

L. CORNELIUS SISENNA AND THE EARLY FIRST CENTURY B.C.

The most important historical work in Latin that was actually written in the first half of the first century B.C. was L. Cornelius Sisenna's history of the War of the Allies and the Civil Wars which followed it, up to Sulla's dictatorship or conceivably death¹—the most important one that was *not* written being of course Cicero's. Sallust praised Sisenna's work highly in the *Jugurtha*, though complaining that it was not sufficiently frank about Sulla, and his own lost histories began, very probably, where Sisenna's left off. Varro's *logisticus* on the writing of history, of which, alas, only a brief and unenlightening fragment remains, bore Sisenna's name.² Cicero twice admitted that Sisenna's was easily—'facile'—the best piece of historical writing existing in Latin in his time, though he thought that it had serious shortcomings;³ he had of course an axe to grind, since he was toying with the idea of himself providing a historical masterpiece to set beside those of the Greeks (and, if he had chosen the contemporary history that Atticus apparently urged upon him, one may speculate that he would probably, like Sallust, have started where Sisenna stopped). Thus when Sallust claimed that Sisenna treated his subject 'optime et diligentissime'⁴ he was perhaps consciously contradicting Cicero, who had said, among other things, that Sisenna was lazy—'neque laboris multi'⁵—though it is possible that Sallust means little more than that his work was long and detailed, as it certainly was.

There can be little doubt that Livy used Sisenna, at least for the Social War and its aftermath, and that he was influential on the tradition as we have it. It is certain that Velleius Paterculus knew him, and regarded him highly, for he dates all the late-second and early-first-century historians whom he mentions by reference back to or forth from Sisenna, who introduces the list.⁶ Even Tacitus once quotes him.⁷ But our fragments, though reasonably numerous, are mostly very brief, being chiefly selected to illustrate Sisenna's peculiar literary style, and most of them derive, via Nonius, from his books III and IV, dealing with the period of the Social War alone. He has come to be regarded as an enigmatic figure.

But there has recently been a good deal of interest directed on him, especially by Italian scholars, who have produced a number of useful, though usually one-sided, studies. I would like to press one or two of the arguments a little further and to make one or two possibly new suggestions, but chiefly to pull together something of what has been achieved, and to set his work in the intellectual

¹ Frag. 132P = 134B deals with Sulla's election to the dictatorship in 82. There are very few fragments from the later books, however, and the fact that Sallust begins with the year 78 (frag. 1.1M) makes it possible that Sisenna continued to Sulla's death early in that year. (R. Syme, *Sallust* (1964), p. 180 n. 10, thinks Sulla's funeral would have made a good end.)

I quote Sisenna's fragments both with the numeration of Peter's *HRR* and that of G. Barabino, *Studi Noniani* 1 (1967), Part ii, which takes account of the so-called *Lex*

Lindsay in Nonius, from whom so many of the fragments come; she also provides a useful commentary, aiming chiefly at setting the fragments in their narrative context, and at linguistic comparisons; there is no general discussion of the work.

² A. Gellius, *N. A.* 16.9.5.

³ Cicero, *Brutus* 228, *De legibus* 1.7.

⁴ Sallust, *Bell. Jug.* 95.2.

⁵ *Brutus* 228; in a rhetorical context, strictly speaking.

⁶ Velleius 2.9.1.

⁷ *Hist.* 3.51 (frag. 129P = 130B).

context of its period. It will, I hope, then appear that we do not know quite as little about it as has been supposed.

Sisenna's life need not detain us long. It seems usually to be supposed that L. Cornelius Sisenna was a Roman patrician in the technical sense, like such great families of the *gens Cornelia* as the Scipiones and Lentuli, or Sulla himself.⁸ But it is surely likely that he was, rather, of—fairly remote—Etruscan descent. There can be no doubt about the origin of that *cognomen*; compare Porsenna, Tarquenna, Vibenna, Volasenna, Spurinna, Caecina, and the rest—especially as a Fulvia Sisennia was the wife of a *princeps* of Etruscan Volaterrae (and the mother of the poet Persius);⁹ Sisennia would be the normal feminine form of Sisenna (used as a *nomen*) as Caecinia is of Caecina. It is true that the few inscriptions with the name Sisenna (usually as a *nomen*) almost all come from Rome, and none from Etruria (though there is a lady called Sisinia at Tuscania):¹⁰ but this proves little, especially if the main branch of the family had moved to the capital. Schulze merely thought of an Etruscan name being taken over by a Roman Cornelius;¹¹ but an enfranchised Etruscan taking the *nomen* Cornelius and keeping his own old name as a *cognomen* is probably easier; parallels can be found, notably, at Perugia, the son of a man of the Sortes family who takes to calling himself Nigidius Sors.¹² The 'Cornelius' might attest patronage from, possibly, a Scipio, or simply be felt to be a good Roman name: 'the appearance of such names as Fabius, Cornelius, Cassius and Aufidius on the Etruscan monuments with interference phenomena . . . points to the possibility that Latin names had been adopted with the express purpose of enabling the possessor to obtain Roman citizenship.'¹³

This the Corneii Sisennae had had, by the historian's time, for some generations. The first recorded member of the family was urban praetor in 183 B.C.,¹⁴ and a Cn. Sisenna governed Macedonia in 118;¹⁵ a Cn. Sisenna L. f., probably a younger man, was a moneyer perhaps a few years later.¹⁶ The historian, whose

⁸ So recently E. Badian with a query in 'Waiting for Sulla', *JRS* 52 (1962), 47 = *Studies*, p. 206, and without one in 'Where was Sisenna?' *Athenaeum* 42 (1964), 422; and in his chapter on 'The Early Historians' in *Latin Historians* (1966), ed. T. A. Dorey. *MRR* registers him as a patrician, with a question mark.

⁹ *Vita Persi* 1; she may have been of quite local origin, as the Fulvii are an old family of Volaterrae.

¹⁰ *CIE* 5712 ('il gentilizio . . . di sapore prettamente etrusco'). She is P. or possibly L. f. Cf. M. Torelli, *St. etr.* 33 (1965), 497 ff: the inscription perhaps second or first century B. C.: he compares Sisinnius, *CIL* vi. 4186, Sisennius, *CIL* vi. 1058.111.9, 26005, and Sisenna as *gentilicium* vi. 19838, viii. 11201, etc.

¹¹ *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen* (1904), p. 94.

¹² So H. Rix, *Das etruskische Cognomen* (1963), p. 382, tentatively, for Cornelius Sisenna and others. Less tentatively, J. Kaimio,

in 'Studies in the Romanization of Etruria', *Acta Ac. Fin. Rom.* (1975), p. 181: 'if the Etruscan name did not seem suitable to the Roman nomenclature it could be transferred into the *cognomen*'; various examples are given.

¹³ Kaimio, *op. cit.*, p. 213. The cities of Etruria devoted to Scipio Africanus, Plutarch, *Fab. Max.* 25.5.

¹⁴ Livy 39.45.

¹⁵ *SIG*³ 704, 705; cf. *MRR* i. 528.

¹⁶ Crawford, *RCC* no. 310, dates him to 118–107 B. C. The types show Jupiter and an anguipedic giant or demon, each with a thunderbolt, and astral symbols (sun, moon, and stars). F. W. Goethert, 'Summanus' *MDAI(R)* 55 (1940), 233 (with earlier bibliography) thinks the thunderbolt has hit the giant in the side; cf. the types of L. Valerius Acisculus and A. Manlius Q. f., *RRC*, nos. 309, 474.4. This similarity makes it unlikely that the coin refers to Etruscan lore of fulguration.

father's *praenomen* we do not know, was both urban and peregrine praetor in 78 (owing to the sudden death of a colleague and the difficulty of holding elections in that disturbed year?). The family had done nicely, though not yet so well as the certainly Etruscan Perpernae, who had reached the consulship and the censorship.

We cannot tell how loose the historian's connections with Etruria had become. A Cornelius Sisenna, apparently imperial in date and a *negotiator* by position, who set up a sepulchral monument for himself at Philadelphia in Lydia, has the non-Etruscan tribe Fabia,¹⁷ but even if this were also the tribe of the prominent republican members of the family, it would not be surprising, as those given Roman citizenship long before the general enfranchisement of Etruria would not be registered in the tribes later typical of the area.¹⁸ But even rather remote connections with one of the less convulsed regions of Italy are of some interest in the leading historian of the Social War, especially since our tradition, on which Sisenna was certainly influential, treats the Italians with sympathy. Perhaps it is true that, when Velleius describes Sisenna simply as the historian 'belli civilis Sullanique', he is reflecting Sisenna's view that the Social War was really a civil war; if so, he like Velleius had indeed the *punto di vista italico* which Mazzarino claims for him. How far what we know of his work bears this out we shall see.¹⁹

Sisenna's election 'Sulla vivo' to a praetorship for 78, the at least mainly favourable picture of the dictator that Sallust attests, and the friendship with Lucullus and Hortensius known from Plutarch,²⁰ not to mention the defence of

¹⁷ *CIL* iii. 408. Possibly M. f.? He set up the monument *vivos sapiens*, the equivalent of *ζῶν καὶ φρονῶν*, which M. Guarducci, *Epigrafi greca* iii. 149, thinks not pre-imperial. For Romans in Philadelphia during the principate, A. J. N. Wilson, *Emigration from Italy in the Republican Age of Rome* (1966), p. 140. Etruria and Lydia had of course mythological links, which *negotiatores* may have exploited.

L. R. Taylor, *VDRR*, pp. 272, 283, thinks there may have been some patrician Cornelii in the Fabia (which included Alba Fucens, Luca, Rudiae, Asculum); she suggests the L. Corn. M. f. Rom. on the sc. *de agro Pergameno* (Sherk 12) might be a Sisenna, p. 207.

¹⁸ For the Sisenna described as Gabinus' son see below. For later members of the family, Dio 54.217 says that in 13 B. C. a Cornelius Sisenna was censured for his wife's conduct and replied in the Senate that he had married her on Augustus' advice (the Emperor was furious). Groag, *RE* 4.1511, thinks this might be the Cornelius Sisenna who was moneyer after 12 B. C., and/or the man who issued coins, probably as governor of Sicily, perhaps also the patron of L. Cornelius Sisennae libert. Hilarus, *CIL* vi. 1900; he suggests that he was the historian's grandson and father of the Cornelia who brought the name Sisenna into the great family of the Statilii Tauri, marrying a Statilius probably the son of Augustus'

general. *IG* vii. 1854, from Thespieae, a statue perhaps to this lady, who was doubtless the mother of T. Statilius Sisenna Taurus cos. 16 A. D., who lived in Cicero's old house on the Palatine (Velleius 2.14.3); the Statilii were very rich. *CIL* vi 6322–71, slaves of a Cornelia connected with the Statilii, probably the same.

The Sisenna of Hor. *Sat.* 1.7.8 is probably unconnected and less distinguished.

¹⁹ Peter, *HRR* 1.cccxxxix, S. Mazzarino, *Il pensiero storico classico* (1966), ii. 432. Florus 2.6 also implies that the Social War was a civil war, but E. T. Salmon, 'Sulla Redux', *Athenaeum* 42 (1964), 60, shows that most ancient sources 'treat the Social War as a separate entity'.

²⁰ *CIL* i². 2.589 (Sherk 22); Plutarch, *Lucullus* 1. Seneca Rhetor, *Contr. Praef.* 19, bears out the friendship with Hortensius—it was 'a Sisenna provocatus' (another bet?) that Hortensius attended an auction, to prove his amazing memory by reporting afterwards every piece of business. *Pace* Peter cccxlii, this does not prove that Sisenna also had an outstanding memory and tried to outdo his friend. Quintilian 11.2.2 implies that Hortensius' feat was due to training in the art of memory, by which objects (or symbols) are associated in the mind with a series of places, real or imaginary. Can we infer that Sisenna, not *laboris multi*, had not studied it (many decried it)?

Verres (together with Hortensius) in 70 all reveal his optimate links clearly enough; and the friendship with the distinguished *eques* Cn. Calpidius, resident in Sicily, may reveal ties with a family of optimate sentiments; Calpidius' son, a senator, has been suspected of being one of Sulla's new appointees to that office; Q. Calpidius, tr. pl. 98 and pr. 79—admittedly not necessarily a close, or perhaps any, relation, had strong Metellan ties, and a Calpidius was sent to the East by the Senate in 82, during Sulla's dictatorship.²¹ We might also note that Cicero vouches for Sisenna's splendid and elegant collection of plate, such as to attract Verres' attention even in the middle of his trial, and his generally grand mode of life.²²

Other known ties are rather more problematical. Sisenna was a legate to Pompey in the Pirate campaign of 67, and died on it; one would like to have some idea how close and long-standing the friendship was. (In fact Pompey had not chosen his legates entirely from his own cronies.) It is known that Pompey's faithful follower Gabinius had a son called by the sources simply Sisenna, and this must mean that he was either a step- or adoptive son.²³ If the first, the question arises, who was Gabinius' wife? And the answer is the notorious Lollia, Caesar's mistress and probably daughter to Pompey's legate L. Lollius²⁴ or to Lollius Palicanus, the loquacious Picene tribune of 72. If her first husband was Sisenna, then in order for them to have a son who was on campaign in Syria in the mid-50s, even if described as quite young at this time, the marriage would have had to take place before 70; such a very Pompeian alliance, at a time when Pompey was not *bien vu* by the Sullan Establishment, is perhaps not very likely. Sisenna's friendship with Licinius Macer, the well-born *popularis* tribune and historian, hardly helps, as there is nothing to tie Macer to Pompey, and it may merely show that birth and intellectual interests counted with Sisenna as well as political outlook—though Badian, perhaps wrongly, thinks it proves Macer's presence on the winning side in the *Bellum Sullanum*.²⁵

There are several problems concerning the date and number of Sisenna's publications. I find it hard to believe, as many do, that he wrote his famous

²¹ *Verrines* 2.2.43; Münzer, *RE* 3. 1353. Wiseman's stemma, connecting all the Calidii (*New Men in the Roman Senate* (1971), p. 220, is tacitly rejected by E. Gruen, *The Last Generation of the Roman Republic* (1974), p. 202n.

²² *Verrines* 2.4.33–4.

²³ E. Badian, 'The Early Career of A. Gabinius', *Philol.* 103 (1959), 97, thinks he was adopted (if so there was at least one brother or cousin to carry the family on into the Augustan age); Münzer, *RE* 4.1510, thinks he was a step-son.

²⁴ Münzer, *RE* 13.1376, 1394; one would like to know how Sisenna treated Pompey and his father in the *Histories*, but the only fragment bearing on either is the tale of the soldier in Pompeius Strabo's army who kills his brother on the other side—a demonstration of the horrors of civil war that if pressed might imply blame to Strabo for such war

(frag. 129P = 130B).

²⁵ *De leg.* 1.7; Macer as a Marian moneyer in the 80s, Crawford, *RRC* i. 78 ff. He probably entered the Senate via the tribunate in 73, and a quaestorship in the early 70s is not to be postulated, as it is by Badian, 'The Early Historians' (see above, n. 8). *MRR* does not mention one. True, Macer must have been cautious during the Sullan period.

There is little to be gained from the story of how Sisenna, as praetor, wrongly refused to give the goods of one Cn. Cornelius (a client of his?) to 'the noble and excellent young man' P. Scipio, perhaps the P. Scipio who supported Roscius of Ameria and/or the man who as Q. Caecilius Metellus Pius Scipio Nasica was *cos.* 52. (Peter reads L. for P., without comment). The second *non* in Asconius *In Corn.* i. 58 St. is assured by the rhythm.

Histories simply as the result of a bet. The story in Plutarch, *Lucullus* 1, according to which Lucullus was, in youth (certainly the early 80s), designated as the result of a wager with Sisenna and Hortensius to write a history of the Social War in Greek prose, rather than Latin prose or verse, is often elaborated into an arrangement by which the other two friends agreed to take the other forms for themselves; as Sisenna must have taken Latin prose, Hortensius' (attested) *Annales* must have been in verse—a conclusion which Velleius' serious reference to them for the deeds of his ancestor Minatus Magius does not make very likely;²⁶ though Velleius' remark that Sisenna wrote his work on the Civil War when *senior* does not, in its peculiar context, prove that he only began it in the 70s. Badian accepts the (expanded) story of the bet and sees Sisenna then continuing to write of current events like Thucydides (or, one might add, Polybius);²⁷ but if it is true that Sisenna started where Asellio left off (see below), he probably had from the start the intention of covering more than a couple of years. However, this argument is far from conclusive.

Some think that Sisenna's historical interests were already of long standing by the 80s. Velleius' much-disputed words, 'historiarum auctor iam tum Sisenna erat iuvenis', are still often taken, as they first were by Riese, to mean that he was already as a young man a historian ('iam tum' being perhaps the Marius–Jugurtha struggle, when in fact Sisenna was still a boy),²⁸ rather than that the historian Sisenna was already at this time a young man. But the latter—it is an awkward and chronologically inaccurate link-phrase introducing Velleius' list of historians—is that which the best judges of Velleius' Latin seem to prefer.²⁹

Frasinetti argues on the even more fragile basis of Plutarch, *Lucullus* 1, that the reference to Sisenna there as τὸν ἱστορικόν shows that he was already at the time of the bet a historian, and is one of those who hold that the isolated reference in Nonius to 'Sisenna ab urbe condita', as opposed to his *History* or *Histories*, points us to this early work; though most scholars believe that the four fragments about Roman pre-history come from a preface to or excursus in the *Histories*.³⁰ It has been argued that Nonius is, exceptionally, using a second-hand source for this strange reference, which might help to explain the anomaly. And the silence of Cicero in the discussion on historiography in the *de Oratore*, set in 91, is perhaps an argument against an early *ab urbe condita*; a kind reference to the efforts of a bright young man, perhaps as we shall see a political sympathizer of the main speakers, and a prophecy that he was destined to greater things would have been much in Cicero's manner.

Equally, I am not happy about the now apparently unanimous identification of the historian with the translator of Aristides' *Milesiaca*. No ancient source makes this connection explicitly, unless we are to translate Ovid, *Tristia* 2.443–4:

²⁶ Vell. Pat. 2.16.3. Would a history simply of the Social War be called *Annales*?

²⁷ 'Where was Sisenna?' (see above, n. 8).

²⁸ Vell. Pat. 2.9. A. Riese, *Festschrift*. . . zu Heidelberg (1865), p. 55; still so taken by P. Frasinetti, 'Sisenna e la Guerra Sociale', *Athenaeum* 50 (1972), 78; E. Paratore, 'La leggenda di Enea nei frammenti di Sisenna', *St. Urb.* 49 (1975), 223, is tentative. Sisenna must have been born c. 119 (*Brutus* 228);

but Velleius is not quite as chaotic as sometimes thought: Rutilius Rufus, described as a contemporary of Sisenna's, was perhaps nearly so as a historian, since he probably wrote in exile in extreme old age; and it should be accepted that Antias is Sullan, not a generation later.

²⁹ Including A. J. Woodman, in a letter to me.

³⁰ Op. cit. in n. 28.

vertit Aristiden Sisenna, nec obfuit illi
historiae turpes inseruisse iocos

as some do, to mean that Sisenna translated Aristides and also inserted improper stories into his *History*; or else that he 'n'eut pas à souffrir d'avoir mêlé à ses travaux historiques de honteux badinages', which to André makes him the author of separate erotic poems.³¹

But the trouble is that Ovid is going through Latin literature in this passage in roughly chronological order: Ennius, Lucretius, Catullus, Calvus, and then a whole group of writers of the latest republican and triumviral periods—Ticidas, Memmius, Cinna, Anser, Cornificius, (Valerius) Cato, the admirers of Perilla (thought to be the wife of Clodius Aesopus, son of the actor, she fits well in time), and Varro of Atax. Then

nec minus Hortensi nec sunt minus improba Servi
carmina; quis dubitet nomina tanta sequi?

Then comes Sisenna; after this the next couplet deals with Gallus, clearly balancing the Sisenna one, and in some editions linked only by a semicolon. Then we go on to the early Augustans, Tibullus and Propertius: 'his ego successi'—for, says Ovid, he will not name living men.

Four lines then seem totally out of order, if we also accept, as most do, that Hortensius is the great orator and Servius is Servius Sulpicius the great lawyer (and that they wrote love-poetry in their youth). There is a possibility however that Ovid meant the younger Hortensius: the orator had a ne'er-do-well son whose *mores* grieved him greatly,³² and a Hortensius was pouring out facile verse while Cinna was polishing his *Zmyrna* (Catullus 95). True, when Catullus wrote this the orator was alive, but old and unwell—would he have been producing love-poetry? And Sulpicius' son, a studious and literary youth according to Cicero,³³ may be the Servius whose judgement of poetry Horace respected,³⁴ and perhaps the father of the poetess Sulpicia.³⁵ In that case, we are plainly faced with a Sisenna of roughly the triumviral period as the translator of the *Milesiaca*. It is true that there are considerations that can be urged against this. Ovid's list of Greek erotic authors, which precedes his Roman one, is not arranged in strict chronological order, but partly by genre, though it starts with archaic lyric and ends with those who have lately written *Sybaritica*. Pliny, *Ep.* 5.3.5, seems to think that the Hortensius and Servius who wrote erotic verse were

³¹ J. André, ed. 1968, following Reitzenstein, *Das Märchen von Amor und Psyche bei Apuleius* (1912), p. 64, cf. E. Rohde, *Rb. Mus.* (1893), 130. Improper stories as part of the history, e.g. G. Luck's trans., 1967–72. At first sight the argument that *historia* in connection with Sisenna must mean 'history' is plausible, but at 416 'Eubius, impurae conditor historiae' is hardly a historian (the work dealt with abortion).

Th. Birt, *Kritik u. Hermeneutik* (1913), p. 106, glosses 'mit ernsthafter Geschichtsschreibung, *historiae*, stellt also der Historiker

Sisenna die lasterhafte Aristidesübersetzung gleich.' Surely as 'desperat' as he finds Reitzenstein's version.

³² There is no possibility of violent re-ordering of the passage; Ennius and Lucretius are tied inextricably to Catullus and Calvus. For the younger Hortensius, Cicero, *ad Att.* 6.3.9; Val. Max. 5.9.2.

³³ *Ad fam.* 4.3.4, 4.5.4.

³⁴ Horace, *Sat.* 1.10.86.

³⁵ Cautiously, Münzer, *RE* 4a 862, and R. Syme, 'Missing Senators', *Historia* 4 (1955), 52.

the famous figures of those names—but he may have been misled by Ovid's 'nomina tanta'.³⁶ Fronto, noting 'Sisenna' as a source for indecent words, gives no sign of thinking him a different man from the 'Sisenna' who wrote the history he elsewhere refers to. It would perhaps also be a coincidence that Cicero describes the historian as 'non sine facietis' (as an orator) and we have seen his liking for bets.³⁷

But I cannot think that these things outweigh introducing confusion into Ovid's list of Latin authors. Ovid is, besides, talking primarily if not entirely of poets, and a reference to a historical work would seem quite out of place.³⁸ And would Cicero have said of a notorious author of *Milesiaca*, as he said (without any qualification) of the historian in the year of his death, and in a context that gave him no motive for flattery, that he was 'et vita et prudentia longe dissimilis' compared with a couple of disreputable senators (Asconius, *In Corn.* 1.58 St.)? Even though, no doubt, Sisenna might have argued that his muse was jocund but his life was chaste? I would tentatively suggest that what in fact Ovid meant was that his, recent, Sisenna inserted improper poems into the narrative of the *Milesiaca*, as Petronius was to do in the *Satyricon*. But however that may be,³⁹ it does not affect the question of date. This later Sisenna could be Gabinius' step- or adoptive son (Lollia will not have brought him up severely), or the scurrilous Sisenna of Horace, *Sat.* 1.7.8, of whom however his commentators know absolutely nothing.⁴⁰

Finally, the historian, as it appears from Cicero not a frequent or important advocate, clearly did not publish any of his speeches—that is why Cicero appeals in the *Brutus* to his history, and also to Atticus' memory, for evidence as to his style. For the rather remote possibility that he wrote on the subject of grammar, see n. 123 below.

The *Historiae* at least existed, and were written by the Sisenna whom Cicero knew. Their general characteristics are not however all that easy to discern, and very different judgements have been made. Badian is contemptuous of Bardon's notion that Sisenna was a soldier and for this reason liked battle scenes.⁴¹ It is true, as Badian says, that Cicero does not, in the *Brutus*, call Sisenna a 'vir fortis', but in the *Verrines* he implies he is a 'vir fortissimus'; and he would hardly have become one of Pompey's legates in 67 if he had had no military experience: he did then, like the other legates, command ships, cavalry, and infantry,⁴² and took his forces from Macedonia or Greece to Crete to overawe Metellus.⁴³ In fact he will surely have fought in the Social War, when Rome put into the field every

³⁶ Ovid's 'nomina tanta' probably applies to all the poets he has mentioned, and their greatness as poets, not to the social position and non-poetic fame of Hortensius and Servius.

³⁷ Fronto, *Ep.* 57 Van Den Hout = 62 Naber: *Brutus* 228.

³⁸ Even if the Greek *Sybaritica*, and Eubius' work, were in prose.

³⁹ The precise form of the *Milesiaca*, and its relation to Menippean satire, are uncertain.

⁴⁰ The idea that it was Sisenna's translation of the *Milesiaca* that Surena found in the baggage of Crassus' officer Roscius is pleasant, but would the Parthians, and the

people of Seleucia, have recognized it in Latin dress? Roscius was probably reading the original Greek (Plutarch, *Crassus* 32.3–4).

⁴¹ E. Badian, 'Waiting for Sulla' (see above, n. 8). H. Bardon, *La Littérature latine incon nue* i (1952), 255. Sisenna is among the *vir i fortissimi*, perhaps all governors, including Marius, Pompey, and C. Marcellus, who stayed with Sthenius in Sicily, *Verr.* 2.2.110.

⁴² Appian, *Mithr.* 94.

⁴³ Dio 36.1; Plutarch, *Pomp.* 26 describes the legates as ἡγεμονικοὶ δὲ καὶ στρατηγικοὶ (the latter word probably means 'praetorian').

available officer. Badian himself indeed suggests that he was, like Lucullus and possibly Hortensius, military tribune in Campania under Sulla; Lucullus certainly served under Sulla before his quaestorship; Hortensius fought in the ranks in the first year of the war, and as military tribune in its second, and his special information about Minatus Magius suggests the Campanian front. The suggestion that it was as *contubernales* in the field that the three young men made their bet is tempting. (If so, and if either Hortensius or Sisenna was still there in 88—and tribunes often served for more than one year—it is worth observing that they must have refused to follow Sulla in his march on Rome, since all his officers save his quaestor, perhaps Lucullus, did so.⁴⁴).

And if Sisenna governed Sicily after his praetorship in 78, as has been suggested on the strength of the facts that he stayed at some time before 70 with Sthenius of Thermae, like others, perhaps all governors, whom Cicero mentions, and had many other ties in the area,⁴⁵ his province was by no means a wholly peaceful one; the pirates were strong in Sicilian waters,⁴⁶ Spartacus a few years later believed that the embers of the slave wars in the island could easily be fanned into flame,⁴⁷ and there may also have been embers of the Marian resistance that Pompey had put down; while in 77 the threat from Lepidus had not yet been disposed of.

Sisenna, if he was really here, will have had to take careful military precautions, even if there was no actual fighting. Perhaps the experience in Sicily of problems caused by pirates might partly explain why Pompey chose him as a legate in 67; and it might conceivably throw light on the interest in the naval operations of the Social War revealed by a number of fragments, although our later sources do not think them worth mention; or had Sisenna actually been involved in these?⁴⁸

There are also a great number of fragments with extremely precise indications of topography, perhaps especially for Campania, or detailing numbers and varieties of siege engines (as well as ships).⁴⁹ Indeed Badian had possibly changed his mind by the time he came to write his article on the early Roman historians, since here he notes Sisenna's liking for technical military terms, which may well be more than one of his purely literary idiosyncrasies. It is worth remembering that, as far as we know, there were no Latin works specifically on military science to succeed Cato's manual, presumably out of date owing to recent changes in the legion (though the author of the *ad Herennium* was thinking in the 80s of writing one).⁵⁰ In the first century at Rome it seems to have been accepted that one learnt about generalship partly by reading history. Polybius' didactic efforts in this field had been plain. Sallust makes Marius accuse noble consuls of sitting down to repair their inexperience by reading 'et acta maiorum et Graeca militaria

⁴⁴ E. Badian, 'Where was Sisenna?' (see above, n. 8). For Hortensius, *Brutus* 304, Vell. Pat. 2.16.3; only his quaestor followed Sulla to Rome, Appian, *B. C.* 1.57—perhaps Lucullus, Badian, 'Waiting for Sulla' (above, n. 8). The more junior Cicero also served Sulla, perhaps only for one year.

⁴⁵ *Verr.* 2.2.110; the other Romans named are holders of *imperium*. 2.2.43 shows Sisenna had many contacts in Sicily, including the important *eques* Cn. Calidius, father of a senator. An ex-governor as an advocate would be a good card for Verres to play. *MRR*

accepts the governorship, with a query.

⁴⁶ Plutarch, *Pomp.* 26, *Crassus* 10; Cicero, *Verr.* 2.5 *passim*. Appian, *Mithr.* 93, defeat of a Sicilian praetor.

⁴⁷ Plutarch, *Crassus* 10.

⁴⁸ *Frgs.* 38–9P=41–2B (Book 3); 104–7P=75 and 63–5B (Book 4); perhaps also 9P=11B (Book 3); 139P=141B. Appian, *B. C.* 1.212 on defence of the coast; Livy, *Ep.* 75, a fleet off Campania.

⁴⁹ *Frgs.* 40–1, 90–2P=20, 53, 120–1, 82B.

⁵⁰ *Ad Her.* 3.2.3.

praecepta'; Cicero claims that Lucullus on his way to the East belatedly developed his ability as a general 'partim in percontando a peritis, partim in rebus gestis legendis'.⁵¹ Diodorus claims most implausibly to be providing good vicarious experience in military as well as political matters.⁵² The Social War was very hard fought indeed, over territory much of which was familiar to many Romans, and it had the added interest of pitting legion against legion, not against phalanx or barbarian troop, something that had not been seen before (though frags. 7 and 23P = 8 and 52B, where stones are used as weapons, suggest a good deal of irregular warfare too: cf. 21P = 39B *sparum*, a *telum agreste*). It is hard to believe that Sisenna did not at least attempt something of serious military interest.

There must also have been a serious political aspect to the work: something so firmly called *Historiae* (the tradition is surely very strong)⁵³ is likely, even if written as late as around 70, which is not certain, to hark back to Sempronius Asellio's famous distinction between *annales* and *historia*⁵⁴—the latter giving not mere lists of facts, but also motives and causes of both military and political events, such as Polybius had thought the very stuff of useful history. The old suggestion that Sisenna in fact continued Asellio's histories⁵⁵ has much to recommend it (the latest fragment of Asellio seems to deal with the death of Livius Drusus⁵⁶).

It was of course common for Greek historians to pick up where admired predecessors left off; this would be the first example we know of from Rome, and would be both a compliment to the serious but unliterary Asellio and a sign of Greek influence. At all events, Sisenna ought certainly not to be called an annalist; he himself attests that he grouped events carefully, at least inside a single year, on geographic principles, 'ne vellicatim ac saltuatim scribendo lectorum animos impediremus'.⁵⁷

It does indeed seem from the fragments that Sisenna was closely concerned with politics. There are a number dealing, apparently, with political trials, especially perhaps those under the Varian law, and a number that come from strongly political speeches: one of these last justifies the Italians' recourse to war in their desperation, one seems to urge the extension of the franchise to peoples who are 'exleges' (probably not qualified for it under the Lex Julia), but have assisted Rome; one records attacks by 'mali et audaces' on our 'ordo', doubtless the Senate.⁵⁸ The account of political events in the 80s would doubtless be the more valuable if Sisenna indeed was, as Badian argues, in Rome throughout, rather than with Sulla in the East. Balsdon objected to this theory and suggested that Appian's decline in vividness after Marius' death meant that Sisenna left the city then.⁵⁹ But the implications of *Brutus* 227–8 are fairly clear: what Cicero seems to be saying is that Antistius in the mid-eighties had no rival as a speaker

⁵¹ *Jug.* 85.12; *Acad.* 2.1.2.

⁵² *Diod. Sic.* 1.1.5.

⁵³ *Peter* cccxxxix.

⁵⁴ Asellio frags. 1–2P.

⁵⁵ Recently, H. H. Scullard, *From the Gracchi to Nero*⁴ (1976), p. 407. Frasinetti (op. cit. in n. 28) thinks Sisenna 143P=5B a flashback to Rutilius Rufus' trial, Barabino, p. 83, to C. Gracchus' law.

⁵⁶ 11P. For the structure of Asellio's

work, see now G. Morelli, 'Sempronio Asellione e Cesellio Vindice in Carisio', *St. Urb.* (1975).

⁵⁷ *Frag.* 127P=127B. A. D. Leeman, *Orationis Ratio* (1963), p. 84, treats him as one of the annalists.

⁵⁸ *Frag.* 10, 110, 113P=14, 99, 105B (cf. 114P=102B).

⁵⁹ Review in *JRS* 55 (1965), 231.

among his coevals ('eius aetatis'—not 'in that period'); among those younger than he, Sisenna came nearest to him.⁶⁰

This should be kept in mind when we come to consider Cicero's complaint that Sisenna seemed to have read no Greek historian but Cleitarchus and to have aimed at imitating him. Cicero, as we shall see, is thinking primarily of style, but perhaps of a tendency to melodramatic scenes as well. No doubt this criticism was not wholly unjust, but it may have led to an underestimation of the work's more serious sides. It is worth recalling that Cicero also describes Sisenna, if primarily in a forensic context, as 'gnarus rei publicae'.⁶¹

In addition, it does not seem possible that Sulla dominated Sisenna's work in the way that Alexander dominated that of Cleitarchus, though this has been believed⁶² (not that Alexander was necessarily an unblemished hero to Cleitarchus⁶³). Sulla's *Commentaries* are often thought to have been Sisenna's main source at least for Sulla's own campaigns in Italy and the East, but he must have had oral ones too; for example, Lucullus' account of his naval exploits in the Eastern Mediterranean (at least if Sisenna was writing in the early 70s, when Lucullus was in Rome, as he was not in the last years of his friend's life). The fragment referred to above, on the grouping of events, shows that Sisenna dealt with the affairs of both Greece and Asia in the same summer, and thus cannot have concentrated on Sulla's experiences alone. Fragment 133P = 135B, giving the origin of the name Pessinus in Galatia, shows not only Sisenna's liking for etymology, but probably that he described Mithridates' repression of the Galatians after the defeat of Archelaus, successfully resisted by the surviving tetrarchs, in which the Romans were not involved at all.⁶⁴

And Sallust's words 'parum mihi libero ore locutus videtur', of Sisenna's treatment of Sulla, do not, given his own very hostile view of Sulla's later career, suggest that Sisenna was totally enthusiastic; rather that, perhaps, he palliated the murders and proscriptions, and the harsh treatment of much of Italy. This in fact looks likely from a careful consideration of the fragments of Sallust's own *Histories*. It is frustrating to have so little of his discussion, in the preface, of earlier Roman historians. We know he praised Cato's brevity and Fannius' truthfulness—are these qualities picked out to contrast with what he now thought

⁶⁰ Other arguments in Badian's 'Where was Sisenna?' (above, n. 8) are not conclusive: Brutus, in *Brutus*, does not know of the case in which Sisenna appeared against Rutilius, but Atticus does, which may suggest it occurred in the 90s or early 80s—but Sisenna could have left Rome thereafter.

⁶¹ *Brutus* 228; but Sisenna's characteristics, he thinks, were clearly visible in his histories.

⁶² Peter ccxcxlii; Leeman, op. cit. in n. 57, p. 82. Peter holds that Sisenna admired Sulla as his *gentilis*—but apart from the fact that it is doubtful whether they were, or were regarded as, members of the same *gens*, what of Cornelius Cinna (who may or may not have been a patrician)?

⁶³ Tarn, holding that Cleitarchus was hostile to Alexander, has not persuaded; but Cleitarchus probably mentioned Alexander's massacres and other crimes.

⁶⁴ Appian, *Mithr.* 46. Sisenna's and Sulla's works were on much the same scale (over twenty books each, if we accept Nonius' reference to the former's Book 23 (132P = 134B), so Sisenna's wider canvass must have meant compression of Sulla's account. Sulla's style was apparently simple (he did not attract the grammarians) though perhaps not inelegant; recently, G. Pascucci, 'I commentari di Silla', *St. Urb.* (1975), p. 283, E. Valgiglio, 'L'autobiografia di Silla nelle biografie di Plutarco', *ibid.*, p. 245.

to be Sisenna's shortcomings.⁶⁵ At any rate, having said in the *Jugurtha* that he would not be dealing elsewhere with Sulla, since Sisenna's treatment was largely adequate, in the *Histories* Sallust in fact went back to some extent over events preceding his proper starting-point of 78. It is perhaps not wrong to suspect that he stressed events or aspects that he thought Sisenna had omitted or ignored. It is for example probably safe to assume that Sisenna did not report that the consulship of the younger Marius was pushed on against the opposition of his mother Julia; Sallust may well have had personal traditions on the Marian side that enabled him to supplement his predecessor in such matters.⁶⁶ More importantly, Peter was probably right in accepting that a fragment of Sallust claiming that Sertorius' deeds in Spain as a young man, under T. Didius, then in raising supplies in the Social War and subsequently as an independent commander had been underplayed 'primo per ignobilitatem, deinde per invidiam scriptorum', is a criticism of Sisenna as well as of the historians of Pompey.⁶⁷ Now Exuperantius' confused little work is based on Sallust; it gets itself into a tangle in chap. 7 which is obviously caused by a flashback in Sallust on Sertorius' early life. But through the Exuperantian haze one can discern that Sertorius is described as opposing the fraternization between the consuls' army and Sulla's in 83 that led to mass desertions from the former, and as energetically recruiting thereafter in Etruria, where the inhabitants were faithful to the Mariani who had given them the vote; his criticism of the way things were being run in Rome is said to have perhaps been a factor in his being sent to Spain. If none of this was in Sisenna, it may suggest not only that he was uninterested in Sertorius, but that by now at any rate he had left Rome; but also perhaps that he played down Etruscan opposition to Sulla—and possibly that of other Italians. This might be borne out by his own famous fragment, 132P = 134B, 'multi populi, plurimae contiones dictaturam suffragaverunt';⁶⁸ if, that is, we take the 'multi populi' to be Italian ones. This is a *punto di vista italico* of a sort. At all events, it contradicts Appian's assertion (*B. C.* 1.99) that the reaction to Sulla's dictatorship was distinctly chilly.

How much there was in Sisenna's work on the background and earlier history of the Italians we cannot tell, especially since we know so little of Books 1 and 2; but there was certainly something on the old Italic custom of the *ver sacrum*, whether this simply reflects antiquarian interest or because there may have been some sort of attempt to revive it in the Social War.⁶⁹ The fragment mentioning

⁶⁵ Sallust, *Hist.* 1.4M. Frag. 1.2M, *recens scriptum*, is referred to Sisenna by Maurenbrecher, obviously most insecurely (though Syme, *op. cit.* in n. 1, p. 182, accepts it). 1.5M perhaps accused Cato of bias.

⁶⁶ Sallust, *Hist.* 1.35M.

⁶⁷ *Id. ibid.* 1.88M. A. Schulten, *Sertorius* (1926), p. 15, says that Sallust started the *Histories* by complaining that Sisenna was also unfair to Lepidus. I see no evidence. He argues that the hostile tradition on Sertorius in the Livian sources and Appian is perhaps ultimately due to Sisenna; but Sisenna was perhaps brief or silent on the man. Syme, *op.*

cit. in n. 1, p. 206, thinks Varro a better candidate. (I also cannot share Schulten's belief that Sisenna's style was 'poseidonisch'.)

⁶⁸ Barabino, p. 184, translates 'la maggior parte del popolo e delle assemblee'. Leeman, *op. cit.* in n. 57, p. 84, on the other hand, accepts Peter's tentative suggestion *nationes* for *contiones*. But a reference to both urban and rural support seems probable.

⁶⁹ *Frag.* 99–100P=122–3B. P. Frasinetti (*op. cit.* in n. 28) suggests that, as in Strabo 5.14.12, it was used to explain the foundation of Bovianum in Samnium.

those who had always used gold and silver in profusion would seem to refer to some Italian people;⁷⁰ Florus 1.2.7 has, as Frasinetti points out, a story that the Samnites had gold and silver arms in early times; in actual fact, they were a poor people—the richer Campanians used precious metal lavishly for ornaments, and it could be that they were being referred to. It is at first sight surprising to find that Sisenna (frag. 1P = 1B) declared that Antenor (though not Aeneas) betrayed Troy to the Greeks, for Antenor was the founder of Padua (Patavium), and the Veneti of the area had long been pro-Roman; but it is possible that relations had recently been embittered by the Romans' omission to extend the citizenship to them in 89;⁷¹ armed rebellion by the Transpadani was of course expected a few years later. Perhaps for this reason the story of Antenor's treachery re-emerged in Sisenna, and also a little later Alexander of Ephesus.

Two other fragments may help to fill out the picture of Sisenna's optimate but pro-Italian views. One is what is perhaps a very favourable reference to Scaurus, the *princeps senatus*, when dragged before the Varian commission: 'neque aetatis granditatem, neque ea merita, neque ordinis honestatem aut dignitatem sibi esse excusationi'. (Of course, this could come from a speech, and not necessarily reflect its author's own sentiments.) Scaurus, of course, apart from being disliked by Sallust, was an adviser to Livius Drusus (and first husband of Sulla's wife Metella). The second fragment is an unfavourable reference to someone, perhaps Q. Caepio, who quarrelled so violently with Drusus that the latter wanted to throw him off the Tarpeian Rock, and who accused Scaurus before the Varian Commission: but the passage would only be dealing with his subsequent rash conduct in the war. Badian, who also supposes that Sisenna was probably a sympathizer of Livius Drusus, has suggested that he could be behind the version in Appian and Valerius Maximus that puts the Italian rising after the Varian Law and as a direct consequence of it—obviously a pro-Drusan version.⁷²

Finally, Sallust's *Histories* were certainly not sparing of the atrocities of Marius and Cinna; but their author seems to have said firmly that those of Sulla and the Sullans were worse, and probably he felt that Sisenna had not done full justice to them. In particular, we know that Sallust recounted Catiline's peculiarly horrible murder of Marius Gratidianus, who was perhaps his own kinsman.⁷³ It is safe to assume that Sisenna did not mention this; Catiline still had a tolerably respectable position when he was writing.

We have seen that Cicero accused Sisenna of imitating Cleitarchus. Now Cleitarchus' work on Alexander was probably the best known in Rome of all the so-called 'tragic' histories of Hellenistic writers (the term was used, not in flattery, by Polybius, and picked up by Cicero and Diodorus at least). Pliny calls Cleitarchus 'celebratus auctor', and his work was the most popular source for the career of

⁷⁰ Frag. 102P=124B. E. T. Salmon, *Samnium and the Samnites* (1967), p. 35 n.7.

⁷¹ R. Scuderi, 'Il tradimento di Antenore', *Contrib. dell'Inst. di Stor. Ant.* 4 (1976), 28, thinks Sisenna simply wants to whitewash Aeneas by blaming Antenor alone, since the story of treachery by one or both existed and had perhaps been revived by Mithridates' propaganda.

⁷² Frag. 115P=104B; 50P=26B. But

perhaps not the same Q. Caepio: T. P. Wiseman, *Cinna the Poet* (1974), p. 184. Badian's suggestion is in 'Quaestiones Variae', *Historia* 18 (1969), 447; accepted by G. Calboli, 'Su alcuni frammenti di Cornelio Sisenna', *St. Urb.* 49 (1975), 151.

⁷³ Sallust, *Hist.* 1.47–51M on Sullan atrocities; 43–45M probably all on Marius Gratidianus, 44 explicitly so.

Alexander, the aspect of Greek history in which the Romans were most interested.⁷⁴ Cicero in a letter pretends that Caelius is always reading it, though he himself disdains it.⁷⁵ Diodorus, working in Rome at about the same time, probably used it for his account of Alexander.⁷⁶ *Brutus* 41–3 shows that Cleitarchus was one of those who melodramatically made Themistocles commit suicide, by drinking bull's blood (Cicero deprecates those who try 'rhetorice et tragice ornare' their material in this way) and Plutarch shows that he was one of those who falsely made the same statesman end as a suppliant of Xerxes himself, not his son.⁷⁷ Quintilian says that his *ingenium* was good, but 'fides infamatur'. We know from Tacitus that Sisenna had a pathetic episode of brother killing brother in the Civil War, with the survivor committing suicide on the funeral pyre.⁷⁸ This would surely have appealed to Cleitarchus.

Now our tradition on the Social War in particular involves various markedly dramatic episodes, some of which should probably be traced to the hand of Sisenna. Many of the fragments of his books 3 and 4 can be neatly fitted into the narrative of Appian, our fullest source, as Peter and Barabino have shown, and this suggests a possible place to look for traces of our author.⁷⁹ The suicide of Vidacilius in Asculum on his own pyre is one of these episodes; so is the duel of a huge Gaul and a tiny Mauretanian.⁸⁰ In isolation it would seem over-bold to suggest that 121P = 71B, 'silentium oritur', refers to the watchers of this fight. But Barabino makes a case for a clutch of fragments from Nonius, of which this is one, dealing with the campaign of Sulla in Campania against Cluentius, in which Appian places the duel, and two of these at least explicitly mention Gauls.⁸¹ And duels between huge Gauls and small but victorious opponents seem to be *de rigueur* for Roman historians of this period: cf. A. Gellius 9.13, Manlius Torquatus and a gigantic Gaul, from Claudius Quadrigarius (the onlookers' silence is mentioned); and 9.11, Valerius Corvinus and another enormous Gaul, perhaps not from Claudius, but an annalist of about the same date.⁸²

Poppaedi Silo's appearance in Caepio's camp as a pretended refugee, with slave babies whom he claimed were his sons, would also have given Sisenna splendid opportunities;⁸³ so would the story in Valerius Maximus of the heroic young man of Pinna, who saved his father from the Romans while avoiding opening the town to them.⁸⁴

I would also suspect that the famous episodes of Marius' encounter at Minturnae with the Cimbrian or Gallic slave sent to kill him, and his meditations on the ruins of Carthage, may be Sisenna's invention or elaboration. We know

⁷⁴ N. H. 10.136. A. Wardman, *Rome's Debt to Greece* (1976), p. 95.

⁷⁵ *Ad fam.* 2.10.

⁷⁶ So recently, F. Schachermeyr, *Alexander der Grosse* (1973), p. 658, P. Goukowsky, ed. Diodorus 17 (1976), J. R. Hamilton, 'Cleitarchus and Diodorus Book 17' in *Greece and the East in Ancient History and Prehistory* (Studies presented to F. Schachermeyr) (1977), p. 126, against the more complex theories of Tarn and others.

⁷⁷ Plutarch, *Themistocles* 27.1.

⁷⁸ Quintilian 10.1.75; Tacitus, *Hist.* 3.51; Livy, *Ep.* 79, and Val. Max. 5.5.4. If Tacitus does not specifically say that the suicide

was on the brother's pyre he is perhaps compressing or tactfully toning down, rather than using an earlier and simpler source than the others.

⁷⁹ I am assuming nothing about Appian's immediate source.

⁸⁰ Appian, *B. C.* 1.48, 1.50.

⁸¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 138 ff. (71–2P=68–9B; cf. 61P=70B, a *carrus*, Gallic cart).

⁸² *Pace* Peter, who registers this last episode as Quadrigarius frag. 12. For duels in Cleitarchus, note perhaps Diodorus 17.20, 83, and 100.

⁸³ Appian, *B. C.* 1.44.

⁸⁴ Val. Max. 5.4.7.

from frag. 125P = 129B that he did deal with Marius' flight from Rome in some detail (here he sails from the mouth of the Liris to meet his friends at the island of Aenaria).⁸⁵ In fact, the whole ultra-romantic account of Marius' exile was possibly first developed by Sisenna, though as Passerini says there were so many variants that it is impossible to trace any single hand.⁸⁶ If this is true, we must admit that even if his *fides* too is *infamanda*, Sisenna's dramatic imagination was first-class; and he was making up very successfully for the lack of exoticism in his subject that must have forcibly struck an admirer of Cleitarchus. Carney has noted the similarity of the tales of Marius' exile to the elaborated version of Themistocles' exile; conceivably Sisenna was consciously copying what must have been an impressive digression in Cleitarchus.⁸⁷

Livy appears to have had an account of Galba's escape from the Lucanians by the aid of a woman.⁸⁸ This has been linked with frag. 13P = 19B about a licentious woman.⁸⁹ Cleitarchus certainly included romantic touches; he described the incestuous love of her father for the legendary Myrrha, Harpalus' honours to the Athenian hetaira Glycera, the instigation to the burning of Persepolis by that other hetaira, Thais, and the Queen of the Amazons' visit to Alexander in order to conceive a child by him. A further fragment deals with punishments for adultery.⁹⁰ All this adds up, in fact, to a very large proportion of the certain fragments (and Diodorus 17 has several female roles). It is also easy enough to find prominent female roles in other Hellenistic historians, such as Phylarchus, or Cleitarchus' own father, Deinon. But whether episodes of this kind in Sisenna's work could really qualify as Ovid's 'turpes iocos' seems doubtful.⁹¹

Cleitarchus does not however seem to have tricked his narrative out extensively with supernatural happenings; not too surprisingly, if he is, as Jacoby accepts, the Cleitarchus mentioned by Diogenes Laertius, who left the Cyrenaic school to study under Stilpo the Megarian. Stilpo was contemptuous of popular religion.⁹² Sisenna too may have been fairly sceptical. The account in frag. 3P = 3B of Aeneas' death beside the river Numicius is, as has been pointed out, brutally unambiguous: 'obtruncatur', he is cut down.⁹³ Previous versions known to us all say that he disappeared mysteriously, as a prelude to being worshipped as a god. Sisenna has been seen as inspired by euhemerism here: if so, that was

⁸⁵ E. Candiloro, 'Sulle Historiae di L. Cornelio Sisenna', *SCO* 12 (1963), 212, connects frag. 4P=4B, on the rocks called *arae propitiae*, with this journey; it is more commonly associated with that of Aeneas, since Virgil mentions them in this context (so Peter and Barabino).

⁸⁶ A. Passerini, *Studi su Caio Mario* (1971), p. 183; cf. M. Bang, 'Marius in Minturnae', *Klio* 10 (1910), 178, who notes that while Cicero, *post red. ad Quir.* 19–20, heard from Marius' own mouth a rhetorical account of his rescue from the marsh by the people of Minturnae, he never mentions the attempted execution by the hand of the Gallic or German slave. If Sisenna is involved, it is not then primarily either the schools of rhetoric, or 'popular legend', that were responsible for

working the story up (so T. F. Carney, 'The Flight and Exile of Marius', *Greece & Rome* 8 (1961), 98).

⁸⁷ Op. cit. in last note. Marius' attempt to take refuge with an African king vaguely recalls Themistocles' action in Persia.

⁸⁸ Livy, *Ep.* 72.

⁸⁹ Barabino, p. 100.

⁹⁰ *FGH* iib, no. 137, frags. 3, 11, 16, 30, 32.

⁹¹ See n. 31 above.

⁹² Diog. Laert. 2.113. But if Diodorus 17 is direct from Cleitarchus, note Alexander's prophetic dream about the way to cure Ptolemy's wound, also the prophecy of the Chaldaeans etc.

⁹³ Barabino, p. 99; Paratore, op. cit. in n. 28, p. 223.

nothing new in a Roman historian.⁹⁴ But Cicero suggests that in his rejection of prophetic dreams Sisenna was inspired by 'some Epicurean or other'.⁹⁵ That would be newer; he would be one of the first Roman senators attested as an Epicurean, the first being the notorious T. Albucius, whose devotion to the school was clearly regarded, in the last years of the second century, as rather shocking and ridiculous.⁹⁶ More acceptable seems to have been C. Velleius, the Epicurean speaker of the *De natura deorum*, set apparently in the early 70s; he would be about a contemporary of Sisenna's.⁹⁷ Apart from Cicero's rather tentative suggestion of Epicureanism, the evidence for the latter's religious or philosophic outlook is thin; frag. 123P = 126B raises the question whether the gods take any interest in mankind, but only raises it; the passage could be from a speech.⁹⁸ However, Sisenna's easy-going character and tendency to oblige his friends in legal matters, which Cicero attests,⁹⁹ are at least easily conciliable with Epicureanism, as is his friendship with Atticus (though the latter's Epicureanism was pretty nominal, and his circle of friends wide).

It has been argued by La Penna¹⁰⁰ that Sisenna's polemic against prophetic dreams must have been seen as polemic against Coelius Antipater, from whose account of the Hannibalic War (fairly recently published when Sisenna wrote) Cicero excerpted so many supposed prophetic dreams for the *De divinatione*; indeed, Coelius very likely had an excursus on such dreams, since not all those he recounted come from the Hannibalic period. Sisenna may indeed have had in mind his only Latin predecessor with real literary ambitions (perhaps also earlier historians of Rome such as Fabius Pictor in his account of Aeneas),¹⁰¹ but the several scholars are also surely right who suppose that Sisenna would be taken as contradicting Sulla's commentaries, with their fervent advice to follow dreams,¹⁰² and their frequent miracles and portents. However, Sisenna was not perhaps a very serious or consistent philosopher; he did retail one prophetic dream, and he certainly recorded portents at the start of the Social War, with the haruspices' interpretation of them; whether as a good conservative (this being public, rather than dangerously individual religion), as a believer in the Etruscan lore of his ancestors, or simply as a historiographical *topos*, one cannot say.¹⁰³

⁹⁴ 'The First Latin Annalists', *Latomus* 35 (1976), 689.

⁹⁵ *De div.* 1.99; but it has been observed that Polybius and Panaetius, no Epicureans, also rejected these.

⁹⁶ *Brutus* 131, *De fin.* 1.8, perhaps also Varro, *Sat. Menipp.* 128 Bücheler.

⁹⁷ He is referred to in *de or.* 3.78 as a friend of L. Crassus, so was not very young in the 70s. *MRR* suggests he was enrolled in the Senate by Sulla, though Niccolini believed he was tribune before 90.

⁹⁸ As Candiloro, *op. cit.* in n. 85, suggests.
⁹⁹ *Brutus* 228, cf. Asconius, *In Corn.* i 58 St.

¹⁰⁰ A. La Penna, 'Polemiche sui sogni nella storiografia arcaica', *St. Urb.* 49 (1975), 49.

¹⁰¹ Fabius Pictor, frag. 3P.

¹⁰² Sulla, frag. 8P; so E. Candiloro, *op. cit.* in n. 85, and U. Laffi, 'Il mito di Silla', *Athenaeum* 45 (1967), 177; Barabino, p. 88.

¹⁰³ Frags. 5P=6 and 10B. Cicero's tenses *De div.* 1.0 ('cum disputavisset . . . tum insolenter disputat') possibly suggests that the account of Caecilia Metella's veridical dream was not immediately followed by an attack on the possibility of such things, but that this came later in the work—possibly apropos of a dream of Sulla's. *Insolenter*, 'impertinently' also suggests the contradiction of two separate passages.

Frasinetti, *op. cit.* in n. 28, p. 87, comparing 11P=12B with *Obsequens* 99, thinks that Sisenna also mentioned *prodigia* during the course of the war. Diodorus 17 reports omens in chs. 10, 17, 41, and 116.

One final possible similarity to Cleitarchus' matter, as opposed to his manner. As far as we can tell, the Greek historian, though he doubtless had an interpretation of Alexander's character, does not seem to have been concerned with that of Alexander's generals or other minor figures. And it is possible that early Roman historians were also uninterested in detailed character-sketches. Woodman has noted that we have no fragments of a character-sketch from any even of the immediately post-Sullan historians, with the possible exception of Claudius Quadrigarius. One might well have expected that Nonius, quoting so plentifully, if so briefly, from Books III and IV, would have run up against some character-sketch of a Roman or Italian leader: he quotes from narrative of events both *domi* and *militiae*, from descriptions of topography and of weaponry, and from speeches. But all there is is a very brief characterization of the agitator Titinius—though Sisenna certainly did ascribe motives to particular actions of individuals.¹⁰⁴ The contrast with the fragments of Sallust's *Histories*, and of course of all fully extant Roman historiography, is marked. Perhaps it is, in part, the last spark of the old oligarchic tradition of distrust for individual ambition, that led the elder Cato even to suppress the names of Roman commanders.

The author of the *De sublimitate* declares that Cleitarchus' style was affected and inflated¹⁰⁵ in a manner that he traces back to Gorgias; and he compares that of the rhetors Hegesias and Matris. Hegesias in particular was the most prominent representative of what came to be called Asianism in oratory, or at least of a branch of it. And some scholars, since the nineteenth century, have felt that so-called Asianism gives us the clue to Sisenna's peculiar style; though our brief fragments cannot let us know if Sisenna had the staccato construction which, along with care for rhythm, bold use of figures, especially metaphor, and eccentric expression, are typical of Hegesias and some of his later Latin followers.¹⁰⁶ Cicero, in saying that Sisenna was aiming at something 'puerile' in imitating Cleitarchus is doubtless thinking primarily of style; compare *Brutus* 287, of Hegesias' imitation of Charisius: 'at quid est tam fractum, tam minutum, tam in ipsa, quam tamen consequitur, concinnitate puerile?' The elder Seneca also complains of 'pueriles sententias' in tasteless and exaggerated *suasoriae*, and *μειρακιῶδες* is a term used by Dionysius of Halicarnassus about Isocrates, and even of Plato's more Gorgianic moments; and defined by the *De sublimitate* as *σχολαστική νόησις, ὑπὸ περιεργασίας ληγοῦσα εἰς ψυχρότητα*.¹⁰⁷ Sisenna's use of vulgar forms, like the monstrous *persubhorrescere*, or technical, sometimes foreign terms, would not conflict with this tendency to the inflated, for the

¹⁰⁴ A. J. Woodman, *Velleius Paterculus: The Tiberian Narrative* (1977), p. 32. Titinius, frag. 32P=76B: the passage is corrupt; read perhaps, with Barabino, 'cui minus proprietatis mentis ab natura tradita videretur'. Cf. frags. 46, 50P=49, 26B—the latter perhaps almost amounts to a character sketch.

¹⁰⁵ *De Sublim.* 3.2: φλοιῶδες γὰρ ἀνὴρ καὶ φυσῶν κατὰ τὸν Σοφοκλέα 'μικροῖς μὲν αὐλίσκοις, φορβείας δ' ἄτηρ.

¹⁰⁶ Such as Maecenas and Arellius Fuscus, as Dr. J. Fairweather argues in an unpublished

dissertation.

¹⁰⁷ Too much use of artificial figures like paronomasia leads to a *puerilis elocutio*, ad *Her.* 4.23.32. Cf. Seneca Rhetor, on those who 'insanierunt in hac suasoria' (Othryades inscribing the trophy with his blood); he also speaks of *cacozelos*, those without taste. Dion. Hal. *Isocr.* 12: τῆς μέντοι ἀγῶγης τῶν περιόδων καὶ τῶν σχηματισμῶν τῆς λέξεως τὸ μειρακιῶδες οὐκ ἐδοκίμαζον; cf. *Pomp.* 2.6: τοῖς Γοργιείοις ἀκαίρως καὶ μειρακιωδῶς ἐναβρύνεται [sc. σχήμασι].

so-called Asianists were not remarkable for *elegantia* or purity of vocabulary.¹⁰⁸

Cicero in the *Brutus* gives the impression that it was Sisenna's friend and slight junior Hortensius who first dazzled Rome with Asianist oratory. But it seems likely that a number of speakers in the late second and early first century were affected to some degree by similar influences. Coelius Antipater's desperate search for rhythm, leading to such wild hyperbata that he felt obliged to apologize for them,¹⁰⁹ is to be recalled, and the rhythmic cola of his friend and pupil L. Crassus, notably in the famous passage beginning 'eripite nos ex miseriis'.¹¹⁰ It was perhaps in these years of his youth that Varro, also just older than Cicero, imbibed his admiration for Hegesias, on which Cicero was to be so cutting;¹¹¹ but Cicero himself had not been totally uninfluenced by the styles that he is one of the first, in the *Brutus*, to call Asianist.

It looks at first sight as if, given that Sisenna was really an Epicurean, he ought not to have been an Asianist: Philodemus' Epicurean *Rhetoric* (perhaps actually written in the 70s) seems to link Cleitarchus with Alcidamas the pupil of Gorgias, Hegesias, and others, as models of the arbitrary, not the naturally beautiful style, and to deprecate their excessive metaphors;¹¹² and Epicureans in theory objected to archaisms and obscurities of all kinds.¹¹³ However, Theon in his *Progygmnasmata* quotes, for over-rhythmical prose produced by studied word-order, not only Hegesias and 'the so-called Asian rhetors', but some of Epicurus' works—one that he regards as genuine and one he thinks might be spurious.¹¹⁴ Marx in this context rightly compares¹¹⁵ Mucius Scaevola's account, according to Lucilius, of the careful mosaic of words that determined the style of Albucius, that 'perfectus Epicureus' as Cicero called him. Cicero thought Epicureanism, as it influenced Albucius in particular, a 'minime aptum ad dicendum genus';¹¹⁶ but in Rome at this time a plain and simple style was what the Stoics, such as Tubero and Rutilius Rufus, not the Epicureans, were advocating. But later Atticus for one wrote with great purity and simplicity, avoiding ornament.¹¹⁷

Those who stress Sisenna's 'Asianism' often do not note his devotion to analogy, the belief in and desire to further regularities of grammatical formation; for this is a theory that used at least to be connected, at any event for a slightly later period at Rome, with a devotion to a pure and simple style, if not actually the disputed concept of 'Atticism'. But Dihle for one sees that Sisenna's peculiar version of analogy, which seems in fact to have gone far beyond anything any Greek grammarian advocated, must be taken into account.¹¹⁸ Cicero says that Sisenna 'quasi emendator sermonis usitati cum esse vellet . . . recte loqui putabat

¹⁰⁸ Leeman, *op. cit.* in n. 57.

¹⁰⁹ Frag. 1P (cf. 24b, 'has res ad te scriptas Luci misimus Aeli').

¹¹⁰ *ORF*² no. 66 frag. 24.

¹¹¹ *Ad Att.* 12.6.1.

¹¹² Philodemus, *Rhet.* 4.1 col. 7 p. 15, col. 21 p. 180 Sud.

¹¹³ P. H. De Lacy, 'The Epicurean Analysis of Language', *AJP* 60 (1939), 88.

¹¹⁴ Theon, *R. G.* 1.168W=2.71Sp: καὶ τῶν τῶν Ἐπικούρου.

¹¹⁵ F. Marx, *Proleg. in Auct. ad Herennium* (1894), p. 140.

¹¹⁶ *De Or.* 3.161 quotes the passage

(Lucilius 84–5 Marx): 'quam lepide λέξεις compostae ut tesserae omnes/Arte pavimento atque emblemate vermiculato.'

¹¹⁷ *Esp. ad Att.* 2.1.2.

¹¹⁸ A. Dihle, 'Analogie und Attizismus', *Hermes* 85 (1957), 170; cf. G. Kennedy, *Rhetoric in Rome* (1972), p. 240. For the earlier view, G. L. Hendrickson, 'The *De Analogia* of Julius Caesar', *CP* 1 (1906), 118, referring to Norden's connection of Atticism and Analogy at *Antike Kunstprosa* 1.184, thinks that Sisenna, shown by Marx to be interested in analogy, cannot be an Asianist.

esse inusitate loqui'.¹¹⁹ Aulus Gellius and Quintilian, from Varro, apropos of the fact that Sisenna insisted in saying 'adsentio' in the Senate instead of 'adsentior' (in which many followed him, without succeeding in enforcing the use of the active form), make it clear that this was an attempt to defeat *consuetudo* in the name of analogy.¹²⁰ Varro also tells us that he insisted on 'patres familiarum' in place of 'patres familiae', and this more logical plural form was widely adopted.¹²¹

Indeed, the important place that the account of Sisenna's attempts to correct the language bears in Cicero's sketch in the *Brutus* of the history of 'pure Latin' suggests that it was of some real significance (as do Varro's mentions of it). Cicero's context implies that Sisenna was the first orator (not necessarily the first grammarian) to worry about correct Latinity in a conscious manner; he was 'bene Latine loquens',¹²² but Cicero later shows that second-century orators with a reputation for this virtue owed it to tradition, not learning; while in Catulus and Cotta it was primarily a matter simply of pronunciation, assumed as a reaction to the influx into Rome of poor Latin-speakers. Where Sisenna found his interest in analogy we cannot say.¹²³ The first Latin *grammatici* whom we know to have been interested in the subject are both perhaps too late to have influenced him, and seem to have united this interest with more sober tastes in style. Antonius Gniphio, who is said to have studied in Alexandria, expounded analogistic views, probably in his *De Latino sermone*; he wanted to form the plurals of *ebur* and *robur* as *ebura* and *robura*, and to talk of *marmur* and *marmura*.¹²⁴ Staberius Eros wrote a *De proportione*: *proportio*, as Quintilian makes clear, was an early Latin equivalent for *ἀναλογία*, though *ratio* was later more used.¹²⁵ Gniphio taught Caesar, whose own *De analogia* enjoyed great success, and Eros taught M. Brutus. Both Caesar and Brutus were famous for a chaste and refined style as different as possible from the eccentric and innovatory Sisenna. Reitzenstein indeed thought that the analogists disputed among themselves, and that Caesar's famous remark about avoiding an unusual word as though it were a reef, 'tamquam scopulum', was directed against Sisenna, which is not impossible. Certainly, Cicero contrasts Sisenna, who thought 'recte loqui' was 'inusitate loqui', with Caesar, who 'rationem adhibens consuetudinem vitiosam et corruptam pura et incorrupta consuetudine emendat'.¹²⁶ He, like Varro, and according to Varro

¹¹⁹ *Brutus* 259–60.

¹²⁰ A. Gellius, *N. A.* 2.25.9; Quint. 1.5.13, 'multique et hunc et analogiam secuti'.

¹²¹ Varro, *L. L.* 8.73.

¹²² *Brutus* 228.

¹²³ R. Reitzenstein, *Marcus Terentius Varro und Johannes von Mauropus* (1901), p. 53 n. 1, thought Sisenna wrote on the subject in the eighties; but the grammarian Sisenna who commented on Plautus seems to quote Virgil and must therefore be a later and separate figure (besides, commentaries are not produced by senators, in spite of general interest in many aspects of *grammaticae*). Varro, *L. L.* 8.73. 'ut Sisenna scribit' does not necessarily imply a *discussion* of the form he uses; and Charisius,

GRF 129 (Sisenna fr. 3) with its 'Sisenna . . . ait' and 'inquit', though it does refer to the analogistic historian, probably derives from Varro and so is not independent evidence that he actually discussed his preferred forms. (Certainly, one would not expect a grammatical excursus in a history, so if discussion were to be postulated, a separate grammatical work is likely.)

¹²⁴ Suetonius, *de gramm.* 7; Quint. 1.6.23.

¹²⁵ Suetonius, *de gramm.* 13; Quint. 1.6.3; Priscian 385.1.

¹²⁶ Marx, *op. cit.* in n. 115; Reitzenstein, *op. cit.* in n. 123, p. 63. Hendrickson, *op. cit.* in n. 118, thinks Cicero is actually using Caesar's work here (*Brutus* 259).

the great Aristarchus, would only accept analogistic reform when there was a choice between good and bad usage.¹²⁷

Since the rival doctrine of anomaly, which stressed the irregularities of language, was according to Varro largely the brain-child of the Stoic Chrysippus, and of Crates of Pergamum, who had Stoic leanings,¹²⁸ it is perhaps not altogether surprising to find a possible Epicurean among the analogists. Though Lucretius' evolutionary view of language might seem to suggest that usage was paramount, and that it was the rival view, postulating a Lawgiver who invented and imposed language, which might suit the analogizers better, yet Epicurus himself seems from the letter to Herodotus to have envisaged two stages in the history of language: one in which it developed *φύσει*, and a second in which there was some place for *θέσει*.¹²⁹ But it is doubtless mistaken to attempt to reduce Sisenna's views to consistency, any more than we do with those of Atticus, whose superficial Epicureanism did not prevent him too from being devoted to the un-Epicurean subjects of history and *grammaticae*. Sisenna's innovations were probably designed to expand, as well as correct, the Latin language, which was considered poorer than the Greek; his notorious 'sputatilica', produced on one occasion in court,¹³⁰ is probably formed on the basis of *καταπτυστόν*.¹³¹

The 70s, when Sisenna was probably writing his history, form rather a bare patch for anyone who is trying to trace the intellectual history of the first century B.C.; it is interesting to catch some glimpses of a leading figure of the time, who seems to unite a number of perhaps somewhat ill-digested intellectual interests. Recent writers have called him either a 'pragmatic' historian (Candiloro), or a 'tragic' historian (La Penna)—just as those who consider his style tend to see only his 'Asianism' or only his interest in analogy. In both cases we should take the two aspects into account. La Penna has pointed out that ultimately Roman historiography united the Polybian and pragmatic tradition with that of the 'tragic' historians whom Polybius so despised. It may be that Sisenna was in fact the first Roman historian to do this with any success; though there is not so much sign of the moralizing and sententious aspects that were also to be so important.

He was then a complex figure, and his superiority to his forerunners will have been both intellectual and stylistic. Cicero calls him 'doctus vir', where he explicitly denies the adjective to Coelius Antipater, who had 'vires agrestes . . . atque horridas' only, though superior in style at least to his own predecessors.¹³² This advance is only what one would expect at such a time of rapid intellectual maturing as the early first century B.C. at Rome, when far more Romans studied in Greece with the best masters, and far more Greek learned men came to Rome, than had been the case even at the end of the second century.

Though he was surely too long, and too difficult in style, to be the 'scrittore da grande pubblico' that Mazzarino calls him,¹³³ for the next decades Sisenna was inescapably there. We ought perhaps to scrutinize Cicero's pronouncements on historiography with this in mind. As we saw, in the *De oratore*, set in 91, he

¹²⁷ Varro, *L.* 9.18.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.* 9.1.

¹²⁹ Lucretius 5.1028 ff; Epicurus, *ad Her.* 75.6.

¹³⁰ *Brutus* 259.

¹³¹ The imitation of Greek words was one of the categories of acceptable new formations distinguished by the rhetors, *de Or.* 1.155.

It is not quite clear from the manuscripts whether Sisenna, like Accius a little earlier, stuck to Greek forms in Latin transliteration; but frag. 106P=64B, *myoparonas* is well attested. (Cf. C. Julius Caesar Strabo, *ORF* 126, first to insist on Greek forms of names.)

¹³² *Brutus* 228, *de leg.* 1.2.6.

¹³³ *Op. cit.* in n. 19, p. 176.

does not refer to Sisenna by name; but perhaps the stress on truthfulness as the first rule of the historian is a glancing blow at Sisenna as well as his models; so perhaps too the recommendation of a style 'fusum atque tractum et cum lenitate quadam aequabiliter profluens' (though it is Coelius Antipater who is openly blamed for failing in this).¹³⁴ In the *Brutus* Cicero says, apropos of Caesar, 'nihil est enim in historia pura et illustri brevitate dulcius';¹³⁵ the passage follows straight on from Atticus' contrast between Sisenna and Caesar where choice of words and use of *ratio* in language are concerned, and the contrast between the two men may well still be in Cicero's mind: Sisenna's histories were neither pure nor brief.¹³⁶ It may be, too, that it was not wholly wrong to look for traces of Sisenna's influence in the work of the *Auctor de Bello Africo*—he had some literary aspirations, but not towards the style of his own general;¹³⁷ and that, in spite of dramatic differences, he had some impact on the abrupt, unCiceronian and unCaesarian style of Sallust.¹³⁸ He was, as historian, stylist, and figure of his times, as Cicero attests he was socially, a 'vir primarius'.¹³⁹

New Hall, Cambridge

ELIZABETH RAWSON

¹³⁴ *De orat.* 2.54.

¹³⁵ *Brutus* 262.

¹³⁶ Fronto, *Ep.* 132 Van den Hout=114 Naber, says Sisenna wrote 'longinque', probably 'longwindedly', rather than (as Peter ccxlii, from Norden, op. cit., pp. 117, 118) 'archaically', i.e. with words brought from far away. But W. D. Lebek, *Verba Prisca* (1970), p. 58, and esp. pp. 267 ff., the fullest recent account of Sisenna's language, does not think that he archaizes (nor that his language is often poetic, or vulgar—nor that he is an absolutely consistent follower of analogy).

Fronto groups most of the historians he mentions in pairs, and it has been suggested that a pair to Sisenna has fallen out (Rutilius? see Van den Hout ad loc.) and even that 'longinque' belongs to the lost name (Haynes, Loeb ed. 2.49).

¹³⁷ G. Landgraf, 'Die Vorlage der neu aufgefundenen Epitome rerum gestarum Alexandri Magni', *Berl. Phil. Woch.* 21 (1901), 410, goes too far when he says 'durchblättert man die meist bei Nonius erhaltenen Fragmente dieser Historiker, so erhellt sofort die Ähnlichkeit seines [sc. Sisenna's] Stilcharakters mit dem des Auctor Belli Africi', but the latter work does seem to show a propensity for the adverbs in *-im* for which Sisenna had a mania (observed by Gellius, *N. A.* 12.151 and studied by G. Barabino, 'Sisenna e gli avverbi in *-im*', *Tetraonyma* (1966), p. 33, noting that a number were common, or increasingly so in his day, others not attested before or apart from him. She accepts that in extending the list he was pursuing analogy). And Quintilian does attest that the phrase 'albente caelo' was thought to have been first used by Sisenna, 8.3.35; it appears twice in the *Bellum Africum* (11 and 80), though also once in

Caesar, *B. C.* 1.68, and then only in late Latin. The *Bell. Afr.* also likes alliteration, Greek words, not only technical terms hard to avoid, and melodramatic episodes: the duel to death of Scipio and Juba, burnings alive on the pyre, even huge Gauls (strewn on the field of battle). There are set speeches and other crude rhetorical effects. The author may possibly have looked back to the great historian of the last civil war, finding Caesar's style too subtle to attract him (for his own, A. Bouvet, ed. Budé (1949), pp. xxvi ff.). Bardon, op. cit. in n. 41, p. 255, accepts Landgraf's view.

¹³⁸ W. Richter, 'Der Manierismus des Sallust und die Sprache der römischen Historiographie', *ANRW* 1.3.774. This, like Landgraf, exaggerates, and underestimates the number of times the idea has been (very briefly) canvassed before. I am also far from clear that there is a real connection between Sisenna's possible proemium *ab urbe condita* (or rather from the fall of Troy, given the fragments) and the proem of Sallust's histories, let alone of his extant works, as is so often claimed (among others by A. Momigliano, 'Some Observations on the *Origo Gentis Romanae*', *JRS* 4 (1958), 56 = *Secondo contributo*, p. 145). Even the *Catilina* is very brief indeed on Rome's prehistory. The idea of a connection is finally rejected by Paratore, op. cit. in n. 28. Barabino, p. 77, suggests that Sisenna had a Thucydidean *archaeologia* as an excursus, but it seems unlikely that Sisenna, unlike Sallust, cared for Thucydides, or that a passage retailing the adventures of Aeneas ought to be called Thucydidean.

¹³⁹ *Verrines* 2.4.33.