosophy of History*, Columbia University Press, New York 1965; reprinted in *Narration and Knowledge*, Columbia University Press, New York 1985.
- GABBA, E. 1997, *Republican Rome: The army and the allies*, Blackwell, London.
- GOLDSTEIN, L. 1976, *Historical Knowing*, University of Texas Press, Austin.
- 1996, *The What and the Why of History: Philosophical Essays*, Brill, Leiden and New York.
- HARDY, E. G. 1924, *The Catilinarian Conspiracy in its Context: A Re-Study of the Evidence*, Blackwell, London.
- HUTTON, P. H. 1993, *History as an Art of Memory*, University Press of New England, Hanover.
- KEPPIE, L. 1998, *The Making of the Roman Army: From Republic to Empire*, University of Oklahoma Press, Norman and London.

- KOSELLECK, R. 2002, *The Practice of Conceptual History: Timing History, Spacing Concepts*, Stanford University Press, Stanford.
- LEVENE, D. S. 1992, "Sallust's *Jugurtha*: An 'Historical' Fragment", in *Journal of Roman Studies*, 82, pp. 53–70.
- 2010, *Livy: On the Hannibalic War*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- MACKAY, L. A. 1962, "Sallust's Catiline: Date and Purpose", in *Phoenix*, 16, pp. 181–194.
- MARINCOLA, J. 2009, "Historiography", in *A Companion to Ancient History*, ed. by A. ERSKINE, Blackwell, Malden, pp. 11–22.
- 2010, "The Rhetoric of History: Allusion, Intertextuality, and Exemplarity in Historiographical Speeches", in *Stimmen der Geschichte: Funktionen von Reden in der antiken Historiographie*, ed. by D. PAUSCH, de Gruyter, Berlin and New York, pp. 259–289.
- MCGUSHIN, P. 1977, *C. Sallustius Crispus, Bellum Catilinae. A Commentary*, Brill, Leiden.
- MINK, L. O. 1987a, "Narrative Form as a Cognitive Instrument", in *Historical Understanding*, ed. by B. FAY *et al.*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, pp. 182–203. Original publication in *The Writing of History: Literary Form and Historical Understanding*, edited by R.H. Canary and H. Kozicki, University of Wisconsin Press, Madison 1978, p. 129–149.
- 1987b, "Philosophical Analysis and Historical Understanding", Original publication in *The Review of Metaphysics* 21, p. 667–698, in *Historical Understanding*, ed. by B. FAY *et al.*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, pp. 118–146.
- OBER, J. 1993, "Thucydides' Criticism of Democratic Knowledge", in *Nomodeiktes: Greek Studies in Honor of Martin Ostwald*, ed. by R. M. ROSEN and J. FARRELL, University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, pp. 81–98.
- O'GORMAN, E. 2009, "Intertextuality and Historiography", in *The Cambridge Companion to Roman Historians*, ed. by A. FELDHER, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 231–269.
- PELLING, C. 2013, "Intertextuality, Plausibility and Interpretation", in *Histos*, 7, pp. 1–20.
- RAMSEY, J. T. 2007, *Sallust's Bellum Catilinae*, 2nd ed., Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- ROLFE, J. C. 1931, *Sallust*, edited with an English Translation. Revised Edition, Loeb Classical Library, Harvard University Press and Heinemann, Cambridge, MA and London.
- ROTH, P. 2012, "The Past", in *History and Theory*, 51, pp. 313–339.
- SYME, R. 1964, *Sallust*, Sather Classical Lectures 33, University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- WHITE, H. 1966, "The Burden of History", in *History and Theory*, 5, pp. 111–134.

- WIEDEMANN, T. 1993, "Sallust's Jugurtha: Concord, Discord and Digressions", in *Greece and Rome*, 40, pp. 48–57.
- WOOD, N. 1991, *Cicero's Social and Political Thought*, University of California Press, Berkeley.
- WOODMAN, C. S. and A. J. KRAUS 1997, *Latin Historians*, Greece and Rome: New Surveys in the Classics no. 27, 27, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- YARDLEY, J. C. 2006, *Livy, Hannibal's War: Books Twenty-One to Thirty*, A New Translation by Yardley, J. C. Introduction and Notes by D. Hoyos, Oxford University Press, Oxford.