



Project
MUSE®

Scholarly journals online

The Unthucydidean Voice of Sallust

JONAS GRETHLEIN

University of California, Santa Barbara

SUMMARY: Since antiquity, Sallust has been said to have modeled his historiography after Thucydides. Focusing on the voice of the narrator, this article draws attention to an aspect that distinguishes Sallust from Thucydides and reminds us more of Herodotus. While Thucydides's narrative seems to unravel itself, Sallust makes his presence as narrator strongly felt by first-person interventions and expressions of uncertainty (I). Moreover, he integrates other voices at the extradiegetic level (II). These features of Sallust's voice give his account a strong mimetic aspect, underscore his reliability and engage the readers in the "act of reading."

MANY SCHOLARS HAVE ARGUED THAT SALLUST MODELS HIS historiography after Greek examples.¹ The most evident influence is Thucydides; Quintilian already juxtaposed the two.² Sallust's pessimism is seen to resemble the dark view of Thucydides's *Histories*. Not only do scenes in the *C(oniuratio) C(atilinae)* and *B(ellum) J(ugurthinum)*³ seem to imitate passages from Thucydides's *Histories*, but evidently whole phrases have been copied from there. Moreover, the roughness of Sallust's diction evokes the Thucydidean style.

¹ Perrochat and Avenarius claim to give evidence for Thucydides, Hellenistic historiography, Plato, Xenophon, Isocrates, Demosthenes and Lycurgus as models for Sallust. A new angle is presented by Levene 2000 who argues that Sallust imitates Cato. I would like to thank TAPA's anonymous referees for their comments and suggestions.

² Quint., *Inst. or.* 10.1.101 and 10.2.17. Cf. also Vell. Paterc. 2.36.2; Senec. *Suas.* 6.21. Besides Patzer, Perrochat, Avenarius and La Penna 149–152, see Scanlon, who also presents a survey of older scholarship on Sallust's imitation of Thucydides (11–19); Schmal 148–153; Nicols; Sklenář 215–217.

³ Translations of Sallust are taken from Rolfe with some modifications; translations of Herodotus are based on Godley.

Focusing on the voice⁴ of the narrator in *BC* and *BJ*, I would like to draw attention to an aspect that distinguishes Sallust from Thucydides and at first glance reminds us more of Herodotus.⁵ Needless to say, every narrative is recounted by a narrator, but this narrator can be present in his narrative to different degrees. Most strikingly, he can draw attention to himself by first-person interventions, but he also makes his presence felt when he concedes uncertainty about something, presents alternative versions, or introduces other extradiegetic voices.

Thucydides and Herodotus provide two very different models for the historian's voice. The beginning and the few other places of explicit reflection left aside, Thucydides seems to step back behind the story—his narrative is artfully shaped, but seldom does the person of the narrator come to the fore. Only in a few places does Thucydides give first-person narratives; he rarely refers to the process of investigation and avoids expressing uncertainty or presenting alternative versions. The voice of the narrator vanishes in the story, which seems to unravel itself,⁶ thus making the narrative look objective and giving the readers the impression of having direct access to the events.⁷

⁴ Although inevitably aspects of perspective will be touched upon, I emphasize that my analysis is directed towards the level of the voice, not focus. According to Genette's system, "focalization" refers to perception ("qui voit"), while voice signifies the level of utterance ("qui dit"). De Jong's pioneering works (1987; 1991) have made Bal's very wide definition of "focus" fashionable among classicists. Focalization is applied to a great range of phenomena including the narratorial instance. However, Bal's model has serious shortcomings. Cf. Nelles and, within Classics, Rood 294–296. For an analysis of focalization in ancient historiography, see, for example, Dewald 1999; for a less theoretical approach to the same phenomenon, see Davidson (on Polybius).

⁵ Sallust as a narrator has already been examined by Évrard 1990 and 1997. These articles present useful collections of passages, but are rather technical and fall short of discussing single passages and drawing conclusions. For narratological or narratologically inspired readings of Sallust see also Levene; Petersmann; Kraus. The relation of Sallust to Herodotus has not attracted much attention, but there are some references in scholarship. For example, Renehan 100 claims that *BJ* 6.1 is an imitation of *Hdt.* 1.136. I will not argue for an imitation, but a similarity in narrative technique.

⁶ On the invisibility of the Thucydidean narrator see for example Marincola 8f., 173. On the low number of self-references in Thucydides see Hornblower 1994b: 163 (see also with a different emphasis Loraux); on the avoidance of different accounts and the naming of sources see Connor 5f.; Hornblower 1994a: 45; Gribble 45, who makes an effort to show that, even though Thucydides conceals his presence, he has left his mark in the narration. On the subjectivity of Thucydides see also Westlake 1989: 181–200; on Thucydides as narrator in general see Hornblower 1994b and Rood.

⁷ Drawing on Benveniste's distinction between discourse (*discours*) and narrative (*récit*) Genette 1969: 63 writes: "Inversement, l'objectivité du récit se définit par l'absence de

Herodotus, on the other hand, often speaks in the first person and makes his presence in the narrative strongly felt: in many cases he names his sources, concedes uncertainty and is prone to give different accounts.⁸ His readers are made aware that they are not directly perceiving the events themselves, but are reading the product of research and of narrative shaping.

In this article, I examine the voice of Sallust, who not only presents his historical *persona* in the poems, but as a narrator enters the stage of his narrative time and again.⁹ Then, unlike Thucydides, Sallust does not conceal his pres-

toute référence au narrateur.” (“On the contrary, the objectivity of the narrative is defined by the absence of any reference to the narrator.”) However, he notes that pure narrative without elements of subjective discourse is extremely rare (64–69). Cf. Gribble 42. As Barthes points out, the invisibility of the narrator is a mode of telling which is typical of historiography. He asks “under what conditions the classical historian is enabled—or authorized—himself to designate, in his discourse, the act by which he promulgates it.” (66). He distinguishes two “shifters.” The “shifter” of listening “designates any reference to the historian’s listening, collecting testimony from elsewhere and telling it in his own discourse” (67). The second “shifter” refers to organizing the discourse, e. g. the temporal order. Wheeldon 45–50 emphasizes that first-person interventions in the ancient historians are very few and tries to explain why third-person-narrative appears to be more objective.

This also raises the issue of history and narrative. Most prominently, White 1973; 1978; 1987; 1999 has argued against nomological views that historical accounts always contain narrative elements, offering a “tropology” which grasps the narrative character of historical works. As the broad reception of his works reveals, White has managed to establish the paradigm of narratology in the theory of history, see e. g. Kellner; Ankersmit. However, presupposing that there are “objective” events and data before the narrative encoding, he remains himself trapped in categories of positivist philosophy. Cf. Carroll 147–152 and Lorenz. The philosopher Carr, on the other hand, convincingly points out that every experience already has a narrative structure. For a phenomenological approach to narrative, see also the monumental *opera* by Ricoeur 1983–1985; 2000.

⁸ On alternative versions and quotation of sources in Herodotus, see Lateiner 76–108; Fowler 69–80. On Herodotus’s voice, see Brock and Dewald 2002 with further literature in 272 n. 13. The different narrative modes of Herodotus and Thucydides are compared by Dewald 1987: 148–150; Marincola 121; Fowler 76 n. 105; Gribble 42.

⁹ When in the following I refer to the narrator of *BC* and *BJ*, I mean Sallust. According to Genette 1991: 78–88 it is a *differentia specifica* between fictional and factual texts that in the latter the narrator and author are identical. See already Hamburger 76 and Cohn 791–800, who shows that Hamburger’s distinction between fictional and factual heterodiegetic narrations also applies to homodiegetic narrations.

This difference between fictional and factual narratives touches upon the debate whether the narratological systems which have been developed for fictional texts can also include factual narratives. For a sceptical view see Martinez/ Scheffel. However, this problem is not particularly urgent for an analysis of ancient historiography, which contains

ence as narrator. First, I will examine Sallust's voice, focusing on first-person narrative, but also taking into account expressions of uncertainty (I). Second, I will look at the relation of Sallust's voice to other extradiegetic voices within the narrative (II). Finally, a summary and comparison of Sallust with Thucydides and Herodotus will illuminate the specific characteristics of his voice that are utterly un-Thucydidean, but also distinct from Herodotus (III).

I. SALLUST'S VOICE

In *BC* 13.1, Sallust presents a meta-historical reflection: "Nam quid ea *memorem* quae nisi iis qui videre nemini credibilia sunt, a privatis compluribus subvorsos montis, maria constrata esse?" (Why, pray, should I speak of things which are incredible except to those who have seen them, that a host of private men have levelled mountains and built upon the seas?).¹⁰ Not only does the first-person intervention make the narrator's presence strongly felt, but, furthermore, Sallust points out that he selects the elements of his narrative and links this process to his readers' expectations. Far from unraveling itself, the narrative is revealed to be a hermeneutical process between a narrator and his recipients. In the following, I would like to show that, much closer to Herodotus than Thucydides, Sallust marks his narratorial presence by mentioning his historical research and referring to his shaping of the narrative (a) and by expressing uncertainty (b).

a) While Thucydides avoids references to his own historical research, Herodotus frequently refers to the process of inquiry on which his narrative is based. For example, after elaborating on the River Nile, he says in 2.99.1: Μέχρι μὲν τούτου ὅψις τε ἐμῇ καὶ γνώμῃ καὶ ἱστορίῃ ταῦτα λέγουσά ἐστι, τὸ δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦδε Αἰγυπτίου ἐρχομαι λόγους ἐρέων κατὰ τὰ ἤκουον· προσέσται δέ τι αὐτοῖσι καὶ τῆς ἐμῆς ὀψιος. (Thus far all I have said is the outcome of my own sight and judgment and inquiry. Henceforth I will record Egyptian chronicles, according to that which I have heard, adding thereto somewhat what I myself have seen). Mentioning the means he is using to discover facts, the *pater historiae* makes his narratorial presence strongly felt. There are no comparable reflections on method in Sallust, but in a similar fashion, the Roman historian employs first-person interventions to refer to his historical research, *BC* 53.2: "Sed *mihi multa legenti, multa audienti* quae populus

many aspects that we would classify as fictional. Besides, Carrard 83–148 demonstrates that the aspect of voice on which my article focuses can be analysed most fruitfully even in the historians of the Annales-school.

¹⁰ Cf. Grethlein for an attempt to figure out an implicit "meta-history" in Sallust.

Romanus domi militiaeque, mari atque terra praeclara facinora fecit, forte lubuit adtendere quae res maxume tanta negotia sustinuisset” (For my own part, as I read and heard of the many illustrious deeds of the Roman people at home and abroad, on land and sea, it chanced that I was seized by a strong desire of finding out what quality in particular had been the foundation of exploits so great).

Herodotus’s voice comes also to the fore in first-person reflections on the topic and structure of his narrative. For example, at the end of his proem he states, 1.5.3:

ἐγὼ δὲ περὶ μὲν τούτων οὐκ ἔρχομαι ἐρέων ὥς οὕτως ἢ ἄλλως κως ταῦτα ἐγένετο, τὸν δὲ οἶδα αὐτὸς πρῶτον ὑπάρξαντα ἀδίκων ἔργων ἐς τοὺς Ἕλληνας, τοῦτον σημήνας προβήσομαι ἐς τὸ πρόσω τοῦ λόγου, ὁμοίως σμικρὰ καὶ μεγάλα ὅσπερ ἀνθρώπων ἐπεξιών.

For my own part, I will not say that this or that story is true, but I will name him whom I myself know to have done unprovoked wrong to the Greeks, and so go forward with my history, and speak of small and great cities alike.

Thucydides’s *Histories*, on the other hand, are also carefully designed, but only rarely does the author draw attention to his narratorial activity.¹¹ Again, Sallust can be aligned with Herodotus; he often refers to his shaping of the narrative. Let me take an example parallel to the passage quoted from Herodotus. At the end of the *BC* proem and the beginning of the narrative, the narrator comes to the fore in numerous first-person interventions, 4.3–5:¹² “Igitur de Catilinae coniuratione quam verissime *potero* paucis *absolvam*; nam id facinus in primis ego memorabile *existumo* sceleris atque periculi novitate. De quoius hominis moribus pauca prius explananda sunt quam initium narrandi *faciam*” (I shall therefore write briefly and as truthfully as possible of the conspiracy of Catiline; for I regard that event as particularly worthy of memory because of the extraordinary nature of the crime and the danger arising from it. But before beginning my narrative I must say a few words about the man’s character).

More examples could be provided where Sallust uses first-person interventions to refer to his narrative activity,¹³ but I will confine myself to one

¹¹ Gribble 44 n. 24 counts two cases where Thucydides refers to himself as organizer of the narrative: 5.1.1; 6.94.1.

¹² On the strong presence of the first person in the proem of *BJ*, see Évrard 1990: 132f., who also emphasizes the structuring function of the first-person-references (136).

¹³ See for example the introduction of the account of a first conspiracy in which Catilina was involved, *BC* 18.1: “Sed antea item coniuravere pauci contra rem publicam, in quis Catilina fuit; de qua quam verissime *potero dicam*.”

special case, which, though easily overlooked, marks the narrator's activity.¹⁴ Often, Sallust explicitly refers back to what he has already said.¹⁵ The cross-references are particularly striking when the distance to the earlier remark is short. For example, in *BJ* 36.4 Sallust reports that Sp. Postumius Albinus returned from Africa to Rome for the *comitia*. Only 5 lines later in Reynolds's OCT, he picks up this point, *BJ* 37.3: "Ea mora in spem adductus Aulus, quem pro praetore in castris relictum *supra diximus* ..." (Because of this delay Aulus, who had been left in charge of the camp, as I said above, was inspired with the hope of...).

b) The narratorial presence is also made apparent when the narrator is uncertain of something. We often find this in Herodotus: for example, in the account of the battle at Salamis Herodotus reports that Artemisia could not flee from an Athenian ship, since she was surrounded by allied ships. In that situation, she saved herself by attacking the ship of an ally, Damasithymos, 8.87.3:

εἰ μὲν καὶ τι νεῖκος πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐγεγόνεε ἔτι περὶ Ἑλλήσποντον ἑόντων,
οὐ μέντοι ἔχω γε εἰπεῖν, οὔτε εἰ ἐκ προνοίης αὐτὰ ἐποίησε, οὔτε εἰ
συνεκύρησε ἢ τῶν Καλυνδῶν κατὰ τύχην παραπεσοῦσα νηῦς.

I cannot say if she had some trouble with him while they were still at the Hellespont, nor if her deed was done of set purpose or if the Calydonians met her by crossing her path at haphazard.

Herodotus is uncertain about two things, firstly a fact—whether there had been an argument between Artemisia und Damasithymos—and secondly the reason for her manouver—was it premeditation or merely chance? The gap between the event and its account draws attention to the narratorial instance that is conveying the story.

While Thucydides avoids conceding any kind of uncertainty, Sallust frequently does. However, he expresses uncertainty only with respect to the

¹⁴ Cf. Star 437: "Finally, cross-references assert the author's presence in his work and his control over his material."

¹⁵ On cross-references in Sallust see Star 433f.; Évrard 1990: 141–145 and 1997: 23f. Évrard argues that Sallust uses cross-references to create strong characters. Moreover, he notes for *BC* that nearly all cross-references are personal (1990: 141f.).

¹⁶ See furthermore *BC* 5.7 (referring to 5.1–6); 16.1 (~14.5f.); 20.1 (~17.3–7); 26.3 (~23.1–4); 57.1 (~50); 57.2 (57.1); *BJ* 25.4 (~15.4); 30.3 (~27.2); 33.2 (cf. Koestermann ad loc.); 34.1 (~33.2); 38.6 (~35.6); 52.5 (~49.1); 69.4 (~67.3); 75.6 (~75.2); 84.1 (~73.6). Vretska 1976 ad *BC* 5.7 notes a development from *BC* to *BJ*; there is an increase of plural forms and a tendency to use *dicere* instead of *memorare*. He follows the explanation by Skard 1956: 84f., according to whom this change is due to an increase of historical objectivity. See also the impersonal cross-reference *BJ* 96.1.

reasons and motives of his characters; uncertainty about facts (i. e. what has happened) can only be found in connection with other voices (cf. section II below). Let me start with a simple example. In *BJ* 90.1 Sallust says: "Igitur consul omnibus exploratis, *credo* dis fretus, nam contra tantas difficultates consilio satis providere non poterat..."¹⁷ (The consul then, after reconnoitring everywhere, putting, I believe, his trust in the gods, for against such great difficulties he could not make sufficient provision by his own wisdom...). Sallust gives a reason for his assessment (*nam...*), but the *credo* implies that he does not know Marius's motivation for sure. Time and again, a gap opens between Sallust and the events that he is covering; frequently, he provides his readers with different possibilities for the motives of his characters. Even where no first-person narrative is involved, the expression of uncertainty marks that the story does not unfold itself, but is presented by a narrator.

One could argue that, since Sallust's uncertainty is directed towards motives and reasons, it is based on veracity—Sallust simply acknowledges that he has no access to the inner selves of his characters.¹⁸ However, this squares badly with many instances where Sallust does not hesitate to give insight into the feelings of his characters;¹⁹ as an example, I quote Iugurtha's reaction to the last instruction by Micipsa, *BJ* 11.1: "Ad ea Iugurtha, tametsi regem ficta locutum intellegebat et ipse longe aliter animo agitabat, tamen pro tempore benigne respondit"²⁰ (Although Iugurtha knew that the king spoke insincerely, and though he had very different designs in his own mind, yet he returned a gracious answer, suited to the occasion). Instead, I would like to argue that there are three different functions of narratorial uncertainty in Sallust; these functions can be localized at the levels of mimesis, rhetoric and reception.²¹

First, by not giving a definite account or by offering divergent possibilities, Sallust adopts the restrictions of knowledge that his characters have. Thus,

¹⁷ Vretska 1976 ad loc. writes: "Die Worte *credo dis fretus* enthalten zweifellos einen gewissen Tadel, wie er noch stärker cap. 92.2 *omnia non bene consulta in virtutem trahebantur* seinen Ausdruck findet." ("The words *credo dis fretus* obviously imply a rebuke which is even stronger in 92.2 *omnia non bene consulta in virtutem trahebantur*.") Cf. Paul ad loc.

¹⁸ This would align Sallust with the interpretation of Tacitus by Allison 138 who argues that Tacitus employs antithesis to suggest reasons and motives where he has no safe knowledge.

¹⁹ Cf. Paul 5.

²⁰ Booth 3 calls the "trick of going beneath the surface of the action to obtain a reliable view of a character's mind" "one of the most obviously artificial devices of the story-teller." The insight into the thoughts and emotions of characters clearly distinguishes ancient from modern historiography. Cf. Nünning 375.

²¹ Of course, the levels of mimesis, rhetoric and reception are linked to each other. For example, a mimetic dimension has an impact on the reception.

the narrative gains a mimetic aspect;²² it imitates the perception of the events by contemporary witnesses. Moreover, I would like to suggest that in my two examples, concerning motives of Bocchus and Aulus, the form of the presentation (discourse) expresses the content of the action (story).²³

At the end of *BJ*, it takes some time before Sulla manages to catch Iugurtha. The reason for this deferral is Bocchus, the king of the Maures. He is constantly changing his mind, sometimes tending to support Iugurtha, sometimes the Romans. Three times, the narratorial voice is uncertain of his motivation, *BJ* 88.5f:

Nam Bocchus nuntios ad eum saepe miserat: velle populi Romani amicitiam; ne quid ab se hostile timeret. *Id simulaveritne, quo inprovisus gravior adcideret, an mobilitate ingeni pacem atque bellum mutare solitus, parum exploratum est.*

As for Bocchus, he had sent Marius frequent messengers, saying that he desired the friendship of the Roman people and bidding Marius to fear no hostile act on his part. Whether he feigned this, in order that he might strike an unexpected, and therefore a heavier blow, or from natural instability of character was in the habit of wavering between peace and war, is not altogether clear.

At first sight, it is Marius who is at a loss about what Bocchus's motives are. Yet Sallust does not help to clarify the matter. The impression that he knows as little as Marius is reinforced by *parum exploratum est*. The impersonal phrase can apply to the character as well as the narrator. Regarding the motives of Bocchus, the horizons of character and narrator converge. This interpretation

²² The mimetic character of Sallust's writing has already been pointed out from different angles: Batstone 1986; 1990 examines the *BC* and shows that "conflicting possibilities of interpretation and their lack of resolution are used by Sallust to create a mimetic sense of the events and even to convey that obscurity of actors which was in fact part of the conspiracy" (1990: 112f.). See also his stimulating article on the *synkrisis* of Cato and Caesar in *BC* (1988) where he argues that the open reading experience mirrors the unresolvable conflict Sallust is describing. Levene analyzes the *BJ* as a fragment and sees the form as a reflection of the content. In his reconstruction of a Sallustian "history of mind" and "philosophy of history," Gunderson notes the loss of authorship (86) and takes this as a reproduction of the historical confusion in Roman society (116–118).

²³ The dichotomy story-discourse or *fabula-sujet* is not without problems. Using it, we have to be aware that the story "exists only at an abstract level; any manifestation already entails the selection and arrangement performed by the discourse as actualized by a given medium. There is no privileged manifestation" (Chatman 37). Cf. Todorov 6: "The *story* is thus a convention; it does not exist at the level of events themselves." With this in mind, however, the dichotomy is a highly useful tool to point out the mediating instance of narrative presentation. Cf. Culler. For a survey of different definitions, see Sternberg 10–13 and Pier; for a harsh criticism of the dichotomy story-discourse, see Smith.

is backed up by the following reflection on Bocchus's motivation, *BJ* 103.2: "Tum rursus Bocchus, *seu reputando quae sibi duobus proeliis venerant seu admonitus ab aliis amicis quos incorruptos Iugurtha reliquerat*, ex omni copia necessariorum quinque delegit..." (Then Bocchus again, led either by the recollection of what had happened to him in two battles or by the warnings of other friends of his whom Iugurtha had failed to bribe, chose out of the whole body of his relatives five...). Again, Sallust gives two divergent motivations without opting for one. Finally, in *BJ* 113.1 the narratorial uncertainty is explicitly expressed through a first-person narrative: "Haec Maurus secum ipse diu volvens tandem promisit, *ceterum dolo an vere cunctatus parum conperimus*"²⁴ (After long consideration, the Moor at last promised this. Whether his hesitation was feigned or genuine I cannot say).

By being uncertain about the motives of Bocchus, Sallust adopts the perspective of the Roman characters in his narrative who have no access to Bocchus's mind. In this regard, his account gains a mimetic dimension. We can perhaps push this interpretation a bit further and read the uncertainty of the narratorial voice as an expression of Bocchus's wavering: as the permanent unpredictability of Bocchus's actions is creeping into the representation, the narratorial voice loses the ability to give a straight account. The form of the presentation becomes an expression of the content. Put in narratological terms, Sallust makes the discourse mirror the story.

Let me offer another example: I have already quoted from the passage in which Albinus Aulus has to return to Rome for the *comitia* and leaves his brother in charge of the troops, *BJ* 37.3f

Ea mora in spem adductus Aulus, quem pro praetore in castris relictum supra diximus, *aut conficiundi belli aut terrore exercitus ab rege pecuniae capiundae* milites mense Ianuario ex hibernis in expeditionem evocat, magnisque itineribus hieme aspera pervenit ad oppidum Suthul, ubi regis thesauri erant. Quod quamquam et saevitia temporis et opportunitate loci neque capi neque obsideri poterat...tamen *aut simulandi gratia, quo regi formidinem adderet, aut cupidine caecus ob thesauros oppidi potiundi vineas agere, aggerem iacere aliaque quae incepto usui forent properare.*

Because of this delay Aulus, who had been left in charge of the camp, as I said above, was inspired with the hope of either finishing the war or forcing a bribe from the king through fear of his army. He therefore summoned his soldiers in the month of January from their winter quarters for active duty in the field,

²⁴ It has been claimed that Sallust drew on Sulla's *Memories* for the end of *BJ*; cf. Vitelli 389–392 and Calabi 252–262. Even if the *parum conperimus* refers to this source, this does not call into question the rhetorical function which I suggest. The infrequency of the hints at sources suggests that their mention has a particular function.

and making forced marches in spite of the severity of the winter season, reached the town of Suthul, where the king's treasure was kept. He was unable either to take the town or lay siege to it because of the inclemency of the weather and the strength of the position... Yet either with the idea of making a feint, in order to frighten the king, or because he was blinded by a desire to possess the town for the sake of its treasure, he brought up the mantlets, constructed a mound, and hastily made the other preparations for an assault.

It is noteworthy that, twice in a short passage, different motivations for Aulus's decisions are presented. Again, Sallust limits the information he gives to the perspective of the historical characters, and his narrative becomes a close mimesis of the event. This perspective can be defined more precisely: after reporting Aulus's expedition, Sallust turns to Rome (*BJ* 39.1: *sed ubi ea Romae compertae sunt...*). With the two expressions of uncertainty, Sallust already adopts in his account the perspective of those on whose perception he is elaborating afterwards. Like the Romans in Rome, he cannot determine what drove Aulus to start his disastrous expedition.

I suggest that, similarly to the account of Bocchus, the interpretation of the Aulus passage can be taken a bit further. The narratorial voice's uncertainty not only takes the stance of a direct witness of the events, but is also a formal expression of the confusion of Aulus's improvident actions, which is made explicit in *BJ* 38.1: "At Jugurtha cognita vanitate atque inperitia legati subdole eius augere amentiam..." (Jugurtha, however, well aware of the presumption and incapacity of the acting commander, craftily added to his foolishness...).²⁵ As Aulus becomes lost, the narrative too loses its track—the form of the presentation (discourse) is imitating the content of the action (story).

The second function of narratorial uncertainty that I would like to discuss is rhetorical. Here, I am concerned with Sallust's use of expressions of uncertainty in order to highlight other parts of the narrative. When the Numidians massacre the Roman troops in Vaga, only the prefect Turpilius manages to escape. On this Sallust gives the following comment, *BJ* 67.3: "*Id misericordiane hospitis an pactione aut casu ita evenerit parum conperimus, nisi, quia illi in tanto malo turpis vita integra fama potior fuit, inprobus intestabilisque videtur*" (Whether he owed this to the mercy of his host, to connivance, or to chance I have been unable to learn; at any rate, since in such a disaster he chose to live disgraced rather than die with an unsullied reputation, he seems to me a wretch and utterly detestable). As in the quoted examples, Sallust takes the perspective of the historical characters and prepares the turn to Metellus's per-

²⁵ The uncertainty of the narrator is later mirrored at the level of the action, *BJ* 38.5: "postremo fugere an manere tutius foret in incerto erat."

ception in the following sentence (*BJ* 68.1: “Metellus postquam de rebus Vagae actis conperit...”). Furthermore, the restriction of the narrator’s knowledge has, I think, a rhetorical function. The different explanations for Turpilius’s survival serve to underline Sallust’s notion that—no matter what the causes were—his behavior was indecent. The uncertainty about the exact historical circumstances highlights the clarity of Sallust’s moral judgment.

The mention of alternative versions has a slightly different rhetorical function in the story of the Philaeni, where Sallust says at *BJ* 79.5f.:

Igitur Carthagine duo fratres missi, quibus nomen Philaenis erat, maturavere iter pergere; Cyrenenses tardius iere. *Id socordiane an casu accidierit parum cognovi*. Ceterum solet in illis locis tempestas haud secus atque in mari retinere; nam ubi per loca aequalia et nuda gignentium ventus coortus harenam humo excitavit, ea magna vi agitata ora oculosque implere solet: ita prospectu inpedito morari iter.

Accordingly, two brothers were sent from Carthage, called Philaeni, and these made haste to complete their journey. Those from Cyrene went more deliberately. Whether this was due to sloth or chance I cannot say, but in those lands a storm often causes no less delay than on the sea; for when the wind rises on those level plains, barren of living things, it sweeps up the sand from the ground and drives it with such violence as to fill the mouth and eyes. Thus one is halted because one cannot see.

Within the frame of a legend, Sallust’s statement that he could not figure out if the Cyreneans’s slowness was due to carelessness or merely accidental seems slightly out of place. However, it not only leads Sallust to elaborate on the winds and the landscape in the search of a plausible explanation, but the concession not to know the reason for the delay suggests that the main account is trustworthy. The explicit uncertainty about a detail throws the reliability of the account as a whole into relief.²⁶

²⁶ Cf. Hornblower 1994b: 150: “One way in which a narrator can inspire belief in categorically uttered proposition *p* is by at the same time expressing diffidence about proposition *q*.” He gives examples from Herodotus and Thucydides (150f.), for further literature see *ibid.* n. 50. Another device which helps to back up the reliability of dubious accounts is the reference to commonplaces. For example, Sallust gives a fairly legend-like account of how Marius managed to take the castle close to the river Muluccha (*BJ* 92–94). There seemed to be no way to capture the castle until a Ligurian soldier mindlessly collecting snails happened to find an access to it from behind. The following details of the narration are of interest, 93.3f.: “Ubi postquam solitudinem intellexit, more ingeni humani cupido difficilia faciundi animum invadit. Et forte in eo loco grandis ilex coaluerat inter saxa, paulum modo prona, deinde inflexa atque aucta in altitudinem, quo cuncta gignentium natura fert. Quoius ramis modo, modo eminentibus saxis nisus Ligus in castelli planitiem

So far, two functions have been pointed out for the expressions of uncertainty, a mimetic and a rhetorical function. Both can be found in *BC* 31.5f., where Catilina enters the senate and Cicero gives his famous speech:

Postremo *dissimulandi causa aut sui expurgandi*, sicut iurgio lacesitus foret, in senatum venit. Tum M. Tullius consul, *sive praesentiam eius timens sive ira commotus*, orationem habuit luculentam atque utilem rei publicae, quam postea scriptam edidit.

Finally, in order to conceal his designs or to clear himself, as though he had merely been the object of some private insult, he came into the senate. Then the consul Marcus Tullius, either fearing his presence or carried away by indignation, delivered a brilliant speech of great service to the state, which he later wrote out and published.

Strikingly, Sallust gives two possible reasons for both Catilina's attendance and Cicero's speech. At a first level, the uncertainty is mimetic. The narratorial stance is brought into line with the characters' perspective; like one of the senators who attended the meeting, Sallust can only guess about the motives of Catilina and Cicero. Moreover, by offering two possibilities for both antagonists, the form of the presentation mirrors their juxtaposition at the level of the story. At a second level, the double expression of uncertainty helps Sallust to stylize himself as narrator. The equal treatment of the two opponents suggests an unbiased account. Neither is favored by closer scrutiny; Sallust is separated from both by the same distance. Thus expressions of uncertainty help Sallust to present himself as a reliable, unbiased narrator with a clear judgement.

Now, I would like to turn to the level of reception. Narratorial expressions of uncertainty engage the reader. They convey the impression that we, the receivers of the narrative, take the perspective of direct witnesses and follow

pervenit, quod cuncti Numidae intenti proeliantibus aderant." ("When he found that he was alone there, the love of overcoming difficulties which is natural to mankind seized him. It happened that a great oak had grown up there among the rocks; it bent downward for a little way, then turned and grew upward, as is the nature of all plants. With the help, now of the branches of this tree and now of projecting rocks, the Ligurian mounted to the plateau about the fortress, while all the Numidians were intent upon the combatants.") Koestermann ad loc. (333) writes: "Die Erzählung trägt fast novellistischen Charakter. Sallust verliert sich in pittoresken Einzelheiten." ("The narrative strongly resembles a novella. Sallust is getting lost in obscure details.") This grasps only one aspect: that the account with all its details is dubious. I suggest that Sallust counterbalances this impression by the two commonplaces, one about the human mind, the other about the direction of growth. Their incontrovertibility lends the appearance of reliability to the account.

the events themselves. By confronting the same ambiguities as the characters, reading becomes the re-experience of the events reported. However, this re-experience is limited or, better, pre-structured: while the characters face an infinite amount of possibilities, the readers' attention is carefully directed by the narratorial voice.

All the discussed passages focus on the characters' motivation or the reasons for events. Often, Sallust offers a positive and a negative evaluation. For example, Aulus's expedition clearly was a mistake, but whether he was guided by the desire to finish the war or get a bribe from Iugurtha makes a difference. On the other hand, whether Cicero delivered his speech because he feared Catilina or because he was carried away by *ira*, the image drawn is not a flattering one; far from being the superior statesman whose image he wishes to project, Cicero appears to be led by one of two emotions, neither of which distinguishes a great politician. In this case, Sallust's expression of uncertainty subtly guides the readers to a rather critical view of Cicero.

From slightly different angles, both the "Constance School" and American reader-response theories have pointed out that texts are completed in the process of reception; reading, they argue, is an active process.²⁷ For example, Iser argues that this process is pre-structured by the text, the gaps ("Leerstelle") of which are filled by the recipient. I would like to suggest that the narratorial expressions of uncertainty in Sallust reinforce the active participation of the reader in the construction of the text—they raise particular questions and thus give the "act of reading" a specific direction.

As an example, let me adduce a passage which has been given a masterful analysis by Batstone.²⁸ In *BC* 49.4 the consequences of a slanderous rumor about Caesar are described:

...magnum illi invidiam conflaverunt usque eo ut nonnulli equites Romani, qui praesidii causa cum telis erant circum aedem Concordiae, *seu periculi magnitudine seu animi mobilitate impuls*i, quo studium suum in rem publicam clarius esset egredienti ex senatu Caesari gladio minitarentur.

²⁷ The bibliography is huge; here, only a few references must suffice: for the "Constance School," which makes use of Gadamer's hermeneutics for literary studies, see Iser 1974; 2000, who pursues a *Wirkungstheorie*, and Jauß 1970; 1997, who develops a *Rezeptionsästhetik*; see also Warning 1975. For the American reader-response theory see Fish 1980; Tompkins, ed.; Suleiman/ Crosman, eds. Moreover, there are numerous other authors who tackle the open process of reception from different perspectives, e. g. Eco from a semiotic point of view and Derrida from a poststructuralist angle. For the application of reader-response approaches in Classics see e. g. Pedrick/ Rabinowitz, eds.

²⁸ Batstone 1986: 114–16.

...they stirred up such hostility that some Roman knights, who were stationed as an armed guard about the temple of Concord, carried away either by the greatness of the danger or by their own excitability, drew their swords upon Caesar as he was leaving the senate, in order to make their loyalty to their country more conspicuous.

Batstone shows that *periculi magnitudine* cannot signify an objective danger, since Sallust exonerates Caesar. Instead, it must be focalized by the knights.²⁹ He goes on to suggest that *animi mobilitate* be taken with the following final clause; then, the knights try to conceal their indecisiveness by their decisive action. On the other hand, Batstone deems it possible that *animi mobilitate* is a cynical comment by Sallust who notes that, because of human nature, the knights have turned against their own friend.

Batstone's subtle reading reveals the dynamic process of reception, which is set in motion by the two possibilities that Sallust raises. Let us take a further look at the juxtaposition. It seems more natural to take *animi mobilitate* not as focalized by the knights, but as a narratorial comment. In that case, Sallust does not juxtapose two mutually exclusive reasons; the explanations he offers are not even equal, but refer to different levels of understanding: while the first one offers a specific explanation—the knights sense an imminent danger—the second one refers the reader to either the character of the knights or of man in general. Seen from this angle, the juxtaposition makes the reader confront fundamental questions of historiography. At what level is human action to be understood? Is it to be seen in its specific context or is it to be viewed against universal categories? Or do we have to take into account both? But then, what is their exact relation to each other?

To sum up: Sallust's voice comes to the fore in first-person interventions, when he mentions his research or structures the narrative. Moreover, his narratorial presence is strongly felt in expressions of uncertainty referring to the motivation and purposes of his characters. Although Sallust claims in some cases that he was unable to decide on the correct interpretation, we cannot attribute the use of multiple possibilities to his restricted access to the past. Instead, expressions of uncertainty have three functions, at the levels of mimesis, rhetoric and reception. First, the uncertainty of the narratorial voice takes up the perspective of the characters and gives the impression of corresponding to the events themselves. It is particularly used to mirror the confusion which is reigning in the story. Second, Sallust's acknowledgement of the limits of his knowledge inspires confidence in the reliability of his ac-

²⁹ At the same time *periculi magnitudine* hints, as Batstone 1986: 115 shows, at an objective danger of which the knights are however unaware.

count. Third, the offer of alternative versions reinforces and pre-structures the active participation of the reader in the construction of the text.

II. ADDITIONAL VOICES

In most narratives there are different voices.³⁰ The story is told by the narrator at the extradiegetic level. He is either part of the story (homodiegetic) or stands outside of it (heterodiegetic). Within his narrative, the narrator can have his characters tell stories—they are intradiegetic narrators. Furthermore, in historiographical accounts the narrator can refer to other voices at the extradiegetic level, the insertion of which draws attention to the narrator's shaping activity. These extradiegetic voices shall be dealt with in this section, the first part of which examines the treatment of sources (a) while the second focuses on extradiegetic voices in the past (b).

a) In the works of modern historians, voices outside of the story come into play through the quotation of sources and the critical discussion of other accounts. In ancient historiography, Herodotus frequently introduces the voices of his sources; for instance, before he starts his narrative with Croesus (1.6), he adduces the Persian and Phoenician versions of how the fights between East and West started (1.1–5).³¹ Most other ancient historians, however, rarely quote sources and their references to other historians are limited. Sallust's practice deviates from that of Herodotus in this regard. Significantly, the only mention of a source that he claims to have used is in an ethnographic context. Turning to the geography and history of Africa, he names the Punic books of king Hiempsal (17.7).³²

Yet the use of a source is implied when Sallust sketches the early history of Rome, *BC* 6.1: "Urbem Romam, *sicuti ego accepi*, condidere atque habuere

³⁰ I draw on the concept of narrative voice as outlined in Genette 1972: 225–267. My seemingly banal explanation of the most basic narratological concept is, I hope, excused by the confusion and lack of precision generated by the great variety of narratological theories and the even greater variety of their applications.

³¹ See the list compiled by Jacoby 398f.

³² Moreover, Sallust stresses the difficulties which accompanied his research on Africa (17.2), refers to different opinions as to whether there are two or three continents (17.3), and declares that according to the Africans Hercules died in Spain (18.3). Trüdingen 127f. argues that Sallust has taken over the reference to Hiempsal's books from an earlier writer. When Sallust justifies his digression on Sulla, he asserts not only his *tanti viri res admonuit*, but also claims that previous treatments, L. Sisenna still being the best, have not demonstrated the liberty appropriate for covering this subject (95.2). However, he does not give any details of these accounts.

initio Troiani...” (The city of Rome, according to what I have received, was at the outset founded and inhabited by Trojans...).

Accipere denotes the process of reception and hints at a source underlying Sallust’s account.³³ In a few more passages, a λέγεται suggests that Sallust draws on a source.³⁴ In *BC* 19.4–6, Sallust even juxtaposes two different accounts of Piso’s death:

*Sunt qui ita dicant*³⁵, imperia eius iniusta superba crudelia barbaros nequivisse pati; *alii autem* equites illos, Cn. Pompei veteres fidosque clientis, voluntate eius Pisonem adgressos: numquam Hispanos praeterea tale facinus fecisse, sed imperia saeva multa antea perpressos. Nos eam rem in medio relinquemus. De superiore coniuratione satis dictum.

Some say that the barbarians could not endure his rule, unjust, insolent, and cruel; others, that the horsemen, who were old and devoted retainers of Pompey, attacked Piso at his instigation. The latter point out that the Spaniards had never before committed such a crime, but had tolerated many cruel rulers in former days. We shall not attempt to decide this question, and enough has been said about the first conspiracy.

Sallust does not explicitly give a preference for either of the versions. The second one perhaps gets some emphasis from the argument against the first. On the other hand, this argument could undermine itself: would not persistent bad treatment provide the Spaniards with a perfect reason to kill Piso? Probably, Sallust really was not sure about the circumstances of Piso’s death.

³³ Skard 1956: 61 and Vretska 1976 ad loc. think that the *ego* indicates that Sallust is deviating from the normal tradition; more cautiously, McGushin ad loc. notes that it implies “differences of opinion.”

³⁴ *BC* 15.2: “Postremo captus amore Aureliae Orestillae, quous praeter formam nihil umquam bonus laudavit, quod ea nubere illi dubitabat timens privignum adulta aetate, *pro certe creditur* necato filio vacuum domum scelestis nuptiis fecisse.” *BC* 24.3: “Ea tempestate plurimos quousque generis homines adscivisse sibi *dicitur*.” *BJ* 9.4: “Sed ipse paucos post annos morbo atque aetate confectus, quom sibi finem vitae adesse intellexeret, coram amicis et cognatis itemque Adherbale et Hiempsale filiis *dicitur* huiusce modi verba cum Iugurtha habuisse.” *BJ* 75.7: “Deinde, ubi ad id loci ventum quo Numidis praeceperat et castra posita munitaque sunt, tanta repente caelo missa vis aquae *dicitur* ut ea modo exercitui satis superque foret.” *BJ* 113.3: “...Maurus adhibitis amicis ac statim inmutata voluntate remotis ceteris *dicitur* secum ipse multum agitavisse.” On *dicitur* in Sallust, see Évrard 1990: 137. More generally, see Westlake 1977; Fowler 77f. Oakley ad Liv. 6.33.4 states that in Livy *dicitur* often implies that the truth of the account is doubtful, but that sometimes it only hints at the use of a source.

³⁵ Many codices read *dicunt*; see, however, the argument of McGushin ad loc. for *dicant*.

At the same time, the insertion of additional voices has the same functions as the expressions of uncertainty examined in section I. The ambiguity expresses the confusion at the level of the action and engages the reader who must weigh the different versions himself. Moreover, it can be argued to have a rhetorical function. Piso's death is the end of a brief excursus into an earlier conspiracy. Its ambiguity throws the clarity of the main plot in relief. Sallust goes on to give *verbatim* a speech by Catilina (BC 20). Again, the uncertainty about marginal details underscores the reliability of the main account.

b) Even with the instances quoted above, the voices of the sources and earlier historians are barely perceptible in Sallust. Yet, there are other additional voices in Sallust's narration. While the λέγεται-phrases refer to utterances in the present, quite a few anonymous comments are situated in the past.³⁶ They are either single utterances or contradicting versions, with or without Sallust's assessment. Some of them describe reactions to events and may be seen as belonging to the story.³⁷ For example, in BJ 86.3 Marius's decision to recruit his soldiers without regard for their *classis* is commented upon by two anonymous voices:

Id factum alii inopia bonorum, alii per ambitionem consulis memorabant, quod ab eo genere celebratus auctusque erat et homini potentiam quaerenti egentissimus quisque opportunissimus, quoi neque sua cara, quippe quae nulla sunt, et omnia cum pretio honesta videntur.

Some said that he did this through lack of good men, others because of a desire to curry favor, since that class had given him honor and rank and since to one who aspires to power the poorest man is the most helpful, since he does not hold his own possessions dear, having none, and considers anything honorable for which he receives pay.

Here, the contradicting voices do have a function at the intradiegetic level, for they mirror the political tensions in the Republic. The focus on *inopia bonorum* can be traced back to a popular point of view,³⁸ particularly since the passage follows Marius's long speech in which he attacks the nobility's corruption; the second explanation with the spiteful phrase *quoi neque sua*

³⁶ On anonymous voices in ancient historiography, see Pauw. See also Ries, Shatzman, and Allison on Tacitus.

³⁷ Davidson shows the prominent function of different layers of spectatorship ranging from the historical protagonists to the readers in Polybios. My focus is more narrow, since I do not take into view focalization but confine my discussion to the level of voice.

³⁸ Koestermann ad 86.2f. disregards the function of voice when he writes: "Der Historiker faßt zwei mögliche Deutungen ins Auge, entweder *inopia bonorum* (im Adjektiv

cara, quippe quae nulla sunt presents the nobility's perspective. As Marius has just said, the nobility does not acknowledge his achievements. The unresolved tension between the juxtaposed voices underlines the ambivalent portrait of Marius that Sallust implicitly presents with his speech.³⁹

However, most often the anonymity of the inserted voices suggests that the main function of the comments lies not at the intradiegetic level, but in the introduction of additional voices at the extradiegetic level. Their employment enables Sallust to mention explanations which he does not want to vouch for. For example, in *BJ* 36.3 he quotes one opinion why the war was dragging on under Albinus: "Ac fuere qui tum Albinum haud ignarum consili regis existumarent neque ex tanta properantia tam facile tractum bellum socordia magis quam dolo crederent" (There were some who thought that even then Albinus was not unaware of the king's design, and who found it impossible to believe that the ease with which the king protracted a war begun with such urgency was not due rather to guile than to incompetence). Similar to the expressions of uncertainty, the juxtaposition of extradiegetic voices helps to engage the readers and has a rhetorical function. Let us turn to another passage in which Marius is the object of divergent judgments. Since he does not claim any privileges for himself, but shares the life of his soldiers, he disciplines the army more by earning their respect than by inflicting punitive measures, *BJ* 100.5:

Quod multi per ambitionem fieri aiebant, alii a pueritia consuetam duritiam et alia quae ceteri miserias vocant voluptati habuisse. Nisi tamen res publica, pariter ac saevissimo imperio, bene atque decore gesta.

Many said that he did this through a desire for popularity; others that he himself took pleasure in hardship, to which he had been accustomed from childhood, and in other things which the rest of mankind call afflictions. But at all events, its service to our country was as great and as glorious as it could have been with the severest discipline.

The readers are offered two different possibilities to make sense of Marius's self-discipline. As in the knights' attack on Caesar, the explanations do not really exclude each other, but refer to different levels. The first one emphasizes Marius's motive for his ascetic lifestyle, the second one focuses on its genesis. In addition, the first has a negative bias and manages to turn Marius's

verrät sich seine wahre Einschätzung der besitzenden Klassen) oder aber *ambitio* als Grund für sein Vorgehen..."

³⁹ Vretska 1955: 112–120 emphasizes the questionable aspects of Marius's speech, which contribute to the ambiguous character of Marius in *BJ*.

modesty into something negative. The reader is presented with two different perspectives and is forced to make a judgment himself.

Furthermore, I suggest that the use of two extradiegetic voices also has a rhetorical function. Like with the comments on Marius's draft, Sallust does not evaluate either of them explicitly, but he adds his own judgment, emphasizing the positive impact on the Republic of Marius's toughness. Seen from this angle, Sallust uses the anonymous comments as a foil for his own assessment. The juxtaposition presents him as a narrator who is beyond party strife, truly concerned about the Republic's state.

Let us look at another example: Sallust quotes different explanations for Memmius's anger after being called backed to Rome, *BJ* 82.3:

Quam rem alii in superbiam vortebant, alii bonum ingenium contumelia ad-censum esse, multi quod iam parta victoria ex manibus eriperetur: nobis satis cognitum est illum magis honore Mari quam iniuria sua excruciatum neque tam anxie laturum fuisse si adempta provincia alii quam Mario traderetur.

Some attributed his conduct on this occasion to arrogance; others declared that a noble spirit had been exasperated by insult; many thought that it was due to the fact that the victory which he had already won was snatched from his grasp. Personally, I feel confident that he was tormented more by the honor done to Marius than by the affront to himself, and that he would have felt less annoyance if the province had been taken from him to be given to any man other than Marius.

Two explanations refer to Memmius's character, the first with a negative evaluation (*superbia*); the second being based on a positive image (*bonum ingenium*); the third interpretation traces the anger back to the disappointing situation. Again, the introduction provides the reader with a complex image, highlighting different aspects and offering different assessments. This time, however, Sallust's own point contains an implicit evaluation that obviously rules out the third explanation: it is not the fact that he is deprived of a victory that bothers Memmius most. Moreover, the second part of Sallust's statement—it is the promotion of Marius in particular that annoys Memmius—runs against the second explanation according to which it was shame that affected him.⁴⁰ Thereby, the narratorial comment implicitly backs up the first point of view. This ties in well with Sallust's criticism of Memmius's *superbia* in *BJ* 64.1.⁴¹

⁴⁰ Koestermann ad loc. argues that *iniuria* and *contumelia* are nearly identical. He gives Metellus's utterance in Gell. 12.9.4 as evidence: *tanto vobis quam mihi maiorem iniuriam atque contumeliam facit*.

⁴¹ On the negative character of the assessment, see Levene 1992: 61f.

Why, then, does Sallust offer divergent assessments without explicitly opting for one of them, although he seems to favor one? First, the phrase *magis...quam* shows that the case may not be that clear-cut. The juxtaposition of different explanations establishes a more complex account, prompting the reader to reflect upon different explanations. Second, the juxtaposition of his own judgement to the opinions of those who clearly have a partisan point of view highlights Sallust's reliability. Third, his assessment appears to be objective, since it follows the criticism of other assessments. Quoting different opinions, then questioning all but one is much more effective than simply stating this judgement.

So far, the examples which I have given for the employment of additional extradiegetic voices resemble the passages in which Sallust presents different accounts himself. Both focus on motives and causes for the characters' actions. In a few cases, Sallust uses anonymous voices to mention events he is uncertain of. He concludes his view of Catilina's circle with the following claim, *BC* 14.7: "Scio fuisse nonnullos qui ita existumarent, iuventutem quae domum Catilinae frequentabat parum honeste pudicitiam habuisse; sed ex aliis rebus quam quod quoiquam id conpertum foret haec fama valebat" (I am aware that some have believed that the young men who frequented Catiline's house set but little store by their chastity; but that report became current rather for other reasons than because anyone had evidence of its truth). Sallust's caution is already expressed in the indirect phrasing for homosexual relations. Moreover, in a ring composition, Sallust builds up a strong contrast between his own account and the stories about homosexual relations in Catilina's circle:⁴² the juxtaposition of *scio*—*existumarent* at the beginning is taken up by the contrast *conpertum foret*—*fama* in the end. This device further serves to increase the tension: *fama* expresses the unreliability more clearly than *existumare*, and Sallust's own knowledge is widened into what *quisquam* can know.

Why after all does Sallust tell this story if evidence cannot be given for it? I think it serves two goals: mentioning but explicitly not guaranteeing the truth of a story enables Sallust to stimulate his readers' fantasies about what was going on among Catilina's friends without committing himself to a dubious account. Moreover, the insertion of unverified stories highlights the reliability of Sallust's account. Sallust can have his cake *and* eat it *and* get credit for it too.

The account of the first meeting of the conspirators ends with the following passage, *BC* 22.1–3:

⁴² Cicero mentions homosexual relations between Catilina and his friends; *Cat.* 2.8.23.

Fuere ea tempestate qui dicerent Catilinam, oratione habita, quom ad ius iurandum popularis sceleris sui adigeret, humani corporis sanguinem vino permixtum in pateris circumtulisse; inde quom post execrationem omnes degustavissent, sicuti in sollemnibus sacris fieri consuevit, aperuisse consilium suom [atque eo dictitare fecisse] quo inter se fidi magis forent, alius alii tanti facinoris conscii. Nonnulli ficta et haec et multa praeterea existumabant ab iis qui Ciceronis invidiam, quae postea orta est, leniri credebant atrocitate sceleris eorum qui poenas dederant. Nobis ea res pro magnitudine parum conperta est.

It was said at the time that when Catiline, after finishing his address, compelled the participants in his crime to take an oath, he passed around bowls of human blood mixed with wine; that when after an imprecation upon traitors all had tasted it, as is usual in solemn rites, he disclosed his project, and his end in so doing was, they say, that they might be more faithful to one another because they shared the guilty knowledge of so dreadful a deed. Others thought that these and many other details were invented by men who believed that the hostility which afterwards arose against Cicero would be moderated by exaggerating the guilt of the conspirators whom he had put to death. For my own part I have too little evidence for pronouncing upon a matter of such weight.

Like the homosexual activities of Catilina and his companions, the blood-oath is a rather irrelevant detail. Why does Sallust bother to tell it when he is unwilling to vouch for its truth? Here, he does not carefully circumscribe the rumor, but even elaborates on it.⁴³ The terror of the blood-oath is underscored by the comparison to regular sacrifices, which is rhetorically emphasized through alliteration: *sicuti in sollemnibus sacris fieri consuevit*. Despite this difference, the two reasons that explain the ambiguity about the *impudicitia* of Catilina's circle apply again: quoting other voices allows Sallust to spice up his account without undermining his claim to being a trustworthy historian.⁴⁴ On the contrary, the explicit juxtaposition to other sources in fact highlights the reliability of his own account.

Another point about which Sallust is uncertain is the role of Crassus in the conspiracy of Catilina. In *BC* 17.7, he quotes those who believed that Crassus joined the conspiracy:

Fuere item ea tempestate qui crederent M. Licinium Crassum non ignarum eius consili fuisse: quia Cn. Pompeius, invisus ipsi, magnum exercitum ductabat, quouiisvis opes voluisse contra illius potentiam crescere, simul confisum, si coniuratio valuisset, facile apud illos principem se fore.

⁴³ Gärtner 459–62 argues that rich details in Sallust's account are inspired by the model of Hellenistic historiography.

⁴⁴ Cf. Vretska 1976 ad 22.1. McGushin ad loc. discusses the sources for this report.

There were also at that time some who believed that Marcus Licinius Crassus was not wholly ignorant of the plot; that because his enemy Gaius Pompeius was in command of a large army, he was willing to see anyone's influence grow in opposition to the power of his rival, fully believing meanwhile that if the conspirators should be successful, he would easily be the leading man among them.

Sallust neither affirms nor rejects this account; apart from the rumors about the blood-oath and *impudicitia*, he does not question the possibility of safe knowledge. He even adds some weight to the story by quoting two explanations that were given for Crassus's involvement.

Sallust later presents Crassus again through different voices. When the conspiracy has already been dismantled, L. Tarquinius, caught on his way to Catilina, affirms the account that Volturcius has given of Catilina's plans, *BC* 48.4–9:

Praeterea se missum a M. Crasso qui Catilinae nuntiaret ne eum Lentulus et Cethegus alique ex coniuratione deprehensi terrerent, eoque magis properaret ad urbem adcedere, quo et ceterorum animos reficeret et illi facilius e periculo eriperentur. Sed ubi Tarquinius Crassum nominavit, hominem nobilem, maximis divitiis, summa potentia, (1) alii rem incredibilem rati, (2) pars tametsi verum existumabant, (2a) tamen quia in tali tempore tanta vis hominis magis leniunda quam exagitanda videbatur, (2b) plerique Crasso ex negotiis privatis obnoxii, conclamant indicem falsum esse, deque ea re postulant uti referatur. Itaque consulente Cicerone frequens senatus decernit Tarquini indicium falsum videri eumque in vinculis retinendum neque amplius potestatem faciundam, nisi de eo indicaret quodius consilio tantam rem esset mentitus. (1a) Erant eo tempore qui existumarent indicium illud a P. Autronio machinatum quo facilius, appellato Crasso, per societatem periculi reliquos illius potentia tegetet; (1b) alii Tarquinium a Cicerone inmisum aiebant, ne Crassus more suo suscepto malorum patrociniū rem publicam conturbaret. (1c) Ipsum Crassum ego postea praedicantem audiui tantam illam contumeliam sibi a Cicerone inpositam.

He added that he had been sent by Marcus Crassus to advise Catiline not to be alarmed by the arrest of Lentulus, Cethegus, and the other conspirators, but to make the greater haste to come to the city, in order that he might thereby revive the spirits of the rest, and that they might the more easily be saved from their danger. As soon, however, as Tarquinius named Crassus, a noble of great wealth and of the highest rank, some thought the charge incredible; others believed it to be true, but thought that in such a crisis so powerful a man ought to be propitiated rather than exasperated. There were many, too, who were under obligation to Crassus through private business relations. All these loudly insisted that the one giving the information was false and they

therefore demand that the matter be laid before the senate. Accordingly, on the motion of Cicero, the senate in full session voted that the testimony of Tarquinius appeared to be false; that he should be kept in chains and given no further hearing until he revealed the name of the man at whose instigation he had lied about a matter of such moment. At the time some believed that this charge had been trumped up by Publius Autronius, in order that by naming Crassus and involving him in the danger he might shield the rest behind his influence. Others declared that Tarquinius had been instigated by Cicero, to prevent Crassus from taking up the cause of the wicked, after his custom, and embroiling the state. I heard Crassus himself assert afterwards that this grave insult was put upon him by Cicero.

Again, Sallust neither affirms nor rejects Crassus's involvement in the conspiracy; he subtly intertwines different accounts including motives and explanations.⁴⁵ First, he juxtaposes those who did not believe Tarquinius (1) and those who did (2). Then, he elaborates on the motives which led the second group to support the incarceration of Tarquinius despite their belief (2a and b). Finally, he returns to the first group and gives their explanations as to why Tarquinius had lied (1a–c).

What is the reader to make of this? On the one hand, the observation that the first part of Tarquinius's report ties in well with Volturcius's confession might back up the reliability of his accusation of Crassus. On the other, the ring composition, the extensive review of explanations for Tarquinius's lie and the fact that in the end Sallust reports the statement that he himself (*ego*) had from Crassus may incline the reader to be sceptical about Tarquinius's accusations. Again, taking up different voices enables Sallust to integrate accounts, the truth of which he might not want to vouch for.⁴⁶

But is the ambiguity *only* due to Sallust's historical judgment, which does not allow him to decide in favor of one version? The fact that Sallust neither comments on the reliability of the sources nor explicitly denies the possibility of a clear assessment allows us to suggest another reading. The ambiguity

⁴⁵ For a thorough analysis of this passage, see Batstone 1986: 108–114, who already argues that the ambiguities in Sallust's account are a mimetic expression of the obscurities of the events themselves. In one aspect, my analysis deviates from his interpretation. Batstone 1986: 108f. points out that the members of group 2b could belong either to group 1 or 2. While this is possible, I think it is most likely that, parallel to 2a, 2b signifies a part of group 2.

⁴⁶ In this case, it is not only Crassus, but Cicero who appears in a rather shady light. First, he is said to have been the driving force behind Tarquinius's incarceration, and then Sallust quotes the opinion that he set up the whole intrigue to intimidate Crassus. On Sallust's view of Cicero, see the literature given by McGushin ad *BC* 22.3.

which the unvalued juxtaposition of different versions evokes transfers the uncertainty from the level of the story to the level of the discourse. This ties in well with the observation that all the cases in which Sallust is uncertain not of motives but of facts are from the *BC*. As Sallust has it, the Catilinarian conspiracy, being the symptom of a deep crisis, seriously destabilized the Republic. The danger of Catilina creeps from the story into its representation—the discourse mirrors the story. Confronting divergent accounts the readers themselves experience the instability of the *res publica* that Catilina's contemporaries had to face.⁴⁷

Like Herodotus, Sallust introduces additional extradiegetic voices in his narrative. However, his use of them is different from the Herodotean practice. While Herodotus extensively quotes (and names) his sources, in Sallust the comments are anonymous and tend to be short. The introduction of anonymous comments may well refer to different accounts and allow Sallust to present stories the truth of which he would not want to vouch for.⁴⁸ Yet, we can see the same functions that I have noted for the expressions of uncertainty: at the level of rhetoric, the extradiegetic voices underscore the reliability of the narrator, while at the level of the reception, they engage the reader; moreover, there is a mimetic dimension when the form of the presentation comes to mirror its content.

III. CONCLUSION

My reading of the narratorial voice in Sallust's monographs has revealed a narrator very different from Thucydides, to whom Sallust has been compared since antiquity. While in the narrative parts of the *Histories* the narrator is nearly invisible, the Sallustian narrator comes to the fore again and again, referring to his research and structuring his narrative.⁴⁹ Most rare in Thucydides are the passages in which doubts or alternative versions are presented.⁵⁰ In Sallust, however, the narrator is often uncertain of the motives of his characters. Moreover, he quotes other extradiegetic voices that give comments on the story. While the Thucydidean style evokes the impression of the events

⁴⁷ Cf. Batstone 1986; 1990; Gunderson.

⁴⁸ This would align him with Tacitus. Allison 139 argues that the latter refers to sources when he speaks of rumor.

⁴⁹ Hornblower 1994a, 17 n. 30 notes that there are very few cross-references in Thucydides.

⁵⁰ Hornblower 1994b, 151f. with n. 57. Hornblower 2004: 300 notes that Thuc. 5.65.3 is the only passage in which Thucydides expresses uncertainty by an unadjudicated alternative and argues for "a gesture towards the Herodotean subject-manner."

telling themselves, the voice of the Sallustian narrator reinforces the gap between narrative and events.

These features of Sallust's voice remind us more of Herodotus who makes his narratorial presence permanently felt by giving alternative versions and juxtaposing different accounts.⁵¹ Moreover, two of the functions that the expressions of uncertainty and the insertion of additional extradiegetic voices have in Sallust can be found in Herodotus. Already the *pater historiae* uses these means to highlight his reliability and to engage his readers.

Yet, the similarity has its limits. Herodotus's alternative versions can be far lengthier than the brief remarks in Sallust most of which only focus on the motivation of his characters. Often, accounts that Herodotus claims are wrong contain some truth at a non-representational level.⁵² Moreover, Herodotus seems to present different accounts when he truly cannot decide in favor of one version.⁵³ I would not go so far as to exclude that Sallust's statements of uncertainty and the mention of different versions can be a sincere indication that he does not exactly know what happened. However, another function seems to be more important: time and again, Sallust restricts his narratorial knowledge to the perspective of his characters and, furthermore, makes the discourse mirror the story. Sallust's narrative conveys the feeling of experiencing the events like a contemporary witness.⁵⁴

This mimetic dimension is not only un-Herodotean, but is also to be distinguished from the objectivity of Thucydides's account. The free unfolding of the Thucydidean narrative makes the reader often believe he has access to the events from an omniscient perspective; Sallust, however, establishes a mimetic effect by the restriction of his focus. Reading the *BC* and *BJ*, we are led by a narrator with a very skillfull and distinctive voice which not only strongly engages and subtly directs the reader, but also manages to achieve a mimetic effect and appear reliable at the same time.

⁵¹ Moreover, Herodotus gives cross-references; cf. Brock 8–10 who assumes with Johnson 248f. that cross-references are an indicator of the process of writing (13). In contrast, Hornblower 1994a: 17 n. 30 regards them as a trace of the *Histories'* oral background. However, there is no reason to argue that the cross-references in Sallust are Herodotean. Cross-references are too widely spread in Latin literature for this. See Star.

⁵² Lateiner 77: "False or inadequate histories can contain valuable truths and preserve illuminating false opinion. Veracity is only one historical criterion."

⁵³ Cf. Jacoby 473f. I am not convinced by Fehling's thesis that Herodotus has made up most of his sources. Cf. the literature on this debate given by Fowler 81 n. 125.

⁵⁴ On the mimetic dimension of Sallust's work, see the literature in n. 22. On mimesis in ancient historiography in general see Fornara 30–32. For an interesting study of mimesis in Polybios, see Davidson.

WORKS CITED

- Allison, J. W. 1990. "Dissimulatio. Tiberius or Tacitus?" In J. W. Allison, ed., *Conflict, Antithesis, and the Ancient Historian*. Columbus. 133–155.
- Ankersmit, F. R. 1994. *History and Tropology. The Rise and Fall of Metaphor*. Berkeley.
- Avenarius, W. 1957. "Die griechischen Vorbilder des Sallust." *SO* 33: 48–86.
- Barthes, R. 1967. "Le discours de l'histoire." *Information sur les sciences sociales* 6: 65–75.
- Batstone, W. 1986. "Incerta pro Certis. An Interpretation of Sallust *Bellum Catilinae* 48.4–49.4." *Ramus* 15: 105–121.
- . 1988. "The Antithesis of Virtue. Sallust's Synkrisis and the Crisis of the Late Republic." *CA* 7: 1–29.
- . 1990. "Intellectual Conflict and Mimesis in Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae*." In J. W. Allison, ed. *Conflict, Antithesis, and the Ancient Historian*. Columbus. 112–132.
- Booth, W. 1961. *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. Chicago.
- Brock, P. 2003. "Authorial Voice and Narrative Management in Herodotus." In P. Derow and R. Parker, eds. *Herodotus and His World. Essays from a Conference in Memory of George Forrest*. Oxford. 3–16.
- Calabi, I. 1951. "I commentarii di Silla come fonte storica." *Atti della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, s. 8 Memorie. Classe di Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche* 3: 247–302.
- Carr, D. 1986. *Time, Narrative, and History*. Bloomington.
- Carroll, N. 1990. "Interpretation, History and Narrative." *The Monist* 73: 134–166.
- Carrard, P. 1992. *Poetics of the New History. French Historical Discourse from Braudel to Chartier*. Baltimore.
- Chatman, S. 1978. *Story and Discourse. Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film*. Ithaca.
- Cohn, D. 1990. "Signposts of Fictionality." *Poetics Today* 11: 775–804.
- Connor, W. R. 1985. "Narrative Discourse in Thucydides." In *The Greek Historians. Literature and History: Papers presented to A. E. Raubitschek*. Stanford. 1–17.
- Culler, J. 1980. "Fabula and Sujzhet in the Analysis of Narrative. Some American Discussion." *Poetics Today* 1: 27–37.
- Davidson, J. 1991. "The Gaze in Polybios' *Histories*." *JRS* 81: 10–24.
- Derrida, J. 1982. *L'oreille de l'autre. Otobiographies, transferts, traduction*. Montreal.
- Dewald, C. 1987. "Narrative Surface and Authorial Voice in Herodotus' *Histories*." *Arethusa* 20: 147–170.
- . 1999. "The Figured Stage. Focalizing the Historical Narratives of Herodotus and Tragedy." In T. M. Falkner et al., eds., *Contextualizing Classics. Ideology, Performance, Dialogue. Essays in Honour of J. J. Peradotto*. Lanham. 221–252.
- . 2002. "'I didn't give my own genealogy'. Herodotus and the Authorial Persona." In E. Bakker et al. (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*. Leiden. 276–289.
- Earl, D. C. 1979. "Nunc ad inceptum redeo. (Sallust, *BJ* 4.9). An Unreal Problem?" *LCM* 4: 43.
- Eco, U. 1979. *The Role of the Reader. Exploration in the Semiotics of Texts*. Bloomington.
- Évrard, É. 1990. "L'émergence du narrateur principal dans le *Bellum Iugurthinum* de Salluste." *Lexis* 5–6: 127–146.
- Évrard, É. 1997. "L'émergence du narrateur principal dans l'œuvre de Salluste." In R. Poignault, ed., *Présence de Salluste*. Tours. 13–26.

- Fish, S. 1980. *Is There a Text in this Class? The Authority of Interpretive Communities*. Cambridge.
- Fornara, C. W. 1983. *The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome*. Berkeley.
- Fowler, R. L. 1996. "Herodotos and His Contemporaries." *JHS* 116: 62–87.
- Gadamer, H.-G. 1986. *Wahrheit und Methode. Grundzüge einer philosophischen Hermeneutik*. Tübingen.
- Gärtner, H. A. 1960. "Erzählfomen bei Sallust." *Historia* 35: 449–473.
- Genette, G. 1969. *Figures II*. Paris.
- . 1972. *Figures III*. Paris.
- . 1991. *Fiction et Diction*. Paris.
- Godley, A. D. 1920–1925. *Herodotus. With an English Translation*. Cambridge MA.
- Goldhill, S. 2002. *The Invention of Prose*. Oxford.
- Grethlein, J. 2006. "Nam quid ea memorem... The Dialectical Relation of *res gestae* and *memoria rerum gestarum* in Sallust's *Bellum Iugurthinum*." *CQ* 56.1: 135–148.
- Gribble, D. 1998. "Narrator Interventions in Thucydides." *JHS* 118: 41–67.
- Gunderson, E. 2000. "The History of the Mind and the Philosophy of History in Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae*." *Ramus* 29: 85–126.
- Hamburger, K. 1957. *Die Logik der Dichtung*. Stuttgart.
- Hornblower, S. 1994b. "Narratology and Narrative Techniques in Thucydides." In S. Hornblower, ed., *Greek Historiography*. Oxford. 131–66.
- . 1994a. "Introduction: Summary of the Papers; The Story of Greek Historiography; Intertextuality and the Greek Historians." In S. Hornblower, ed., *Greek Historiography*. Oxford. 1–72.
- . 2004. *Thucydides and Pindar. Historical Narrative and the World of Epinikian Poetry*. Oxford.
- Iser, W. 1976. *Der Akt des Lesens*. Munich.
- . 2000. *The Range of Interpretation*. New York.
- Jacoby, F. 1913. "Herodotus." In *RE, Suppl.* 2. Stuttgart. 205–520.
- Jauf, H. R. 1970. *Literaturgeschichte als Provokation*. Frankfurt.
- . 1997. *Ästhetische Erfahrung und literarische Hermeneutik*. 2nd ed. 1982. Frankfurt.
- Johnson, W. A. 1994. "Oral Performance and the Composition of Herodotus' *Histories*." *GRBS* 35: 229–254.
- de Jong, I. 1987. *Narrators and Focalizers. The Presentation of the Story in the Iliad*. Amsterdam.
- . 1991. *Narrative in Drama. The Art of Euripidean Messenger-Speech*. Leiden.
- Kellner, H. 1989. *Language and Historical Representation. Getting the Story Crooked*. Madison.
- Koestermann, E. 1971. *C. Sallustius Crispus. Bellum Iugurthinum*. Heidelberg.
- Kraus, C. 1999. "Jugurthine Disorder." In C. Kraus, ed., *The Limits of Historiography. Genre and Narrative in Ancient Historical Texts*. Leiden. 217–47.
- La Penna, A. 1968. *Sallustio e la "rivoluzione" Romana*. Milan.
- Lateiner, D. 1989. *The Historical Method of Herodotus*. Toronto.
- . 1992. "Sallust's Jugurtha. An 'Historical Fragment'." *JRS* 82: 53–70.
- . 2000. "Catiline and Cato the Censor." *CQ* 50: 170–191.

- Loroux, N. 1986. "Thucydide a écrit la guerre du Peloponnèse." *Métis* 1: 139–161.
- Lorenz, C. 1998. "Can Histories be True? Narrativism, Positivism and the 'Metaphorical Turn.'" *H&T* 37: 309–329.
- Marincola, J. 1997. *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography*. Cambridge.
- Martinez, M. and Scheffel, M. 2003. "Narratology and Theory of Fiction. Remarks on a Complex Relationship." In T. Kindt and H.-H. Müller, eds., *What is Narratology? Questions and Answers Regarding the Status of a Theory*. Berlin. 221–37.
- McGushin, P. 1977. *C. Sallustius Crispus. Bellum Catilinae*. Leiden.
- Nelles, W. 1990. "Getting Focalization Into Focus." *Poetics Today* 11: 365–382.
- Nicols, J. 1999. "Sallust and the Greek Historical Tradition." In R. Mellor and L. Tritle, eds., *Text and Tradition. Studies in Greek History and Historiography in Honor of M. Chambers*. Claremont. 329–344.
- Nünning, A. 1999. "Verbal Fictions? Kritische Überlegungen und narratologische Alternativen zu Hayden Whites Einebnung des Gegensatzes zwischen Historiographie und Literatur." *Literaturwissenschaftliches Jahrbuch* 40: 351–380.
- Oakley, S. P. 1997. *A Commentary on Livy, Books VI–X*. I. Oxford.
- Patzer, H. 1941. "Sallust und Thukydides." *Neue Jahrbücher* 4: 124–36.
- Paul, G. M. 1984. *A Historical Commentary on Sallust's Bellum Jugurthinum*. Liverpool.
- Pauw, D. A. 1980. "Impersonal Expressions and Unidentified Spokesmen in Greek and Roman Historiography and Biography." *AClass* 23: 83–95.
- Pedrick, V. and Rabinowitz, N. S. eds. 1986. "Introduction." *Audience-Oriented Criticism and the Classics = Arethusa* 19.2: 105–14.
- Perrochat, P. 1949. *Les Modèles Grecs de Salluste*. Paris.
- Petersmann, G. 1993. "Die Fiktionalisierung von Fakten. Kompositionsstrukturen als Fiktionalitätssignale bei Sallust und Tacitus." *AU* 36: 8–18.
- Pier, J. 2003. "On the Semiotic Parameters of Narrative. A Critique of Story and Discourse." *What is Narratology: Questions and Answers Regarding the Status of a Theory*. In T. Kindt and H.-H. Müller, eds. Berlin. 73–97.
- Renehan, R. 1976. "A Traditional Pattern of Imitation in Sallust and His Sources." *CP* 71: 97–105.
- Ricoeur, P. 1983–1985. *Temps et récit. I-III*. Paris.
- . 2000. *La mémoire, l'histoire, l'oubli*. Paris.
- Ries, W. 1969. *Gerücht, Gerede, öffentliche Meinung. Interpretationen zur Psychologie und Darstellungskunst des Tacitus*. Heidelberg.
- Rood, T. 1998. *Thucydides. Narrative and Explanation*. Oxford.
- Rolfe, J. C. 2000. *Sallust*. Cambridge.
- Scanlon, T. F. 1980. *The Influence of Thucydides on Sallust*. Heidelberg.
- Schmal, S. 2001. *Sallust*. Hildesheim.
- Shatzman, I. 1974. "Tacitean Rumours." *Latomus* 33: 549–78.
- Skard, E. 1932. "Studien zur Sprache der *Epistulae ad Caesarem*." *SO* 10: 61–98.
- Skard, E. 1956. *Sallust und seine Vorgänger. Eine sprachliche Untersuchung*. Oslo.
- Sklenář, R. 1998. "La République des Signes. Caesar, Cato, and the Language of Sallustian Morality." *TAPA* 128: 205–217.
- Smith, B. H. 1981. "Narrative Versions, Narrative Theories." In W. J. T. Mitchell, ed., *On Narrative*. Chicago. 209–232.

- Star, R. J. 1981. "Cross-References in Roman Prose." *AJP* 102: 431–37.
- Sternberg, M. 1978. *Expositional Modes and Temporal Ordering in Fiction*. Baltimore.
- Suleiman, S. R. and Crosman, I. eds. 1980. *The Reader in the Text. Essays on Audience and Interpretation*. Princeton.
- Todorov, T. 1980. "The Categories of Literary Narrative." *Papers on Language and Literature* 16: 3–36.
- Tompkins, J. P. ed. 1980. *Reader-Response Criticism. From Formalism to Post-Structuralism*. Baltimore.
- Trüdinger, K. 1918. *Studien zur Geschichte der griechisch-römischen Ethnographie*. Basel.
- Vitelli, C. 1898. "Note ed appunti sull' autobiografia di Lucio Cornelio Silla." *SIFC* 6: 353–394.
- Vretska, K. 1955. *Studien zu Sallusts Bellum Jugurthinum*. Wien.
- . 1976. *Sallust. De Catilinae Coniuratione*. I–II. Heidelberg.
- Warning, R. ed. 1975. *Rezeptionsästhetik. Theorie und Praxis*. Munich.
- Westlake, H. D. 1977. "λέγεται in Thucydides." *Mnemosyne* 30: 345–362.
- . 1989. *Studies in Thucydides and Greek History*. Bristol.
- Wheeldon, M. 1989. "True Stories. The Reception of Historiography in Antiquity." In A. Cameron, ed., *History as Text. The Writing of Ancient History*. London. 33–63.
- White, H. 1973. *Metahistory. The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe*. Baltimore.
- . 1978. *Tropics of Discourse. Essays in Cultural Criticism*. Baltimore.
- . 1987. *The Content of the Form. Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation*. Baltimore.
- . 1999. *Figural Realism. Studies in the Mimesis Effect*. Baltimore.
- Wiedemann, T. 1979. "Nunc ad inceptum redeo. Sallust, Jugurtha 4.9 and Cato." *LCM* 4: 13–16.