

# SALLUST AND THE MONOGRAPH

by

TINA TERESA ROYSTON

(Under the Direction of Mario Erasmo)

## ABSTRACT

This thesis examines the Bellum Catilinae of Sallust in an effort to understand the significance of the monograph in Roman historiography and how Sallust utilized the format to create an effective work of history. This text occupies a significant and unique place in Roman historiography, because Sallust's Roman predecessors chose, for the most part, to compose their histories annalistically. For his initial works, however, Sallust chose to compose monographs, the first of which was the Bellum Catilinae. This choice of subgenre was novel and innovative given the prevalence of annalistic writing at Rome. Sallust's use of the format, therefore, is all the more deliberate and significant.

INDEX WORDS: Sallust, Monograph, Polybius, Cicero

SALLUST AND THE MONGRAPH

by

TINA TERESA ROYSTON

A.B., University of Georgia, 1998

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF ARTS

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2004

© 2004

Tina Teresa Royston

All Rights Reserved

SALLUST AND THE MONOGRAPH

by

TINA TERESA ROYSTON

Major Professor: Mario Erasmo

Committee: Erika Hermanowicz  
James Anderson

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso  
Dean of the Graduate School  
The University of Georgia  
August 2004

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My endless gratitude goes to my parents who have given me the best possible life and supported me in everything I have done, and most importantly they have taught me how to be a good and hardworking person, without them I could have never gotten as far as I have. My thanks also goes to my friends who are always a source of support and encouragement. I'm lucky to have you all: Tara, Karon, Elizabeth, Melissa, Heather and Latana. My sincere gratitude also to the entire Classics department, I have never worked with a better group of people. Dr. Erasmo, Dr. Hermanowicz and Dr. Anderson have my especial respect and gratitude for their constant kindness and support through the completion of my thesis. I have been enriched as a person and intellectually by my association with them and the entire department. All my love goes to my angel on this earth for the constant love, support and encouragement, words can never capture what my angel has done for my life.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	iv
INTRODUCTION .....	1
CHAPTER	
1    Monograph Before Sallust .....	4
2    Cicero, Sallust and the Monograph.....	26
3    Understanding the Monograph Through Philosophy.....	58
CONCLUSION.....	67
REFERENCES .....	68

## Introduction

This thesis examines the Bellum Catilinae of Sallust in an effort to understand the significance of the monograph in Roman historiography and how Sallust utilized the format to create an effective work of history. This text occupies a significant and unique place in Roman historiography. Sallust's Roman predecessors chose, for the most part, to engage in annalistic history, a format in which the account ran from the foundations of the city up to contemporary times. Writers such as Naevius, Ennius and Cato composed such histories, and Sallust himself wrote a history in this tradition (Histories) of which only fragments survive. For his initial works, however, Sallust chose to compose monographs, the first of which was the Bellum Catilinae. This choice of subgenre was novel and innovative given the prevalence of annalistic writing at Rome. Sallust's use of the format, therefore, is all the more deliberate and significant.

A prefatory note concerning terminology is necessary. "Monograph" is a modern term that has been applied to this subgenre of history. The tradition of monograph historiography is difficult to reconstruct, because few examples survive and little ancient commentary exists on the subject. The two ancient sources that provide any substantial comment on the monograph are Polybius and Cicero. Polybius was critical of the format and asserted that it distorted history. Presently, however, terminology is our concern. Polybius labeled this type of history as τὴν κατὰ μέρος ἱστορίαν (Polyb. 1.4.10) which literally translates as "a history by part."<sup>1</sup> Cicero wrote a letter (Ad fam. 5.12) to the historian Lucceius in which he requested a historical account concerning his role in

---

<sup>1</sup> Polybius, The Histories. Vol. 1. Translated by W.R. Paton. Loeb Classical Library. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968).

the events surrounding the Catilinarian conspiracy.<sup>2</sup> In this letter Cicero assigned a term to the type of history he desired once and then only indirectly. Cicero called the intended work a *libellus* (Ad fam. 5.12.7) which means literally “pamphlet” or “little book.” Both convey the basic concept of this subgenre: an account that is separate from continuous history and narrow in focus in respect to subject and time-frame. Monograph, therefore, is not a term derived from the ancient sources but one applied later and used as a descriptive label but referring to the type of history discussed by Polybius and Cicero and composed by Sallust.

This thesis contains three chapters and focuses primarily on the Bellum Catilinae. Chapter one consists of survey of Greek and Roman historiography prior to Sallust (this is not intended to be a comprehensive survey but one which focuses on historical narratives that might bear some relevance to the monograph format). The tradition for the monograph is difficult to reconstruct due to a scarcity of examples and information about the format in ancient sources. This chapter, however, undertakes a discussion of the origins of and influences on the monograph format in Greek and Roman historiography. Chapter two focuses on the relationship among Cicero, Sallust and the monograph. Cicero provides a great deal of information on the writing of history and historical theory in ancient Rome. His letter to Luceius with its discussion of the elements of a monograph is especially relevant. The letter tells us how the monograph was being defined in Sallust’s day by the major literary arbiter of the time. Therefore, an examination of it will be useful in relation to the Bellum Catilinae. In chapter two I also discuss how Sallust’s monograph reflects the elements outlined by Cicero for the subgenre and how Sallust introduces innovations to the format. Lastly, in chapter three,

---

<sup>2</sup> Cicero. Select Letters. Ed. D.R. Shackleton Bailey. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980).



I discuss the effectiveness of the Bellum Catilinae as a historical work, especially how Sallust weaves together various elements that maximize the effect of the format, and how he creates an account not only of the conspiracy but commentary on Roman society and history as a whole.

To what ends are these questions being posed? Historical works are not simply a record of past events. Each text is a product of its time and is shaped by the author. The selection of genre is a matter of conscious choice and strategy. Choices of genres, style and subject matter can tell us something historical and important about the author and his narrative aims. The monograph, therefore, tells us something significant about Sallust and his motives for composing the Bellum Catilinae. By understanding the subgenre and his choice of it, we might be better able to comprehend his history and what he wanted the reader to gain from it.

## Chapter 1

### Monograph Before Sallust

How do we define “monograph” in an ancient context? This is no easy task from a modern standpoint, because very few examples of and very little detailed information about the monograph survive from antiquity. Prior to Sallust the only substantial commentary on the format comes from two writers: Polybius and Cicero. Their views on the monograph, interestingly, are quite contrary, because Cicero requested that a historian compose a monograph about him (Cic. Ad fam. 5.12) while Polybius denounced the format as an ineffective medium for historical writing (Polyb. 1.4.6-11). Even though their judgments on the effectiveness of the format are diametrically opposed, they both seem to agree on the basic characteristic of a monograph.

Polybius in the first book of his Histories expends considerable effort to argue for and validate the superiority of a general history. He argues that history can only be understood properly when viewed in a comprehensive fashion (4.1-11). It is within this argument that Polybius denounces monographic histories, or as he terms them κατὰ μέρος γραφάντων ἱστορίας (1.4.6), as ineffective. The faults that Polybius finds with the format are not a concern here but rather how he defines it as history by part or by portion (κατὰ μέρος) or, in other words, as specific topics or episodes detached from the continuous stream of history. The definition is further elaborated by the use of a metaphor. Polybius declares that such histories give an unjust view of matters (1.4.7), and he argues that such histories are comparable to a man seeing the severed limbs (διερριμμένα τὰ μέρη) of an animal and trying to piece together an accurate image of the entire animal (1.4.7-10). This metaphor represents Polybius’ conception of the

monograph as a detached episode or a part of a whole. It also conveys his notion that a part may be exaggerated and that monographs can result in distortion of history.

Cicero gives us a basic definition of a monograph that is quite similar. It is contained within his request to Lucius Lucceius to compose a monograph about him (Cic. Ad fam. 5.12). Lucceius is urged in this letter to follow the pattern of *multi Graeci* who have detached their accounts of wars from the rest of history: *qui omnes a perpetuis suis historiis ea quae dixi bella separaverunt* (5.12.2).<sup>1</sup> Cicero advises Lucceius to disconnect the Catilinarian conspiracy from other hostilities: *tu quoque item civilem coniurationem ab hostilibus externisque bellis seiungeres* (5.12.2). This basic concept of a monograph, which is focused and narrow, echoes that of Polybius, because the terminology of separation and detachment is quite similar, Cicero as well attaches a term to this type of history only once and then indirectly when he uses *libellus* which literally translated means “little book” (Cic. Ad fam. 5.12.7). Thus the two ancient sources that provide any substantial commentary on the format recognize a core definition of the monograph: a relatively brief historical account that focuses on an episode detached from continuous history.<sup>2</sup>

I find that Polybius’ description has considerable parallel to Sallust’s method of selecting a historical topic as *carptim* (Sall. Cat. 4.2) which translates as “by pieces or singly.” For the sake of clarity the term monograph will be used in this thesis.

Who are the *multi Graeci* referred to by Cicero? Can elements of the monograph be traced to earlier general histories? These two questions will serve as useful guides for

---

<sup>1</sup> The text used throughout this thesis for this letter is that of Shackleton Bailey. M. Tulli Ciceronis, Epistulae ad familiares, Libri I-XVI. Ed. D.R. Shackleton Bailey. (B.G. Teubner.: Stvtgardie in Aedibus, 1988).

<sup>2</sup> Cicero continues on in the letter to give other characteristics of a monograph but this, I think, can be regarded as the core definition. The other aspects will be discussed in chapter two of this thesis.

a survey of Greek historiography in relation to Sallust. The first major Greek practitioner of prose history was Herodotus. With his initial words he explained the nature and purpose of his history (Hdt. Hist.1.1):

*Ἡροδότου Ἀλικαρνησέος ἱστορίας ἀπόδεξις ἥδε ὥς μήτε τὰ γενόμενα ἐξ ἀνθρώπων τῷ χρόνῳ ἐξίτηλα γένηται μήτε ἔργα μεγάλα τε καὶ θωμαστά τὰ μὲν Ἕλλησι τὰ δὲ βαρβάροισι ἀποδεχθέντα ἀκλεᾶ γένηται τὰ τε ἄλλα καὶ δι' ἣν αἰτίην ἐπολέμησαν ἀλλήλοισι.*

*What Herodotus the Halicarnassian has learnt by inquiry is here set forth: in order that the memory of the past may not be blotted out from among men by time, and that great and marvelous deeds done by Greeks and foreigners and especially the reason why they warred against each other may not lack renown (trans. by Godley, 3).*

On the contrary, Thucydides chose a much narrower focus when he limited his history solely to the Peloponnesian War. Contemporary events and their immediate causes were the substance of his narrative as opposed to the narrative of Herodotus which covered much of Persia's history, geography and ethnography. With his initial words Thucydides defines the subject matter of his history (Thuc. Pelop. War. 1.1.1):

*Θουκυδίδης Ἀθηναῖος ξυνέγραψε τὸν πόλεμον τῶν Πελοποννησίων καὶ Ἀθηναίων ὥς ἐπολέμησαν πρὸς ἀλλήλους, ἀρξάμενος εὐθύς καθισταμένου καὶ ἐλπίδας μέγαν τε ἔσεσθαι καὶ ἀξιολογώτατον τῶν προγεγενημένων.....*

*Thucydides, an Athenian, wrote the history of the war waged by the Peloponnesians and the Athenians against one another. He began the task at the very outset of the war, in the belief that it would be great and noteworthy above all the wars that had gone before... (trans. by Smith, 3).*

From the beginning he fixed the precise date of the war and continued his account annalistically (Bk. II). He made little use of digressions except for material that had a

direct bearing on the war.<sup>3</sup> Thucydides intentionally distanced himself from Herodotus by rejecting his methods and by dedicating himself to a higher degree of accuracy and discretion in gathering information (Thuc. Pelop. War. 1.22.2):<sup>4</sup>

τὰ δ' ἔργα τῶν πραχθέντων ἐν τῶν πολέμῳ οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ παρατυχόντος πυνθανόμενος ἤξιωσα γράφειν οὐδ' ὥς ἐμοὶ ἔδοκει, ἀλλ' οἷς τε αὐτὸς παρῆν καὶ παρὰ τῶν ἄλλων ὅσον δυνατὸν ἀκριβεῖα περὶ ἐκάστου ἐπεξελεθῶν.

*But as to the facts of the occurrences of war, I have thought it my duty to give them, not as ascertained from any chance informant nor as seemed to me probable, but only after investigating with the greatest possible accuracy each detail, in the case both of the events in which I myself participated and of those regarding which I got my information from others.*

(trans by Smith, 39).

Herodotus tried to acquire the most reliable information from the most informed sources available. He consulted, for example, Egyptian priests about the pyramids and customs, but he was not an eyewitness to many of the events which he recorded. The first-hand nature of Thucydides' historical information is again seen as he begins his description of the plague (Thuc. Pelop. War. 2.48.3):

...ἐγὼ δὲ οἷόν τε ἐγίγνετο λέξω καὶ ἀφ' ὧν ἂν τις σκοπῶν, εἴ ποτε καὶ αὐθις ἐπιπέσοι, μάλιστ' ἂν ἔχοι τι προειδὼς μὴ ἀγνοεῖν, ταῦτα δηλώσω αὐτὸς τε νοσήσας καὶ αὐτὸς ἰδὼν ἄλλους πάσχοντας.

*...but I shall describe its actual course, explaining the symptoms, from the study of which a person should be best able, having knowledge of it beforehand, to recognize it if it should ever break out again. For I had the disease myself and saw others sick of it.*

(trans by Smith, 345).

These two passages show the importance that Thucydides placed on the value of using discretion in the selection of source material and his emphasis on history based on

<sup>3</sup> T.J. Luce, The Greek Historians. (London and New York: Routledge, 1997), 69.

<sup>4</sup> Herodotus did conduct his own research as in his narrative on the antiquity of Egypt (Bk. II).

contemporary events versus events of the more distant past.<sup>5</sup> Thucydides' influence fostered an increased emphasis on political analysis and contemporary events.<sup>6</sup> The Catilinarian conspiracy was an event witnessed by Sallust, and often in the text he engages in political analysis which was no doubt informed by first hand knowledge. More importantly Thucydides differed from his predecessor in the scope of his subject matter. Even though the overall length of his history is considerable, his relatively limited focus on the war between Sparta and Athens, and his limiting of himself to relevant material, brought his work closer to the format of a monograph.<sup>7</sup> This makes him important to consider as a likely influence upon Sallust.<sup>8</sup>

Xenophon's Anabasis was the story of ten thousand Greek troops on their failed expedition to and escape from Persia. The account is detached from continuous history and its topic and timeframe are narrow in focus. One could argue that the Anabasis belongs in the genre of memoir, because it is a narrative of Xenophon's own experiences.<sup>9</sup> Its separation from continuous history, its narrow focus in topic and time are characteristic of a monograph and therefore may have also influenced Sallust.

Xenophon also wrote an account of the life of King Agesilaus of Sparta. This work does have a single focus, but it is perhaps better classified as biography or

---

<sup>5</sup> In fact Thucydides criticizes Herodotus at 1.21 where he accuses the "prose chroniclers" of being more interested to catch the attention of their public than telling the truth and using sources that cannot possibly be checked due to the passage of time. According to Momigliano (1966; 214) Herodotus' reputation in antiquity depended fundamentally on the direction that Thucydides gave to historiography.

<sup>6</sup> Arnaldo Momigliano, Studies in Historiography. (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1966), 130.

<sup>7</sup> For a detailed study of Thucydides and his historical methods see J.B. Bury, The Ancient Greek Historians. (New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1958), 75-149.

<sup>8</sup> Thucydides' influence on Sallust will be addressed further in chapter three.

<sup>9</sup> Shackleton Bailey asserts, in his commentary on Cicero's Ad fam. 5.12, the possibility that the Anabasis may have been patterns for the memoirs of Roman senators such as Sulla. See Cicero. Select Letters. Ed. D.R. Shackleton Bailey. (London: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 143.

encomium rather than monograph.<sup>10</sup> It should be noted, however, that the line between genres was not distinct in the ancient world to the degree that it is in modern times. The distinction between history and biography was especially blurred at times. Cicero's letter to Lucceius is an interesting example. In this letter Cicero elaborates on a historical account in which the monographic and unitary dimension of the narrative serve to concentrate the reader's attention on a single man (Cicero) placed at the center of the conspiracy. This presupposes an interaction between history and biography.<sup>11</sup> This also implies an interaction between monograph and biography, because, as discussed earlier Cicero requests, in this letter, that Lucceius compose a monograph about the consulship. Perhaps this is stretching the lines too far but the narrow focus and concentration of the Agesilaus is similar, in those respects, to a monograph as defined by Cicero and Polybius. So we can see hints of the monograph with the Anabasis and even in the Agesilaus, but it is not certain whether Xenophon conceived of these works as distinct from a general history narrative.<sup>12</sup>

Historical writing during the lifetime of Alexander the Great tended to focus on his expeditions and the events surrounding them. Callisthenes, a historian of this period and the nephew of Aristotle is of interest to the current topic. His work was broken off prematurely by his execution for treason in 327 BCE<sup>13</sup> and little is known about it. Most importantly for this thesis we are told by Cicero that he composed a monograph on the

---

<sup>10</sup> This classification is mine and hence modern. It should be noted that genres in the ancient world were often not clearly differentiated and were dialectic. In addition it must be remarked that in the context of ancient Greece there was no systematic theory concerning literary genres before the classification brought about by Hellenistic philology in the third and second century BCE, see further Bruno Gentili and Giovanni Cerri, History and Biography in Ancient Thought. (Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben, 1988), 84.

<sup>11</sup> Gentili and Cerri (1988), 64.

<sup>12</sup> For a detailed study of Xenophon see Stephen Usher, The Historians of Greece and Rome. (Bristol: Bristol Classical Press, 1985), 66-99.

<sup>13</sup> Jacoby (1926), FGrH, 124

Phocian War (Cic. Ad fam. 5.12.2). Unfortunately, this is the extent of information provided, and thus we know only that Cicero considered it to qualify as a monograph.

The Hellenistic Age was a period dominated by great kingdoms: the Seleucids in Asia Minor, the Antigonids in Greece and the Ptolemies in Egypt. After Alexander's death his empire was divided among his generals, and writers now tended to attach themselves to one court or another.<sup>14</sup> Most of the works of the Hellenistic historians are now lost and only survive in fragmentary form, but the limited information that remains reflects little similarity to the monographic format.

Timaeus of Tauromenium whose life spanned the later fourth century BCE and the first half of the third century BCE carried his historical focus to the West. His history in thirty-eight books centered on affairs in the West and continued the narrative down to 264 BCE when the Romans crossed into Sicily. In it he included information about Rome, Carthage and even the Greek East.<sup>15</sup> The method of dating by Olympiads was first employed in historical writing by Timaeus.<sup>16</sup> Cicero tells us that Timaeus composed a monograph on the War of Pyrrhus (Cic. Ad fam. 5.12.2). The fragmentary nature of these histories allows an opportunity to know little more than the subject matter that they addressed. Unfortunately, again we know only that he composed a monograph but are given no details on the format or style.

The Hellenistic Age also witnessed the creation of so-called tragic history. The aim of this type of writing was to rouse the emotions especially pity or fear. The emotional arousal was generated by scenes recreated in writing of protagonists shaken

---

<sup>14</sup> F.W. Walbank, The Hellenistic World. Revised Edition. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993), 17.

<sup>15</sup> Jacoby (1926), FGrH 566.

<sup>16</sup> Luce (1997), 109-111.



by calamities and fate so vivid that it was almost as if it were all happening on-stage before the reader's eyes. This historical approach became quite popular in the fourth century BCE and Hellenistic Age and was taken to extremes by writers such as Duris of Samos and Phylarchus.<sup>17</sup> B.L. Ullman in his article "History and Tragedy" discusses at length the influences of tragedy on history. He begins his argument with a discussion of Aristotle's definitions of tragedy and history which he summarizes as:

*To summarize the difference between history and tragedy as stated by Aristotle either explicitly or inferentially, tragedy imitates the actions of men, history states facts; the purpose of tragedy is to arouse fear and pity, especially through the unexpected and through change of fortune, but history has no such purpose; tragedy deals with a complete action, having a beginning, middle, and end, history does not necessarily do so. The process which Aristotle favors in a tragedy is this: terrible things should produce fear or pity for the purpose of catharsis; he opposes sensationalism which fails to produce fear and the resultant catharsis.*

Ullman argues that Aristotle's words may have been a trigger for opposing attitudes about history and its relationship to tragedy. Other factors that blurred the lines between tragedy and history were the desire to tell a good story and the influence of epic poetry, the source of the stories of tragedy.<sup>18</sup> He also emphasizes the influence of Isocrates who introduced rhetorical and poetic effects into historical prose and gave prominence to the portrayal of the calamities of fortune.<sup>19</sup> There is little similarity between the majority of Hellenistic writing and the monograph because most were not narrow in focus and were of considerable length. Elements of tragedy, however, are apparent in the Bellum Catilinae and will be addressed later.

---

<sup>17</sup> Luce (1997), 119 and fragments in FGrH 76 and 81 respectively.

<sup>18</sup> Polybius (2.56-63) criticizes Phylarchus and his use of "tragedy" and exaggeration in his historical works.

<sup>19</sup> B.L. Ullman, "History and Tragedy," TAPA 73 (1942), 26-28. Twenty-one discourses and nine letters of Isocrates (436-338 BCE) survive that are mostly extant; Isocrates, The Works of Isocrates, 3 vols. Translated by George Norlin and Larue Van Hook. Loeb Classical Library. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1969-1980).

The Greek spectrum of writers that pre-date Sallust ends with Posidonius of Apamea who was a philosopher and a historian. His Histories apparently began where Polybius left off but only survive in fragmentary form.<sup>20</sup> The account covered the Greek East and the Western Mediterranean from 146 to the time of Sulla (78 BCE).<sup>21</sup> The Histories were vast in scope in terms of events and time, thus bearing little similarity to the monographic format.

Even this brief survey of the Greek historians who precede Sallust, demonstrates that the tradition of historiography was both long-standing and rich. The monograph was a facet of that tradition. Cicero tells us in a letter to Lucius Luceius (Cic. Ad fam. 5.12.2) that three Greek authors composed monographs: Callisthenes, Timaeus and Polybius. Unfortunately these works and all examples of the monograph for this period of Greek historiography are lost to us. We are able, therefore, to say little about the nature of the format in this time period. We know only that the monograph was utilized in Greek historiography.

The Romans drew upon Greek historical tradition in the process of establishing their own accounts of origins and history. Greek precedents, however, were not the only sources upon which Roman historical writing was predicated. Native elements and tendencies also contributed to the rise of the genre in Rome. The practice of historical writing was well developed when Sallust began to compose his own works. The list of historians, however, that precedes him is not a lengthy one because many works of the historians are now lost to us, and many of the remainder are only known through fragments. Due to its fragmentary nature, the historical tradition before Sallust is

---

<sup>20</sup> The fragments can be found in Posidonius, Vol. 1 The Fragments. Eds. L. Edelstein and I.G. Kidd. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972).

<sup>21</sup> Walbank (1993) 19-20.

difficult to reconstruct because often it must be pieced together by references in later grammarians and historians. Enough material does remain so that a fairly coherent picture of the tradition can be reconstructed, and we are able to get some idea of the context in which Sallust was writing. It is convenient to examine the development of Roman historiography from a couple of angles: the predecessors of Roman history and the historians themselves.

Ronald Mellor in his book The Roman Historians argues that a devotion to ancestral and national past pervaded Roman literature, art, architecture, city planning, political and legal institutions, their religion and legends.<sup>22</sup> Roman historical writing, according to Mellor, from its very beginnings was narrower in scope than its Greek counterpart and was focused on the state and political life of the community.<sup>23</sup> This devotion to things political can be seen in some of the predecessors of history proper. From early times Roman magistrates often kept *commentarii* among their private documents and sometimes these were incorporated into the official records. These *commentarii* were basically personal accounts written by a magistrate about his tenure in office. The use of *commentarii* presumably favored the development of a prose style of writing that was connected to contemporary politics and not distantly removed from proper memoirs.<sup>24</sup> The details of a magistrate's career might also be displayed at his funeral and at his grave. Epitaphs on placards, detailing one's career and his accomplishments in life, may have been carried beside the *imagines* of his ancestors in the funeral procession. Grave monuments themselves contained epitaphs that gave the

---

<sup>22</sup> Ronald Mellor, The Roman Historians. (London and New York: Routledge, 1999), 1.

<sup>23</sup> Mellor (1999), 10-11.

<sup>24</sup> Gian Biagio Conte, Latin Literature: A History. Translated by Joseph B. Solodow. (Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999), 18.

highlights of a man's life.<sup>25</sup> The funeral monuments of the Scipios near the Via Appia are perhaps the most well known examples.<sup>26</sup>

Fabius Pictor was the first Roman prose historian.<sup>27</sup> Pictor (late third century BCE) belonged to the *gens Fabia* which was one of the noblest families of Rome. He served as a senator, as a magistrate and as a commander against the Insubrian Gauls between 225 and 222 BCE. The history which he composed extended from the foundations of the city to the close of the Second Punic War.<sup>28</sup> Our knowledge of the work derives from a few surviving fragments and mentions in later writers. Some of the preserved fragments show an interest in the origins of institutions and ceremonies. He probably also had an interest in the origins of Rome, the period of the monarchy and the beginning of the Republic since many practices were traced back to these periods.<sup>29</sup> In fact we know that Pictor discussed the origins of Rome all the way back to the time of Aeneas because of a few lines in Cicero's *De Divinatione* (Div. 1.43):

*Sint haec, ut dixi, somnia fabularum, hisque adiungatur etima Aeneae somnium, quod in nostri Fabi Pictoris Graecis annalibus eius modi est, ut omnia, quae ab Aeneas gesta sunt quaeque illi acciderunt, ea fuerint, quae ei secundum quietem visa sunt.*

*Grant, I repeat, that these dreams are myths and in the same category put Aeneas' dreams, related in the Greek annals of our countryman, Fabius Pictor. According to Pictor everything that Aeneas did or suffered turned out just as it had been predicted to him in a dream (trans. by W.A. Falconer, 273).*

---

<sup>25</sup> Mellor (1999), 12.

<sup>26</sup> For examples see Mario Erasmo, *Archaic Latin Verse*. (Newburyport: Focus Publishing, 2001), 19-20

<sup>27</sup> Arnaldo Momigliano, *The Classical Foundations of Modern Historiography*. (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1990), 88.

<sup>28</sup> The fragments of Pictor can be found in Hermannus Peter, *Historicorum Romanorum Fragmenta*. (Lipsiae In Aedibus: B.G. Teubneri, 1883), pgs. 6-31 and in Jacoby (1926), FGrH 809.

<sup>29</sup> Conte (1999), 69.

Pictor was also concerned with more contemporary issues including the conflict between Carthage and Rome. We know this because Polybius criticizes his lack of objectivity on the matter.<sup>30</sup> The quote from Cicero brings up one of the important issues about Pictor—the fact that he wrote in Greek. There has been much debate about why he made this choice. Momigliano posits that perhaps Pictor felt that the Roman historical tradition was unsatisfactory and that he was forced to look to Greek models. Greeks had been specialists in dealing with national origins and created a considerable amount of literature concerning the foundation of cities, and they had even written on the foundation of Rome. Momigliano, therefore, argues that Pictor looked to the better developed models and paid homage to the mastery of the Greeks.<sup>31</sup> Stephen Usher, however, presents a slightly different argument. He posits that perhaps Pictor was targeting a Greek audience or at least an educated audience that included upper class Romans like himself. Another hypothesis of Usher is that Greek was the only tested language of historiography.<sup>32</sup> Another motive may have been to counteract the influence of Greek historical writing favorable to the Carthaginians and therefore to promote the Romans as superior to their Punic rivals.<sup>33</sup> All are legitimate arguments for his choice of language, but we may never know his motives for certain.

Pictor adapted the techniques and methods of Greek historians and applied them to aspects of Roman history which neither the Greeks nor any one else had previously studied to any extent. In the process he used the Roman chronological system and no doubt used the pontifical annals and other Roman sources. A balance was struck between

---

<sup>30</sup> Conte (1999), 69.

<sup>31</sup> Momigliano (1990), 101-102.

<sup>32</sup> Stephen Usher, The Historians of Greece and Rome. (Bristol: Bristol Classical Press, 1985), 131.

<sup>33</sup> Conte (1999), 69.

native traditions and Greek influences. It is doubtful whether Pictor uncovered substantially new facts, but the attempt was a pioneering one.<sup>34</sup>

A new era began when he enlisted the help of Greek historians in the reconstruction of Roman history. This change, according to Momigliano, had both positive and negative effects on Roman historiography. The positive aspects were that the Romans now had the resources of Greek historiography at their disposal, and their political judgment, source criticism and stylistic devices were augmented. Romans were inspired to examine their history from various angles- political and biographical for example. There were also negative side effects in that the Romans inherited the inability to do real research on the intermediate period between the origins and contemporary history. They, like the Greeks, were better equipped to collect and criticize mythical traditions or to observe more recent history. The middle ground remained a difficult area to deal with effectively. Momigliano also argues that the Romans were unable to react spontaneously to their own past, because they always consciously judged themselves in a Greek mirror.<sup>35</sup> Pictor also initiated a trend that was to become prominent in Roman historiography, because he was the first of a long line of senators who devoted their *otium* to composing their own versions of events and thus composing history. This link between public service and historical writing became firmly established in Rome.<sup>36</sup> Sallust himself was a senator who when he had withdrawn from public life devoted his *otium* to historical writing.

For about another generation Roman writers followed the example of Fabius Pictor by composing their histories in Greek. It is uncertain if they continued to do so

---

<sup>34</sup> Momigliano (1990), 102-103.

<sup>35</sup> Momigliano (1990), 106-107.

<sup>36</sup> Usher (1985), 131-132.

because of a desire to appeal to a wider readership, the under-developed state of Latin prose or out of cultural pretentiousness.<sup>37</sup> The first two Punic Wars made Rome a player on a much larger stage in the Mediterranean, and Greek was more effective for Rome in communicating with this larger world where the Greek language still predominated. The most prominent of these so-called *annales Graeci* was L. Cincius Alimentus who had been praetor in 210 BCE and a prisoner of Hannibal. Only about half a dozen of his fragments survive.<sup>38</sup> C. Acilius and A. Postumius Albinus both composed histories of Rome in Greek in the middle of the second century BCE.<sup>39</sup> Both were members of the senatorial class thus continuing to foster the link between political life and historical writing. Acilius had philosophical inclinations and Postumius was able to rise to the consulship in 151 BCE. Little is known about either of their works except that apparently Postumius apologized in advance for errors in his Greek and Acilius suffered from an excess of phil-Hellenism.<sup>40</sup>

The next major contribution to Roman historiography was made by Marcus Porcius Cato of Tusculum (234-149 BCE) who published numerous speeches and some historical works including the *Origines* (c. 168-149 BCE).<sup>41</sup> This was probably the first prose history written in Latin. It traced the history of the city from its beginnings down to 150 BCE in seven books.<sup>42</sup> Cato is perhaps best known for his criticism of Roman aristocratic families for their personal luxury, corruption and servile acceptance of Greek

---

<sup>37</sup> Mellor (1999), 17.

<sup>38</sup> Peter (1883), pgs. 31-34 and Jacoby (1926), FGrH 810.

<sup>39</sup> Peter (1883) pgs. 34-37 and Jacoby (1926), FGrH 3 for Acilius' fragments and Peter (1883) pgs. 37-39 and Jacoby (1926), FGrH 812 for Postumius.

<sup>40</sup> T.A. Dorey ed. *Latin Historians*. (New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, 1966), 6-7 in the chapter "The Early Historians" by E. Badian.

<sup>41</sup> Michael Grant, *Greek and Roman Historians: Information and Misinformation*. (London and New York: Routledge, 1995), 113.

<sup>42</sup> The fragment of the *Origines* can be found in Hermannus Peter, *Historicorum Romanorum Fragmenta*. (Lipsiae In Aedibus: B.G. Teubneri, 1883), pgs. 40-65.

ideas. The purpose of his history was at least in part the instruction of future leaders. He, however, waged his own political battles through his writing. By describing his own public career, he made the historian's own personality a source of authority and credibility. Cato thus perpetuated and even strengthened the link between political service and the writing of history.<sup>43</sup> Another significant characteristic of his writing is that he rejected the use of the annals and their chronology.<sup>44</sup> We know this because of a fragment of the *Origines* preserved by Aulus Gellius (Aul. Gell. *Attic Nights*. 2.28.4-7):

*Sed de lunae solisque defectionibus, non minus in eius rei causa reperienda sese exercuerunt. Quippe M. Cato, vir in cognoscendis rebus multi studii, incerta tamen et incuriose super ea re opinatus est. Verba Catonis ex Originum quarto haec sunt: "Non lubet scribere quod in tabula apud, pontificem maximum est, quotiens annona cara, quotiens lunae aut solis lumine caligo aut quid obstiterit."*

*But in the case of eclipses of the sun or moon they concerned themselves no less with trying to discover the causes of that phenomenon. However, Marcus Cato, although a man with great interest in investigation, nevertheless, on this point expressed himself indecisively and superficially. His words in the fourth book of his *Origines* are as follows: "I do not care to write what appears on the tablet of the high priest: how often grain was dear, how often darkness, or something else, obscured the light of sun or moon." (trans. by J.C. Rolfe, 223).*

Cato thus appears to have rejected the annals for their triviality and chose instead to arrange his work by subject matter.<sup>45</sup> His greatest contribution lies in the new direction that he gave to Roman historiography when he composed in Latin.<sup>46</sup>

This distaste for the *annales* and chronological format based on them did not transfer itself to the immediate successors of Cato. The century between Cato and Sallust

---

<sup>43</sup> Mellor (1999), 17-19.

<sup>44</sup> Dorey (1966), 8.

<sup>45</sup> Dorey (1966), 8

<sup>46</sup> Dorey (1966), 9.



was populated by a series of annalistic historians who used the *annales maximi* as their formal models and framework. We have only fragmentary remains of their works and little is known about them or their works. Apparently they did not go far beyond chronicles based on the annals and often invented material to fill in gaps. Some of the annalists whose names have come down to us are: L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi (consul 133 BCE), C. Fannius, L. Coelius Antipater and Sempronius Asellio.<sup>47</sup> There was also a group called the Sullan annalists which included Gnaeus Gellius, Q. Claudius Quadrigarius (Aul. Gell. *Attic Nights*. 9.13) and L. Cornelius Sisenna.<sup>48</sup> Two further annalistic accounts that were *ab urbe condita* are known to have been composed by C. Licinius Macer and Valerius Antias.<sup>49</sup> Ernst Breisach argues that one can easily assume that the habit of recording year by year the events in the collective life of the state shaped these annalistic histories. This was a sub-genre that became characteristic of much of Roman historiography.<sup>50</sup> The reputation, however, of the annalists was not renowned, and apparently they were not well respected especially by Cicero (*Leg.* 1.2.6-7):

*Nam post annalis pontificum maximorum, quibus nihil potest esse ieiunius, si aut ad Fabium aut ad eum, qui tibi semper in ore est, Catonem, aut ad Pisonem aut ad Fannium aut ad Vennonium venias, quamquam ex his alius alio plus habet virium, tamen quid tam exile quam isti omnes? Fanni autem aetati coniunctus Antipater Paulo inflavit vehementius habuitque vires agrestis ille quidem atque horridas sine nitore ac palaestra, sed tamen admonere reliquos potuit ut adcuratius scriberent. Ecce autem succedere huic belli: Clodius, Asellio; nihil ad Coelium, sed potius ad antiquorum languorem et inscitiam. Nam quid Macrum numerem? Cuius loquacitas habet aliquid argutiarum, nec id tamen ex illa erudita Graecorum copia, sed ex librariolis Latinis, in orationibus autem*

<sup>47</sup> Dorey (1966), 19-21. The fragments are available in Peter (1883): Calpurnius Piso pgs. 76-86, Fannius pgs. 87-89, Antipater pgs. 98-108. and Asellio pgs. 108-111.

<sup>48</sup> Fragments in Peter (1883): Gellius pgs. 92-97, Quadrigarius pgs. 136-151 and Sisenna pgs. 175-189.

<sup>49</sup> Ernst Breisach, *Historiography: Ancient, Medieval and Modern*. (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1983), 54. Fragments in Peter (1883): Macer pgs. 190-197 and Antias pgs. 151-175.

<sup>50</sup> Breisach (1983), 43.

*multa ineptias, elatio summam inpudentiam. Sisenna, eius amicus, omnes adhuc nostros scriptores, nisi qui forte nondum ediderunt, de quibus existimare non possumus, facile superavit.*

*For after the annals of the chief pontiffs, which are records of the driest possible character, when we come to Fabius, or to Cato (whose name is always on your lips), or to Piso, Fannius, or Vennonius, although one of these may display more vigour than another, yet what could be more lifeless than the whole group? Fannius' contemporary, Antipater, to be sure, blew a somewhat more forceful strain, and showed some power, though of a rough and rustic character, lacking in polish and the skill that comes from training; nevertheless he might have served as a warning to his successors that they should take greater pains with their writing. But lo and behold, his successors were those fine specimens, Clodius and Asellio. These two are not to be compared with Coelius, but rather with the feebleness and clumsiness of our earlier historians. And why should I even mention Macer? His long-winded style show indeed some little acumen (though borrowed not from the Greeks; wealth of knowledge, but from the Roman copyists), but his speeches contain many absurdities, and his elevated passages are exaggerated beyond all bounds. His friend Sisenna has easily surpassed all our other historians up to the present time, with the exception of those whose works may not yet have been published, and therefore cannot be estimated (trans. by C.W. Keyes, 303-305).*

Again in *De Oratore* Cicero criticizes the annalists and their histories (*De or.* 2.42.52-54):

*Erat enim historia nihil aliud nisi annalium confectio, cuius rei, memoriaeque publicae retinendae causa, ab initio rerum Romanarum usque ad P. Mucium pontificem maximum, res omnes singulorum annorum mandabat litteris pontifex maximus, referebatque in album, et proponebat tabulam domi, potestas ut esset populo cognoscendi, hique etiam nunc Annales Maximi nominantur. Hanc similitudinem scribendi multi secuti sunt, qui sine ullis ornamentis monumenta solum temporum, hominum, locorum gestarumque rerum reliquerunt. Itaque qualis apud Graecos Pherecydes, Hellanicus, Acusilas fuit, aliique permulti, talis noster Cato, et Pictor, et Piso, qui neque tenent, quibus rebus ornetur oratio- modo enim huc ista sunt importata,- et, dum intellegatur, quid dicant, unam dicendi laudem putant esse brevitatem. Paulum se erexit, et addidit historiae maiorem sonum vocis vir optimus, Crassi familiaris, Antipater: ceteri non exornatores rerum, sed tantummodo narratores fuerunt.*

*For history began as a mere compilation of annals, on which account, and in order to preserve the general traditions, from the earliest period of the City down to the pontificate of Publius Mucius, each High Priest used to commit to writing all the events of his year of office, and record them on a white surface, and post up the tablet at his house, that all men might have liberty to acquaint themselves therewith, and to this day those records are known as the Pontifical Chronicles. A similar style of writing has been adopted by many who, without any rhetorical ornament, have left behind them bare records, of dates, personalities, places, and events. In this sense Pheredcydes, Hellanicus, Acusilas, and very many others among the Greeks, correspond to our own Cato, Pictor, and Piso, who do not understand the adornment of composition- since it is only of late that decoration of that sort has been brought into this country- and, so long as their narrative is understood, regard conciseness as the historian's single merit. Antipater, an admirable man and a close friend of Crassus, raised his crest a little higher, and imparted to history a richer tone: the rest did not embellish their facts, but were chroniclers and nothing more (trans. by E.W. Sutton, 237).*

Cicero obviously saw little of value or substance in the annalists. One must consider, however, that Cicero was also interested in promoting his own style which was more embellished and rhetorical. It, therefore, served his purpose to criticize the annalists. It is still, nevertheless, difficult for us to make any judgments, because the century of annalistic writing must be evaluated by mere fragments and commentary in later authors.<sup>51</sup> We can say little more than that they continued what was a long tradition in Rome of using the annalistic framework and that they influenced later writers to use similar formats.<sup>52</sup> Two of the authors mentioned above, Antipater and Sisenna, require special note especially in relation to Sallust. Antipater introduced the historical monograph to Rome. His history consisted of seven books and concentrated solely on the Second Punic War.<sup>53</sup> This is obviously important to consider when discussing the

---

<sup>51</sup> Later sources were often biased or even hostile to their predecessors. The same phenomenon can be seen in verse history where Livius and Naevius were all but ignored after Ennius' Annales.

<sup>52</sup> Mellor (1999), 24.

<sup>53</sup> Mellor (1999), 20-21.

works of Sallust. Sisenna wrote an extended history of the Social War and its aftermath probably covering the period between 91 and 78 BCE. He is significant in relation to Sallust because the fragmentary *Histories* of Sallust pick up in 78 BCE where Sisenna left off.<sup>54</sup> Lastly, the *Commentarii* of Julius Caesar require mention. These works, the *Bellum Gallicum* and the *Bellum Civile*, are difficult to place in a genre. The term *commentarius* indicated a style of narration between a collection of raw facts and their elaboration in the artistic form typical of historiography. Caesar stated facts with simplicity but often dramatized certain scenes and inserted speeches.<sup>55</sup> It is not certain if they should be classified as biography, propaganda, history, or some combination of genres. They exerted a great deal of influence on literature at Rome and subsequent historians and thus should not be ignored.

The last significant historian (in relation to the monograph) before the time of Sallust was Polybius. He composed a history which was written in Greek concerning the Mediterranean world in forty books covering the period from 264 BCE down to 145 BCE.<sup>56</sup> F.W. Walbank calls Polybius the most important historical source for these years and, and he labels him a “sane and balanced writer though not free from prejudice.”<sup>57</sup> The first two books pick up where Timaeus left off; the text was in Greek but the focus was on Rome’s expansion east and west.<sup>58</sup> Polybius was very much concerned with the didactic function of history especially in relation to the education of leaders. Practical lessons and general wisdom were contained in his history for the edification of his

---

<sup>54</sup> Mellor (1999), 24.

<sup>55</sup> Conte (1999), 226.

<sup>56</sup> Only his *Histories* survive extant; Polybius, *The Histories*, 6 vols. Translated by W.R. Paton. Loeb Classical Library. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968-1980).

<sup>57</sup> Walbank (1993), 19.

<sup>58</sup> Luce (1997), 123.

readers. Historical truth was of paramount importance to Polybius, because only a true account could properly teach the lessons of history. This veracity, he believed, was achieved through autopsy and political experience.<sup>59</sup> Truth, according to Polybius, was also attained through a synoptic view of history as distinct from the monograph or special history which distorted the truth by inflating the importance and interest in its narrow subject. Polybius believed that the monograph or special history was incapable of grasping the wider nexus of causes and effects.<sup>60</sup> In fact, as mentioned above (pp. 1-2), he was quite critical in his opinion of the monograph and its effectiveness (Polyb.

Histories. 1.4.7-11):

καθόλου μὲν γὰρ ἔμοιγε δοκοῦσιν οἱ πεπεισμένοι διὰ τῆς  
κατὰ μέρος ἱστορίας μετρίως συνόψεσθαι τὰ ὅλα  
παραπλήσιόν τι πάσχειν, ὥς ἂν εἴ τινες ἐμφύχου καὶ  
καλοῦ σώματος γεγονότος διερριμμένα τὰ μέρη θεώμενοι  
νομίζοιεν ἱκανῶς αὐτοπται γίνεσθαι τῆς ἐνεργείας αὐτοῦ  
τοῦ ζῶον καὶ καλλονῆς. εἰ γάρ τις αὐτίκα μάλα συνθεῖς  
καὶ τέλειον αὐθις ἀπεργασάμενος τὸ ζῶον τῷ τ' εἶδει καὶ  
τῇ τῆς ψυχῆς εὐπρεπείᾳ, κᾶπειτα πάλιν ἐπιδεικνύοι τοῖς  
αὐτοῖς ἐκείνοις, ταχέως ἂν οἶμαι πάντα αὐτοὺς ὁμολογήσειν  
διότι καὶ λίαν πολὺ τι τῆς ἀληθείας ἀπελείποντο πρόσθεν  
καὶ παραπλήσιοι τοῖς ὀνειρώττουσιν ἦσαν. ἔννοιαν μὲν γὰρ  
λαβεῖν ἀπὸ μέρους τῶν ὅλων δυνατόν, ἐπιστήμην δὲ καὶ  
γνώμην ἀτρεκῇ σχεῖν ἀδύνατον. διὸ παντελῶς βραχὺ τι  
νομιστέον συμβάλλεσθαι τὴν κατὰ μέρος ἱστορίαν πρὸς  
τὴν τῶν ὅλων ἐμπειρίαν καὶ πίστιν. ἐκ μέντοι γε τῆς  
ἀπάντων πρὸς ἄλληλα συμπλοκῆς καὶ παραθέσεως, ἔτι  
δ' ὁμοιότητος καὶ διαφορᾶς, μόνως ἂν τις ἐφίκοιτο καὶ  
δυνηθείη κατοπτεύσας ἅμα καὶ τὸ χρήσιμον καὶ τὸ τερπνὸν  
ἐκ τῆς ἱστορίας ἀναλαβεῖν.

*He indeed who believes that by studying isolated histories he can  
acquire a fairly just view of history as a whole, is, as it seems to me,  
much in the case of one, who, after having looked at the dissevered  
limbs of an animal once alive and beautiful, fancies he has been as  
good as an eyewitness of the creature itself in all its action and grace.*

<sup>59</sup> Luce (1997), 128-130.

<sup>60</sup> Polybius, The Histories. Translated by Mortimer Chambers. (New York: Twayne Publishers, Inc., 1966), xxxiii.

*For could anyone put the creature together on the spot, restoring its form and the comeliness of life, and then show it to the same man, I think he would quickly avow that he was formerly very far away from the truth and more like one in a dream. For we can get some idea of a whole from a part, but never knowledge or exact opinion. Special histories therefore contribute very little to the knowledge of the whole and conviction of its truth. It is only indeed by study of the inter-connection of all the particulars, their resemblances and differences, that we are enabled at least to make a general survey, and thus derive both benefit and pleasure from history* (trans. by Paton, 11-13).

It is interesting to note that Cicero states that Polybius composed a monograph on the Numantine War (Cic. Ad fam. 5.12.2). This fact is difficult to reconcile given Polybius' condemnation of the format, but perhaps the fact that Polybius was an eyewitness to the siege of Numantia affected his choice of genre on the subject or perhaps he is simply defending his current style of writing. Most importantly, however, are the details that he provided about the monographic format.

This background in Greek and Roman historiography has several purposes: to establish the historiographic context in which Sallust was working and to note the presence of monographs in the Greek and Latin historical tradition previous to Sallust. The only definite Roman monographs are attributed to Coelius Antipater in his treatment of the Second Punic War<sup>61</sup> and Polybius' account of the Numantine War. So few fragments survive that we can say essentially nothing and can make no comparison with Sallust. As a result we have no idea to what degree Antipater or Polybius influenced and inspired Sallust in his choice of literary format.

The absence of a discussion of Cicero is perhaps surprising even though he did not compose history *per se*. His influence, however, on historical writing at Rome was

---

<sup>61</sup> Cicero refers to the proem of Antipater's treatment of the war at Orator 69.230. Cicero, Brutus and Orator. Translated by H.M. Hubbell. Loeb Classical Library. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962).

profound especially in the time of Sallust, and his role in the Catilinarian conspiracy was significant. The discussion of Cicero, Sallust and the monograph, therefore, merits its own chapter.

## Chapter 2

### Cicero, Sallust and the Monograph

Cicero's letter to Lucius Luceius ( Ad fam. 5.12), written in 56 BCE, is of particular importance in considering the Roman historical monograph because, in this letter, Cicero requests that Luceius compose a monograph to cover events from the beginning of the Catilinarian conspiracy to Cicero's return from exile in 57 BCE (Fam. 5.12.4). It is quite doubtful, however, that Sallust knew of this letter at the time it was written in 56/55 BCE as it was a private correspondence. Some letters of Cicero were collected and published after his death by his freedman M. Tullius Tiro<sup>1</sup> and it is commonly accepted that the Ad Familiares collection fell into this timeframe of publication. Before publication, Cicero referred to Tiro's efforts to collect the letters and his own desire to correct them (Ad Att. 16.5.5).<sup>2</sup> This particular correspondence dated from July 44 BCE but we have no certainty about when the letters circulated and moreover, the process of collection and correction would have taken a substantial amount of time. There is some dissent about when the Bellum Catilinae itself was published. Some scholars argue that it appeared immediately after Caesar's assassination and others assign a date of 40 BCE.<sup>3</sup> The probability that Sallust had access to any of Cicero's letters before the publication of the Bellum Catilinae is slim especially if we accept the earlier date. Nonetheless, the letter is important because it tells us how a "monograph" was defined in his day the major literary arbiter of the time. Therefore, an examination of

---

<sup>1</sup>Oxford Classical Dictionary. Third Edition. Eds. Simon Hornblower and Antony Spawforth. (Oxford and New York: Oxford Press, 1996), 1562. The reference to Tiro's collecting Cicero's letters can be found in Ad Att. 16.5.5.

<sup>2</sup>Cicero. Epistulae ad Atticum. Vol. 3. Translated by E.O. Winstedt, M.A. Loeb Classical Library. (London: William Heinemann, 1925).

<sup>3</sup>Sallust. The Works of Sallust. Translated by J.C. Rolfe. Loeb Classical Library. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000), xiii.



this letter will be useful in relation to Sallust's Bellum Catilinae in terms of content and scope.

The letter to Lucceius raises a few issues that require discussion before we examine the ways in which Cicero defines a monograph. First, it will be useful to consider Cicero's motivations for his request to Lucceius. Cicero desired Lucceius' work to confer those gifts that history often bestows upon famous men. He expresses his desire thus (Cic. Fam. 5.12.1):

*Ardeo cupiditate incredibili, neque, ut ego arbitror, reprehendenda, nomen ut nostrum scriptis illustretur et celebretur tuis.*

*I burn with incredible desire, not a desire that should be blamed as I think, that my name might be made famous and celebrated in your writing.*

Cicero, quite openly, confesses that he wants Lucceius' writing to give fame to his own name. Despite all his achievements, such as the consulship in 63 BCE, he still desires a written account to secure his place in history. The vehemence and urgency of his request is apparent in his language, *ardeo* and *cupiditate incredibili*. His desire is heightened by Lucceius' apparent skill and reputation as a writer of history. Cicero himself appears to have been a great admirer or at least an admirer in order to meet his own ends (5.12.1):

*Genus enim scriptorum tuorum, etsi erat semper a me vehementer expectatum, tamen vicit opinionem meam, meque ita vel cepit vel incendit, ut cuperem quam celerrime res nostras monumentis commendari tuis.*

*The style of your writing, although it has always been exceedingly desired by me, nevertheless it surpassed my expectation, and thus either captured me or set me afire, such that I desire my affairs to be recorded by your chronicles.<sup>4</sup>*

---

<sup>4</sup> All translations of Cicero and Sallust are my own.

Cicero is asking Luceius to perform the most basic duty of the historian, to record deeds and events (*res nostras monumentis commendari tuis*). He wants his achievements to be committed to writing in order to preserve them but not simply recorded by any historian. He longs to have *res nostras* chronicled by a skillful and stylish historian which apparently Luceius was in his opinion. Again the language used, *incendit* and *cuperem*, indicates the importance that Cicero attaches to his entreaty and perhaps suggests also, that the remuneration would equal his own zeal. One can sense, through such words, just how much Cicero desired to have his deeds preserved by Luceius. Cicero continues to elaborate his appeal (5.12.1):

*Neque enim me solum commemoratio posteritatis ac spes quaedam immortalitatis rapit sed etiam illa cupiditas ut vel auctoritate testimoni tui vel indicio benevolentiae vel suavitate ingeni vivi perfruamur.*

*Truly not only does the remembrance of posterity and a certain hope of immortality carry me but also that desire that I living might enjoy fully either the authority of your testimony or proof of your kindness or charm of your genius.*

Cicero here admits to his desire to receive a two-fold glory. History has long been regarded as at least one avenue to achieving immortality and Cicero hopes to achieve it at least, in part, through this proposed work. He also confesses to, perhaps, a much more gratifying wish, to enjoy the benefits of Luceius' work while still alive.

The desire to have his deeds recorded is so great that Cicero, if refused by Luceius, will be forced to take up the task himself (5.12.8). This last resort, however, he wished to avoid because such an account would have a dual drawback since the author must write with a certain degree of reserve when praising himself and pass over those things worthy of blame (5.12.8). According to Cicero (5.12.8) in autobiographical

writing there was less credibility (*ut minor sit fides*) and less authority (*minor auctoritas*).

These were characteristics which contributed to the effectiveness of historical writing.

The commemoration of his consulship was obviously too important for Cicero to risk it being marred by a lack of *fides* and *auctoritas*. In addition, such writing about oneself could be looked upon as too prideful and immodest (5.12.8). This task was too dear to his heart to allow any weakness that might compromise the history. In some of the closing words of the letter Cicero reiterated his desire to avoid this and his great desire that Luceius take up the task (5.12.9):

*Haec nos vitare **cupimus** et, si recipis causam nostram, vitabimus idque ut facias **rogamus**.*

*Ac ne forte mirere cur, cum mihi saepe ostenderis, te accuratissime nostrorum temporum consilia atque eventus litteris mandaturum, a te id nunc **tanto opere et tam multis verbis** petamus, illa nos **cupiditas incendit** de qua initio scripsi, festinationis, quod **alacres animo sumus** ut et ceteri viventibus nobis ex libris tuis nos cognoscant et nosmet ipsi vivi gloriola nostra perfruemur.*

*I wish to avoid these things, and if you take up my cause, I will avoid them; I beg that you would do this. And not by chance you might wonder why, when after you will have indicated to me that you are going to set down the policies and events of my years in writing, I request it from you now with such effort and with so many words, that desire of haste sets me afire, about which I wrote at the beginning, because I am eager in mind; so that others, while I am living, might get to know me from your works, and that I myself living might enjoy my little glory.*

With this passage Cicero leaves little doubt about either the vehemence or purpose of his request. Again the word choice clearly reflects the emotion with which Cicero appealed to Luceius. The language is very similar to the beginning of the letter in its expression of desire: *cupimus*, *incendit*, and *illa cupiditas*. The emphatic nature of *tanto opere* and *tam multis verbis* reflects the importance of the request for Cicero. We get, not only a

sense of his desire, but also a sense of urgency: *illa cupiditas festinationis* and *alacres animo sumus*. This feeling of haste is compounded when he again expresses his eagerness to enjoy the fruits of reputation and fame while still living: *ut et ceteri viventibus nobis ex libris tuis nos cognoscant et nosmet ipsi vivi gloriola nostra perfruamur*. So again we see that Cicero not only desired his fame and consulship to be immortalized by a history, but he also wished to bask in glory while living.

For my thesis, the central issue of the letter to Luceius is the object of Cicero's request, a monograph. He believed that a *modicum quoddam corpus* can be compiled from the beginning of the Catilinarian conspiracy to his return from exile (5.12.4). First it is necessary to address a question dealing with terminology. In the letter to Luceius, Cicero went into details about the characteristics of the account which he wanted from Luceius, but he ascribed a term to it only once and then indirectly. Cicero, in appealing to Luceius, proclaimed that Xenophon's account of Agesilaus of Sparta conferred more praise upon the king than portraits or statues: *unus enim Xenophontis libellus in eo rege laudando facile omnis imagines omnium statuasque superavit* (5.12.7). The first issue of importance is to realize that, by making, this allusion Cicero is labeling the work desired from Luceius as a *libellus*. This term can be rendered in English as "pamphlet" or "little book." The latter, I believe, conveys most accurately what Cicero intended. Cicero, therefore, did not use the term monograph but rather *libellus*. Monograph is a term not derived from Cicero but one applied later and used as a descriptive label referring to the type of history requested by Cicero and written by Sallust. The term *libellus* was also

used by the contemporary Neoteric poet Catullus to describe his collection of poetry: *cui dono lepidum nouum libellum arida modo pumice expolitum?* (c.1.1).<sup>5</sup>

Now let us turn to the characteristics of the monograph as requested by Cicero. The initial characteristic mentioned is one that corresponds to some previous Greek histories. Callisthenes, Timaeus, and Polybius, according to Cicero (5.12.2), detached wars from the continuity of Greek history. So, in like manner, Cicero wanted Lucceius to detach the Catilinarian conspiracy from other external hostilities and wars (5.12.2):

*...quin te admonerem ut cogitares coniunctene malles cum reliquis rebus nostra contexere an, ut multi Graeci fecerunt, Callisthenes Phocicum bellum, Timaeus Pyrrhi, Polybius Numantinum, qui omnes a perpetuis suis historiis ea quae dixi bella separaverunt, tu quoque item civilem coniurationem ab hostilibus externisque bellis seiungeres.*

*...Indeed I would advise you that you should consider whether you prefer to join together my affairs with other matters, or as many Greeks have done, as Callisthenes did the Phocian War, Timaeus the war of Pyrrhus, Polybius the Numantine War, who all separated those wars, which I said, from their own continuous histories, you also likewise should separate the civil conspiracy from hostile and external wars.*

Further on in the letter, Cicero, again, urged that Lucceius treat his actions and experiences separately (5.12.6):

*Quo mihi acciderit optatius si in hac sentential fueris, ut a continentibus tuis scriptis, in quibus perpetuam rerum gestarum historiam complecteris, secernas hanc quasi fabulam rerum eventorumque nostrorum.*

*Thereby it will be more welcome to me, if you will be of the opinion that you should detach this play, so to speak, of my affairs and fortunes from your continuous writings, in which you embrace an uninterrupted history of events.*

A monograph, therefore, as defined by Cicero is an episode separate from continuous historical accounts, a self-contained event and narrative. The focus should be more

---

<sup>5</sup> Catullus. The Poems of Catullus. Edited and translated by Guy Lee. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 2-3.

narrow and concentrated. As Cicero said, this monograph should cover only *a principio enim coniurationis usque ad reditum nostrum* (5.12.4). Lucceius' mind and effort are to be concentrated: *et simul, si uno in argumento unaque in persona mens tua tota versabitur* (5.12.2). Cicero set very narrow limits for the monograph in that it must center on one subject and one personality.

Lucceius was asked, not simply to give an account or description of this one subject and personality, but Cicero envisioned that the work should also be an analysis that delved into the causes and reasons behind the conspiracy. He explained to Lucceius that the *corpus* should be one (5.12.4):

*...in quo et illa poteris uti civilium commutationum scientia vel in explicandis causis rerum novarum vel in remediis incommodorum, cum et reprehendes ea quae vituperanda duces et quae placebunt, exponendis rationibus comprobabis.*

*...in which you will be able to use that knowledge of civil changes either in explaining the causes of the revolution or in putting forth remedies of its troubles, as you both censure those things which you consider ought to be blamed, and you approve, in expounding reasons, those things which please you.*

So far the characteristics of a monograph as defined by Cicero are that it must be an episode detached from continuous history, an episode that has a narrow range of focus both in time and concentration on one subject and one personality, and that it must be an exposition that involved the presentation of causes and reasons. The final characteristic to be addressed bears great similarity to tragic history, and, in fact, I believe that Cicero advocated that Lucceius introduce elements of tragedy into this monograph.

A brief recapitulation of the nature of tragic history, discussed in chapter one, is warranted.<sup>6</sup> Ullman argues that Aristotle's definitions of tragedy and history may have

---

<sup>6</sup> See chapter one pages 12-13.

triggered the development of opposing attitudes to history and its relationship to tragedy. Aristotle drew a clear distinction between the two genres and defined them as having quite divergent purposes. Tragic history, however, was not simply a reactionary movement but was influenced by other factors such as a desire to tell a good story and epic poetry (the source of stories for tragedy). Isocrates also influenced its development because of the emphasis he gave to the portrayal of the calamities of fortune.<sup>7</sup> Tragic history, therefore, was basically a reflection of its name in that it was a historical account but with elements of tragedy such as appealing to the emotions of the reader and a portrayal of the vicissitudes of fortune. I do not go so far as to say that tragic history was Cicero's desire but that elements of tragedy be introduced to enliven the narrative. The integration of tragic and dramatic elements was not novel to Cicero, but he does give considerable emphasis to their use in the proposed monograph. I believe that is correlated to the monograph, that is a short, condensed work could be enhanced and brought to its fullest esthetic because of the added drama.

Cicero believed that the events surrounding Catilina's conspiracy would provide Luceius with a variety of material that would hold the attention of the reader. There was nothing, according to Cicero, more capable of delighting the reader than the changes of circumstances and of fortune (5.12.4)<sup>8</sup>:

*Multam etiam casus nostri varietatem tibi in scribendo suppeditabunt plenam cuiusdam voluptatis, quae vehementer animos hominum in legendo te scriptore tenere possit. Nihil est enim aptius ad delectationem lectoris quam temporum varietates fortunaeque vicissitudines quae etsi nobis optabiles in experiendo non fuerunt, in legendo tamen erunt iucundae; habet enim praeteriti doloris segura recordatio delectationem...*

---

<sup>7</sup> B.L. Ullman, "History and Tragedy," *TAPA* 73 (1942), 26-28.

<sup>8</sup> A notion that goes back to Herodotus but was a prevalent element in some Hellenistic histories and tragic monographs.

*Indeed my misfortunes will furnish great variety for you in writing, a variety full of a certain pleasure, which would be able especially, with you as the writer, to capture the minds of men while reading. truly nothing is more suitable for amusement of the reader than changes and vicissitudes of fortune; which although not desirable for me in experiencing them, nevertheless will be pleasant in reading. Indeed an untroubled recollection of an experienced sorrow possesses delight...*

In this passage, several elements are tragic in nature: the desire to tell a good story and one that seized and retained the reader's attention through variety and the portrayal of the changes of fortune. Cicero believes that the reader could be actively engaged in the recollection of his *praeteriti doloris*. This last point is reminiscent of the cathartic aspect of tragedy. He continues this idea of the vicarious experience for the reader when he states: *ceteris vero nulla perfunctis propria molestia, casus autem alienos sine ullo dolore intuentibus, etiam ipsa misericordia est iuncunda* (5.12.5). Again Cicero declares that the *casus* of his life could furnish a medium for readers to experience them as well. The readers, through their feelings of pity and compassion, could become engaged in the text and experience a sort of pleasure. As Ullman points out, this is quite similar to Aristotle's statement that the tragic poet produced pleasure out of fear and pity (Poet. 14.1453b12).<sup>9</sup> Cicero listed as particularly effective examples the death of Epaminondas at Mantinea and the exile and return of Themistocles.<sup>10</sup> The *ordo ipse annalium* did not have the power to captivate the reader's interest, but the monograph that Cicero proposed had the power to incite emotion (5.12.5-6):

---

<sup>9</sup> Ullman (1942), 50.

<sup>10</sup> Cicero appears to be mistaken here because Themistocles did not return from his exile. After he was ostracized he went to Argos but eventually fled westwards to Corcyra and Epirus. Eventually he arrived in Asia Minor via Macedonia and the Aegean Sea. After 465 BCE King Artaxerxes made him governor of Magnesia where he apparently died a natural death but Thucydides does engage in some speculation of suicide by poison (Thuc. Pelop. War. 1.135-138).



*At viri saepe excellentis ancipites variique casus habent admirationem, exspectionem, laetitiam, molestiam, spem, timorem; si vero exitu notabili concluduntur, expletur animus iucundissima lectionis voluptate.*

*But often the uncertain and varied fortunes of a distinguished man contain astonishment, suspense, delight, vexation, hope, fear; if indeed they are concluded by a remarkable ending, the mind is filled with a most pleasant enjoyment of reading.*

Here again, Cicero discusses several tragic aspects that were effective in entertaining the reader. The changeable nature of fortune and its effects on distinguished men could incite a series of emotional responses that lead to the reader's enjoyment. Furthermore, Cicero was talking about a dramatic idea when he referred to the conclusion of their fortunes with a *notabili exitu*. He essentially was talking about a denouement or grand finale in the dramatic sense. If one translates *exitu* as "death" then the connection to tragedy is even stronger.

In the next section of the letter, the vocabulary used is also connected with that of the stage. In asking or suggesting that Lucceius detach the account from a continuous history, Cicero refers to it as *hanc quasi fabulam rerum eventorumque nostrorum* (5.12.6). *Fabula* is a term that can mean "story" or "account," but it was very often used to mean a "play" whether tragedy (*fabula palliata*) or comedy (*fabula togata*) or *fabula praetexta*, or historical drama in Roman dress, which Naevius introduced to Rome.<sup>11</sup> The "dramatic" terminology continues as Cicero describes this *fabula* as possessing *varios actus multasque <mut>ationes et consiliorum et temporum* (5.12.6).<sup>12</sup> *Actus* can be rendered as "acts" and if read so heightens the connection to Cicero's concept of the

<sup>11</sup> Mario Erasmo, *Archaic Latin Verse*. (Newburyport: Focus Publishing, 2001), 12.

<sup>12</sup> The text has suffered some corruption. Shackleton Bailey uses *mutations* but the Loeb edition edited by W. Glynn Williams uses *actiones*. *Actiones* coincides with the stage terminology and Williams translates it as "scenes." *Mutationes*, while not a term related to the stage, still echoes the changeability of fortune.

monograph as one which incorporates dramatic elements. Cicero was comparing his various political moves and times in office to “acts” and “performances.” This vocabulary clearly signifies that he believed that Lucceius’ monograph would be most compelling if it incorporates aspects of and models itself on, at least in part, tragedy to produce history with drama. Such was the conception of the monograph in Cicero’s eyes. It was a conception, as Sir Ronald Syme states, based upon drama, color, concentration and a theme of high politics.<sup>13</sup> The monograph through its focus on one personality and one subject and enhanced by elements of tragedy and drama would be *uberiora* and *ornatiora* in the words of Cicero (5.12.2). This introduction of drama into historical narrative was not unique to Cicero, but his emphasis on it is significant. The condensed nature of the monograph did not allow for elaborate digression or other lengthy commentary, so dramatic elements were intended to produce the maximum effect in limited space.

I will now discuss how the Bellum Catilinae incorporates the characteristics outlined by Cicero and the ways in which Sallust introduces his own innovative elements. Finally, I would like to discuss the effectiveness of the monograph as a historical account.

Cicero described a monograph as being an account of an episode that was detached from continuous history, focused in time and on one personality and one subject and embellished with elements of tragedy. This is a very apt description of the Bellum Catilinae. The Bellum Catilinae possesses focus both in time and in subject matter. Sallust does allow himself minor digressions when a) he recounts a highly abbreviated history of Rome (Cat. 6-13) and b) a brief account of the so-called First Conspiracy of Catilina in 66 BCE (18-19). Except for these two digressions, which still have direct

---

<sup>13</sup> Sir Ronald Syme, Sallust. (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2002), 57.

relevance to the main theme, the entire monograph addresses the conspiracy of 63 BCE. Sallust himself declares that he selects portions of Roman history that seem to him to be memorable (Sall. Cat. 4.2):

*...sed a quo incepto studioque me ambitio mala detinuerat, eodem regressus statui res gestas populi Romani carptim, ut quaeque memoria digna videbantur, perscribere.*

*...but having returned to the same pursuit, from which evil ambition had deterred me, I decided to write about the deeds of the Roman people individually, those things which seemed worthy of memory.*

There is differentiation made between the monograph and continuous history that Cicero speaks of in the letter to Lucceius, because Sallust refers to the entire canvas of Roman history, *res gestas populi Romani*, but announces his intention to address only selected portions that he deems most worthy. The keyword is the adverb *carptim* by which Sallust declares that he will treat his historical subjects individually.

Sallust concentrates his account on one personality: Catilina. The monograph is driven by the character and actions of this one man. Sallust engages in a lengthy description and analysis of not only Catilina's personality but also his personal history (5 and 14-16). Speeches are delivered in the monograph by both Caesar (51) and Cato (52) which are lengthy and dramatic and are important in gaining an understanding of the text. Sallust, in addition, gives an account of the dispositions and characters of these two men. This account is relatively brief and does not develop their characters to such an extent that they dominate the narrative itself but contribute considerably to Sallust's overall vision of Rome. The nature, character, and actions of Catilina are the central focus and driving force of the narrative.

The Bellum Catilinae is not just a narrative but also an analysis of events. Sallust asserts that Rome has become more depraved from its previous days of integrity and morality. He does not, however, simply state this, but attempts to explain his assertion by such arguments as the fall of Carthage that brought increased leisure and wealth which, in turn, led to a further decline in morality at Rome (10.1-6). Sallust himself declares that he has a desire to understand reasons and causes as, for example, when he is entering a discussion of what has made the Roman people great (53.2):

*Sed mihi multa legenti multa audienti quae populus Romanus domi militiaeque, mari atque terra praeclara facinora fecit, forte lubuit adtendere, quae res maxume tanta negotia sustinuisset.*

*But it pleased me, reading and hearing the many splendid deeds which the Roman people accomplished in peace and in war, on sea and on land, to direct my attention to what quality especially has sustained such affairs.*

Sallust does not want to accept these deeds at face value but to understand how they were accomplished. He goes on (53.3-6) to consider the issue and concludes that Rome completed these accomplishments by the merit of a few men: *paucorum civium egregiam virtutem* (53.4). Another instance of his historical analysis occurs when he describes the oath that Catilina demanded from his followers and the partaking of human blood to seal the pledge (22.1-3). Two explanations for these actions are put forth by Sallust a) Catilina did this to ensure greater loyalty amongst the conspirators due to the shared knowledge of such a dreadful deed (22.2) b) this and other details were exaggerated to ameliorate the criticism leveled at Cicero (22.3). Sallust states that there is not sufficient evidence for him to draw a conclusion (22.3). No pronouncement on the issue is made, but it is an instance of historical analysis because he presents varying ways

of interpretation. These are a few of examples of how Sallust engages in such analysis of historical events.

The final characteristic is the incorporation of the elements of tragedy. Cicero believed that Lucceius could engage and retain the reader's interest in his monograph through the use of certain qualities that are tragic or dramatic in nature. One quality was an emphasis on the changeability and the "ups-and-downs" of fortune which add interest to the story by eliciting emotion from the reader and allowing the reader to share vicariously the experience. The Bellum Catilinae is very much the story of a man, Catilina, who is subjected to the uncertain course of fortune. Catilina was born of a noble family and possessed some good qualities (5.1) and thus possessed positive potential. However, fired by factors such as his loss of the consulship in 63 BCE, he embarked on the road to revolution. Sallust presents us with the drama of Catilina's life. The fortunes of Catilina are as Cicero described: *at viri saepe excellentis ancipites varique casus habent admirationem, expectationem, laetitiam, molestiam, spem, timorem* (Fam. 5.12.5). The presentation of his fortunes allows the reader a vicarious experience and generates a range of emotions. Catilina is not an *excellens vir* as envisioned by Cicero, but, at one time, he possessed the potential to be so.

Sallust also uses the speeches of Caesar and Cato to affect the reader in a similar fashion. These speeches function on at least one level to trigger emotion (the speeches work on other levels as well which I will address later). In the case of Caesar's speech (51), the orator appeals to and invokes respect for Roman ancestors in that their models should be followed in rendering punishment upon the conspirators (51.4):

*Magna mihi copia est memorandi, patres conscripti, quae reges atque populi ira aut misericordia impulsu male consuluerint. Sed ea malo*

*dicere quae maiores nostri contra lubidinem animi sui recte atque ordine fecere.*

*There is plenty for me to relate, Fathers of the Senate, which kings and peoples who either driven by wrath or pity deliberated upon badly. But I prefer to tell about those things which our ancestors, against the passion of their own mind, did rightly and with order.*

This passage is a good example of the effectiveness of the entire speech. The invocation of the ancestors would have struck a chord in Sallust's aristocratic audience and would draw them into the history by appealing to the *mos maiorum*. It also succinctly encapsulates Caesar's entire argument against the execution of the conspirators a) to follow the precedent of the *maiores* and b) that passion must not be the guiding force behind the sentence. Thirdly, this short section echoes Sallust's discussion in the opening sections of the monograph about the necessity of the mind ruling over the body and passions (1.2-3). Sallust cleverly employs elements of his own philosophical ideas to construct Caesar's argument. Cato's speech (52), however, speaks to the fear of revolution within his audience when he speaks of the conspirators as: *qui patriae, parentibus, aris atque facis suis bellum paravere* (52.3). He also invokes the *mos maiorum* (52.21-23):

*Sed alia furere, quae illos magnos fecere, quae nobis nulla sunt; domi industria, foris iustum imperium, animus in consulendo liber, neque delicto neque lubidini obnoxius. Pro his nos habemus luxuriam atque avaritiam, publice egestatem, privatim opulentiam. Laudamus divitias, sequimur inertiam. Inter bonos et malos discrimen nullum, omnia virtutis praemia ambitio possidet. Neque mirum: ubi vos separatim sibi quisque consilium capitis, ubi domi voluptatibus, hic pecuniae aut gratiae servitis, eo fit, ut impetus fiat in vacuam rem publicam.*

*But there were other things which made those men great, things which are not present for us: diligence at home, just rule abroad, a free mind in deliberation neither subject to fault nor to passion. In place of these things we possess luxury and greed, public poverty,*

*and private opulence. We praise wealth, we follow laziness. There is no discrimination between good men and bad men, ambition holds all the rewards of virtue. Nor is it a wonder; when you each separately plan for himself, when at home you are slaves to pleasure, here you are slaves to money and favor, on that account it comes about that an attack develops against the idle republic.*

Cato's speech like that of Caesar's operates on various levels. Again we see an appeal to the ancestors which would trigger feelings of nostalgia and pride in Sallust's audience. Sallust uses the speech of Cato as well to serve his own agenda, because we see his doctrine of the mind functioning at its best when it rules over the body and its passions (*animus in consulendo liber neque delicto neque libidini obnoxius*). The philosophical thread that began in the initial sections runs through these speeches. We observe in Sallust's "mini-history" how he conceives of the Republic as suffering decline and reaching its nadir in his own day and this section of Cato's speech allows Sallust to attack the wrongs he sees in his own day through Cato's words. These speeches function on several levels at once and through their triggering of emotion in the audience help to add drama to the narrative.

Cicero also argues that the reader's enjoyment is further enhanced by a dramatic end to these fortunes, *exitu notabili* (Fam. 5.12.5). Sallust gives us just such an ending for Catilina. The description of the final battle between Catilina's forces and those of the Republic is marked by what can only be called Sallust's praise and admiration of the rebel army and its leader (61.1). The body of Catilina is found furthest in advance with a face showing his indomitable spirit (61.4-5):

*Catilina vero longe a suis inter hostium cadavera repertus est, paululum etiam spirans ferociamque animi, quam habuerat vivos, in voltu retinens.*

*Indeed Catilina was found far from his own men among the bodies of*

*the enemy, still breathing slightly and keeping his defiance of spirit in his face, as he had living.*

This perhaps is not exactly the type of *exitus* that Cicero had in mind and certainly not one he would have thought possible for himself. It can be classified, however, as a *notabilis exitus* and possesses considerable drama. This ending is highly dramatic and brings the monograph to an effective conclusion but at the same time raises questions. The nature of the *exitus* of Catilina generates ambiguity about Sallust's sentiments towards the man. In the majority of the work there is little uncertainty that Sallust regards Catilina as a danger to the state and an enemy. Yet at the end he emphasizes Catilina's nobility and courage in battle. It is curious why he chooses to raise these issues in the his reader's mind only at the work's conclusion. Catilina, however, throughout the monograph is a constant contradiction, because he is a man with proper background and talent yet he is corrupt. This fact, I believe, plays into Sallust's commentary on Roman society and the ideal Roman man (which I will discuss in chapter three).

The Bellum Catilinae is, therefore, a monograph very much in the style outlined by Cicero. It is a narrative of an episode detached from continuous history. There is focus in respect to time-frame and focus on one personality and one subject. The narrative is enlivened and embellished with elements of tragedy. Thus, the monograph integrates elements outlined by Cicero, but Sallust adds his own touches to the subgenre.

Indeed the Bellum Catilinae meets all the criteria set forth by Cicero and so, given that Cicero was a voice of literary authority at the time, it is reasonable to assert that it conformed to the contemporary definition of a monograph. In addition, Sallust was apparently following tradition in the titling of monographs because those that we know of



were centered on wars (this point contains uncertainty, because we are not sure if Sallust used this title or it was a later development). Cicero writes in the letter to Lucceius that Callisthenes, Timaeus and Polybius each composed monographs on wars (Cic. Ad fam. 5.12.2). The Latin historian, Coelius Antipater, wrote a monograph on the Second Punic War and introduced the format to Rome.<sup>14</sup> Sallust was apparently following tradition in his title and choice of subject matter with both the Bellum Catilinae and the Bellum Iugurthinum. However, there are elements in the Bellum Catilinae not addressed by Cicero in his letter to Lucceius. These elements, therefore, might be considered innovations on the part of Sallust. We have no way of knowing whether some of these elements were present in earlier monographs because none survive. The information in the letter to Lucceius, therefore, must be our main source of comparison and so those elements which I will label as innovative in Sallust are defined so in relation to Cicero's outline.

One might expect an account of the Catilinarian conspiracy to commence with a description of Catilina or the situation in Rome in 63 BCE, but Sallust begins on a very different note. The first four sections of the Bellum Catilinae are devoted to a philosophical discussion in which Sallust states that man's power and superiority to other animals lies in his body and mind and most especially in the fact that the mind rules the body. Not only warfare but also agriculture, navigation and architecture depend on mental excellence (Cat. 2.7-8). Sallust declares that he finds it most becoming to seek renown through the employment of the intellect (1.1-4). This philosophical exposition

---

<sup>14</sup> Ronald Mellor, The Roman Historians, (London and New York: Routledge, 1999), 20-21. Cicero refers to the proem of Antipater's work on the Second Punic War at Orator 69.230. Cicero. Brutus and Orator. Translated by H.M. Hubbell. Loeb Classical Library. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962).

serves two purposes. It functions as a forum for Sallust to state his belief that the intellect should be the guide of man.<sup>15</sup> More importantly, however, it lays the groundwork for Sallust's justification for the writing of history. He states what was commonly believed and practiced in his day by Roman noblemen: *pulchrum est bene facere rei publicae*. Public service was the main avenue to achieving reputation and honor. The composition of history is Sallust's pursuit now, because his political career has ended and he does not intend to waste his new found *otium*: *non fuit consilium socordia atque desidia bonum otium conterere* (4.1). However, he feels that he must justify and validate his new occupation, and so he continues to elaborate on the idea of service to the republic by saying that service through words is not trivial: *etiam bene dicere haud absurdum est* (3.1). He does not directly award equal repute to the narrator of deeds and to the performer of deeds but declares that the writing of *res gestas* to be among the most difficult of tasks, a task that is not accomplished by brute strength but by the intellect, and Sallust has already stated that mental excellence is the more appropriate avenue to renown (1.3). Sallust thereby is subtly asserting something that he denied before when he states: *tametsi haudquaquam par gloria sequitur scriptorem et actorem rerum* (3.2). I believe that Sallust uses this philosophical discussion about the superiority of the intellect to assert that the writing of history, because it is dependent upon the mind which he has defined as *rectius.....quam virium opibus* (1.3), is a greater accomplishment and service to the republic than *res gestas* themselves. I believe that this is both a clever and

---

<sup>15</sup> The prologue to the *Bellum Iugurthinum* is very similar in its philosophical theme (Sall. *Iug.* 1.1-4).

convincing use of philosophy and argumentation on Sallust's part to validate himself and his history to his readers.<sup>16</sup>

Sections six through thirteen of the Bellum Catilinae are devoted to a “mini-history” of Rome. It is a highly collapsed and abbreviated account of Rome from the time of Aeneas up until 63 BCE.<sup>17</sup> The presence of the historical summary itself is not surprising because it is simply a reflection of the well-established annalistic style of historical writing at Rome of starting at the fall of Troy and recounting events leading up to an event which was contemporaneous to the date of composition. Roman historical writing, as discussed in chapter one, was greatly influenced by the *annales* which were the yearly record of magistrates and events of public concern such as treaties, declarations of war and prodigies. Historical writing at Rome adopted this year by year method of recording and Ennius even entitled his historical epic poem the Annales. Many Roman historians, previous to Sallust, used this straightforward model of organization, including Fabius Pictor, Sempronius Asellio and Q. Claudius Quadrigarius, just to list a few. The fact that Sallust, therefore, went back to Rome's foundations and then moved up to contemporary times in this “mini-history” is not unusual.<sup>18</sup> This interaction between the monograph and annalistic format is significant. Sallust does not ignore previous tradition but integrates an annalistic style into his monograph.

---

<sup>16</sup> D.C. Earl puts forth a different interpretation of this prologue in which he argues that Sallust uses it to state his definition of *virtus* which is then applicable to the rest of the monograph. The prologue, I believe, is open to many interpretations and operates on various levels which include this argument of *virtus* and Sallust's validation of his new literary pursuit. D.C. Earl, The Political Thought of Sallust. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961), 5-17

<sup>17</sup> In comparison Ennius takes the first five books of his Annales to cover Roman history only up to 340 BCE.

<sup>18</sup> See chapter one pages 17-26 for a more detailed account of historical writing at Rome previous to Sallust.

What perhaps is surprising is the emphasis on morality in his “mini-history.” Sallust covers the period from the Trojan settlement up to the beginning of the Catilinarian conspiracy itself, and thus he covers the evolution of Rome’s history from the kings to the republic. Through this span of years Sallust mentions only two figures by name, Aeneas and Lucius Sulla. The mention of Aeneas is, of course, not unique and almost obligatory, but I think it is significant that the only other person mentioned by name in his “mini-history” is Sulla. There is no mention of Brutus, the Scipios or any of the traditional republican heroes. Sulla alone is named and condemned as a corruptor of the army and a conduit for eastern luxury and wantonness into Rome (11.5-7).<sup>19</sup>

The lack of historical figures and the particular mention of Sulla only in the Republican era is unusual and surprising but this may address a larger issue. Sallust is much more concerned with the subject of morality in this “mini-history” than with historical events or figures. The moral history of Rome to Sallust is very much one of initial greatness and subsequent decline. The early days of the Republic were a time when, according to Sallust, virtue reigned: *igitur domi militiaeque boni mores colebantur; concordia maxuma, minuma avaritia era; ius bonumque apud eos non legibus magis quam natura valebat* (9.1-2). This virtual “golden age” came to an end when Rome vanquished her rival Carthage. Fortune turned against Rome with the fall of her rival city: *saevire fortuna ac miscere omnia coepit* (10.2). Avarice, insolence, cruelty and ambition destroyed the noble qualities of earlier time (10.4-6). The vices grew until the entire state was infected: *post ubi contagio quasi pestilentia invasit, civitas immutata, imperium ex iustissimo atque optumo crudele intolerandumque factum*

---

<sup>19</sup> D.C Earl discusses Sallust’s view of the moral crisis in great detail and emphasizes that Sallust produces an idealized, over-generalized account, because he focuses too much on the *concordia* previous to 146 BCE and ignores pre-existing aspects of moral decline (Earl [1961], 41-59).

(10.6). Sulla is described as the one who dealt the final blow to the “moral” republic (11.4-7). The subject of morality pervades Sallust’s “mini-history” and especially the emphasis on Rome’s moral decline after the defeat of Carthage. The idea of Rome’s moral decline is not unique to Sallust, but the degree of emphasis on morality and the absence of historical events and figures is striking especially the absence of Republican heroes. In particular it is striking that the sole figure mentioned in Republican times is Sulla who is condemned by Sallust.

It should be noted that his model of descent from an almost “mythic” golden age to a corrupt age is not an invention of Sallust. This method of analyzing civilization was a standard literary *topos* of the Greeks and the Romans. Hesiod in this Works and Days (110-200) lists five ages of man beginning with a golden age and ending with an immoral iron age.<sup>20</sup> Livy also, who started to compose his history Ab urbe condita not long after Sallust, viewed the past as a gradual decline. He did not divide his model into ages but simply a progression from a moral time to his own contemporary immoral times (1.10-12).<sup>21</sup> In the first century AD Ovid in his Metamorphoses (much like Hesiod) viewed civilization in terms of ages and a descent from a golden age to an age of iron (1.90-150).<sup>22</sup> Sallust, therefore, is using a well-established *topos* but binds it cleverly into his presentation. It is woven into the plot so that it contributes to the whole portrayal of Catilina.

---

<sup>20</sup> Hesiod. The Homeric Hymns and Homeric. Translated by Hugh G. Evelyn White. Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967).

<sup>21</sup> Livy. Ab Urbe Condita. Vol. 1. Translated by B.O. Foster. Loeb Classical Library. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1939).

<sup>22</sup> Ovid. Metamorphoses. Vol. 1. Translated by Frank Justus Miller. Loeb Classical Library. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966).

This “mini-history” is a systematic progression from a moral Roman state to one that grows gradually more and more corrupt and immoral after the fall of Carthage. The systematic and progressive nature of this account is very deliberate on Sallust’s part and it has a teleological function. Sallust makes the conspiracy of Catilina the culmination of Rome’s moral decline and corruption. All the luxury, insolence and greed have set the stage for this extraordinary act or as Sallust himself describes it (4.4-5):

*nam id facinus in primis ego memorabile existumo sceleris atque periculi novitate.*

*For it was an evil deed memorable, I think, among the most notable crimes and memorable in the novelty of its danger.*

He presents the conspiracy in such a way as to attempt to convince his audience that Catilina and his actions are the crowning event to Rome’s descent into immorality. This argument is reinforced by the abrupt transition that Sallust makes from the end of the “mini-history” to Catilina and the formation of his conspiracy. He jumps straight from condemning his contemporaries and the state of Rome to Catilina’s recruitment of conspirators (14.1-2):

*in tanta tamque corrupta civitate Catilina, id quod factu facillimum erat, omnium flagitiorum atque facinorum circum se tamquam stipatorum catervas habebat.*

*in a state so great and so corrupt Catilina, it was such an easy thing to do, held around himself throngs of every disgrace and crime just as crowds of attendants.*

This first phrase is especially interesting because its construction supports this teleological argument. Sallust, in this short phrase, juxtaposes *Catilina* with *tanta corrupta civitate* and through their proximity both connects and equates Catilina to the corrupt state. The connection is further strengthened by the alliteration of *corrupta*

*civitate Catilina*. Through this use of alliteration Sallust joined together corruption, the state and Catilina. Rome's history, as conceived by Sallust, culminates in corruption and immorality, and he juxtaposes this end to the beginnings of the Catilinarian conspiracy. This is completely deliberate and thus fulfills the teleological purpose of his "mini-history."

In the Bellum Catilinae Sallust on several occasions engages in elaborate descriptions of both historical figures and places. Some of these descriptions are of interest because they are essentially about elements secondary to the storyline of the conspiracy yet Sallust invests them with a great deal attention and detail. The first instance, a description of Catilina, is primary to the story but still striking in its condensed detail (5.1-5):

*L. Catilina, nobili genere natus, fuit magna vi et animi et corporis, sed ingenio malo pravoque. Huic ab adulescentia bella intestina, caedes rapinae discordia civilis grata fuere, ibique iuventutem suam exercuit. Corpus patiens inediae, algoris vigiliae supra quam quoiquam credibile est. Animus audax, subdolus, varius, quoius rei lubet simulator ac dissimulator, alieni adpetens, sui profusus, ardens in cupiditatibus; satis eloquentiae, sapientiae parum. Vastus animus immoderata incredibilia, nimis alta semper cupiebat.*

*Lucius Catilina, born from a noble family, was powerful in the force of both his mind and his body, but with an evil and perverse nature, to this man from his youth civil wars, slaughter, pillage, civil unrest were pleasing, therein he occupied his own youth. His body was tolerant of hunger, cold, and lack of sleep beyond that which was believable for anyone. His mind was bold, cunning, inconstant, concerning any matter it pleased him to be a pretender or a faker, greedy for the possessions of another, lavish of his own, burning in his passions; there was enough eloquence in him, too little wisdom. His crude mind craved immoderate, incredible, things always very high..*

This passage is notable because of the degree of description and detail conveyed in such a condensed fashion. There are a great number of adjectives crammed into such a short

passage, yet it has an easy, readable flow. Sallust creates a vivid image of Catilina and lends considerable vitality to him, and it is an impressive literary feat to create the persona of Catilina so vividly in such a condensed fashion.<sup>23</sup>

The other noteworthy source in which we find a description of Catilina is the orations of Cicero delivered during his consulship against Catilina. One finds that the Ciceronian portrayal differs markedly from the Sallustian one. In both portrayals, the overall character of Catilina is similar: audacious, greedy, a corruptor of youth and possessing great tolerance of extreme conditions. A contrast arises between Ciceronian and Sallustian styles. Cicero is florid and verbose with lengthy and detailed depictions of Catilina. Cicero does not confine himself to a single portrait of the man but rather all four orations are filled with Cicero's elaborations on Catilina's nature and character. Sallust, however, confines his depiction predominately to the above passage [there is a discussion of his corruption of the youth (24.1-7) and his affair with Aurelia Orestilla (25.1-5)]. This one passage, condensed and distilled by Sallust, encapsulates the man. This is not to imply that the Sallustian style excels the Ciceronian, but each style was fashioned and constructed for its individual purpose and format. The style demanded by Cicero's orations differed markedly from that demanded by Sallust's monograph. Catilina's portrayal in the orations and in this monograph serve as proof that genre quite often dictates certain elements of composition and style.

Sallust gives us another vivid description which is equally condensed yet detailed, but it is even more notable because it is about a woman and a figure that plays relatively minor role in the conspiracy. Catilina won the support of a few women through whom he

---

<sup>23</sup> A similar style of condensed, vivid description can be found on occasion in Suetonius' De Vita Caesarum, for example the life of Divus Iulius 1.45 and Divus Augustus 2.79-80.



hoped to either win their husbands over to his cause or as a means to incite the city slaves (24.3-4). Sempronia was among these women, and Sallust devotes considerable attention to her description where he uses the same combination of detail and condensation for her portrayal. Sempronia was apparently an extraordinary woman who possessed masculine daring: *quae multa saepe virilis audaciae facinora commiserat* (25.1-2). She was a woman skilled culturally as well: *litteris Graecis Latinis docta, psallere [et] saltare elegantius quam necesse est probae, multa alia, quae instrumenta luxuriae sunt* (25.2). Culture, however, did not endow her with morality: *sed ei cariora semper omnia quam decus atque pudicitia fuit* (25.3). These are only a few examples of the elaborate portrayal that Sallust gives to Sempronia. As stated above, the description itself is striking because of its style, but this instance is even more so because Sallust devotes such care and attention to someone who is essentially an insignificant character.<sup>24</sup>

Quintus Curius, one of the members of the conspiracy, is treated with similar descriptive skill. Sallust manages to encapsulate the man's character in a brief space (23.1-4). He is described as a man: *natus haud obscuro loco, flagitiis atque facinoribus coopertus, quem censores senatu probri gratia moverant* (23.1-2). An equal amount of vanity and audacity reside in Curius, and he could neither keep a secret nor even hid his own crimes (23.2). Curius' nature even leads him to threaten his mistress, Fulvia, if she did not bow to his will (23.3). When Fulvia learns of Curius' involvement in the conspiracy, she reveals her knowledge and this led to the eventual exposure of the plot

---

<sup>24</sup> Thomas Scanlon discusses the character sketches of Sallust in the *Bellum Catilinae* and their similarity to those of Thucydides. He implies that character sketches are used as *exempla virtutis aut vitii* by Sallust. Scanlon also states that Sallust follows Thucydides' self-confidence in the judgment of personalities but is not as subtle in his praise and condemnation. The Sallustian sketches, according to Scanlon, do still embrace the same psychological and political criteria which Thucydides often describes, namely the abilities to think, to act and to speak. Thomas Francis Scanlon, *The Influence of Thucydides on Sallust*. (Heidelberg: Carl Winter-Universitätsverlag, 1980), 84-89.

(23.4). I believe this character description of Curius serves a dual purpose. Most obviously it is an avenue for the introduction of Fulvia and her role in revealing the conspiracy. Secondly, I believe Sallust uses the description to represent the character of the conspirators as a whole. Catilina's nature is described earlier but little information is given about his followers. I think, therefore, that we are meant to see in Curius the character of all the conspirators, and thus Sallust makes economical use of this portrait of Curius.<sup>25</sup>

Sallust does not limit his attention and descriptive talents to historical persons only but turns them also to a setting. Lentulus and the other conspirators who are apprehended in Rome are sentenced to death by Cicero and the Senate and their execution is carried out in the Tullianum (55.5-6).<sup>26</sup> Sallust does not simply name this as the site of execution but goes into specifics about it (55.3-5):

*Est in carcere locus, quod Tullianum appellatur, ubi paululum ascenderis ad laevam, circiter duodecim pedes humi depressus; eum muniunt undique parietes atque insuper camera lapideis fornicibus iuncta: sed incultu tenebris odore foeda atque terribilis eius facies est.*

*There is a place in the prison, which is called the Tullianum, when you will have gone up a little to the left, sunk about twelve feet below the ground. Walls close around it on all sides and above a vault joined with stone arches: but its appearance is terrible with neglect, darkness and foul odor.*

Again Sallust delves into considerable detail on a subject seemingly minor to the storyline. Why does he devote so much attention to the Tullianum? Perhaps one reason is to increase the drama of the executions and to emphasize the gruesome aspect of the

---

<sup>25</sup> There are also character sketches of Caesar and Cato, but I would like to deal with those in a different context.

<sup>26</sup> Samuel B. Platner discusses the layout and archaeology of this prison and references the other places in ancient authors where it is mentioned. See Samuel Ball Platner. The Topography and Monuments of Ancient Rome. Second Edition. (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1911), 250-252.

act of execution. Sallust may perhaps even be making a subtle comment or even condemnation of the decision to execute these conspirators. It is also a way to induce fear and terror in the reader. Sir Ronald Syme posits that digressions and speeches lend variety to the work and that they are devices that allow a historian to free himself in time and space and elaborate on themes important to him.<sup>27</sup> They are avenues for the historian to introduce personal commentary into the narrative. Sallust uses the *est locus* construction in an unconventional way, because it is normally used as a device to remove the reader from the narrative to a mythological setting.<sup>28</sup> Here the construction serves the opposite function and grounds the reader firmly in a physical locality.

The descriptive emphasis given to the Tullianum is more striking, because Sallust gives no other location equal attention. This passage is an example of Sallust's ability to take one element and make it function on multiple levels. This skill is at work throughout the monograph and is one way that Sallust exploits the full potential of this format. As stated above, the episode serves to inspire fear and terror in the reader. It also may be an avenue through which Sallust subtly condemns the decision to execute these men. One might expect other locations to receive considerable treatment, such as the Mulvian Bridge where the republican forces captured some conspirators with the aid of the Gauls and which is an important juncture in the narrative and in the defeat of Catilina. Cicero, in the third oration against Catilina, gives considerable detail of the scene: republican forces invest the bridge as it is growing dark, guards are stationed in surrounding villas with the Tiber and bridge between them and the conspirators are seized around three in the morning (3.4.5). Sallust, however, merely states that

---

<sup>27</sup> Sir Ronald Syme, *Sallust*. (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2002), 68.

<sup>28</sup> For example Ennius in the *Annales* uses the construction to draw the reader to a more legendary time and place: *Est locus, Hesperiam quem mortales perhibebant*. See Erasmo *Archaic Latin Verse* (2001), 39.

republican forces secretly guarded the bridge and the Gallic envoys and conspirators were captured there (45.1-5). One would also expect mention of the temple of Jupiter Stator where Cicero convened an emergency meeting of the Senate. Cicero mentions the temple several times and even addresses Jupiter Stator in the First Catilinarian oration (1.13.33). Sallust, however, makes little reference to the Senate meeting under these unusual circumstances. He states simply that Catilina came into the Senate and Cicero then delivered his oration against him (31.4-9). One meeting of the conspirators at the home of Marcus Laeca gets considerable attention from Sallust (20.1-22.3).<sup>29</sup> At this particular meeting Catilina delivers a speech to his followers and seals their alliance with the drinking of human blood (22.1-3). The veracity of this statement can not be proven but its inclusion is purposeful. I believe that Sallust uses this detail to reflect the depravity of both Catilina and the corrupt state of the republic. Sallust gives details of the meeting but no geographical or physical descriptions of the locale. The Tullianum is the only location which Sallust describes with any degree of physicality.

The passage about the Tullianum can function on yet another level. The foul and terrible nature of the prison is juxtaposed beside Lentulus: *ita ille patricius ex gente clarissima Corneliorum* (55.6). We see a nobleman, a Roman of the highest order being let down into this lowly place to be executed. The other captured conspirators meet the same fate (55.6). We see what should be the pinnacles of Roman society sinking (quite literally) to the lowest depths because of their crimes. Sallust emphasizes the rank and pedigree of Lentulus and the circumstances of his death in the Tullianum purposefully. It is a reflection of Sallust's opinion of contemporary Roman society and the nadir to which

---

<sup>29</sup> It is not explicitly stated by Sallust that this meeting takes place at the home of Marcus Laeca. I believe that one can conclude this based on a subsequent meeting at Laeca's house (27.3). Here Sallust uses the adverb *rursus* and so this implies that the first meeting had also been at this location.

it had arrived. Society was chaotic and the opposite of the way it should be as it was in Rome's initial years. The juxtaposition of the patrician Lentulus and the Tullianum serve as commentary on Roman society. This theme of Roman society being unnatural is one that runs throughout the monograph and one which I would like to address separately.

The two speeches delivered by Caesar and Cato are integral to Sallust's vision of Roman society and function on several levels at once. They work as counterpoints to each other with Caesar and Cato arguing both sides of the debate over the appropriate punishment for the conspirators. Caesar argues for the exercise of moderation (51) and hence for exile, and Cato proposes the most severe punishment of death (52). The two speeches show considerable Thucydidean influence. Thomas Scanlon points out that the speeches of Thucydides and Sallust serve a dual purpose of elaborating important themes and characterizing significant individuals.<sup>30</sup> The speeches of Caesar and Cato certainly address an important issue, the suitable punishment for the conspirators captured in Rome. It is a debate literally between life and death and had wide implications, as Cicero was to painfully learn from his exile which stemmed from their eventual execution. Sallust goes on later (54) to make a direct and pointed comparison between Cato and Caesar but also accomplishes an equally effective comparison with these two speeches.

Sallust, like Thucydides, also uses speeches to characterize important individuals. In the Catilinarian debate, Caesar expresses his characteristic *mansuetudo* and *misericordia* and Cato his characteristic *severitas* and *dignitas* (51-52).<sup>31</sup> The speeches, in addition, show a concern, especially since both sides of the issue are presented, for extracting the general truth and elucidating historical events, both of which are

---

<sup>30</sup> Thomas Francis Scanlon, The Influence of Thucydides on Sallust. (Heidelberg: Carl Winter-Universitätsverlag, 1980), 90.

<sup>31</sup> Scanlon (1980), 91.

characteristic of the speeches of Thucydides. Both historians present speeches that they consider to be most revealing of the issues behind historical events or most characteristic of the speakers themselves.<sup>32</sup> Sallust does both with the speeches of Caesar and Cato.

One final point, not necessarily an innovation in the sub-genre, but a point of originality, is that Sallust composed this monograph on the Catilinarian conspiracy with only the slightest reference to Cicero as a participant. In the Bellum Catilinae Cicero is referred to approximately twenty-six times either by name or by his title of consul. Almost half of these references are contexts in which Cicero is taking no action but is a passive recipient of information or attack. This is certainly in contrast to the importance Cicero attached to his own role in the letter to Lucceius and the Catilinarian orations. The letter to Lucceius certainly assigns the focus to Cicero. In the Catilinarian orations we see continuous mention of Cicero's personal efforts and actions taken to protect the city and dispel the conspiracy. Cicero, whether through exaggeration or merit, portrays himself as the rescuer of the republic. This is not at all the image we get in the Bellum Catilinae, and Cicero's historical role in the suppression of the conspiracy would be considerably smaller if Sallust were our sole source. Sallust does remark on the noteworthy fact that Cicero was a *novus homo* (23.5-6), and some actions of the consul's are remarked upon such as the inducement of Quintus Curius to reveal his knowledge of Catilina's plans (26.3-4). Sallust describes Cicero's first oration against Catilina as brilliant and a great service to the state (31.6-7). Sallust does say that Cicero defended the city (36.3) and engineered the plan to gain the Allobroges' aid in revealing the conspiracy (41.5).

---

<sup>32</sup> Scanlon, (1980), 92.

What is the reason for Sallust's relative inattention to Cicero's role? One might argue for personal motivation fueled by dislike. It is perhaps best, however, not to reduce the matter to a personal level with such distant hindsight. It would be difficult to formulate a convincing argument of total animosity given the fact that some of Sallust's comments are positive towards Cicero and the role he played in the conspiracy. The First Catilinarian, for example, is described by Sallust as brilliant and a great service to the state (31.6). At another point Cicero is referred to as the best of consuls, *optumo consuli* (43.1). The relatively minor role given to Cicero in the Bellum Catilinae should perhaps be attributed to another reason. The tone of the work is pessimistic and critical of Roman society. Over attention to and praise of Cicero's success in dealing with the conspiracy would not fit into Sallust's theme of decline. The monograph is an exposition of Rome's descent and corruption as seen by Sallust. A focus on Cicero and his successful exposure of the revolution would not fit into the vision that Sallust wished to present.

The Bellum Catilinae is thus a monograph that corresponds to the characteristics put forth for the genre by Cicero but is also one that contains innovations introduced to the format by Sallust. This combination of "established" elements and innovations make this monograph a highly effective work of history in several respects.

### Chapter 3

#### Understanding the Monograph Through Philosophy

Sallust uses the monographic format to focus on the Catilinarian conspiracy but magnifies it onto a much larger stage to comment on Roman history and society. In the monograph he presents us with his view of the world and Roman people. Catilina and his revolt form the nadir of Roman civilization. The conspiracy is the nucleus from which Sallust expands his view of the larger world and through it he tries to convey his understanding of the world to his audience. This understanding, I believe, is based on a philosophical thread that runs through the entire work, a thread that weaves in and out of the text and is a key to understanding the text.

The first four sections of the monograph are devoted to a philosophical discussion. As shown earlier, Sallust uses this material to state his idea that the mind should be the guide of man and to justify the writing of history. The philosophy presented also runs throughout the work and factors into Sallust's concept of Rome's degeneration.

It will be helpful first to review the core elements of this philosophical introduction. Man's power lies in the body and the mind with the mind ruling over the body (1.2-3):

*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.*

*But all our power is found in the mind and in the body; we use the rule of the mind, we use rather the service of the body; the one is in common with the gods, the other in common with the beasts.*



Glory should be sought by means of the mind rather than physical force: *quo mihi rectius videtur **ingeni** quam virium opibus gloriam quaerere* (1.3). It has proven true that the power of the mind avails most in war (2.2). Strength of mind, if employed to the same extent in peace as in war, can bring order and stability (2.3-5):

*Quod si regum atque imperatorum **animi** virtus in pace ita ut in bello valeret, aequabilius atque constantius sese res humanae haberent, neque aliud alio ferri neque mutari ac misceri omnia cerneret. Nam imperium facile iis artibus retinetur, quibus initio partum est.*

*If the strength of mind of kings and rulers would be as strong in peace as in war, human affairs would hold themselves more level and more stable, you would not see one thing to be passed to another nor would you see everything to be changed and confused. For rule is easily retained by the skills by which it was created in the beginning.*

Proper use of the mind, therefore, brings order. This concept is key to understanding Sallust's history and his view of Roman society. Sallust asserts that men do not properly employ their minds (2.8):

*Sed multi mortales, dediti ventri atque somno indocti incultique vitam sicuti peregrinantes transigere; quibus profecto **contra naturam** corpus voluptati, **anima** oneri fuit.*

*But many men given over to the stomach and to sleep, unlearned and uncultured go through life as travelers; for whom truly contrary to nature the body is for pleasure, the mind as a burden.*

Improper use of or neglect of the mind is against nature. The issue of something being unnatural is another element to Sallust's concept of Rome's corruption. Nature created the beasts to be obedient to their stomachs and face to the ground (1.1-2). However, nature intended man to be ruled by his mind and thereby control his passions. Proper use

of the mind and conforming to nature's intent brings order. These philosophical elements are keys to understanding Sallust's concept of Rome's decline.

The location of this philosophical discussion at the very opening of the monograph is an indicator of its importance as a guide to understanding the entire work. The word *animus* shows up repeatedly throughout the text.<sup>1</sup> The central theme of the work is the Catilinarian conspiracy and how it is representative of the nadir of Rome. Through the conspiracy Sallust wants the reader to understand the larger world of Roman society, at least how he conceives of it.

In Sallust's view, Rome declined from a "golden age" to the degenerate state of his own day. The "mini-history" or archaeology section of the monograph is where we find Sallust's story of Rome. The *animus* played a role in these initial "golden" years. The welfare of the state was ensured by the counsel of a chosen few: *delecti, quibus corpus annis infirmum, ingenium sapientia validum erat, rei publicae consultabant* (6.6). When the rule of kings eventually turned to tyranny, the Romans devised the consulship and hoped through this device to curb unlimited authority: *eo modo minime posse putabant per licentiam inolescere animum humanum* (6.7). It is important to note Sallust's emphasis on control of the *animus*. At that time the state grew even stronger as each man kept his mind at ready: *sed ea tempestate coepere se quisque magis extollere magisque ingenium in promptu habere* (7.1). Men used what nature had given them: *ingenium nemo sine corpore exercebat* (8.5). Good morals were cultivated at home where harmony and justice prevailed not as much by means of laws as by nature: *non legibus magis quam natura* (9.1) We are meant to understand *natura* here in the sense

---

<sup>1</sup> The concept of the mind is found numerous times in the text. Subsequent to the introductory sections *ingenium* appears ten times, *mens* appears four times and *animus* appears forty-six times. The frequency lends validity to fact that the concept is key.

that men at that time were behaving the way nature intended by using the mind as a guide. This, I believe, echoes the ideas Sallust states in the beginning sections. Proper use of the mind brings order and in this case a “golden age.”

The fall of Carthage, according to Sallust, initiates Rome’s decline. With the fall of Carthage, the role of the *animus* changes and with it Rome’s character is altered. Noble qualities are replaced by arrogance and cruelty (10.4). It became practice to show a good front rather than to possess a good mind: *magisque voltum quam ingenium bonum habere* (10.5-6). Avarice held sway which makes the manly mind and body effeminate: *corpus animumque virilem effeminat* (11.3). The mind is being corrupted and being made into something contrary to nature. Sulla and the advent of Eastern luxury added further corruption: *loca amoena voluptaria facile in otio ferocis militum animos molliwerant* (11.5-6). In this atmosphere where the mind was weakened and was not properly employed we see more of the unnatural. Mountains were leveled to accommodate the houses for the rich and the wealthy built even on the sea (13.1-2). Men acted the part of women: *virī muliebria pati* (13.3). The people who were so habituated to indulgence slept before necessary and did not wait on the onset of hunger and thirst to partake (13.3). Improper use of the *animus*, according to Sallust, has led to disorder and corruption. Rome is now the opposite of what it was in the “golden age” where the mind was guide.

Catiline and the conspiracy are the culmination of Rome’s descent. Accordingly, we see in Catiline the epitome of the opposition to Sallust’s philosophy. There was a great force in both his mind and body but that mind was evil and perverse: *sed ingenio malo pravoque* (5.1). It was also *audax*, *subdolus* and *varius* (5.4). Such a mind was not

capable of control and indeed Catilina was ruled by his passions: *ardens in cupiditatibus* (5.4-5). This presentation is in direct contrast to Sallust's conception of how a man should be ruled by a sound mind. Catilina is the ultimate product of a society that has opposed nature in its abuse of the mind.

Catilina furthered his enterprise by recruiting among the youth of Rome. This was all the easier because their minds were susceptible: *eorum animi molles etiam et [aetate] fluxi dolis haud difficulter capiebantur* (14.5-6). He won them over by noting and appealing to their desires (14.6). Here again we see how Sallust weaves his philosophy into the text and into the corruption of Rome. The *animus* is not employed properly and chaos and revolution are the results.

There are two other examples of the "unnatural" that I would like to focus on. Sempronia is an excellent example of what Sallust perceives as an unnatural product of a corrupt Rome. She is a woman that goes against nature because often she has committed crimes of masculine daring: *quae multa saepe virilis audaciae facinora commiserat* (25.1). Her skill at dancing was more than necessary and she held her chastity and modest cheapest of all things (25.3). Sempronia pursued men more than she was pursued by them (25.3-4). In short this woman was the opposite of a proper Roman matron. Her abilities and actions were unnatural and in Sallust's view a product of a corrupt city.

The description of the Tullianum (55.3-5) is another example where we see the "unnatural." The juxtaposition of the prison and Lentulus is deliberate and pointed on Sallust's part. The Tullianum is hideous in its subterranean darkness and foul odor. Lentulus, a patrician of illustrious pedigree, is lowered into it and strangled. The scenario seems somehow unsettling and literally unnatural. Roman patricians are not supposed to

die in such a manner. It is shocking that the highest level of society meets such a lowly demise.

Catilina is the central character of the monograph and is the representation of Rome's nadir. He is the culmination of Rome's decline and corruption and the ultimate product of a society that has lost the guiding principle of the *animus*. Sallust gives considerable attention to two other men: Caesar and Cato. Both give speeches that present the opposing sides of the Senatorial debate concerning the sentence necessary for Lentulus and the other conspirators captured in the city (51 and 52). Sallust also compares the two men (53) whom he states are the two greatest men in his own lifetime. Given the focus on Caesar and Cato they must fit into Sallust's concept in an important way.

Their speeches function on several levels. As discussed earlier, they add drama and invoke emotion in the audience. They are used as a device to present both sides of the debate over the fate of the conspirators. I believe that Cato and Caesar are used by Sallust to help create a frame of the Roman aristocrat. There is a very important relationship constructed between Catilina, Caesar and Cato. Sallust uses these three to create the frame. The issue is what makes a proper Roman man. Based on the philosophical introduction I argue that Sallust considers the ideal Roman man to be one who, obedient to nature, employs his mind to rule the body and to serve the state (as he himself did by composing history). It is clear that Sallust does not conceive of Catilina as the ideal Roman. The presentation of Cato and Caesar is not so clear. There is a fluidity between the three men. All are Roman upper class so they share a common history, morals, education and *mos maiorum*. There is even a fluidity between their speeches.

The speeches of all three contain concepts used by Sallust as part of his philosophy of the *animus*. Catilina, for example, condemns the wealthy few who level mountains and build on the seas (20.11) just as Sallust in his own words had done in his “mini-history” (13.1-2). In a similar vein Cato rants against the wealthy men of the Senate and their passion for their possessions (52.5). Caesar and Cato both use Sallust’s philosophy to support their opposing arguments. Caesar asserts that the mind can best deliberate when free of passion: *ubi intenderis ingenium, valet si libido possidet, ea dominatur, animus nihil valet* (51.3-4). Cato praises the same trait in Roman ancestors: *animus in consulendo liber neque delicto neque libidini obnoxious* (52.21-22). Cato does not believe that the Romans of his own day have such a mind. It is interesting that Sallust puts such similar ideas in the opposing arguments of Caesar and Cato. Both speeches also contain appeals to the ancestors and *mos maiorum*. Sallust comes down clearly on the side of neither man, and he allows both to speak with ideas and words of his philosophy. The fluidity between the two creates uncertainty and we do not know who is “right.” It is reminiscent of Cato’s declaration: *iam pridem equidem nos vera vocabula rerum amisimus* (52.11). We are left to ask what is the truth or who is the true Roman man.

Through his characterizations, Sallust asserts that the true Roman man does not exist in his day. Sallust sets up a frame of the Roman aristocrat with Catilina, Cato and Caesar. Catilina is the clear example of a Roman man turned inside out, who does not properly employ his mind in the service of the state. Cato and Caesar are lauded by Sallust as the two great men of his own lifetime. Both are great men but neither seems complete. Sallust declares that Caesar’s greatness rests upon his *beneficiis ac munificentia* (54.2). Cato was held great based on his *integritate vitae* (54.2). Sallust

continues to describe the two men but with a constant focus on Caesar's generosity and Cato's austerity. Just as the two men argue for opposite sides in the sentencing of the conspirators so also Sallust seems to oppose their characters. As Sallust himself says they were: *divorsis moribus fuere viri duo* (53.6). Each man is great, yet somehow incomplete. If the characters of Caesar and Cato were combined then the ideal Roman man would emerge. This is perhaps Sallust's most critical commentary of Roman society: Rome has reached such a point of decline that she can no longer produce a true Roman man. Catilina also factors into Sallust's idea that Rome cannot produce a true Roman man at its present stage. As noted in chapter two, Catilina is a constant contradiction, because he possesses all the proper pedigree and background yet he is corrupt. Sallust further blurs our perception of the man with his portrayal of him at the final battle (61.4-5). Here the nobility and courage of Catilina is given a surprising degree of emphasis considering much of Sallust's depiction of him throughout the monograph. We are left questioning what is a true Roman man, and we see that even the two greatest of the time, Cato and Caesar, are flawed. This echoes a declaration of Cato in his speech: *iam pridem nos vera vocabula rerum amisimus* (52.11). Not only have the true words and meanings of things been lost but also the definition of what it is to be a Roman man. If no proper definition exists any longer then certainly no such man can exist.

The manner in which Sallust presents his philosophy in the very beginning and then weaves it into the text, in order to discuss the conspiracy and to comment on Roman society and history, is highly effective. In so doing, he constructs his worldview and communicates to his readers his understanding of the world. The philosophical

introduction is also an example of an element that functions on many levels because with it Sallust accomplishes several tasks. He uses it as a platform for his ideas, a justification for the value of writing history and establishes a thread that runs throughout the text. The character sketch of Sempronia also accomplishes a dual task a) it gives a portrait of the type of woman whom Catilina wished to win over to his cause b) she serves as an example of the “unnatural” in Rome in Sallust’s day. The speeches of Cato and Caesar serve multiple functions as well. They are a medium to add drama and involve the audience vicariously. The opposing sides of the penalty debate are illustrated in these two speeches. And finally the speeches help Sallust to create his frame of the Roman man. This Sallustian “economy” is highly suited to the condensed monographic format. It allows Sallust to focus his topic and also to make much broader commentary on Roman society. Depth is added to the narrative and at the same time allows him to create a history that goes far beyond simply the conspiracy.



### Conclusion

The Bellum Catilinae is a work that generates countless interpretations and analyses, because Sallust created a work with depth and nuance. In the introduction the question was posed: Why is the choice of subgenre important? Choices of genres, style and subject matter can tell us something important about the text, the author and the author's narrative aims. Sallust used the monograph format to focus in on an event that he considered crucial in Roman history. The format allowed him to address in detail the conspiracy and its leader, and thus he successfully documents the historical event. Even though there is limit in subject matter and timeframe, the text explodes onto a much larger stage. Through the style and techniques which have been discussed (especially his weaving of philosophy into the text), the monograph becomes not simply an account of one historical event but a commentary on Roman history and society. Sallust communicates an understanding about something much larger than a single revolt. I believe that the ability of history to further understanding about man and his world is one of the most important and beneficial characteristics of history.

## References

### Primary Sources

Appian. Roman History: The Civil Wars. Vol. 3. Translated by Horace White. Loeb Classical Library. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1933.

Aristotle. On Poetry and Style. Translated with Introduction by G.M.A. Grube. Indianapolis: Bobs-Merrill Educational Publishing, 1983.

Aulus Gellius. The Attic Nights. Vol. 1. Translated by J.C. Rolfe. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970.

Aulus Gellius. The Attic Nights. Vol. 3. Translated by John C. Rolfe. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967.

Caesar. Alexandrian, African and Spanish Wars. Translated by A.G. Way. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1978.

Cassius Dio. Roman History. Vol. 3. Translated by Earnest Cary. Loeb Classical Library. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1914.

Catullus. The Poems of Catullus. Edited and translated by Guy Lee. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Cicero. Ad Familiares. Vol. 1. Translated by W. Glynn Williams. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965.

Cicero. Brutus and Orator. Translated by H.M. Hubbell. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1962.

Cicero. De Oratore. Bks. I-II. Vol. 3. Translated by E.W. Sutton and H. Rackham. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979.

Cicero. De Re Publica and De Legibus. Vol. XVI. Translated by C.W. Keyes. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1977.

Cicero. De Senectute. De Amicitia. De Divinatione. Vol. XX. Translated by W.A. Falconer. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979.

Cicero. Epistulae ad Atticum. Vol. 3. Translated by E.O. Winstedt, M.A. Loeb Classical Library. London: Willima Heinemann, 1925.

Cicero. Epistulae ad Atticum. Vol. 1. Translated by E.O. Winstedt. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Oxford University Press, 1980.

Cicero. Epistulae ad familiares. Vol. 1. Translated by W. Glynn Williams, M.A. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952.

Cicero. Select Letters. Ed. D.R. Shackleton Bailey. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.

Ciceronis, M. Tulli. Epistulae ad familiares. Libri I-XVI. Ed. D.R. Shackleton Bailey. B.G. Tevbnner: Stvtgardie in Aedibus, 1988.

Herodotus. The Histories. Translated by Aubrey De Selincourt. Revised with Introductory matter and notes by John Marincola. New York: Penguin Books, 1996.

Hesiod. The Homeric Hymns and Homerica. Translated by Hugh. G. Evelyn White. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967.

Isocrates. The Works of Isocrates. 3 vols. Translated by George Norlin and Larue Von Hook. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1969-1980.

Jacoby, Felix. Die Fragmente Der Griechischen Historiker (FGrH). Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1926.

Livy. Ab Urbe Condita. Vol. 1. Translated by B.O. Foster. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1939.

Ovid. Metamorphoses. Vol. 1. Translated by Frank Justus Millier. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966.

Peter, Hermannus. Historicorum Romanorum Fragmenta. Lipsiae In Aedibus: B.G. Tevbnneri, 1883.

Polybius. The Histories. Translated by Mortimer Chambers. New York: Twayne Publishers Inc., 1966.

Polybius. The Histories. 6 vols. Translated by W.R. Paton. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968-1980.

Posidonius, Vol. 1. The Fragments. Eds. L. Edelstein and I.G. Kidd. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972.

Quintilian. Institutio Oratoria. Vol. 1. Translated by H.E. Button. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963.

Sallust. The Works of Sallust. Translated by J.C. Rolfe. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000.

Sallusti C. Crispus. Catilina. Iugurtha. Fragmenta Ampliora. post A.W. Ahlberg.

Edidit Alphonsus Kvrress. B.G. Tevbner: Lipsiae in Aedibus, MCMLVII.

Suetonius. De Vita Caesarum. Vol. 1. Translated by J.C. Rolfe. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979.

Thucydides. The Peloponnesian War. Translated by Benjamin Jowett. Revised and Abridged with introduction by P.A. Brunt. Oxford: New English Library, 1966.

Thucydides. History of the Peloponessian War. Translated by Rex Warner with Introduction and notes by M.I. Finley. New York: Penguin Books, 1972.

Thucydides. History of the Peloponessian War. 4 vols. Translated by Charles Forster Smith. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975-1980.

Xenophon. Anabasis Books 1-7. Vol. 3. Translated by Carleton L. Brownson. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1980.

Xenophon. Hellenica Books 1-V. Vol. 1. Translated by Carleton L. Brownson. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1947.

Xenophon. Hellenica Books VI-VII and Anabasis Books I-III. Vol. 2. Translated by Carleton L. Brownson. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1961.

Xenophon. Scriptora Minora. Translated by E.C. Marchant. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1962.

### Secondary Sources

Allen, Walter Jr. "Cicero's Conceit." *TAPA* 85 (1954): 121-144.

Breisach, Ernst. Historiography: Ancient, Medieval and Modern. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1983.

Bury, J.B. The Ancient Greek Historians. New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1958.

Conte, Gian Biagio. Latin Literature: A History. Translated by Joseph B. Solodow. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999.

Dorey, T.A. ed. Latin Historians. New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, 1966.

Earl, D.C. The Political Thought of Sallust. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961.

Erasmio, Mario. Archaic Latin Verse. Newburyport: Focus Publishing, 2001.

- Fantham, E. Comparative Studies in Republican Latin Imagery. Toronto, 1972.
- Fornara, Charles. The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1983.
- Gentili, Bruno and Giovanni Cerri. History and Biography in Ancient Thought. Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben, 1988.
- Grant, Michael. Greek and Roman Historians: Information and Misinformation. London and New York: Routledge, 1995.
- Hall, Jon. "Cicero to Lucceius (Fam. 5.12) in its Social Context: *Valde Bella?*" *Classical Philology* 93 (1998): 308-321.
- Hornblower, Simon and Antony Spawforth, eds. Oxford Classical Dictionary. Third edition Oxford and New York: Oxford Press, 1996.
- Hutchinson, G.O. Cicero's Correspondences: A Literary Study. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.
- Kirk, G.S. and J.E. Raven. The PreSocratic Philosophers: A Critical History with Selection of Texts. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1957.
- Luce, T.J. The Greek Historians. London and New York: Routledge, 1997.
- Luraghi, Nino, ed. The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Mellor, Ronald. The Roman Historians. London and New York: Routledge, 1999.
- Momigliano, Arnaldo. The Classical Foundations of Modern Historiography. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1990.
- Momigliano, Arnaldo. Studies in Historiography. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1966.
- Murray, Oswyn. "History." Greek Thought: A Guide to Classical Knowledge. Eds. Jacques Brunschwig and Geoffrey E.R. Lloyd with collaboration of Pierre Pellegrin. Translated under direction of Catherine Porter. Cambridge and London: Belkap Press, 2000.
- Platner, Samuel B. The Topography and Monuments of Ancient Rome. Second Edition. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1911.
- Scanlon, Thomas Francis. The Influence of Thucydides on Sallust. Heidelberg: Carl

Winter-Universitätsverlag, 1980.

Shimron, B. "Ciceronian Historiography." *Latomus* 33 (1974): 232-244.

Syme, Sir Ronald. Sallust. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2002.

Ullman, B.L. "History and Tragedy." *TAPA* 73 (1972): 25-53

Usher, Stephen. The Historians of Greece and Rome. Bristol: Bristol Classical Press, 1985.

Walbank, F.W. The Hellenistic World. Rev. Ed. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993.