

*NAM QUID EA MEMOREM: THE DIALECTICAL
RELATION OF RES GESTAE AND MEMORIA
RERUM GESTARUM IN SALLUST'S
BELLUM JUGURTHINUM*¹

According to our idea of history, there is a reciprocal relationship between one's construction of the past and history. On the one hand, the historicist tradition has emphasized the distinct temporal perspectivity of our representation of the past. As Goethe says:

Daß die Weltgeschichte von Zeit zu Zeit umgeschrieben werden müsse, darüber ist in unseren Tagen wohl kein Zweifel übriggeblieben. Eine solche Notwendigkeit entsteht aber nicht etwa daher, weil viel Geschehenes nachentdeckt worden, sondern weil neue Ansichten gegeben werden, weil der Genosse einer fortschreitenden Zeit auf Standpunkte geführt wird, von welchen sich das Vergangene auf eine neue Weise überschauen und beurteilen läßt.²

Furthermore the view of the past that professional historians have, even (and especially) those who lay claim to scientific objectivity, bears the mark of their historical vantage point.

On the other hand, the New Historicism has heightened our awareness that the perception of the past shapes history. For example, it has been shown extensively what role the construction of the past plays for collective identities and in what ways the view of the past influences actions. History and its representation shape each other reciprocally. This close relation manifests itself at the semantic level: history/histoire/Geschichte/storia can denote the past, but also the record of the past.³ To avoid ambiguity, I will restrict 'history' to the past and use 'memory' or '*memoria*' to signify its representation.

In this article, I would like to take a look at the relation which Sallust sees between history and memory. Sallust—this is my thesis—regards the relation between *res gestae* and *memoria rerum gestarum* as dialectical, albeit in a way different from our idea of history. This view will help us better to understand Sallust's historiographical concept as well as his reconstruction of the crisis of the Roman Republic. In my argument, I focus on *B(ellum) J(ugurthinum)*, but do also refer to the earlier monograph, *B(ellum) C(atilinae)*. To be on safe ground, I start with the explicit reflections on historical memory in the proems. In this context, a new reading of chapter 4 of the proem in *BJ* is given (§I). Secondly, I will turn to Marius' speech in *BJ* 85 and see how far it complements the reflections of the *BJ* proem (§II). Thirdly, I will demonstrate that the dialectic of history and memory manifests itself in the plot of *BJ* (§III). Finally, my conclusion will shed new light on Sallust's concept of historiography and his view of the crisis of the Republic (§IV).

I

In the proem of *BC* Sallust, contrasting *uita actiua* and *uita contemplatiua*,

¹ I would like to thank D. Konstan, C. Krebs, and the anonymous referee for their comments.

² Goethe (1981⁹), 93.

³ Koselleck (1975), 653–8.

emphasizes the difficulties of writing history.⁴ He mentions challenges from two sides, the production and the reception: firstly, the historian must strive to match the deeds with his words; secondly, his criticism is liable to provoke a rebuke for envy. His praise will not impress the readers if its object seems to be within their own reach; however, as soon as it is not, his account will raise suspicions regarding its veracity.⁵ It is the first part that is of interest to my argument:

Ac mihi quidem, tametsi haudquaquam par gloria sequitur scriptorem et auctorem rerum, tamen in primis arduum uidetur res gestas scribere: primum quod facta dictis exaequanda⁶ sunt . . . (BC 3.2)

Here, Sallust follows a long tradition claiming that it is difficult, but none the less essential, for the historian to make his account match with history.⁷ If we turn to the proem in *BJ*, we can see that there the relation of history to the memory of the past is described in the same way as the relation between historiography and history in the proem of *BC*:

Nam saepe ego audiui Q. Maxumum, P. Scipionem, <alios> praeterea ciuitatis nostrae praeclaros uiros solitos ita dicere, quom maiorum imagines intuerentur, uehementissime sibi animum ad uirtutem adcendi. Scilicet non ceram illam neque figuram tantam uim in sese habere, sed memoria rerum gestarum eam flammam egregiis uiris in pectore crescere neque prius sedari quam uirtus eorum famam atque gloriam *adaequauerit*. (BJ 4.5–6)

The ancestors' fame has guided Q. Maximus and P. Scipio in their lives and made them famous themselves. While in *BC* 3.2 the historical record is requested to match the deeds (*exaequare*), Q. Maximus und P. Scipio have striven to match the *memoria rerum gestarum*, preserving the ancestors' fame, with their own deeds (*adaequare*). The relation between history and its memory is dialectical: in the same way that the historical memory is modelled after history, it serves itself as a model for history.

Seen from this angle, the *maiorum imagines*, mentioned by Sallust, become an image of the dialectic between memory and history: being faithful copies of the faces of the ancestors, as our sources stress,⁸ they inspire acts of imitation themselves.

⁴ For the difficulties in writing history see Thuc. 1.22.3; cf. 20.1; Hdt. 3.115.2. Cf. Marincola (1997), 148–58.

⁵ The delicate relation between historiography and history is exemplified later in the proem, *BC* 8.2–5: *Atheniensium res gestae, sicut ego aestumo, satis amplae magnificaeque fuere, uerum aliquanto minores tamen quam fama feruntur. Sed quia prouenire ibi scriptorum magna ingenia, per terrarum orbem Atheniensium facta pro maxumis celebrantur. Ita eorum qui fecere uirtus tanta habetur quantum eam uerbis potuere extollere praeclara ingenia. At populo Romano numquam ea copia fuit, quia prudentissimus quisque maxime negotiosus erat: ingenium nemo sine corpore exercebat; optumus quisque facere quam dicere, sua ab aliis bene facta laudari quam ipse aliorum narrare malebat.*

⁶ Some manuscripts have *exsequenda* instead of *exaequanda*. But as recent editors and commentators (Vretska [1976], McGushin [1977], Ramsey [1984], Reynolds [1991]) agree, *exaequanda* is the original text. See especially Vretska ad loc. (p. 90). Cf. Diggle (1989), 60.

⁷ In Sallust see also *H.* 2.98.6: *Quid deinde proelia aut expeditiones hibernas, oppida excisa aut recepta enumerem, quando res plus ualet quam uerba?* As an example for this tradition from Greek literature, we may quote Isocr. 4.13: . . . ὥς χαλεπὸν ἐστὶν ἴσους τοὺς λόγους τῷ μεγέθει τῶν ἔργων ἐξευρεῖν. For more parallels see Oakley ad Liv. 6.20.8.

⁸ Pol. 6.53.5: ἡ δ' εἰκὼν ἐστὶ πρόσωπον εἰς ὁμοιότητα διαφερόντως ἐχειρασμένον καὶ κατὰ τὴν πλάσιν καὶ κατὰ τὴν ὑπογραφὴν. Herod. 4.2.2: κηροῦ δὲ πλασάμενοι εἰκόνα πάντα ὁμοίαν τῷ τετελευτηκότι. App. *Iber.* 89 and Val. Max. 8.15.1–2 report that an *imago* of Scipio Africanus was stored in the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus on the Capitol. Cf. Flower (1996), 48–52.

In the form of *exempla*, memory makes history a continuity of great deeds.⁹ This is underscored by the *uiri praeclari* whom Sallust has chosen, Q. Maximus and P. Scipio. Although there is a great number of Roman politicians with the name Q. Maximus, it is a fair guess that Sallust refers to the famous Cunctator.¹⁰ The second person is more difficult to identify. There are two probable candidates, Scipio Africanus Maior, the victor of the battle at Zama, and Scipio Africanus Minor, the son of L. Aemilius Paullus who was adopted by the son of the Africanus Maior. Both are frequently used as *exempla*, but Africanus Maior is slightly more likely, as then both *exempla* would be great generals of the Second Punic War.

However, I think, the ambiguity itself is meaningful: if *memoria* and history imitate each other, the ensuing historical continuum makes it difficult to distinguish different persons. The ambiguity of whether Sallust is referring to Scipio Maior or Minor expresses the underlying model of history. History is seen as a long chain of great deeds, mediated by the *exempla* of the past. The deeds of the older Africanus in the fight against the Carthaginians are followed, taken up, and brought to a closure by the younger Africanus. Hence, both can serve as *exempla* and it is difficult to decide to whom Sallust actually refers.

However, this relation of reciprocal imitation is disturbed according to Sallust. With bitterness he notes that the achievements of the *maiores* are no longer emulated, nor do the *homines noui*, as they used to, strive for true virtue (*BJ* 4.7). Due to the dialectical relation, the disruption of the old balance has an impact on both history and memory.

The consequences for history are evident: the disregard for the *memoria rerum gestarum* leads to a decline in history.¹¹ This causal connection is marked when the idea of a competition with the ancestors' *exempla* which was at the core of the old order is transferred from the field of true virtue to wealth and excess:

At contra quis est omnium, his moribus, quin diuitiis et sumptibus, non probitate neque industria cum maioribus suis contendat? (*BJ* 4.7)

In the case of the *homines noui*, Sallust blames the method with which they seek power and honour:

Etiam homines noui, qui antea per uirtutem soliti erant nobilitatem anteuenire, furtim et per latrocinia potius quam bonis artibus ad imperia et honores nituntur; proinde quasi praetura et consulatus atque alia omnia huiusce modi per se ipsa clara et magnifica sint ac non perinde habeantur ut eorum qui ea sustinent uirtus est. (*BJ* 4.7)

⁹ On the relevance of *exempla* in Roman history see n. 44.

¹⁰ The commentators make different attributions: Ernout (1946) believes that the text refers to Cunctator and Africanus Maior. According to Paul (1982) it is Cunctator and either one of the Africans. Koestermann identifies them with the two sons of L. Aemilius Paullus, that is, Maximus, who was adopted into the *gens Fabia*, and Scipio Africanus Minor, who came into the *gens Cornelia*. Yet, this interpretation is not very likely—if a Q. Maximus is quoted as a great *exemplum* of the past, it suggests itself that it is Cunctator. Cf. the examples from Cicero collected by Schoenberger (1911), 15–17. However, the fact that these different identifications are possible is significant: the naming system mirrors a concept that sees history as a continuum dissolving the perilous force of change.

¹¹ Cf. Tiffou (1974), 240. On the other hand, positive actions implying the display of real *uirtus* are traced back to a *memoria* working properly, *BJ* 58.3: *Ceterum ex omni multitudine non amplius quadraginta, memores nominis Romani, grege facto locum cepere paulo quam alii editiorem neque inde maxuma ui depelli quierunt, sed tela eminus missa remittere, pauci in pluribus minus frustrari; sin Numidae propius adcessissent, ibi uero uirtutem ostendere et eos maxuma ui caedere, fundere atque fugare.*

What consequences does the disturbance of the old relation of history and *memoria* have for the latter? In accordance with an extensive tradition, Sallust stresses the use of his historiographical engagement:

... tanto tamque utili labori meo ... (BJ 4.3)

Sallust emphasizes the usefulness of his work by the newly balanced antithesis of *otium* and *negotium*.¹²

... me magis merito quam ignavia iudicium animi mei mutauisse maiusque commodum ex otio meo quam ex aliorum negotiis rei publicae uenturum. (BJ 4.4)

A comparison with the proem of the *BC* can help us to understand these reflections better. In *BC* 3.1–2, Sallust explicitly considers historiography:

Et qui fecere et qui facta aliorum *scripsere* multi laudantur. Ac mihi quidem, tametsi haudquaquam par gloria sequitur *scriptorem* et auctorem rerum, tamen in primis arduum uidetur *res gestas scribere*.

By contrast, in the proem of the *BJ*, the terminology is much broader; Sallust deals with *memoria rerum gestarum*:

Ceterum ex aliis negotiis quae ingenio exercentur in primis magno usui est memoria rerum gestarum. (BJ 4.1)

In 4.6 he says:

... sed memoria rerum gestarum eam flammam egregiis uiris in pectore crescere ...

Memoria rerum gestarum can signify historiography, but has a broader basic meaning: memory of past deeds.¹³ This allows Sallust to view historiography together with other media of memory.¹⁴ *BJ* 4.5–6 mentions the *imagines maiorum* which played a major role in the memorial culture of the nobility.

Wax masks were taken of office holders, starting with *aediles*, and were kept by the families in the *atrium*.¹⁵ Under the *imagines* there were *tituli* mentioning the offices and giving details about extraordinary achievements.¹⁶ The commemorative function of the *imagines* came to the fore at funerals:¹⁷ in the procession actors wore the masks, and the *laudatio* would praise the deeds of the dead and the ancestors. By this process

¹² Cf. Tiffou (1974), 242 and Marincola (1997), 138–40. Already Cato fr. 2P plays with the antithesis *otium–negotium* to add some weight to non-political activities. Cf. now Beck and Walter (2001), ad loc. (fr. 1. 2 in their collection).

¹³ Cf. Timpe (1996), 277. See *TLL* s.v. IB2. On *memoria* see also the references in Walter (2004), 26, n. 59 and 27, n. 64.

¹⁴ However, Sallust's juxtaposition of his historiography and other media of *memoria* is to be distinguished from the differences which Halbwachs (1925 and 1950) and Nora (1984–1992) have claimed for modern historiography and *memoria*. In Sallust there is no contrast between a lively memory and the distanced view of the historian, but it is the historian's task to take on exactly the function that the old *memoria* is failing to fulfil. On the difficulties that come with the projection of this distinction to Roman history, see Walter (2004), 214. On different media of *memoria* in the Roman Republic see Walter (2001) and Beck and Walter (2001), 27–50.

¹⁵ On the problematical assumption of a *ius imaginum* see Flower (1996), 53–9; on the *atrium* as the place where the *imagines* were kept, *ibid.* 185–222.

¹⁶ On the *tituli* see Flower (1996), 159–84.

¹⁷ Cf. Flower (1996), 91–158.

the temporal extension of the past was translated into a spatial succession. The *imagines* were considered to inspire the young to live up to the standards of the past:

Τὸ δὲ μέγιστον, οἱ νέοι παρορμῶνται πρὸς τὸ πᾶν ὑπομένειν ὑπὲρ τῶν κοινῶν πραγμάτων χάριν τοῦ τυχεῖν τῆς συνακολουθούσης τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς τῶν ἀνδρῶν εὐκλείας.¹⁸

(Pol. 6.54.3)

However, according to *BJ* 4.7 the *imagines maiorum* have come to fail to exert their hortatory function.¹⁹ Under the new political circumstances, the *commodum historiae* must be conveyed by another medium—it is Sallust's historiography which takes over this function.²⁰ The broad focus on *memoria* allows Sallust to juxtapose his historiography against the *imagines maiorum*. From their failure Sallust can derive a special justification for his own work. The justification works at two levels, one negative, the other positive.

Firstly, the neglect of the old *exempla* explains the decline of politics which makes it difficult to serve the Republic as a politician (*BJ* 4.4; cf. 3). By unfolding the plight of politics Sallust backs up his decision to write history. Secondly, the failing of the

¹⁸ See also Afranius, *Vopiscus* 12.364–5.; Cic. *Phil.* 2.26; *Panegyricus Messallae* 28–34; Val. Max. 5.8.3; Vell. Pat. 2.116.4; *Laus Pisonis*; Tac. *Ann.* 2.27.

¹⁹ The hortatory function of *memoria* comes to the fore in Varro, *Ling.* 6.49, where it is etymologically linked to *monere*.

²⁰ In this interpretation I take a perspective different from the *communis opinio* which assumes that Sallust's account of the *imagines maiorum* in *BJ* 4.5–6 is an elaboration on history's use and a justification of his historiography. For example, Flower (1996), 46 writes: 'In a passage at the end of his prologue to the *Jugurtha* . . . Sallust speaks of the inspiration drawn from their ancestors' *imagines* by earlier statesmen, specifically Fabius Maximus and Scipio Africanus. This is important to Sallust who is using the whole notion of the influence and power of historical *exempla* to justify his writing of history.' Cf. Earl (1961), 9. I agree that Sallust mentions the *imagines maiorum* to buttress the usefulness of his historiography. However, the *imagines maiorum* serve this function, not by mirroring historiography, but by being contrasted to it. The historiographical work of Sallust gains its relevance from the failure of the *imagines maiorum* to maintain the *commodum historiae*.

This might seem only a minor shift in emphasis, but it helps to avoid two problems which arise with the *communis opinio*. Firstly, Sallust not only states that the *imagines maiorum* have lost their hortatory function, but their positive *exempla* are rather badly suited to mirror a historiography which focuses on negative developments. This is evident, when scholars argue that, against his explicit statements, Sallust implicitly questions the use of history, cf. particularly Leemann (1955), 46–7; see also Steidle (1958), 110; Koestermann *ad BJ* 4.7; Kraus (1999), 244. This tension disappears if we take the *imagines maiorum* not as a symbol of history's use in general, but only as one medium of *memoria* which is juxtaposed to Sallust's historiography. As Vretska (1955), 159, notes, the use of history is not restricted to positive *exempla*, but also includes negative ones; see also Koestermann *ad BJ* 4.4 and Büchner (1960), 116. However, Vretska's reference to the *munus magnificum* in Tac. *Ann.* 3.65 is misleading. As Luce (1991) has shown, the idea that historiography has an impact on reality, since politicians take into account the historiographical verdict, is unique and Tacitean. The closest to Sallust's moralistic concept will be Liv. *praef.* 10 who notes the function of history as source of positive and negative paradigms: *Hoc illud est praecipue in cognitione rerum salubre ac frugiferum, omnis te exempli documenta in industri posita monumento intueri; inde tibi tuaeque rei publicae quod imitere capias, inde foedum inceptu foedum exitu quod uites*.

Secondly, in 4.2 Sallust states that he will not deal with the use of history in general, cf. Herkommer (1968), 130–1. Assuming that the *imagines maiorum* do exemplify the *commodum historiae*, scholars have explained the *praeteritio* as merely a rhetorical device (La Penna [1959], 27; Tiffou [1974], 241 n. 46; Kraus [1999], 243–4). This is possible, but would be an extreme example of using a *praeteritio* to introduce a topic while claiming not to do so. Taking the *imagines maiorum* as a contrast to Sallust's historiography allows for an easier, less strained reading—Sallust does not elaborate on the use of history in general, but on the ability of different media to convey the *commodum historiae* in a specific political situation.

old *memoria rerum gestarum* provides historiography with a special function—it must maintain the *commodum historiae*.²¹

Moreover, the failure of the old mechanisms of memory defines historiography at the level of content: its special task is to show how the neglect of the old *exempla* leads to a crisis in history. Telling the history of the crisis of the Republic is analysing its relation to its past. By focusing on the function of *memoria*, historiography, itself a medium of memory, takes an auto-reflexive turn; it becomes meta-historical.

Let me sum up this interpretation, which has shown that the proems of *BC* and *BJ* assume a dialectical relation between history and memory. According to Sallust, in earlier times there was a reciprocal balance between history and its memory. As the historical record is obliged to match history, history imitated the *memoria rerum gestarum*. This relation of mutual imitation has been disturbed in the crisis of the Republic: due to the inherent dialectic, that disruption has consequences for both history and *memoria*. On the one hand, the neglect of the past *exempla* leads to a decline in politics. On the other hand, the old forms of *memoria* do not work any more and fail to offer the *commodum historiae*. This development lends a special justification to Sallust's historiography, which not only takes over the function that the *imagines maiorum* used to have, but becomes meta-historical by turning to the impact which the neglect of the past has on history.

After the reading of the proems has concentrated on the meaning which the dialectic of history and memory carries for Sallust's historiography, I will now take a look at the consequences which follow from the neglect of the *memoria rerum gestarum*. To this end, I turn first to Marius' speech in *BJ* and then consider Jugurtha's career.

II

In *BJ* 85 Sallust has Marius deliver a speech, while he is preparing his expedition to Africa. It is beyond dispute that Sallust freely composes the speeches in his works;²² he uses them not only to characterize the speakers, but also creates an intense interaction with his narration. Of course, Marius' speech cannot be read as an expression of Sallust's opinion; the harsh rejection of education does not tie in with Sallust's engagement as a historian and some points are in tension with the narrative.²³ However, Marius' reflections on the use of the past resemble Sallust's considerations in the proem and complement his analysis.

²¹ In this context, Timpe's analysis of different media of memory is of interest. Commenting on the late Republic, he notes (1996, 292): 'Außerdem hat die Schriftlichkeit, weil sie effizient und durchschlagskräftig ist, die Eigenschaft, alles andere zu verdrängen. So kommt es, daß man in der späten Republik, Cicero z. B., der Meinung ist, *memoria*, geschichtliche Erinnerung, sei überhaupt in erster Linie schriftlicher Bericht in annalistischer Form. Geschichtsschreibung wird nun zum Hauptstrom der Erinnerung, alles andere ist Nebenfluß.' Kraus (1994), 16 compares Livy's historiography to the funeral procession of the *imagines*.

²² Cf. Büchner (1960), 161 and 241–2. Flower (1996), 16–23, acknowledges that the speech is not a faithful representation of Marius' words, but, comparing it to Plutarch's record and, more questionably, regarding language and style, claims that the speech essentially goes back to Marius. She makes the interesting observation that the criticism which Marius directs against the nobility's abuse of their ancestors corresponds to the role which the ancestors normally had in the first speech of a *consul* (ibid. 18–19, 155).

²³ Already the beginning of the speech is undercut by irony when it is compared to Sallust's judgement on Marius' further career, *BJ* 85.1: *Scio ego, Quirites, plerosque non isdem artibus imperium a uobis petere et, postquam adepti sunt, gerere: primo industrios supplicis modicos esse, dein per ignauiam et superbiam aetatem agere*. Cf. *BJ* 63.6: *Tamen is ad id locorum talis uir—nam postea ambitione praeceps datus est—consulatum adpetere non audebat*. The harsh treatment of

In the proem Sallust complains that in his time the *mores maiorum* are not emulated any more, but that the competition has come to focus on wealth (*BJ* 4.7). Sallust has Marius present a similar reproach in *BJ* 85.38:

Maiores eorum omnia quae licebat illis reliquere: diuitias, imagines, memoriam sui praeclaram; uirtutem non reliquere, neque poterant: ea sola neque datur dono neque accipitur.

Not only does Marius note the rupture of the tradition similarly to Sallust—with the polemical twist that *uirtus* cannot be bequeathed, but with *diuitiae*, *imagines*,²⁴ *memoria* and *uirtus* he takes up the central terms of *BJ* 4.

However, Marius goes one step further blaming the nobility for abusing the tradition by deriving claims from it, while not acknowledging his own achievements:

Quod ex aliena uirtute sibi adrogant, id mihi ex mea non concedunt, scilicet quia imagines non habeo et quia mihi noua nobilitas est, quam certe peperisse melius est quam acceptam corrupisse. (*BJ* 85.25)

The contrast between the earlier use of *exempla*, which Sallust mentions in the proem, and the present abuse of the past, as pointed out by Marius, is underlined by the imagery of fire and light. In the proem Sallust writes:

Nam saepe ego audiui Q. Maxumum, P. Scipionem, <alios> praeterea ciuitatis nostrae praefatos uiros solitos ita dicere, quom maiorum imagines intuerentur, uehementissime sibi animum ad uirtutem *adcedi*. Scilicet non ceram illam neque figuram tantam uim in sese habere, sed memoria rerum gestarum eam *flammam* egregiis uiris in pectore crescere neque prius sedari quam uirtus eorum famam atque gloriam adaequauerit. (*BJ* 4.5)

Sallust has Marius take up this imagery:

Atque etiam, quom apud uos aut in senatu uerba faciunt, pleraque oratione maiores suos extollunt: eorum fortia facta memorando *clariores* sese putant. Quod contra est; nam quanto uita illorum *praeclarior*, tanto horum socordia flagitiosior. Et profecto ita se res habet: maiorum gloria posteris quasi *lumen* est, neque bona neque mala eorum *in occulto* patitur. (*BJ* 85.21–3)

While according to the proem the *maiores* were inflamed themselves by *bona exempla* and were driven by this flame to achieve glory, in Marius' description the present *nobiles* do not catch fire themselves; the *lumen* of their ancestors' glory merely highlights their own mediocre existence. The common ground of imagery connects the narrator's and the protagonist's observations.

the nobility and the reproach of their military incompetence are counterbalanced by the rather positive image of Metellus. See e.g. the contrast between *BJ* 85.9: *Illis difficile est in potestatibus temperare qui per ambitionem sese probos simulauere* and *BJ* 45.1: *Sed in ea difficultate Metellum non minus quam in rebus hostilibus magnum et sapientem uirum fuisse conperior: tanta temperantia inter ambitionem saeuitiamque moderatum*. Cf. Scanlon (1987), 53. Vretska (1955), 112–120, emphasizes the questionable aspects of Marius' speech which contribute to the ambiguous character of Marius in *BJ*. See also Koestermann *ad* 84.5 and Earl (1961), 77. See also Walter (2004), 101–2 on Marius' speech.

²⁴ On the *imagines* see also *BJ* 85.10, 25. In *BJ* 85.29–30 Marius says: *Non possum fidei causa imagines neque triumphos aut consulatus maiorum meorum ostentare, at, si res postulet, hastas, uexillum, phaleras, alia militaria dona, praeterea cicatrices aduerso corpore. Hae sunt meae imagines, haec nobilitas, non hereditate relicta* . . . Here, Marius inverts the *imago*: while the wax masks as a model are a trace of the body, the scars are a trace in the body. Cf. Plut. *Mar.* 9.2: *καὶ τραύμασιν οἰκείοις πρὸς τὸν δῆμον οὐ μνήμασι νεκρῶν οὐδ' ἀλλοτρίαις εἰκόσι νεανιεύεσθαι* . . . On the cultural semantics of scars see Flaig (2003), 123–36; on the symbolical capital that the *imagines* were for the *nobilitas* see Flower (1996), 61–70; on Marius as having no *imagines* at his disposal see Flaig (1995), 128–9.

In his proem, Sallust unfolds the failure of his time in two steps (*BJ* 4.7): firstly, he complains that there is no longer competition with the *mores maiorum*. That this criticism refers to the nobility is made clear by the second part of his diagnosis:²⁵ even the *homines noui*, ‘who earlier were used to surpass the old nobles in virtue’, now use the same questionable methods to win power and honour. This distinction plays a major role in the speech of Marius, the *homo nouus*. He not only compares himself to the *maiores* who gained *nobilitas* from their own achievements (*BJ* 85.17), but presents himself as their true successor in contrast to their failing offspring:

Haec atque alia talia maiores uostri faciundo seque remque publicam celebrauere. Quis nobilitas freta, ipsa dissimilis moribus, nos illorum aemulos contemnit et omnis honores non ex merito, sed quasi debitos a uobis repetit. (*BJ* 85.36–7)

He even raises the following question:

Ac si iam ex patribus Albini et Bestiae quaeri posset mene an illos et se gigni maluerint, quid responsuros creditis nisi sese liberos quem optumos uoluisse?²⁶ (*BJ* 85.16)

While the nobility has betrayed its heritage, Marius himself claims to follow their model. By taking up the ancestors’ *exempla* he continues the tradition of the nobility. This description ties in very well with Sallust’s analysis according to which the *homines noui* first based their ambition on real *uirtus*. Moreover, looking beyond the speech, we can see that Marius is also the embodiment of the later decline of the *homines noui* that Sallust notes in his proem.²⁷ In *BJ* 63.6 Sallust adumbrates his future:

Tamen is ad id locorum talis uir—nam postea ambitione praeceps datus est—consulatum adpetere non audebat.

In summary, we can say that Sallust has Marius take up and complement the analysis of the relation between history and memory which he has given in the proem: the tradition of *uirtus* is corrupted and the old *exempla* are abused by the *nobiles* to legitimize their claims to power. Yet, being part of history, Marius not only points out the disturbed balance between history and memory, but exemplifies it himself in his further career.

Perhaps this look at Marius’ speech enables us to understand better the juxtaposition of *imagines maiorum* and *memoria rerum gestarum* in *BJ* 4.6:

Scilicet non ceram illam neque figuram tantam uim in sese habere, sed memoria rerum gestarum eam flammam egregiis uiris in pectore crescere neque prius sedari quam uirtus eorum famam atque gloriam adaequauerit.

²⁵ *BJ* 4.7 is taken up in the next paragraph: *At contra quis est omnium, his moribus, quin diuitiis et sumptibus, non probitate neque industria cum maioribus suis contendat?* *BJ* 5.1–2: ... *dehinc quia tunc primum superbiae nobilitatis obuiam itum est; quae contentio diuina et humana cuncta permiscuit eoque uecordiae processit ut studiis ciuilibus bellum atque uastitas Italiae finem faceret.* The diachronic competition with the ancestors is replaced by the synchronic competition in form of the *stasis*.

²⁶ Cf. the *elogium* of Cn. Cornelius Hispanus, *CIL* I² 15 = *ILS* 6: *Virtutes generis mieis moribus accumulaui, / progeniem genui, facta patris petiei. / Maiorum optenui laudem, ut sibi me esse creatum / laetentur, stirpem nobilitauit honor.*

²⁷ Cf. Earl (1961), 74.

One could argue that, in the juxtaposition of the mere figure of the wax masks to the *memoria rerum gestarum*, understood as real memory motivating great achievements, the criticism of the abuse of the *imagines maiorum*, which is later presented by Marius, is already implied.²⁸ Accepting this, we could even go a step further and point out that the link between the memory of the past and historical actions in the present is marked in *BJ* 4.8:

Proinde quasi praetura et consulatus atque alia omnia huiusce modi per se ipsa clara et magnifica sint ac non perinde habeantur ut eorum qui ea sustinent uirtus est.

The juxtaposition of the empty form of the *imagines* to real memory not only corresponds to the distinction between offices and real virtue, but can be linked causally to it. The mere claim into which the use of the *imagines maiorum* has deteriorated comes with a pursuit of offices for their own sake, while it is the proper *memoria rerum gestarum* that leads to *uirtus*.²⁹ It is not only the proem which gives us a deeper understanding of the narrative; in this case, reading the proem from the narrative makes us discover additional layers of meaning in its complex fabric.

III

As a last step, I would like to demonstrate that the consequences that result from the neglect of the past are not only reflected on by Sallust and his protagonists, but also come to the fore at the level of the plot. It has been noted that the young Jugurtha represents typical Roman virtues, before he turns into a dangerous source of disorder.³⁰ I would like to show that this deterioration is marked as the estrangement from the positive *exemplum* of the past.

In the proem, P. Scipio is named as somebody who was motivated to gain glory by the *exempla* of the past. He is himself the *exemplum* of the undisturbed mutual imitation of history and memory. As I have argued above, it is difficult to decide whether Sallust refers to Scipio Maior or Scipio Minor. In either case, it is significant that after Scipio Maior is briefly mentioned in 5.4 (in 5.4 Sallust characterizes him as *quoi postea Africano cognomen ex uirtute fuit*³¹), Scipio Minor plays a role at the beginning of Sallust's narration. Whether the same Scipio or the adopted grandson of the Scipio is represented in the proem, he establishes a link between proem and narration.

²⁸ It is striking that the juxtaposition of *imagines* and *memoria* is presented in an *accusatiuus cum infinitiuo*, *BJ* 4.6: *Scilicet non ceram illam neque figuram tantam uim in sese habere, sed memoria rerum gestarum eam flammam egregiis uiris in pectore crescere* . . . As Koestermann ad loc. notes, *scilicet* is followed by an *accusatiuus cum infinitiuo* in old Latin and in archaizing authors. But since Sallust in other places (*BJ* 41.3) does not construct *scilicet* with an *accusatiuus cum infinitiuo*, it is reasonable to attribute a special meaning to it here. In the sentence before, an *accusatiuus cum infinitiuo* reports the opinion of famous men. By following this construction, *BJ* 4.6 may derive some authority from their utterance.

²⁹ Cf. *BJ* 4.5: . . . *ad uirtutem* *adlendi*, *BJ* 4.6: . . . *neque prius sedari quam uirtus eorum famam atque gloriam adaequauerit*. Moreover, there is a link between the *imagines* and the pursuit of offices: *imagines* were just given to those who had served at least as *aediles*. See also Moatti (1997), 43, n. 43.

³⁰ For this development cf. Kraus (1999), 224–8. Earl (1961), 61–3 stresses Jugurtha's virtue, but also observes that the *curriculum* of his education deviates from the Roman norms.

³¹ On the link between *uirtutes* and *exempla* see e.g. Tac. *Agr.* 8.2: *Habuerunt uirtutes spatium exemplorum* . . . *Hist.* 1.3: *Non tamen adeo uirtutum sterile saeculum, ut non et bona exempla prodiderit*. Scipio Africanus is named as an *exemplum* by Cicero, when he reproaches P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica for falling short of the model of his ancestor, Cic. *Verr.* 4.36.

At first, it looks as though P. Scipio would serve as an *exemplum* also in Sallust's narration. It is P. Scipio after whom Jugurtha first models his behaviour:³²

Nam Iugurtha, ut erat inpigro atque acri ingenio, ubi naturam P. Scipionis, qui tum Romanis imperator erat, et morem hostium cognouit, multo labore multaque cura, praeterea modestissime parendo et saepe obuiam eundo periculis in tantam claritudinem breui peruenerat ut nostris uehementer carus, Numantinis maximo terrori esset. Ac sane, quod difficillimum in primis est, et proelio strenuos erat et bonus consilio, quorum alterum ex prouidentia timorem, alterum ex audacia temeritatem adferre plerumque solet. (BJ 7.4–5)

His efforts make him even part of Scipio's circle:³³

Igitur imperator omnis fere res asperas per Iugurtham agere, in amicis habere, magis magisque eum in dies amplecti, quippe quous neque consilium neque inceptum ullum frustra erat. Huc adcedebat munificentia animi et ingeni sollertia, quis rebus sibi multos ex Romanis familiari amicitia coniunxerat. (BJ 7.6–7)

With Scipio successfully imitating the *exempla maiorum* and turning himself into a role model for the younger, the old balance of history and memory seems to guide the plot safely. However, Jugurtha does not follow P. Scipio's *exemplum* for a long time. The inflammation which, as we have seen in the proem (BJ 4.5: *ad uirtutem adcendi*), marks the proper reception of past *exempla* comes from a different source, BJ 8.1:

Ea tempestate in exercitu nostro fuere complures noui atque nobiles quibus diuitiae bono honestoque potiores erant, factiosi domi, potentes apud socios, clari magis quam honesti, qui Iugurthae non mediocrem animum pollicitando *adcendebant*:³⁴ si Micipsa rex occidisset, fore uti solus imperi Numidiae potiretur; in ipso maxumam uirtutem, Romae omnia uenalia esse.

Here, the perilous subject of money and bribery, which will characterize Jugurtha's later activities, is named for the first time.³⁵ The prospect is made even clearer by a direct warning; significantly it is P. Scipio whom Sallust employs as a Herodotean warner anticipating the future deterioration of Jugurtha:³⁶

Sed . . . P. Scipio . . . donatum atque laudatum magnifice pro contione Iugurtham in praetorium abduxit ibique secreto monuit ut potius publice quam priuatim amicitiam populi Romani coleret neu quibus largiri insuiceret: periculose a paucis emi quod multorum esset. Si permanere uellet in suis artibus, ultro illi et gloriam et regnum uenturum; sin properantius pergeret, suamet ipsum pecunia praecipitem casurum. (BJ 8.2)

The continuity of the tradition, in case Jugurtha stays within the lines drawn by P. Scipio, is expressed by *permanere*; its rupture leads, as in Marius' case,³⁷ to a headlong fall.

³² Cf. Jugurtha in BJ 22.2: *Ab adolescentia ita se enisum ut ab optumo quoque probaretur, uirtute, non malitia P. Scipioni, summo uiro, placuisse.*

³³ On the friends whom Scipio gathered around himself at Numantia see Koestermann *ad BJ* 8.1. Kraus (1999), 226, states that 'Jugurtha stood in for Scipio' (240, cf. 226). Kraus (1997), 27, points out that Jugurtha embodies Roman virtues.

³⁴ See BJ 20.1: . . . *simul et illorum pollicitationibus adcensus quos paulo ante muneribus expleuerat* . . .

³⁵ On the destabilizing aspect of money and exchange in BJ see Kraus (1999), 221–32. See also Appendix 1 in Paul (1984), 261–3.

³⁶ Kraus (1999), 228, makes the interesting observation that 'in private he [i.e. P. Scipio] warns against private dealings'.

³⁷ BJ 63.6: *Tamen is ad id locorum talis uir—nam postea ambitione praeceptus datus est—consulatum adpetere non audebat.* On the similarities between Marius and Jugurtha see Kraus (1999), 239, with further literature in n. 65.

Whether representing the same P. Scipio who is mentioned in 4.5 or his adopted grandson, the character makes the reader view the plot against the background of the reflections in the proem. When Jugurtha fails to follow his *exemplum* permanently, the ensuing Jugurthine disorder appears as the consequence of the failing reception of the past *exempla*.³⁸

It is the disturbance of the old balance of *memoria* and history imitating each other that drives the *BJ*'s plot. Earl gives the following comment on Jugurtha:

His '*multus labor*' and '*multa cura*', his careful discipline and his bravery by which he won *gloria* again recall the qualities and behaviour of the Romans of the early Republic.³⁹

Seen from this angle, Jugurtha's failure to respond properly to the *exemplum* of Scipio embodies *in nuce* the decline of Roman politics as a neglect of the *exempla* of the past. In the mirror of the Nubian Jugurtha the cause of the Republic's crisis is reflected.⁴⁰

IV

In this article, I have tried to show that the relation between history and its memory is crucial to our understanding of Sallust's *BJ*. There is a dialectic at work between *res gestae* and their *memoria*, which is significantly different from the dialectic that historicists, both 'old' and 'new' ones, construct. Sallust does not show any awareness of the temporal perspectivity of historiography and his moralist notion of *memoria* is to be distinguished from modern concepts of *memoria*. However, he sees a reciprocal relation between history and memory: in the ideal state, represented by the memorial culture of the old Republic, they are balanced: on the one hand, the record of the past is faithfully modelled after history; on the other, history is an imitation of past *exempla* preserved by *memoria*. The disturbance of this relation, which Sallust notes in the proem to *BJ*, is at the core of his analysis of the crisis of the Republic as well as his own historiographical concept.

Let us first turn to Sallust's view of Roman history:

Sallust's amazement and treatment of facts, indeed his whole attitude to his subject, are largely determined by his general view of Roman history after the destruction of Carthage as a decline through definite stages from a state of personal and national virtue into *ambitio*, *avaritia* and *luxuria*.⁴¹

I have argued that in *BJ* Sallust describes the crisis of the Republic not merely as a moral decline, but that this process is traced back to the neglect of the *memoria rerum*

³⁸ On the circle of *exempla* see Hölkeskamp (1996), 320.

³⁹ Earl (1961), 62, referring to *BC* 7.4ff. and 9.3ff.

⁴⁰ The development of the Roman Republic is mirrored at different levels. Scanlon (1987), 38–9, points out that the history of Carthage in the digression on the geography of Africa resembles Roman history. Levene (1992) interprets the open, fragment-like form of the *BJ* as an expression of the content. On the form see also Wiedemann (1993). On Sallust's style as an expression of the content of his historiography see Woodman (1988), 117–28.

⁴¹ Earl (1961), 81. See more recently Walter (2004), 322: 'Die mit der Weltherrschaft beginnende Wende der römischen Geschichte ist durch den Wandel der *mores* verursacht, den die Weltherrschaft nach sich zog. Dieser Wandel jedoch ist zwar selbstverantwortet, und er läßt sich auch analysieren und gedanklich nachvollziehen, er ist aber in Wahrheit doch nicht restlos zu erklären.' I think the neglect of the past provides the reason which Walter is missing. On Sallust's model of decadence see Batstone (1988), Heldmann (1993), and Schüttrumpf (1998); on the construction of a decadence in first- and second-century historiography see Bringmann (1977).

gestarum.⁴² This assessment is presented prominently in the proem, the frame in which the narration is set, taken up by Marius in his speech, and underlies the deterioration of Jugurtha, who is, as Kraus has pointed out, the source of disorder in *BJ*.⁴³

The historical plausibility of Sallust's analysis is a subject beyond the scope of this article, but it is interesting to see that in recent scholarship not only the importance of *exempla* as part of the public discourse has been emphasized,⁴⁴ but that furthermore the connection between *memoria* and the crisis of the Roman Republic has been suggested as a topic for future research:

Auch die Krise der Republik wird mithin in vieler Hinsicht verständlicher, wenn die das 'kulturelle Gedächtnis' konstituierende Verklammerung von Gegenständen und Inhalten, Wertvorstellungen, Deutungsmustern von Vergangenheit und Gegenwart einerseits und den spezifischen Formen und Medien ihrer Darstellung, Bewahrung, Erneuerung—oder auch ihrer Selektion, ihres Verlustes und selbst ihres Vergessens—andererseits in den Mittelpunkt zukünftigen Forschens tritt.⁴⁵

Surely, Sallust's moralist perspective should not be mixed up with Hölkeskamp's functionalist approach to *memoria*, but it is worth noting that the link between history and memory can be found already in Sallust.

Secondly, far from undermining the use of historiography, the dialectic of memory and history gives Sallust's historiography a special justification. It must take over the function that the memory represented by the *imagines maiorum* no longer fulfils. Moreover, by focusing on the consequences of the disregard for the *memoria rerum gestarum* in the recent past and the present, Sallust's historiography takes on a meta-historical dimension.

What light does the relation between history and memory shed on Sallust's view of himself as a historical *persona* that is writing *memoria rerum gestarum*? In the proems of both *BC* and *BJ*, Sallust feels the need to justify his recess from politics. His narrations contain an apologetic component in so far as they give evidence for the corruption of politics. Now we can go a step further: Sallust underlines the value of his historiographical engagement by generally stressing the close relation of history

⁴² A similar view is presented by Cicero in *Rep.* 5.2: *Nostra uero aetas cum rem publicam sicut picturam accepisset egregiam, sed iam euanescentem uetustate, non modo eam coloribus isdem quibus fuerat renouare neglexit, sed ne id quidem curauit ut formam saltem eius et extrema tamquam liniamenta seruaret. quid enim manet ex antiquis moribus, quibus ille dixit rem stare Romanam? quos ita obliuione obsoletos uidemus, ut non modo non colantur, sed iam ignorentur. nam de uiris quid dicam? mores enim ipsi interierunt uiuorum penuria, cuius tanti mali non modo reddenda ratio nobis, sed etiam tamquam reis capitis quodam modo dicenda causa est. nostris enim uitii, non casu aliquo, rem publicam uerbo retinemus, re ipsa uero iam pridem amisimus.* It is interesting to see that Augustine gives this quote when he juxtaposes the criticism of the Republic by Sallust and Cicero (*Civ.* 2.21). On this passage and Cicero's attempt to trace the Republic's crisis back to the neglect of the glorious past see Roloff (1938), 60–7; Stemmler (2000), 141–5; Walter (2001), 259; Walter (2004), 176, with further literature in n. 96. Walter also mentions Cicero's appreciation of Varro's antiquarian studies. However, he pushes his interpretation of *Rep.* 5.2 too far, when he claims, (2001), 259: 'Was moderne Historiker als "Systemkrise" der römischen Republik bezeichnen und analysieren und was die Zeitgenossen als eine "moralische" Krise wahrnahmen, konnte zumindest einem von ihnen also in gewisser Weise auch als eine Krise der Erinnerung und ihrer Medien erscheinen.' Cicero does not refer to the flexibility of media as Walter implies.

⁴³ Kraus (1999).

⁴⁴ Cf. e.g. Hölkeskamp (1996); Stemmler (2000 and 2001) emphasizes the difference between Greek *paradeigmata* and Roman *exempla* (2001, 227). See also Walter (2004), 51–70, with further literature. On *exempla* as a mode to remember the past in general see Stierle (1983); Rüsen (1982), 547–51.

⁴⁵ Hölkeskamp (1996), 328. However, see the criticism by Walter (2004), 60 with n. 84.

and memory, and, in particular, by analysing the crisis of the Republic as a consequence of the disregard for the past. This lends his activity as a historian an eminent political function. The dialectic between *res gestae* and their *memoria* allows the failed politician Sallust to claim that as a historian he can leave the shadow of the *uita contemplatiua* and return to the light of the *uita actiua*— . . . *me magis merito quam ignauia iudicium animi me mutauisse maiusque commodum ex otio meo quam ex aliorum negotiis rei publicae uenturum* (BJ 4.4).

Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg

J. GRETHLEIN

jonas.grethlein@altphil.uni-freiburg.de

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- W. Batstone, 'The antithesis of virtue. Sallust's synkrisis and the crisis of the later Republic', *CA* 7 (1988), 1–29.
- H. Beck and U. Walter, *Die Frühen Römischen Historiker. I: Von Fabius Pictor bis Cn. Gellius* (Darmstadt, 2001).
- K. Bringmann, 'Weltherrschaft und innere Krise Roms im Spiegel der Geschichtsschreibung des zweiten und ersten Jahrhunderts v. Chr.', *A&A* 23 (1977), 28–49.
- K. Büchner, 'Das *verum* in der historischen Darstellung des Sallust', *Gymnasium* 70 (1963), 231–252.
- K. Büchner, *Sallust* (Heidelberg, 1960).
- J. Diggle, 'Facta dictis aequare. Sallust, hist. II fr. 98', *PACA* 17 (1989), 59–60.
- D. C. Earl, *The Political Thought of Sallust* (Cambridge, 1961).
- A. Ernout, *Salluste* (Paris, 1946).
- E. Flaig, 'Die *Pompa Funebris*. Adlige Konkurrenz und annalistische Erinnerung in der Römischen Republik', in O. G. Oexle (ed.), *Memoria als Kultur* (Göttingen, 1995), 115–48.
- E. Flaig, *Ritualisierte Politik. Zeichen, Gesten und Herrschaft im Alten Rom* (Göttingen, 2003).
- H. I. Flower, *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture* (Oxford, 1996).
- J. W. Goethe, 'Materialien zur Geschichte der Farbenlehre', in E. Trunz (ed.), *Hamburger Ausgabe in 14 Bänden XIV* (Munich, 1981⁶).
- M. Halbwachs, *Les cadres sociaux de le mémoire* (Paris, 1925).
- M. Halbwachs, *La mémoire collective* (Paris, 1950).
- K. Heldmann, *Sallust über die römische Weltherrschaft. Ein Geschichtsmodell im Catilina und seine Tradition in der hellenistischen Historiographie* (Stuttgart, 1993).
- E. Herkommer, *Die Topoi in den Prooemien der römischen Geschichtswerke* (Tübingen, 1968).
- K.-J. Hölkesskamp, 'Exempla und mos maiorum. Überlegungen zum kollektiven Gedächtnis der Nobilität', in H.-J. Gehrke and A. Möller (edd.), *Vergangenheit und Lebenswelt. Soziale Kommunikation, Traditionsbildung und historisches Bewußtsein* (Tübingen, 1996), 301–33.
- E. Koestermann, *C. Sallustius Crispus, Bellum Iugurthinum* (Heidelberg, 1971).
- R. Koselleck, 'Geschichte, Historie. V. Die Herausbildung des modernen Geschichtsbegriffs', in *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe II* (Stuttgart, 1975), 647–91.
- C. Kraus, *Livy. Ab Urbe Condita, Book VI* (Cambridge, 1994).
- C. Kraus, 'Jugurthine Disorder', in C. Kraus (ed.), *The Limits of Historiography. Genre and Narrative in Ancient Historical Texts* (Leiden, 1999), 217–47.
- C. Kraus, 'Sallust', in C. Kraus and A. Woodman, *Latin Historians* (Oxford, 1997), 10–50.
- A. La Penna, 'Il significato dei Proemi Sallustiani', *Maia* 11 (1959), 23–43, 89–119.
- A. D. Leeman, 'Sallust's Prologe und seine Auffassung von der Historiographie, II. Das Jugurtha-Prooemium', *Mnemosyne* 8 (1955), 38–48.
- D. S. Levene, 'Sallust's Jugurtha. An "Historical Fragment"', *JRS* 82 (1992), 53–70.
- T. J. Luce, 'Tacitus on "history's highest function": *praecipuum munus annalium* (Ann. 3.65)', in *ANRW II* 33, 4 (Berlin, 1991), 2904–27.
- J. Marincola, *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography* (Cambridge, 1997).
- P. McGushin, *C. Sallustius Crispus. Bellum Catilinae* (Leiden, 1977).
- C. Moatti, *La raison de Rome. Naissance de l'esprit critique à la fin de la République (IIe-Ier siècle avant Jésus-Christ)* (Paris, 1977).
- P. Nora, *Les lieux de mémoire I–III* (Paris, 1984–92).
- S. P. Oakley, *A Commentary on Livy. Books VI–X. I. Introduction and Book VI* (Oxford, 1997).

- G. M. Paul, *A Historical Commentary on Sallust's Bellum Jugurthinum* (Liverpool, 1984).
- J. T. Ramsey, *Sallust's Bellum Catilinae* (Oxford, 1984).
- L. D. Reynolds, *C. Sallusti Crispi Opera* (Oxford, 1991).
- H. Roloff, *Maiores bei Cicero* (Göttingen, 1938).
- J. Rüsen, 'Die vier Typen des historischen Erzählens', in R. Koselleck et al. (edd.), *Formen der Geschichtsschreibung* (Munich, 1982), 514–605.
- T. Scanlon, *Spes Frustrata. A Reading of Sallust* (Heidelberg, 1987).
- H. Schoenberger, *Beispiele aus der Geschichte, ein rhetorisches Kunstmittel in Ciceros Reden* (Augsburg, 1911).
- E. Schütrumpf, 'Die Depravierung Roms nach den Erfolgen des Imperiums bei Sallust, *Bellum Catilinae* Kap. 10—philosophische Reminiszenzen', in P. Kneissl and V. Losemann (edd.), *Imperium Romanum. Studien zu Geschichte und Rezeption. Festschrift für Karl Christ zum 75. Geburtstag* (Stuttgart, 1998), 674–89.
- W. Steidle, *Sallusts historische Monographien, Themenwahl und Geschichtsbild* (Wiesbaden, 1958).
- M. Stemmmler, 'Auctoritas exempli. Zur Wechselwirkung von kanonisierten Vergangenheitsbildern und gesellschaftlicher Gegenwart in der spätrepublikanischen Rhetorik', in B. Linke and M. Stemmmler (edd.), *Mos maiorum. Untersuchungen zu den Formen der Identitätsbildung und Stabilisierung in der römischen Republik* (Stuttgart, 2000), 141–205.
- M. Stemmmler, 'Institutionalisierte Geschichte. Zur Stabilisierungsleistung und Symbolizität historischer Beispiele in der Redekultur der römischen Republik', in G. Melville (ed.), *Institutionalität und Symbolisierung. Verstetigungen kultureller Ordnungsmuster in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart* (Cologne, 2001), 219–40.
- K. Stierle, 'Geschichte als Exemplum—Exemplum als Geschichte. Zur Pragmatik und Poetik narrativer Texte', in R. Koselleck and W.-D. Stempel (edd.), *Geschichte—Ereignis und Erzählung* (Munich, 1983), 347–375.
- E. Tiffou, *Essai sur la pensée morale de Salluste à la lumière des ses prologues* (Paris, 1974).
- D. Timpe, 'Memoria und Geschichtsschreibung bei den Römern', in H.-J. Gehrke and A. Möller (edd.), *Vergangenheit und Lebenswelt. Soziale Kommunikation, Traditionsbildung und historisches Bewußtsein* (Tübingen, 1996), 277–99.
- K. Vretska, *C. Sallustius Crispus. De Catilinae Coniuratione I–II* (Heidelberg, 1976).
- K. Vretska, *Studien zu Sallusts Bellum Jugurthinum* (Wien, 1955).
- U. Walter, 'Die Botschaft des Mediums. Überlegungen zum Sinnpotential von Historiographie im Kontext der römischen Geschichtskultur zur Zeit der Republik', in G. Melville (ed.), *Institutionalität und Symbolisierung. Verstetigungen kultureller Ordnungsmuster in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart* (Cologne, 2001), 241–79.
- U. Walter, *Memoria und res publica. Zur Geschichtskultur im republikanischen Rom* (Frankfurt, 2004).
- T. Wiedemann, 'Sallust's Jugurtha. Concord, discord, and the digressions', *G&R* 40 (1993), 48–57.
- A. J. Woodman, *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography. Four Studies* (Portland, OR, 1988).