THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PREFACE IN ROMAN HISTORIOGRAPHY

by

LAUREN FRANCES MCGOWAN

(Under the Direction of James Anderson)

ABSTRACT

This study traces the development of the preface in Latin historiography through the works of the major extant Roman historians Sallust, Livy, and Tacitus. While each author must meet the expectation of a preface to introduce his work, he has substantial freedom in executing this convention of the historiographical genre. The style and content reflects the author's approach to his text and his audience. The preface, as place both of tradition and innovation, also reveals the author's conception of his own position among historiographers. Through a close reading of these prefaces, I show how each author borrows from and expands upon his predecessors and how the subgenre of the preface evolves.

INDEX WORDS: preface, historiography, Sallust, Livy, Tacitus

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PREFACE IN ROMAN HISTORIOGRAPHY

by

LAUREN FRANCES MCGOWAN

B.A., Dickinson College, 2008

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

2010

© 2010

Lauren Frances McGowan

All Rights Reserved

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PREFACE IN ROMAN HISTORIOGRAPHY

by

LAUREN FRANCES MCGOWAN

Major Professor:	James Anderson
Committee:	Erika Hermanowicz Naomi Norman

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
May 2010

DEDICATION

for my family

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my advisor, Dr. James Anderson, and my committee members, Dr. Erika Hermanowicz and Dr. Naomi Norman, for their time, effort, and insightful comments and suggestions in helping me write this thesis. I am grateful to Patrick and to my family for their love and support in this and all that I do.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The preface to a classical historiographical work provides a space for the author to introduce himself, his subject, his methods, and his agenda. It is the reader's first glimpse into the text and it occupies a distinct place, often differentiated in style and subject matter from what succeeds it. The major Roman historians Sallust, Livy, and Tacitus utilize the preface to address varying topics, such as moral and political decline at Rome and the author's position relative to his predecessors. The preface often gives insight into the historical work as a whole, preparing the reader for the themes of the text. As a convention of historical narrative, the preface also has its own features which develop throughout the corpus of extant Latin histories. Studies have shown the development of the historiographical genre as a whole and how later authors approach their predecessors. This thesis traces the development of the preface and attempts to define a pattern of influence in the prefaces from Sallust, Livy, and Tacitus. I argue that each preface reveals influences from other authors—specifically from their prefaces—through the presence of verbal echoes and similarities in content and themes. Each author's interpretation of this convention, especially places where he deviates from predecessors, illustrates the evolution of this convention. This thesis demonstrates how historians utilize, manipulate, and appropriate the preface and determines a pattern for how prefaces work in the scope of Latin historiography.

Chapter 1 begins with the earliest extant prefaces, those of Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae*, sections 1-4, and *Bellum Iugurthinum*, sections 1-5.1. Chapter 2 analyzes how Livy interprets the preface in the introduction to his *Ab Urbe Condita*. Chapter 3 explores the preface in the

historiographical works of Tacitus, analyzing the prefaces to the *Agricola*, sections 1-3, *Historiae* I, sections 1-4.1, and *Annales* I, section 1. My approach to these passages is a close reading of the texts in comparison to one another. This includes a study of specific verbal echoes among prefaces as well as a comparison of themes and subject matter from previous prefaces.

Chapter 1 discusses the roles of tradition and innovation in the prefaces of Sallust's two monographs. The *Bellum Catilinae* and *Bellum Iugurthinum* depart from annalistic Roman historiography. Their prefaces indicate a strong influence from previous sources, particularly Thucydides and Cato, but in each work the preface is utilized in a novel manner. While both contain the hallmarks of a historiographical preface, Sallust includes a discussion of philosophy and moral decline in each work; these additions do not appear in historical writing before these monographs. This chapter discusses the stylistic and formal aspects of these prefaces as well as the development of these components between the *Bellum Catilinae* and the *Bellum Iugurthinum.* Although the prefaces have been considered vague and unrelated to the text, I argue that the prefaces to Sallust's monographs are integrally related to the rest of their respective works because they reveal a moral paradigm which governs the texts.

Chapter 2 analyzes the interpretation of the historiographical preface in Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita*. His preface responds to that of Sallust, but also contains several aspects not seen before. Livy uses first- and second-person verbs to focus on the effect his history has on himself and his audience; this fosters a close relationship between author and reader. This preface also demonstrates a novel approach to politics by referring to the contemporary political milieu and the specifics of Roman moral decline more than Sallust. Livy's preface also reveals a complex relationship with poetry: he begins with an opening phrase which comprises most of a hexameter, he alludes to the poets' invocation of the gods (though, significantly, Livy himself

does not invoke the gods), and he defends his use of poetic sources in retelling the historically dubious beginnings of Rome. This chapter discusses these aspects of Livy's preface and argues for Livy's reliance on Sallust as a source. The Sallustian echoes in the preface have been long debated. I argue that Livy's references to Sallust are not ironic or derogatory but rather demonstrate Livy's positive feelings towards his predecessor. Livy's adoption of the term *negotium* to describe his career in historiography indicates that his conception of the historiographical process is entirely filtered through Sallust.

Chapter 3 discusses the development of the preface in Tacitus through the *Agricola,* the *Historiae*, and the *Annales*. These texts see the preface evolve into a platform for Tacitus' political opinions. The *Agricola*, although it has often been classified as a biography, contains a preface that engages with the historiographical tradition. I argue that the references to Sallust and Livy, as well as the contextualization of the preface in the contemporary political milieu, indicate the influence of the historiographical precedents of this preface. In the *Historiae,* Tacitus confronts the reader with a summary of the negative events he will narrate. This preface focuses on the particulars of the contemporary political scene more than the *Agricola* but, unlike the *Agricola,* provides no hope of redemption for Rome's deplorable condition. The preface to the *Annales* becomes even more involved with the political sphere: Tacitus moves away from all personal reflection on his work and any philosophical discussion and deals almost exclusively with politics. He compresses Roman history from the beginning to Augustus in a single paragraph. I argue that this preface demonstrates Tacitus' negative approach to the principate. This chapter shows how Tacitus takes the preface from the philosophical creation of Sallust and the personal reflection of Livy and turns it into a vehicle for his political views on the principate.

This thesis describes the progression of the historiographical preface through Sallust, Livy, and Tacitus. The verbal echoes and parallels in content and subject matter in these prefaces indicate that the authors intend us to read their introductions with the prefaces of their predecessors in mind. The forms and contents of the prefaces vary significantly, based on the nature of the work and the author. Despite the differences, patterns emerge which allow us to see the preface as a subgenre within Roman historiography, whose expectations develop over time. This study analyzes the connections between Roman historiographical prefaces in order to illuminate more clearly the development of the subgenre.

CHAPTER TWO

THE PREFACES OF SALLUST

Before Sallust, annalistic historians, the so-called *narratores rerum,*[1] dominated Roman historiography. In his first works, the *Bellum Catilinae* and *Bellum Iugurthinum*, Sallust abandons this tradition and turns instead to the genre of the monograph, a format which allows a closer focus on the background, causes, and results of a single historical event. This departure from the annalistic genre affords Sallust a measure of independence in applying traditional stylistic and formal conventions to his monographs. While the preface remained an expected part of a historical narrative, Sallust could compose his prefaces with a degree of novelty and innovation because he was freed from some of the expectations laid on other historians. This chapter analyzes the prefaces to Sallust's two monographs to determine how much they adhere to traditional elements of a historical preface as well as how much Sallust introduces innovations into the form of the preface. The first part of this chapter examines three *topoi*, common to almost every historiographical preface, and how the prefaces to the *Bellum Catilinae* and *Bellum Iugurthinum* interpret these elements. The second part studies the stylistic predecessors of Sallust and their influence in these passages. The third section argues that the prefaces are integrally related to their texts; this connection demonstrates how Sallust employs the preface in a novel way, while still writing prefaces which are grounded in the historiographical tradition.

---

[1] Cicero refers to Roman historians as such: *ceteri non exornatores rerum, sed tantum modo narratores fuerunt* (the others [old historians, excepting Coelius Antipater] were not embellishers of events, but only chroniclers of them; Cic. *De Or.* 2.54; all translations are my own except where noted). This pejorative description disparages historians for merely listing things and not giving the causes and reasons behind events (see Chapter 3 for Cicero's *De Oratore* and Tacitus and cf. Sallust, *Bellum Catilinae*, 2nd ed. ed. J. T. Ramsey (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 7).

Formal Structure

Tore Janson's discussion of Latin historiographical prefaces outlines several of the *topoi* common to both Greek and Latin histories. Among them, Janson isolates three main elements: *laudatio historiae* (praise of history), the "reason for choice of subject," and the "historian's attitude to his work."[2] This section examines the formal structure of the *Bellum Catilinae* and the *Bellum Iugurthinum* through a study of the appearance of these *topoi* and their development between the two monographs.

The *laudatio historiae* portion of a preface, Janson writes, must emphasize to the reader the importance of history and the author's own theories for writing it, which can vary widely;[3] this element is crucial for legitimizing the work. In the *Bellum Catilinae,* Sallust attempts to validate historiography by equating it to serving the Republic in actions: *pulchrum est bene facere rei publicae, etiam bene dicere haud absurdum est* (it is noble to act well for the Republic; to speak well for the Republic is also hardly out of place; *Cat.* 3.1). The litotes in the second half of the phrase emphasizes how Sallust tries to bestow equivalent honor on intellectual pursuits and public service. The specific reference is to speaking (*dicere*), but we can consider that Sallust refers to writing—and other activities—because he repeats the same thought just after and substitutes *scripsere* in place of *dicere*: *et qui fecere, et qui facta aliorum scripsere, multi laudantur* (both those who accomplish deeds, and those who write down the deeds of others, are widely praised; *Cat.* 3.1).[4] Recognizing that public opinion of these activities is somewhat diminished, Sallust asserts the difficulty of writing historiography:

> *Ac mihi quidem, tametsi haudquaquam par gloria sequitur scriptorem et auctorem rerum, tamen in primis arduum videtur res gestas scribere: primum quod facta dictis exaequanda sunt; dehinc, quia plerique, quae delicta*

[2] Tore Janson, *Latin Prose Prefaces: Studies in Literary Conventions* (Stockholm: Almquist & Wiksell, 1964), 66-7.
[3] Ibid., 66.
[4] Ramsey, *Bellum Catilinae,* 62 argues for this interpretation of *dicere.*

> *reprehenderis, malivolentia et invidia dicta putant; ubi de magna virtute atque gloria bonorum memores, quae sibi quisque facilia factu putat, aequo animo accipit, supra ea veluti ficta pro falsis ducit* (Even though hardly equal glory follows the recorder and originator of events, nevertheless writing history seems, to me at least, to be especially difficult: first because the deeds must be matched with words; then, because many, when you reproach someone's faults, think your words are spiteful and malicious; when you recall the great virtue and glory of good men, whatever each reader thinks he can do easily, he hears with an open mind, but he considers those things beyond him as made up lies; *Cat.* 3.2).

Sallust is at pains to show how hard the historian's job is (*in primis arduum*) because the writer is at the mercy of his readers' flawed judgment. The desired result of this passage is that the reader considers historiography to be on equal footing with politics, a profession which is already well respected and does not need to be defended. Sallust's position regarding the relative importance of historiography and service to the Republic is crucial in both prefaces and is discussed further below.

The positive view of history is even more forcefully stated in the preface to the *Bellum Iugurthinum*: *ceterum ex aliis negotiis quae ingenio exercentur in primis magno usui est memoria rerum gestarum* (but, of all the jobs which are done by *ingenium*, the recording of accomplishments is especially of great use; *Iug.* 4.1). This *laudatio historiae* goes beyond that of the *Bellum Catilinae* in two ways: first, Sallust shows that historiography exceeds not only activities in the political sphere, which Sallust considers *minime…cupienda* (least desirable; *Iug.* 3.1), but it also surpasses the usefulness of all other products of the *ingenium.* Rather than considering historiography among other intellectual pursuits (as the interchangeability of *dicere* and *scripsere* in the *Bellum Catilinae* suggests), historiography now exceeds everything else. The great purpose of history is to spur contemporary Romans to worthy deeds through the remembrance of their ancestors' accomplishments (*Iug.* 4.6).[5] Secondly, the use of the indicative

[5] Sallust writes that others feel that this remembrance comes from the sight of the ancestors' *imagines* but he contrasts the wax likenesses with the more valuable wax on which history is written: *scilicet non ceram illam neque*

mood (*exercentur, est*) is more assertive than the statement of the similar idea in Sallust's first monograph, which subjugated his opinion by the impersonal construction *mihi videtur*.

Ramsey and Syme argue that Sallust's more confident position on the value of historiography is one indication that the *Bellum Iugurthinum* was composed after the *Bellum Catilinae*; traditional dating places the publication of both works between 43 and 40 B.C.[6] and scholars generally assume the *Bellum Catilinae* to be Sallust's first monograph.[7] In his debut work, it would be unsurprising that Sallust appears "apologetic and uncertain"[8] and "discreetly on the defensive"[9] regarding the role of history. The phrase *mihi videtur* illustrates Sallust's hesitancy to be overbold; as one who has recently left the political world (see below) it would not be fitting to recklessly disparage serving the Republic in office. When he comes to the *Bellum Iugurthinum*, Sallust is emboldened to assert the value of his occupation. In addition to the developments in his position described above, Sallust preemptively reproaches those who would label his work *inertia* (idleness; *Iug.* 4.3) by rebuking them for their lavish proclivities.[10] Sallust's confidence enlivens the *laudatio historiae* in this preface; it seems, then, logical to agree with Syme and Ramsey that this preface is part of a later work because of this development in Sallust's position. [11]

---

figuram tantam vim in sese habere (of course neither *that* wax nor figure has such power in itself; *Iug.* 4.6). The comparison between the media of writing and sculpture – and the claim of superiority for the wax used in writing – underscores Sallust's point that historiography exceeds other pursuits of the *ingenium* since sculpting would be a product of the *ingenium* as much as writing.

[6] Gian Biagio Conte, *Latin Literature: A History*. trans. Joseph Solodow (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994), 234.

[7] Ramsey, *Bellum Catilinae*, 6.

[8] Ibid.

[9] Ronald Syme, *Sallust* (Berkeley: University of California, 1964), 216.

[10] Sallust remarks sarcastically and, it seems, bitterly about his supposed adversaries: *tamque utili labori meo nomen inertiae imponant, certe quibus maxuma industria videtur salutare plebem et conviviis gratiam quaerere* (they would give the name of idleness to my so useful work, those for whom the height of purposefulness seems to be to greet the plebs and curry favor in banquets; *Iug.* 4.3).

[11] Although Sallust is much more confident about the value of historiography in the *Bellum Iugurthinum,* he must defend his occupation and chosen genre nonetheless. The defense of historiography in the *Bellum Catilinae* does

The defense of Sallust's choice of subject also appears in both prefaces. Sallust plainly expresses the reasoning for choosing Catiline's conspiracy as his topic. Once he has described his personal path to historiography, Sallust proposes to treat the accomplishments of the Romans *carptim, ut quaeque memoria digna videbantur* (selectively, as each accomplishment seemed worthy to remember; *Cat.* 4.2).[12] This phrase highlights two things: first, that Sallust is choosing to write in monograph form, picking selectively from Roman history. This is a rejection of the annalistic style, which covers events year-by-year, often starting from the beginning of Roman history. Secondly, it reveals an influence from Thucydides, who also justifies his choice of topic on the grounds that it is ἀξιολώγατος (most worthy of mention; Thuc. I.1).[13] Within these parameters—events that can be described selectively and those worth remembering—Catiline's conspiracy is appropriate and notable for its novelty: *nam id facinus in primis ego memorabile existumo sceleris atque periculi novitate* (for this deed I judge especially remarkable for the novelty of its crime and its danger; *Cat.* 4.4). The desire to be novel in some way is common to most historiography;[14] this theme is discussed in Chapters 2 and 3 in conjunction with the desire for novelty in the prefaces of Livy and Tacitus.

In the *Bellum Iugurthinum* Sallust presents a twofold reason for his choice of topic: *primum quia magnum et atrox variaque victoria fuit, dein quia tunc primum superbiae nobilitatis obviam itum est* (first because [this war] was great, and savage, and of inconsistent victory, then

---

not suffice. The expectations of the preface, as Janson writes, require a defense of the historian's task in each work; cf. Janson, *Latin Prose Prefaces*, 66-7.

[12] Douglas J. Stewart, "Sallust and Fortuna," *History and Theory,* 7 (1968): 314; Stewart notes that *carptim* is "a verb specially appropriate to describe fruit-gathering – exactly the word a man might use who wished to talk about crucial moments in history."

[13] Ramsey, *Bellum Catilinae,* 68. Sallust's justification for his choice of subject is, of course, not identical to Thucydides', but it is significant that he chooses to invoke Thucydides at this moment as it attempts to place Sallust's subject matter (Catiline's conspiracy) on par with Thucydides' (the Peloponnesian War). Sallust's connection with Thucydides is discussed further below.

[14] Novelty, Janson writes, can take different forms: the subject itself can be new (as we see in the *Bellum Catilinae*), or the author can be the first to write about something in a particular way, or the first to surpass his predecessors (as Tacitus suggests in the prefaces to the *Historiae* and *Annales*; see Chapter 3 and Janson, *Latin Prose Prefaces,* 67).

since at that time, for the first time, there was resistance to the pride of the nobility; *Iug.* 5.1). The first part refers to the subject's intrinsic interest and importance in Roman history; the second half accords with Sallust's indictment of the nobility throughout the text. While this motive differs from the one proposed in the *Bellum Catilinae*, the former's theme of novelty reappears through the insistence on *primum*, emphasizing that this was the first time these things happened.[15]

The third element in Roman historiographical prefaces which Janson outlines is the historian's attitude toward his work. This should include an "assurance of impartiality" and a discussion of the historian's personal relationship to his subject matter.[16] Such a claim helps establish the author's authority and credibility and explains, in part, why a preface is useful to an author. Although it is not necessarily in question, the author must demonstrate his credibility (or at least the illusion of his credibility) to maintain his authority.[17] In the *Bellum Catilinae*, Sallust promises to write a balanced report because he has no motive for bias: *mihi a spe, metu, partibus rei publicae animus liber erat* (my mind was free from hope, fear, and the partisanship of the Republic; *Cat.* 4.2). The reality of his political situation—that he was expelled from the Senate in 50 B.C.[18]—is carefully skirted. Sallust admits a foray into politics, excusing himself on the basis of his young age and the fact that it was very common: *Sed ego adulescentulus initio, sicuti plerique, studio ad rem publicam latus sum* (but in the beginning, as a youth, I, just like many, was carried away to [the service of] the Republic by zeal; *Cat.* 3.3). Despite his subsequent

---

[15] Sallust, *Bellum Catilinae: A Commentary*, ed. P. McGushin *Mnemosyne*, Supplement 45 (Leiden: Brill, 1977), 83 notes that the professed novelty of opposition to the nobility "cannot strictly be true for as Sallust himself says in Chapter 42, the Gracchi brothers (133-122) were the first to champion the cause of the *plebs* against the *nobilies.*"

[16] Ibid.

[17] M.J. Wheeldon argues that an author does not have to "establish" authority per se: so long as the conventions of the historiographical genre are present (e.g., the existence of a preface, the use of the third-person), the audience will assume the author's authority; see M.J. Wheeldon, "'True Stories': The Reception of Historiography in Antiquity," in *History as Text: The Writing of Ancient History,* ed. Averil Cameron (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1989), 48. The establishment of authority in Livy's preface is discussed in Chapter 2.

[18] G.M. Paul, "Sallust," in *Latin Historians,* ed. T.A. Dorey (New York: Basic Books, 1966), 88.

seduction by the immorality of the political system, Sallust insists that he maintained the moral high ground: *animus aspernabatur insolens malarum artium* (my mind spurned [these things], unused to the evil arts; *Cat.* 3.4). He then implies that he left politics willingly: *mihi reliquam aetatem a re publica procul habendam decrevi* (I *decided* that the rest of my life should be led away from the [political life of] the Republic; *Cat.* 4.1). Ironically, it was for his alleged moral shortcomings that Sallust was removed from the Senate.[19] The apparent inconsistencies between Sallust's call for a life of virtue and actual lack of morality can be explained by the need to maintain authority. By stressing his alleged objectivity, Sallust distances himself from the implied bias of the political sphere and attempts to portray himself as a neutral, credible source.

In the *Bellum Iugurthinum* Sallust does not assert his objectivity so plainly, but still reminds the reader *decrevi procul a re publica aetatem agere* (I have decided to spend my life away from the Republic [i.e., political life]; *Iug.* 4.3). The repetition of *decrevi* obscures, as in the *Bellum Catilinae,* the fact that Sallust was forced out of political life whether or not he "decided" to leave. He again mentions his time as a magistrate, inviting the reader to compare his moral fiber to the lesser men who took office after him (*Iug.* 4.4). Sallust's claim of impartiality seems ironic: his alleged neutrality rests on the fact that he is removed from the political scene. This may seem logical to modern readers—if Sallust does not participate in politics, he would have no reason for bias against political figures or parties. To his contemporaries, however, Sallust's refusal to participate in the public life of the Republic would seem suspect. Recognizing this shortcoming, Sallust compensates by emphasizing the usefulness of historiography compared to military or political success, or compared to the antics of the nobility.

---

[19] Paul, "Sallust," 88.

The presentation of these *topoi* differs between the two texts: while both adhere to the expectations of a preface, Sallust introduces his subject and motivation innovatively in each monograph. Even between such texts as these, which have many verbal and conceptual similarities,[20] we can see a development of Sallust's ideas and their presentation in the *topoi* discussed. The increased assertiveness in Sallust's defense of history has already been noted. A progression in the level of abstraction between the prefaces also occurs. The preface of the *Bellum Catilinae* remains abstract in its philosophy and vague on historical points. Following Cato, who famously refuses to name any historical figure in his *Origines*,[21] Sallust gives no contemporary examples in the decline of morals and the only proper names he mentions are Cyrus and the Athenians and Spartans, to whom he refers as examples of increasing imperialism (*Cat.* 2.2). In the preface to the *Bellum Iugurthinum*, Sallust includes more contemporary figures: he cites Q. Fabius Maximus and P. Cornelius Scipio (*Iug.* 4.5) as examples of Romans looking to their ancestors for *exempla*. While not exact contemporaries of Sallust, these men are much more recent than Cyrus.[22] Sallust also alludes to contemporary political events in the *Bellum Iugurthinum*: he warns against giving up liberty *potentiae paucorum* (to the power of a few men; *Iug.* 3.3). According to Watkiss, this refers to the recent formation of the Second Triumvirate (43 B.C.).[23] The indictment of the nobility, the *homines novi* (*Iug.* 4.7), and the imminent destruction of the state due to political strife (*Iug.* 5.2) all refer to more contemporary events, and quite possibly to particular people. This trend in contextualizing the preface and

---

[20] Donald Earl, *The Political Thought of Sallust* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961), 6.
[21] Conte, *Latin Literature,* 87. Cato is thought to have done this in an attempt to underscore the collectivity of Roman history over individual deeds, and as a way to downplay the importance of the aristocratic families. See Chapter 3 for Cato's influence on the preface to Tacitus' *Agricola*.
[22] The reason for choosing these particular men is unclear. Although both are exemplary Republican heroes of the Second Punic War, Sallust almost seems to be condemning them, since they fall prey to the mistake of thinking that the ancestral masks (*maiorum imagines*) instill a desire to accomplish great deeds rather than history (*memoria rerum gestarum*).
[23] Sallust, *Bellum Iugurthinum*, ed. Leslie Watkiss (London: University Tutorial Press, 1971), 80.

moving away from abstractions increases throughout Latin historiography; Chapter 2 studies Livy's oblique references to the political situation and Chapter 3 examines the great importance Tacitus gives to discussion of contemporary politics. The fact that the preface to the *Bellum Iugurthinum* is less abstract and more engaged in contemporary politics again suggests that this preface was indeed written later than that of the *Bellum Catilinae*.

Another development of the ideas in the two prefaces is Sallust's treatment of historiography as an occupation. In both prefaces, Sallust proclaims the usefulness of his field, but his terminology changes. In the *Bellum Catilinae* Sallust still considers writing an activity for *otium* (leisure) only to be done after leaving the public arena:

> *non fuit consilium socordia atque desidia bonum otium conterere, neque vero agrum colundo aut venando, servilibus officiis, intentum aetatem agere; sed a quo incepto studioque me ambitio mala detinuerat eodem regressus, statui res gestas populi Romani…perscribere* (it was not my plan to waste my good leisure time in laziness and idleness, nor to pass my life intent on cultivating the fields or hunting, servile tasks; but, having returned to that task I began from which wicked ambition had detained me, I decided to write about the deeds of the Roman people; *Cat.* 4.1-2).

Although he claims that man is only fully benefitting from life when he is devoted to some endeavor (*aliquo negotio intentus*; *Cat.* 2.9), Sallust rejects laziness, hunting, and farming as poor uses of *otium* and desires to return to his *studium* (pursuit; *Cat.* 4.2) of writing history. This *studium* is then, by extension, an alternate use of Sallust's *otium*. His position in the *Bellum Catilinae* largely corresponds to that of Cato who values history immensely but seems to believe it best left for leisure time.[24] Sallust does, however, depart dramatically from Cato when he

[24] In this fragment of Cato's preface, we see the separation between *otium* and *negotium* which he draws: *clarorum virorum atque magnorum non minus otii quam negotii rationem exstare oportere* (it is right that there be an account of the leisure, as well as the business, of the famous and great men; Cato, *Orig.* fr. 1 Peter). Churchill writes this about the division of *otium/negotium* and the relative importance of historiography in Cato's preface: "There is a clear connection between a leisure which stands up to scrutiny and the general assertion of the value of history: The writing of history was a leisure activity. The statement [i.e., fr. 1] was intended to lead to a justification of the writing of history as a worthy leisure pursuit. There is no indication that Cato excluded literary endeavor from *otium*, and good evidence that he included it…He did most of his writing…during the later years of his life, when he

refers to hunting and farming, other activities in *otium,* as servile tasks (*servilibus officiis*; *Cat.* 4.1).[25] The rejection of Cato's view, especially on such "worthy occupations"[26] as these, is surprising given Sallust's admiration for Cato and how he follows his predecessor in many other aspects, as is demonstrated below.

In the *Bellum Iugurthinum*, Sallust considers the writing of history (*memoria rerum gestarum*) to be *negotium* (job, duty, worthwhile activity), superior to other pursuits of the *ingenium* (*Iug.* 4.1). This shift is significant: Sallust has become so confident in the worth of historiography that he classifies it as *negotium*—as an occupation that one can do and be honored for doing, and on par with political offices—rather than *otium*, an activity that can be meaningful, but is not a justifiable occupation. Sallust's assertion of the value of history benefits Livy's view of historiography, as Chapter 2 discusses.

The bulk of both Sallust's prefaces lies outside the traditional components of historiographical prefaces; Sallust devotes the most space to a philosophical discussion regarding the relative value of the *animus* and the *corpus*. In the *Bellum Catilinae*, Sallust establishes the dichotomy between *animus* and *corpus* early: *sed nostra omnis vis in animo et corpore sita est: animi imperio, corporis servitio magis utimur* (but all our strength is located in the mind and the body: we employ the rule of the mind and we use rather the service of the body; *Cat.* 1.2). In the second paragraph of the *Bellum Iugurthinum*, a similar sentiment is expressed: *nam uti genus*

---

was less busy with *negotia.*" See J. Bradford Churchill, "On the Content and Structure of the Prologue of Cato's *Origines*," *Illinois Classical Studies,* 20 (1995): 96-8.

[25] The preface to Cato's *De Agricultura* praises the virtue of these men: *et virum bonum quom laudabant, ita laudabant: bonum agricolam bonumque colonum; amplissime laudari existimabatur qui ita laudabatur* (and when they praised a good man, they praised him thus: "good farmer, good cultivator;" those who were praised in this way thought that they were praised most honorably; Cato, *Agr.* Pref.). Ramsey, *Bellum Catilinae,* 66 attempts to account for such a significant shift away from Cato's thought by saying that Sallust may be attributing these activities to the *corpus* and thus lesser than pursuits of the *animus/ingenium* or that this could be a slight against the nobility, who rarely participate in such activities. If a slight against the nobility, it would seem more appropriate in the *Bellum Iugurthinum*, where a major theme is the *superbia* of the aristocracy.

[26] Ramsey, *Bellum Catilinae*, 66.

hominum compositum ex corpore et anima est, ita res cuncta studiaque omnia nostra corporis alia, alia animi naturam secuntur (for as the race of men is composed of body and soul, so all things, and all our pursuits, follow the nature of the body in some way, while others follow the nature of the mind; *Iug.* 2.1). The duality of the *animus* and *corpus* in each work is accompanied by arguments for why the *animus* is superior to the *corpus*. The distinctly moral tone of each preface is beyond the traditional scope of historiographical prefaces. However, the presence of morality is unsurprising since the ancient view of historical "fact" was greatly influenced by the relative morality of a person or event.

Each preface argues for the superiority of the *animus* and the pursuits of the *ingenium* in acquiring *virtus*, the quintessential characteristic of a good Roman. The philosophy Sallust employs to express these ideas, while its presentation and position in the preface are perhaps novel, is hardly new. Syme writes that Sallust's philosophy is merely a distillation of Platonic thought filtered through other Roman philosophers;[27] the duality of the *animus* and *corpus* is certainly Platonic in origin.[28] Other sources for Sallust's philosophy include Isocrates, Polybius, Panaetius, Cicero, Dicaearchus, and the Stoics.[29] Posidonius is also commonly cited as a source[30] but whether Sallust used Posidonius' work for direct verbal echoes is unknown.[31] That Sallust was influenced by Posidonius is hardly surprising: Posidonius was a Stoic philosopher, his ideas were congruent with many of Sallust's own views, and he was himself a historian with a predilection for moral interpretation of events.[32] It is not necessary to criticize Sallust's so-called "distillation" of these influences as being a feeble amalgamation of great philosophers'

---

[27] Syme, *Sallust,* 241.
[28] M. Rambaud, "Les prologues de Salluste et la démonstration morale dans son œuvre," *Revue des Études latines,* 24 (1946): 119.
[29] M.J. Wheeldon, "True Stories," 55.
[30] Earl, *Political Thought of Sallust,* 6; Syme, *Sallust,* 241; McGushin, *Bellum Catilinae,* 293.
[31] McGushin, *Bellum Catilinae,* 295.
[32] OCD vid. Posidonius.

ideas; while Sallust's philosophy is not groundbreaking, it is integral in the reader's interpretation of the text, as is discussed below.

In addition to influence from Greek philosophy, Earl argues that Roman aristocratic ideals also shaped Sallust's views.[33] The aristocratic ideal is "the assumption that the proper field of activity for the Roman was the *respublica.*"[34] It is clear that Sallust is reacting to this ideal in his defense of history, which exists (besides being a convention of the preface) in order to excuse (or obscure the reason for) Sallust's lack of participation in customary activities in service of the Republic. The pervasive influence of the aristocratic ideal also explains Sallust's shift in moral terminology: Earl argues that Sallust changes the meaning of *virtus* from a term restricted to aristocratic men in the political sphere to a broader term which encompassed all types of morality (as our "virtue" does today). This expanded definition incorporates and justifies more activities, including Sallust's choice to write history.[35]

To establish his philosophical arguments, Sallust borrows heavily from traditional *topoi* and figures of speech. These ideas, adapted and gleaned from many sources, may seem trite, but are no less important for it.[36] In the *Bellum Catilinae*, the idea that men who are *oboedientia ventri* (obedient to their stomachs; *Cat.* 1.1) are like animals is a "*topos* as old as Plato."[37] Later in the same paragraph, Sallust describes how to "[approach] immortality through fame,"[38] another trope of classical thought. Similar *topoi* are found in the *Bellum Iugurthinum*: there, Sallust also mentions men who are *dediti corporis gaudiis* (devoted to the pleasures of the body;

---

[33] Earl, *Political Thought of Sallust,* 8.
[34] Ibid.
[35] Ibid., 16.
[36] Ibid., 6-7.
[37] Ramsey, *Bellum Catilinae,* 55; see Plato *Rep.* 586A. The image goes back to Hesiod, who refers to men as γαστέρες οἶον (only stomachs; Hes. *Theog.* 26).
[38] Ramsey, *Bellum Catilinae*, 56.

Iug. 2.4). Sallust draws from the cultural knowledge familiar to all his readers rather than, it seems, quoting others' philosophical works directly.

Stylistic Inheritances

Sallust is not only the heir of a philosophical tradition, but also of a literary one. The style of the prefaces features several traits of previous authors, above all Thucydides and Cato.

Thucydides

Sallust's borrowings in both content and style from the Greek historian Thucydides are well documented by commentators on both monographs and are visible throughout the texts, not just in the prefaces. The phrase *memoria digna videbantur* (*Cat.* 4.2) has already been noted for its similarity to Thucydides' claim to write memorable deeds. Sallust's statement of impartiality also reflects that of Thucydides in which he promises to relate speeches in probable words and not to rely on incredible witnesses (Thuc. I.22.1-3). Thucydidean stylistic traits influence Sallust's prose:

> From Thucydides [Sallust] learnt the technique of presenting his material in a dramatic way…he adopted [Thucydides'] style of writing: an abrupt and terse use of language, a poetical and old-fashioned vocabulary, great variety in words, in grammatical constructions and in the arrangement of phrases and sentences.[39]

The archaisms in Sallust's prefaces are numerous: they are discussed below in conjunction with Cato's influence on the preface since they come more directly from Sallust's Latin predecessors than from Thucydides' Greek vocabulary. The "abrupt and terse use of language" appears in Sallust's condensed Latin syntax: by omitting conjunctions and placing clauses in parataxis, Sallust's wording often surprises the reader and can seem confusing. An example of this compression is visible in the phrase *quae homines arant nauigant aedificant* (whatever men

[39] Watkiss, *Bellum Iugurthinum,* 31.

plow, sail, or build; *Cat.* 2.7), where any connecting word has been omitted and *quae* must stand "for the activity itself denoted by each of these verbs."[40]

General similarities between Thucydides' and Sallust's prefaces are to be expected given Janson's description of *topoi* common to both Greek and Latin histories. The overwhelming influence of Thucydides in Sallust is, however, surprising. There is much discussion over how Thucydides—not, for example, Herodotus—came to be the model for Sallust's historiography. Ramsey attributes this in part to the biographical similarities of the historians: both were active in politics and subsequently "forced to retire from the political arena."[41] McGushin, in his commentary, concurs and adds that the two "share the same basic view of human nature and agree in the way in which they considered history should be written."[42] Thucydides was also gaining wider popularity at the time Sallust was writing, thus making him generally more available as a model. Ramsey suggests that negative attitudes towards the contemporary political situation in Rome lent themselves to a deeper appreciation of Thucydides' pessimistic histories.[43]

Sallust's relationship to Cicero may also explain his use of Thucydides as a model, as some scholars have posited. While Cicero is a source for Sallust's content in at least the *Bellum Catilinae,*[44] Sallust's departure from Cicero in the matter of style is remarkable. Woodman argues that the distinctly "un-Ciceronian rhythms of Sallust's clausulae [and] the succession of short sentences"[45] indicate a conscious rejection of Cicero's recommended style for

---

[40] Ramsey, *Bellum Catilinae*, 60.
[41] Ramsey, *Bellum Catilinae,* 10.
[42] McGushin, *Bellum Catilinae,* 11. The presentation of history in Sallust and Thucydides is not, however, identical. Sallust writes with morality and the decline of the state's morals always in mind; Thucydides' history does not have the same moral outlook.
[43] Ibid.
[44] McGushin, *Bellum Catilinae,* 8; A.J. Woodman, *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography: Four Studies* (Portland: Areopagitica Press, 1988), 124.
[45] Woodman, *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography,* 122.

historiography.[46] Sallust's choice to model his writing on Thucydides consciously rejects Cicero; this can also be seen as a rejection of Herodotus' "encomiastic historiography" as too "conservative" and incompatible with the views presented in Sallust's work, according to Woodman.[47]

Ramsey, however, suggests that Sallust actually shares Cicero's views on historiography.[48] In the *Brutus*, Cicero discusses the appeal of Thucydides' style for the orator and historian:

> *optume, si historiam scribere, non si causas dicere cogitatis. Thucydides enim rerum gestarum pronuntiator sincerus et grandis etiam fuit* ([Imitating Thucydides is] wonderful, if you intend to write history, not plead cases. For Thucydides was a sincere narrator of accomplishments and was also great; Cic. *Brut.* 287).

Although unsuitable for oratory, Thucydides' style is acceptable for recording *res gestae*. Ramsey's opinion seems to imply that Sallust was following Cicero's advice by modeling his work after Thucydides. Nevertheless, Sallust chose to avoid the "polished prose that Cicero recommended as the ideal medium for history" in following Thucydides.[49]

Although these arguments are useful for examining how Sallust's historiography may have been a reaction or homage to Cicero, it would perhaps be more useful to examine what Sallust might gain by alluding to Thucydides in his preface. One possible benefit of this connection is that Sallust implicitly aligns himself with Thucydides' purported methodologies. Thucydides claims to be an eye-witness to many events he describes and to have consulted reliable witnesses for everything else (Thuc. I.22.1); as has already been discussed, Sallust

---

[46] This style, which Cicero advocates in a letter asking Lucceius to write a monograph about his consulship in 63 B.C., means treating events with a *copia* (abundance; Cic. *Ad Fam.* 5.12). While Cicero's desire that the historian detail the causes and results of an event (see Cic. *De Or.* II.63) seems to be met in Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae*, the compression of the language and the use of archaic vocabulary go against Cicero's recommendations.
[47] Woodman, *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography,* 126.
[48] Ramsey, *Bellum Catilinae,* 10.
[49] Ibid., 11.

makes no claim to being an eye-witness. By invoking Thucydides, however, Sallust may imply that he follows Thucydides' methodology. This would earn him more credibility. Another possible gain from alluding to Thucydides is that Sallust capitalizes on Thucydides' surge in popularity. The reflection of Thucydides' style in the compression and archaic flavor of the rest of the narratives constantly reminds the reader of Thucydides' influence on Sallust's historiography.

Cato

Sallust's prefaces also indicate that Cato served as one of his major stylistic influences. Cato was the first Roman historian to compose history in Latin and his *Origines* is one of the first works to break away from the strictly annalistic style of historiography.[50] Like that of Thucydides, Cato's influence on Sallust's writing is undeniable. Many of the typical Sallustian stylistic features, such as *brevitas*, *inconcinnitas*, archaisms, poeticisms, can be traced back to Cato's *Origines*. Although this work only exists in fragments, it is possible to see Cato's influence on Sallust's ideas, vocabulary, and syntax.

Several stylistic features of Cato's are already prominent within the prefaces. Syme notes Sallust's propensity to use "emphatic frequentatives" (e.g., *grassatur, Iug.* 1.3; *agitabatur, Cat.* 2.1) and "picturesque inchoative" verbs (e.g., *senenscunt, Iug.* 2.3; *torpescere, Iug.* 2.4), both archaisms and generally avoided in the prose writing of Sallust's day.[51] Sallust also replaces nouns in *–tas* with those in *–tudo* (e.g. *cupido, Cat.* 3.5 for *cupiditas; lubido*, *Cat.* 2.5); these "weighty terminations…suggested ancient majesty" since they were often found in old tragedy[52]

---

[50] The fragments suggest that Cato, while he recorded events in chronological order, did not use a strictly year-by-year format; see Cato, *Origines,* ed. and trans. Martine Chassignet (Paris: Belles Lettres, 1986), xi-xii.
[51] Syme, *Sallust,* 261.
[52] Plautus, for example, uses nouns ending in *–tudo* often: *suavitudo* (*Bac.* Non. 173 M; *St.* 755) appears in place of *suavitas*, which becomes more common later. Similarly, *hilaritudo* is found instead of *hilaritas* (*Cist.* 54; *Mil.* 677; *Rud.* 421).

and took the place of more common nouns (Sallust uses, for example, forms of *necessitudo* ten times between the *Bellum Catilinae* and *Bellum Iugurthinum* but never uses *necessitas*).[53] The "archaic and poetic" *–ere* verb ending in place of *–erunt* (e.g. *coepere*, *Cat.* 2.2) is also frequent. Although, on Cicero's authority (*Orat.* 157), both the *–ere* ending and the regular *–erunt* perfect endings were common in Sallust's time, since Cato used this ending rather frequently in the extant fragments of the *Origines*,[54] we can consider that Sallust's use of this it "seems to be a conscious borrowing" from him, as Ramsey argues.[55] Influence from Cato is evidenced outside the prefaces in Sallust's use of archaic vocabulary.

As in his choice of Thucydides, Sallust's reliance on Cato as a model was conscious. Ramsey writes, "Not only in language but also in outlook, Cato was ideally suited to the needs of Sallust."[56] His reason for choosing Cato can be attributed to several factors. Cato, like Sallust, was from outside Rome and would have encountered setbacks in his political career for not coming from traditional aristocratic families.[57] Sallust's negativity towards the aristocracy, especially in the preface of the *Bellum Iugurthinum*, seems to have its roots in Cato's thought; the *Origines* downplays the role of the nobility whenever possible.[58] The purpose of Cato's *Origines* was to be a didactic text, highlighting the importance of virtue in Roman history;[59] this view of history and its implementation even in the preface of Cato, is adopted by Sallust in his moralistic view of history also beginning with the preface.

---

[53] Ibid., 261-2.
[54] See, for example, the following instances: *accessitavere* (I, 20 J); *fuere* (I, 22 J); *meminere* (II, 1, J); *decessere* (IV, 10 J); *rescivere* (IV, 12 J) in Cato, *Origines,* ed. Martine Chassignet, xvii.
[55] Ramsey, *Bellum Catilinae,* 59.
[56] Ibid., 11.
[57] Ibid., 2.
[58] Watkiss, *Bellum Iugurthinum,* 31. This view is supported by the fact that, as has already been noted, Cato rarely mentions important historical figures by name, but prefers to emphasize the collective nature of Roman history.
[59] Cato, *Origines,* ed. Martine Chassignet, xvii.

Other stylistic sources

In addition to influence from major sources such as Thucydides and Cato, Sallust's prefaces show that he took inspiration from other historians and from poetry. Since the works of most historians before Sallust are not extant except in fragments, the full extent of his borrowings from them may never be known. However, there is evidence that Sallust followed the model of Sisenna, a historian of the early first century B.C., who showed a propensity for adverbs ending in –tim;[60] Examples of this exist in both prefaces: *carptim, Cat.* 4.2; *furtim, Iug.* 4.7. Sisenna's "tragic" historiography, which added dramatic elements to histories,[61] clearly also influenced Sallust's depiction of, for example, Catiline.

The evidence for poetic influence on Sallust is found throughout the prefaces. The traits of poetic style often overlap the archaisms borrowed from Cato and Thucydides,[62] but one additional poetic feature should be mentioned. Found in Cato, but most common in archaic poetry, Sallust employs a great deal of alliteration throughout the prefaces: e.g., *fluxa atque fragilis, Cat.* 1.4*; facilia factu…aequo animo accipit…ficta pro falsis, Cat.* 3.2*; malis moribus; Cat.* 3.5*; multis miseriis, Cat.* 4.1*; pollens potensque, Iug.* 1.3*; periculosa ac perniciosa petunt, Iug.* 1.5; *omniaque orta occident et aucta, Iug.* 2.3. Conte writes that alliteration is "typical of the earliest *carmina*" and "native to Latin;"[63] it is especially notable in Ennius' *Annales*.[64] Such poetic influences in history are not entirely surprising, since both genres shared certain aspects, as Quintilian notes.[65] Livy's preface also capitalizes on the connection between history and poetry, as Chapter 2 discusses.

---

[60] Ramsey, *Bellum Catilinae,* 67.
[61] Conte, *Latin Literature,* 122.
[62] Syme, *Sallust,* 258.
[63] Conte, *Latin Literature,* 82.
[64] See, e.g., *O Tite tute Tati tibi tanta tyranne tulisti* (Ennius *Ann.* fr. 109).
[65] Quintilian writes that history and poetry are written *ad narrandum* (for narration) rather than *ad probandam* (to prove something) as oratory is. He also contrasts the purpose of oratory and that of poetry and history: *non ad*

Unity of the Text and Purpose of the Prefaces

Sallust prioritizes the debate between *animus* and *corpus* and only discusses his proposed topic in the last paragraph of each preface. This has led some scholars to believe that the prefaces were written separately from the body of the text as short philosophical set pieces, unrelated to the themes of the work as a whole.[66] Their view is supported by the fact that Cicero, by his own admission, wrote prefaces separately and kept a stockpile to attach to his works as needed (Cic. *Ad Att.* 16.6.4). No evidence, however, suggests that Sallust continued this practice. Quintilian is adduced to show that the prefaces and texts are unrelated:

> *C. Sallustius in bello Iugurthino et Catilinae nihil ad historiam pertinentibus principiis orsus est* (C. Sallust undertook nothing in the prefaces to the *Bellum Iugurthinum* and *Catilinae* pertaining to history; *Inst. Or.* III.8.8).

As Wheeldon notes, this comment could mean either that the prefaces are unconnected to their specific historical work or that the prefaces "had no relevance to history in general,"[67] depending on the definition of *historia* as the historical genre or the historical text. In either case, Quintilian's criticism can be overlooked as it was primarily concerned with whether or not Sallust followed rhetorical practice in his prefaces.[68] Most scholars now agree that the prefaces and texts are integrally related and that the preface adds to the reader's overall understanding of the work;[69] this does seem to be the proper interpretation of the prefaces to the monographs, as this section intends to show.

The connection between the preface and the text is demonstrable in the *Bellum Catilinae* in several places. Catiline, in exhorting his comrades, parrots much of the moral language

---

actum rei pugnamque praesentem sed ad memoriam posteritatis et ingenii famam componitur (it is composed not for the pleading of a case or for the immediate fight, but for the memory of posterity and the reputation of the *ingenium* [of the author]; *Inst. Or.* X.1.31).

[66] See G. Boissier, "Les Prologues de Salluste," *Journal des Savants* 1 (1903): 59-66.

[67] Wheeldon, "True Stories," 52.

[68] Ibid.; cf. Syme, *Sallust,* 245.

[69] See, for example, Syme, *Sallust,* 241.

Sallust uses in the preface and echoes several phrases out of Sallust's description of Rome's history. Catiline appeals to *virtus*, *ingenium* and *animus* as the motivating forces behind his plot, as the following passages demonstrate:

> *ni virtus fidesque vostra satis spectata mihi forent, nequicquam opportuna res cecidisset* (unless your *virtus* and faithfulness had been sufficiently seen by me, this opportune matter would have come in vain; *Cat.* 20.2); *viget aetas, animus valet* (our age is strong, our *animus* is strong; *Cat.* 20.10); *neque animus neque corpus a vobis aberit* (neither my *animus* or body will be absent from you; *Cat.* 20.16); *etenim quis mortalium, cui virile ingenium est, tolerare potest…* (and indeed who of mortals, for whom there exists a manly *ingenium*, can tolerate…; *Cat*. 20.11).

These passages echo the repetition of these moral terms in the preface.[70] Catiline's distinction between *animus* and *corpus* at 20.16 is so close to Sallust's description of the same separation—both in the preface and in his depiction of Catiline[71]—that Catiline appears to be a perfect student of Sallust's philosophy on this point. While Sallust depicts a Catiline who can mimic his moral terminology, Catiline's speech shows that he manipulates the ultimate goal of this philosophy: he distorts the *animus*, *ingenium* and *virtus* to be not the best qualities of a man, as Sallust describes, but the qualities which make a man a good revolutionary. Catiline's distortion of the preface's moral vocabulary connects the preface to the body of the text; a reader must know Sallust's moral philosophy before fully understanding Catiline's manipulation of it.[72]

---

[70] See *animus* at *Cat.* 1.2, 1.5, 2.3, 3.2, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2; *ingenium* at *Cat.* 1.3, 2.1, 2.2; and *virtus* at *Cat*. 1.4, 1.5, 2.3, 2.7, 3.2, 3.3.

[71] *nostra omnis vis in animo et corpore sita est; animi imperio, corporis servitio magis utimur* (our entire strength is situated in the mind and in the body; we use the rule of the mind and the service of the body; *Cat*. 1.2); *L. Catilina, nobili genere natus, fuit magna vi et animi et corporis* (L. Catiline, born of a noble family, was of a great strength both of mind and body; *Cat.* 5.1).

[72] This speech also, perhaps surprisingly, anticipates ideas that are found in the preface to *Bellum Iugurthinum*: Catiline's claim that power consolidates into a few men (*nam postquam res publica in paucorum potentium ius atque dicionem concessit*; for, after the Republic conceded to the law and authority of a few men; *Cat.* 20.7) is echoed in a similar sentiment at *Iug.* 3.4, which specifically picks up the phrase *potentiae paucorum* (to the power of a few men). Catiline's resentment towards the nobility seems to be generally echoed in Sallust's disdain for the nobility in the preface to the *Bellum Iugurthinum.* Catiline's disdain is seen, for example, this phrase: *quis…tolerare potest illis divitias superare quas profundant in exstruendo mari et montibus coaequandis, nobis rem familiarem etiam ad necessaria deesse?* (who can tolerate that their riches are plentiful, the riches they pour out in raising the sea and leveling the mountains, while our own assets for necessary matters are lacking?; *Cat*. 20.11).

Caesar's speech reveals an even closer relationship to the preface; his opening sentence begins as follows:

> *Omnis homines, patres conscripti, qui de rebus dubiis consultant, ab odio, amicitia, ira atque misericordia vacuos esse decet* (It is fitting, conscript fathers, that all men who debate about doubtful matters be free of hatred, partisanship, anger, and pity; *Cat.* 51.1).

Caesar's beginning parallels to a large extent the first sentence of the monograph: *Omnis homines qui sese student praestare ceteris animalibus summa ope niti decet* (it is fitting that all men, who are eager to excel past the other animals, should strive with the greatest might; *Cat.* 1.1). Caesar repeats Sallust's accusative *omnis homines,* the relative clause modifying *homines*, and the impersonal *decet*. The beginning of Caesar's speech also appeals to impartiality, a hallmark of the good historian, mirroring Sallust's claim of objectivity in the preface: *mihi a spe metu, partibus rei publicae animus liber erat* (my mind was free from hope, fear, and partisanship of the Republic; *Cat.* 4.2).

Caesar continues to reprise Sallustian moral terms and ideas throughout his speech. For example, the phrase *si lubido possidet, ea dominatur, animus nihil valet* (if lust takes hold, it dominates, and the mind is not strong at all; *Cat*. 51.3) picks up on the idea in the preface that the *lubido dominandi* (lust of domination; *Cat*. 2.2) leads one to overly favor the *corpus* to the detriment of the *animus/ingenium* (*Cat.* 2.1-3). Caesar's statement *in maxuma fortuna minuma licentia est* (in the greatest fortune there is the least freedom; *Cat*. 51.13) seems to echo the syntax of a phrase from the "Archaeology:" *concordia maxuma, minuma avaritia erat* (harmony was the greatest, greed was at its least; Cat. 9.1).[73] These parallels illustrate Caesar's appropriation of the vocabulary and content of the beginning of the monograph; in some aspects,

[73] This connection seems particularly meaningful: immediately after the passage in the "Archaeology," Sallust writes *ius bonumque…non legibus magis quam natura valebat* (law and goodness were strong not through laws but by nature; *Cat*. 9.1). However, Caesar's speech, although it recalls this earlier passage through the verbal echo, argues for the necessity of the law in maintaining order (*Cat.* 51.25-36).

Caesar acts as the mouthpiece for Sallust's moral platform as expressed in the preface. Like Catiline, however, Caesar employs this philosophy to a different end than the one which the preface intends.

Cato's speech contains similar reminiscences of the preface. Cato espouses the same opposition to greed as Sallust does in the preface: *saepe de luxuria atque avaritia nostrorum civium questus sum, multosque mortalis ea causa advorsos habeo* (I have often complained about the luxury and greed of our citizens, and I consider many men enemies for this reason; *Cat*. 52.7). Sallust pinpoints the advent of *avaritia* and *ambitio* as the root of evils in Roman society (*Cat*. 10.4-5) and later blames *luxuria* for its corrupting influence (*Cat.* 11.5).[74] Cato also refers to the decline in the quality of Roman men and the diminished achievements of contemporary Rome; this theme of decline dominates the "Archaeology."[75]

Once again the repetition of earlier themes serves as the means to Cato's own ends. Catiline employs themes from the preface to incite his men to revolution and equate his own position with traditional morality. Caesar uses the preface to argue against the death penalty for the conspirators; Cato utilizes similar language, but to convince the Senate to vote in favor of the death penalty. These examples illustrate that the philosophy and morality expressed in the preface and through the "Archaeology" are present throughout the text, demonstrating the integral connection between the preface and the body of the monograph. The preface, then,

---

[74] Also see *Cat.* 12.2: *Igitur ex divitiis iuventutem luxuria atque avaritia cum superbia invasere* (thus, from riches, luxury and avarice, along with pride, invaded the youth).

[75] Cato's comparison between past and present Romans is as follows: *Sed alia fuere, quae illos magnos fecere, quae nobis nulla sunt: domi industria, foris iustum imperium…pro his nos habemus luxuriam atque avaritiam, publice egestatem, privatim opulentiam…Inter bonos et malos discrimen nullum, omnia virtutis praemia ambitio possidet.* (But there were other things that made them great, which are nothing to us: at home, there was industriousness, abroad just rule…in place of these things we have luxury and avarice, public neediness and private greed…There is no distinction between good and bad men, ambition takes hold of all the rewards of virtue; *Cat.* 53.21). This statement summarizes well the discussion of moral decline in the "Archaeology" and echoes in particular the invasion of bad habits: *namque avaritia fidem, probitatem ceterasque artis bonas subvortit; pro his superbiam, crudelitatem, deos neglegere…* (for avarice subverted faithfulness, honesty, and other good skills; in place of these [it brought] pride, cruelty, neglect of the gods; *Cat.* 10.4).

anticipates the major themes of the text and important figures in the text refer to different aspects of the preface for their own use.

This demonstration of the unity of the text shows the greater purpose of the philosophy throughout the prefaces. While recycled from other sources and far from original,[76] the prefaces use this philosophy to introduce the mindset towards humanity that will govern the rest of the work. By giving a framework for his philosophical outlook, Sallust guides the reader to conclusions about characters without having to state explicitly whether a character is good or bad. Rambaud argues that the division between men who follow the *corpus* and those who follow the *animus* is used by Sallust later in the text to characterize figures in his narratives:

> Le principe de cette fière morale, tel qu'il est exposé dans les prologues, est un principe de classement que l'historien applique tout au long de ses monographies. Souvent, il caractérise un personnage ou un groupe social en quelques mots: c'est toujours en le situant par rapport aux normes établies dans les 'prooemia'….[77]

Since he has established the superiority of the *animus* and of *virtus* at the beginning, Sallust provides a paradigm into which later characters fit. This allows Sallust to seem ambivalent about characters at times; this occurs, for example, in his characterization of Catiline. While he praises Catiline as being of great strength of mind and body (*fuit magna vi et animi et corporis; Cat.* 5.1) and describes the heroic death of his followers with their wounds in front (*advorsis volneribus; Cat.* 61.3), Sallust does not allow a positive view of Catiline since the man is also *ingenio malo pravoque* (of a depraved and evil nature; *Cat.* 5.1). By seeing Catiline in the moral framework which the preface establishes, the audience realizes that Catiline must be evil. Although Sallust may praise Catiline, the reader can see Catiline's ultimate failure stemming from the fact that he lies outside the moral ideal.

---

[76] Rambaud, "Les Prologues de Salluste," 119.
[77] Ibid.

A similar example is found in Sallust's description of Jugurtha. Sallust describes the young Jugurtha positively: *erat impigro atque acri ingenio…proelio strenuus erat et bonus consilio* (he was of an energetic and fierce nature, he was strong in battle and good in deliberation; *Iug.* 7.2-5). Shortly afterward, Jugurtha is described as being ruled by anger and fear (*ira et metu anxius*; *Iug.* 11.8). His actions continue to worsen throughout the text. The preface teaches the reader about Sallust's moral program so that the reader immediately recognizes Jugurtha's flaws and how he is inconsistent with the moral paradigm.

The prefaces serve, then, as a sort of microcosm for the moral world of Sallust's monographs. The themes which Sallust presents in the preface, namely the superiority of the *animus* to the *corpus* and the continual decline of morality, resurface throughout the monographs. Their initial presentation in each preface lays a foundation through which the reader understands the rest of the texts. The prefaces also succeed in providing a subtler assertion of the importance of the subject matter. Instead of proclaiming that he will narrate the greatest events of his age because they fit his moral pattern, Sallust provides an "indirect approach" by first establishing a "theoretical system for classifying men's actions" and applying it as if "to some well-known event chosen apparently at random."[78] Sallust can then *show* his readers the importance of Catiline or Jugurtha's War in his moral program, rather than announcing their importance at the beginning. The significance of the preface to Sallust's theories on history, philosophy, and humanity is made manifest in their application throughout the texts. Sallust's use of the preface as a microcosm of his ideals is a novel use of this convention; it exploits the connections between the preface and the whole text in ways that are unseen before Sallust.

[78] Stewart, "Sallust and *Fortuna*," 315.

While Sallust's works comprise the first extant examples of monographs in Latin historiography, his work does not exist in a vacuum, separated from other literary works because of the novelty of the genre. Rather, even though Sallust was experimenting with a format that broke from the Roman annalistic historiographical tradition, his prefaces indicate a reliance on his predecessors. In the structure of his prefaces, Sallust conforms to the conventions of most historiography. Where he departs from the norm in writing about philosophy, Sallust is still inspired by the moral focus of Cato's history and his philosophy is a combination of some of the most well-known tropes of classical thought. In style Sallust was perhaps surprising for his time since he relied on archaisms, poeticisms, and other un-Ciceronian vocabulary. These stylistic traits were not, however, invented by Sallust and instead show how he carefully incorporated characteristics of previous historians. Although it would perhaps be tempting to call the prefaces trite and lacking innovation because of their borrowings, the blend of all the elements Sallust combines is really their most novel aspect. Sallust merges philosophy and historiography, among many other inspirations, and changes the preface—which risks coming off as "tired repetition of empty rhetorical tricks learnt at school"[79]—into something productive for the work through the connections between the preface and the text as a whole. The combination of familiar elements demonstrates how Sallust approaches the prefaces in an innovative way while remaining steeped in the literary tradition of his predecessors.

[79] Averil Cameron, *History as Text: The Writing of Ancient History* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1989), 34.

CHAPTER THREE

LIVY'S PREFACE

Livy's preface is challenging to the reader not only because of its style,[80] but also for its unique approach to genre and the conventions of the preface. From the first sentence, it is clear that Livy offers his audience historiography far different from the Sallustian monograph. While Livy, unlike Sallust, writes his *Ab Urbe Condita* in a genre long established at Rome, his preface reveals that he does not blindly adhere to the traditions of the annalists who came before him. There are, of course, many similarities between Livy and his predecessors. However, we can learn more about Livy's purposes in the preface by examining where he differs from previous historians.[81] This chapter focuses on four issues in Livy's preface to show how this text advances the development of the preface as a literary convention in Latin historiography. The four issues are as follows: the increased connection between the author and reader, the references to contemporary society embedded in the preface, the place of poetry within the preface, and Livy's relationship to his predecessors, most especially Sallust. While each of these issues is crucial to Livian scholarship in its own right, this chapter approaches each topic in terms of how it affects the position of Livy's preface in the evolution of Latin historiography.

The Connection between Author and Reader

In his article on Livy's preface, John Moles notes its "general rather confessional tone …somewhat reminiscent of Sallustian prefaces."[82] While the preface bears many similarities to

[80] It is a "style tortueux, peu ordinaire chez Tite-Live" in Eugen Cizek, "À propos de la poétique de l'histoire chez Tite-Live," *Latomus Revue d'Études Latines.* 51, no. 2 (1992): 363.
[81] See R.M. Ogilvie, *A Commentary on Livy Books 1-5* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965), 23.
[82] John Moles, "Livy's Preface," *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 39 (1983): 159.

those of Sallust, its tone can be described as much more than "rather confessional." The use of first- and second-person verbs as well as Livy's close relationship with the reader, established through his exhortations to readers and through revelations of his own feelings, create an intimacy between Livy and his audience that is not present in Sallust's prefaces.

Livy uses the first person six times in the first sentence, immediately drawing the reader's attention to himself:[83]

> *Facturusne operae pretium sim si a primordio urbis res populi Romani perscripserim nec satis scio nec, si sciam, dicere ausim, quippe qui cum veterem tum volgatam esse rem videam, dum novi semper scriptores aut in rebus certius aliquid allaturos se aut scribendi arte rudem vetustatem superaturos credunt* (Whether I will get a return if I should record the deeds of the Roman people from the beginning of the city, I do not know well enough nor—if I did know—would I dare to announce it, since I perceive that this matter is not only old but also very common, while, all the time, new writers believe that they either add something more certain in these matters or they believe that they surpass the crude antiquity of the matter by their writing skill; Pref. 1).

Throughout the preface, Livy continues to employ first-person verbs, pronouns, and adjectives.[84] These are almost always singular; Livy uses the first-person plural sparingly,[85] focusing instead on the personal relationship established by the use of the singular. References to the audience, the implied second person of the preface, are expressed in the third person at the beginning: *legentium plerisque* (to most of those reading [this history]; Pref. 4); *festinantibus ad haec nova* (to those hurrying on to these newer subjects; Pref. 5); *ad illa mihi pro se quisque acriter intendat animum* (in my opinion, each reader should, of his own accord, turn his thoughts to these things; Pref. 9). Livy also refers to the Roman people (who comprise the audience of this work) in the third person: *ea belli gloria est populo Romano ut…suum conditorisque sui*

---

[83] "…of the fourteen instances of the first-person verb, six come in the first sentence," M.J. Wheeldon, "'True Stories': the reception of historiography in antiquity," in *History as Text: the Writing of Ancient History,* ed. Averil Cameron (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1989), 56. The first-person verbs are *sim, perscripersim, scio, sciam, ausim,* and *videam* (Pref. 1).

[84] E.g., *mea fama* (3), *consoler* (4), *ego...petam* (5), *aut me amor...fallit* (11), *inciperemus* (13).

[85] See the following instances: *nostra…aetas* (5); *nec vitia nostra nec remedia pati possumus* (9); *nobis quoque mos esset, libentius inciperemus* (13).

parentem Martem postissimum ferat (such is the Roman people's glory in war that they claim most-powerful Mars as their own parent and the parent of their founder; Pref. 7). These instances of third-person references show Livy's concern for his reader, but the bond between the author and his audience becomes stronger later in the preface.

Towards the end, Livy gives specific instructions to his reader, addressing him with second-person singular verbs, adjectives, and pronouns:

> *Hoc illud est praecipue in cognitione rerum salubre ac frugiferum, omnis te exempli documenta in inlustri posita monumento intueri; inde tibi tuaeque rei publicae quod imitere capias, inde foedum inceptu foedum exitu quod vites* (this is especially beneficial and fruitful in considering these matters [i.e., history]: namely, that you should see every type of example set forth in a brilliant memorial; from there, you may take for yourself and your Republic what to imitate and you can avoid whatever is wicked in its beginning and end; Pref. 10).

The use of the second-person singular focuses Livy's exhortations on each specific reader, creating a closer relationship than the third-person verbs did. Livy's use of first- and second-person references stand in contrast to Sallust, who rarely employs the second person,[86] and writes in the first person far less frequently. Sallust refers to himself in the first person in both monographs when he discusses his path to historiography,[87] but other first-person pronouns come in impersonal statements, deflecting responsibility for the opinion away from Sallust.[88] Quite the opposite, Livy's authorial persona is ever-present through his self-references and

---

[86] In Sallust, second-person verbs are almost always generalizing and would seem to be better if replaced with an impersonal third-person verb. See, for example, *prius quam incipias…consuleris* (*Cat.* 1.6), *cerneres* (*Cat.* 2.3), *corrigas* (*Iug.* 3.2).

[87] *Ego adulesctntulus initio* (*Cat.* 3.3); *ego credo* (*Iug.* 4.3)

[88] This is especially notable in "*mihi quidem…videtur*" (*Cat.* 3.2) when Sallust discusses his most strongly held belief, namely that historiography is a worthy pursuit and, indeed, superior to all other activities, using an impersonal verb with the pronoun in the dative. Sallust hardly seems to take ownership of his opinion here, which is surprising considering the polemic he establishes regarding the importance of historiography; see Chapter 1.

addresses to the reader.[89] This reliance on the first person is, however, surprising considering the historian's need to establish authority in the preface.

M.J. Wheeldon argues that a historian would not have needed to persuade an ancient audience that his work contained historical "truth," so long as other qualifications which indicate truth are met.[90] The reader would assume from the beginning that a historian was truthful so long as he conformed to the readers' expectations of a historiographical work. One way that an author signals his authority is his use of the third person, since this corroborates the reader's expectation that a "disinterested authority lay behind the text."[91] By using third-person, the author displays "distance and certainty… objectifying phenomena in space by setting them apart from the perceivers, 'you' and 'I' (reader and writer)."[92] When the historian employs, on the other hand, first- and second- person verbs, he conveys informality and intimacy.[93] Since the reader expects the third person as part of the establishment of authority (or, at least, the illusion of this authority), a preface presents unique problems since the form requires that a historian introduce himself and his work.[94] Different authors deal with this tension variously. Herodotus[95] and Thucydides[96] introduce themselves in the third person, as though there is only a

---

[89] We should recognize a distinction between Livy the author and Livy the narrator of the *Ab Urbe Condita*, the authorial persona Livy creates; however, it is difficult to know where to draw this distinction, especially in a text where the use of the first-person seems to imply that the author and his persona as narrator are one. See John Marincola, *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997): 6-7.
[90] Wheeldon, "True Stories," 44.
[91] Ibid., 48.
[92] Ibid., 47.
[93] Ibid., 46.
[94] Ibid., 50: "The basic difficulty for the Roman historian in composing his preface was that whereas some claim to disinterestedness was more or less obligatory, the use of the first person mode of itself drew attention to the historian's particular perspective. Therefore, despite the fact that this claim was a conventional *topos*, it was not a subject about which the historian could afford to be artistically indifferent and for which he could rely on conventional phrases."
[95] Ἡροδότου Ἁλικαρνησσέος ἱστορίης ἀπόδεξις ἥδε (Herod. I.1). Leslie Kurke, "Charting the poles of history: Herodotus and Thoukydides," in *Literature in the Greek and Roman Worlds,* ed. Oliver Taplin (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000): 138 writes that Herodotus' first sentence highlights the performance aspect of his work through the use of the deictic ἥδε but the placement of Herodotus in the genitive case deemphasizes the authorship. Kurke argues that this construction is characteristic of "the form of early inscriptions, which 'speak'

"disinterested authority" and not a real person behind their work. Sallust, in an attempt to mitigate the tension, preserves an illusion of his authority by using impersonal verbs with the personal pronoun in the dative (*mihi videtur*, Sall. *Cat.* 3.2).[97] However, even in the third person, as Wheeldon notes, the reader is never fully unaware of the historian's presence in the text. Recognizing this, Livy "make[s] a virtue of the necessity to write in the first person, by creating in the authorial persona itself a model of the kind of reader he would wish his audience to imitate."[98] Rather than trying to find the balance in introduction and authority, Livy draws attention to himself as the author of the text in order to create a rapport between himself and his readers. Livy will use this personal connection to guide his readers to the ultimate use of history, as is discussed below.

Besides the first-person verbs, Livy highlights himself in other ways in the preface. In the first sentence, Livy ponders what he will receive in return for his great work: *facturusne operae pretium sim…nec satis scio* (I do not know whether I will get a return on this task; Pref. 1).[99] He also creates a polemic against the *novi…scriptores* (new authors; Pref. 1), setting himself apart from (and above) his competitors and predecessors.[100] The overall effect of the first sentence not only gives a sense of Livy's concern for his own benefits from this project, but

---

from the position of the object inscribed, while they characterize their absent owners in the genitive and the third-person…the syntax of Herodotus' first clause is predicated on the connection made between reader and text in the absence of the author."

[96] Θουκυδίδης Ἀθηναῖος ξυνέγραψε τὸν πόλεμον τῶν Πελοποννησίων καὶ Ἀθηναίων (Thuc. 1.I.1); but note the use of the first person later in the same paragraph: νομίζω (Thuc. 1.I.2). Contrasting the opening lines of Herodotus and Thucydides, Leslie Kurke, "Charting the poles of history," 150 writes, "Thucydides chooses the modest verb ξυνέγραψε…and yet the implication of this verb is not so modest after all, since it suggests that the 'facts' to be written up are clear and unambiguous, in need only of recording." This approach makes the text seem "autonomous," as Kurke argues, and "effaces" Thucydides' authorship.

[97] Wheeldon notes that this strikes a compromise between Livy and using solely third-person verbs, but he remains unconvinced that this technique successfully preserves Sallust's authority in the preface.

[98] Ibid., 56.

[99] Moles, "Livy's Preface," 142 argues that the *operae pretium* is, indeed, Livy's but that it could also be the reader's reward for his trouble.

[100] His relationship to Sallust is, however, somewhat different and is discussed below.

of his feigned modesty about his aptitude for historiography. Livy continues to focus on himself, imagining himself being consoled by the greatness of his competitors if his history should fail (Pref. 3),[101] and stressing the enormity of his task (Pref. 4).[102] Section 5 focuses on the author's self-indulgent escapism:

> *Ego contra hoc quoque laboris praemium petam, ut me a conspectu malorum quae nostra tot per annos vidit aetas, tantisper certe dum prisca illa mente repeto, avertam* (I, however, will seek even this reward of my labor, that as long as I seek these old things with my whole mind, I will turn myself away from the sight of those evils which our age has seen for so many years; Pref. 5).

Livy reveals that, unlike the majority of his readers, he is looking for a different benefit of historiography: this is the ability to retreat from the maladies of his time and focus on the earliest beginnings of Rome (*prisca*).[103] Further references to his own benefits and self-aggrandizement can be seen in his calling his work an *amor* (love; Pref. 11) and his identification with the poets (Pref. 13); both are discussed later. The preface, then, is overwhelmingly dominated by its author. Where Sallust uses the preface as a platform for discussing philosophy and the nature of humankind, Livy presents himself as a man who is utterly invested in his work and deeply devoted to his cause.

Livy also displays a great concern for his readers. He is bothered by the fact that his readers, scorning ancient history, will rush on to contemporary events: *festinantibus ad haec nova* (hurrying on to these new things; Pref. 4). This troubles Livy, since he is concerned that

---

[101] *Et si in tanta scriptorum turba mea fama in obscuro sit, nobilitate ac magnitudine eorum me qui nomini officient meo consoler* (And if in such a crowd of writers my fame should end up in anonymity, I would be consoled by the nobility and greatness of those who obscure my name; Pref. 3).

[102] *Res est praeterea et immensi operis, ut quae supra septingentesimum annum repetatur et quae ab exiguis profecta initiis eo creverit ut iam magnitudine laboret sua* (Besides, the matter is an immense undertaking, as it goes back over seven hundred years and it has grown, having set out from small beginnings, to the point where it is burdened by its own greatness; Pref. 4).

[103] While Ogilvie, *Commenatry*, 24 notes that Livy's escapism is unique to his preface, he focuses overmuch on Livy's desire to retreat from the world. Moles, "Livy's Preface," 150 argues for a compromise between the past and present on the grounds that the "escapism of section 5 has turned out to be a feint" since Livy does, in fact, treat contemporary history. Michael Paschalis, "Livy's *Praefatio* and Sallust" (Ph.D. diss., Ohio State University, 1980), 93 would agree, noting that Livy shows distaste throughout the preface for the Antiquarians, who see "legendary material [as]…an end in itself" (96), rather than instruction for the present day.

the readers find *voluptas* (pleasure) in his work, in its content as well as style.[104] Lest his audience forget their duty in reading, Livy establishes their task in no uncertain terms:

> *ad illa mihi pro se quisque acriter intendat animum, quae vita, qui mores fuerint, per quos viros quibusque artibus domi militiaeque et partum et auctum imperium sit* (in my opinion, each reader should, of his own accord, turn his thoughts to these things: what kind of life, what kind of character existed, through what sort of men and through which arts, both at home and abroad, rule was acquired and increased; Pref. 9).

He is not content with having explained how his readers should approach his work; he also reminds them of the ultimate benefit of history, which is learning about previous examples in order to find which to imitate and which to avoid.[105] This is not the impersonal, generalizing use of the second person found in Sallust's prefaces; Livy is personally exhorting his readers, pleading with them to overcome their hesitations in reading about Rome's beginnings and find the underlying message in reading history. The use of the second person here represents "un *crescendo,* un *climax*, car Tite-Live part de 'chacun' pour aboutir à toi et à *tua res publica.*"[106] Livy takes pains to examine the personal benefit of history to each reader, in contrast to Sallust's approach, which extols the intrinsic value of history, but does not (overtly, at least) relate it to his readers' lives. For Livy, the very survival of Rome is at stake and it is vital that his readers take his message to heart: the state is crumbling before his eyes[107] and the only hope of redemption

---

[104] Gary B. Miles, *Livy: Reconstructing Early Rome* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995), 15 asserts that Livy focuses on his readers appreciating his content rather than style; Moles, "Livy's Preface, 157, on the other hand, argues that Livy shows a greater concern for style by associating his historiography with poetry; this is discussed below.

[105] *Hoc illud est praecipue…salubre ac frugiferum, omnis te exempli documenta in inlustri posita monument; inde tibi tuaeque rei publicae quod imitere capias, inde foedum inceptu foedum exitu quod vites* (this is especially beneficial and fruitful: namely, that you should see every type of example set forth in a brilliant memorial; from there, you may take for yourself and your Republic what to imitate and you can avoid whatever is wicked in its beginning and end; Pref. 10).

[106] Cizek, "À propos de la poétique," 356.

[107] Livy indicates Rome's imminent demise through these remarks: the state is languishing under its own weight (*ab exiguis profecta initiis eo creverit ut iam magnitudine laboret sua*; Pref. 4), the resources of the state are causing its ruin (*iam pridem praevalentis populi vires se ipsae conficiunt;* Pref. 4), and the state can no longer endure its vices nor their remedies (*nec vitia nostra nec remedia pati possumus*; Pref. 9).

lies in his audience learning from previous examples.[108] This is what justifies the extensive use of the first- and second-person forms. Livy's message is personal and desperate and necessitates the increased intimacy between historian and audience.

In spite of the emotional tone of the preface, many describe Livy as removed from the Romans whose story he narrates: "He is something of an outsider looking in upon the historiographical rat-race."[109] Several scholars argue that Livy's provincial origin provides him with an anthropological, distant perspective on the Roman people compared to Sallust who is deeply embedded in the Roman political system.[110] Evidence for this perspective is found in section 1 where Livy describes himself seeing his competitors as if from the outside.[111] A stronger argument comes from Livy's avoidance of the word *nostri* which, throughout Latin historiography, commonly denotes the Roman people.[112] The relative absence of the first-person plural has already been noted; the only important exception in the preface is *vitia nostra* (our vices; Pref. 9). Leeman explains this use of the plural by saying it refers to the present time.[113] Livy was indeed outside the political system at Rome, but there does not seem to be much more proof than the lack of *nostri* for the claim that he "looked at Roman history as something not quite his own."[114] Rather, the opposite seems to be true. Even though Livy never held an office at Rome, there is evidence that he saw himself in terms of the Roman political/work system,

---

[108] As indicated in Pref. 10; see note 105.
[109] Moles, "Livy's Preface," 144.
[110] See Moles, "Livy's Preface," 144; A.D. Leeman, "Are We Fair to Livy? Some thoughts on Livy's Preface" *Helikon* 1 (1961): 34; Cizek, "À propos de la poétique," 362.
[111] *quippe qui cum veterem tum volgatam esse rem videam, dum novi semper scriptores aut in rebus certius aliquid allaturos se aut scribendi arte rudem vetustatem superaturos credunt* (Pref. 2): This description shows Livy looking in at the previous works of historiographers (*videam*) and also discusses the *novi semper scriptores* as though he himself was not a part of this group.
[112] John Marincola, *Authority and Tradition*, 287 discusses the convention of using *nos* and *nostri* in Roman historiography: "It is characteristic of the Roman historians to use the first-person plural frequently when referring to the Roman state or to Roman soldiers in battle. Cato may have been the first to do this, since one fragment of the *Origins* speaks of 'our commander.' [*imperator noster,* Cato, *Orig.* fr. IV, 4 J] By Sallust's time, the convention is already fully developed."
[113] Leeman, "Are We Fair to Livy?" 37.
[114] Ibid., 38.

much as his contemporaries and, more importantly, the senatorial historians who came before him (see below). While the absence of the first-person plural in Livy's preface is notable, it is not enough to prove that he felt himself an outsider in Roman society. Livy proves throughout the preface that the health of the state is of chief personal importance to him and the intimate first- and second-person words point to a close relationship with his Roman audience.[115]

Contemporary Allusions

Scholars have long debated when Livy wrote and published the first pentad of the *Ab Urbe Condita* and whether that date is different from the composition of the preface. Dating the preface and first pentad is even more critical for Livy's text than for others since the answer affects our perception of Livy's relationship to the civil wars and to Augustus. Conventional dating places the publication of the first five books between 27 B.C. and 25 B.C. based on internal evidence and posits a starting date of ca. 29 B.C. for the work. This view accepts that Augustus is a presence in the preface.[116] There is mounting evidence, however, that the two passages pointing to this publication date (I.19.2-3 and IV.20.7, both referring to Augustus, not Octavian) are actually later interpolations in the text.[117] Several scholars, including Woodman and Luce, now place the composition of the first pentad earlier, perhaps before Actium in 31 B.C. The date of the preface is further complicated since authors commonly wrote their prefaces last. We will never know for certain if Livy wrote his preface before the pentad, at the end, or at a different point such as after Book 1. The implications of this dating are vast: if Livy did write the preface before Octavian was named Augustus, as Woodman, Luce and others assert, then

---

[115] Paschalis, "Livy's *Praefatio*," 157 agrees: "Throughout the *Praefatio* runs a deep consciousness of the crisis of the *res publica*, which is inherited from Sallust but given a new tone of emotional involvement." See the examples of this crisis in note 107.
[116] Ogilvie, *Commentary,* 2.
[117] T.J. Luce, "The Dating of Livy's First Decade," *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 96 (1965): 211.

there are no possible references to Augustus in the preface. Removing Augustus from the text changes the tenor of the whole preface, and affects several key passages in particular.

Livy makes several allusions to his own time in the preface. He remarks that his readers will probably rush on to *haec nova* (these new things; Pref. 4), and contrasts this with the *pridem praevalentis populi vires* (resources of a formerly strong people; Pref. 4). He claims that history helps him turn away from the evils *quae nostra tot per annos vidit aetas* (which our age has seen for so many years; Pref. 5); remarking on this, Ogilvie notes that "Livy's distaste for his own times could not be more strongly stated."[118] The most important remark for the dating of the preface is this: *donec ad haec tempora quibus nec vitia nostra nec remedia pati possumus perventum est* (until [the reader] has come to these times in which we are able to endure neither our vices nor their remedies; Pref. 9).

The key to this passage is the interpretation of *remedia.* Livy's disgust for the moral failings of his time is evident, but to what specifically does he refer with this word? Those who accept the later composition date of the preface and first pentad assert that the *remedia* are Augustus' moral legislation of 28 B.C.; these measures incurred great opposition and were repealed.[119] This interpretation seems logical, but if the preface was written earlier, it cannot be accepted. Woodman, Paschalis, and Moles argue that the preface was written before Actium, that is, amid the civil wars.[120] Such a date better suits Livy's negativity toward his own age: the bitterness towards his contemporaries (*pridem praevalentis populi*) and the ills which society sees (*nostra tot per annos vidit aetas*; Pref. 4), make sense in the context of civil war.[121] The

---

[118] Ogilvie, *Commentary,* 26.
[119] Ibid., 28: "It is hard, therefore, to doubt that Livy, like Horace, is referring to the failure of that legislation." See also Cizek, "À propos de la poétique," 363.
[120] Moles, "Livy's Preface," 151; Paschalis, "Livy's *Praefatio,*" 23. A.J. Woodman, *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography: Four Studies* (Portland: Areopagitica Press, 1988), 132.
[121] Paschalis, "Livy's *Praefatio,*" 9, 23 notes that Livy's language here is reminiscent of Horace *Ep.* 16 and Sallust *Hist.*, strengthening the connection between Livy and civil war literature.

lack of reference to a Golden Age also supports this.[122] What, then, are the *remedia* if not a reference to Augustus' legislation? Are they the prospect of one-man rule, commonly cited as the only cure for the civil wars?[123] This interpretation of *remedia* would hold and make sense whether the preface was written before or after the civil wars, since "Livy surely could have written in such pessimistic terms even after Actium."[124]

We may, alternatively, view the reference to *remedia* as purely rhetorical, part of Livy's generalizing statement about his time. Taken as a gnomic statement, *remedia* would not refer to any specific legislation or solutions to the political ills. Instead, it would be Livy's broad comment on the fact that his contemporaries (people in *haec tempora*, these times) are never satisfied, either with their indulgences or the solutions proposed to counteract them. This explanation is plausible, but I believe that *remedia* can refer to an actual solution. Livy situates this passage within an actual discussion of Roman moral decline, not a theoretical discourse on all types of moral decline. The placement of this phrase amidst the other contemporary allusions of the preface shows that Livy is not speaking universally, but commenting specifically on decline at Rome.

The existence of contemporary allusions at all in the preface is unsurprising, given the precedent in Sallust. In Sallust's prefaces, as Chapter 1 demonstrated, only that for the *Bellum Iugurthinum* refers to the contemporary political scene (*potentiae paucorum,* Sall. *Iug.* 3.4). The *Bellum Catilinae* discusses the decline of morals and the deplorable state of Rome after the fall of Carthage and the rule of Sulla, but only in the "Archaeology" section (Sall. *Cat*. 5.9-13.5). This section records the progress of Rome *ut paulatim inmutata ex pulcherruma [et optuma] pessuma ac flagitiosissuma facta sit* (how the Republic changed little by little from the most

[122] Ibid., 11.
[123] Woodman, *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography*, 132; Moles, "Livy's Preface," 151.
[124] Moles, "Livy's Preface," 151.

beautiful [and best] state and was turned into the worst and most shameful; Sall. *Cat.* 5.9). Livy, influenced by Sallust's "Archaeology," condenses his version of the decline of Roman morals and includes it in the preface. In section 9, Livy is instructing the reader to examine how Roman discipline slipped *paulatim* (little by little) at first, until morals began to plummet head first (*praecipites;* Pref. 9);[125] this leads directly to the passage on vices and remedies. Sections 11-12 give a condensed description of Roman moral decline:

> *…nulla umquam res publica nec maior nec sanctior nec bonis exemplis ditior fuit, nec in quam [civitatem] tam serae avaritia luxuriaque immigraverint, nec minus cupiditatis erat: nuper divitiae avaritiam et abundantes voluptates desiderium per luxum atque libidinem pereundi perdendique omnia invexere* (no state was ever greater, holier, or richer in good *exempla*, nor did avarice and luxury come so late into any civilization, nor [did any other state] have less greed: recently, riches have brought in avarice, and abundant pleasures have brought in a desire for ruining and destroying everything through luxury and lust; Pref. 11-12).

This passage covers the same general points as Sallust's: Rome was a model of morality at its foundation (or, at the start of the Republic, at least) and has only recently fallen into moral decay.[126] The fact that Rome's decline is positioned within the preface and refers to contemporary politics—whatever the precise reference is—demonstrates how the preface is becoming more contextualized. Rather than using the preface to provide a general and philosophical description of decline—much as Sallust did, barring some brief references to contemporary politics in the *Bellum Catilinae*—Livy uses the preface to discuss the specific case of Rome in his own day. He asks the reader to reflect on the positive characteristics of Roman civilization (the *vita, mores, viri,* and *artes* in Pref. 9), Roman rule (*imperium*; Pref. 7 and 9), and the late introduction of evils into Rome (Pref. 11). Livy constantly draws the reader's attention

---

[125] Note the echo of *paulatim* from Sall. *Cat.* 5.9.

[126] Sallust, however, blames the majority of the decay on the fall of Carthage and on Sulla's domination in Rome. Livy's focus is primarily on importations of luxury and riches into Rome as the culprit (this is seen most clearly in *immigraverint*). Some scholars believe this is an indication that Livy rejected Sallust's view of the decline; see below.

to Rome's decline and present situation (as well as its possible redemption). He engages with Roman history and the contemporary political scene more actively than Sallust. The trend of contextualizing the preface in contemporary political events is advanced even further by Tacitus, as Chapter 3 discusses.

Poetry and Livy's Preface

The Romans recognized a strong bond between history and poetry. In his treatise on oratory, Quintilian writes that history:

> *Est…proxima poetis, et quodam modo carmen solutum est, et scribitur ad narrandum, non ad probandum, totumque opus non ad actum rei pugnamque praesentem sed ad memoriam posteritatis et ingenii famam componitur: ideoque et verbis remotioribus et liberioribus figuris narrandi taedium evitat* (is nearest to the poets and, in a certain way, an unbound song [i.e. prose poem], and it is written for narrating, not for proving, and the whole work is composed not to achieve a case or for a present fight, but rather for the memory of posterity and the fame of one's ability; Quint. *Inst. Or*. X.1.31).

Although Quintilian's view is colored by the fact that he writes in praise of oratory and remarks on the unsuitability of history for oratory, his opinion is still noteworthy. Woodman writes that this connection between history and poetry is long-standing, dating back to Homer's influence on Herodotus: "the ancients believed that [Herodotus] imitated Homer, which suggests that in some sense Homer was regarded as his predecessor."[127] Herodotus invokes a comparison to epic in the preface by emphasizing the importance of his subject matter.[128] As argued in Chapter 1, Sallust

---

[127] Woodman, *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography,* 1. Kurke, "Charting the poles of history," 137 argues that Herodotus' focus on the performance aspect of his work (as evidenced by the presence of the deictic element in his opening line) reveals this influence from Homeric tradition.

[128] Woodman, *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography*, 2. Cf. ἔργα μεγάλα τε καὶ θωμαστά (great and wondrous deeds; Hdt. I.1). Also see Thucydides, who also emphasizes the greatness of his theme, perhaps more than Herodotus: ἐλπίσας μέγαν τε ἔσεσθαι καὶ ἀξιολογώτατον τῶν προγεγενημένων (believing that [the Peloponnesian War] would be great and the most worthy of note of all the things that came before; Thuc. 1.I.1); κίνησις γὰρ αὕτη μεγίστη δὴ τοῖς Ἕλλησιν ἐγένετο (for this was indeed the greatest war that ever happened for the Hellenes; Thuc. 1.I.2). The proem to the *Iliad* does not explicitly claim at greatness; epic was regarded as the genre appropriate for great works, so there was no need to assert what intrinsically belongs to it. Homer does allude to the greatness of his theme by talking about the sheer number of heroic people whom Achilles affects (πολλὰς δ᾽ ἰφθίμους ψυχὰς Ἄϊδι προϊαψεν ἡρώων; he sent many strong souls of heroes to Hades; Hom. *Il.* I.3-4) and

employs poetry in his historiography, borrowing archaic vocabulary and utilizing poetic devices within the preface.[129] The connection between poetry and historiography in Livy's preface is, however, much deeper than in Sallust's. This section explores Livy's conscious allusions to poetry and poets and discusses why such references have a place in the preface to the *Ab Urbe Condita*.

Livy's preface opens with almost a full line of dactylic hexameter (*facturusne operae pretium sim*), posing to the reader "an immediate challenge."[130] By writing in meter, Livy intentionally confuses the readers' expectations regarding a historiographical text—specifically, the expectation that the work be in prose. But is the verse actually intentional? The dactylic hexameter is only preserved in Quintilian's comment on the line;[131] other extant manuscripts offer a reading not in verse.[132] Although Ogilvie cites a verse opening line as a "fashionable affectation" of a prose work,[133] it was seen as a stylistic faux-pas, an unnecessary mixing of genres.[134] It is, however, highly unlikely that the verse opening is a mistake; Luce argues persuasively that Quintilian's verse reading is correct and that the line must be intentional.[135] Prefaces received a great deal of attention from their authors, both as the first thing a reader sees,

---

discussing the gods' involvement in the events (Διὸς δ᾽ ἐτελείετο βουλή; the plan of Zeus was being fulfilled; Hom. *Il.* I.5).

[129] See Chapter 1.

[130] Moles, "Livy's Preface," 139.

[131] *T. Livius hexametri exordio coepit: "facturusne operae pretium sim" (nam ita editum est, [quod] melius quam quo modo emendatur* (T. Livy begins in the exordium with a hexameter: "I will make a return on this work" (for so it was put forth, and this is better than how it was emended); Quint. *Inst. Or.* IX.4.74).

[132] Luce, "The Dating of Livy's First Decade," 235; Moles, "Livy's Preface," 139. Other variants are *sim operae pretium* (manuscript N) and *sim si a primordio…perscripserim operae* (manuscript O).

[133] Ogilvie, *Commentary*, 25.

[134] Luce, "The Dating of Livy's First Decade," 236. See Quint. *Inst. Or.* IX.4.72-74: *Versum in oratione fieri multo foedissimum est totum, sed etiam in parte deforme, utique si pars posterior in clausula deprehendatur aut rursus prior in ingressu…et ultima versuum initio conveniunt orationis…sed initia initiis non conveniunt, ut T. Livius hexametri exordio coepit* (For an entire verse to happen in an oration is by far most vile, but even for a part of a verse it is unsightly, at any rate if the last part [of a verse] is found in the ending, or even the first part [of a verse] in the beginning…although, the endings of verse are appropriate in the beginning of orations, but the beginnings [of verse] are not appropriate to the beginnings [of a speech], as T. Livy begins in the exordium with a hexameter).

[135] Ibid., 237.

and typically the last the author writes; their care in the composition of prefaces "precludes mere accident,"[136] such as the chance that the first line happened to fall into dactylic hexameter without the author's intending it.

The hexameter line is a "deliberate echo of Rome's first writers of *Annales*…and of Q. Ennius in particular."[137] Other passages in the preface further link Livy to Ennius. Moles argues that the phrase *operae pretium* (Pref. 1) is taken from a fragment of Ennius' *Annales*.[138] Livy's use of *monumentum* may also be echoing a fragment.[139] Ennius' work combines historical writing and epic poetry; his influence on the Roman annalistic tradition is considerable.[140] The fact that Livy borrows from Ennius when he both aligns himself with and separates himself from the annalists points again to the complex relationship between history and poetry.

Along with Ennius, Livy echoes the epic poets in general. Livy's use of hexameter, as the meter of epic poetry, automatically places him not just in the realm of poetry, but of epic in particular.[141] When discussing his competitors, the *novi semper scriptores*, Livy consoles himself that, if he should fail, he would be comforted by their greatness: *et si in tanta scriptorium turba mea fama in obscuro sit, nobilitate ac magnitudine eorum me qui nomini officient meo consoler* (and if in that crowd of authors my fame should fall into obscurity, I would be comforted by the nobility and greatness of those who block out my name; Pref. 3).[142] The idea that Livy would accept being overshadowed by such men "evokes the topic of epic poetry whereby dying warriors console themselves with the thought of the greatness of their

---

[136] Ibid.
[137] Ibid.
[138] Moles, "Livy's Preface," 142; see Ennius *Ann.* 494 *"audire est operae pretium procedere recte…."*
[139] Moles, "Livy's Preface," 155.
[140] Ibid., 157.
[141] Ibid. 157 notes that epic is the meter for war, so it is logical that both Thucydides and Herodotus treat Homer as a predecessor for their histories.
[142] See below for the echo from the fragments of Sallust's *Historiae* here.

vanquishers."[143] This allusion to epic identifies Livy with the subject matter of his history. Livy presents himself as a warrior who might be overcome by other warriors. Warriors just like this form the material for Livy's history. Later in the preface when poetry is invoked, Livy changes allegiances. Rather than appearing as the subject matter, Livy compares himself to the poets,[144] those who write about the warriors. Livy's switch between identifying with the poets and the warriors themselves again underscores how he sees himself integrally involved in Roman society. His personal stake in the success of his history is so great that Livy portrays himself as a participant in both sides of historiography – the authors and the subjects.

In Section 6 Livy asserts that he will neither confirm nor deny the stories surrounding Rome's foundation since they are more suitable for poetry: *quae...poeticis magis decora fabulis quam incorruptis rerum gestarum monumentis* (these things are more fit for poetic tales than for the imperishable monument of accomplishments; Pref. 6). History and poetry are placed at odds with one another. In the first line and in subsequent references to poetry, Livy aligns himself with poetry; now he attempts to draw a line between them. This division has always been implicit—Livy is not fooling his readers into thinking they are reading poetry when he is clearly writing historiography—but now Livy actively separates the two genres. The effect is to assert Livy's impartiality: by giving a full disclosure of his methodology, Livy tries to appear more truthful.[145] He implies that he will give all the evidence, since this is the *venia* (allowance; Pref. 6) we should make for antiquity, and let the reader choose for himself whether to affirm (*adfirmare*) or refute (*refellere*) the stories.[146] This accompanies his assurance of impartiality in

---

[143] Ibid., 145.
[144] *ut poetis, nobis quoque mos esset* (as with the poets, so also will this custom be for us; Pref. 13).
[145] See below for this origin of this passage in the thought of Thucydides and Herodotus.
[146] A similar pattern occurs in Livy's treatment of several early stories: Livy often identifies his stories as either epic/poetic or historical, often putting these two ideas at odds by telling two versions of a story (or one aspect of a story). His account of Romulus' death, for example, first records that Romulus was taken up to heaven where he became a god. Livy then admits that some people believed Romulus was murdered by the senators, although this

section 5, where Livy asserts that he will be *expers curae* (free of care; Pref. 5) and will avoid anything that can shake his truthfulness: *non flectere a vero* (not to deviate from the truth; Pref. 5). As seen in Sallust, however, this pretense of bias-free credibility does not hold throughout the text. Even in the earliest part of Book 1, while grasping at impartiality, Livy implicitly or explicitly guides the reader to what he presumes to be the proper story.[147]

At the end of the preface Livy again combines historiography and poetry, playing on the readers' expectations for his work by concluding with an invocation to the custom (*mos*) of the poets:

> *cum bonis potius ominibus votisque et precationibus deorum dearumque, si, ut poetis, nobis quoque mos esset, libentius inciperemus, ut orsis tantum operis sucessus prosperos darent* (We would begin willingly, if the custom of the poets could also be our own, with all good dedications and supplications of the gods and goddesses that they should give a successful outcome to the beginnings of such a work; Pref. 13).

Although some scholars wish to see a demonstration of Livy's piety here,[148] the explanation that this is simply formal will not suffice. There are some similarities with poetic invocations and other religious formulae,[149] but it is, in fact, unconventional for a work of historiography to begin with an invocation to the gods. Livy himself has implied the unsuitability of poetry for his subject matter. In his discussion of this invocation, Moles notes that it "hovers between the hypothetical and the actual."[150] The use of the subjunctive and of *si* lends uncertainty to this passage: Livy wishes his readers to think he is invoking the gods,[151] but he does not actually do so. The effect of this invocation is again to conflate the genres of historiography and epic poetry

---

was a less common story (*perobscura fama*; I.16.4). While Livy has a clear preference for this second and more "historical" version, by including both stories, he appears more honest with his audience.

[147] For attempts at impartiality see, e.g., I.1.6 *duplex inde fama est*; for Livy's tendency to prefer one story to another see, e.g., I.7.2 *volgatior fama*.

[148] Ogilvie, *Commentary,* 25, Paschalis, "Livy's *Praefatio,*" 153.

[149] Moles, "Livy's Preface," 156 writes that this passage has a formal similarity with the religious formula *absit/abesto omen.*

[150] Ibid.

[151] It is interesting that Livy addresses his so-called invocation to the *deorum dearumque*, not to the Muses.

– as well as to confuse Livy with a poet. The question still remains, however, as to why Livy chooses to infuse his historiographical preface with so many elements of the poetic.

One possible reason for this is to legitimize his work. This is essentially how Thucydides and Herodotus employ it: by invoking a connection between their work and epic, a highly respectable genre which only records memorable and laudable deeds, they confer poetry's worth and greatness on history.[152] Livy's references to his history as an *incorruptum monumentum*, and his description of Rome's greatness before her moral decline seem to accomplish this by emphasizing the magnitude of his task and the enduring nature of his work. However, Livy does not share Sallust's need to legitimize the writing of history, and indeed Livy seems quite self-assured that his history will be worthwhile. Why, then, does he need poetry?

Another possibility is that poetry makes the history more palatable for his readers: "It is true that historiography is both pleasurable and useful, but if you want to play up the pleasurable element, it is appropriate to invoke poetry, the form more naturally associated with [pleasure]."[153] Livy is concerned that his readers enjoy his history; this is evident in section 4 where he recognizes that the ancient stories will bring *minus…voluptatis* (less pleasure) to his audience. Although he cautions against finding only pleasure in his work and encourages his readers to seek the true benefit of history (Pref. 10), the associations with poetry show that Livy is, after all, worried lest he be overshadowed by others (Pref. 3) because his work is less enjoyable than the poets. In this interpretation, Livy's approach to the polemic between history and poetry seems reminiscent of Lucretius' approach to poetry and philosophy in his *De Rerum Natura*. Although there are no verbal similarities linking these passages directly, the similarities in thought are remarkable:

---

[152] See note 40 above.
[153] Moles, "Livy's Preface," 157.

> *sed vel uti pueris absinthia taetra medentes*
> *cum dare conantur, prius oras pocula circum*
> *contingunt mellis dulci flavoque liquore,*
> *ut puerorum aetas inprovida ludificetur*
> *labrorum tenus, interea perpotet amarum*
> *absinthi laticem deceptaque non capiatur,*
> *sed potius tali facto recreata valescat*
> (But just as doctors, when they try to give foul wormwood to boys, they first touch the cups around the rims with honey, the sweet yellow liquid, so that the young age of the boys is duped for a time, meanwhile he drinks down the bitter liquid of the wormwood and, although deceived, he is not taken, but rather he grows strong, refreshed by such a deed; Lucr. 1.936-942)

Livy's preface does take up the medical imagery of this passage: the Roman people were formerly strong (*pridem praevalentis populi*; Pref 4), but now overcome by disease/vice (*vitia*, Pref. 9) and in need of a cure (*remedia*; Pref. 9). The general sentiment echoes Lucretius' feelings in the passage from *De Rerum Natura*: Lucretius wishes to teach his audience philosophy, but fears they will recoil, so he coats the philosophy with the sweet honey of the Muses (*musaeo dulci…melle*; Lucr. 1.947) by putting it in verse. Livy, recognizing that his audience would rather rush on to new things (*festinare ad haec nova*; Pref. 4), sweetens the ancient history which he loves so much, and which he believes will reverse Rome's decline, with poetic language. While this is an imperfect comparison, it seems beneficial to understand Livy's use of poetry in the preface—as well as throughout the early books—in terms of this passage from Lucretius.[154] Livy has a great love for his subject (*amor*; Pref. 11) and, in order to impart this to his readers, he needs their goodwill; the poetry in the preface serves this purpose.

Livy and his Predecessors

As has already been demonstrated with Sallust's prefaces in Chapter 1, Livy's preface relies heavily on the literary examples of his predecessors. The preface, inasmuch as it is a

[154] Lucretius, like Livy, also opens with a problematic invocation (*Aeneadum genetrix, hominum divomque voluptas, alma Venus*; Mother of the sons of Aeneas, desire of men and gods, nurturing Venus; Lucr. 1.1-2). This opening is challenging since Lucretius creates a polemic against the power of the gods throughout his epic.

highly formalized composition, depends on conventions for many of its ideas. Livy's preface responds to the works of many predecessors, though most especially Sallust. This section explores Livy's inheritances from Greek historians, from earlier Latin authors, and from Sallust.

Quintilian records a sentiment common in the ancient world and even today that Sallust is to Thucydides as Livy is to Herodotus: *Nec opponere Thucydidi Sallustium verear, nec indignetur sibi Herodotus aequari Titum Livium* (Neither would I fear to oppose Sallust to Thucydides, nor would Herodotus be ashamed that Titus Livy equaled him; Quint. *Inst. Or.* X.1.101). Herodotus' impact on Livy's narrative style is considerable, but there is an influence from both Greek historians in Livy's preface. Livy divides his material into two sections: the first part, Rome's early history (*quae ante conditam condendamve urbem*; Pref. 6), is *poeticis magis decora fabulis* (more fitting for poetic tales; Pref. 6). The scope of the second part of the material is not clearly defined, but Livy implies that after a certain point, history becomes credible and fitting for proper recording: *incorruptis rerum gestarum monumentis* (on the incorruptible monument of accomplishments; Pref. 6). This division between credible and incredible material is inherited from Thucydides, who cautions against recording unreliable information (Thuc. I.20.3). Thucydides also distances his work from the poets and chroniclers whose work, he argues, does not contain the truth.[155] Livy's "refusal to pass judgment on 'what is said'" comes from Herodotus.[156] By echoing the thought of Thucydides and Herodotus in his preface, Livy asserts that his history will rival theirs.

---

[155] "On the whole, however, the conclusions I have drawn from the proofs quoted may, I believe, safely be relied on. Assuredly they will not be disturbed either by the lays of a poet displaying the exaggeration of his craft, or by the compositions of the chroniclers that are attractive at truth's expense; the subjects they treat of being out of the reach of evidence, and time having robbed most of them of historical value by enthroning them in the region of legend" (Thuc. I.21.1, trans. Richard Crawley).

[156] Moles, "Livy's Preface," 149. Herodotus makes it clear that he is obligated to record everything that is said, but that he does not need to give his own opinion as to the truthfulness of his statements: ἐγὼ δὲ ὀφείλω λέγειν τὰ λεγόμενα, πείθεσθαί γε μὲν οὐ παντάπασι ὀφείλω (Hdt. 7.152.3).

Livy's debt to Ennius has already been noted. Other Latin predecessors also figure in the preface, though not all in the same laudable way in which Ennius appears. By virtue of the fact that he writes Rome's history from its foundations, Livy is participating in the annalistic tradition, as Cato and Fabius Pictor did before him.[157] Livy's attitude towards the annalists and antiquarians, those who wrote only about past events with no connection to contemporary times, is quite negative. Paschalis argues that Livy's polemic against the annalists is made clear in his use of *perscripserim* in the first line. Sallust uses this word in the *Bellum Catilinae* (4.2) and it was employed by Sempronius Asellio in the context of opposing "a concept of historiography as a mere cataloguing of facts and events in favor of one which considers also causes and connections."[158] The borrowing of *perscribere* and the negative depiction of the *novi scriptores* show that Livy, although indebted to the annalistic tradition, rebels against his predecessors in his historiographical approach. Livy also inherits much from Cicero; where Sallust recoils from the Ciceronian style, Livy embraces it, making his work "the flesh of Cicero's theory of historiography."[159] Cicero's influence, though not especially strong in the preface, is pervasive in Livy's speeches, philosophy, and political viewpoint throughout the *Ab Urbe Condita*.[160]

Within the preface itself, Livy's most important inheritance comes from Sallust.[161] Although his overall project differs from Sallust's monographs, the annalistic style Livy generally adopts shares many similarities with Sallust's *Historiae*, an incomplete work covering

---

[157] See Miles, *Livy: Reconstructing Early Rome,* 11 on Roman historians writing about foundation myths rather than recent events.
[158] Paschalis, "Livy's *Praefatio*," 71.
[159] P.G. Walsh, "Livy" in *Latin Historians,* ed. T.A. Dorey (New York: Basic Books, 1966), 119. Cicero's influence on Livy in the preface can be seen in Livy's description of what his reader should look for in his work: *quae vita qui mores fuerint, per quos viros quibusque artibus domi militaeque et partum et auctum imperium sit* (Pref. 9). This broad scope of Livy's history parallels to some extent Cicero's recommendation that historiography should include a full treatment of events, their causes, and their outcomes, which he describes both in his theoretical treatment of the historiographical genre (Cic. *De Or.* II.63) and in his letter to Lucceius (Cic. *Ad Fam.* 5.12). Cicero's influence on Sallust's prefaces has been discussed in Chapter 1 and his influence on Tacitus' prefaces, especially the preface to the *Historiae*, is discussed in Chapter 3.
[160] Ibid.
[161] Paschalis, "Livy's *Praefatio,*" 1 claims that "Sallust is [the preface's] single clearly traceable source."

the years 78-67 B.C. now extant only in fragments. The verbal echoes from the *Historiae* are numerous. One might expect Livy to imitate Sallust on the grounds that he is a major, and extremely recent (especially if we accept the early date for the preface) predecessor/competitor; the great extent of the parallels show that Livy was actively engaging with this work, not alluding to it merely out of convention.[162]

The first fragment[163] of Sallust's *Historiae* (*Res populi Romani M. Lepido Q. Catulo consulibus ac deinde militiae et domi gestas conposui;* I have recorded the deeds of the Roman people from the consulship of M. Lepidus and Q. Catulus and afterward, both at home and in war; Sall. *Hist.* 1 fr. 1) is echoed in Livy's preface with *res populi Romani perscripserim* (that I should write about the deeds of the Roman people; Pref. 1); this use of *perscripserim*, as has already been noted, comes from *Bellum Catilinae* 4.2. Livy commences his history *a primordio urbis* (from the very beginning of the city; Pref. 1), alluding to Sallust, who writes *a primordio urbis ad bellum Persi Macedonicum* from the very beginning of the city to the Macedonian war of Perseus; Sall. *Hist*. 1 fr.8). Paschalis notes that Livy's first sentence combines three Sallustian fragments, revealing a deep knowledge of his predecessor's work.[164] Livy's reference to other writers, *in tanta scriptorium turba* (in such a crowd of writers; Pref. 3), echoes Sallust's phrase *in tanta doctissumorum hominum copia* (in such an abundance of the most learned men; Sall. *Hist.* 1 fr. 3).[165] The assurance of impartiality, *non flectere a vero* (not to deviate from the truth; Pref. 5), is taken in part from Sallust's claim: *neque me divorsa pars in civilibus armis movit a*

---

[162] L. Amundsen, "Notes to the preface of Livy," *Symbolae Osloenses* 25 (1947): 34, "Even if we account for the strong formal tradition to which I have previously referred, there can hardly be any doubt that Livy had a copy of *Historiae* at hand when he wrote his preface."
[163] This edition of the fragments of the *Historiae* is from L.D. Reynold's text: Sallust. *Catilina; Iugurtha; Historiarum Fragmenta Selecta; Appendix Sallustiana.* ed. L.D. Reynolds (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991).
[164] Paschalis, "Livy's *Praefatio*," 71.
[165] Moles, "Livy's Preface," 145 notes that Livy's use of *turba* is "not *necessarily* a pejorative term," but suggests that we understand it as such given Livy's "somewhat ironic" attitude towards his predecessors.

vero (nor has an opposing side in the civil forces moved me from the truth; Sall. *Hist.* 1 fr. 5).[166] The description of Rome's moral decline has already been noted for its similarities to the "Archaeology" of the *Bellum Catilinae.* This passage also bears resemblance to a fragment of the *Historiae*: *Ex quo tempore maiorum mores non paulatim ut antea, sed torrentis modo praecipitati; adeo iuuentus luxu atque auavritia corrupta…* (from that time the morals of our ancestors declined not little by little, as before, but headlong as if in a torrent; Sall. *Hist.* 1 fr. 16). Livy's phrasing picks up both *paulatim* and *praecipites* (Pref. 9). Livy's preface reveals, then, a pervasive influence from Sallust, especially the early fragments (presumably from the preface) of the *Historiae*. This is not to say, however, that there are no differences between the two.

The first major distinction is that of genre. Although Sallust says he is writing *a primordio urbis*, his *Historiae* are not on the same scale as Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita*;[167] the "verbal reminiscences…are thus very challenging."[168] The whole trajectory of their respective works is at odds. Another main difference is where each author places the decline of morals. For Sallust, Rome's demise arrives with the fall of Carthage, causing an immediate influx of ruinous vice. In Livy, on the other hand, decline is gradual, not riding on any single factor;[169] Roman morality is constantly slipping due to outside influence. This view leads to another discrepancy: *ambitio*, which features prominently in Sallust's discussion of decline in all three

---

[166] Paschalis, "Livy's *Praefatio,*" 89 argues that the beginning of this claim, *expers curae,* could also be a condensation of Sallust's claim of impartiality in the *Bellum Catilinae*: *eo magis quod mihi a spe metu partibus rei publicae animus liber erat* (4.2).

[167] Sallust begins in 78 B.C., following Sisenna's lost *Historiae* which ended with Sulla's death. Our fragments end at 67 B.C., but we do not know when the *Historiae* would have finished, if completed. See Gian Biagio Conte, *Latin Literature: A History*, trans. Joseph Solodow (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994), 240.

[168] Moles, "Livy's Preface," 160.

[169] T.J. Luce, *Livy: The Composition of his History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977), 294: "Livy had a developmental concept of history." This point is made clear in the preface through his use of *paulatim* to describe Rome's decline (Pref. 9).

works,[170] is absent from Livy, who in section 12 attributes decline to *avaritia* (greed), brought by *divitiae* (wealth), and *desiderium per luxum atque libidinem pereundi perdendique omnia* (a desire for ruining and destroying everything through luxury and lust), brought by *abundantes voluptates* (abundant pleasures).[171] Livy's preface is also seen as espousing "un optimisme nuancé"[172] by those who argue that the preface was written under Augustus. If, on the other hand, we accept that the preface was written during the civil wars, Livy seems to share Sallust's pessimism regarding the status of Rome's morality.[173] For Livy, however, this decline was reversible and correctible by careful study of his history.[174]

The existence of the Sallustian references in Livy's preface is undeniable; scholars have, however, fiercely debated Livy's intent in engaging with the *Historiae*. Was this out of respect and admiration for Sallust or did Livy scorn his predecessor? Most of the scholarship on this subject maintains that Livy's attitude towards Sallust is predominantly negative. Ogilvie sums up this viewpoint: "[Livy's] repugnance to Sallust's approach to history is evident from the Preface and from his whole technique of composition."[175] Cizek argues that Livy's every reference to Sallust is ironical.[176] Moles offers a more nuanced relationship between the historians, but still finds that Livy may not use Sallust with the best of intentions, such as the phrase *in tanta scriptorum turba* (Pref. 3), which Moles argues "lacks the positively respectful

---

[170] Cf. *At Discordia et avaritia atque ambitio et cetera secundis rebus oriri sueta mala post Carthaginis excidium maxume aucta sunt* (*Hist.* 1 fr. 11); describing Marius: *nam postea ambitione praeceps datus est* (*Iug.* 63.2); describing himself: *imbecilla aetas ambitione corrupta tenebatur* (*Cat.* 3.3) and *me ambitio mala detinuerat* (*Cat.* 4.2); *Ambitio multos mortalis falsos fieri subegit* (*Cat.* 10.5).
[171] The common explanation given for why Livy left out *ambitio* is that he believed it came in gradually, not all at once as Sallust did.
[172] Cizek, "À propos de la poétique," 363.
[173] Moles, "Livy's Preface," 160.
[174] Woodman, *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography,* 137.
[175] Ogilvie, *Commentary,* 3.
[176] Cizek, "À propos de la poétique," 361.

tone of Sallust's [wording]."[177] Many other scholars agree that we should read the Sallustian allusions as Livy's condemnation of his predecessor.[178]

By contrast, Wheeldon, Moles and Paschalis offer an interpretation of the references to Sallust that suggests Livy held a more positive attitude towards him. The pervasive influence of Sallust is due to "the debt of the historian to his predecessor"[179] and should not, they argue, be interpreted as irony or hostility. This reading of Livy's use of Sallust offers a better understanding of why Livy relies so heavily on Sallust; it also points to a source for Livy's negativity in the preface, especially if we consider that it was written during the civil wars. Most discussions of Livy's dependence on Sallust do not, however, treat the one aspect which I believe helps further define the relationship of these historians: *negotium*.

As Chapter 1 argued, one of the goals of Sallust's prefaces is to expand the definition of *virtus* from a political term, only applicable to (implied, senatorial) men within the political sphere, to a broader term denoting excellence in other areas of life. The result of this shift in vocabulary ensures that Sallust, although writing historiography and removed from service to the state, can attain *virtus* by writing. Hence, historiography excels over other pursuits, even political ones: *ex aliis negotiis quae ingenio exercentur in primis magno usui est memoria rerum gestarum* (out of all the other *negotia* which the *ingenium* practices, the recording of accomplishments is of particular use; *Iug.* 4.1). This represents a transformation of historiography as *otium*, a leisure activity as it had been for Cato and all previous senatorial historians, to *negotium*, a viable occupation in service of the Republic.

---

[177] Moles, "Livy's Preface," 145.
[178] E.g. Leeman, "Are We Fair to Livy?" 32; Amudsen, "Notes to the preface of Livy," 34; Woodman, *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography,* 24.
[179] Paschalis, "Livy's *Praefatio,*" 86.

The idea that historiography belongs to *otium* is common outside of Cato as well: Cicero states that in order to write history one must *cura vacare et negotio* (be free of concern and occupation; *De Leg.* I.3.8). The historian must not be mired in the party politics of the time and must have *otium* in which to write; the implication is, however, that he should still have *negotium*, a "day job," so to speak. It is Sallust's self-appointed task to justify himself: although formerly a senator, he was outside the political system by the time he wrote. He defends his decision to write, even without a political *negotium*, by claiming that historiography *is negotium* and just as worthy a vocation as politics (indeed, superior to politics in the *Bellum Iugurthinum*).[180] Leeman writes that Livy, since he was from outside Rome and never, as far as we know, involved in the Roman political system, considered himself apart from Roman history and did not have the same need to defend his *otium*.[181] On the contrary, I believe that Livy considers himself very much a part of Roman history. Livy, as he views himself alternately as a poet (Pref. 13)—the recorder of important deeds—and as a participant in the events he describes (Pref. 3), presents himself as being completely entrenched in society. The emotional connection he shares with his readers also confirms that Livy sees himself as an integral part of Roman society. As a part of Roman culture, then, Livy would surely be aware of the implications of *negotium* and *otium* and realize that, before Sallust, historiography belonged to the realm of senators with *otium*.

In section 11 of the preface, Livy hopes that his passion (*amor*) for his work (*negotium*) does not mislead him: *ceterum aut me amor negotii suscepti fallit*… (but either the love of my undertaken *negotium* deceives me…). By referring to his work as *negotium*, Livy reveals a

---

[180] Cf. M. Ruch, "Tite-Live. Histoire Romaine. Points de vue sur la preface." *Didactica Classica Gandensia* 7 (1967): 79, "[Sallust] doit renoncer à son idéal politique et donner une nouvelle signification à l'*otium*, s'il fait son examen de conscience, c'est pour prouver que l'*otium* de l'écrivain n'est pas une négation de la virtus."
[181] Leeman, "Are We Fair to Livy?" 38.

crucial component of his relationship to Sallust. The use of *negotium* makes it clear that Livy is not just presenting his history in a Sallustian context; he views the very process of historiography in terms of Sallust's own prefaces. By calling his work *negotium*, Livy embraces Sallust and shows himself to be Sallust's beneficiary.

Sallust's attempt to shift the moral terminology resulting in definitions of *virtus* and *negotium* which include historiography has succeeded: Livy, a non-senator from outside Rome, can now unashamedly put forth his history without having to justify his career or authority to write. This is why Livy appears so confident in his preface. He works to ensure his readers' pleasure through the inclusion of poetry, but he is confident in the intrinsic worth of historiography in a way that would not have been possible without Sallust's prefaces. This also validates Livy's focus on himself. He has benefitted from Sallust's hesitance and detached treatment of the preface and he can be much more forward and self-assured in his own preface.

The understanding of *negotium* in Livy's preface is the key to an appreciation of his debt to Sallust and a crucial element in the whole interpretation of the preface. While borrowing heavily from Sallust, Livy moves the preface in different ways, expanding its use and conventions. By writing candidly about himself and addressing the reader personally, Livy makes the preface a more intimate experience between author and audience. His allusions to contemporary events reveal an increasing tendency to contextualize the preface. The pervasive use of poetry in the preface demonstrates Livy's participation in the tradition of historiography and poetry as well as his desire to please and instruct his readers. Finally, Livy's use of his predecessors, most notably Sallust, shows his engagement with his contemporaries and rivals. Livy, working within the conventions of the preface, still demonstrates much innovation and sets the stage for Tacitus' prefaces.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE PREFACES OF TACITUS

Writing at the end of the first century A.D. and throughout the Trajanic era,[182] Tacitus belonged to a different world than Sallust, who wrote during the last years of the Republic, and Livy, who composed his preface just as Augustus was consolidating power. Tacitus, although he was a member of the senatorial class and his career was furthered by the emperors, never approved of the principate. His pessimism towards the administration permeates his writing and is remarkable in the prefaces, where he takes an overt stance on contemporary politics. This chapter traces the evolution of the preface in the *Agricola*, *Historiae* Book 1, and *Annales* Book 1.[183] The prefaces of Tacitus' historiographical works inherit many traits from his predecessors but also introduce novel elements. These include Tacitus' constant focus on the contemporary political situation—particularly on his developing views about the principate—as well as the depersonalization of his prefaces. While Tacitus, like his predecessors, introduces himself and claims his objectivity, we see that he becomes more detached with each preface, giving hardly any personal information about himself by the preface of the *Annales.* We also see Tacitus experimenting with the formal structure of the preface by blurring the line between the preface and the body of the text in both the *Historiae* and *Annales.* The preface is no longer set apart from the text; Tacitus moves seamlessly from preface to text through the inclusion of sections which contain elements of the preface and of narrative. This chapter demonstrates how Tacitus,

---

[182] Rhiannon Ash, *Tacitus* (Bristol: Bristol Classical, 2006), 27 notes that Tacitus could well have been writing his debut work after Agricola's death in A.D. 93. This would mean that his literary activity began while Domitian was still alive; the publication of the work, however, only comes after Domitian's death.

[183] Tacitus' other works will not be considered: the *Germania*, Tacitus' ethnography on the German tribes, does not have a preface and the *Dialogus de Oratoribus* does not belong to the historiographical genre.

working within established conventions, alters the form of the preface as he engages with the realities of the principate.

***Agricola* 1-3**

Scholars have long debated the genre of the *Agricola*, Tacitus' first work, published in A.D. 98. The text's combination of elements from biography, panegyric, historiography, ethnography, and *laudatio funebris* cause many to refrain from classifying the *Agricola* as any single genre. Those who do choose one almost always pick biography, asserting that Tacitus' primary emphasis is on Agricola's life, and the other facets of the text are secondary to its main purpose. Evidence for seeing the *Agricola* as a biography or a mixture of genres comes most often from the preface. A.D. Leeman, while he treats the Tacitean prefaces in chronological order, places the *Agricola* last, considering it an anomaly and inappropriate to compare with Tacitus' other historical prefaces. In my opinion, however, such an approach attempts to pigeon-hole the preface and risks ignoring the amalgam of genres actually present. Leeman himself recognizes the limitations of his treatment: "The curious thing about the *Agricola* is, however, that it treats its subject nevertheless in the manner of historiography: the style is scarcely less 'Sallustian' than that of the two great histories."[184] By considering the *Agricola* solely as biography and looking for only biographical influences, Leeman finds himself baffled by the historiographical nature of the preface. It seems preferable, as other scholars have also noted,[185] to treat the preface of the *Agricola* among the historiographical prefaces. Whatever the genre of the *Agricola* as a whole, the preface consciously participates in the historiographical tradition by

[184] A.D. Leeman, "The Prologues of Tacitus," *Yale Classical Studies* 23 (1972): 199.
[185] Rhiannon Ash, *Tacitus* (Bristol: Bristol Classical, 2006), Dylan Sailor, "Becoming Tacitus: Significance and Inconsequentiality in the Prologue of *Agricola*," *Classical Antiquity* 23, no. 1 (2004), and, to some extent R. M. Ogilvie and I. Richmond, eds., Tacitus. *De vita Agricolae* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967) all give some consideration of the historiographical precedents of the *Agricola* preface and avoid seeing it solely as a biographical preface.

engaging with predecessors within that genre; consequently, this section demonstrates how the *Agricola* utilizes and manipulates the form of the historiographical preface and how Tacitus innovates in his earliest prologue.[186]

First, a clarification must be made regarding the general nature of this passage. Scholars have pointed to the composition of the *Agricola* as a Sallustian period of Tacitus' career;[187] the form of the text, reminiscent of Sallust's monographs, supports this. At the same time, scholars consider the preface of the *Agricola* evidence for a Ciceronian period, before Tacitus breaks with Cicero's oratorical style to forge his own signature technique; they then classify the rest of the text as Sallustian and/or Livian.[188] These claims are not mutually exclusive. The formal structure of the *Agricola,* with its preface, ethnographic digressions, and impassioned speeches, reveals a large debt to Sallust's monographs. Within the *Agricola*, the preface is more rhetorical than the body of the text and more obviously influenced by Cicero's stylistics. Ogilvie and Richmond cite the virtual synonyms of the preface (*vicit ac supergressa es*t, 1.1; *comitio ac foro*, 2.1; *fiduciam ac robur*,3.1), the ascending tricolon (*vocem populi Romani et libertatem senates et conscientiam generis humani*, 2.2), and balanced clauses of the preface as examples of the Ciceronian influence on the preface.[189] Bews also cites the connections between the preface and Cicero, as well as the closeness between the end of the *Agricola* and Cicero: "verbal echoes and

---

[186] Inasmuch as the *Agricola does* exhibit many traits of a biography, comparanda may also be sought among the biographies of Cornelius Nepos, the earliest surviving examples of Latin biography. Nepos, however, does not give his works a literary preface: the beginning of the *Cato* and *Atticus*, for example, begin with the person's birth and family background. The connection between the *Agricola* and the biographical tradition of Nepos can be found most strongly in section 4 when Tacitus describes Agricola's birth and home life. We can especially see a connection with Nepos' life of Cato. Tacitus writes *Gnaeus Iulius Agricola, vetere et inlustri Foroiuliensium colonia ortus* (Gn. Iulius Agricola, sprung from the old and famous colony of Forum Iulium; *Agr.* 4) and the beginning of *Cato* reads *M. Cato, ortus municipio Tusculo adulescentulus* (M. Cato, as a little boy, sprung from the town of Tusculum; *Cato* 1). The echo of *ortus* in the *Agricola* shows the influence of biography on Tacitus' account of Agricola's early life.

[187] Clarence W. Mendell, "Literary Reminiscences in the Agricola," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 21 (1921): 53.

[188] R. M. Ogilvie and I. Richmond, *De vita Agricolae*, 22 and Janet P. Bews, "Language and Style in Tacitus' *Agricola,*" *Greece & Rome* 34 (1987): 201-21 both assert this position.

[189] R. M. Ogilvie and I. Richmond, *De vita Agricolae,* 22.

structure [of the conclusion of the *Agricola*] recall Cicero's *consolatio* on the death of Crassus in Book 3 of *De Oratore*."[190] In the matter of the content and sources of the passage, however, I believe that we can term the preface "Sallustian" and "Livian" since it follows the precedent of these historians and their prefaces.

One might rightly wonder with what expectations a first-time reader would approach Tacitus' *Agricola*. In A.D. 98 when the text was published, Tacitus was a renowned orator, as well as a capable and favored politician,[191] but not necessarily known as an author. Having no prior knowledge of Tacitus, an audience member at a public reading or a first-time reader might know only a title if there even was one, or he might know nothing of the nature and subject of the text. Whatever the case—whether a reader knows that this work concerns the life of Tacitus' father-in-law (and thus may have reasonably assumed the text is a biography), or whether he knows nothing—consider what his impression must have been after encountering just the first words: *clarorum virorum facta moresque posteris tradere* (to pass down the deeds and customs of famous men to future generations; *Agr.* 1.1). Leeman takes this sentence to be "a clear definition of the task of the biographer,"[192] a declaration of Tacitus' moralizing approach to recording his father-in-law's life. But, this phrase does more than announce Tacitus' program. With his opening words, Tacitus evokes Cato's *Origines*, which begins as follows: *clarorum virorum atque magnorum non minus otii quam negotii rationem exstare oportere* (it is right that there be an account of the leisure, as well as the business, of the famous and great men; Cato, *Orig.* fr. 1 Peter). This opening aligns Tacitus with Cato as well as Sallust, whose use of Cato's style and content in his own prefaces has been documented in Chapter 1. The echo places

[190] Janet Bews, "Language and Style," 202.
[191] See the discussion on the preface to the *Historiae* for the Flavian support of Tacitus' career.
[192] A.D. Leeman, "The Prologues of Tacitus," 200.

Tacitus squarely within the historiographical tradition, a fact an audience acquainted with these authors would immediately recognize.

Why might Tacitus echo Cato at the outset of his text and entire literary career rather than Sallust or Livy, his more recent predecessors? Scholars have cited several reasons for Tacitus' choice of Cato. Ogilvie and Richmond note in their commentary that, through this allusion, Tacitus expresses his agreement with Cato's preference of meritocracy to rank or birth.[193] Agricola's career is a model of the *virtus* Cato so admired in his *Origines* and it is thus fitting to harken back to Cato.[194] The connection between Republican heroes, such as those whom Cato praised, and Agricola implies early on Tacitus' feelings on morality and the principate, ideas he will refine further in this and his other prefaces. Mendell writes that the reference to Cato, a Stoic philosopher, would be an "ingratiating reminiscence" to the philosophical crowd of Tactius' day.[195] Perhaps we should also see here a connection between the fact that Cato's *Origines* is the first history written in Latin, and Tacitus' work is the first to surface after the suppression of literary talent under Domitian (*omni bona arte in exilium acta;* every good skill/art was driven into exile; *Agr.* 2.2). Such a connection is not too far-fetched given the desire of historians to seem novel in their work:[196] Tacitus becomes novel by virtue of the fact that his voice is the first to emerge after Domitian's death.[197] His claim later in the preface that he writes *incondita ac rudi voce* (with a rough and undeveloped voice; *Agr.* 3.3) then refers not

---

[193] R. M. Ogilvie and I. Richmond, *De vita Agricolae,* 2.

[194] It is worth noting, however, that Cato, who valued collective achievement over individual glory, would probably not have appreciated a work which singles out the actions and character of one man, even one as virtuous and Republican-seeming as Agricola.

[195] Mendell, "Literary Reminiscences in the Agricola," 56. The Stoic connection is also, for Mendell, the primary reason for Sallust's choice of Cato as model.

[196] Tore Janson, *Latin Prose Prefaces: Studies in Literary Conventions* (Stockholm: Almquist & Wiksell, 1964), 67. Also see Dylan Sailor, "Becoming Tacitus," 143: "Claims to succeed to the authority of an established text work for the consolidation of all kinds of literary authority."

[197] Cf. *Nunc demum redit animus* (now at last the soul revives; *Agr.* 3.1) for the general revival (not just literary) after Domitian.

solely to his "unsophisticated" technique,[198] but to the fact that he is just recovering his ability to speak and write.[199]

It is, then, already apparent from the first line of the *Agricola* that Tacitus consciously desires his work to be seen in terms of the historiographical tradition. The preface also contains all the expected elements: the author's announcement of the topic, praise for historiography, and disclosure of the author's own position and attitudes. After the opening verbal echo from Cato, Tacitus explains how autobiography was formerly acceptable for good men, but now even biography is suspect because of the poor state of morals. At this point, he reveals his plan: *at nunc narraturo mihi vitam defuncti hominis venia opus fuit, quam non petissem incusaturus* (but now, since I am about to narrate the life of a dead man, I must ask for pardon, which I would not seek if I were about to accuse him; *Agr.* 1.4). Thus he announces his project by the end of the first paragraph, but withholds his intended subject until almost the end of the preface: *hic interim liber honori Agricolae soceri mei destinatus* (this book is, in the meantime, dedicated to the honor of my father-in-law, Agricola; *Agr.* 3.3). This is the first mention of Agricola, long after several other names have been introduced.[200] Most of these, some long dead, could be possible subjects for the *vita defuncti hominis*; by delaying the identification of the true subject of the

---

[198] This feigned modesty is also found in Livy, as described in Chapter 2.

[199] Sailor, "Becoming Tacitus," 140, also suggests this additional meaning of *incondita ac rudi voce* and argues that this is a place of ambiguity in the preface: Tacitus thinks of himself as being at the forefront of a new literary era, but asks that his work be praised or excused on the basis of its filial piety: *professione pietatis aut laudatis erit aut excusatus* (it will be praised or excused by its profession of piety; *Agr.* 3.3). Sailor (171) argues that this ambiguity and doublespeak allow Tacitus a loophole: if his work is received poorly, he can count it as merely a private show of piety; if well, he has given himself the basis for a prominent literary career. The idea that Tacitus' claim at an undeveloped voice is due to its suppression, not his ignorance, can be further supported by the use of *vox* earlier in the preface: *memoriam quoque ipsam cum voce perdidissemus* (we would have lost memory itself along with voice; *Agr.* 2.3). Here the voice of the people is repressed by Domitian during his rule. We may also see in this claim a nod to Livy's claim of modesty and inferiority compared to his predecessors; see Chapter 2.

[200] Rutilius (1.3), Scaurus (1.4), Arulenus Rusticus (2.1), Thrasea Paetus (2.1), Herennius Senecionus (2.1), Helvedius Priscus (2.1), Nerva Caesar (3.1), Nerva Trajanus (3.1). Agricola's name is not especially highlighted or honored either: it appears mid-sentence and in the genitive case.

work, Tacitus seems to be intentionally misleading the reader and calling the nature of his text into question.

The *laudatio historiae*, a prominent feature in the prefaces of both Sallust and Livy, takes a rather different form in the *Agricola* but is still recognizable. The whole first paragraph, which is dedicated to the benefits of biography and autobiography for the education of future generations, serves this purpose. While not discussing historiography precisely, the second paragraph continually highlights the importance of text. Tacitus discusses how authors and freedom of speech were treated under Domitian: the authors, and their books, were burned publicly as if this would stamp out Roman liberty.[201] Tacitus begins this section with the introductory verb *legimus* (we read/we have read, *Agr.* 2.1), a word which Sailor notes is superfluous given that the events described—the punishment of Rusticus and Senecius—are recent enough not to need to be read in a text.[202] The effect is "a startling and emphatic assertion of the primacy of texts' role in later knowledge of these events."[203] While broader than the traditional praise of historiography found in his predecessors, we can see here Tacitus' desire to draw attention to the role that writing and authors play, especially in regard to political opposition.

Tacitus' relationship to his subject is revealed with his use of *socer* (father-in-law; *Agr.* 3.3). The appearance of this word in the genitive case within its clause[204] downplays the personal connection between Tacitus and Agricola which, if it were stressed, might make the reader question Tacitus' objectivity. The statement that he writes *incondita ac rudi voce* is the only claim at impartiality in the preface and it is hardly the profession of modesty and credibility

---

[201] Tacitus does not mention that there was, of course, some literature published under Domitian, notably the epic poetry of Statius, Valerius Flaccus, and Silius Italicus.
[202] Sailor, "Becoming Tacitus," 150-1.
[203] Ibid.
[204] *Hic interim liber honori Agricolae soceri mei destinatus* (*Agr.* 3.3).

that we find in Sallust or Livy.[205] The inclusion of elements typical of historiographical prefaces at the beginning of the *Agricola* emphasizes the fact that Tacitus is presenting his biography as part of this tradition.

This view of the preface is strengthened by further verbal parallels and thematic similarities to the prefaces of Sallust and Livy, several of which have already been noted. Much of the vocabulary of virtue throughout the preface echoes that of Sallust in the prefaces to his monographs. The triumph of *magna aliqua nobilis virtus* (some great and noble virtue; *Agr.* 1.1) over vice, and the mention of several other morally charged terms, particularly *ingenium* (*Agr.* 1.2) recall Sallust's emphasis on philosophy and morality.[206] The stark contrast between the past (e.g., *antiquitus, Agr.* 1.1; *vetus aetas*, *Agr.* 2.3) and the present (e.g., *nostris…temporibus*, *Agr.* 1.1; *nunc*, *Agr.* 3.1) parallels Sallust's delineation between past and present. This division is discussed further below.

Two phrases in particular echo the first sentence of the *Bellum Catilinae*. Sallust, writing on what distinguishes men from beasts begins his monograph in this way:

> *Omnis homines, qui sese student praestare ceteris animalibus, summa ope niti decet, ne vitam silentio transeant veluti pecora, quae natura prona atque ventri oboedientia finxit* (all men who wish to excel beyond the other animals ought to strive with the greatest might lest they pass through life in silence just as the beasts, whom nature has made leaning forward and obedient to their stomachs; Sall. *Cat.* 1.1).

In his description of how virtue was formerly easy to achieve, Tacitus writes: *sed apud priores ut agere digna memoratu pronum magisque in aperto erat* (but among our ancestors, as accomplishing deeds worthy to be remembered was easy and more available; *Agr.* 1.2). *Pronum* here echoes Sallust's *prona*; Tacitus, however, employs it in the metaphorical sense of "easy" whereas Sallust's use signifies "physically bent forward," referring to men who lean forward as

[205] See Livy Pref. 3 for his profession of modesty and Sall. *Cat.* 4.2 for Sallust's claim of objectivity.
[206] See Chapter 1 for a discussion of Sallust's focus on morality.

the beasts do. We might disregard this echo as coincidence except for two things. First, as Chapters 1 and 2 have demonstrated, a preface is a carefully constructed text, in which each word is intentional and meaningful; any reference to Sallust would be deliberate. Secondly, Tacitus echoes the same sentence from Sallust later in the preface: *senes prope ad ipsos exactae aetatis terminos per silentium* (the old men [have come] practically to the very end of their lives in silence; *Agr.* 3.2). The *per silentium* recalls *silentio* from Sallust. The allusion condemns those who were complicit in Domitian's reign of terror, an accusation from which Tacitus spares neither himself nor Agricola; this theme is resumed in the second paragraph:

> *adempto per inquisitiones etiam loquendi audiendique commercio. memoriam quoque ipsam cum voce perdidissemus, si tam in nostra potestate esset oblivisci quam tacere* (after even the exchange of conversation [speaking and listening] was taken away by the inquisitions, we would have lost our very memory too, along with our voice, if it was as much in our power to forget as it was to be silent; *Agr.* 2.3).

The Sallustian echoes equate those who were silent under Domitian with the beasts, whom Sallust describes as inferior, lacking in morals and voice. Tacitus both acknowledges his involvement in this silence and affirms that, by writing the *Agricola,* he has gained a voice.

From Livy, Tacitus borrows vocabulary to describe the importance of text and the condition of the state. In section 1, Tacitus relates the savagery committed against authors and their texts: *delegato triumviris ministerio ut monumenta clarissimorum ingeniorum in comitio ac foro urerentur* (a committee was sent out by the triumvirs to burn the monuments [i.e., books] of the brightest talents in the comitium and the forum; *Agr.* 2.1). Livy uses *monumentum* twice in his preface, once to distinguish history from poetry (*poeticis magis decora fabulis quam incorruptis rerum gestarum monumentis*; more appropriate for poetic tales than the incorruptible monuments of accomplishments; Livy *Pref.* 6), and again when explaining how history provides *exempla* for its audience (*omnis te exempli documenta in inlustri posita monumento intueri*; you

can see every type of *exemplum* placed on a distinguished monument; Livy *Pref.* 10). Tacitus' use of *monumentum* to mean "book" or "legacy" would be peculiar if one did not know the Livian context: the echo of this word recalls the positive value of history which Livy underscores, and contributes to the idea of the "monumentality" of texts. [207]

Tacitus also employs Livy's terminology to discuss the condition of the state. As Chapter 2 demonstrated, Livy uses the metaphor of illness to explain the problems of his time: *nec vitia nostra nec remedia pati possumus*; we can endure neither our diseases nor their cures, Livy *Pref.* 9). Tacitus borrows and expands upon this metaphor when describing Rome's emerging renaissance under Nerva and Trajan:

> *natura tamen infirmitatis humanae tardiora sunt remedia quam mala; et ut corpora nostra lente augescunt, cito extinguuntur* (nevertheless, because of the nature of human sickness, the remedies are slower than the evils and, just as our bodies grow slowly, they are destroyed quickly; *Agr.* 3.1).

Leeman notes that "the metaphor of the patient in a state of beginning convalescence pervades the whole chapter" and points to the widespread use of this metaphor in describing the Roman state.[208] As Chapter 2 discusses, the exact reference of *remedia* in Livy's preface is debated. Tacitus seems to mean neither Augustus' moral legislation nor one-man rule here, but simply the means of reviving the state after the *mala* caused by Domitian. Nevertheless, Tacitus' prominent use of a word so contested and meaningful in Livy links this discussion of illness directly to Livy's preface and again reminds the reader of the *Agricola*'s debt to Tacitus' historiographical predecessors.

Having established the need to approach the preface to the *Agricola* in terms of other historiographical prefaces and demonstrated how Tacitus follows in his predecessors' footsteps, we can now turn to the innovations in this preface. As has already been mentioned, the

[207] See Sailor, "Becoming Tacitus," 149.
[208] Leeman, "The Prologues of Tacitus," 204.

Agricola's dichotomy between past and present recalls similar distinctions made in the prefaces of both Sallust and Livy. Tacitus, however, is much more forceful with these distinctions and constantly brings the separation between the two periods to the forefront. The first signal of the division comes in the first line with the contrast between *antiquitus* (of old; *Agr.* 1.1) and *nostris…temporibus* (in our own time, *Agr.* 1.1). Sailor summarizes the differences between these periods: in the time represented by *antiquitus*, famous actions were accomplished easily and virtuously, handed down frequently, and writing about one's own life was respectable.[209] On the other hand, in *nostris temporibus* the opposite is true. This division anticipates the further separation of time in the preface: Tacitus later praises the *beatissimi saeculi ortus* (the beginning of the most beautiful age, *Agr.* 3.1) at the accession of Nerva. There are, then, three periods: former times (*antiquitus*), the time under Domitian, and Tacitus' present time under Trajan. This subsequent distinction suggests that Tacitus sees the state's fortune turning around beginning with Nerva and continuing into the reign of Trajan, as well as an opportunity for virtue and texts to regain their importance.

Other time words in the preface similarly force the reader to confront the contrast between the different periods.[210] These words signal that Tacitus manipulates the reader's concept of time. Not only does he draw conclusions on the reader's behalf about how texts are written and the prevalence of virtue in his day, but he also distinguishes the new administration from Domitian's reign. Tacitus meddles with the timeline of events later in the *Agricola* as well. Tacitus implicates Domitian in Agricola's death, implying that the frequent visits of the emperor's freedmen and physicians played a role in Agricola's demise (*Agr.* 43.2-3). By doing so, Tacitus implies that Agricola's suspicious death occurred during Domitian's reign of terror,

[209] Sailor, "Becoming Tacitus," 143.
[210] cf. *aetas* (1.1); *apud priores* (1.2); *nunc* (1.4; 3.1) ; *vetus aetas* (2.3) ; *primo statim* (3.1) ; *olim* (3.1), *inter alia*

when in fact Agricola died before this. Tacitus wishes to vilify Domitian and he succeeds by manipulating the timeline of Agricola's death. The appearance of so many time words focuses the reader's attention on time but also disguises the author's artifice in its manipulation.

Another striking feature of the preface to the *Agricola* is its overtly political nature. Unlike the prefaces of Livy and Sallust which make only veiled references to their respective political milieux, Tacitus engages with contemporary figures and *principes*. Although not mentioned by name, Domitian dominates Tacitus' account of the *inquisitiones* and book burnings (*Agr.* 1); Tacitus returns to Domitian in section 3, asserting that by the savagery of the *princeps* (*saevitia principis*; *Agr.* 3.2) many died and the rest were kept silent *per quindecim annos, grande mortalis aevi spatium* (for fifteen years, a great span of a mortal's life; *Agr.* 3.2).[211] Tacitus praises Nerva for beginning a blessed age (*beatissimum saeculum; Agr.* 3.1) and for joining together *res olim dissociabiles…principatum ac libertatem* (things once alien, the principate and liberty; *Agr.* 3.1). Trajan, too, receives praise for increasing the *felicitatem temporum* (happiness of the times; *Agr.* 3.1). While not a daring political move to disparage Domitian, from the perspective of literary precedent, it is bold for Tacitus to engage so greatly with the regime, since it forces the *princeps* to commend Tacitus' work. Sailor argues this point:

> …by setting Nerva and Trajan into a starkly divided universe of "good *princeps*/bad *princeps*" and assigning hostility to texts to the characteristics of "bad *princeps*," [Tacitus] leaves the present *principes* little to do but positively to support the present text. Indeed, he strives to make *Agricola* the natural complement to the present reign and even a crucial testimonial to its legitimacy.[212]

At the same time, we must remember that the narrator is Tacitus' authorial persona, not the man himself, and his own views cannot necessarily be determined. Nevertheless, there is a marked increase in the involvement with the political atmosphere: it has evolved naturally from Sallust,

[211] The fifteen year span is Domitian's reign, A.D. 81-96.
[212] Sailor, "Becoming Tacitus," 153.

who avoids it almost entirely, to Livy, who ambiguously refers to the present, and now to Tacitus, who makes the contemporary political scene a major feature of the preface.[213]

As part of this political discussion, Tacitus condemns the inaction of the elite. His continued use of first-person plural verbs and pronouns[214] indicates that he considers himself, as well as Agricola, to be among those whom Domitian silenced and who are now recovering slowly. First-person plurals, as we have seen in Chapters 1 and 2, can often refer to the author; as such, some instances may refer to Tacitus alone; however, it seems more likely that most, if not all, refer to the collective group of senators.[215] This is supported by the collective nature of the tricolon in section 2 which covers all facets of society: *scilicet illo igne vocem populi Romani et liberatem senatus et conscientiam generis humani aboleri arbitrabantur* (of course they thought that in that fire were destroyed the voice of the Roman people, the liberty of the senate, and the conscience of human kind; *Agr.* 2.2) and by the description of young becoming old and the aged becoming older still during the reign of Domitian (*Agr.* 3.2). The collective nature of the preface is in contrast to Livy: Chapter 2 demonstrated Livy's personal relationship with the audience and his reliance on first- and second-person singular verbs and pronouns to accomplish this. Tacitus uses the first-person singular sparingly[216] and the second-person singular only twice.[217] Rather than establishing a rapport with his reader, Tacitus uses the preface to admit his participation in Domitian's reign and speak on behalf of the whole senate. Thus, it seems inappropriate to consider the preface "personal," as some scholars do.[218] Although the *Agricola*

---

[213] As we will see, by the time he writes the preface to the *Annales,* the political scene is almost the *only* feature of the preface.
[214] E.g., *nostris…temporibus* (1.1); *legimus* (2.1); *dedimus profecto grande patientiae documentum* (2.3); *nos* (2.3); *corpora nostra* (3.1); *etiam nostri superstites sumus* (3.2); *venimus* (3.2).
[215] See Rhiannon Ash, *Tacitus* (Bristol: Bristol Classical, 2006), 24.
[216] *Mihi narraturo vitam defuncti hominis venia opus fuit, quam non petissem incusaturus* (1.4); *ut <sic> dixerim* (3.2); *soceri mei* (3.3).
[217] *Oppresseris…revocaveris* (3.1).
[218] R. M. Ogilvie and I. Richmond, *De vita Agricolae,* 125.

is about his father-in-law, there is no emotional family connection expressed here. As is argued above, the lack of personal connection between Tacitus and Agricola gives the impression of Tacitus' straightforwardness in reporting the life of his father-in-law. Livy's description of Roman history is far more passionate than Tacitus' announcement of a family member as his subject. The absence of a strong connection between Tacitus and his subject matter focuses the reader's attention on what *is* important to Tacitus, namely the effects of Domitian's reign on the aristocracy. The unemotional stance towards his *socer* in the preface prepares us for Tacitus' future prefaces, which become increasingly more detached and even less personal than that of the *Agricola*.

The end of the preface finally announces Agricola as the subject of the work and promises future endeavors: *hic interim liber* (this book meanwhile; *Agr.* 3.3). The use of *interim* shows that Tacitus, even at this early stage, anticipates a long and prosperous career. Through his deferral, a tactic common in other authors and especially poetry,[219] Tacitus promises future work as a way to excuse his present text. This technique reappears throughout Tacitus' corpus.

***Historiae* I.1-4.1**

The *Historiae,* Tacitus' history of events from A.D. 69 to A.D. 96 and the death of Domitian, was written between A.D. 100 and 110.[220] This preface differs greatly from that of the *Agricola*. It reveals an influence from Sallust's *Historiae* in the announcement of subject matter and the annalistic style. The bulk of the preface is devoted to a preview of events to come in the *Historiae*; this preview demonstrates how Tacitus was influenced by a Ciceronian view of historiography. We also see in this text the developing patterns of Tacitus' prefaces: there is a strong focus on political events and Tacitus' commentary on the principate changes its tenor

[219] Sailor, "Becoming Tacitus," 157.
[220] Gian Biagio Conte, *Latin Literature: A History*. trans. Joseph Solodow, (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994), 530.

from his remarks in the *Agricola*. In addition, although he reveals information about his political background, this preface shows Tacitus becoming more detached and less personal. The preface to the *Historiae* is also Tacitus' first experiment with a preface that is not clearly defined, but rather connected to the body of the text.

I consider that the preface to the first book extends through section I.4.1. Chilver divides the text into three sections: a true preface (section I.1), a summary of the proposed work (sections I.2-3), and a survey of the empire beginning in section I.4 and continuing through section I.11.[221] A.J. Woodman suggests extending what he terms the content section from paragraph I.2 through I.4.1.[222] This division is preferable since there are still programmatic elements in the text at the beginning of section I.4, before the survey of events begins. The differences in what actually constitutes the preface results from the smooth transition Tacitus makes between preface, introductory material, and narrative. While I point to I.4.1 as the end of the preface since this is the end of programmatic announcements, the introductory material after shows that Tacitus is beginning to write prefaces that are more integrated into the text itself.

Tacitus begins the *Historiae* by naming the reigning consuls: *Initium mihi operis Servius Galba iterum Titus Vinius consules erunt* (I begin my work with the time when Servius Galba was consul for the second time with Titus Vinius for his colleague;[223] *Hist.* I.1.1). This opening situates the reader in A.D. 69 and seems to announce an annalistic program for the history.[224] The first line recalls the preface to Sallust's *Historiae: res populi Romani M. Lepido Q. Catulo consulibus ac deinde militiae et domi gestas composui* (I have compiled the deeds of the Roman

---

[221] G.E.F. Chilver, *A Historical Commentary on Tacitus'* Histories *I* and *II* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979), 33.
[222] A.J. Woodman, *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography: Four Studies*. (Portland: Areopagitica Press, 1988): 160.
[223] Trans. Hadas.
[224] Chilver, *A Historical Commentary,* 33: Tacitus' decision to being with the political upheaval of 69 rather than with the events following the death of Nero has been criticized, but Chilver defends Tacitus' choice, noting that it allows a cleaner beginning to the *Historiae* and avoids accounting for the events preceding Nero's death. Ash, *Tacitus,* 65 notes that Tacitus begins paradoxically with an ending (the end of the Julio-Claudians) and suggests that this is a purposeful manipulation of the readers' expectations.

people at home and abroad from the time when M. Lepidus and Q. Catulus were consuls and following; Sall. *Hist.* fr. 1).[225] By echoing Sallust's beginning, Tacitus claims a place for his work within the annalistic tradition.

After such an opening, Tacitus continues to follow Sallust by creating a polemic between himself and his historiographical predecessors and by asserting his lack of bias, much as we see Sallust doing in the extant fragments of the preface to the *Historiae*. Tacitus writes that after Actium, when power was consolidated in one man, literary talents (*ingenia*) disappeared and that historical truth (*veritas*) was undermined both by ignorance (*inscitia*) and a desire for flattery (*libidine adsentandi*; *Hist.* I.1.3-8).[226] In this passage Tacitus does not treat his historical predecessors kindly. While it was common for authors to assert their primacy over their peers and forerunners,[227] being so critical towards one's predecessors is unknown in Latin historiography before Tacitus. Syme notes here a specific reference to Livy, whose skill as a historian Tacitus had praised in the *Agricola*,[228] but now condemns. The fact that Livy is not mentioned by name should not, Syme says, be a concern—it was merely out of "dignity and discretion" that Tacitus gives no specific names.[229] Leeman, on the other hand, does not think Tacitus references Livy here based on Livy's reputation as a Republican historian.[230] Whether or not he means Livy or any specific author, it is significant that Tacitus takes such a strong stance against his predecessors.

---

[225] Sallust, *Catilina; Iugurtha; Historiarum Fragmenta Selecta; Appendix Sallustiana,* ed. L.D. Reynolds (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991).

[226] While Tacitus' reasons for choosing Actium as the turning point of historiography are clear because of his feelings towards the principate, it might be interesting to compare Sallust's choice for the turning point in Rome's moral history, which he places at the fall of Carthage in 146 B.C. (Sall. *Cat.* 10.1). We saw in the preface to the *Agricola* how the desire for flattery (or at least the desire to keep peace) brought about the silencing of the aristocracy against Domitian's reign.

[227] See especially Chapter 2 for Livy's deprecation of his literary predecessors.

[228] Tacitus refers to Livy and Fabius Rusticus as *eloquentissimi autores* (most eloquent authors) in *Agr.* 10.3.

[229] Ronald Syme, *Tacitus*, 2 vols. (London: Oxford University Press, 1958), 146.

[230] Leeman, "The prologues of Tacitus," 179: "[Livy] was a Republican historian '*après la lettre*'" based on the fact that Augustus referred to him as a *Pompeianus.*

Tacitus then describes the two ways that writers are untruthful:

> *sed ambitionem scriptoris facile averseris, obtrectatio et livor pronis auribus accipiuntur; quippe adulationi foedum crimen servitutis, malignitati falsa species libertatis inest* (although you would easily shun the ambition of an author, disparagement and envy are welcomed with eager ears; indeed the evil accusation of servility is found in flattery, while the fake look of liberty belongs to derision; *Hist.* I.1.10-13).

An author can be swayed either by excessive love or dependence on his subject, or by excessive hatred. Tacitus, as Chilver notes, is at pains to avoid an accusation of *adulatio* in his work, but less concerned with an accusation of *malignitas.*[231] Tacitus attempts to assure his own impartial approach by a full disclosure of his position within the principate: he freely admits that his political career was supported by the emperors: *dignitatem nostram a Vespasiano inchoatam, a Tito auctam, a Domitiano longius provectam non abnuerim* (I would not deny that my career was begun by Vespasian, increased by Titus, and propelled even further by Domitian; *Hist.* I.1.14-15). He maintains that he had no relation to Galba, Otho, or Vitellius *nec beneficio nec iniuria* (neither through benefit or injustice; *Hist.* I.1.14). Tacitus implies that because he confesses his allegiances and debts from the beginning, he can provide the absolute truth: *incorruptam fidem professis neque amore quisquam et sine odio dicendus est* (anyone professing uncorrupted faithfulness out to speak without passion and without hate; *Hist.* I.1.16). As Chilver notes, although Tacitus writes about contemporary events, associates himself with the political arena of the day, and claims to have no bias, Tacitus never actually says to what degree he was an eye-witness to the events he describes.[232] For the reader, the disclosure of Tacitus' career may only bring Tacitus' biases to the forefront, rather than make him seem impartial. It seems that Tacitus, then, is taking a risk by revealing his biases since may damage his credibility. To mitigate this possibility, Tacitus provides vivid depictions of events and mentions his political

[231] Chilver, *A Historical Commentary*, 36.
[232] Ibid., 35.

career to make the reader think Tacitus has first-hand knowledge of the events he narrates, thus securing his credibility. Without any secure evidence of being an eye-witness, however, the reader may be left wondering about Tacitus' sources and alleged objectivity in reporting events.

At the end of the first paragraph, Tacitus claims that *si vita suppeditet* (if life remains, *Hist.* I.1.17), he will write about the *principatum divi Nervae et imperium Traiani* (principate of the divine Nerva and the rule of Trajan, *Hist.* I.1.17-18), material that he finds *uberiorem securioremque* (more fertile and more untroubled, *Hist.* I.1.18). This is another deferral, similar to the one already noted in the preface to the *Agricola*. Tacitus is both excusing his current choice of subject, much as he excuses choosing the praise of his father-in-law for his first work, and planning a further project in his career. It is interesting to note, however, that this promise is unfulfilled: we do not have any record of a treatment of Nerva or Trajan among the works of Tacitus.[233]

Tacitus' second paragraph begins with a sobering programmatic statement: *opus adgredior opimum casibus,*[234] *atrox proeliis, discors seditionibus, ipsa etiam pace saevum* (I am undertaking a work rife with calamities, terrible in battles, discordant with rebellions, and savage even under peace itself, *Hist.* I.2.1-2). The sentence reads like a cynical movie trailer, announcing the terrible things that will happen in the text. This is in contrast to the moral discourses we find in Sallust and, to some extent, in Livy. Tacitus moves rapidly through his topics, using asyndeton to convey speed. The events previewed include encounters with inhabitants of the empire (*Hist.* I.2.4-8), the destruction of Pompeii (*Hist.* I.2.10-11), polluted

---

[233] Ibid., 37: Chilver notes that some have held that this second postponement of writing about Nerva's and Trajan's reigns "contradicts the promise made in *Agr.* 3.3 that his next work would include a *testimonium praesentium bonorum*." I do not think that *interim* in the *Agricola* necessarily implies that the *next* work will be about Nerva and Trajan, thus this is not a contradiction.

[234] The commentators of this passage note that *opimum* is a possible emendation to a problem in the text while other manuscripts preserve *opibus;* the argument in favor of *opimum* is its syntactical agreement with the rest of the sentence, Chilver, *A Historical Commentary,* 38-9.

religious rites, a reference to disgraced Vestal virgins (*Hist.* 1.2.12-13),[235] among other topics. The description of the wars is most striking: *trina bella civilia, plura externa ac plerumque permixta* (three civil wars, several foreign, and a good many mixed, *Hist.* I.2.3-4). The use of *permixta* surprises the reader: how could there be ambiguity about the enemy in a war? This image demonstrates to the reader the complete turmoil of the Romans, who were unable even to identify the enemy properly.[236]

Tacitus then summarizes the state of the Empire subsequent to A.D. 69, classifying regions as troubled (*adversae*) or relatively pacified (*prosperae*); notable among the litany are Britain and the Nero impersonator. Tacitus writes that *perdomita Britannia et statim omissa* (Britain was thoroughly subjugated and immediately abandoned, *Hist.* I.2.5-6): this refers to the conquest of Agricola and the later reduction of troops in Britain—an allusion both to Agricola's successes and the subsequent Roman failures in that region. Tacitus also mentions the *falsi Neronis ludibrio* (the false charade of a Nero, *Hist.* I.2.8), the imposter who nearly set off a war in Parthia; Tacitus here refers to the parade of people claiming to be Nero after the emperor's death.[237] The fact that Nero was popular enough as *princeps* to have posthumous impersonators goes conveniently unmentioned later in section 4 when Tacitus writes that the end of Nero was met with joy (*Hist.* I.4.5-10). While still within the preface, Tacitus has seemingly forgotten his claim to be free of *adulatio* and *malignitas*.

After the geographical survey of the empire, Tacitus moves to events in Italy and Rome, marking the shift in topic linguistically with *iam vero* (*Hist.* I.2.8). The description reverses the traditional order in an annalistic history. As Livy does in the *Ab Urbe Condita,* the annalist

---

[235] Chilver, *A Historical Commentary,* 43.
[236] Ibid., 39 suggests that the *bella…permixta* references the invasion of the Rhoxolani or the Jewish War.
[237] Suetonius also attests that fanatics published edicts and dressed statues as though Nero were alive (*quasi viventis*) after his death; he also recounts the same story of the Nero impersonator in Parthia (Suet. *Nero* 57).

describes each year in the same way: first, events in Rome, then foreign affairs, and finally prodigies. Although this is a preface and not a regular annalistic treatment of a consulship year, we might expect the normal progression of events given the beginning, which names the two consuls.[238] Tacitus does mention prodigies at the end of paragraph 3, but the inversion of the other elements of annalistic history is notable. The effect is to narrow the reader's attention from the farthest reaches of the empire (*Hist.* I.2.3-8), closer to Italy (*Hist.* I.2.8-11), then on Rome (the burning of the Capitol is especially significant, *Hist.* I.2.11), then finally to religious and social issues and interpersonal relationships (*Hist.* I.2.13-20). The subjects mentioned emphasize the breakdown of Roman society: wars are *permixta*, and now familial relationships, even down to a master-slave dynamic, are crumbling (*Hist.* I.2.20). This passage reveals Tacitus' most pessimistic views and seems to indicate a reversal of *Agricola* 3 where he sees hope of redemption.

Woodman suggests a comparison between the second paragraph and the remarks of Cicero in both the *De Oratore* and the letter to Lucceius (*ad Fam.* 5.12) about how to write historiography.[239] Cicero asks Lucceius for an account of his consulship in monograph format and describes what makes historiography appealing to an audience:

> *etenim ordo ipse annalium mediocriter nos retinet…at viri saepe excellentis ancipites variique casus habent admirationem exspectationem, laetitiam molestiam, spem timorem* (indeed the very record of the annals holds our attention only moderately…but the dangerous and variable fates of an excellent man hold wonder, surprise, happiness, annoyance, hope and fear; Cic. *ad Fam.* 5.12).

Cicero advocates an arrangement of material that will engage the reader and be dramatic. In the *De Oratore* he provides a theoretical approach to writing about historical events:

---

[238] We can also compare *Annales* I.1.1 which begins immediately with *urbem Romam*, and only moves outside the city later.

[239] A.J. Woodman, *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography: Four Studies*. (Portland: Areopagitica Press, 1988): 167.

> *vult etiam, quoniam in rebus magnis memoriaque dignis consilia primum, deinde acta, postea eventus exspectentur, et de consiliis significari quid scriptor probet et in rebus gestis declarari non solum quid actum aut dictum sit, sed etiam quo modo, et cum de eventu dicatur, ut causae explicentur omnes* (since in the recording of great events first plans, then actions, then results are sought, [the nature of the text] even calls for what the author approves of from the plans, and that, in the actions, not only what was said or done, but also how and with what result be described, so that the causes may be explained; Cic. *De Or.* II.63).

As in the letter to Lucceius, Cicero desires a historiographical style that is removed from dry annalistic treatments of events. In the preface to the *Historiae,* Tacitus' preview of events reveals an influence from this method of historiography. The list of wars, natural disasters, and the deaths of famous men would be varied enough to keep any audience satisfied. In addition, at the end of the preface, Tacitus promises not only to relate the events as they occurred (*non modo casus eventusque rerum, Hist.* I.4.4-5), but to give the *causae* (reasons, *Hist.* I.4.5) behind the events. This promises a methodology that will investigate the underlying causes of Rome's problems, not simply enumerate them.

Section 3 begins – perhaps surprisingly – with a glimmer of hope. While we are denied the glimpse of a happy life under Nerva and Trajan such as we see in the *Agricola*, Tacitus concedes that even in such abysmal conditions there are some shining moments*: non tamen adeo virtutum sterile saeculum ut non et bona exempla prodiderit* (the age was not so barren of virtues that it did not produce any good models, *Hist.* I.3.1-2). Much as Agricola and other virtuous men can accomplish deeds worthy to pass down to posterity (cf. *Agr.* 1), Tacitus admits some models of morality:

> *comitatae profugos liberos matres, secutae maritos in exilia coniuges: propinqui audentes, constantes generi, contumax etiam adversus tormenta servorum fides* (mothers accompanied their fleeing children; wives followed their husbands into exile; relatives were daring, sons-in-law were steadfast, the fidelity of slaves was immovable even against torture; *Hist.* I.3.2-5).

The sudden shift to positive *exempla* may be an appeal to Tacitus' audience. Ash notes that, since he is writing about such recent times, Tacitus would be conscious of the fact that his readers were involved in some events and perhaps guilty of some disgrace. The quick preview of events attracts readers, and the timely reminder of positive *exempla* helps ensure an attentive and amenable audience.[240] Unlike in the *Agricola*, however, Tacitus does not use specific examples to reinforce the idea that there were some virtues in this age; this is strange since Tacitus has already clearly placed us within a specific historical time and place. This is not the general introduction and comment on the decline of morals we see in Sallust's and Livy's prefaces; rather, Tacitus has, from the first sentence, put us squarely in A.D. 69. It should then seem very odd that he cannot provide a single instance of the limited *exempla* of the age. The absence of a nod to Agricola, who was the paragon of virtue in the Empire throughout the *Agricola*, is especially glaring. Such a surprising omission underscores Tacitus' pessimistic attitude in the *Historiae* and points to Tacitus' increasing detachment in his prefaces. Instead of naming a hero, Tacitus only gives broad comments on some positive *exempla* of the time. In the *Annales* Tacitus removes all good *exempla* and holds an entirely negative view.

The phrase *clarorum virorum* appears in section 3 as a reference to the good models of men—already few in number—who were driven to suicide. As has already been shown, this phrase comes from Cato's *Origines*. Tacitus' use of it here echoes both Cato's original, and to Tacitus' previous, use of it more than a decade before in the *Agricola*. It is significant that this appears in conjunction with death: the *clarorum virorum* in Cato would be those representing Republican values; their ultimate demise, because of their incompatibility with the principate, is a recurring theme throughout Tacitus' works.

---

[240] Ash, *Tacitus*, 69.

The beginning of paragraph 4 returns to programmatic announcements:

> *ceterum antequam destinata componam, repetendum videtur qualis status urbis, quae mens exercituum, quis habitus provinciarum, quid in toto terrarium orbe validum, quid aegrum fuerit, ut non modo casus eventusque rerum, qui plerumque fortuiti sunt, sed ratio enim causaeque noscantur* (but before I set forth what I intend, it seems it should be recalled what was the state of the city, what was the frame of mind of the army, what was the condition of the provinces, what was strong or weak throughout the whole world, so that not only the causes and results of matters – which are often accidental – may be known, but also the rationale and the causes; *Hist.* I.4.1).

In addition to the connection to Cicero's historiographical theory, this passage bears resemblance to Livy's preface wherein he describes the circumstances which produced the Roman state: *quae vita, qui mores fuerint per quos viros quibusque artibus domi militiaeque et partum et auctum imperium sit* (what life, what morals existed, through what sort of men and by what sort of skills at home and abroad rule was acquired and increased; Livy *Pref.* 9). Livy does not actually state that he is seeking the reasons, but rather implies it through his discussion of the benefits of history. Tacitus, on the other hand, explicitly discusses his methodology and makes use of this passage to lead into his introductory material on the state of the empire.

This preface, unlike that of the *Agricola*, gives an image of Roman affairs without a happy ending. Tacitus does not mention the reigns of Nerva or Trajan as the epilogue to the evils he will describe, he withholds any specific examples of virtue, and focuses exclusively on the political and social breakdown of Roman society. There is no hero to save the day as there was in the *Agricola*. No voice of opposition stands up against the downfall of morals. The preface to the *Historiae* is immediate—it places the reader in a specific political context with no general moral history as in Sallust or Livy—and is singularly insistent on the evils and the villains of the story.

***Annales* I.1**

The *Annales*, Tacitus' annalistic history in 16 or 18 books which treated the period from Augustus' death through the reign of Nero, was written after the *Historiae* although it depicts an earlier time. The preface to Book 1 is remarkable for its compression of Roman history: Tacitus hurries through the highlights of the Roman world from its legendary beginning to Augustus' death in five short paragraphs. Indeed, the monarchy is allotted only a single line. The introductory material is generally considered to extend through section 15, but only the first paragraph contains programmatic elements such as we expect to find in a historiographical preface.[241] This section discusses how the preface to the *Annales* develops the patterns of Tacitus' preface. We see an ever-increasing focus on the political scene to the exclusion of almost all other elements, as well as a decrease in the personal information Tacitus discloses. This preface also reveals Tacitus' views on the principate much more clearly than in the *Agricola* or *Historiae* and we see that Tacitus' cautiously optimistic views on the principate from his early career have shifted into an entirely negative approach to the administration.

The inclusion of a quasi-narrative, quasi-prefatory section (i.e., sections I.2-15) is new in the scope of Latin historiography. In Sallust and Livy, the preface is clearly separated from the body of the work; the *Agricola* preface follows this pattern. The *Historiae,* on the other hand, marks Tacitus' first experiment with interweaving the preface and the narrative of the history. There, the programmatic elements extend into fourth paragraph and progress naturally into the background information. In the *Annales* Tacitus blurs the line between the preface proper and the introductory material that follows even more than he did in the *Historiae*. The initial paragraph establishes several of the themes throughout the work, such as the problems caused by

[241] Cf. Leeman, "The Prologues of Tacitus," 186: "the Annals prologue consists of one small chapter only, and there are fourteen half-introductory, half-narrative chapters following it."

the principate and the disappearance of liberty. These themes resurface in the introductory material as Tacitus describes Augustus' career, his death and funeral, and the accession of Tiberius (*Ann.* I.2-15). While the entire introduction to Book 1 is significant for an understanding of Tacitus' program and approach to the principate, I consider here only the programmatic elements revealed in the first paragraph and how they reflect the historiographical tradition of prefaces.

Much as he began the *Agricola*, Tacitus starts the *Annales* with a reference to the previous historiographical tradition; the first line, a complete—if not brilliant—hexameter, alludes both to Sallust and Livy: *urbem Romam a principio reges habuere* (From the beginning, kings ruled the city of Rome, *Ann.* I.1.1). In his commentary, Miller notes that hexameter lines in prose works often occur accidentally, but this reference is certainly a conscious reference to Livy, who also intentionally began the *Ab Urbe Condita* with an almost complete line of hexameter.[242] The first line also refers to Sallust. The diction of the sentence recalls the beginning of the "Archaeology" section of the *Bellum Catilinae*, wherein Sallust summarizes the history of Rome: *Urbem Romam, sicuti ego accepi, condidere atque habuere initio Troiani* (As I understand it, the Trojans ruled and founded the city of Rome in the beginning; Sall. *Cat.* 6.1). The change from *Troiani* to *reges* is significant: Tacitus is not looking to highlight the mythological founders of Rome, but rather to establish the political system which governed Rome from the beginning. Another minor change is similarly meaningful: where Sallust writes *initio*, in the beginning, Tacitus has *a principio, from* the beginning. Rhiannon Ash remarks that this must give pause to the reader:

---

[242] N.P. Miller, ed., Tacitus *Annals I* (London: Bristol Classical Press, 1992), 97. We might also expect a connection between Livy's preface and that of the *Annales* if the title *Ab Excessu Divi Augusti*, whose reference to the *Ab Urbe Condita* is unmistakable, is authentic; such a title implies that the *Annales* picks up from where Livy's history would presumably end. See above, Chapter 2.

> Since Tacitus pointedly says that Rome was held by kings, not "in the beginning," but "from the beginning," we wonder about the nature of the comparison being posited with the present. In the past, Rome was held by kings – but unlike it is now under the principate? Or just as it is today under the principate? Is even Trajan in some sense a king?[243]

This is indeed an ambiguous beginning to the *Annales* and represents a potential shift in Tacitus' attitudes towards the principate from his stance in the *Agricola.* Whereas Tacitus seems to hold a mildly positive, or at least ambivalent, opinion of the principate in the *Agricola,* where he praises Nerva and Trajan, now the principate is vilified through its implied connection to the kingship. The reference to Sallust and Livy reminds the reader that Tacitus inherits both their traditions, despite his polemic against his predecessors.

The second half of the first sentence raises several interesting points: *libertatem et consulatum L. Brutus instituit* (L. Brutus established liberty and the consulship, *Ann.* I.1.1). First, it demonstrates the extreme compression of the introduction. There are no consuls mentioned as in the preface to the *Historiae* to situate the audience in a particular year. Instead, Tacitus jumps from the monarchy to the beginning of the Republic in one sentence. Secondly, the sentence highlights the role of L. Brutus alone in the downfall of the monarchy but does not mention the senate. This omission is surprising, both because of the fact that the senate's role is ignored here, and because of the large (albeit negative) role the senate played in the preface to the *Agricola.*

Thirdly, the sentence combines two ideas which are essential to Tacitus' view of the empire: Brutus instituted *libertatem* and *consultatum*. The diction of the sentence presents the ideas as equivalent direct objects of *instituit*, as though they are comparable items. They are quite different: *libertas* is an abstract concept and *consultatus* is a government office, not a physical object, but more concrete than *libertas*. This seems to be an instance of zeugma where

[243] Ash, *Tacitus,* 82.

Tacitus uses *instituit* with both concepts to link grammatically things that are not necessarily equivalent. The combination of these two is significant: Tacitus implies by their connection that liberty exists in conjunction with—and, perhaps, because of?—the consulship. There is no *libertas* mentioned in the (albeit very brief) description of the monarchy. For Tacitus, the idea of the Republic is intrinsically linked with the old Roman value of freedom—the freedom that comes from not being ruled by a single leader. This sentence puts a phrase from the *Agricola* into clearer relief. In that preface, Tacitus praises Nerva for joining together things that were *olim dissociabilis* (once incompatible, *Ann.* I.3.1), the *principatum ac liberatem* (principate and liberty, *Ann.* I.3.1). The use of *dissociabilis*, which is found only here in the Tacitean corpus,[244] emphasizes the oddity of the line within the *Agricola*. Tacitus' views on the principate are evident in that work, but he has come to flesh out his views on the emperors much more clearly in later works. If we view the line from the *Agricola* in conjunction with the beginning of the *Annales*, we can see that Nerva's mixing of two incompatible things is peculiar because *libertas*, from the beginning, has been expressly associated with the Republic, not the principate. Finding a place for *libertas* in the worldview of the principate is a difficult, and apparently praiseworthy, task and marks Nerva as a good emperor for Tacitus. Yet, Tacitus becomes less at peace with the principate as his literary career progresses. Perhaps with this sentence he is retracting his praise for Nerva since he no longer believes that the principate is a properly working form of government.

The short treatment of the Republic is notable for what it lacks as much as what it contains. The Republican figures Tacitus mentions are not its traditional heroes—where are Cato, Camillus, Cincinnatus?—but those who held power in exceptional ways: Cinna and Sulla (who both used the dictatorship), Pompey, Crassus, Caesar, Lepidus, Antonius, and Augustus (all

[244] R. M. Ogilvie and I. Richmond, *De vita Agricolae,* 136.

members of the two triumvirates at the end of the Republic). This incomplete survey of the Republic highlights again that Tacitus is not giving a beginner's guide to Roman history, but a summary which emphasizes the shift in the government throughout Rome's history.

In the next sentence, Tacitus discusses the inception of the principate: *qui cuncta discordiis civilibus fessa nomine principis sub imperium accepit* ([Augustus] who received the whole state, worn out by civil discord, into his rule under the name of *princeps*, *Ann.* I.1.3). The impetus for creating this office comes because the people are tired of fighting. Augustus' rule, Tacitus implies, was only a short-term solution to a long-existing problem of civil unrest. The diction of this passage also contains a criticism of the principate: the monarchy and Republic are described in short declaratory sentences which makes Tacitus appear to be ambivalent about the quality of these forms of government. He implies that they both represent the natural order of things: the kings ruled *a principio*, from the beginning, as far back as anyone can remember; Brutus instituted *libertas* and the consulship at the same time, as though they are concepts that naturally occur together. The institution of the principate comes about because the people are tired and need structure, not because it is a normal or natural form of government. While Tacitus' political views are more compressed and less personal here than in any other of his prefaces, this short description gives the most complete sense of his feelings towards the principate.[245] Tacitus again uses the preface as a vehicle for his opinions far more explicitly than his predecessors had.[246]

---

[245] At least, it gives his authorial persona's views on the principate. Tacitus' true views, as has been discussed, cannot be discerned.

[246] This expression of political views continues throughout the introductory material of *Annales* Book 1 and is not limited strictly to the preface proper. We see, for example, in the second paragraph Tacitus' description of Augustus' rise to power tries to bring in the principate in cloaked in Republican terms: Tacitus writes that Augustus, having laid aside the name of the triumvirate (and thus dropping any remaining and tenuous connection to the "Republican" figures he describes in the previous paragraph) was *consulem se ferens* (conducting himself as a consul, *Ann.* I.2.1). Augustus tries to keep the sham of the Republic by evoking the consulship; as *Ann.* I.1.1 has

In the rest of the first paragraph, Tacitus mentions several things that remind the reader of his previous works. He writes that the *prospera vel adversa* (the prosperous things and the troublesome things, *Ann.* I.1.4) are written down by distinguished writers. This refers to both the impulse to record significant events detailed in the *Agricola*, and contains a verbal reminiscence of the *prospera* and *adversa* things described in the *Historiae.* The verb *tradere* in I.1.6 similarly recalls the focus on the transmission of memorable events emphasized in the *Agricola*. Also in I.1.6, Tacitus claims that he will write *sine ira et studio* (without anger or agenda, *Ann.* I.1.6). This assurance of impartiality echoes those found in the *Historiae* and in the works of Sallust and Livy. While this assertion is normal in that it follows the expected pattern for historiographers, it is notable for Tacitus because it declines to mention that his career was helped by the people he condemns in the text. The lack of context for this claim of impartiality is consistent with the removal of almost all personal references in this preface. Tacitus makes only a standard claim to be unbiased, and the reader must be satisfied and go without an explanation. We might see here that Tacitus removed a mention of his career because it made him seem more credible. I do not think this is absolutely necessary, although it may have played a role. The absence of Tacitus' career here seems to be more a result of the complete depersonalization of the preface rather than a change in what Tacitus believes best conveys his impartiality.

This preface, like that of the *Historiae*, is distinctly pessimistic and engaged in political discourse. As we saw in the *Historiae*, Rome is inevitably heading for disaster. There is no hope of redemption and, in this preface, there is not even hope of a future work of Tacitus where he will narrate better times. The preface to the *Annales* is characterized by its political nature;

---

showed, the consulship and *libertas* are inextricably linked. By demonstrating how Augustus' actions were merely a pretense at Republicanism at the start of the principate, Tacitus again emphasizes his feelings on the principate.

Tacitus discusses little else. There are almost no personal references and the distance between the author and his audience has grown. Tacitus does not address the reader at all and makes no attempt to give a sense of his bias and background in introducing his work. Whereas we see the preface to the *Agricola* introducing the author, here we are denied even Tacitus' reasons for writing and his relationship to his subject. The lack of personal matter focuses the audience's attention on the singularly pessimistic view on Roman history and the principate which Tacitus presents.

James Westfall Thompson wrote this about the prefaces in Tacitus:

> The somber mind of Tacitus…though his art is nearly equal to that of Thucydides, inhibited largeness of view, and we look in vain in his works for a proem worthy of his real intellectual grandeur. The nearest approach to a genuine prologue which Tacitus makes is the first chapter of the *Life of Agricola*, a work which was a labor of love.[247]

While I agree with Thompson that Tacitus is often pessimistic in his world view, this chapter has demonstrated the fallacy of this quotation. The prologues of Tacitus are sophisticated and masterfully composed; they participate in the line of Roman historiography, often harkening back to Livy and Sallust and evoking their work. They also represent innovation in the form of the preface as we see the development of several trends within the Tacitean corpus. Foremost is the increasing politicization from the *Agricola,* which discusses politics, to the *Annales*, which is almost entirely consumed by the discussion of the government. Tacitus' views on the administration also become more defined and aggressive throughout his corpus: he praises Nerva and Trajan for their rule in the *Agricola*, but by the *Historiae* and *Annales* Tacitus has little good to say about the principate. The increase in detachment and depersonalization is also important. The *Agricola* reveals camaraderie not between author and audience but between Tacitus and his fellow silenced senators. Here Tacitus still justifies his reasons for writing and adheres to

[247] James Westfall Thompson, "The Charm of the Prologue," *The Sewanee Review* 38, no. 1 (1930): 12.

standards of historiographical prefaces. The preface to the *Historiae* explains Tacitus' position as an author under the principate, but engages less with the audience. The *Annales* deals even less with his reasons and impartiality in writing and does not address his audience at all. Tacitus grounds his work in the contemporary political atmosphere more than his predecessors and he writes with the principate always forefront in his mind. He has moved away from the lofty, philosophical prefaces of Sallust, away from the personal exhortations of Livy, and creates prefaces which speak with an unmatched sense of immediacy and pessimism.

While it would be unreasonable to expect that Tacitus' views and presentation in all three prefaces remain exactly the same, the variation in these prefaces is remarkable. We might ask, then, what Tacitus gains by presenting his readers with such different prefaces. This chapter has demonstrated that Tacitus is fully aware of his place in the historiographical tradition, so we cannot think that such drastic changes in the prefaces are coincidental or simply matters of stylistic changes. I believe that the change in the form of the prefaces serves to underscore the development of Tacitus' views on the principate. The move from the mostly conventional preface of the *Agricola* to the overtly politicized and depersonalized prefaces of the *Historiae* and *Annales* corresponds with the evolution of Tacitus' opinion of the administration. In the *Agricola* Tacitus praises the emperor, optimistic about a return to normalcy after Domitian's reign. In the *Historiae* Tacitus gives a nod to the more fruitful days of Nerva and Trajan but denies his audience the view of good moral *exempla* which would ensure the preservation of Rome's moral character. By the preface to the *Annales* Tacitus has become wholly opposed to the idea of the principate. The insistence on politics and removal of personal references from the preface highlights Tacitus' negative views of the principate and pessimistic outlook on Rome's

future and explains why Tacitus presents his readers with three very different examples of the preface.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION

This thesis has examined the development of the preface as a convention in Roman historiography. Although each author writes a preface with the same expectations in mind, the preface has changed a great deal from Sallust to Tacitus, as even a cursory glance at the prefaces to the *Bellum Catilinae* and the *Annales* would reveal. By examining where an author chooses to follow his predecessors and where he finds it appropriate to innovate, we see that the preface changes from a place for philosophical reflection to a vehicle for political analysis. This study has brought to light several patterns through the prefaces of Sallust, Livy, and Tacitus, including the politicization of the preface, the treatment of historiography as a profession, and the level of personal connection between the author and reader.

In the prefaces studied, there is a marked decrease in the level of abstraction over time. Sallust uses the prefaces of his monographs to discuss philosophy and general themes of moral decline. He almost never refers to the contemporary political scene. Livy's preface discusses moral decline, limiting his examination to the shortcomings of the Roman state and contextualizing the preface in Roman history. Nevertheless, the only real reference to contemporary politics is ambiguous and may not refer to any specific event at all. Tacitus, however, rejects abstraction in his prefaces in favor of contextualizing the preface within his contemporary milieu. The *Agricola* discusses the treatment of literature and the silencing of the aristocracy under Domitian. The prefaces to the *Historiae* and *Annales* treat politics to the exclusion of most other elements traditionally found in the preface. The increasing

contextualization shows the preface being used as a vehicle for expressing political views about a specific situation (for Tacitus, the existence of the principate), rather than as a forum for writing generally about mankind's condition and the decline of morals.

There is also a change in the view of historiography as a profession. Chapter 1 discussed Sallust's view of the evolution of the occupation of the historian from an activity of *otium* to one of *negotium*. Chapter 2 showed how Livy benefitted from this shift in terminology: after Sallust, Livy does not need to defend his choice of profession and his reasons for not being involved in the political sphere.

The connection between the author and his audience also develops over the course of these prefaces. We see Livy employing first- and second-person pronouns and verbs to establish a closer relationship with his reader than the one Sallust creates. This technique highlights Livy's personal investment in having his readers learn about Roman history. In Tacitus, however, there is a remarkable and relatively sudden decrease in the personal aspect of the preface. In place of personal exhortations to the reader, Tacitus composes prefaces which refer to himself only when necessary and rarely to the reader, focusing instead on the grim political atmosphere.

Roman historians use the convention of the preface to highlight what is important to them in introducing their works. This is a place to pay homage to or flout predecessors and a space to comment on philosophy, moral decline, and politics. The expectations of the preface call for a certain amount of consistency in form: this makes the differences between prefaces all the more interesting. This thesis has traced how Sallust, Livy, and Tacitus create and employ their prefaces in order to show the developing patterns in this convention. Through balancing their reliance on tradition and innovation, each author reinvents the preface to suit his own needs. By

a close study of these texts, this thesis has shown how the idea of the preface evolves throughout Roman historiography.

REFERENCES

Primary Texts and Commentaries

Cato the Elder. *Origines.* ed. and trans. Martine Chassignet. Paris: Belles Lettres, 1986.

Chilver, G. E. F. *A Historical Commentary on Tacitus'* Histories *I and II*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979.

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

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

Herodotus. *The Histories.* ed. A.D. Godley. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1920.

Livy. *Book I.* ed. H.E. Gould and J.L. Whiteley. London: Bristol Classical Press, 2004.

Ogilvie, R.M. *A Commentary on Livy Books 1-5.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965.

Sallust. *Bellum Catilinae*, 2nd ed. ed. J. T. Ramsey. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Sallust. *Bellum Catilinae: A Commentary*. ed. P. McGushin. *Mnemosyne*. Supplement 45. Leiden: Brill, 1977.

Sallust. *Bellum Iugurthinum*. ed. Leslie Watkiss. London: University Tutorial Press, 1971.

Sallust. *Catilina; Iugurtha; Historiarum Fragmenta Selecta; Appendix Sallustiana.* ed. L.D. Reynolds. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Tacitus. *Annals I.* ed. N.P. Miller. London: Bristol Classical Press, 1992.

Tacitus. *Annalium ab excessu divi Augusti libri.* ed. Henry Furneaux. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1896.

Tacitus. *De vita Agricolae*. ed. R.M. Ogilvie and I. Richmond. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967.

Tacitus. *Opera Minora*. ed. M. Winterbottom and R.M. Ogilvie. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975.

Thucydides. *History of the Peloponnesian War.* trans. Richard Crawley. London: J.M. Dent, 1910.

Secondary Sources

Amundsen, L. "Notes to the preface of Livy." *Symbolae Osloenses* 25 (1947): 31-35.

Ash, Rhiannon. *Tacitus.* Bristol: Bristol Classical, 2006.

Bews, Janet P. "Language and Style in Tacitus' *Agricola.*" *Greece & Rome* 34, no. 2 (1987): 201-211.

Boissier, G. "Les Prologues de Salluste." *Journal des Savants*, no. 1 (1903): 59-66.

Cameron, Averil, ed. *History as Text: The Writing of Ancient History*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1989.

Churchill, J. Bradford. "On The Content and Structure of the Prologue of Cato's *Origines*." *Illinois Classical Studies.* 20 (1995): 91-106.

Cizek, Eugen. "À propos de la poétique de l'histoire chez Tite-Live." *Latomus. Revue d'Études Latines.* 51, no. 2 (1992): 355-364.

Conte, Gian Biagio. *Latin Literature: A History*. trans. Joseph Solodow. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994.

Earl, Donald. *The Political Thought of Sallust.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961.

Janson, Tore. *Latin Prose Prefaces: Studies in Literary Conventions*. Stockholm: Almquist & Wiksell, 1964.

Kurke, Leslie. "Charting the poles of history: Herodotos and Thoukydides." in *Literature in the Greek and Roman Worlds*. ed. Oliver Taplin. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Leeman, A.D. "Are We Fair to Livy? Some thoughts on Livy's Preface." *Helikon*. 1 (1961): 28-40.

Leeman, A.D. "The Prologues of Tacitus." *Yale Classical Studies.* 23 (1972): 169-209.

Luce, T.J. *Livy: The Composition of his History*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977.

Luce, T.J. "The Dating of Livy's First Decade." *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*. 96 (1965): 209-240.

Marincola, John. *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Mendell, Clarence W. "Literary Reminiscences in the Agricola." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 21 (1921): 53-68.

Miles, Gary B. *Livy: Reconstructing Early Rome.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995.

Moles, John. "Livy's Preface." *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society.* Vol. 39 (1983): 141-68.

Paschalis, Michael. "Livy's *Praefatio* and Sallust." Ph.D. diss., Ohio State University, 1980.

Paul, G.M. "Sallust." in *Latin Historians.* ed. T.A. Dorey. New York: Basic Books, 1966.

Rambaud, M. "Les prologues de Salluste et la démonstration morale dans son oeuvre." *Revue des Études latines* 24 (1946): 115-130.

Ruch, M. "Tite-Live. Histoire Romaine. Points de vue sur la preface." *Didactica Classica Gandensia* 7 (1967): 74-80.

Sailor, Dylan. "Becoming Tacitus: Significance and Inconsequentiality in the Prologue of "Agricola."" *Classical Antiquity* 23, no. 1 (2004): 139-177.

Stewart, Douglas J. "Sallust and Fortuna." *History and Theory,* Vol. 7, no. 3 (1968): 298-317.

Syme, Ronald. *Sallust*. Berkeley: University of California, 1964.

Syme, Ronald. *Tacitus*, 2 vols. London: Oxford University Press, 1958.

Thompson, James Westfall. "The Charm of the Prologue." *The Sewanee Review* 38, no. 1 (1930): 5-20.

Walsh, P.G. "Livy" in *Latin Historians.* ed. T.A. Dorey. New York: Basic Books, 1966.

Wheeldon, M.J. "'True Stories': the reception of historiography in antiquity." in *History as Text: the writing of ancient history.* ed. Averil Cameron. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1989.

Woodman, A.J. *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography: Four Studies*. Portland: Areopagitica Press, 1988.