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Sallust nowhere explicitly compares his historical works to that of Thucydides, yet his debt to Thucydides in themes, style and even certain passages is evident in the Bellum Catilinae, the Bellum Jugurthinum, and the Historiae. When in the first monograph Sallust pays tribute to the great talent of the recorders of Athenian deeds we may assume that Thucydides is among them: "sed quia provenere ibi scriptorum magna ingenia, per terrarum orbem Atheniensium facta pro maximis celebrantur" (BC 8.3). Even the final words of this tribute recall the Thucydidean phrase, "ἐπὶ τὸ μείζον κοσμοῦντες" (I.21.1). We can also surmise that Sallust was familiar with the history of the Peloponnesian War as related by Thucydides and by Xenophon from his references to the War and its aftermath in Bellum Catilinae 2.2 and 51.28-31. Sallust himself tells us that he has read much (mihi multa legenti, BC 53.2), a fact evident from his sophisticated style. Whether his familiarity with Thucydides was mainly through selected "purple patches" chosen for rhetorical schools, or whether he knew Thucydides's entire work well can only be determined from a close examination of Sallust's use of Thucydides in his writing.

Although Sallust does not expressly admit his debt to Thucydides, as, for instance, Lucretius does with regard to Ennius (Lucr. I.117-126), or Horace with Lucilius (Serm. I.4), the emulation and similarity were apparent to the ancients: aemulumque Thucydidis Sallustium

1
(Vell.Pat. II.36.2); "nec opponere Thucydidi Sallustium verear" (Quint. Inst. X.101-102).

Scholarship on the subject of Sallust's debt to Thucydides over the past century began with several doctoral theses and an article; the main virtue of all these was their careful illustration of stylistic devices and passages. Dolega (1871) has collected Thucydidean passages, _sententiae_ and Graecisms in Sallust and has compared the plan and structure of Sallust to Thucydides. Robolski's (1881) list of rhetorical devices used by both authors is still the most comprehensive collection of its kind, even if some of the suggested parallels are inaccurate. Mack (1906) contains an interesting but unconvincing argument that Caesar's speech in the _Catilina_ is structurally comparable to Diodotus's speech in the Mytilenean debate. Mack's second _Programm_ (1907) collects parallel passages which supplied many useful citations for more interpretative studies.

These earlier comparative studies provided a basis for the important work of the last forty years whose task has apparently been to determine more precisely why, in what ways, and to what extent Sallust's style and thought have been influenced by Thucydides. In general the problems which have occupied these scholars are as follows: 1) the personal, historical, or literary reasons for Sallust's imitation of Thucydides; 2) the stylistic forms of imitation including antithesis, variation, brevity, dramatic unity and Graecisms; 3) resemblance to or translation of passages in Thucydides including discussions of whether Sallust was familiar merely with selections from Thucydides chosen for the rhetorical
schools or whether he knew the entire text; and 4) the extent to which Sallust has adopted Thucydidean concepts of history, e.g. objectivity, moral concepts of virtue, expediency, greed, etc., the need for leadership, concern for the universal, and interest in human nature. Let us briefly review the major arguments of the most important scholars, and see how they have given rise to the present study.

Strebel, writing about Thucydides's influence on Greek and Roman literature, distinguishes the earlier Hellenistic interest in Thucydides from the interest of Roman Atticists who merely sought to copy Thucydides's style and not his universal conception of history. Among these Atticists was Sallust who wrote Poseidonian history in a Thucydidean style. K. Bauhofer, writing at the same time as Strebel, argues that Sallust's historical concepts were a blend of the Thucydidean practice of inquiry for the truth and the Hellenistic or Herodotean aim to delight readers.

H. Patzer in an important article contends that Sallust's imitation of Thucydides evidences a contemporary need for originality in Latin literature. Patzer contends that the degree of imitation argues for Sallust's knowledge of the entire text of Thucydides. Both historians are concerned with the need for leadership, although the moral comments of Thucydides are relegated to digressions. He argues that the view of human nature as the dominant force in history in Historiae 1.7 is essentially the Thucydidean one of III.82.2. He contrasts nicely the views of leadership by demonstrating that whereas Thucydides presents one idealistic speech, the Funeral Oration, and one exemplar of virtue,
Pericles, Sallust must rely on two speeches in the Catilinarian debate and the two complementary ideals of leadership embodied in Caesar and Cato to present his composite picture of *virtus*.

L. Stock, in reaction to Patzer's thesis, radically distinguishes Sallust's and Thucydides' concepts of history, i.e. their political concepts and their concepts of human nature. Thucydides is more interested in politics than morality; for Sallust the two questions are inseparable. For both historians, the circumstances of war and peace determine events, but in entirely different ways. Sallust's ideal leader is simply virtuous; Thucydides's is virtuous and intelligent. The noble element of Sallust's human nature strives for moral ideals; for Thucydides men and nations strive merely for security and self-preservation. Stock concludes: "Sallust hat sich in seinem Denken ebenso als ein echter Römer erwiesen wie Thukdides ein echter Griech ist."

Perrochat in the most comprehensive monograph on Sallust and Thucydides discusses the shared concepts of history (subject, content and procedure), language and style, and imitated or translated passages. The shortcoming of this treatment is that it is too sketchy on the concepts of history shared by Sallust and Thucydides, it does not view style in its contemporary context, and it gives no analysis of the significance of the imitated passages.

Campiche argues that the purposes of the two historians differ since Thucydides wishes to derive the generalized constants from the specifics of events and thereby provide some prescience for the future, whereas Sallust aims to document Roman decline. But I believe that we
must ask not how we view Thucydides, but how Sallust saw him.

Paladini\(^4\) compares and contrasts the historical approaches of the two historians in the following way. They are similar in their attempts to reconcile politics with morality, but Thucydides is politically didactic and Sallust is morally didactic. This is a difference of stress. Sallust often expresses his views openly in the narrative and through direct characterization. Thucydides hides his views by presenting two opposing interpretations of an issue in a debate or an antilogy. Regarding different views of causation, Thucydides usually explains events by citing other preceding events; Sallust does this rather by reference to the characters of the participants. Paladini emphasizes differences and Sallust's sympathy with Thucydides is not fully appreciated.

Astabes\(^5\) briefly surveys the conceptual similarities, including concentration of events by dramatic and rhetorical principles, desire to grasp the truth of the past, the unity of particular events by presenting the more stable elements (e.g. human nature), and the investigation of the psychological motives of persons and groups. In general, Astabes concludes, Sallust excelled in the concentration of his narrative in the monographs; Thucydides applied proper proportion to events and was factually more accurate.

Avenarius\(^6\) argues that Sallust was only familiar with selections from Thucydides I-III and VII. Avenarius, like Perrochat, organizes the imitations according to passages in Thucydides. He finds that although the historical and human concepts underlying Historiae 1.7
and III.82.2 are different, there is some shared sympathy in the unruliness of human nature and in the possible solution of enlightenment by devotion to duty. Avenarius diagnoses the influence of Thucydides on Sallust mainly as a result of the contemporary Thucydidean movement among Atticists.

Büchner is, like Avenarius, conservative in assessing the significance of the imitations. He argues that certain passages in Thucydides, e.g. his analysis of Corcyrean stasis, happened to coincide with a certain Roman reality and were therefore available for reuse. Imitations merely show that Sallust might be a Roman Thucydides or Plato. But behind these incidental imitations, Büchner argues, there are radically different views of human nature depicted in Historiae 1.7 and III.82.2.

Syme finds a great sympathy in the similarly grave, concentrated, antithetical, yet varied styles of both historians and in their attitudes toward human nature, the behavior of language, politics, and psychology. Syme is more explicit on style than on similar attitudes, to which he merely alludes as the possible original reason for Sallust's attraction to Thucydides.

At least one scholar, R. Renehan, has most recently distinguished incidental imitations from purposeful allusions in Sallust. Since allusion is important to the interpretation of many passages in my thesis, it will be helpful to examine Renehan's paper closely.

Renehan has recognized that borrowed phrases bring in train a wealth of connotations due to their traditional associations. Thus well read people will associate Cato in Bellum Catilinae 54.6 with Amphiarius
in Aeschylus (Sept. 592ff.) and the characterization of a virtuous but unfortunate man will be richer for the association. Certain of Sallust's imitations from Cicero, Herodotus, and Plato are similarly analysed.

Regarding Sallust and Thucydides, Renehan suggests the following:

Clearly, by taking over expressions which Thucydides uses in his account of Greek *stasis* and applying them to *res Romanae*, Sallust is making an implicit judgment on Rome: As Greece was then, so Rome is now. This technique is far more effective than a bald statement of opinion would have been ... Sallust is a master of the device.

Renehan notes that this technique, which he calls "a traditional pattern of imitation," was also used by Sallust's sources. Associations between those earlier imitators and their models are in turn examined by Renehan. Isocrates fashions himself as a latter day Socrates by using the autobiographical pattern of the *Apology* in his *Antidosis*, much as Sallust associates himself with Plato the politician turned philosopher (cf. BC 3.3, 4-5, 4.1-2 respectively with Ep. 7.324B, 325A, 325E-326A). The analogy, Isocrates:"Socrates": :Sallust:Plato, can thus be established. So Polybius (31.23-30) models his conversation with Scipio on that of Alcibiades with Socrates in the *First Alcibiades* and the resultant general/teacher relationship may be stated, Alcibiades: "Socrates": :Scipio:Polybius. Renehan's suggestion that Sallust wishes to be associated with Thucydides and Plato as archetypes of previously active public figures who have turned respectively to history and philosophy out of disillusionment is a suggestion which has been made by previous scholars but never so convincingly. The importance of Renehan's study for this thesis is that the device of "a traditional pattern of imitation," roughly equivalent to what I call "allusive
"imitation," is established as a common device among the ancients. Moreover Renehan, unlike other scholars, sees imitations as Sallust himself must have seen them, namely as subtle devices of criticism or praise in his own writing. My thesis relies on the broader associations of imitations particularly in the sections on "Themes" and "Passages."

In general, with the exception of Renehan, recent studies present several inaccuracies. Regarding themes or concepts, they attempt to view Thucydides's work through our own eyes and not Sallust's. Regarding themes and style, they usually fail to distinguish Sallust's use of Thucydides independently in each work to suit the purpose of that work. That there may be a change of purpose from the more ethical in the Bellum Catilinae to the more political in the Bellum Jugurthinum and to a sharper synthesis of both in the Historiae, and that there may be a stylistic evolution toward a more independent word choice and syntax has been suggested by several scholars.\textsuperscript{21} Regarding imitative passages, there have been few attempts to explain the imitations, especially those found in individual allusive passages, in terms of the individual purposes of each of Sallust's works. This study will view imitative themes, style and passages in the context of each work and thus give a more proper perspective to Sallust's developing use of imitation.

The question of Sallust's place among the contemporary Atticists, i.e. his literary reasons for selecting Thucydides as a model, have been thoroughly and convincingly treated by A.D. Leeman\textsuperscript{22} who suggests that Thucydidean Atticism was a new variety of which Sallust was a radical exponent. Therefore I will not treat the question of Sallust's literary choice of Thucydides as model although I will mention the
possible personal and historical reasons for his choice. Nor will I treat the two Epistulae ad Caesarem senem which are attributed by some scholars to Sallust since the letters by nature are not historiographical and will not by definition employ the thematic and stylistic devices used by historians.

This study focuses on those areas in which Sallust has been acknowledged by recent scholars to be imitating Thucydides, namely themes, style, and individual passages. Since the comparison will be based on modern judgments of Sallust and Thucydides as well as on what I judge to be Sallust's view of Thucydides, it is fitting to begin with a chapter comparing Sallust's and Thucydides's individual concepts of history from our perspective, so that basic differences and similarities in both authors' approaches can be acknowledged from the start. Insofar as both authors share a view of history, human nature, crowds, etc., we may proceed to analyse those similar viewpoints in the context of each of Sallust's works. Therefore the second, third and fourth chapters will treat respectively the Bellum Catilinae, the Bellum Jugurthinnum, and the Historiae; and each chapter will contain separate sections on themes, style, and passages. From this comparison it is hoped that despite the important differences in the cultural, political, and personal experiences of Sallust and Thucydides we may recognize how the Roman historian benefits in his own writing from a desire to emulate the Greek's fame and literary contribution to his state. That Sallust had this desire is less debatable than his actual success in becoming the "Roman Thucydides."
The texts relied upon throughout have been Jones's and Powell's Oxford Classical Text of Thucydides, Kurfess's Teubner edition of Sallust, and Maurenbrecher's edition of the Historiae.
Footnotes

Introduction

1 Sallust claims that fortuna celebrates the praises of all deeds more often from whim than out of truth ("ex lubidine magis quam ex vero celebrat", BC 8.1). Thucydides censures the human habit of boasting which often obscures the truth (ἵνα καταλογήσημεν κοιμήσεις, V.68.2). So behind the similar phrases of BC 8.3 and I.21.1 lies a similar suspicion in both historians that fame does not necessarily correspond to truth. All subsequent citations of Thucydides will give the book in Roman numerals followed by chapter and paragraph without mention of Thucydides. Citations of Sallust will similarly omit the author's name and regularly use the abbreviations BC for Bellum Catilinae, BJ for Bellum Jugurthina, and H for Historiae.


4 Silvius Dolega, De Sallustio Immitatore Thucydidis, Demosthenis, Aliorumque Scriptorum Graecorum (Dissertation, Breslau, 1871); J. Robolksi, Sallustius in conformanda oratione quo iure Thucydidis exemplum secutus esse existimetur (Dissertation, Halle, 1881); R. Schild, Quibus in rebus Sallustius Thucydidem respexerit (Programm, Nordhausen, 1888); E. Kornemann, "Thucydides und die römische Historiographie," Ph 63 (1904): 144-153; K. Mack, Quae ratio intercedat inter Sallustii et Thucydidis historicas (Programm, Kremsier, 1906); idem, Quos locos Thucydidis immitatus esse Sallustii vere existimetur (Programm, Kremsier, 1907).


Cf. Horace's dependence on yet innovation from Lucilius in the Sermones.


Stock, p. 130.


Wilhelm Avenarius, "Vorbilder des Sallust," pp. 48-86.


Renehan, p. 97.


CHAPTER I

A COMPARISON OF HISTORICAL CONCEPTS

Introduction

The following comparison and contrast of Sallust and Thucydides in their literary purposes and historical concepts is intended to distinguish important sympathies and differences. The topics in this first chapter, namely "Subject," "Decline and Human Nature," "Politics and States," "Morals and Individuals," "Historical Philosophies," "Τυφώμη and Virtus," and "Religion and Chance," were chosen because former studies have focused upon these issues\(^1\) and because these topics are all basic to our interpretation of Sallust's and Thucydides's attitudes to historiography which will be assumed in the more specific discussions in the later chapters.

We may for the purposes of this study distinguish two types of borrowings from Thucydides employed by Sallust: adaptation of identifiable Thucydidean passages or topoi, and the employment of similar historical attitudes.\(^2\) The former are the surest and most convenient demonstration of influence; to explain the reason for borrowing such passages is a more difficult task. The extent to which Sallust adopted Thucydidean attitudes is the less definable and yet more important question. We must first try to identify the subjects and purposes of Thucydides's and Sallust's works and ask how much these are
in sympathy, how much they differ. Then the more strictly defined borrowings may be examined with greater insight against the background of the general, complementary or contrasting attitudes of each author to his subject.

Subject

At the outset of his History Thucydides contends that his subject, the war between the Athenians and Peloponnesians, was most worthy of record (ἀξιολογοῦτατον) on account of its magnitude; the war was "the greatest disturbance among the Hellenes, some part of the barbarians, and, in a sense, most of mankind" (I.1.2). This disturbance (κίνησις αὐτὴ μεγίστη) may be fairly described as a political earthquake which shook the contemporary world much as the geological one did Delos in 431 B.C. (Δῆλος ἐκινήθη, II.8.3), or as the outbreak of stasis shocked all Greece (πᾶν...τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν ἐκινήθη), III.82.1). Thus Thucydides's narrative is one of a social movement which involves the realignment of political powers along the lines of allegiance. A great political movement is his central topic about whose focus radiate his attitudes to human nature and behavior (I.22.4, 23.6). Moreover he leaves no doubt that his analysis of international movements in history past or to come rests squarely on an evaluation of human principles when he speaks of the recurrence of similar events according to τὸ ἀνθρωπίνον and claims in I.23.6 that the truest explanation of the war was Spartan fear of Athenian growth. The expression "ἀνθρωπεία φύσις " or its synonyms recur often in the History: I.76.3; II.50.1; III.45.7; V.105.1; etc. Human nature is
most significantly described in the History as that by which men seek to rule. We may then properly expect that Thucydides's attitudes to this historical movement will conform to certain assumptions regarding human nature which need to be defined later.

Sallust's scope appears to be limited in the Catilina to an individual's crime and the resultant danger which is memorable on account of its novitas (BC 4.4). His subject in the Jugurtha concerns the Roman people's war with the king, an event notable because of its novel nature, namely the opposition to superbia nobilitatis and the remarkably great, savage and varied character of the conflict (BJ 5.1). Although these subjects are confined largely to the internal politics of Rome, Sallust like Thucydides concerns himself with events universal, momentous and crucial to the documentation of decline. Newness and change, the advent of violent solutions, bode instability and confusion in the state, decline of rule abroad (BC 2.3; BJ 3.2). Unlike Thucydides's treatment, however, developments in the Bella are confined to a lingering decay and the partisan strife within one state, as reflected in a conspiracy and a foreign war. Yet, as in the case of Thucydides's thesis, the unwinding of the movement is described in terms of human character, often in darkly pessimistic tones.

The prologue to the Historiae of Sallust is fragmentary; Sallust's reasons for the choice of this subject can only be surmised. The chronicle begins in 78 B.C., thus resuming at the point where Cornelius Sisenna, a pro-Sullan historian, ended his account; Sisenna's account was well and diligently executed (BJ 95.2). Sallust's scheme may have been to follow "die grossen Linien des Kampfes für die
Freiheit des römischen Volkes" by filling in the period between Sulla's death and the Catilinarian conspiracy yet untreated by others. Or perhaps more accurately Sallust once again wished to indicate to men of reason the particularly crucial events along the contemporary path of moral decay, while he formally side-stepped the affairs of Sullan domination as he had promised in earlier writing. There is one further possible explanation for Sallust's choice of subject matter in the Historiae: Sallust's fascination with the selfish motives of men in his day was topical in his writing. "Civil war, tearing aside words, forms and institutions, gave rein to individual passions and revealed the innermost workings of human nature: Sallustius, plunged deeper into pessimism, found it bad from the roots." The post-Sullan period was appropriate to his thesis and fertile with such themes: "hunc post dominationem L. Sullae lubido maxima invaserat rei publicae capiundae" (BC 5.6; cf. BC 12-13). As in the monographs, the reason for selecting this period for his Historiae springs from Sallust's desire to explore and expose the human character behind the events of decline.

Decline and Human Nature

Sallust and Thucydides share a somewhat similar approach in their treatments of decline in a programmatic concern for the human element: "Sallust puts the individual at the center of the stage and portrays him acting under the sway of the passions. The words for desire and fear abound..." Sallust's prologue to the Historiae and Thucydides's conclusions on Corcyrean stasis best illustrate this parallel:
Nobis primae dissensiones vitio humani ingenii evenere, quod inquies atque indomitum semper inter certamina libertatis aut gloriae aut dominationis agit. (H I.7)

Sallust like Thucydides hinged the recurrence of bitter civil strife on human nature; yet Sallust's characterization seems somewhat bleaker by his description of the fault of human nature as a force always restless and unbridled. In peace time, at least, according to his scheme of human behavior Thucydides allows men to have "better standards" (لاءيوuos τὰς γνώμας,III.82.2).¹²

Decline and human nature are central to both authors' topics which concern the advent of great peril to the state and record reactions typical and exceptional. But the picture of decline is different for each. The greatest danger to Rome spreads from within, according to Sallust, and is better likened to an insidious tabes (BC 10.6, 36.5; BJ 32.4; H 4.46) than the shock of an earthquake. This theme of decline in Sallust will be analysed below in the context of each work. Yet for Thucydides internal, political discord accompanies international conflict, and moral cancer arising from selfish wants eats at political fibers, e.g. the personal calumnies (τὰς ἴδιὰς διαβολὰς) or disagreements (διαφορὰς) among Pericles's successors (II.65.10, 12), personal hatred (ἴδιὰς ἔχομαι) among the Corcyreans (III.81.4), the danger from partisanship (ἐκ τῶν ἴδιῶν) warned of by Pericles (II.42.3), and the personal disagreements (τὰς ἴδιὰς διαφορὰς) among Sicilians condemned by Hermocrates (IV.63.1). But
whereas for Sallust morality requires a constant attention to *virtus* in affairs foreign and domestic, Thucydides seems to distinguish foreign policy which may under favorable circumstances (I.76.3; II.40.4) allow consideration of justice but more usually proceeds according to the imposed will of those in power (I.76.2; V. 89, 105) from domestic policy which strives at all times to enforce individual freedom within the constraints of human divine law (II.37). Civil discord, central to Sallust, must be recognized as subsidiary yet essential to Thucydides's main thesis of the *μεγίστη κίνησις* involving Athenian growth and Spartan fear. Certainly personal disagreements (*αἱ ἀμφοτέροις*) among Pericles's successors (II.65.10) and other salient examples of disagreements between individuals, e.g. Archidamus and Sthenelaides (I.80 ff.), Cleon and Diodotos (III.37 ff.), and Nicia and Alcibiades (VI.9 ff.), are cited by Thucydides as illustrations of the larger, factional divisions of opinion within each state involved in the international conflict which is Thucydides's proper subject. Thucydides similarly justifies his digression on the nature of the Corcyrean *stasis* by noting how it was the first of many such conflicts which shook all Greece (III.82.1). J. Finley in his assessment of Corcyrean *stasis* notes that the words are applicable not only to the whole Greek world but to Athens also "since revolution is expressly cited as the cause of Athens' defeat."  

**Politics and States, Morals and Individuals**  
But broader differences distinguish the similar theme of decline based on human nature. Thucydides's approach to the subject of
Athenian decline deals more with states as characters and their political ideals\(^{15}\): "The intentional idealism of Pericles' Funeral Oration is the moralizing exception which proves his anti-moralizing rule."\(^{16}\) Sallust's approach to Roman decline is more moral and biographical. By "moral" I mean that his dicta are more prone to moralizing. Thucydides describes nations and races playing out a conflict of human motives\(^{17}\); Sallust, particularly in the *Bella*, tends to treat individuals, especially Roman individuals, as embodiments of moral ideals. The theme of international conflict, although essential in Sallust's *Bellum Jugurthum*, is subordinated to show how "by civil discord, war and devastation nearly spelled the end of Italy."\(^{18}\) The discord is illustrated by internal factions surrounding Scaurus, Bestia, Albinus, Metellus, Marius and others. Thucydides's archaeology and prologue (I.1-23) accordingly do not focus on any particular personal agent; his grand subject centers about the conflict of the two greatest Hellenic powers, their allies and resources (I.18.3-19). The narrative of the war is prefaced by an explanation of "the truest explanation" (ἡ ἀληθεστάτη πρόφασις, I.23.6), which has been seen as "a deep seated psychological motive"\(^{19}\). Thucydides distinguishes minor incidents at Corcyra and Potidaea which provided positive grievances for Sparta against Athens, from the real (although not alleged) Spartan fear of Athenian imperialism.\(^{20}\) So by proposing the most general explanation for the war, he lifts the highly specific account of the narrative immediately following (Επίσημανός ἐστιν πόλις...) from the exposition of particular pretexts to a more universal illustration of the psychological interplay between states.\(^{21}\)
Throughout the narrative proper, Thucydides returns to this reliance on the more generic characteristics of each state, namely Athenian ambition and Spartan inertia (cf. I.70-71.3, 118.2, 132.5; IV.55.2; V.63.2, 105.3-4; VI.88.10; VII.48.4; VIII.96.5). At the same time the conflict is assessed in terms of the influence of important leaders or groups within each state. Thucydides duly acknowledges the roles of men like Themistocles (I.138), Pericles (II.65), Cleon and Brasidas (V.16.1), and Alcibiades (VIII.46.1-4, 86.4), each of whom could destroy or stabilize international equilibrium. Similarly factions within states can arouse international attention, e.g., Corcyra (I.31.1-3 and III.69-85), Mytilene (III.47), Plataea (II.2.2), Sicily (IV.59-64), Samos (VII.21). But individuals and factions are regularly treated only with regard to their effects on the greater conflict between Athens and Sparta. Thucydides writes with the constant awareness of this proper theme and the truest explanation, but one which was not professed. Factual accuracy and not irrelevant material which could have been introduced to embellish his account with τὸ μυθώδες (I.22.4) is the object of Thucydides's historical method (I.22.1-3).

Sallust on the other hand selected a more biographical approach and edited according to his view of decline as a largely moral phenomenon. Sallust's mind, although allegedly free from the influences of fear, hope, and partisanship (BC 4.2), was not objective in Thucydides's and our sense of the objectivity of a kind of "political science". Rather Sallust was still writing under the influence of the Hellenistic historians who, "disregarding documentary evidence and
the technique of historical writing, aimed, as a general rule, not at being accurate and learned, but readable." Hellenistic, particularly Isocratean, historiography had through the influence of oratory recognized the validity of the argument from probability. "Progress in this pseudo-science," as G. Williams explains, "depended on a systematic exploration of human nature and character. So it was that the studies of human nature which were relevant to rhetorical education and practice also assisted the historian who used these concepts in his investigation." Sallust places the personalities of his writings at the center of events, a Hellenistic practice but for him without the elaborate pathos and melodramatic devices. Dramatic, "peripatetic" history springing from the Isocratean canons no doubt bore influence directly on Sallust; that school in turn through Coelius Antipater probably recognized the merits of Thucydides as the formulator of the incipient monograph. Thucydides's dramatically unified books VI and VII on the Sicilian expedition, and his briefer excursuses on Pausanias and Themistocles (I.126-138) and the Peisistratids (VI.54-59) show the essential Aristotelian dramatic unities of plot, time and setting from which the monograph sprang. Through one channel or another this mature form came into Sallust's hands as he selected his principles of arrangement. In the monograph a single theme organized around a single person increases the richness and concentration of the writing. So Cicero remarked to L. Lucceius in urging him to fashion, quasi fabula, a monograph on the consul's role in the Catalinarian conspiracy (Ad.fam. V.12). Not the struggle of states and the optimum administration of imperium which were central
to Thucydides's subject, but the individual responses to a state in
decline determine the proper focus of Sallust's writings, as can be
most clearly seen in the fully preserved monographs: each begins
with an account of the antagonist's fall from pristine *virtus* (BC 5.1-
8; BJ 6-8) and ends with his tragic defeat (BC 60.7; BJ 113.6).
Various protagonists balance the biographical account by illustrating
*bonae artes* or some form of *virtus*: in the *Bellum Catilinae*, see
Cicero, Caesar and Cato; in the *Bellum Jugurthinum*, Memmius, Metellus
and Marius.

In addition to the distinctive tendency of each author to de-
scribe conflict in terms of states or individuals, political and moral
emphases distinguish their approaches. Thucydides's approach is
based upon a "truest explanation," the origin of political strife in
conflicting psychological motives, ambition and fear. Moral judgment
is eschewed. In the Melian dialogue, the Athenians urge the Melians
not to take refuge in unreasoned hope, but rather to recognize that
the strong rule and the weak must follow (V.103,105). So also the
Athenian spokesmen at Sparta (I.76) acknowledge "rule of the stronger"
as the basic tenet of human political nature, but admit that those
who can exercise power with justice are most worthy of praise.
Pericles himself justifies Athenian rule as "worthy" (II.41.3), when
circumstances can afford moral worthiness, but later asserts that
Athenian rule must be maintained, tyrannical as it is in character
(II.63.2). These *dicta* do not reflect traditional morality, but
rather expediency. That Thucydides agreed with Pericles's sentiments
is implied in the praise of II.65. Thucydides's *History* is.
psychological and political because its concerns are the human motives of political bodies.

D.C. Earl nicely summarizes Sallust's historical philosophy:
"Sallust's political thought, then, centers on a concept of virtus as the functioning of ingenium to achieve egregiora facinora and thus to win gloria through bonae artes." A moral evaluation of virtus is set forth in the prologues of both monographs in essentially the same form. The man who exercises virtus animi over vis corporis is bound to gain more lasting glory and, as a leader, to hold the state on a steadier course (BC 2.2-6). This central tenet of Sallustian philosophy is consistently illustrated by the individuals in his writings who are portrayed as defenders of virtus or victims of ambitio and avaritia. Descriptions of political groups are not ignored, notably with digressions on the origins of domestic factions such as the depraved Catilinarian conspirators (BC 12-13), the volatile plebs urbana in Catiline's day (BC 36.4-39.5), the partes and factiones in Rome during Jugurtha's revolt (BJ 41-42), and the civil discord which followed the destruction of Carthage (H I.11-12). But Sallust's treatment of these themes in the isolation of the prologues or excursuses is abandoned in the more biographical narrative proper. Personalities represent the values of virtus animi or vis corporis, bonum ingenium or ambitio and avaritia, whereas for Thucydides the state in international conflict is represented as an entire political entity, itself responsible for its actions. So Thucydides does not bother to name names in his condemnation of Pericles's successors. Pericles and Cleon level their criticisms not at individuals but at
the people as a whole who are prone to act without forethought (II.61.2; III.38.1-2). The praise in the funeral oration likewise is directed to the entire democratic city-state (II.37-41). Certainly Pericles and Cleon are strongly characterized respectively as leader and demagogue, but within the whole of the History each man is characterized generally in so much as he directs the events of the city-state by his speeches or by representing a particular view in a debate. Certainly at the root of this political/moral and social/biographical distinction between Thucydides and Sallust lies the real difference in their own political situations, respectively a democratic city-state and an aristocratic empire which fostered in turn pragmatic views about political bodies and idealized, moralistic views centered around outstanding or notorious figureheads of "empire". This hypothesis must stand as such presently and will be investigated later by closer examination of contrasting passages in each man's writings.

In summary the Athenian fall from power is represented by Thucydides as a grand movement concerned with political bodies which can be characterized according to general psychological traits like fear of other nations or partisan hatreds. The process of decline in the late Roman Republic according to Sallust, however, is best described as an insidious contagion which has eroded the values of the state and which manifests itself prominently in the actions of individuals.

These differences in approach are somewhat dictated by nature of subject (a conspiracy requires less international perspective), the
rise in popularity of the historical monograph, and the concern for character portrait in Roman history. But the similarities thus far encountered, i.e., a shared fondness for causality based on human nature, careful dramatic structuring, etc., are largely the result of Sallust's admiration of and sympathy with Thucydides's work.

**Historical Philosophies**

Just as any historian consciously or unconsciously selects his subject, his moral, biographical, political or generic emphasis, and decides on an appropriate medium, so he also approaches his topic with some consistent historical philosophy regarding how and why events unfold. Whether they are chiefly concerned with moral, political, or other causation, good historians do not impose patterns, but discern them _a posteriori_. Accordingly Cicero states, "neque eam [historiam] reperio usquam separatim instructam rhetorum praeceptis: sita enim sunt ante oculos." (De or. II.15.62). Yet some philosophy of history is implicit in each account as an organizing principle. Do events unfold in linear fashion as Hesiod's ages of man or do they recur in repetitive patterns of human behavior as Plato's cycle of constitutions? Here again the two historians differ in approach.

Thucydides implies a view of history as a roughly recurrent pattern when he promises the clear truth of events past and to come according to human nature. So the effective forces in the Archaeology function throughout Thucydides's narrative of the war: e.g., greed of pirates (I.5.1), of Minoan coastal cities (I.8.3) and of the Hellenes (I.13.1); rule of the stronger in the Minoan world (I.8.3), in Agamemnon's expedition (I.9.1); fear aiding Agamemnon's conscription
of forces; self-interest of the tyrants (I.17); the value of dangerous experience in schooling leadership (I.18.3 concerning Athens and Sparta, cf. I.84.4 re Sparta, I.144.3 re Athens). In the narrative proper similar motivations are recognized by the Athenians before the Peloponnesian League who cite honor, fear and profit as consistent with human nature (δ' ἀνθρωπερίς τρόπος, I.76.2) and by the Athenian generals at Melos who claim that it is in conformity with human nature to rule where one has the power to do so (V.105.2). The existence of such a pattern is implied in Pericles's words "even if now we should perhaps yield since all things by nature decline (πάντα γὰρ πέφυκε καὶ ἑλλασσόσθαι, II.64.3), our memory will be left behind..." J. Finley speaks of Thucydides's "recurrent pattern" informed by human nature; Hunter sees it on a grand scale encompassing "patterns not merely of human behavior but type-character, events and even sequences of events." In historical perspective human thoughts, passions, actions and reactions are viewed by Thucydides as recurrent in roughly similar circumstances.

Sallust's linear view of the contemporary republic focuses on the decline of boni mores and virtus, once the basis of the state's well being. In the Bella he maintains the view that boni mores flourished prior to the destruction of Carthage and removal of metus hostilis in 146 B.C. (BC 9; BJ 41.1-2) and that thereafter partisan greed and ambition infected the state (BC 10; BJ 41.3-5). Earl notes that this view was slightly modified in the Historiae where stages of discordia and peace alternated; expulsion of the kings, metus Etruscus, the struggle of the orders, metus Punicus between the second and third
Punic wars, and final contemporary discordia are recorded as a downward spiral of mores.\(^4\) This modification in pattern is difficult to explain from fragmenta and Earl's conjecture that the alteration is "a response to criticism of his earlier idealised view as published in the Bella" is a plausible explanation.\(^4\) In the Bella, at least, Sallust appears to have adopted a scheme describing linear decline resulting from the removal of metus hostilis and breakdown of virtus, a concept which has been assigned to Posidonius\(^4\) and was also found in earlier authors.\(^4\) But, as Syme points out, from whatever source the philosophical tradition of concord arising from fear was transmitted to Sallust, the fact that the linear scheme is based upon the historical fact of the debate between the elder Cato and Scipio Nasica on the advisibility of destroying Carthage, suggests the irrelevance of a discussion of philosophic tradition.\(^4\) With regard to our comparison with Thucydides, two points stand out. First, Sallust espoused, at least for the Bella, an albeit idealized scheme of linear decline for the state and this decline was described in terms of morals. Second, Republican virtus pre-146 B.C. preserved qualities of industria and iustum imperium, qualities which are later associated only with leaders standing as moral paragons. Roman malae artes post-146 B.C. were in abundance by Sallust's day (e.g., BC 3.3-4; BJ 3; H I.18). By focusing on the status of Roman virtus, Sallust fashions a linear schema for the process of Roman well being.

\(\Gamma\nu\varepsilon\mu\nu\ \text{and}
\Virtus\)

For Thucydides and Sallust respectively, political and biographical approaches are described in recurring and linear terms. Yet one
further difference in approach needs to be distinguished, namely their analyses of human psychology. Despite a similar disdain for greed and ambition, Sallust and Thucydides separately establish their own stable elements in the human character by which the passionate side may be restrained. Thucydides implicitly suggests that some form of intelligence or sound judgment (γνώμη) balances man's emotional passions (ὀργή) and that this is in accord with his dominant concern for the political side of conflict, divorced from explicit moral evaluation. Sallust's antithesis sets vis corporis against virtus animi in the somewhat schematized, Platonic fashion of the prologues; this concern with explicit moral judgment conforms to Sallust's overall moral scheme of Roman decline. Yet in each author is a positive, didactic suggestion for the wise and good to pursue γνώμη or virtus as they define these terms.

Although both authors share an appreciation of psychological analysis within their political or moral schemes, further elucidation regarding differences and similarities of analysis is required. Sallust describes an idealized picture of ancestral Roman mores and their consequent linear decline. Thucydides is not concerned with isolating the faculties of γνώμη and ὀργή, or related terms for psychological faculties into such a neat, abstract dichotomy as that of vis corporis and virtus animi as Sallust offers in his prologues. But both historians frequently treat the topical human desires, avarice and ambition, with similar disdain. The clearest borrowing occurs in Sallust's account of Roman decadence, where avarice and ambition, the substance of all evils, flourished after the destruction of Carthage, much as
they did during Corcyrean stasis:

igitur primo pecuniae, deinde imperi cupido crevit: ea quasi materies omnium malorum fuere. (BC 10.3)

Πάντων δ' ἄκουσαν αἴτιον ἀρχην ή διὰ πλεονεξίαν καὶ φιλοτιμίαν (III.82.8)

These synonymously recur in the Catilina as lubido dominandi (2.2), avaritia (3.3), honoris cupido (3.5), lubido ... rei publicae capiundae (5.6), and luxuria et avaritia (5.8, 12.2).

Intellectual qualities, groupable under γνώμη in Thucydides, are weighed as important factors in determining the course of the war; γνώμη, intelligence, is an exceptional facet of human nature sometimes set in opposition to ὁργή, the concept of passion. Both are active and not merely theoretical principles necessarily tied to particular events. Unlike the various manifestations of ὁργή usually associated with larger groups and crowd psychology, γνώμη or the related faculties ξύνεσις and πρόνοια most frequently appear as qualities by which individuals distinguish themselves: Archidamus (I.79.2), Themistocles (I.138.3), Pericles (.140.1), Hermocrates (VI.72.2), Brasidas (IV.81.2), the Peisistratids (VI.54.4). That this intellectual acumen is not necessarily tied to moral excellence displays Thucydides's desire to shed on events a "caractère d'intelligibilité" or "intellectualisme." Exceptional individuals like Brasidas and the Peisistratids (IV.81.2, VI.54.5) with ὁργή καὶ ξύνεσις merely prove that the qualities may indeed be complementary, but not necessarily so. For Thucydides one essential opposite of human ὁργή is γνώμη.
Pericles, the most successful Athenian leader when compared to his successors, illustrates Thucydidean intellectualism in practice (II.65.8). His success hinges on a combination of mental power, oratorical ability, patriotism and freedom from avarice (II.60.5). The latter two factors do not represent a strictly amoral γνώμη except that they follow the dictates of expediency. Preservation of freely granted favors is properly a policy of peace time when διενομοῦσιν γνώμαι are permitted (III.82.2). But when the issue is loss of empire and danger in its administration (II.65.1), all hatred on the part of other states must be borne with a view to self-preservation. Therefore Thucydides's supreme quality of γνώμη, even as embodied by Pericles, is a more intellectual than moral criterion.

Thucydides views intellect, γνώμη, as the cardinal virtue which is opposed to passion, ὁργή. He avoids passionate appeals to justice, τὰ δίκαια, and often illustrates the need to follow the dictates of expediency, τὰ ξύμφερον. This view should be seen within the larger cultural context of Thucydides's day, namely within the contemporary Sophistic movement. Besides the Sophists' acknowledged influence on Thucydides's antithetical and generalizing style, Thucydides's stance on the contemporary issue of natural necessity vs. conventional morality, i.e. φύσις vs. νόμος, is to some degree determined by Sophistic thought. The pre-Sophistic gods of Homer, Hesiod, and Herodotus are banished from Thucydides's History, and with them go both the view of justice administered as divine vengeance for human transgression and the cycle of good fortune followed by disaster. In their place comes human nature and the conflicting elements of ὁργή-γνώμη.
Laws only interfere with the natural right of the stronger as the Athenians and Diodotus maintain (I.76; III.45; V.105), and as Thucydides reports, although he is careful to keep his own views on right of the stronger in the background. Yet Thucydides's conviction that the intelligence of experienced statesmen like Pericles, Themistocles and Archidamus is needed to decide what is most expedient in each situation comes through clearly (II.65; I.138; I.84). It is perhaps Thucydides's chief hope in writing the History that future statesmen can be taught the truth based on human nature which will serve them usefully in the future.

Some Sophists believed that with training in excellence, ἠμητήρ, the man of talent might best manage personal and political affairs. ἠμητήρ in its contemporary moral sense of personal, public, and religious righteousness is rarely used by Thucydides (e.g. IV.81.2 re Brasidas; VI.54.5 re Peisistratids; VII.86.5 re Nicias; VIII.68.1 re Antiphon). Rather he prefers to illustrate the ideal product of his educational aims in the statesmanship of Pericles and the παίδευσις of Athens. Only in the early fourth century were laws, the just man of natural talent, and an ideal of justice reconciled in Plato's Republic, which itself rested on an ingeniously structured moral philosophy, an outcome of the teachings of Socrates and the Sophists.

For Sallust the libidinous aspect of human nature is balanced by virtus animi and various types of bonae artes which include an emphasis on counsel before action (BC 2.6-7), a typical Thucydidean topos. But Sallust is rather more insistent on the necessity of virtus as a
moral remedy for the corruption of the state (BC 53.5). Thus he offers Cato and Caesar as the rare contemporary personifications of virtus, but with different morals (divorsis moribus, BC 53.6). Caesar's outstanding mores were mansuetudo and misericordia; Cato's severitas and dignitas (BC 54.2). In the Bellum Jugurthinum Memmius, Metellus and Marius consecutively stand as exemplars of a qualified virtus. Memmius was a bold tribune of independent character who did not hesitate to stem the tide of corruption among powerful nobles whose dignity was not subverted by anger: "vir acer" (27.2); "libertate ingenii et odio potentiæ nobilitatis" (30.3); "dignitate quam irae magis consuleris" (33.3). Metellus was great and prudent in military strategy (45.1), admittedly a man of virtus (64.1). Although he generally avoided the malae artes of ambitio and saevitia (45.1), as well as avaritia (43.5), like most nobles of the time he had "contemptor animus et superbia" (64.1). Early in life, according to Sallust, Marius displayed virtuous qualities usually associated with nobles: "industria, probitas, militiae magna scientia, animus belli ingens, domi modicus, lubidinis et divitiorum victor, tantum modo gloriae avidus" (63.2). Yet he was later given over headlong into ambition (63.6) as is foreshadowed by his encounter with Metellus (64.5). Despite Marius's praise of the virtus of the novus homo (85), we may question to what extent he actually embodied this ideal.61 The unlettered virtus of Marius was an image certainly not in harmony with what we know of Marius's life 62 regarding his shrewdness in politics, military affairs, and business dealings in Spain. This novus homo was thus depicted as a natural leader schooled in
experience, and not a product of the idle luxury of the noble élite who can only eloquently boast of heroism, not perform its acts (BJ 85.31 ff.). It is within this social context, which opposes the actual virtus of the new man to the inherited dignity of the noble, that we must understand the characterization of Marius. Thus the virtus of the military man here is not far out of line with that of the Thucydidean general who, like Cleon or Brasidas, must be not only a shrewd strategist but also a brave and effective leader in battle.

Sallust's speeches often demolish the speaker's own pretence. As in the Bellum Catilinae, the presence or absence of virtus in individuals of the Bellum Jugurthineum constitutes a crucial theme of Sallust's portrait of decline. Hope rests with individuals so long as desires for wealth or power can be overcome by diligently selfless performance (BJ 114.4). Virtus is the Sallustian opposite of base passion; it is his solution to moral decline (BJ 1.3-4).

The Historiae illustrate the post-Sullan period in which the introduction of luxuria caused virtus to wane, and avaritia atque superbia took hold of Roman youth (BC 12.2). Civil dissension arose from vitium humani ingenii, namely vis corporis, the Sallustian counterpart of virtus (H 1.7). Preludes to Rome's Sullan decadence are treated in moral terms in the prologue where removal of metus Punicus accompanied the introduction of various malae artes: discordia, avaritia, ambitio (H 1.11-12, 16, 18) and the reliance on vires (H 1.18). Sallust's treatment of virtus in the personages of the fragmentary Historiae is difficult to discern. But notably Lepidus's speech and Mithridates's letter to Arsaces suggest the typical
Sallustian concern with subversion of values in the face of civil violence (H 1.55.3 ff.) or for the sake of expedient external alliances (H 4.69.17, 20-21). Among other persons described in the fragments only Sertorius merits explicit praise as "sanctus alia et ingenio validus" (H 1.116; cf. 1.80,84, also favorable). Caesarian, Cato-nian or Metellan types of virtus were scarce between civil wars. Only the deleterious effects of greed and ambition in the wake of Sulla can flourish. Yet it is from a scheme of vitium humani ingenii and virtus hebescens that Sallust devolves his Historiae, the same scheme which arose in the monographs.

For Thucydides however it is characteristic of human nature that ἀφόρος is assumed for motives of fear, honor and profit and maintained with δικη only when possible (I.76.2-3; cf. V.105.2). The most substantial basis for an empire is γυμνῦ by Thucydides's reckoning. Huart offers a pertinent contrast in his analysis of the Athenian basis of success under the leadership of Pericles. Not arms, but Pericles's γυμνῦ is Athens' chief asset:

La victoire d'Athènes à la fin de 431 ... ne fut pas celle, des forces materielles d'Athènes, elle fut celle de la γυμνῦ, et, ce qui est encore plus extraordinaire, de la γυμνῦ d'un seul homme, en face du déchaînement de la folie ... 65

Γυμνῦ, particularly as embodied by Pericles, best answers ἀργυρί (cf. I.140.1; II.21.3-22.1, 59, 65.1). In this Periclean policy for maintaining ἀφόρος the justice and morality which loom so large for Sallust are subordinated to the more immediate problem of survival. Even if the Athenian empire was unjustly obtained, it is fatally dangerous to relinquish it (II.63.2). Sallust shows a disdain for violence as an
effective or necessary solution; the constantly changing situation of events recommends a reliance on the spiritual *ingenium* by which fame and eternal life may be purchased (*BC* 1.3-6; *BJ* 2.3-4, 3.2). Like Athens in 431 B.C., the Rome of Cato's ancestors grew by its spiritual strengths, not its arms:

Nolite existumare maiores nostros armis rem publicam ex parva magnam fecisse ... sed alia fuere, quae illos magnos fecere, quae nobis nulla sunt: domi industria, foris iustum imperium, animus in consulendo liber, neque delicto neque lubidini obnoxius.  

(*BC* 52.19, 21)

**Religion and Chance**

We have observed how Thucydides's and Sallust's views differ on the process of decline roughly in repetitive and linear patterns, how their approaches to historiography, political and biographical, differ, and how each sees a different element of human nature, *γυμνη* and *virtus*, as central to his didactic value. Also, within each great difference, certain views are shared, notably on the deleterious effects of human passions. So too on the topic of religion and chance, important similarities and differences may be discerned. Chance is the unpredictable, metaphysical force which most ancient historians attempt to include within their schemes of history. In general for Thucydides and Sallust the gods are not to be reckoned in events except in so far as men depend upon their aid or claim their allegiance; this might be expected in view of the historians' preoccupation with the human, as shown above. The mysterious element of *τυχή* or *fortuna* plays a quasi divine role in each of their schemes. Yet religious skepticism and views of the force of "chance" are quite distinct for each.
Thucydides nowhere explicitly condemns traditional religious attitudes per se, except when practised to the extreme, e.g. Nicias' over reliance on oracles and signs (VII.50.4), unless we take the Athenian complaint against Melian piety based on unreal hopes as Thucydides's own opinion (V.105.4). He does, however, continually demonstrate the vanity of religious practices or their perverted use as pretences; the oracles about the war's length (V.26), signs regarding the course of the war (II.8.2, 17.2, 54) and the Spartan hypocrisy in using religion as an excuse for political ends, e.g., I.118.3 about the usurpation of Delphic finances, I.127.1 to protest the curse of the Alcmeonidae, II.74.2 (cf. III.68.4) about Sparta's claim of justification in ravaging Plataea, all describe such perversion of religion. Similar is the Athenian pretension to reverence before the Melians (V.105.4). Elsewhere the vain appeals of the Plataeans (III.58), the Melians (V.104) and of Nicias (VII.77.3-4) are recorded to the detriment of piety, as are the superstitions of soldiers during thunderstorms (VII.70.1, VII.79.3). The gods are never quite renounced so long as they might function as usual moderators of licentiousness despite failure in extremis (II.53.4). For men of wisdom in sober human discourse, the gods are of use only when there is a pre-established, material probability of success (V.89,103).

The primary, stable element behind the patterns of history which Thucydides suggests is τὸ ἀνθρώπων (I.22.4). The prognostic value of these patterns is imprecise owing to changing people, nations, situations and the intervention of τὰ μετ' η. 69
... does not dominate at will but denotes minor incalculable variations in the patterns of events. Manifestations of τὸχν are usually recorded when they point out men's folly or wisdom in political decisions; thus Chance is strictly related to the main flow of events and not introduced ex machina as a sensational device. The fact that Pericles (I.143.5), Hermippus (VI.34), Brasidas (II.87.2; IV.81.1), Archidamus (I.78.2), Demosthenes (III.97.2; VII.42.3-5) and others make decisions, usually successful ones, with a view to τὸχν is a measure of their γνωμή, specifically the ability to improvise or provide for sudden mishaps. Proper reactions to the unforeseeable merit Thucydides's attention (II.59.3, 60.1) as they help point out his appreciation of intelligence and his belief in the malleability of events despite an overall determinism. Τὰ παθήματα of non-human causation can only be briefly catalogued and wondered at by the political historian, much as a physician observes medical pathology (I.23.3). Let the expert scientist uncover their significance (II.48.3). Let the historian record them and typical human reactions to τὸχν.

Regarding both sorts of τὸχν, adverse and prosperous, Thucydides states through Diodotus that it is generally easier to shun adversity than maintain prosperity (III.39.4). Good fortune tends to foster ὑβδις; bad encourages recklessness especially for great international undertakings (III.45.6). So Thucydides ominously finds fault with Athens for making too much of ἡ παροῦσῃ εὐτυχίᾳ after Pylos (IV.64.5; cf. V.14.1). The wise remain prudent in prosperity, patient in adversity, so Pericles advises (II.61.2-3). Τὰ δαιμόνια like the
plague must be borne (II.64.1). The Peloponnesian generals remind their men not to fall with \( \tau \nu \chi \eta \) but to remain courageous in \( \gamma \nu \omega \mu \alpha \). \( \tau \nu \chi \eta \) for Thucydides, then, in general does not direct events so much as it serves to demonstrate men's abilities in meeting with effective \( \gamma \nu \omega \mu \eta \) the immediate circumstances which \( \tau \nu \chi \eta \) may induce. Traditional religion is set aside except to illustrate vain hopes or foolish superstitions. But religion too can be important because belief, and action consequent on belief, is part of \( \tau \circ \gamma \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi \lambda \nu \omega \nu \). \( \) 

Fortuna emerges from Sallust's writings as a sinister, unbridled force. Sallust's, like Thucydides's, concept of "chance" largely replaces the gods who only rate a modicum of traditional reverence. Sallust too proposes that prayer without actual power is worthless. In a similar tone Stalin once asked, "how many divisions has the Pope?" Sallust's acknowledgement of the gods is merely formal. When the lazy implore the gods, they become hostile and angry. Along with the other venalia after the destruction of Carthage, men's neglect of the gods (deos neglegere, BC 10.4) crept in. Numidian or soldiering masses cling to pitiable, superstitious substitutes for reverence (BJ 75.9). Sallust's Roman ancestors were, on the other hand, religiosissimi in their temple building (BC 12.3-4) and sacrifices (BC 9.2). Each man's better element, vis in animo, is shared with the gods (BC 1.2). When the gods are willing, Marius tells the people, all things are opportune (BJ 85.48). The wicked, taken by avarice and ambition, are heedless of or hostile to the gods. 

The identification of the gods with fortuna, which they traditionally dispense, is clearly seen in the case of Marius, who heeds the
seer’s advice to rely on his happy fortuna and seek the consulship (BJ 63.1). Marius’s behavior is in clear violation of Sallust’s prescription in the prologue:

animus qui ubi ad gloriam virtutis via grassatur abunde pollens potensque et clarus est neque fortuna eget, quippe probitatem, industrium, aliasque artis bonas neque dare neque eripere cuquam potest (BJ 1.3)

Reliance on fortuna is no certain substitute for the road to virtus. So Sallust reproaches Marius when he describes him as reliant on the gods (dis fretus, BJ 90.1; cf. 63.1).

Fortuna in general is spoken of as a force apart from reverence to the gods which works through its own lubido (BC 8.1, 51.25; BJ 102.9; Ep. I.1.1). Fortunae violentia is spoken of (BC 53.3). Fortuna thus is closely bound to mores and changes with them for better or worse in an obscure interdependence (Is it cause-effect?). At any rate fortuna has the power to upset and confound societies, as it did Rome following the destruction of Carthage (BC 10.1).

The moral connection of fortuna is more clearly related in the Historiae where Philippus exhorts the people with "fortuna meliores sequitur." We may see this bias embodied in Caesar who as exemplar of Sallustian virtus must be favored by fortuna. At least if Epistula ad Caesarem I is genuine, Sallust tells in the words of the consul Appius Claudius Caecus, he is "master of his own fortune," ("faber suae fortunae", Ep. I.1-2). Caesar's fortuna was doubtless a well worn theme which may be derived from Alexander or traced even to the archetypical qualities of Greek heroes. But the point here is that by naming Caesar "master of his fortune" and appealing to Caesar to
establish concord, Sallust offers an interesting parallel to Thucydides who similarly depicts Pericles as the great leader in adversity whom even such misfortunes as the plague failed to change in his policies.

Thus Pericles says to the Athenians:

\[
\text{ἐγὼ μὴν ὁ αὐτὸς εἰμι καὶ οὐκ ἔξισταμαι: ὑμὲς δὲ μεταβάλλετε...καὶ μεταβολὴς μεγάλης, καὶ ταύτης ἐξ δλίγου ἐμπεισόψης ταπείνῇ ὑμῶν ἢ διάνοια ἐγκαρτερεῖν ἢ ἐγνωτε. (II.61.2)
\]

Sallust's gods then, like Thucydides's, are merely shown in their traditional functions and assume no special role in his historical scheme. But Sallust does not depict reverence in such a vain or hypocritical light as does Thucydides. Perhaps the Roman felt that the religion of his society offered more redemptive value so long as it was practised with good counsel and action. "Delicta maiorum in-veritus lues, Romane, donec templae refeceris," Horace warned (Odes III.6.1 ff.), and Sallust may well have agreed with such public piety.

Fortuna by Sallust's time no doubt was largely divorced from religious connotations in historical contexts and was rather employed as a matter of course as an historical agent. Sallust's fortuna may be described as a violent, self-willed force, which may on occasion favor better men. This element of history is not nearly so well integrated as Thucydides's τύχη which is consistently used to demonstrate the response of the wise and thoughtless men toward the unexpected and to explain his appreciation of γνώμην. Fortuna is best employed by Sallust to illustrate Marius's not-so-prudent character as politician and general. Sallust wishes to describe Marius's later, more violent acts as incipient in this early portrait of the too lucky consul.
Conclusion

The purpose of this preface has been to align and distinguish the general attitudes of both historians to their themes, so that the following analysis of similar themes, style and individual passages may be seen in its proper perspective. Important differences emerge despite a common interest in the process of decline according to the passions of human nature. Thucydides rigorously confines his analysis to the political, military, and human repercussions of the "greatest movement" which resulted from the antithetical "personalities" of the two states and their respective allies. Sallust's subject is Rome's internal discord since the loss of concord with the removal of metus hostilis; this party strife is mirrored in a domestic conspiracy, a controversial war, and a tortured period of infida pax. Thucydides viewed the historical process as a roughly recurrent one according to the dominant human qualities of ἀρετή and γνώμη. Sallust generally views Roman progress as a linear decline in terms of vittus from the loftier standards of his ancestors. Sallust is more concerned with individuals as the embodiments of virtues and vices characteristic of larger social trends. His monographs are ideally suited to this biographical approach which was carried on in the fragmentary Historiae, but there the success or failure of dramatic organization around individuals cannot be analyzed. Sallust also tends to be more schematized than Thucydides, as is readily seen from the programmatic prologues which speak of artes in isolation from events, whereas Thucydides treats passion and intellect only as engaged in the narrative. More
important for the purpose of this study, namely to investigate how and why Sallust was influenced by Thucydides, are the similarities in attitude arising from similar personal experiences. Both men, driven from promising military and political careers by vicissitudes of the day, witnessed their states in turbulent decline wrought by the degradation of certain cherished principles. Both witnessed with tragic helplessness the habitual contagion of human desires which causes a reversal of values and the subversion of truth. Traditional religion need only be accounted for as an influence on society and individuals, not a system of divine causation. Obscure chance intervened as the only non-human influence on human events. Therefore contemporary conflicts inspired each man in a different yet comparable way to record the disruptive elements and to esteem the exceptional ones which lend stability.
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CHAPTER II

BELLUM CATILINAE

Introduction

Sallust tells us in his first monograph that he returned to a career of writing when his political ambition waned: "a quo incepto studioque me ambitio mala detinuerat, eodem regressus statui res gestas populi Romani carptim ... perscribere" (BC 4.2). That Sallust was apparently well read in both Greek and Latin is obvious not only from the great number of attestable forerunners,¹ but also from his skilled demonstration of an at times conscious deviance from established literary and rhetorical devices.² In the context of a defense of his accuracy, Sallust cites his wealth of reading and experience: "sed mihi multa legenti multa audienti quae populus Romanus domi militiaeque, mari atque terra, praeclara facinora fecit ... " (BC 53.2). The point is perhaps an obvious one, that Sallust, like most ambitious politicians of his day, was widely read and that many literary influences are bound to affect his writings. Like Cicero and others before him, he sought consolation during his retirement in literary pursuits. But since Sallust's passion for writing is avowed in Bellum Catilinae 4.2 as his true vocation and politics as only an unfortunate detour, we may surmise that despite his late start in writing, he had read much throughout his pre-literary career and long contemplated a return to literary pursuits.

49
According to Cassius Dio (43.9.2), in 45 B.C. upon Sallust's return from his governorship of Numidia, the former praetor was indicted on charges of extortion, but the charges were dropped, perhaps due to Caesar's intervention. How soon after Sallust's fall from politics he had begun writing the Bellum Catilinae cannot be determined from available evidence, but a terminus post quem of 44 B.C. is suggested by the portraits of Cato and Caesar in Bellum Catilinae 54 and by the word fuere in Bellum Catilinae 53.6. It may have been written entirely in 43 B.C. or early in the Triumvirate as a response to Cicero's De Consiliis Suis after that orator's death (Dio 39.10.2f.). In any case, the approximate dating of the late 40's B.C. is sufficient for the purpose of this study. In writing of the events of the Catilinarian conspiracy, Sallust was doubtlessly influenced by the vicissitudes of the last years of Caesar's life and of the contemporary triumviral politics and was still in the shadow of the dictator's death. So the subject of the first monograph, namely the newness of a crime ("sceleris atque periculi novitas") which was later to become common, and his highlighting of certain events within the narration, e.g. the emergence of a plebs urbana (BC 36.4-35.9), certainly have been chosen in view of their contemporary relevance.

Sallust's pervasive imitation of Thucydides in themes, style and passages in the Bellum Catilinae suggests that the imitation cannot be construed as incidental as it might be in the case of many other Sallustian forerunners with the notable exception of Cato the Elder. As the subject of Sallust's monograph was chosen in view of its
contemporary relevance, so Thucydidean themes, stylistic techniques, and passages, as will be investigated below, have been chosen due to their relevance both to the subject of the work and to the author's view of contemporary politics. That Sallust had learned the political lessons of the Peloponnesian War is explicitly mentioned by the author in the prologue of the *Bellum Catilinae* when he cites Athenian and Spartan "desire to rule" as the original cause of that war and of the general oppression following the benign rule of kings in prehistoric times: "postea veroque quam in Asia Cyrus, in Graecia Lacedaemonii et Athenienses coeptere urbis atque nationes subigere, lubidinem dominandi causam belli habere, maximam gloriam in maximo imperio putare ..." *(BC 2.2).* (Note also the similarity between Sallust's and Thucydides's descriptions of prehistoric kingship:

"igitur initio reges — nam in terris nomen imperi id primum fuit — diversi pars ingenium, alii corpus exercebant" *(BC 2.1)*

\[\text{πρότερον ἡσαύ ἐπὶ ὁποῖες γέρασι πατρικαὶ βασιλεῖαι (I.13))}.\]

This doctrine of "desire for power" (*lubido dominandi*; πλεονεξία) perhaps originated in the Machtpolitik teachings of the Sophists (e.g. Callicles in Plat. *Gorg.* 483D, and Thrasymachus in Plat. *Rep.* 344Af.), but Sallust himself may well have become familiar with the doctrine, especially as applied to the Peloponnesian War, through Thucydides (cf. especially I.76, V.105). Again, later in the monograph *(BC 51)*, Sallust through Caesar's words applies the Athenians' lesson to Rome. Just as Athens' initial foolish acceptance (*stulta laetitia*) of the Thirty Tyrants later changed to servitude and regret, so Caesar warns that due to the vagaries of human nature in a large
state, a single consul may exercise a violent and unjust rule over Romans: "sed in magna civitate multa et varia ingenia sunt, ... ubi hoc exemplo per senatus decretam consul gladium eduxerit, quis illi finem statuet aut quis moderabitur?" (BC 51.35). Granted that the savagery of the Thirty Tyrants was recorded by Xenophon (Hell. 2.3.4), Aristotle (Ath.Pol. 34.3-4) and Ephorus (seen in Diodorus, 14.3-6) as well as Lysias, Andocides and Isocrates, and that Sallust probably learned of it from these writers, nevertheless the degeneration of Athens from Pericles to the Thirty must have been viewed by Sallust and other Romans as an important lesson regarding the use of power in a great state as conveyed by Thucydides.

In addition to Thucydides's political relevance, there is the equally strong argument for Sallust's choice of this model in his purely literary preference for an historian whose style betrays an opposition to the normally smooth and balanced prose of his day and who claims that his approach to his subject is more objective due to his noninvolvement in politics:

"statui res gestas populi Romani carptim, ut quaeque memoria digna videbantur, perscribere, eo magis quod mihi a spe metu partibus rei publicae animus liber erat." (BC 4.2)

καὶ ξυνέβη μοι φεύγειν ... καὶ γενομένος παρ' ἀμφοτέροις τοῖς πράγμασι ... καθ' ἑσυχίαν τι αὐτῶν μᾶλλον αἰσθέσθαι. (V.26.5)

The claim of objectivity and accuracy was a topos among ancient historians, but this claim together with the fact of both historians' departures from politics suggests a sympathy in Thucydides's and Sallust's cases, if not a literal correspondence between the two passages.
Sallust's choice of Thucydides as a stylistic model was also rooted in the literary scene of Late Republican Rome. A.P. Leeman constructs a careful and convincing argument that Sallust in adopting Thucydides as a model for his seriousness, loftiness and impressiveness (σεμνότης, μεγαλοπρέπεια, κατάπληξις, Dion. Hal. Thuc. 50) was departing from other forms of Atticist style in his day. This Sallustian style Leeman names "modernist Atticism," to be distinguished from the "pure Atticism" of Lysias, Calidius, Brutus, and Calvus (ca. 60 B.C. in Rome) and from the "primitive Atticism" which takes Thucydides as an exemplar, but with the caution of proprietas: "ut noto civilique et proprio sermone utatur vitetque quam maximam obscuritatem Sallustii et audaciam in translationem" (Suetonius, de Gramm. 10.1 citing Ateius's warnings to Pollio). The warning is that of Ateius Philologus, Sallust's former tutor in rhetoric, to his student Asinius Pollio. Asinius Pollio is the chief example of "primitive Atticism", which had begun before 46 B.C. "Modernist Atticism" then emerged after 46 B.C., that is after the publication of the Orator, and probably was at its strongest after the death of Cicero. It is best evidenced in Sallust, Annius Cimber, and "Sallustianus" L. Arruntius. But as Leeman elsewhere points out, perhaps Sallust's chief contribution to Atticism was to combine Greek analogical innovation with the archaizing tendency and the brevity of Cato, a combination which, as we may surmise from Cicero (Brut. 65), was entirely original. Along with Cato comes the flavor of traditional mores; with Thucydides comes seriousness, obscurity and brevity. It was not the flowing, periodic style in
history sought by Cicero (Or. 66), but rather a struggling style born of
the effort to match contemporary political turbulence in words:
"facta dictis exaequanda sunt" (BC 3.2). Let us turn first to
Thucydidean themes in the Bellum Catilinae.

Themes

Several themes which suggest a comparison with Thucydides, already
discussed in the context of my first chapter, appear in the first mono-
graph. The flourishing of greed and ambition and the consequent decline
of morals in the state is noted by both. The common people are disdained
since they contribute to the crisis within the state. The process of
moral decline in Greece and at Rome is likened to a plague with similar
symptoms of immorality. Moralizing themes are familiar topoi among
Greek and Roman historians, but verbal and conceptual similarities in
Thucydides's and Sallust's descriptions suggest that Thucydides was an
important model.

Ambition: Lubido dominandi

Thucydides's analysis of the strife amidst stasis enticed Sallust
in his first work to adapt it to his purposes in at least three places
(BC 2, re government in general; 10, re Rome post 146 B.C.; 36-39, re
the formation of a plebs urbana), and with a special interest in the
description of the operation of greed and the reversal of values.
Sallust's borrowing of the concept of lubido dominandi as the basis of
moral decay indicates his adherence to the Thucydidean belief that the
desire for power when not tempered by intelligent leadership is a force
for corrosive decay (BC 2.3-4 re early kings; 5.6 re Sulla; 52.21 re temperate rule of Roman ancestors. Cf. Thuc. I.76.3; II.40.4-5). It is a force which, according to Sallust, also precipitated the Persian and Peloponnesian Wars and was indeed active in his own time (BC 2.2-4). Thucydides's equivalent might be ἁρχὴ ἢ διὰ πλεονεξίαν καὶ φιλοτιμίαν (III.82.8). Sallust's solution to the problem of this corruptive force is found in virtuous leadership, especially a fair and moderate type much like that of the Pericles of Thucydides's eulogy (II.65.5-7).

The qualities of a good leader, bonae artes, and their opposites, malae artes, are Sallust's innovations. Sallust freely uses artes meaning "qualities" in the prologue both in a positive sense (BC 2.4; 2.9; 9.3; 10.4; 11.2) and in a negative sense, as in malae artes (BC 3.4; 5.7; 13.5). Artes are a Sallustian innovation, one that later appealed to Tacitus (e.g. Hist. I.10; Ann. I.9, 28). But they are cautiously confined to the prologue (BC 1-13) where they serve their diagnostic, analytical purpose (although they come to be used more liberally throughout the narrative of the Bellum Jugurthinum). Artes are a convenient polarization of psychological qualities vis-a-vis the cruder, more realistic sketch of civil turmoil by Thucydides. Regarding Thucydides, A.W. Gomme remarks:

In his history ... Thucydides is more recorder than philosopher even though we may feel that he was always thinking of general laws - but thinking about rather than formulating them and giving them to the general world.

It is enlightening in this context to note that Thucydides's most explicitly philosophical excursus, III.82-3, which is an exceptional passage proving his non-philosophizing rule, is the very passage most
often imitated by Sallust. The traditional moral connotations of "moral excellence" have been carefully avoided with few exceptions (e.g. VII.86.5 re Nicias). Peace allows "nobler standards" (δύνατον τὰς γνώμας) whereas "war vulgarizes the sentiments of the majority with its immediate needs" (πρὸς τὰ παρόντα τὰς ὑπάρχοντα κατὰ πολλῶν δύναμιν, III.82.2). This is the essence of his schematization of human psychology in war and peace. But even Thucydid's γνώμη-δραγὴ dichotomy is one common to his age and does not involve the innovation and sententious ambiguity of peculiar terms as bonae or malae artes. We may also note that Sallust calls those who lack bonae artes, but who, nevertheless, seek glory, honor and power ignavi: "sed ille [bonus] vera via nititur, huic [ignavo] quia bonae artes desunt, dolis atque fallaciis contendit" (BC 11.2; cf. 12.5). This characterization of ignavi becomes more prominent in the Bellum Jugurthinum, and there we will see that it roughly corresponds to Thucydides's ἀποδάγμονες, the useless, inactive and cowardly citizens.

Disdain for the Crowd: Plebs and οχλος

We noted in Chapter 1 that both authors show contempt for the crowd (plebs, οχλος), a similar attitude perhaps, but one which stems from widely different political, social and personal circumstances. The contempt is similar in its manifestations, and it is a natural bias for men who were once part of the influential elite and who later fell from popular favor and public prestige. The particular manifestations of this disdain must be examined in detail for each author.
Thucydides cites the gullibility by which τὸ πλὴθος or ὁ χλὸς easily might or does fall prey to the suggestions of various orators: Pericles (II.65.8), Cleon (III.37.5), Diodotus (III.42.6, 43.2), Cleon (IV.21), Brasidas (IV.84.2), the Athenian spokesmen at Melos (V.85), Athenagoras (VI.35), those who urged Alcibiades's recall (VI.89.4), Athenian messengers from the Syracusan front (VII.8.2), and Alcibiades (VIII.86.5). Also, critical situations precipitate typical reactions from the crowd. Civil crises breed individual greed and a general disregard for human or divine laws (II.53; III.82.8). In military situations, imminent dangers arouse at times fear and hasty flight (IV.125.1; VII.80.3), at times great civil panic (VIII.92.7, 96.1). When a popular decision ends in failure, the people turn in anger against a scapegoat (II.59.2; VIII.1). In matters large and small the crowd tends to exercise faulty judgment due to a blind acceptance of tradition (I.20.1), prejudice of personal interest (I.21.2), preoccupation with appearances (III.31.1), or presumptive audacity (VI.63.2).

These passages from Thucydides on the crowd's gullibility, its impulsive and greedy behavior, and its lack of prescience seem to have influenced or inspired Sallust's analysis of Roman degeneration. This is particularly evident in Sallust's prologue where he describes the spread of corruption after the fall of Carthage (BC 6-13) and in the digression on the origins of corruption among the plebs urbana (BC 36.5-39.4). These passages suggest the special influence of Thucydides's topical disdain for the crowd.
Thucydides's disdain may have grown out of his aristocratic upbringing. It was the typical pose of the Greek oligarchy to scorn the commoners in defense of their own right to rule (cf. Pindar Pyth. 2.87; Nem. 6.1; Hdt. III.81.1f.; Plato Rep. IV.431B-C). Sallust's attitude to the plebs may have similarly been a common one of the aristocrats of his day; it had been topical in Polybius (VI.56.11) and doubtless other Hellenistic historians. My attribution of special Thucydidean influence rests on similar types of disdain (inconstancy, lack of judgment, gullibility) and certain verbal parallels (Thuc. II.65.1, οπερ φιλεί ομιλος ποιειν; cf. VII.80.3; BJ 34.1 "multitudo ... quae ira fieri amat").

In addition to the broad correspondences between Sallust's prologue and digression in the Bellum Catilinae and Thucydides's plague and stasis, certain references to the inconstancy of the masses suggest a shared view on this theme. Thucydides's aversion seems to center about the crowd's lack of prescient circumstantial judgment and their inconstancy, as well as their tendencies to show greed and fear in critical times. Sallust's evaluation of crowd psychology uncovers similar traits. Fresh news of terror strikes Romans with sudden grief:

Quibus rebus permota civitas atque immuta urbis facies erat. ex summa laetitia atque lascivia, quae diurna quies pepererat, repente omnis tristitia invasit; festinare, trepidare, neque loco neque homini quoiquam satis credere, neque bellum gerere neque pacem habere, suo quisque metu pericula metiri. (BC 31.1-2).

So the Athenians suffered their greatest shock (εκτληξις μεγίστη) with the news from Euboea (VIII.96.1). The humor of the crowd shifts easily with external circumstances; so Caesar in his speech relates how the Athenians were stricken from their sense of stulta laetitia when the
Spartan tyrants turned butchers (BC 51.31). Their variable nature may reveal an attachment to inconstant material wealth:

In terea plebs coniurazione patefacta, quae primo cupida rerum novarum nimis bello favebat, mutata mente Catilinae consilia exsecrari, Ciceronem ad caelum tollere velutí ex servitate erepta gaudium atque laetitiam agitabat ... quippe quoí omnes copiae in usu cotidiano et cultu corporis erant. (BC 48.1-2; cf. the tone of panic in Thuc. VIII.1-2)

As numerous Thucydidean orators seek the easy mark of popular favor, so C. Manlius seeks to arouse the people (plebem sollicitare) in Etruria (BC 28.4), Lentulus solicits the plebs urbana for revolutionary fodder disposed by its mores and fortune (BC 39.6), L. Bestia stirs Faesulan troops with invidia against Cicero, and political factions thrive due to the multitudo civium in the city (BC 51.40; cf. 50.1). Victims of plague and stasis were seduced by their own avarice and ambition in Thucydides's account; likewise the Roman plebs had in the past seceded from the city due to desire to rule (dominandi studium) (BC 33.3) and the band of Allobrogian conspirators were attracted to the hope of a great booty ("magna merces in spe victoriae", BC 41.2).

Sallust seems to sympathise with Thucydides's disdain for the crowd's inconstancy, gullibility and lack of judgment, in short for the vulgar aspect of human nature. For both historians the crowd constitutes a dark backdrop which sharply contrasts with the more brilliant individuals who embody respectively for Thucydides and Sallust, γνώμη and virtus.

The Plague Metaphor

By way of condemning human passions, Sallust twice exploits the metaphor of a moral plague which affects contemporary Rome. Thucydides's
illustration of the moral degeneration of Athenian society at the time of the plague (II.53) obviously serves the more general purpose of recording the psychological reactions of its victims so that the readers may detect similar processes in their own societies. Lucretius, in his translation of Thucydides's plague (6.1138-1286), also chose to emphasize the psychological and to downplay the physical effects of the plague.\(^\text{20}\) In this sense the utility of this passage parallels the function of the medical description: it remains for the physicians to diagnose the disease and reapply the information to similar recurrences (II.48.3).\(^\text{21}\) Sallust accepts the invitation and applies the image of a moral plague to the incidence of a similar, though more generalized, phenomenon in Roman society following the fall of Carthage:

\[... saevire fortuna ac miscere omnia coepit ... Haec primo paulatim crescere, interdum vindicari; post, ubi contagio quasi pestilentia invasit, civitas immutata, imperium ex iustissimo atque optimo crudele intolerandumque factum. (BC 10.6)\]

Thucydides's similar generalization also highlights the aspect of social contamination:

\[πρῶτον τε ἡρξε καὶ ἐσ τῷ ἄλλῳ τῇ πόλει ἐπὶ πλέον ἄνομια τὸ νόσημα. (II.53.1)\]

Both events resemble one another in that a selfish expediency dictated behavior:

\[ambitio multo mortalis falsos fieri subegit, aliud clausum in pectore aliud in lingua habere, amicitias inimicitiasque non ex re sed ex commodo aestumare magisque voltum quam ingenium bonum habere. (BC 10.5)\]

\[ὅτι δὲ ἡ ἤτη τε πανταχόθεν τε ἐσ αὐτὸ κερδαλέου τούτῳ καὶ καλὸν καὶ ἄρσιμον κατέστη (II.53.3)\]

Thus the conventional observances of trust, honesty, reverence and justice were subverted:
namque avaritia fidem probitatem ceteraque artis bonas subvortit; pro his superbia, crudelitate, deos neglegere, omnia venalia habere edocuit. (BC 10.4)

The strains of ambition and deceit in Sallust's digression at the same time shows reference to Thucydides's other, more political digression on social turmoil, the Corcyrean stasis: compare Bellum Catilinae 10.5, quoted on page 60 with

Although Sallust does not directly translate Thucydides's statements on social degeneration, the thematic symptoms of ambition and greed, references to disregard for conventional restraints, and pointed descriptions of the reversal of values suggest the influence of Thucydides's analysis. Sallust's choice of metaphor, the spread of decay as disease at Rome, probably alludes to Thucydides's description of the lawlessness and selfish expediency which accompanied the plague at Athens. Similarly the reversal of values, the dominance of extreme ambition at the expense of any moderate views, recall the morally subversive atmosphere of stasis. Rome after the fall of Carthage, Athens during the plague, and
Corcyra during *stasis* all serve to illustrate a shared focal concern of both historians, namely the disruptive effects of excessive human greed for wealth and power.\(^{22}\) The insistence on explicit metaphor, *uti tabes*, is Sallust's own special emphasis and belies his more insidious and moral picture of decline.

The digression on the *plebs urbana* (BC 36.4-39.5) begins with a description of the miserable situation again using the plague metaphor which Sallust had previously applied to the similar post-Sullan situation: "*tanta vis morbi atque uti tabes plerosque civium animos invaserat*" (BC 36.5). This sentence makes clear Sallust's debt to Thucydides's description of the plague and the implied metaphor of a morally diseased empire therein. Sallust adds comment on the typical nature of plebeian ambition:

... sed omnino cuncta plebs novarum rerum studio Catilinae incepta probabat. Id adeo more suo videbatur facere, nam semper in civitate quibus opes nullae sunt, bonis invidet, malos extollunt, nova ex-optant, odio suarum rerum mutari omnia student, turba atque sedit-ionibus sine cura aluntur, quoniam egestas facile habetur sine damno. (BC 37.1-3)

This final phase echoes Thucydides II.53.2 where the ephemeral nature of material wealth during the Athenian plague encouraged licentious behavior:

\[\text{\`ωστε ταχείας τὰς ἐπαυρέσεις καὶ πρὸς τὸ τερτυὸν ἡξίουν ποιεῖσθαι ἐφήμερα τὰ τε σώματα καὶ τὰ χρήματα ὑμοίως ἠγούμενοι (II.53.2)}\]

The common greed and ambition of the *plebs urbana* with its motley constituency recalls the self-seeking looters during the plague (II.53) as well as the crafty factions during *stasis* (III.82.8).
Finally, we must cautiously note that the "plague metaphor" of civil strife was a common one in Greek and Roman historiography and popular philosophy. Plato in a discussion of afflictions of the soul, identifies disease (νόσος) as a kind of civil strife (στάσις) in the body which has its correlative in the soul:

Νόσος καὶ στάσις οὐ ταύτων νευρώματα... τότερον ἄλλο τι στάσιν ἡγούμενος ἢ τὴν τοῦ φύσει συγγενοῦς έκ τινος διαφοράς διαφορὰν;

(Sophistæ 228a)

Elsewhere Plato uses "to suffer from sickness" (νοσεῖν) and "to engage in civil strife" (στασιάζειν) as synonyms in a discussion of the Isocratean, pan-Hellenic concept that any discord among fellow Greeks should be classified as civil strife:

φόνους... "Ελληνας δὲ Ἠλληνικών, οὐ μόνον τοιούτων δρώσιν, φύσει μεν φίλους εἶναι, νοσεὶν δ' ἐν τῷ τοιούτῳ τὴν Ἑλλάδα καὶ στασιάζειν, καὶ στάσιν τὴν τοιαύτην ἐχθρὰν κλητέων " (Rep. 470c; cf. also Rep.544c, Mx. 243e)

Herodotus also uses the metaphor: η Μίλητος νοσησάσα στάσι (5.28), as does Sophocles: νοσεῖν πόλις (Ant. 1015). It is also common in Demosthenes (e.g. 2.14; 9.39; 50; 18.45; 19.259) and Aristotle (Ath. Pol. 6.4). Yet Sallust's use of the topos (especially contagio quasi pestilentia, BC 10.5 and tanta vis morbi, 36.5) when coupled with the Thucydidean description of stasis based on III.82-3 (especially in the excursus on the plebs urbana, BC 36.4-39.5) "is no doubt influenced by the powerful description of the plague and its moral effects in Thucydides II.47ff."24

**Style**

Sallust's stylistic debt to Thucydides has been widely recognized by both ancient and modern critics who single out particularly the use of brevity, inconcinnity, sententiae, and antithesis.25 My present purpose
in investigating Sallust's stylistic imitation differs from that of previous critics in two ways. First, I wish to isolate those stylistic devices which are particularly relevant to the similar themes of the two historians. The devices to which I refer are the tendency to generalize, i.e. to seek the general truth behind the phenomena of war and civil strife; the tendency to use antithesis but to disrupt the balance intentionally with variation; and finally several incidental techniques, i.e. digressions, character sketches, and speeches, which suggest the special influence of Thucydides. Second, I will treat these devices separately within the context of each work in order to see the imitation within the context of Sallust's stylistic development. This development has been charted by other recent scholars, but not with special reference to Sallust's use of Thucydides.

Generalizations

The Tradition of Generalizations

Sallust and Thucydides show a thematic concern for the general and typical aspects of events. Although this device of generalization has been shared by most important Western historians since Herodotus, it is largely the legacy of Thucydides and therein has been imitated by Sallust. M.I. Finley observes: "[all pre-19th c. A.D. historians] were deeply concerned with general truths and the difficulties in both establishing them and communicating them; in the case of Thucydides, obsessively so."

Thucydides adopted the tendency to generalize most obviously from the Sophists, although it had been inherent in Greek literature since
Homer.\textsuperscript{29} It filtered down to Republican Rome through the study of rhetoric, i.e. the technique of effective communication, which through the liberal minds of Isocrates, Cicero and Quintilain, was reaffirmed as "embracing and making effective all other humane studies."\textsuperscript{30} Proofs were often based on the probability or necessity dictated by human nature. Certainly Sallust was influenced by this rhetorical tradition during his senatorial career and consequently his historical writing.\textsuperscript{31} Yet this direct and fresh influence of Thucydides's technique on Sallust's writing can be seen in his generalizations, particularly those which are translations of Thucydidean ideas, e.g. his comments on crowd psychology (BJ 34.1; cf. II.65.4).

The Style of Generalizations

Demetrius in his treatise \textit{On Style (Περὶ Ἐρμηνείας)} tells us that, stylistically, the best gnomic statements are the briefest: "For brevity is both apothegmatic and gnomic, and it is wiser to concentrate much thought in a small space, just as the potential powers of whole trees are in their seeds."\textsuperscript{32} This theory can be amply illustrated from Greek and Latin maxims: γνῶθι σεαυτόν, ἔρως ἄρει, μηδὲν ἀγαθόν, rem tene, verba sequuntur, etc. Brevity lends to memorability. This brevity which characterizes much of Sallust's writing and particularly his maxims, is a stylistic argument for Sallust's imitation of Thucydides in his use of gnomic generalizations.

The resemblance of the two historians in their brief and gnomic styles was noted by ancient critics. Sallust was criticized by Quintilian according to a theory of rhetoric which valued plain and full
intelligibility above clever brevity:

vitandæst etiam illa Sallustiana (quamquam in ipso virtutis obtinet locum) brevitas et abruptum sermonia genus; quod otiosum fortasse lectorem minus fallat, audientem transvolat, nec dum repetatur exspectat (Quint. Inst. 4.25; cf. ibid, 10.1.32, 10.1.101-102 on immortalis Salustii velocitas matched with Thucydides's brevity)

Seneca evaluated Sallust's antithetical and sententious style in a more positive way and on its own historiographical merits: "Sallustio vigenta amputatae sententiae et verba ante exspectatum cadentia ...

fuere pro cultu" (Ep. XIX.5(114)17). Seneca in fact judged that Sallust surpassed Thucydides in the brevity of his maxims:

cum sit praecipua in Thucydidis virtus brevitas, hac eum Sallustius vicit, et in suis castris illum cecidit; nam in sententia Graeca tam brevi habes quae salvo sensu detrahas ... at ex Sallustii sententia nihil dem sine detrimento sensus potest. (Contr. IX.1.13)

Quintilian similarly notes that Sallust vies with Thucydides in brevity:
"densus et brevis et semper instans sibi Thucydidis" (X.1.73). Among various others Sallust was renowned for his brevity.34

Brevity then is an essential element of Sallust's style; for him as for other ancients it was a necessary compliment to gnomic generalization. Let us merely note at this point that Sallust and Thucydides are both brief and generalizing. We will later examine brevity in connection with the antithetical styles of both authors.

Gnomic generalizations are but one manifestation of Sallust's and Thucydides's tendency to seek the general behind specific events. Generalizing can be seen in an historian's generalizing, epigrammatic sententiae which are also stylistic devices. In their widest sense, generalizations can refer to any historical explanation or causation which is formed from the historian's reading, hearsay evidence, and
first-hand experience. The historian's selection and arrangement of facts can also betray his underlying assumptions. I will, however, confine this discussion to explicitly generalized statements which by insertion into the narrative expand upon the specific facts and tell us "what usually happens in such situations" (e.g. "quod in tali re solet," BJ 15.5; οἶνον ψιλέαν ἐν τῷ τοιούτῳ γίνεσθαι, III.81.5).

Isolated, generalized statements supply the clearest illustrations of the desire of both historians to embody the general in the specific, although the tendency to generalize may also be observed in longer narrative passages, e.g. digressions to place the present strife in a general historical framework (Thuc. I.1-19; BJ 6-13) or in the speeches selected to illustrate a general ideal of virtue (Thuc. II.35-46; BC 51-52). But in our analysis of generalizing statements, we must not confuse them with the related concern for the typical. The selection of the typical in speeches, in narrative passages, and indeed in the subject of an historical work, which attempts to report a series of speeches or events in human history, is allied to the tendency of ancient historians to generalize, that is to show the general truth behind the specific. The typical then consists of words or events which an historian selects to represent the more general, characteristic qualities of other similar phenomena; the selection of the typical is dictated by an historian's generalizations and is the object of them, but is not, strictly speaking, the generalization itself. That is, experience gives rise to a generalization which in turn gives rise to the selection of a typical episode to illustrate the general truth. A good illustration of this process is seen in Sallust's generalization on the Roman formula for success as
gathered from his own reading and listening: "mihi multa legenti, multa audienti ... ac mihi multa agitanti constabat paucorum civium egregiam virtutem cuncta patravisse..." (BC 53.2-4). This generalization thus leads into the famous description of the two typical exempla of *egregia virtus*, Caesar and Cato (BC 54). Similarly, Thucydides's judgment of Pericles's successors who fail to attain Periclean excellence due to their ambitious aims (II.65.10), is illustrated by typically ambitious aims of Cleon (V.16.1). Thus the generalized assumption may be implicit in the historian's process of selection, or it may simply be stated in the form of a maxim. It is this final type of explicit, gnomic generalization in Thucydides and Sallust on which I now wish to focus.

**Sententiae and Gnomae**

We noted that Sallust's and Thucydides's maxims (*sententiae, gnomae*) were first observed by the ancients as stylistic devices typical of both authors (Sen. *Contr*. IX.1.13.14; *Ep.* XIX.5(114),17, 18). Dionysius of Halicarnassus, writing in Rome under Augustus, criticizes Thucydides for his maxims (*νοηματα*) since they interrupt the flow of the sentence by the introduction of parenthetical remarks (Dion. Hal. *Thuc.*, 24.362). But he was mostly admired among the ancients for his quotable *sententiae*. W.K. Pritchett has collected the following testimonia from Plutarch and Marcellinus. Plutarch recognized Thucydides for the abundance of his maxims (*Plut. Fabius Maximus*, 1.8) and at times quotes them (*Plut. Moralia* 540c, 548d, 551a). Marcellinus (*Vita Thuc.* 51) comments: το ὄν γνωμηλογικὸν αὐτοῦ ἐπανειπετο. One modern scholar has counted some one hundred and twenty two maxims in Thucydides's
work and another has noted that the subject of these may be methodological (e.g. I.20.1, 21.1 on the unreliability of hearsay evidence), ethical, political, or concerning the circumstances of war and peace.

Many of Thucydides's maxims occur in parenthesis, as Dionysius noted, and these are usually set off by γαρ or δε (I.42.3, 123; II.45.1, 61.4, 62.3, 64.3; VI.38.4, 78.2). The maxims occur most frequently in speeches or excursuses. They often explain human nature or nature in general:

οἱ γαρ ἄνθρωποι τὰς ἀκοὰς τῶν προγεγενημένων, καὶ ἡ ἐπικήρυξ σφίσιν ἦ, δυσοίως ἀδαμανίτιστως παρὰ ἀλλήλων δέχονται (I.20.1)

πάντα γαρ πέφυκε καὶ ἐλασσοῦσαθαι (II.64.3)

αὐχεῖν δὲ ἔχοντας ἀφαιρεθήναι ἡ κτωμένους ἄτυχήθαι (II.62.3)

καὶ τῶν ἄνθρωπων ἐν ὧν μὲν ἄν πολεμῶσι τὸν παρόντα αἰεὶ μεχίστον κρινόντων (I.21.2)

υφός τε γαρ ἐπιέζοντο κατὰ ἀμφότερα, τῆς τε φροσ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ταύτης σώψης ἐν ἡ ἁπλενούσιν ἄνθρωποι μάλιστα ... (VII.47.2)

Sallust's maxims are similarly methodological (e.g. BC 3.2), ethical, political, or in general about the usual tendencies of human nature in similar circumstances. So Sallust comments in Thucydidean manner on the unreliability of human judgment based on short-term memory: "sed plerique mortales postrema meminere" (BC 51.15; cf. I.21.2 quote above).

These sententiae also resemble Thucydides's in that they are often parenthetically set off by "for" or "but" (nam, enim, igitur sed; cf. γαρ, δε'): sed nostra omnis vis in animo et corpore sita est (BC 1.2)

nam divitiarum et formae gloria fluxa atque fragilis est, virtus clara aeternaque habetur (BC 1.4)

For other examples of this use of sed, see Bellum Catilinar e 1.5, 2.8, 8.1, 10.5, 11.2, 51.12, 35; of nam, see Bellum Catilinar e 1.6, 7.2, 11.2,
20.4, 37.3. Robolski has noted that Sallust's use of nam resembles Thucydides's use of γάρ to expand a thought and sed and igitur resemble δέ in the unusual frequency of their use by Sallust. Also, like Thucydides, Sallust uses these maxims most frequently in speeches, the prologue or excursuses since these passages are by nature more rhetorically embellished. Thus we find generalizations regarding human nature in both authors' accounts of a debate on capital punishment (III.39.4-5; III.45.3; BC 51.1, 52.18, 29).

Occasionally these maxims are stated in the gnomic aorist, a Graecism of style adopted by Sallust: anima oneri fuit (BC 2.8); "[avaritia] neque copia neque inopia minuitur" (BC 11.3). At times they are expressed in clauses using solet which corresponds to Thucydides's εἰσῳδε or φιλεῖ: "quod plerumque in atroci negotio solet" (BC 29.2), "id quod in tali re solet" (BC 30.2), "quanta quoiusque animo audacia natura aut moribus inest, tanta in bello patere solet" (BC 58.2); cf. όινον φιλεῖ ἐν τῷ τοιούτῳ γίγνεσθαι (III.81.5; also I.78.2, 141.6; II.62.3, etc.). This use of solet becomes more frequent in the Bellum Jugurthinum, with the additional neologism of amat in the same sense. 42

Brevity

The brevity which we mentioned as an element of both Sallust's and Thucydides's maxims and of their style in general has been widely recognized by modern scholars as well as by ancient critics. Dionysius says of Thucydides:

The most conspicuous and characteristic features of the author are his efforts to express the largest number of things in the smallest number of words, and to compress a number of thoughts into one, and his
tendency to leave his hearer still expecting to hear something more, all of which things produce a brevity that lacks clearness.

(Dion. Hal. Thuc., 24.363)

Cicero defines brevity as "ita celer est rerum frequentia ut verborum prope numerum sententiarum numero consequatur" (De or. II.56).

Quintilian, like Dionysius, describes Thucydides as a master of such brevity: "densus et brevis et semper instans sibi" (Quint. X.1.73).

The description also fits Sallust whom Seneca Rhetor admits excels Thucydides in this virtue of style: "cum sit praecipua in Thucydide virtus brevitas, hac eum Sallustius vicit et in suis illum castris cecidit." (Seneca, Contr., IX.1.13-14).

Thus both historians strove for brevity. Sallust admits this stylistic ideal together with his claim for accuracy in an important passage in his first monograph where he states his subject: "igitur de Catilinae coniuratione quam verissum potero paucis absolvam" (BC 4.3); and he stresses this quality elsewhere: paucis ... disserere (BC 5.9), "uti paucis verum absolvam" (BC 38.3). The specific manifestations of this brevity, generally classified as brevity of thought and brevity of style, have been investigated thoroughly by others, notably Robolski and Perrochat. Brevity of form can include many constructiones ad sensum, ellipsis (cf. BC 13.2, 48.6, 37.3, 17.6, 55.5; Thuc. I.20, 144; IV.72; VIII.86; etc.), zeugma (BC 17.2), and a pregnant sense in adverbs or in neuter abstract nouns (e.g. ἄπωτας, I.21.1; ἱμαθᾶς, I.140.1).

So Sallust uses the Graecism in incerto habere (BC 41.1) where Thucydides shows ἐν ἄπωτῳ ἔχοντο (I.25.1; cf. II.62.5; III.22.6). Other expressions of uncertainty in Sallust are phrased: in dubio (BC 52.6), in extre mo (BC 52.11), in obscuro (BC 52.12). Thucydides
favors similar phrases: ἐκ τῷ ἀφανεῖ (I.51.2; IV.36.2, 96.5), ἐν τῷ ἀφανεῖ (I.42.2, 138.3; III.23.4). Parallel constructions, particularly with alii ... pars (cf. BC 21, 48.5), and strings of nouns or historic infinitives (cf. BC 11.4, 12.1) also add to the concentrated thought and liveliness of Sallust's narrative:

multi autem ... volventes hostilia cada vera amicum alii, pars hospitium aut cognatum reperiebant; fuere item qui inimicos suos cognoscerent. ita varie per omnem exercitum laetitia, maeror, luctus atque gaudia agitabantur. (BC 61.8-9)

rapere consumere, sua parvi pendere, aliena cupere, pudorem pudicitiam, divina atque humana promiscua, nihil pensi neque moderati habere. (BC 12.2)

Thucydides achieves the same lively, economical description, but using strings of participles rather than nouns or verbs:

τὸς γὰρ ἀντιβολίαν καὶ διλυσμὸν τραπόμενοι ἦσσε ἀπορίαν καθίστασαν, ἄγειν τε σφάσις ἀξιοῦντες καὶ ἕνα ἐκαστὸν ἐπιβιώμενοι εἰ τινὰ ποῦ τίς ὤδοι ἢ ἐταῖρων ἢ ὀικείων, κτλ. ... τα δὲ περὶ τῶν ἐν ὑπανεῖ δεδιότας μὴ πάθωσιν (VII.75.4)

But let us return to the subject of maxims which, as we noted, neatly embody the shared tendencies of both Sallust and Thucydides to strive for brevity and for generalization. A couple of brief, parenthetical maxims from each author expressing similar sentiments on the obscurity of chance and on the need to secure allies by munificence still serve to illustrate how these qualities are combined:

sed perfecta fortuna in omni re dominatur; ea res cunctas ex lubidine magis quam ex vero celebrat obscuratque (BC 8.1)

δουλοὶ γὰρ φρόνησα τὸ αἰφνίδιον καὶ ἀπροσδόκητον καὶ τὸ πλείστω παραδόγμα εξυμβαίνον (II.61.3)

... magisque dandis quam accipiundis beneficiis amicitias parabant (BC 6.5)

οὐ γὰρ πάσχοντες ἐν, ἀλλὰ ὅρωντες κτωμέθα τοὺς φίλους (II.40.4)
Abstract Substantives

One final characteristic of Sallust's style which indicates a shared interest with Thucydides in generalization is in his choice of neuter adjectives or participles as abstract substantives. The to kakon, to agathon, to xumphiou are part of the language of Greek philosophy borrowed by Thucydides. So Latin normally offers malum and bonum as well as the particularly philosophical utile, but Sallust coins malum publicum (BC 77.7). Thus malo rei publica (BC 51.32) corresponds to eti kakon tis polews (II.13), and in place of verba Sallust sometimes uses dicta (BC 3.2, 31.8) which recalls Thucydides's use of to legeomevov or to eirimevov (I.140.2; II.47.3; V.30.1, 39.3; VII.18.2, 77.6). The use of pronominal adjectives is in general a practice of Greek philosophy, but due to its frequent appearance in Thucydides we may suspect that Sallust picked up this form of expression which was alien to Latin from the Greek historian. We may note that elsewhere in Latin, e.g. in the neo-Atticist poets and Cicero's philosophical writings, this neuter abstract was also adopted due either to the poverty of the Latin language or inherent attraction of the Greek style. A passage from each historian will illustrate the philosophical nature of this device:

ambitio multos mortalis falsos fieri subegit, alius clausum in pectore, alius in lingua promptum habere, amicitias inimicitiiasque non ex re, sed ex commodo aestumare ... (BC 10.5)

ta deinotata epexegasan ... ou mechoi tou dikaiou kai tis polei xumphiou protiemevenes, es to ekatespois pou aiei hedonin exon orizontes ...

(III.828)
Antithesis

The Word/Deed Antithesis

We have noted that the Thucydidean stylistic techniques of the Bellum Jugurthinum analysed thus far, namely brevity and gnomic generalizations, include both formal and conceptual imitation. Formally they interrupt the narrative with parenthetical comments on the immediate action and on general themes. By this interruption they may also lend variety and clarity. By their comments they do not forestall or impede but aid the progress of the narrative. Conceptually they introduce, among other things, Thucydidean detachment and disdain for popular sentiment.

A third Thucydidean technique in the Bellum Catilinae, the antithesis of word and deed, also shares this utility of form and thought. What Syme says of Sallust is also true of Thucydides:

He is alert all the time for the contrast between the words and the facts, with an especial delight in orations designed to demolish the speaker. The behavior of language draws his interest provoked or sharpened by the study of Thucydides.48

The imbalanced, ever struggling antitheses in Thucydides's and Sallust's styles suggest a similar struggle in their worlds between imbalanced social forces as will be demonstrated later. The thematic antithesis between words and deeds suggests a gap between the phenomena of word and deed in both authors' historical views. That is, the narration of deeds often demonstrates the false or falsifying arguments of the speeches.

We may note in Sallust's first monograph the Thucydidean interest in reversal of values and meanings: "For some time now we have lost
the true names of things" ("vera vocabula rerum amisimus", BC 52.11); "As they saw fit, they changed the usual sense of words to fit their actions" (τὴν ἐἰσθήσιν ἀξίωσιν τῶν ὀνομάτων ἐσ τὰ ἔργα ἀντιλαξαν, III.82.4). This interest is closely allied to the aforementioned tendency to generalize. The participle, ἐἰσθήσιν, points to this tendency. The general truth or conventional meaning is stated, then contrasted by its actual misuse in current politics. So the contrast of words with deeds, and the consequent moral degeneration of politics, is of central concern to both historians.

But before we look more closely at Sallust's use of this particular Thucydidean technique, let us first define more generally the elements of the antithetical style of both authors and then describe Thucydides's affection for the logos/ergon contrast.

**Antithesis and False Antithesis**

Antithesis was for the ancients merely "the opposition of words or of ideas, or of both, in the two corresponding clauses of a sentence." Of course the device applies as well to opposition within clauses, between sentences, paragraphs, speeches and even entire sections of the narrative. It was, according to Dionysius of Halicarnassus, a "showy feature" (θεατρικα) of Thucydides which was derived from Gorgias (de Thuc. 24.363). The particular variety of antithesis used by Gorgias but favored and developed by Thucydides was false antithesis "where two not antithetical thoughts are expressed in a form which would lead one to expect antithetical thoughts." In addition to paired antithesis, Thucydides thus also exploited variation by false antithesis: ὅ ὦ ὅξ
So variety aids antithesis and the two are closely bound in both historians' styles. Μεταβολή, according to J.G.A. Ros, is a device to avoid repeating at short intervals the same word, phrase or sentence syntax. Due to its original and abundant use in Thucydides, metabolé is Thucydides's own device which "runs in his blood and is as a second nature to him." Variation denotes la rigueur to Thucydides. Thus Thucydides's use of false antithesis plays upon normal antithesis by adding an unexpected variation. For Cicero, antithesis, when it was complete and well balanced was pleasant: "[suave genus dicendi est] cum ex contrariis sumpta verbis verba paribus paria respondeant" (Part. Or. 6.21). But false antithesis (contentio) was avoided by Ciceronian stylists: "contentio est oratio acris" (Auct. Her. 3.13.23); "quae est pericunda, cum orationis non contentione sed sermone tractatur" (Cic. De or. III.53.203).

**Origins and Objectives of Sallust's Antithetical Style**

Sallust's style, like Thucydides's, but unlike Cicero's, regularly strives for false antithesis (contentio). Granted that historia is not is not oratio, Sallust's extremely esoteric style defies Ciceronian canons of propriety. "[Sallust] can be characterized as anti-Ciceronian both in sentence-structure and in vast tracts of his vocabulary," maintains Syme. Sallust avoids the Ciceronian period and maintains a more paratactical syntax. Thucydides likewise favors paratactical
sentence structure which his predecessor Herodotus had favored.\textsuperscript{57}

"This intensity, due primarily to genius, next to the absorbing interest does, in truth, place Thucydides, with all his roughness, far nearer than Antiphon to the ideal of a compact and masterly prose," adds R. Jebb.\textsuperscript{58} A.M. Parry similarly comments, "Thucydides's and Antiphon's and Gorgias's antithetical style is intermediate between the paratactical, strung out style of Herodotus, and the periodic style of Isocrates and Demosthenes."\textsuperscript{59}

Sallust's style, although antithetical in many ways like Thucydides's, did not grow out of a paratactical tradition of prose. Rather it has been derived as a reaction to the popularity of the period, particularly in oratory, in his time. Cicero had similarly reacted to the 'Asianic' style in forming his own. But if Sallust rejects some of Cicero's devices, we should note with caution, he also accepts many others. Nevertheless Sallust, like Thucydides, wrestles with the potential monotony of the paratactical style he has adopted by imposing on it his own \textit{inconcinnitas}\textsuperscript{60} and the result is a Thucydidean, antithetical style whose characteristic elements are the variety and antithesis just mentioned, as well as the brevity discussed above in connection with gnomic generalizations.

The two objectives of Thucydides's antithetical style as summarized by J. Finley\textsuperscript{61} can justly be applied to Sallust: "[His aims are] to fix each specific contrast with utmost precision, but at the same time to give the whole complex of ideas a scope and dignity appropriate to the subject itself." Similarly A. Parry\textsuperscript{62} remarks that Thucydides's style, characterized as "a struggle," only mirrors his belief that "the
free human intellect, by a sophisticated and analytic language, could dominate the outside world. A similar evaluation of style reflecting the struggle experienced by the historian has been applied to Sallust:

Sallust stands in sharp reaction from his whole environment, literary, social, and political. His style is novel and aggressive: he is against the aristocracy ... and also against the triumvirs. Dislikes and disharmonies, so much the better. A powerful will prevails, imposing a uniform colour and manner.

Antagonism to Fine Phrases

Thucydides, Sallust and Nietzsche all felt some alienation from the common spirit of their times and viewed fine phrases with malice: "mein Sinn für Stil, für das Epigramm als Stil, erwacht fast augenblicklich bei der Berührung mit Sallust ... [Ich war streng mit] einem kalten Bosheit gegen das 'schöne Wort,' auch das 'schöne Gefühl.' It has been noted by many that one of the chief aims of the antithetical style of Thucydides and Sallust is to uncover the truth behind fine phrases: "This distinction between thought and actuality, between λόγος and ἔργον, or more or less obvious equivalents, is the real idiosyncracy in Thucydides' style", "he [Sallust] is alert all the time for the contrast between the words and the facts ..."

Let us then focus on the word/deed antithesis as a representative and widely recognized similarity in Sallust's and Thucydides's antithetical styles. Word/deed antithesis is a lexical antithesis, an opposition of meanings, but it does complement verbal and syntactic antithesis. Although we will look primarily at the lexical manifestations of this antithesis in both authors, other forms will be noted.
Word/Deed Antithesis in Thucydides

Thucydides notes the frequent gap between words or reckoning and actions. When there is a discrepancy between the two, misapprehension results and disaster occurs, as illustrated by the Corcyrean Revolt or the end of the Sicilian Campaign. The theme of words cloaking pretexts is one which, as we shall see below, attracted Sallust as it did Thucydides. At Corcyra, for instance, certain Corcyreans in word claim to be prisoners released from the Corinthians on security, but in deed are trying to turn Corcyra over to the Corinthians (τὸ μὲν λόγῳ ... διηγγυημένοι, ἔργῳ δὲ πεπειθμένοι Κορινθίοις Κέρκυραν προσποιήσαι, III.70.1). Party factions served the common need in word but actually created strife (τὰ μὲν κοινὰ λόγῳ θεραπεύοντες ἀθλα ἐποιεῖτο, III.82.8).

In the case of Sicily during a crucial assembly of Athenian Generals, Nicias in fact agrees that their position is weak and that a tactical withdrawal is advisable, but he cloaks his opinion so that the public report of their retreat might not precipitate a disaster: [ὁ Νικιάς] τῷ δὲ λόγῳ οὐκ ἔθούλετο αὔτὰ ἀσθενῆ ἀποδεικνύναι (VII.48.1). As with Sallust, a simple phrase can give the true cause and betray the falsity of the speech which follows this phrase.

The Word/Deed Antithesis in Sallust

We cannot make the transition from Thucydides to Sallust when speaking of a word/deed contrast without at least duly acknowledging the presence of this contrast in earlier Roman thought and Latin style as evidenced, for example, by fragments of the late Republican prose of Q. Claudius Quadrigarius, Am., fr. 16: "sibi per fallacias verba data
esse" and Sempronius Asellio, Res Gestae, fr. 10: "facta sua spectare oportere, non dicta, si minus facundiosa essent." Sallust may have used either or both of these writers as sources of his Bellum Jugurthinum. Even Lucretius condemns clever sounding phrases which allure the fool but are actually "things hidden beneath twisted words" ("inversis quae sub verbis latitantia", I.642). Lucretius's inversa verba in fact remind one of Sallust's conversa rerum natura (B 1.77.13). Sallust's phrase precedes a splendid display of antithetical rhetoric in turn reminiscent of Thucydides's passage on stasis where deeds done in secret and in public (occulta and palam) are contrasted. So in adopting a characteristic word/deed antithesis, Sallust may begin with a natural Latin contrast, but he elaborates upon it in a truth-seeking, Thucydidean manner.

Sallust introduces the word/deed contrast first in the Bellum Catilinae in recognition of the difficulty of his own truth-telling task as an historian: "tamen in primis arduum videtur res gestas scribere: primum quod facta dictis exaequanda sunt" (BC 3.2). Thucydides similarly calls his task "difficult" (χαλεπόν, I.22.1; cf. also χαλεπόν γιὰ τὸ μετρίως εἰπεῖν, II.35.2). Since many readers or listeners will find the words uncomfortable, they are apt to criticize the historian as biased and therefore adapting the truth of the facts by means of his own words:

dein quia plerique quae delicta reprehenderis malevolentia et invidia dicta putant, ubi de magna virtute atque gloria bonorum memoris, quae sibi quisque facilia factu putat, aequo animo accipit, supra ea veluti ficta pro falsis ducit. (BC 3.2)
Through the words of Pericles, Thucydides similarly recognizes that ignorant listeners grow envious when an orator praises deeds which are beyond the doing of themselves: ὃ τε ἀπειρὸς ἐστὶν ἡ καὶ πλεονάζεσθαι, διὰ φθόνον, εἰ τι ὑπὲρ τῆς αὐτοῦ φύσεως ἀκούσῃ ... (II.35.2). The sentiment is quite close to Sallust's comments on the historian's task, although Thucydides's context is quite different. Although the thought may be topical among ancient historians, the literal closeness of Sallust's phrase "quae sibi quique facilia factu putat" to Thucydides's ἐς ὅσον ἄν καὶ αὐτὸς ἐκαστὸς οἷς τι ἐίναι θετικόν δεῖ ἔρισθαι τι ὑπὸ ἡκούσῃ (II.35.2) suggests homage to his great predecessor who himself not only heeded the true distinction between acts and words, but also in the process found the criticisms of the ignorant reprehensible. 73

The discrepancy between word and deed was not so much a problem among Early Republican Romans: "optumus quisque facere quam dicere, sua ab aliis bene facta laudari quam ipse aliorum narrare malebat" (BC 8.5). This explains why Sallust presently appears as "first in Roman history" ("primus Romana Crispus in historia", Mart. XIX.191), and why the deeds of the Athenians have been so widely celebrated due to the "great character of their writers" (scriptorum magna ingeni, BC 8.3) among whom was undoubtedly Thucydides. Yet among Sallust's contemporary Romans, as among Thucydides's Athenians, ambition has fostered mendacity, and the need arises for a truthful historian to set the record straight: "ambitio multos mortalis falsos fieri subegit, aliud clausum in pectore alius in lingua promptum habere..." (BC 10.5). In this latter passage of course the reader may see the influence of
the famous lines of Euripides's *Hippolytus* (612) or *Andromache* (451f.). Many influences worked upon Sallust from his wide reading, but the recurrence of this word/deed contrast in a Thucydidean tone critical of popular habits suggests the Greek historian's influence loomed large.

Syme has convincingly demonstrated that the triumviral period in which Sallust wrote was rife with fraudulence especially in the invocation of political catchwords. So Sallust's references to false words which cloak dishonest deeds is also a wide political theme of his day. So Sallust notes that the popular and senatorial factions each claimed to serve the public good in word, but in deed served themselves: "honestis nominibus ... bonum publicum simulantes pro sua quisque potentia certabant" (BC 38.3). Thucydides's picture of partisan strife offered the model: τὸ μὲν κοινὰ λόγῳ ἑραπατῶντες ἀθλα ἐποιοῦντο (III.82.8). In Cato's speech the degeneration of vocabulary is expressly linked to that of morality: "iam pridem equidem nos vera vocabula rerum audacia vocatur ..." (BC 52.11). Thucydides notes the opposition similarly in his analysis of stasis: τὴν ἐλεθηρίαν ἀξίωσιν τῶν ὀνομάτων ἐς τὰ ἑργα ἀντικαλαξαν τῇ δικαίωσει (III.82.4). That Sallust was fond of this word/deed antithesis is clear from his imitation elsewhere in contexts regarding the political scene: "quae apud alios iracundia dicitur, ea in imperio superbia atque crudelitas appellatur" (BC 51.14).

"Rather/Than" Antithesis: 
Magis Quam and Μᾶλλον Ἡ

Another antithetical device which like the word/deed contrast seeks to uncover the truth behind appearance is the use of "rather/than."
The comparative adverb by its nature requires the comparison of two apparently similar words or phrases. But in the present context it provides another useful illustration of how both authors use the adverbs to contrast word and deed. The first element in such a phrase is of course always the truer one. Thus Thucydides says:

\[ \text{πολέμῳ μᾶλλον ἡ λόγος τὰ ἐγκλήματα διαλύεσθαι (I.37.3)} \]
\[ \text{πλούτῳ ἐργοῦ ... μᾶλλον κατηρή ἡ λόγος κόμψω χρώμεθα (II.40.1)} \]
\[ \text{σκοπούντας μὴ λόγῳ μόνῳ τὴν ὄφελίαν ... ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον τὴν τῆς πόλεως δύναμιν καθ' ἑμέρα ἐργῶθειν μενους ... (II.43.1)} \]

Sallust also uses the phrase to uncover true causes:

ex lubidine magis quam ex vero (BC 8.1)

ius bonumque ... non legibus magis quam natura valebat (BC 9.1)

beneficiis magis quam metu imperium agitabant et accepta iniuria ignoscere quam persequi malebat (BC 9.5)

res tempus pericula egestas belli spolia magnifica magis quam oratio mea vos hortantur (BC 20.15)

Antithesis then, and particularly the word/deed antithesis, points out the contrast between what is real and what is alleged. This style of contrast is nicely suited to Sallust's methodological, political or ethical statements in his sententiae. It seeks to instruct by contrast of opposites, virtues and vices, ideals with realities. This type of teaching by mutually exclusive, antagonistic oppositions has been recognized as part of the characteristic "complex and carefully elaborated system of Sallustian contrasted opposites" which ranges from simple phrases as analysed above to the structure of the work which balances Early Rome with the Late Republic (BC 6-9 and 10-13) or types of leaders like Cato and Caesar with types of villains like Catiline and
Sempronia (BC 5.1-8 and BC 25). By preserving the positive lesson along with the negative, Sallust hopes to present a picture which is "worthy of memory" ("quaeque memoria digna videbantur", BC 4.2). Similarly, it has been argued that "Thucydides's logos is designed not to correct the mistakes of the future but to maintain the validity of Periclean Athens in the realm of thought." So Thucydides calls his subject the "most noteworthy" (ἀξιολογώτατον, 1.1.1).

Character Sketches

The use of individuals as vehicles to convey virtues and vices implicitly by characterization is a device most clearly used by Greek and Roman poets prior to Sallust, although ancient historians and philosophers also use characterizations, implicitly or explicitly, to present "exempla virtutis aut vitiae."

The character sketches of individuals in Thucydides and Sallust vary in length and importance. They may comprise only a phrase or two to introduce a person or they may stand as a lengthy quasi funebris laudatio which Seneca Rhetor recognized, rightly or wrongly, as an original practice of Thucydides, later adopted by Sallust and by Livy:

quoties magni alicuius [viri] mors ab historicis narrata est, toties fere consummatio totius vitae et quasi funebris laudatio redditur. hoc semel aut iterum a Thucydide factum, item in paucissimis personis usurpatum a Sallusto, T. Livius benignus omnibus magnis viris praestitit: sequentes historici multo id effusius fecerunt. (Suas. 6.21)

Thucydides uses sparingly such "funeral orations" over one man, and he notably pays homage at length only to the few great Athenians, e.g. Themistocles (I.138), Pericles (II.65.5-10) and Nicias (VII.86.4-5), who served their state freely and with foresight. It was probably the encomia of these three men which Seneca had in mind and which Sallust
no doubt knew. We may add to these evaluations of individuals at their deaths the passage assessing the importance of Brasidas and Cleon as enemies of the peace later arranged by Nicias (V.16.1) and the praise of Archelaus, King of Macedon (II.100.2), which may be a quasi laudatio funebris composed on the occasion of his death in 399 B.C. These latter examples are more naturally suited to the immediate context of events, however, and are not so obviously epilogue-type literary devices as are the praises of Themistocles, Pericles and Nicias.

Sallust is similarly sparing of praise in his first monograph, but the famous comparison of Cato and Caesar (B.C. 54) stands as a notable exception. One cannot say that this comparison was modeled directly on Thucydides, but it is worth noting, along with Patzer, that the comparison and the speeches preceding it serve a function similar to the Funeral Speech and the description of Pericles (II.35-46, 65) in which an individual represents the moral apex of development in his spirit and in his way of living. "There is no Pericles," Patzer observes, "but the idea of one such comprehensive politician indeed emerges, although implicitly, behind the Caesar-Cato Antilogy; it is Thucydidean."

Detailed laudationes are the exception in both authors' styles of characterization. Sallust and Thucydides are in general fond of the simple character sketch when a great or influential man is first introduced, followed by indirect characterization in the narrative and speeches. The introductory sketch is usually executed in a few, brisk strokes in which only the essential qualities or barest details of social status are imparted in order to fix the character in the narrative framework. Thucydides's comments are generally sparing, but
seem to be more frequent in the latter half or later written pieces of
the History due to an increasing appreciation of the role of the indi-
vidual in events. Archidamus is described as "the Spartan king and a
man who seemed to be both wise and prudent" (ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἀρχιδάμος Ἀρχιδάµος καὶ ξύνετος δοκόντως εἶναι καὶ σάφρων, I.79.2); Pericles is "a man most influ-
ential among contemporaries and a leader of the state" and "a man who
was the leading citizen of the Athenians at that time, and most influ-
ential in word and deed" (ὁ γὰρ δυνατῶτατος τῶν καθ' ἐαυτὸν καὶ ἄγνω
τὴν πολιτείαν, I.127.3; ἂν θε καὶ ἐκεῖνον τὸν χρόνον πρῶτος Ἀθηναίων,
λέγειν τε καὶ πράσσειν δυνατῶτατος, I.139.4); Cleon was "among other
things the most forcible of the citizens and by far the most persuasive
at that time among the common people" (ἐς τὰ ἄλλα βιαίότατος τῶν πολιτῶν
τῷ τε ἡμῶν παρὰ πολὺ ἐν τῷ τότε πέπλανωτατος, III.36.6; cf. IV.21.3);
Brasidas "seemed to be effective in all undertakings at Sparta" and
"just and moderate in his dealings with other cities" (ἂνθρα ἐν τῇ Σπάρτῃ δοκοῦντα δραστήριον εἶναι ἐς τὰ πάντα ... δίκαιον καὶ μέτριον
ἐς τὰς πόλεις, IV.81.1-2); Alcibiades is first seen as a young man
"distinguished by the worthiness of his ancestors" (ἄξιωματι δὲ πρόγονων
τιμώμενος, V.43.2; cf. VI.15.3-4); Athenagoras was "a leader of the
people and at that time very persuasive to the majority" (ὁμοίως τε προστάτης ἦν καὶ ἐν τῷ παρόντι πιθανώτατος τοῖς πολλοῖς, VI.35.2); the
Peisistratid rule was characterized by ἀρετή and ξύνεσις (VI.54.4);
Hermocrates, who is introduced indirectly through his two speeches
(IV.59-63; VI.33-34), is first properly characterized before the Debate
at Camarina as "a man in every way intelligent and in warfare both
competent from experience and outstanding in valor" (ἂνθρ καὶ ἐς τάλλα
Antiphon is "second to none in virtue and most able to contrive and speak what he thought" (ἀνὴρ Ἀθηναίων τῶν καθ' ἐμαυτὸν ἄρετὰ τε οὐδὲνὸς ύστερος καὶ κράτιστος ἐνθυμηθήναι γενόμενος καὶ ἀ γνοῖη ἐπετεῖν, VI.72.2); Phrynichus was "not unintelligent" (οὐκ ἀξίωματος, VIII.27.5; cf. VIII.68.3); Theramenes is "not unskilled in speaking and reasoning" (VIII.68.4); Hyperbolos is "a distressing character" (μοχθηρὸν ἀνθρωπον, VIII.73.3). H.D. Westlake in his analysis of Thucydides's "explicit judgments on ability and character" notes that Thucydides's criteria for direct observations of an individual's military, political or intellectual abilities was dictated by the strict relevance of these qualities to the course of the war. Moreover these "explicit judgments" are only proffered when Thucydides "has convincing evidence and is confident that he is right" in his assessment.

The Greek historiographical tradition in Herodotus, Xenophon and Theopompus shows less cautious, more liberal use of these explicit judgments owing to the different historical aims of those writers. Herodotus felt compelled to record what he had been told without strict regard for veracity (Herodotus VII.152.3); he shows concern for the military prowess of Cyrus (ἀνδρειοτάτος, I.123.1), the wisdom of Themistocles (ἐνθεούλος, VIII.110.1), and the justice of Aristeides (δικαιώτατος, VIII.79.1). Xenophon's historical judgment of individuals is clouded by his concern for literary or dramatic propriety and by his personal views on military valor. Theopompus seems to be preoccupied
with scandal and moral censure: e.g. ἀκόλουθος την καὶ φιλοσόφης (F.Gr.H. 115F. 185) re Apollocrates, son of Dionysius the younger, or μικρὸν μὲν ἄντα τὴν γυμνὴν κόλακα ἢ ἔμητον (F. 209) re Thrasydaeus, a supporter of Philip of Macedon. Thucydides's historical aims and methods were different from those of his predecessors, and either misunderstood or ignored by his successors; thus the character sketches in his History stand apart from the tradition of Greek historiography.

In the Bellum Catilinae Sallust seems to follow Thucydides in the self-confidence in judgment of personalities, but his praise and condemnation are not nearly so cautious and qualified, therefore not so subtle, as is Thucydides's, but they do embrace the same psychological and political criteria which Thucydides often touches on, namely the abilities to think, to act, and to speak. So Catiline is among other things "competent in eloquence, but short on wisdom":

*corpus patiens inediae, algoris, vigiliae supra quam cuique credibile est. animus audax subdolus, varius, cuius rei lubet simulator ac dissimulator, alieni adpetens, sui profusus, ardens in cupiditatis; satis eloquentiae, sapientiae parum* (BC 5.3-4)

Other conspirators are judged on similar criteria, but they are painted a rather flat black which lacks the shading of a Thucydidean portrait:

*Q. Curius, natus haud obscuro loco, flagitibus atque facinoris coopertus, ... huic homini non minor vanitas inerat quam audacia; neque reticere quam audierat, neque suamet ipse scelets occultare* (BC 23.1)

*[Cethegus] natura ferox, vehemens, manu promptus erat; maximum bonum in celeritate putabat.* (BC 43.3)
The Style of Speeches

Use of Speeches

We will notice in our discussion of "Passages" in the Bellum Catilinae below that particular Sallustian speeches can be reminiscent of those in Thucydides, for example the speeches of Caesar and Cato (BC 51-52) as allusion to those of Cleon and Diodotus (III.37-48). It has often been observed that the speeches in Sallust, Thucydides, and most ancient historians are fictional compositions although they may reproduce certain characteristics of the speaker's style, and are usually based on actual, historical speeches. Thucydides's speakers say what he himself thought called for (τὰ δεόντα) in the present circumstances, although he has kept as close as possible to "the general sense of what was truly said" (I.22.1). J. Finley gives an adequate definition of τὰ δεόντα for our purposes: "those broad considerations, political, social, historical, or even psychological in character, on which, to his mind, the choice of policy at a given moment depended." In this sense the speakers combine the specific and the generic, the point of view of actual speakers in an historical situation and "compressed examples of the reasoning to be followed under different circumstances."

This understanding of Thucydides's speeches is important as a key to Sallust's speeches, several of which contain topical borrowings from Thucydides. The presence of such borrowings should lead us to conclude not that the content of the speeches is unhistorical since the words are patently those of Thucydides's individuals and not of Cato or
Caesar, for instance, but that the content of Sallust can follow the general sense of an actual speech and can still include Thucydidean phrases to express certain Sallustian sentiments.

That Sallust saw himself as a successor to Thucydides in his use of speeches is implied by his use of huiuscemodi verba to introduce direct quotations,\(^91\) compare Thucydides's use of ἐκείνος τοῦτος in I.139.4, III.59.3 and frequently passim. The Greek demonstrative denoting quality and referring to what follows is thus translated into the Latin phrase using modi which indicates quality and huiusce, the emphatic demonstrative referring to what follows.\(^92\)

The Historian's Selection of Speeches

The speeches of Thucydides and Sallust serve the dual purpose of elaborating important themes and characterizing important individuals. Only the most crucial speeches of important assemblies, or representative speeches which characterize the motives of an influential individual or of a group are given full elaboration in direct or indirect quotation.\(^93\)

Thucydides for instance selects the four crucial speeches from among the many delivered at the Debate at Sparta (I.67.4, 79.2); only "the two views extremely opposed to one another," (τῶν γνωμῶν τούτων μάλιστα ἀντιπάλων πρὸς ἀλλήλας, III.49.1), those of Cleon and Diodotus, are reported from the number delivered at the Mytilenean Debate (III.36.3). Similarly the policies of Pericles in his reported speeches reflect the views which were often presented in his many unquoted speeches (cf. I.140.1; II.13.2). In the Catilinarian Debate, Caesar
expresses a characteristic mansuetudo and misericordia, Cato imparts his characteristic severitas and dignitas (BC 51-5): "saepenumero, patres conscripti, multa verba in hoc ordine feci, saepe de luxuria atque avaritia nostrorum civium quaestus sum" (BC 52.7). Other views on both sides go unrecorded (BC 52.1) with the exception of a brief mention of Silanus's recommendation of capital punishment (BC 50.4). An evil character can be exposed by his own patently false exaggerations: the perverse and cunning mind of Catiline ("animus audax subdolus varius", BC 5.4) is clearly illustrated in his first speech which urges his followers to undertake a "magnificent and most lovely deed" ("maximum et pulcherrumum facinus", BC 20.3) and which cries out the catch-word, libertas (BC 20.6, 14). The influential eloquence and true libertas, on the other hand, of the tribune Memmius are sounded by his representative oration: "Sed quoniam ea tempestate Romae Memmi facundia clara pollensque fuit, decere existumavi unam ex tam multis orationem eius perscribere" (BC 30.4). Marius's characteristic intention of aggravating the nobles is demonstrated by his oration: "hortandi causa, et nobilitatem uti consuerat exagitandi, contionem populi advocavit." (BJ 84,5).

The speeches in both historians evidence a concern for extracting the general gruth, as well as for elucidating the particular historical events. This concern involves condensation of thought in each speech and selection from among the many speeches of an assembly or of an influential leader or group. In this way the historian presents those speeches considered to be the most revealing of the issues behind
events or those most descriptive of the speakers themselves. Since Sallust's use of speeches and his criteria for selecting them do not change from this somewhat Thucydidean use and selection throughout his writings, later sections on "Style" in the Bellum Jugurthinum and Historiae will not include a separate analysis of Thucydides's and Sallust's speeches, but relevant comments on specific speeches will be found under the sections on "Passages."

Digressions

Digressions were not the exclusive invention of Thucydides in Greek historiography, nor were they perfected as structural devices by him, but he did use them effectively in expounding on the clear truth (τὸ αὖργος, I.22.4) and with such apparent mastery over his material that their echo in Sallust's Bellum Catilinae and later writings is unmistakable. As evidenced in Thucydides, e.g. by the Archaeology (I.2-19), the plague (II.47-54), the judgment of Pericles (II.65), and the analysis of Corcyrean stasis (III.82-83), digressions can arise naturally from and return to the narrative context in a sort of ring composition. The functions of these digressions are several: to fill in background detail, to furnish causes for and commentaries on events which relate to greater themes in the history, to provide variety, and to serve as a purely dramatic, transitional device. Most ancient historians attempt to include all these functions to some degree in a digression, but only Thucydides can distill or abstract the meaning of events with such stark analysis and set it aside in his excursus:

It [III.82f.] focuses, as if in a burning-glass, the impressions we have received from the preceding narrative, while at the same time
it looks forward to the latter part of the work, in which a similar rake's progress brings even the greatest achievement of Pericles to destruction.\textsuperscript{95}

Sallust's digressions on the conspiracy of 66-65 B.C. (B.C. 18) and on Sempronia (B.C. 25) are no more abstract commentaries than those of Thucydides on the Peisistratids (VI.54-59) or on the Pentakontaëtia (I.89-118). These also tell interesting, enlightening or relevant stories, much as the majority of Herodotaean digressions do.

But it is the purely analytic digressions of Thucydides which notably drew Sallust's attention in his first monograph. So he elects to unravel the course of Roman corruption prior to Catiline's conspiracy in an Archaeology (B.C. 6-13), much as Thucydides began his work with an Archaeology on the origins of Athenian naval power (I.2-19).\textsuperscript{96}

Whereas the crucial themes of Thucydides's History, namely the growth of military and naval power out of the human drive for personal security, are leitmotifs of his Archaeology, in the Bellum Catilinae Sallust chooses to delineate the corruption of Rome from \textit{virtus} to desire for wealth and power after the fall of Carthage (10-13). The differences arise from purpose, design and historical philosophy.\textsuperscript{97} So, although context is of course different, these two digressions are similar in their functions of presenting early in the work (1) an analysis of the historical origins of the present political/military/moral situation, and (2) an exposition of what each historian considers to be the significant facets and usual workings of human nature and national character. Thus a backdrop is set in place, against which the nature and course of the subject - the Peloponnesian War and the Conspiracy of Catiline - can be viewed from their particular historical
perspectives. In this sense the two Archaeologies serve a like function.

Sallust's digression on party strife (BC 36.4-39.5) also bears a functional resemblance to a Thucydidean digression - that on Corcyrean stasis. Structurally it divides the narration of the early preludes, the plotting, and the nature of the conspirators (14.1-36.3) from that of their deeds and the supression of the conspiracy in Rome. So the digression on Corcyrean stasis follows from the details of the civil war in Corcyra (III.69-81) and precedes the report of its results (III.85). More importantly regarding the function of these digressions, they again give evidence for the shared interest of the two historians in revealing the typical behind the details of an historical event, particularly in revealing the consistent human motives behind events. The similarity of content in the two digressions as independent passages will be analysed below, but it is sufficient now to note that both are explicitly justified due to the magnitude or precedence of the civil strife in their respective Greek and Roman states:

Διότι ἐν τοῖς πρώτης ἐγένετο, ἐπεὶ ὑστερῶν γε καὶ πᾶν ὡς εἶπεῖν τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν ἱκινηθή (III.82.1)

ea tempestate mihi imperium populi Romani multo maxime miserable visum est (BC 36.4)

The comparison or syncrisis of Caesar and Cato as types of ideal leaders is without a strict classical model, although its origins can be seen in the earlier agonistic Greek literary conventions in drama, speeches, literary criticism, historiography, encomium, et.; in the later, parallel biographies of Plutarch which themselves may be
based on Hellenistic models; and, generally speaking, in the above mentioned tendency of Sallust to use antithesis. Thucydides's implied comparison of Pausanius and Themistocles (1.128.3-138.6) shows evidence of the Greek tradition of antithesis in general. The digression of Sallust in Bellum Catilinae 54 has been mentioned earlier as evidence of an interest in character sketches, and as a portrait of ideal leadership which roughly corresponds to Thucydides's portrait of Pericles. As such it resembles the earlier political and moral digressions of the Bellum Catilinae (6-13, 36.4-39.5) and of Thucydides's History, both of which reveal the essential truth behind the detail of the speeches and the narrative. How the Caesar-Cato Debate may be modeled on the Mytilenean Debate will be investigated within the analysis of "Passages" below.

The purely political analysis of Bellum Catilinae 6-13 and 36.4-39.5 as well as the digression on Caesar and Cato of Bellum Catilinae 54 are thus in some ways modeled on Thucydidean passages which at least influence their form and function. We will observe how this influence is carried on into the digression on the origins of party strife in Rome in Bellum Jugurthinum 41-42 and in the prologue of the Historiae as well as in the character sketches of those works. But the device of an Archaeology does not appear as such again in Sallust's writings, and the strong influence of Thucydides on Sallust's digressions evidenced in the first monograph seems to lessen later.
In addition to the imitation of Thucydides's themes and techniques throughout the *Bellum Catilinae*, Sallust also borrows from Thucydides descriptions of particular battle scenes and of particular individuals which are reused to describe Sallust's own events and people. Sallust's borrowed descriptions are like thematic and stylistic imitations in that they betray their Thucydidean origin by a similarity in words and ideas, but differ in that they seek to imitate Thucydidean persons or events, and not themes or style. That is, an isolated historical event like civil war, or a person in Thucydides, like Pericles, is used by Sallust in a context reminiscent of that of Thucydides.

Allusion and Description

Imitative passages may serve as mere decoration for Sallust, or may allude to Thucydides's context and gain a wider significance by that allusion. For instance the passages in the *Bellum Catilinae* which refer to the subversion of traditional morality with the introduction of the new political vocabulary of factions clearly has its roots in Thucydides's description of *stasis* (*BC* 21.1, 38.3, 52.11; III.82.4, 8). Although expression of this topical idea can be found in other Greek and Roman literature, it is clear from the close parallel of thought and words that the idea has a dependence on and allusion to Thucydides. Whether we can accurately uncover the exact significance of such allusions is another matter. We can make a good start by distinguishing two types of imitation which may be combined to different degrees in any given passage:
1) An allusive imitation is that which intends to make a conscious allusion to an event or individual described in Thucydides, and thus it serves to enrich Sallust's narrative by reminding the reader of Thucydides's description and its context. An example is the Casear-Cato debate which recalls the one between Cleon and Diodotus. 106

2) A descriptive imitation may not be intended by Sallust as a total identification with Thucydides's descriptions, but only as an ornamental application of a Thucydidean phrase to a Sallustian concept. In this, Sallust implies a gesture of respect for and a measure of sympathy with the Athenian historian. The essential point about descriptive imitation is that Sallust conveys a Thucydidean sharpness of detail and color. 107

Pericles as the Virtuous Leader

At various places in the prologue and archaeology of the Bellum Catilinae (1-5, 6-13), Sallust employs phrases reminiscent of Pericles's words as related by Thucydides. In these contexts Sallust appreciates Periclean precepts of **virtus** at home and abroad as useful in a Roman context. Sallust asserts that the lesson from the Persian and Peloponnesian Wars is that **virtus** prevails in peace as in war, and that with this **virtus** human affairs would be maintained more evenly and steadily (BC 2.3). Thucydides's appreciation of Pericles's moderation and caution in peacetime and war offers a close realization of the Sallustian ideal (II.65.5-6). Therefore Sallust's occasional rendering of phrases and sentiments of Pericles in other passages of the Catilina comes as no surprise. In particular Pericles's **epitaphios** furnishes statements
easily and closely suited to Sallust's descriptions of the Roman
Republic prior to moral dissolution. Thus not only the portrait of
leadership furnished by Pericles but also his ideals of statehood are
embodied within the *Bellum Catilinae*. The state must duly deliberate
before acting, then follow up the advice with the necessary action.
So Thucydides gives us Pericles's words in the *epitaphios* and Sallust
his own thoughts in the prologue (*BC* 1.5; *II*.40.2). Foreign alliances
are made and fostered rather by granting favors than by receiving the
services of others. Periclean Athens and Rome of the Early Republic,
according to Sallust, both sought empire with friendly favors (*χαρίτες*,
*beneficia*) when possible (*BC* 6.5; *II*.40.4). The dangers of regarding
wealth as adornment and poverty as a disgrace were surmounted by
Periclean Athens, whereas Roman youths fell prey to those very temp­
tations, according to Sallust's portrait of the post-Sullan Republic
(*BC* 12.1; *II*.40.1) expressed in the words of the funeral oration.

Since greed and ambition are seen by both historians as the prime
source of evil (*BC* 10.3; *III*.82.2) and, although their solutions are
expressed in different moral and political philosophies, Sallust sees
fit to borrow certain Periclean remarks regarding the need both for de­
liberation and for action, the advantage of fair treatment of allies,
and the inherent danger in maintaining an empire (cf. *BC* 1.6 to *II*.40.4;
*BC* 6.5 to *II*.40.4; *BC* 12.1 to *II*.40.1). It is at least the political
wisdom and perhaps even the person of Pericles to which Sallust alludes
in these passages. We will later see how Pericles the person is alluded
to in the *Bellum Jugurthinum* as an almost stock image of the ideal
leader. 108
Two Descriptions of Civil War: Bellum Catilinae 10 and III.82-83

Sallust's description of Roman moral corruption following the destruction of Carthage, Bellum Catilinae 10-13, especially 10, is modeled on Thucydides's analysis of Corcyrean stasis (III.82-83). In general, both passages are analyses of the causes and manifestations of moral decay which accompanies civil strife. Otherwise the particulars of strife as it erupted in Fifth Century Greece and in Late Republican Rome are different since the events were politically and socially different, and the historical philosophies of the two historians, when examined beyond the general sympathy, are also different.

In both analyses, greed and ambition are cited as the chief causes:

igitur primo pecuniae, dein imperi cupido crevit ea quasi materies omnium malorum fuere (BC 10.3)

παντῶν δ' αύτῶν αἰτίων ἀρχῆς δὲ διὰ πλεονεξίαν καὶ φιλοτιμίαν (III.82.8)

Certainly one may argue that the themes of greed and ambition play important roles in entirely different ways within each historian's scheme of historical causation, but the resemblance here at least suggests that Sallust agreed with Thucydides, due either to inspiration or coincidence, that these two human passions should be isolated as the ultimate reason for civil strife and moral corruption.

Traditional morals and the traditional meanings of virtues and vices were subverted by greed and ambition in both analyses of the manifestations of this strife (BC 10.4; III.82.4-6). Lawless pride and cruelty flourished (BC 10.4; III.82.8) and the meanings of words
were corrupted (BC 10.5; III.82.4). The whole state was corrupted, root and stalk (BC 10.6; III.82.8-83). This subversion of morality and spread of corruption is topical in Sallust, both in the Bellum Catilinae (10.3-6, 38.3, 52.11) and in later works (BJ 41.5, 42.4; H I.7, 12). Yet the phrasing in all these passages is similar to that of Thucydides, and one should not conclude that Sallust merely adopted the useful phrasing, but did not necessarily agree with the entire analysis, without first considering that Sallust may indeed have been influenced by Thucydides's thoughts as well as his words on this topic. What we cannot fairly do is establish a limit after which an imitated passage becomes wholly the imitator's possession, as in the common saying, "use a word three times and it becomes yours."

The allusion to the ambition of civil strife recurs later in the digression in the Bellum Catilinae on the origin of the plebs urbana (36.4-39.5). Sallust describes the origin of this ambition in the restoration of tribuniciain powers by Pompey and Crassus (70 B.C.); then he exploits the association of that occasion with the Corcyrean statis (III.82.8) by direct verbal links:

namque, uti paucis verum absolvam, post illa tempora quicumque rem publicam agitavere, honestis nominibus, alii sicuti populi defenderent, pars quo senatus auctoritas maxima foret, bonum publicum simulantes pro sua quisque potentia certabant. neque illis modestia neque modus contentionis erat: utri victoriam crudeliter exercebant. (BC 38.3-4)

... τὰ μὲν κοινὰ λόγῳ θεραπεύοντες ἀθλα ἔποιησεντο, παντὶ δὲ τρόπῳ ἄνων ἀλλήλων περιγίγνεσθαι ἐτύλιμαν τε τὰ δεινότατα ἐπεξίησαν τε τὰς τιμωρίας ἐτι μείζους, οὗ μέχρι του δικαίου καὶ τὴν πόλει ξυμφόρου προσθέντες ἐς ὑπὸ τὸ ἔκατορος που αἰεὶ ἡδονὴν ἔχον ὄριζοντες (III.82.8)

Notably both discuss how the factions cloaked their acts with honest
words. Alleging common interest (bonum publicum simulantes, τὰ κοινὰ θεραπεύοντες), each side sought its own good. The contest allowed no place for moderation.

The significance of the imitation here as in Bellum Catilinae 10.3-4 is an allusion to Thucydides's analysis of stasis which shocked all Greece in a similar way and by implication contributed to the ultimate disintegration of Athenian domestic politics (cf. II.65.10). Sallust's warning is thus supported by historical precedent, an imperial power which in some sense destroyed itself. However we may find fault with this overly dramatic interpretation of Thucydides, we must recognize due to the verbal similarities in the two passages that Sallust probably read Thucydides in this way and applied the Greek lesson to a Roman context. The borrowing here is more than a topos, but rather "the association of definite, phenomenological statements in Thucydides with a definite Roman reality."

The Mytilenian and Catilinarian Debates

Thucydides's habit of grasping questions in antithetical form is probably the result of early training in rhetoric. As discussed earlier, the tendency is manifest in nearly every sentence, paragraph, and notably in his paired speeches. This style of speech, although inherent in the thought and language of the Greeks from Homer on, is essentially the legacy of the sophists, particularly of Protagoras: καὶ πρῶτος ἐφὶ δύο λόγους εἶναι περὶ παντὸς πράγματος ἀντικεῖμενος ἀλλήλους (Diog. Laert., IX51=DK 80A1). Prior to Thucydides,
antilogiae also found expression in Sophocles's Ajax and Antigone as well as in Euripides's Medea. Thucydides's most masterful handling of this technique appears in I.68-86 in which four arguments are conveyed in "paring pairs."

Another such pair in Thucydides, the Mytilenian debate (III.37-48), has been recognized by many scholars as being a model for Sallust's Catilinarian debate (BC 51-52). We may note that others have seen a model for Sallust's debate in Euphorus's account (via Diodorus 13.20ff.) of the debate between Nicolaus and Gylippus.

The speeches of Sallust and Thucydides, as we noticed in our analysis of style, share a similar function in their attempts to embody the general issues of the events as well as the particular historical details, and thus to give a universal significance to the speech as well as to carry forward the action of the narrative. On the basis of these shared functions when applied to the two debates in question, we can see that Thucydides was indeed Sallust's model for this antilogy in certain general lines of argument and in the specific characters of the speakers.

Thucydides was fond of the antilogia and his most notable single speeches are attributed to Pericles. Sallust favored single speeches and used the antilogia in his first monograph only in the Caesar-Cato debate. This exceptional form in Sallust first causes one to search for a model. The first words of Caesar's speech recall Diodotus's opening words on the necessity for an unemotional atmosphere in deliberations:
... (III.42.1)

Vretska has demonstrated with ample examples from other Greek and Latin authors that this theme of "calm in deliberation" was a widespread topos in antiquity, notably in Demosthenes On the Affairs in the Chersonese 1 and Diodorus 13.25.4. But Vretska concludes, along with Perrochot, that one must not overlook the words in such similar formulation at this beginning of Sallust's antilogia as a possible gesture of acknowledgement to Thucydides. The lesson which Vretska draws from his demonstration is perhaps overly cautious, namely that imitation can always refer only to details. Certainly Sallust's originality as historian, political thinker, moralist, and artist must be acknowledged, but his imitation of details precludes neither his originality, nor his greater sympathy with Thucydides on personal or professional grounds.

The possible allusion to Thucydides at the opening of Caesar's speech suggests that there may be certain similarities in the general lines of argument in both authors, which have also been recognized in part by other scholars. In this comparison, Caesar more closely resembles Diodotus in his call for calm deliberation than Cato does Cleon in his severity. Caesar and Diodotus both stand as exponents of rational counsel before rash action (BC 51.1; Thuc. III.42.1). Each in his prologue addresses the need to impose a calm on the audience in...
the face of the state's imminent danger. The audience must carefully
guard their minds from inflammatory rhetoric (BC 51.10; III.42.2).
Nor should they be led astray by irrelevant moral issues when the true
concern is good counsel for the very existence of the state (BC 51.17;
III.44.1). The gravity of the threat demands cautious thought,
Caesar advises, vos ... considerate (BC 51.26); Diodotus warns,
οὐ δὲ ἐκρίνετε (III.43.4-5). Both recommendations finally
rest on the argument that men will view a certain death penalty only
as the removal of what would otherwise be the ultimate restraint to
licentious behavior - the ever present uncertainty of death (BC 51.20-4;
III.45.4).

If Caesar and Diodotus opt for cool deliberation and moderate
punishment, Cato and his roughly equal counterpart, Cleon, argue the
efficacy of capital punishment on the rationale that it stands as a
firm precaution. "Growing soft" (languere, μαλακίζεσθαι) toward
criminal parties will diminish their respect or sharpen their wills
to resist future aggressors (BC 52.18; III.37.2). Cato and Cleon
preface their arguments with a general criticism of the moral laxity
which is a result of the influence of perverse oratory on the age
(BC 52.11-12; III.38.3-7). Cleon declaims the sophistic tastes of the
Athenian assembly; Cato, his listeners' lack of discrimination in vital
issues which have been clouded by the popular terminology of the day
(BC 52.11-12; III.38.3-7).

After Cato and Cleon have initially censured the misplaced
priorities of the age, each proceeds to reason on the basis of human
nature that severe action is the effective solution:

quanto vos adtentius ea agetis, tanto illis animus infirmior erit; si paulum modo vos languere viderint, iam omnes feroces aderunt. (BC 52.18)

πεφυκε γὰρ καὶ ἄλλως ἀνθρώπος τὸ μὲν θεραπεύον ὑπερφονεῖν, τὸ δὲ μὴ ὑπερικον θαυμάζειν (III.39.5)

Each argues that elemency is due only to the transgressors who have later shown respect to the offended state (BC 52.32-34; III.40.3). Finally the peroratio ends with an impassioned call for the death penalty, although Cato argues more from the intrinsic trupitude (crudelia facinora) of the crime, Cleon from the expediency of the clear example (παράδειγμα σαφές) presented to other potential transgressors.

If certain lines of argument are similar by chance or design, there are also many differences both in the general historical situations as well as in the particulars of the arguments. In Thucydides the debate concerns the fate of errant allies, in Sallust the question is about errant citizens. Thus one deals with foreign politics and the other with domestic. The difference is significant since for Thucydides and the Greeks in general the two realms are governed by different moral standards, but for Sallust and the Romans justice and diligence were the catholic ideals ("sed alia fuere, quae illos [maiores] magnos fecere, quae nobis nulla sunt: domi industria, foris iustum imperium", BC 52.21). This distinction is manifest in the fact that Diodotus appeals to the utility of his counsel, Caesar to the dignity of the senate. Another significant difference in the arguments stems from the fact that Athenian Democracy and Empire were generally open to the
criticism that those forms fostered the misuse of political power (see [Xen.] \textit{Ath.Pol.} and \textit{Thuc.} I.76-77), whereas it was not the Roman form of government, but corrupt individuals whom Sallust and his contemporaries censure. So Cleon criticizes the democratic process in his Mytilenian speech, but Cato finds fault only with the present character of the Senate. Another distinction concerns the differing views on the inefficacy of capital punishment: for Caesar death is a release from sorrows (BC 51.20), for Diodotus fear of death is surpassed by the insolence of human passions (III.45).\textsuperscript{126}

In addition to the similarities and differences of the arguments of both pairs of speeches, we should recognize that the speeches also serve to characterize the speakers, and that for Sallust, the more biographical historian, this function will be more important. The question is whether there is any intended similarity between the characters of Diodotus and Caesar or between Cleon and Cato and, if so, how Sallust exploits the similarities. We can only suggest answers, for if there are similarities they are only implicit and along general lines. Since Cleon is disdained by Thucydides,\textsuperscript{127} and Cato is praised by Sallust, the comparison of these two should not be drawn too closely. Furthermore, nothing is known of Diodotus beyond the fact that he opposed Cleon in this debate. Different degrees of interest in the speakers in the debate illustrate among other things, Thucydides's and Sallust's divergent political and biographical views of history. But if we take Sallust's debate in its broadest implications, the comparison of the two sets of speeches indicates Sallust's own philosophical or political ideals. So Patzer sees Cleon and Cato
as moral reformers who in different ways embody severity, and Diodotus and Caesar as the embodiments of the attitude of historical deliberation ("die Haltung des geschichtlich Erkennenden"). Both pairs then represent two possible solutions to the moral decay of the age and address a more universal question than the immediate problem of the death penalty. Together they may form a complement of moral reformer and reflective historian which Sallust saw inherent in himself.

Usher suggests a more political significance for the allusion:

This antithesis between justice and expediency, familiar to readers of Thucydides, assumes a new significance when observed in the context of Roman history. The fact that Cato represented the old Roman standard and Caesar the new points to a development in political savoir faire which has caused the replacement of the crude, uncomplicated notions of right and wrong by the more sophisticated ones of long term interest and diplomacy.

Although I do not think that either debate primarily exhibits the conflict between justice and expediency, there is some truth in the suggestion that Sallust and Thucydides both attempt to contrast strict old standards with a newer, more sophisticated political savoir faire. Again both pairs address a more universal question than the death penalty: the conflict between the old and the new.

The crime of Catiline presented a new problem to Roman politics and morality. The newness and later prevalence of the crime ("sceleris atque periculi novitas", BC 4.4) made it important, much as did the revolt of the freely allied Mytileneans which presented a new and increasingly important threat to Athenian imperial rule. The solution, as Sallust saw it, rested in part with both the old ideals of his Cato and the new of his Caesar, in part with the strict morality and the rational claims of expediency. Sallust illustrates the two possible
solutions in the characters of the two men.

Sallust's Catilinarian debate, by the use of antilogy and by allusion to Thucydides's Mytilenean debate in arguments and in characterization, gains a more universal significance. Debate in a free society can effectively solve problems which threaten the stability of the state.

Summary of Passages in the Bellum Catilinae

Since the Bellum Catilinae is mainly a treatment of domestic politics and ethics, the passages of Thucydides which Sallust imitates deal with matters of political leadership and civil strife. Thus the phrases of Pericles which Sallust has borrowed in his prologue and archaeology inject Periclean wisdom into Sallust's argument. The comparison of Caesar and Cato in Bellum Catilinae 54 likewise invites comparison with Thucydides's praise of Pericles in II.65. But the imitation, if it is recognized by the reader, recalls rather the wisdom of Pericles's words than an image of the man himself, an image which we will see later in the Bellum Jugurthinum. The Caesar-Cato debate is also noteworthy as an imitation which seeks to recall the general issue of danger to the state and the characters of the speakers, i.e. traditional moral reformer and modern rationalist, in the Mytilenean debate, but one need not attempt to find any closer similarities than these general allusive ones. Sallust's allusion to Thucydides's description of Corcyrean stasis indicates a shared interest in the phenomena of moral and semantic degeneration which accompany civil strife. This allusion may also contain an implicit warning to Romans to avoid a self-destruction similar to that which Athens suffered.
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CHAPTER III

BELLUM JUGURTHINUM

Introduction

Sallust seems to have undertaken his second monograph not long after the completion of the first (the BC published post 43 B.C., BJ ca. 40 B.C.). The very fact that Sallust wrote a second monograph testifies to some sort of popular encouragement or personal determination to continue in his avowed profession, "res gestas populi Romani carptim, ut quaeque memoria digna videbantur, perscribere" (BC 4.2). Of course Sallust subjectively selected which events would be considered memoria digna according to their suitability to his moral purpose. We may suppose that Sallust continued to write history with the Bellum Jugurthinum because he, like Thucydides, continued to see the need for his work which promised a didactic utility for contemporary society: "in primis magno usui est memoria rerum gestarum" (BJ 4.5 as I.22.4: ἡθελιμα κρίνειν αὕτα ἄρκοντως ἐξει). In his second work, as in the first, Sallust believed that his record of human affairs along with its thematic observations on human nature and the process of decline, as well as its particular dramatic techniques, would continue to enlighten men on the tendencies of human nature. To aid him in facing this task, Thucydides remained a useful model.
Why he specifically chose the topic of the Jugurthine war as something _memoria digna_ is a legitimate first question. It was a subject familiar to the author as the former praetor of Numidia (46 B.C.) and the events of the Jugurthine war furnished themes suitable to his moral program, namely to convey the process of moral decline, the vicissitudes of fate and fortune and the consistent ways of human nature. More specifically, it was a fierce war of varying fortune and it evidences the first opposition to the insolence of the nobility, at least the first opposition not from the nobles themselves (BJ 5.1). Furthermore the war afforded for Sallust the opportunity to speak of the venality of Rome in the judgment of foreign nations (cf. _omnia Romae venalia_ in BJ 8.1, 20.1, 29.3, 31.25, 35.10) as the conspiracy of Catiline did not (cf. BC 10.4: "[avaritia] omnia venalia habere docuit").

In addition to his concern for human nature and Roman corruption, Sallust adopted other Thucydidean ideas and style. But with his growing maturity as an historian, Sallust's ways became more peculiarly his own. His dependence on Thucydides as a model lessens somewhat: "Der Verarbeitung aber ist intensiver geworden, die Entfernung vom Thukydides stärker als im _Catilina_."² Stylistically this departure from Thucydides is evident in Sallust's more idiosyncratic word choice and wider use of peculiar constructions.³ Idiosyncratic style itself may be considered a Thucydidean trait, yet Sallust's innovations in syntax and vocabulary after the first monograph owe as much to his own ingenuity as they do to his original inspiration from Thucydides. We will examine the extent of Sallust's stylistic debt to Thucydides in
the Bellum Jugurthinum later on in this chapter. Syme remarks that "after the Bellum Catilinae he [Sallust] leaps forward, innovating or rejecting, with a remarkable enhancement of his own devices." Furthermore, the relative number of borrowed passages decreases from ca. 24 in the Bellum Catilinae to 31 in the Bellum Jugurthinum, a work twice as long. But the pervasive influence of Thucydides can still be traced in the Bellum Jugurthinum through the general reminiscence of Thucydidean themes, the use of Thucydidean stylistic techniques and the imitation of specific passages of Thucydides's History.

Themes

The broadest themes of the Bellum Jugurthinum relevant to this study may be briefly summarized as follows: the deleterious effects of men's emotions, notably cupido or ὀργή, upon the state, its allies and its foes. Thus the characterization of certain peoples (especially Athenians and Spartans) by Thucydides, his descriptions of "crowd psychology," and the narration of moral turmoil during civil dissent are all suitably borrowed by Sallust. Periclean statements on the necessity for all citizens to remain politically active and to maintain bonds of χάρις with allies are adopted by Sallust as possible solutions to Roman apathy, inconstancy, and lack of moderation (re fides and χάρις see BC 6.5; BI 14.5, 96.2 and Thuc. I.32; II.40.4).

Pride: Superbia and Μυθησια

First let us see how Sallustian themes in the Bellum Jugurthinum are drawn from Thucydidean phrases and concepts. Sallust tells us that
he wrote this monograph because it was the first time that opposition was shown to the insolence of the nobility (5.1). This theme is unfolded in two stages, i.e., during the Mamilian rogation of 110 B.C. and upon Marius's return to Rome for the consular elections of 108 B.C. In both cases the blow to the nobility is clearly described and the original theme alluded to: "ceteris [nobilibus] metu perculsis" (40.4) and *perculsa nobilitate* (73.7; cf. 42.1 where *nobilitas perculsa* refers to the effects of Gracchan reform). It is equally important that in both instances the plebs, often represented by *novi homines*, is overcome by its own insolence in the immediate victory and merely assumes the haughtiness which it found objectionable in its opponents (40.5, 77.6). Such infectious pride is thematic in the BJ, in small incidents such as the boasting of Rutilius's men after a marginal rout of Bomilcar's forces ("in victoria vel ignavis gloriari licet, adversae res etiam bonos detrectant", 53.8) and in more important events such as the immoderate spirit of the Gracchi in their eagerness for victory ("et sane Grachis cupidine victoriae haud satis moderatus animus fuit", 42.3). There are Thucydidean precedents for the concept of infectious "pride before the fall," notably in Pericles's warning to the Athenians of *αὐχήμα παί χαμάθης* (II.62.4) and in the description of Athens' fall from such brilliance and *αὐχήμα* to the final baseness of the Sicilian defeat (VII.75.6; cf. VII.66.3 where the Spartan generals and Gyippus warn of the danger of *ἔλπις τοῦ αὐχήματος*). These statements are clear forerunners of the Sallustian *dicta* (especially 53.8) in their gnomic thought and style.
Avarice: Venalia and κερδαλέον

The theme of avarice which figures prominently in the Bj is also germane in Thucydides's disdain of such displays of popular greed as those during the plague (II.53.3: ὅτι δὲ ἡδὴ τε ἡδὺ πανταχόθεν τε ἐσ αὐτὸ κερδαλέον τοῦτο καὶ καλὸν καὶ χρήσιμον κατέστη) or among Periclean successors (II.65.7) and displays of extravagance as Alcibiades's horse breeding "which later did not least contribute to Athens' downfall" (V.15.3). Thucydides's praise of Pericles's virtual immunity to bribery (χρηματῶν ... ἀδορείατος, II.65.8, cf. II.60.5) also conforms to Sallust's esteem for spiritual values. The theme of avarice (omnia Romae venalia) can clearly be followed as the words echo throughout the Bellum Jugurthinum: 8.1, 20.1, 31.25, 35.10 (cf. similar statements at 29.3, 80.5). This pestilence of greed, like Alcibiades's extravagance, contributed in no small way to Rome's decline according to Sallust.9

Characterization of Peoples

Qualities like venality and pride were often ascribed by Sallust to social groups, and we have already identified this tendency to generalize regarding typical actions of peoples as another Thucydidean theme shared by Sallust.10 Sallust constantly describes the Numidians as fickle barbarians in order to illustrate his moral that trust is necessary but dangerous among allies (see Bj 14.5, 95.2f., 110.1 and 4; cf. Thuc. I.32; II.40.4: genus Numidorum infidum (46.3), "Numidio quam ingenio infido tum metuenti" (61.5), genus hominum mobile (91.6), and "barbari more suo laetari" (98.6). Cf. also the treachery of
Numidians as individuals and in groups: 71.3 and 66.2).

Thucydides's contrasting characterization of Athenians and Spartans within the speech of the Corinthians at Sparta (I.68-72) later inspired Sallust. Jugurtha denounces Roman character in order to win Bocchus: "Romanos iniustos, profunda avaritia communis omnium hostis esse" (BJ 81.1). The similarity in Jugurtha's purpose to that of the Corinthians who seek to fire the Spartan spirit suggests that for Sallust the Romans, like the Athenians, exercised an avaricious, aggressive imperialism which contributed to their corruption. We should note, however, that both speakers (Jugurtha and the Corinthians) are hostile to the nations accused and that, therefore, the accusations are not those of the authors, but are likely to be exaggerated by the speakers. Sallust's own condemnation may still be implied, if in less harsh terms than Jugurtha's. As the Numidians and Moors must not suffer Romani iniusti, so the Spartans must not tolerate being dealt injustice (ἀδίκωνταί) by the Athenians (I.71.1). As the Romans by their profunda avaritia have become a common enemy to all, so the Athenians being innovators, unhesitating and imperialistic (νεωτεροποιοί, I.70.2; ἀκόντων πρὸς ὑμᾶς μελλήτας καὶ ἀποδημηταί πρὸς ἐνδημοτάτους, I.70.4) threaten the Spartans and Peloponnesians. Likewise the "will to rule" (lubido imperitandi) of the Romans which makes "all kingdoms hostile" (omnia regna adversa) is an echo of Athenian tendencies to covet and possess their allies simultaneously (μόνος γὰρ ἐξουσί τε ὁμοίως καὶ ἐπιτίθεντα ἃ ἂν ἐπινοήσωσι διὰ τὸ ταχεῖαν τὴν ἐπιχειρησίαν πολείσαι ὃν ὅν γνωσίν, I.70.7).

Ἐλπίζοντα ἃ ἂν ἐπινοήσωσι διὰ τὸ ταχεῖαν τὴν ἐπιχειρησίαν πολείσαι ὃν
It is instructive to note in passing that Jugurtha in this speech further illustrates two Sallustian historiographical techniques, a biographical approach and word/deed antithesis. Jugurtha had earlier been described by Sallust in terms of an aggressive spirit which is similar to Jugurtha's own characterization of Athens: "ipse acer, bellicosus, at is quem petebat quietus, imbellis, placido ingenio, opportunus injuriae, metuens magis metuendus" (BJ 20.2). Sallust thus illustrates by Jugurtha's later speech (BJ 81.1) the false sentiments behind the speaker's words. Thus Jugurtha's speech confirms Sallust's biographical approach to and moral judgment on both states and individuals (cf. BJ 20.2 to 81.1 and Thuc. I.70).

Disdain for Crowds: Multitudo and ὌSUMEROS

Crowd psychology also conforms to both historians' concerns for describing typical human phenomena. As was noted in the Bellum Catilinae, Sallust shares Thucydides's disdain for unreasoned or immoral action as demonstrated by two prominent themes: criticism of the masses and the metaphor of a moral plague which infects the state. These themes are of equal importance in the Bellum Jugurthinum. Crowds are usually characterized as inconstant, gullible and lacking clear judgment. The multitudo attempts to frighten Memmius by methods "quae ira fieri amat," a phrase modeled on Thucydides II.65.4, where the mood of the Athenians quickly turns from anger (ὀργή) to approval regarding Pericles's leadership "as the crowd is wont to do" (ὅπερ φίλει ὌSUMEROS ποιεῖν). In the circumstances of civil turmoil, the crowd acts with similar inconstancy: "nam volgus, uti plerumque solet ... cupidum
rerum novarum" (BJ 66.2; cf. 64.2 regarding the Numidian propensity for revolution and Thuc. III.70ff. describing the behavior of the crowd during stasis at Corcyra); women grow bold (BJ 67.1; cf. III.74.1); every sort of slaughter ensues (BJ 67.2; cf. III.81.4-5). These are typical features of crowd psychology during revolutions, but the extreme violence of this particular revolt was due to the extremely savage nature of the Numidian agitators (saevissumi, BJ 67.3).

Sallust also illustrates how the shock of crisis affects the people when they learn of a major defeat. The description clearly alludes to a similar one in Thucydides showing the reaction of the δήμος to the Sicilian defeat:

"Sed ubi ea Romae comperta sunt, metus atque maeror invitatem invasere. Pars dolere pro gloria imperi, pars insolita rerum bellicarum timere libertati, Aulo omnes infesti, ac maxume qui bello saepe praeclari fuerant, quod armatus dedecore potius quam manu salutem quaeviserat"

(BJ 39.1; cf. VIII.1.1-2)

Note that in the case of both disasters, the scapegoats, respectively Aulus and the backers of the Sicilian expedition, were the object of the people's anger (infesti, χαλέψοι'), and that fear and grief seized the people (metus atque maeror, φόβος τε καὶ κατάπληξις μεγ(στὴ δὴ'). Similarly, during the two great crises marking the major stages of the important theme of opposition to the nobility (see especially BJ 40.5, 73.7 and pp.150-54 infra), namely the Mamilian rogation and the election of Marius to the consulship, the plebs responded in their usual, emotional manner: "aspere violenterque ex rumore et lubidini plebis" (40.5) and "Marius ... cupientissima plebe consul factus" (84.1). Not merely the avarice of the nobility but also the passionate reaction of
the plebs, a common Thucydidean theme, together constitute Sallust's main themes which describe the degenerative effects of cupido during civil strife.  

The Process of Decline

Thus far the themes which are concerned with elements of decline, namely pride, venality, and the typically untrustworthy nature of certain races and most crowds, have been discussed especially in relation to Sallust's avowed theme, the opposition to the superbia nobilitatis. Now let us look at the process of Roman decline, already noted as a prominent theme in which we see the reversal of morals in the Bellum Catilinae (see especially 10-12 and 36.4-39.5), and again in the Bellum Jugurthinum (especially 41-42) with similar reliance on Thucydides's chapters on civil strife (III.82-83).

The Plague Metaphor: Contagio quasi Pestilentia

The metaphor of a moral plague at Rome which has been seen in the context of the Bellum Catilinae (10.6, contagio quasi pestilentia), is resumed in the Bellum Jugurthinum to describe the spreading corruption of the commander Bestia's lieutenants in Numidia: "vis avaritiae veluti tabes" (32.4). The negative moral connotations in such a metaphor draw upon Sallust's allusion to Thucydides's description of moral deterioration during the Athenian plague (II.53) and to Thucydides's implied comparison of the simultaneous physical and political change for the worse of the Athenians (see II.53.1 and II.61.2 where Pericles refers directly to the demoralizing effects of the plague). The description of Carthage as a "vile pestilence driven from Africa" ("illa
pestis ex Africa ejecta", BJ 14.10) supports the metaphorical connota-
tion of both words (tabes and pestis) referring to a lingering and dan-
gerous threat to Rome's welfare.

The Earthquake Metaphor:

Permixtio Terrae and Κίνησις

Sallust adds to the plague metaphor one which compares the Roman
civil disturbance to an earthquake: "moveri civitas et dissensio
civilis quasi permixtio terrae oriri coepit" (41.10). This rare, non-
classical expression, permixtio terrae, is best understood as an al-
lusion to Thucydides's vivid metaphorical description of the repercus-
sive shock of Corcyrean stasis to the whole Greek world (Ὕστερον γε
καὶ πᾶν ὡς εἰσεῖν τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν ἐκινήθη , III.82.1), as well as an al-
lusion to "this tremendous disturbance" (Κίνησις... αὕτη μεγίστη, I.1.2)
which stands as the main subject of Thucydides's investigation. 16

War and Peace

Although certain features of Thucydides's description of stasis
(III.82-83) are borrowed in Sallust's digression on the origins of
Roman dissensio civilis, there still exist the two historians' essen-
tially different views on the desirability of international conflict
with regard to its domestic effects. Sallust believes that the metus
Punicus was an effective external deterrent to domestic dissent and
that, when the fear was removed, prosperity (res secundae), as is its
wont, fostered licentiousness and arrogance (lascivia atque superbia,
BJ 41.2-3). Thucydides, on the other hand, believes that war is a
βίατος διδάσκαλος, and that during peace and prosperity (ἐν...εἰρήνῃ καὶ ἀγαθὸς πράγμασι) individuals are apt to have nobler counsel (ἀμείνους τὰς γνώμας, III.82.2). It is dubious whether Sallust would have agreed with Pericles's dictum that "it is complete folly for those who are otherwise faring well to go to war" (II.61.1).

Civil Strife: Dissensio Civilis and Στάσις

Although both historians differ in their views on the domestic effects of war and peace, they agree on the deleterious effects of civil strife. The commonwealth was destroyed by the division into two parties: "ita omnia in duas partis abstracta sunt, res publica, quae media fuerat, dilacerata" (BJ 41.5); τὰ δὲ μέσα τῶν πολιτῶν ὑπ' ἀμφοτέρων ἢ ὁτί οὐ ξυνηγωνίζοντο ἢ φθόνῳ τῶν περιεῖναι διεφθείροντο (III.82.8).

Idle Citizens: Ignavi and Ἀπράγμονες

With regard to the process of decline, both Sallust and Thucydides distinguish good citizens from inactive, useless ones (ignavus, ἀπράγμων). Employing an antithesis of boni and ignavi, "good men" and "idle cowards," Sallust notes that following a minor Roman success with Bomilcar "although in victory certainly the idle may boast, adverse fortune brings down even good men" ("in victoria vel ignavis gloriari licet, adversae res etiam bonos detrectant", BJ 53.8) and that during the wounding of cowardly Romans at Zama, "the good and cowardly were equal to the danger but unequal to the fame" ("parique periculo sed fama impari boni atque ignavi erant", BJ 57.6). Finally this antithesis
appears in Metellus's warning to Bocchus against becoming involved in war:

It is easy to undertake any war, but displeasing to break off. Its beginning and end are not within the power of the same man. Any man, even a coward, could begin a war, but it could be broken off only when the victors want to.

"omne bellum sumi facile, ceterum aegerrume desinere; non in eiusdem potestate initium eius et finem esse; incipere cuvis, etiam ignavo licere, deponi, cum victores velit." (BJ 83.1) (See Thuc. II.63.2 on the difficulty of breaking off from war, I.80ff. and IV.59ff. on the warnings against sudden involvement.)

These three passages taken together describe the ignavus as idly proud, a coward dangerous to his comrades, and improvident in counsel. Although there are no direct corollaries to these passages in Thucydides, the type of idle individual is thematically and consistently denounced by Pericles. In the funeral speech we learn that one who shows no concern for the affairs of the polis is not merely "inactive" (ἀπάγων) but "useless" (ἄχρειος, II.40.2). In Pericles's third speech, the man who flees impending danger (κίνδυνος) is more blame-worthy than one who stands up to it (II.61.1); "political apathy" (τὸ ἀπάγων) is not an asset in the polis which rules, but in a subservient state it is fit to play the slave in safety (II.63.3). The idle cowards (ἀπάγωνες) whom Pericles addresses are those "whose counsel is weakened in carrying out what they planned" (ταπείνη ὑποκύνῃ διάνοια ἑγκαρτερεῖν ἃ ἔγνωτε, II.61.2). These passages do not correspond exactly to Sallust's words, but they express the same disdain for political inactivity, cowardice, imprudence and inconstancy, all of which contribute to the general internal decay of a state. Furthermore they are spoken by Pericles in contexts which, as we have
seen from other borrowings, were well known to Sallust and therefore the recognition of the ignavus characterization as basically in sympathy with a Thucydidean one seems justified.

We began this discussion of the thematic borrowings from Thucydides in Sallust's Bellum Jugurthinum with a statement of Sallust's main theme regarding opposition to the superbia nobilitatis by the plebs, who in turn exhibited their own lubido (BJ 40.3) when the opportunity permitted. We noted the elements of decline jointly recorded by both authors, namely pride and avarice, and how these elements flourish among nobles and plebs in Sallust's writing. Human vices were highlighted by both authors in racial groups where the qualities were inherent or in crowds where mass psychology held sway. Then we observed the process of decline which was variously likened to a moral plague at Rome or Athens because of its insidious spread, or to an earthquake because of the shock which civil dissent caused to both states. Finally we noted that by civil division, the commonwealth was destroyed and reverence for law or any other moral values was sacrificed to the desires of factions. Prominent in this process of decay was the agency of useless citizens who are not only improvident or proud, but dangerous to all fellow citizens.

**Style**

Sallust's imitation of Thucydidean style, i.e. his use of digressions, generalizations and antitheses, resembles his imitation of themes in that both types of imitation pervade the entire work. Of course we should bear in mind that although style and thought are
useful distinctions of literary analysis, they are complementary and inseparable in the actual reading of a work. For example, an historian's psychological terms, like \( \phi \sigma \theta \sigma \varepsilon \text{e} \mu \nu \pi \pi \varepsilon \varepsilon \) (Thuc. II.91.4) or "metus atque maeror civitatem invasere" (BJ 39.1) reveal not only a careful choice and ordering of words, but also a thematic concern for human nature. The selection and arrangement of sections of the history, like the selection of individual words, are also both stylistic and thematic. Sallust's use of serialized episodes within a general annalistic framework is in some ways a Thucydidean stylistic technique. Both historians also use these episodes to further their main themes, namely Athenian growth and Spartan fear, or the opposition of the plebs to the pride of the nobility. So style complements thought in the use of episodes. My point is not that Sallust attempts to convey the same ideas as Thucydides by using Thucydidean devices, but that in doing so and imitating his manner Sallust often calls to the mind of the reader the thought of Thucydides, especially in its frequent generalizations on human nature and decline.

Three stylistic devices of Thucydides are consistently used by Sallust in the Bellum Jugurthinum: digressions, generic statements and antitheses. It is profitable to observe how each technique draws upon its Thucydidean counterpart and how it is adapted to Sallust's purpose.
Digressions in the Bellum Jugurthinum

and Thucydides's History

We have noticed in our discussion of the Bellum Catilinae that Sallust has adopted Thucydides's archaeology and his comments on stasis as a convenient method of displaying human nature at work in antiquity, much as it was in his own times (BC 6-13; cf. Thuc. I.1-19, 36.4-39.5; cf. also Thuc. III.82-83). Such Thucydidean digressions continue to serve Sallust in the Bellum Jugurthinum, not only by illuminating the surrounding narrative but by providing variety and a pause between the dramatic "acts" of the narrative. Sallust's digressions are, like Thucydides's, "the one means by which, in the absence of notes or appendices, a mind as sensitive to the demands of proof could substantiate its claims."20

The Bellum Jugurthinum contains three major digressions, all of which reflect types of Thucydidean topics: geography and ethnography (BJ 17-19, cf. VI.1-5), the origin of party strife (BJ 41-42, cf. III.82-83), legend with a thematic purpose (BJ 78-79, cf. VI.53-59). In general, a digression can elucidate background, explain causes, provide variety and serve as a transition.

Mos Partium et Factionum and Στάσεις

Of the three digressions in the Bellum Jugurthinum just mentioned, the explanation of "mos partium et factionum" (BJ 41-42) can be most readily understood as an elaboration of causes, namely the efficient cause of civil strife brought on by the quaestio Mamilia (BJ 40.5) and the more general cause of all civil strife in Rome thereafter. In
Sallust's view, party strife arose a few years earlier as a result of the freedom from *metus hostilis* following the defeat of Carthage; thence the licentiousness of the people and arrogance of the nobles arose ("lascivia atque superbia inessere", 41.3). Similarly, Thucydides's digression on Corcyrean *stasis*, as a prototype of similar *staseis* in the war, arises naturally from the revolutionary violence at Corcyra provoked by Spartan and Athenian interference: "Every form of death occurred, and, as usually happens in such situations, people did anything which might be expected and more" (πᾶσα τε ἑδέα κατέστη θανάτου, καὶ οἷον φιλεῖ ἐν τῷ τοιούτῳ γίγνεσθαι, οὐδὲν ότι οὐ ξυνέβη καὶ ἐτὶ περαιτέρω III.81.5). Thucydides's digression on the *stasis* at Corcyra, like Sallust's on the one at Rome, points out that this was the first of many, "since later nearly the whole Greek world was shaken, when quarrels arose everywhere" (ἔπει 'ὑπερέρον γε καὶ πᾶν ὡς εἴπειν τῷ ἔλληνικῷ ἐκίνηθη, διὰφορῶν οὐσῶν ἐκαστοῦ, III.82.1). Sallust's digression also conforms to his central theme of opposition to the arrogance of the nobility: "As often insolence from prosperity seized the nobility, so this time it took the plebs" ("ut saepe nobilitatem, sic ea tempestate plebem ex secundis rebus insolentia ceperat", 40.5). Thucydides's digression on Corcyra is equally important for his documentation of a main theme, "the greatest disturbance for the Greeks" (κίνησις γὰρ αὐτῇ μεγίστη δὴ τοῖς Ἕλλησι, I.1.2, cf. III.82.1 quoted immediately above). The digressions also serve as a transition from the previous to the subsequent narrative by describing a stylistic boundary between the two, and by explaining causes or background information which are relevant later in the work. For example, the two digressions under
discussion serve as formal endings to their own narrative sections preceding, i.e. to the Corcyrean stasis and to the Mamilian rogation, and they both aid understanding of the later narrative by describing situations similar to their own, e.g. the Oligarchic Coup of 411 (VIII.89-98) and the effect on the nobles of Marius's election to the consulship (BJ 73.3-7).

In addition to the resemblance between Sallust and Thucydides in their use of a digression as a transitional device, as a complement to its immediate context and as an expansion on some general theme of Sallust's or Thucydides's writings, the digression on "mos partium et factionum" contains many phrases borrowed directly from the passage on Corcyrean stasis. In examining these borrowings we leave for the moment our analysis of the technique of digression and look more closely at the resemblance in actual content. Of course by its nature, civil strife is bound to display certain universal traits and in this we must be careful to distinguish between coincidental resemblances in language and actual borrowings. As was noted earlier, Sallust adopts the Thucydidean metaphor of stasis as an earthquake ("dissensio civilis quasi permixtio terrae oriri coepit", 41.10, cf. πᾶν ὡς εἰπεῖν τὸ Ἐλληπικὸν ἐκτυπήθη, III.82.1) in order to describe the destructive nature of the phenomenon. The result of the movement was the destruction of any moderate faction and the rending of the fabric of the state ("res publica quae media fuerat dilacerata", 41.5, cf. τὰ δὲ μέσο τῶν πολιτῶν ... δἰεψείροντο, III.82.8). The overriding passion for power led to lawlessness and irreverence:
So with power avarice invaded without restraint or moderation. It corrupted and destroyed everything and took no stock of counsel or of the sacred.

"Ita cum potentia avaritia sine modo modestiaque invadere, potuere et vastare omnia, nihil pensi neque sancti habere" (41.9)

Thus neither side gave thought to reverence, but they rather heeded comeliness of argument by which thoroughly reproachful action might seem fitting.

"\[
\text{ωστε εὐσεβείᾳ μὲν συνετέροι ἐνόμισον, εὐπρεπεὶ δὲ λόγου σῖς}
\text{ξυμβαίνῃ ἐπιφθάνως τῇ διαπράξεσθαι ἀμείνοι ἡκουνόν}
\]

(III.82.8, cf. II.53.4)

In addition to lack of moderation and irreverence, the pursuit of vengeance without regard to justice or the welfare of the state equally contributed to the state's downfall:

Therefore from this victory the nobles ... thereafter practised more techniques of fear than demonstrations of power. This fact has commonly ruined great states, while some wish to overcome others by any means and to take vengeance on the vanquished with excessive cruelty.

"Igitur ea victoria nobilitas ... plusque in reliquum sibi timoris quam potentiae addidit. Quae res plerumque magnae civitatis pessum dedit, dum alteri alteros vincere quovis modo et victos acerbius ulcisci volunt." (42.4)

In every way struggling to overcome one another they dared the most terrible actions and took even worse vengeance, not proceeding according to what is just or expedient for the state...

"\[
\text{παντὶ δὲ τρόπῳ ἄγονιζόμενοι ἀλλήλων περιγίγνεσθαι ἐγόλμησαν τε}
\text{τὰ δεινότατα ἐπεξεξάντα τὰ τᾶς τιμωρίας ἐτὶ μείζους, ὧν μέχρι τὸ}
\text{δικαίου καὶ τῇ τόλει εὐμφόρου προτίθέντες}
\]

(III.82.8)

Vengeance is the natural result of the situation when one party emerges the more powerful during civil strife. But in this passage, the similar sentiments are not coincidental; Sallust intends some allusion to Thucydides's description of stasis, as is suggested by the comment that the reign of fear following the victory of one faction "has commonly ruined great states." The "great states" are left
unnamed in a typical Sallustian generalization, but as a result of
the other explicit imitations of Corcyrean stasis in this digression,
the reader is most likely reminded of the Athenian situation as de-
scribed by Thucydides. In particular, one is reminded of the descrip-
tion of Pericles's successors whose ambitions were eventually frus-
trated at last by internal discord. Sallust's implication is that by
the continuation of civil strife, Rome is due to suffer a similar ruin.
Thus he exploits the resemblance between civil disturbances in Greece
and Rome by borrowing Thucydidean phrases, by setting them into a
Thucydidean digression, and by concluding the passage with a warning
that bitter civil strife may destroy the Roman Republic much as it has
other "great states" in the past, notably Athens. By using Thucydidean
phrases and by borrowing a lesson from the downfall of Athens, Sallust
contributes to his own theme of internal strife and predicts the dire
outcome of "mos partium et factionum" which began just after the Gracchi
but reached its most atrocious climax with the recent political mas-
sacres of the Second Triumvirate in 43 B.C.  

To summarize the argument of this section, the digression on "mos
partium et factionum" clearly illustrates the dual stylistic/thematic
use of digressions in general. Both Thucydides and Sallust employ di-
gressions in similar ways, i.e. to distinguish sections of their work,
to give variety to the immediate context, and to refer to general
themes. Moreover the borrowing from Thucydides becomes even more ex-
plicit when Sallust actually uses passages on Corcyrean stasis to des-
cribe party strife at Rome. A warning of Rome's imminent destruction
is implicit in the comparison with Athens, one of the "great states"
which has fallen because of civil strife. By his neat combination of
Thucydides's technique and thought, Sallust has borrowed some lines
from Thucydides's *History* and given to them a new and admonitory tone.

**Ethnographic Digressions**

Next let us consider Sallust's digression on the lands and peoples
of Africa (17-19), which resembles the ethnographic digressions popu-
larized by Herodotus, Hecataeus and the Atthidographers, whose
tradition was shared by Thucydides, notably in his lengthy digression
on Sicilian antiquities (VI.1-5). Although this type of digression was
probably familiar to Sallust from his reading of other historians, e.g.
the Alexander historians or Eratosthenes, and although this particular
digression evidences no literal borrowings from Thucydides, the digres-
sion on Africa nevertheless could owe at least a formal resemblance to
Thucydides's Sicilian digression in its function and it conforms to
Sallust's imitation of Thucydides in other stylistic devices. The di-
gression on Africa and that on Sicily both arise naturally from the
immediately preceding context and give necessary background for the
respective theaters of war. Sallust wishes to elaborate on the char-
acter of the land (17) following the division of Micipsa's kingdom
between Adherbal and Jugurtha (16). Similarly Thucydides describes the
great size of Sicily and the diverse backgrounds of its inhabitants
preceding the detail of the first resolve of the Athenians to sail
against it, despite their ignorance of its magnitude (VI.1). Both
digressions are also transitional. The African digression divides
Sallust's introductory comments on Jugurtha and internal Numidian strife from the narration of the first Roman involvement in the Jugurthine war with the slaughter of Roman merchants at Cirta (20-26). The Sicilian digression changes the tone from the dramatic execution of the Melians (see V.116.4) to a dry exposition of fact and at the same time sets forth necessary background for the narration of the Sicilian expedition. The two digressions furthermore select facts which later become important to the narrative. Sallust supplies us with the characters of the war, Libyans, Gaetulians, and Numidians, with their nomadic natures, with the harsh nature of their land, and with the general division of the land. Thucydides likewise wishes to introduce the various natives of Sicily, with their Ionian, Doric, or other ancestry, a racial division which allegedly affected alliances. Thucydides also wishes to familiarize readers with the number and nature of important cities involved in the Sicilian conflict.

Two Local Legends

Finally let us look at the heroic tale of the brothers Philaenii occasioned by the digression on the founding of Leptis (BJ 78-79). This type of digression containing a moralizing story of local heroes is a common technique with Herodotus and the Atthidographers, but was foreshadowed by the Thucydidean type of digression which we see in the stories of Pausanias, Themistocles and the Peisistratidae (respectively I.126-135.1, 135.2-138; VI.53-59). Let us compare the style and purpose of the stories of the brothers Philaenii and the Peisistratidae to examine again how Sallustian and Thucydidean digressions serve their
immediate and general contexts despite their apparently loose connection to the narrative of the war. It is the similar way in which Sallust and Thucydides use digressions and their somewhat similar content which suggests this comparison.

The digressions on the Philaenii and Peisistratidae may seem on first reading to be tenuously connected to the narrative, but like the other digressions they function as illuminating, interesting and transitional devices. "It does not seem inappropriate" (non indignum videtur), Sallust comments, to remember the story of the Philaenii, since the mention of Leptis calls the deed to mind (BJ 79.1). Sallust's mention of Metellus's inconsequential military aid to Leptis (BJ 77) can only be weakly justified by itself as an opportunity to contrast the fides of local Sidonians with the fickle nature of the Numidians (see BJ 66.2). But if we see the mention of Leptis as an excuse for the more lengthy and moralistic tale of two patriots, the incident at Leptis is more easily understood.

Thucydides's digression on the Peisistratidae arises from the immediate narrative of the unfounded Athenian fear of tyranny which caused the recall of Alcibiades for trial: "The people having heard that the tyranny of Peisistratus and his sons was finally harsh were always afraid and suspected everything" (VI.53.3). Thucydides's object is to show that "neither other people nor the Athenians have said anything accurate about their own tyrants or the past" ( ... ἀποφανῶ οὔτε τοὺς ἄλλους οὔτε ἄυτοὺς Ἀθηναίους περὶ τῶν σφετέρων τυράννων οὐδὲ περὶ τοῦ γενομένου ἀκρίβες οὐδὲν λέγοντας (VI.54.1).
Thucydides's concern for accuracy, like Sallust's desire merely to recall local legend, does not at first glance seem worthy of such a lengthy digression; simply to correct the record or to pause in the course of a tedious campaign cannot explain the full elaboration on each story. So we must look elsewhere, namely at the way in which their themes relate to the themes of each work as a whole.

The contents of both digressions complement certain major themes of Thucydides and Sallust, namely the Thucydidean theme of internal discord precipitated by lack of reasoning and the Sallustian theme of the glory attained by the individual through his sacrifice to the state. Thucydides wishes to illustrate the poor judgment of the people based on faulty knowledge in their decision to recall Alcibiades from the expedition; Sallust to reflect the _virtus_ of Metellus in that of the Philaeni.  

In his digression, Thucydides extracts the lessons of human nature by contrasting the tyrants' intelligence with the popular passions. Within the digression, Thucydides maintains that the tyrants exercised "moral excellence and intelligence" (ἂντίνυν καὶ ἐνυεσιν, VI.54.5), that the conspiracy of Harmodius and Aristogeiton had its origin in the lover Harmodius's grief (ἐρωτίκην λυπη), and that the conspirators' unreasoned boldness was based on impulsive fear (ἡ ἀλογιστος τόλμα ἐκ τοῦ παραξενίμα, VI.59.1). This contradicts the popular view of Harmodius and Aristogeiton as valiant tyrannicides. Thucydides explains the tyrant's supposedly unjust and harsh rule by noting that Hippias was driven to cruelty only later in his reign due to fear (φόβος) of the people (VI.59.2). This digression is thus not irrelevant.
to the stream of Thucydides's narrative, but serves to explain how the recall of Alcibiades was an act of unreasoned fear on the part of the people based on a misinformed legend. That recall of Alcibiades, narrated in VI.60-61, in turn contributes to the ultimate failure of the expedition (VI.65.12).

Sallust's digression is similarly linked in content to the general themes of the work, if not to the immediate narrative. As noted above, the incident of Metellus's aid to Leptis (BJ 77) is only chronologically tied to the preceding capture of Thala ("sed pariter cum capta Thala", BJ 77.1) and is inconsequential to the course of the war; "The place reminds me of this deed," Sallust tells us ("eam rem locus admonuit", BJ 79.1). The two prominent themes of this story, namely the common danger of local feuds to both parties and the heroic martyrdom of individuals for the state, are relevant to the flow of the narrative. After the Carthaginians and Cyrenians had worn one another out somewhat in a land dispute, "they feared that another party might soon attack the vanquished and victors both weary" ("Postquam ... alteri alteros aliquantem attriverant, veriti ne mox victos victoresque defessos alius aggredetur", BJ 79.4). This lesson on the danger from without has special relevance in view of internal discord among factions at Rome: "[The nobles' reign of fear] has commonly ruined great states, while they wished to conquer one another by any means whatever and to avenge the vanquished quite cruelly" ("Quae res plerumque magnas civitatis pessum dedit, dum alteri alteros vincere quovis modo et victos acerbus ulcisci volunt", BJ 42.4; cf. also 73 re discord during Marius's candidacy for consulship). The other lesson is that self sacrifice for
the state brings eternal, glorious fame to the individual: "The Philaeni sacrificed themselves and their lives for the state"
("Philaeni ... seque vitamque suam rei publicae condonavere ", BJ 79.9).
The chief vehicles of this fame are, Sallust implies, monuments (here the ara e) and his own historical record: "And greater favor will accrue to the state from my inactivity than from the activity of others"
("Maiusque commodum ex otio meo quam ex aliorum negotiis rei publicae venturum", BJ 4.4). The theme of patriotic sacrifice has also been illustrated at length in the deeds of Metellus. 29

In view of the moral relevance of this digression to Sallust's theme of individual virtus or patriotism, the presence of the story is justified in the work. Similarly Thucydides's example of the people's poor judgment of the Peisistratidae and Alcibiades illustrates his theme of the thoughtless and destructive effects of factions within the state. Thucydides's apparent task is to set the record straight; Sallust wishes to serve the state by presenting imagines of virtue to its citizens. Yet if both Sallust and Thucydides exploit the use of digression to illustrate themes, the themes themselves, namely the disastrous effects of an inaccurate sense of history and the need for self-sacrifice to the state, show an interesting divergence of interest. The technique of digression is similarly used by Thucydides and Sallust; Sallust's thought, however, at least in the digression on the Philaeni, indicates his greater patriotic orientation and the effect on him of Hellenistic moralizing history, an offshoot of Thucydides's tradition or concept of history.
Conclusions on the Technique of Digressions

From these three Sallustian digressions we can see how both historians use digression to their benefit as a device which arises naturally from the immediate context, fills in background information, furnishes causes for and commentaries upon events which relate to greater themes in the histories, provides variety, and serves as a transition into a later stage of the narrative. They are not merely structural devices, but also advance the progress of the narrative by contributing to major themes. Furthermore the fact that Sallust owes a debt to Thucydides in the similar uses of digressions is supported by the general similarity in subject matter, namely the mechanics of civil strife, the ethnography of a people, and the telling of popular legends. Finally the specific allusions within the digression on "mos partium et factionum" to that on Corcyrean stasis clearly indicate that Sallust reused Thucydidean digressions for his own purpose.

Generalizations

We observed that in the Bellum Catilinae Sallust uses several Thucydidean stylistic devices, such as sententiae, sentences with "to be accustomed to" (solet/εὐωθεῖ) and neuter adjectives, all of which have in common the desire to seek the general truth behind particular phenomena. This tendency to generalize, we noted, may also be observed in entire passages which seek to let the one specific example stand for events which occur often and in a similar fashion during the course of events. Such generalizing passages occur in Thucydides's description of the Plague as the beginning of lawlessness (II.53.1) and in his
description of Corcyrean stasis as the first of many such revolts (III.82.1). Sallust continues to generalize in entire passages of the Bellum Jugurthinum, e.g. 5.1 on the war as the first opposition to the nobility or 30.4 where a single speech of Memmius is selected as typical of his many in exhorting the people: "sed quoniam ea tempestate Romae Memmi facundia clara pollensque fuit, decere existumavi unam ex tam multis orationem eius perscribere" (BJ 30.4; cf. II.13.9 where Thucydides similarly records a typical speech of Pericles).

Sallust also continues to use those more specific generalizing devices. Let us first cite a few examples of his sententiae. As in the Bellum Catilinae, they are often parenthetical remarks made in the context of the prologue, excursuses or speeches. They are also frequently introduced by "but" or "for" in expansion of a previous thought, and are methodological, political, ethical, or generally philosophical in nature:

"nam uti genus hominum compositum ex corpore et anima est .." (BJ 2.1)

"nam concordia parvae res crescent, discordia maximae dilabuntur" (BJ 10.6)

"sed dux atque imperator vitae mortalium animus est" (BJ 1.3)

"sed haec inter bonos amicitia; inter malos factio est" (BJ 31.16)

"ad hoc in re publica molto praestat benefici quam malefici immemorem esse" (BJ 31.28)

Amat and \( \phi_1 \lambda \epsilon \uparrow \)

Sallust and Thucydides each use two different words for "to be accustomed to", solet and amat, and \( \epsilon^2 \omega \epsilon \) and \( \phi_1 \lambda \epsilon \uparrow \). Amat and indicate a stronger tendency since they impute a psychological
connotation of "being fond of" and so "being wont to." This usage in
Sallust is a Graecism and, so far as we know, his innovation in Latin.

*Amare* in this sense was noted by Quintilian on Sallust's *Bellum
Jugurthinum* 34.1 (see *Inst.* 9.3.17): "The crowd which was present in
the assembly was violently incensed and intimidated him by shouting ...
and by all other methods which anger is wont to rouse" ("quae ira fieri
amat"). Sallust uses that expression but once in the *Bellum
Jugurthinum*, to describe the crowd's protestations against the tribune
Baebius's support of Jugurtha. It is instructive to notice that both
Thucydides and Sallust describe crowd psychology in the generalization
which speaks of an almost passionate tendency. By characterizing the
crowd in these terms. Sallust stirs our recollection of two Thucydidean
passages, the first regarding the Athenian crowd's fickle treatment of
Pericles as recorded by Thucydides: "Not much later, as the crowd is
wont to do (ο̂̂̂̂̂περ φιλεῖ δύνασθαι ποιεῖν), they elected him general"
(II.65.4). We may also be put in mind of Diodotus's warning: "I
think two things chiefly stand in the way to good counsel, haste and
anger, of which the one is wont to arise with thoughtlessness, the
other with ignorance and lack of reason" (νομίζω δε δύο τα έναντιώτατα
εν θείαι είναι τάχος τε και οργήν ών το μέν μετα άνοιας φιλεί
gίγνεσθαι, το δε μετα ἄπαιδευσίας και βραχύτητος γνώμης , III.42.1).

This allusion bears special relevance to the immediately prior comment
that Memmius, in contrast to the crowd, "took counsel of propriety
rather than anger" ("dignitati quam irae magis consulens", BJ 33.3).
Thucydides frequently used this verb, \( \phi \lambda \epsilon \tau \upsilon \), to express generalizations (e.g. I.78.2; II.62.3) and with special reference to emotional reactions of crowds (I.141.6; II.65.4; III.42.1, 81.5; IV.125; VII.80.3; VIII.1.4; etc.). So by employing a Greek phrase and a Thucydidean technique, and by embodying in it a Thucydidean idea, Sallust enriches his phrase, "quae ira fieri amat" (BJ 34.1). Here as elsewhere in Sallust's works, a similar Thucydidean style evokes associations with Thucydidean subject matter.

Solet and \( \epsilon \iota \omega \theta \varepsilon \)

Sallust may also employ generalizations using the impersonal solet which similarly corresponds to the Thucydidean technique using \( \phi \lambda \epsilon \tau \upsilon \) or \( \epsilon \iota \omega \theta \varepsilon \), although the peculiar Greek flavor which amat imparts is absent from generalizations with solet. These generalizations often express the thematic Thucydidean disdain for a crowd's emotionality (e.g. BJ 13.5, the Roman people in council after Hiempsal's death; 25.3, the Romans after Adherbal's letter; 59.3; and 66.2, the revolt of the Vagenses) but their use is also extended to comments on certain individuals (4.7, on new men; 96.3, on Sulla). That such generalizations were a recognized Thucydidean device is implied by Cicero's clever parody of Thucydides's style in a statement on his historical fate: "Thucydides suffering that which was accustomed to happen to certain excellent Athenians ("id quod optimo cuique Athenis accidere solitum est"), was driven into exile..." (De orat. 2.13.56).

The generalizations using solet do not evidence an attempt to allude directly to a specific Thucydidean passage, but do express a
similar disdain for the emotional action of the crowd. Cicero's close paraphrase of Thucydides's words, coupled with the very pointed reference to Thucydides, and Sallust's strikingly close imitation of Thucydides's phrase ("quod in tali re solet", BJ 15.1; cf. ὡς ἠλέη ἐν τῷ τοίοῦτῳ γίγνεσθαι, III.81.5), all lead us to the conclusion that Sallust consciously copied Thucydides in his formulation of generalizations, which by association with Thucydides impart to Sallust's own writing on the one hand some of the disdain for popular sentiment and on the other some of the sense of objective analysis inherent in Thucydides's work.

Antithesis of Word and Deed in Sallust

From this consideration of generalizations and brevity in the Bellum Jugurthinum, let us look at Sallust's use of the contrast of word and deed. The Bellum Jugurthinum continues to describe the Thucydidean antithesis of word and deed first described in the Bellum Catilinae (see especially 52.11). For Sallust, actions speak truer than words. A single phrase suffices to undercut the credibility of an entire speech. Jugurtha recognizes the falseness of the flattering words of his father on his deathbed (BJ 10): "Ad ea Jugurtha, tametsi regem ficta locutum intellegebat et ipse longe aliter animo agitabat, tamen pro tempore beneigne respondit" (BJ 11.1). On another occasion, danger in the person of Jugurtha hung over Cirta and the report of this in Rome was mild ("sed rumor clemens erat", 22.1). In view of this single phrase contrasting word and reality, Jugurtha's excuses to the Roman legates are patently false (22.2-4). Later still, Jugurtha
realizes that Metellus's delay in negotiating was actually a prelude to war: "Iugurtha ubi Metelli dicta cum factis compositae ac se suis artibus temptares animadvertit, quippe cui verbis pax nuntiabantur, ceterum re bellum asperrum erat..." (BJ 48.1). If words are shown to be weak, valiant deeds are the strong and decisive characteristic of a soldier. So Albinus's army is characterized as "more ready of tongue than hand" ("lingua quam manu promptior", 44.1) and Marius asks whether deeds or words are of greater value in general ("Nunc vos existuamate facta an dicta pluris sint", 85.14).

Magis Quam and Μᾶλλον

Antithesis is a device favored by both Sallust and Thucydides in similar analyses of causation, notably "rather ... than" (magis ... quam; μᾶλλον...ν), which seek to uncover true human motives and overturn the apparent ones. In the Bellum Jugurthinum, Sallust applies the device to Jugurtha's legates who argue his case in Rome ("largitione magis quam causa freti", 15.1), to the plebs who ordered the Mamilian rogation ("magis odio nobilitatis ... quam cura rei publicae", 40.3), and to the zealous Roman factions who voted during election of consuls ("magis studia partium quam bona aut mala sua", 73.4). Similarly Athenians complain of allies who become angry out of arrogance (ἀδικούμενοι ... οἱ ἀνθρώποι μᾶλλον ὀργίζονται ἢ βιαζόμενοι , I.77.4) or insolent Corcyrean revolutionaries who strengthened their mutual faith not so much out of religious piety as by a mutual partnership in crime (τὰς ἐς σφαῖς αὐτῶς πίστεις οὐ τῷ θείῳ νόμῳ μᾶλλον ἐκρατύνοντο ἢ τῷ κοινῷ τι παρανομῆσαι , III.82.6). Base motives covered up by
specious pretexts are uncovered and made public by both authors.

**Antithesis and the Conflicts of Action and Ideas**

The antithetical style, most notably shared by Thucydides and Sallust in the contrast of word and deed, but evident in other antithetical phrases, e.g. *magis/quam*, *tantus/quantus* and *pro* meaning "instead of," is another Thucydidean technique which Sallust adopted along with the Thucydidean ideas connoted by it. Sallust was as much an 'exile' from his political office as Thucydides from his native Athens. Sallust was in opposition to his environment and sought to expose shallow assumptions, and to give the truer causes of events. In these characteristics he followed Thucydides. Perhaps in the *Bellum Jugurthinum* the deception between the Numidian enemy and Rome, and the animosity between parties at Rome, give to Sallust a greater scope for the display of this antithesis, which is also used in the *Bellum Catilinae*. As in Thucydides's *History*, both internal and external civil strife in the *Bellum Jugurthinum* provide the canvas on which the antagonism inherent in human nature is portrayed.

Basically the opposition in the events of the *Bellum Jugurthinum* and Thucydides's *History* is between appearance and reality. It is the historian's job to sort out the difference and to illuminate the truth behind events: "paeca supra repetam quo ad cognoscendum omnia industriæ magis magisque in aperto sint" (*BJ* 5.3); ἡν μὲν γὰρ ἀληθεστάτην πρόφασιν, ἀφανεστάτην δὲ λόγῳ (*I.23.6*).

Three significant stylistic devices of Thucydides were adopted by Sallust in his *Bellum Jugurthinum* for reapplication to his own subject
matter, namely digressions, generalizations, and antitheses.

Similarities in thought are obvious or can be deduced. Digressions are drawn from their immediate context, lead to general themes, and dwell on similar ethnological, legendary, or aetiological subjects; they also break up events of the narrative in an almost episodic way for both authors. Within one digression (BJ 41-42), that on party strife, Thucydides's comments on the moral upheaval of civil war are borrowed and Rome's downfall is implied by association. Generalizations not only lend universal and objective tone, they expound the usual ways of men with some disdain for those ways. Finally the antithesis shows both a balance and a conflict between forces, particularly between words or thoughts and deeds.

These three techniques complement the themes of the Bellum Jugurthinum cited above. In general these Thucydidean themes and style both pervade the work and lend to it a concern for the human element in causation and a sense of struggle between typical groups of men and outstanding leaders. The themes tell us that the plebs and nobles, certain racial groups and crowds in general are under the sway of pride and avarice, and that a process of decay begun by factional groups was responsible for the failure of the state. Among the techniques are digressions and general comments upon the narrative on important themes such as the schism of civil strife. Generalizations and antitheses also aim at establishing the typical, only to crush it by sudden contrast. The struggle and opposition in both historians' styles not only attempt to describe the subjects of war and civil
strife by imitation, but they suggest both men's restless spirits within, spirits opposed to contemporary prose style and to contemporary politics.

**Passages**

The imitative passages of the *Bellum Jugurthinum*, like those of the *Bellum Catilinae*, fall roughly into categories of allusive and descriptive imitations, that is, those which either intentionally recall Thucydides or merely use his phrases as descriptive ornament.

The passages in the *Bellum Jugurthinum* include four narrative 'battle' passages and four speeches which together with their narrative contexts describe four individuals. In each case a look at the parallel passages will be followed by an analysis of the possible significance of the borrowing.

First, a caution: Laistner\(^{31}\) offers an implicit warning about the danger of comparing ancient battle scenes:

Descriptions of battles, sieges, and other military undertakings in Sallust, as in the majority of ancient historians, show a strong generic resemblance ... few writers were either expert or well informed or even interested enough to strive after accuracy of presentation; instead they were satisfied with due emphasis on the dramatic and the pathetic.

The generally similar nature of ancient battles requires that we cite several clear parallels which mark the Sallustian battle as a borrowing from Thucydides.

**Two Night Battles**

There was only one night battle during the war, Thucydides tells us, that between the Athenians and the Syracusans at Epipolae, and its
nature is similar enough to one fought by Aulus against Jugurtha (BJ 38.4-8) to suggest imitation. The battles begin in confusion:

"Milites Romani perculsi tumultu insolito arma capere alii, alii se abdere, pars territos confirmare, trepidae omnibus locis" (38.5)

καὶ ενταῦθα ἦδη ἐν πολλῇ ταραχῇ καὶ ἀπορίᾳ έγίγνοντο οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι (VII.44.1)

The enemies' forces were large and night added to the uncertainty:

"Vis magna hostium caelum nocte atque nubibus obscuratum, periculum anceps, postremo fugere an manere tuis iei in incerto erat" (38.5)

οπλίται δὲ ἀμφοτέρων οὐκ ὀλίγοι ἐν στενοχώρια ἀνεστρέφοντο (VII.44.2)

ἐν δὲ νυκτομαχίᾳ ... πῶς ἀν τις σαφῶς τι ἤδει; (VII.44.1)

Roman like Athenian forces were forced to flee in confusion:

"Nostri foeda fuga, plenique abiectis armis, proximum collem occupaverunt" (38.7)

ὡστε τέλος εὐμπεσόντες αὐτοῖς ἀπελύοντο ... κατὰ τὴν χώραν ἔπλανθησαν (VII.44.7-8)

Confusion, uncertainty and flight may characterize any night battle, but the similarity in description is best seen in the style of both passages which imitate the confusion by inconcinusitas. Note especially the imbalance and contrast of alii, alii ... pars ... omnibus locis of 38.5, and the foeda fuga (ablative of manner) which balances amictis armis (ablative absolute); compare ἐς used in zeugma and the imbalance of main verb by a participle in VII.44.7: ὄν μόνον ἐς φόβου κατέστησαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐς χεῖρας ἀλλήλοις ἐλθόντες.

The battle was not disastrous, but at least it was demoralizing to the respective Roman and Athenian war efforts. Aulus was forced to submit to the shameful terms ("gravia et flagiti plena", 38.10) of passing under the yoke rather than suffering death; Nicias, however, despite the adverse circumstances (πόνηρα σφῶν τὰ πράγματα, VII.48.1) and in
view of the vindictive character of the Athenians at Athens (VII.48.4) urges his men to persist in their efforts.

Due to the fact that both are night battles and due to the similar stylistic techniques used to describe them, we may surmise that the battle of Aulus against Jugurtha is a purely descriptive imitation of Thucydides's night battle. But when Sallust's battle is considered in the light of the following Thucydidean borrowing which describes the alarm at Rome after the report of Aulus's disgrace we can more definitively recognize the imitation as an allusion to Thucydides's Sicilian Expedition and the subsequent alarm at Athens.

The Shock from Defeat

Sallust's description of the alarm at Rome following Aulus's defeat clearly imitates Thucydides's report of the alarm at Athens following the Athenian defeat in Sicily (BJ 39; VIII.1-2). The elements of the two descriptions and their similar wording reveals the imitation. Harsh and shameful terms of surrender precede the spread of the news: "gravia et flagiti plena" (38.10); οὐδὲν ὄλιγον ἐσ ὀὐδὲν κακοπαθήσαντες (VII.87.6). Then follows an abrupt transition to the scene at home: "Sed ubi ea Romae comperta sunt ..." (BJ 39.1); ἐσ δὲ τῶν Ἀθηνῶν ἐπειδὴ ηγγελθη (VIII.1). Scapegoats suffer the people's wrath: Aulo omnes infesti (BJ 39.1); καλεοὶ μὲν ἦσαν τοῖς ξυμπροθυμηθείσι τῶν ὅπωρων τῶν ἐκπλουν... ὑφιζοῦτο δὲ καὶ τοῖς χρησμολόγοις κτλ. ... (VIII.1).

Defeat and shock mark domestic and foreign revisions of strategy: 1) a domestic reorganization is made by the people in which the Roman plebs call for a rogatio (BJ 40.3) and the Athenians "set things in order"
(ὦπερ φιλεῖ δῆμος ποιεῖν, ἐτοιμοὶ ἔσαν εὐτακτῶν , VIII.1.4); 2) a strategic setback is suffered abroad due to the commander Albinus's inactivity (BJ 39.5) and the insurgence of the whole of Hellas against Athens (VIII.2.1).

The significance of this imitation is that Sallust probably intends an allusion to the Athenian situation immediately after the conflict in Sicily. In view of the borrowing in the "night battle" which immediately precedes it, we may suppose two reasons for the allusion: to illustrate the predictably volatile nature of the people and to emphasize the importance of the defeat as marking a new stage in the progress of the war. Following Thucydides's night battle, Nicias alludes to "the Athenian character which destroys with shameful accusation" (τὰς Ἀθηναίων φύσεις ἐπ' ἁλίσχροι τε αἰτία ... ἀπολείσθαι , VII.48.4). We witness the effects of this character most clearly in VIII.1-2. Sallust therefore probably chose to imitate the night battle primarily for its descriptive quality, but possibly also for its association with the Sicilian Expedition as a whole. This latter possibility is supported by his close, allusive imitation of the alarm at Athens which illustrates popular fear, grief, anger and revisionary measures. The ultimate effects of this alarm on Rome and Athens are salutary: the Mamilian rogation curbs extortion among the nobles, and the new commander, Metellus, revitalizes the army; Athens takes new defensive measures (VIII.4) and the revolt of her allies proves to be rash (VIII.24). The description of the shock itself is useful as a bald illustration of the interaction of foreign and domestic politics, a
theme of central interest to both authors.

Spectaculum Horrible, Τῷ τε Ὠψει Ἐκάστῳ Ἀλγεινᾶ

While Marius marched to Cirta, his winter quarters for 106 B.C., he suffered a savage attack from Jugurtha. The barbarian ferocity of the ambush is illustrated with a lively description of its aftermath (BJ 101.11). This passage seems to be a remarkably condensed version of Thucydides's description of the aftermath of the battle in the Great Harbor at Syracuse (VII.75.3-4):

"Turn spectaculum horribile in campis patentibus sequi, fugere, occidi, capi; equi atque vivi afflictī, ac multi volneribus acceptīs neque fugere posse neque quietem pati; nītī modo ac statim concidere; postremo omnia, qua visus est, constrāta telis, armīs, cadaveribus, et inter ea humum infecta sanguine" (BJ 101.11)

This passage lives through its use of pathetic detail, e.g. the vain efforts of the wounded, which is derived from Thucydides, and through its brevity, e.g. the string of historic infinitives, which is also inherent in Thucydides's description (τῷ τε Ὠψει Ἐκάστω Ἀλγεινᾶ καὶ τῷ γυνώμη αἰσθέσθαι, VII.75.2).

The contents of both passages share several elements, given here in Sallust's order: the general horror of the sight (δεινῶν οἵ τινες, VII.75.2), the desperate cries and struggling of the wounded (οἵ ζῶτες καταλειπόμενοι τραυματίαι τε καὶ ἁσθενεῖς... ᾨμοίηθη ὑπολειπόμενοι, VII.75.3-4), the weak efforts to take flight (ἐπακολουθοῦντες ἐς θυγον δύνατο, εἰ τῷ δὲ προλύπτο τῇ δρόμῃ καὶ τῷ σώμα, VII.75.4), and the sight of general carnage (τῶν τε γὰρ νεκρῶν ἀτάφων δέντων, VII.75.3).
The context in Sallust is so radically different from Thucydides's that a purely descriptive imitation is suggested. For a more allusive use of the same passage, see Bellum Catalinae 61.8-9, where the Roman soldiers uncover kinsmen as well as dire enemies among the enemy's dead and so the army, in pointed contrast to Thucydides's pathetic scene, is filled with a mixture of grief and joy.

Spectators of the Battle

During his narration of the battle at Zama, Sallust needs to describe effectively how the attention of the townspeople watching from the walls was diverted from Marius's bold but vain assault on the city. The point of the episode is to introduce Marius's animus belli ingens (BJ 63.2). The description of the spectators' absorption in the battle lends credibility and vitality to the incident; Sallust relied on Thucydides's description of the spectators during the final battle in the Great Harbor at Syracuse as a basis for this passage:

"Sed illi qui moenia defensabant, qui hostes paulum modo pugnam remiserant, intenti proelium equestre prospectabant. Eos, uti quaque Iugurthae res erant, laetos modo, modo pavidos animadverteres; ac sicuti audiri a suis aut cerni possent, monere alii, alii hortari, aut manu significare, aut niti corporibus et ea hac et illuc quasi vitabundi aut iactentes tela agitare" (BJ 60.3-4)

Like the preceding borrowing, this passage is a purely descriptive imitation and although the allusion to Thucydides might not be passed over by readers, it is not necessary to be aware of Sallust's debt to appreciate the color of the description. Sallust needed to convey the pathos of the scene and so he combined the drama of Thucydides's passage with the well-known tradition of the Homeric teichoskopy
Also like the previous borrowing, this passage uses the antithetical style and *inconcin nitas* to mimic the precarious balance of the battle. Sallust's brevity surpasses even that of Thucydides in this description.

Other elements of the content are likewise shared: the battle is fought with great zeal (*magna vi*, *BJ* 60.1; *πολλά ... προθυμία*, VII.70.3); cheers are mixed with lamentation (*clamor permixtus*, *BJ* 60.2; *ὁλοφυμοδ*, *θν*, *νικῶντες κρατούμενοι*, VII.71.4); spectators are elated or groaning (*BJ* 60.4; *ἀνεθαρασθάν ... ἔδουλοντο*, VII.71.3); many sounds could be heard (*BJ* 60.4; *πάντα δομού ἀκούσαι*, VII.71.4); the sway of bodies matched that of minds (*BJ* 60.4; *τοῖς σώμασιν αὐτοῖς ἵσα τῇ δόξῃ περιδεώς ξυναπονούντες αἰεὶ γὰρ παρ'ολίγου ἥ διεφυγον ἦ ἀπ' αμάλλυστο*, VII.71.3).

The vastly different context does not suggest a significant allusion to Thucydides, i.e. a comparison of the Athenians on the shore with the walled-in citizens of Zama, but it does demonstrate Sallust's desire, in an obvious borrowing but one insignificant for its context, to be associated with Thucydides as a military historian. Rhetorical devices of *pathos* are also at work.

Speeches

In the discussion of Sallust's stylistic debt to Thucydides we noted that Sallust's use of speeches resembled Thucydides's in that although both historians seem to be concerned with keeping close to the actual content of the particular speech, they both use speeches to reveal broader, historical issues and characterize the speaker himself.
Passages of certain Sallustian speeches are also reminiscent of similar passages in Thucydides. The following individuals will be examined with regard to their speeches and the context of their speeches in the narrative: Memmius (BJ 31), Jugurtha (BJ 49.2-3), and Marius (BJ 63-64).

Memmius as Pericles

After the return of Bestia from Numidia and from his illicit arrangement of Jugurtha's surrender, the tribune Memmius delivers a speech which is calculated to arouse the minds of the people against the crimes of the nobles and contains several clear borrowings from Pericles's third speech (II.60-64) also urging the people to action in a time of crisis. Pericles's speech is echoed both in Sallust's description of the speaker as a liberal leader of the people and in the contents of the speech itself which appeals to the people to preserve their freedom, avert political enslavement, and take action to preserve the state.

Preceding the speech of Memmius, the leader is described as a man of libertas (BJ 30.3) and after his speech he is described as a statesman who can assuage the anger of the people: "At C. Memmius ... dignitate quam irae magis consulens sedare motus et animos eorum mollire" (BJ 33.3). Moreover his speech is not only a showpiece of oratory, it is effective in persuading the people: "Haec atque alia huiuscemodi saepe dicundo Memmius populo persuadet" (BJ 32.1). This description of a liberal and effective leader of the people suggests a comparison with Pericles who is similarly a "man of freedom" (κατέξετο τὸ πλῆθος..."
The particular speeches reported by the historian embody both the particular and the general.35 They not only describe the issues behind the events but also relate those historical issues to the more general themes of the work. So both leaders seek to arouse the people:

"intentus omni modo plebis animum incendebat" (BJ 30.2);

(II.59.3). Their motives for arousal are related to the historians' major themes, Sallust's of opposition to the nobility (BJ 30.2, cf. 5.1), Thucydides's of the need for calm reason in statesmanship (II.59.3).36

In addition to the leader, the similarity of situations suggests a reason for imitation. In both cases a statesman seeks to sway the minds of the people away from anger and towards positive action in order to save the state. Memmius thwarts the efforts of Scaurus to turn the people from truth and justice: "At maxime eos (sc. plebem) potentia Scauri ... a vero bonoque impediebat. At C. Memmius ... monere ne rem publicam, ne libertatem suam deserent" (BJ 30.2). Similarly, Pericles in his oration wishes to turn the people from personal anger at him and from detrimental peace with Sparta toward a calm and confident continuation of the war.

So the two speeches contain similar themes of the leader's zeal for the state, the threat to national liberty, the need to preserve ancestral freedom and the need for political activism. Both statesmen
ignore factional interests and adhere to zeal for the state: "Multa ne dehortantur a vobis, Quirites, ni studium, rei publicae omnia superet: opes factionis, ..." (BJ 31.1); compare II.60.1-4 of Pericles's speech where the commonweal (τὸ κοινὸν τῆς σωτηρίας) is defended above partisanship (αἱ ἕδαι εὑμφοραί).

The threat of political servitude, respectively from the nobles and the Spartans, poses a threat to the liberty of the state:

"maxime quod innocentiae plus periculi quam honoris est" (BJ 31.1)
"animo aequo servitutem toleratis" (BJ 31.11)

"vos pro libertate, quam ab illis [maioribus] accepistis, nonne summa opem nitemini" (BJ 31.17)

Despite the significant difference in the natures of the dangers threatening Rome and Athens, the various references in both speeches to "freedom," "servitude" and "danger" to the state contribute to the other themes and the general context in suggesting Sallust's deliberate imitation of Thucydides.

Another Periclean theme borrowed by Sallust, the need to preserve ancestral liberty, is used to encourage the people to act:37

"terte ego libertatem quae mihi a parente meo tradita est experiar" (BJ 31.5)

"vos pro libertate ... nitemini" (BJ 31.17, quoted in full, supra)

"atque eo vehementius quo maius dedecus est parta amittere quam omnino non paravisse?" (BJ 31.17)
The central idea is that political apathy, although it can be benign, may lapse into malignancy which threatens the state's freedom.

Several themes of Memmius's speech, namely disdain for factionalism and the need to avert servitude, to preserve ancestral freedom and to become politically active, suggest that Sallust wished to allude to Pericles's speech. The characterizations of the two statesmen support this suggestion. Both men intervene at a crucial time to encourage the people to take wise and courageous action. Both speakers embody a type of patriotism and a sense of freedom which is lacking in subsequent
leaders. The ideals embodied, however different they actually are in their respective contexts, are established early and are meant to stay in the reader's mind throughout the remainder of the narrative, even though the speaker himself is removed from the action. Memmius, for example, who "settles the minds of the people" ("consulens sedare motus et animos eorum mollire", BJ 33.3), when they are about to erupt in anger at Jugurtha and who "appeals to the dignity and majesty of the Roman people,"\(^\text{40}\) can be contrasted to Marius who in his consular oration seeks to harry the nobles (BJ 84.5) and succeeds in "inflaming the wills of the people" ("plebis animos arrectos videt", BJ 86.1).

The significance of this allusion to Pericles's third speech then is not so much in its illustration of similar issues and solutions. Thucydides wishes to illustrate the need for intelligence above anger (II.62.4-5; 64.4-6), the need for continued military action against Sparta, and the reality of Athenian naval might (II.62.1-3). Sallust on the other hand wishes to demonstrate the theme of the plebeian opposition to the nobles (BJ 31.11-17) and implies that the people should avoid violence and rather use the peaceful inquest (BJ 31.6-7, 18-20). Therefore the significance lies in the similarity of the individual speakers as men of freedom, and in the similarity of the situations which require a recognition of the threat to freedom, a renewal of ancestral pride, and recourse to political activism.

**Jugurtha as Phormio**

Perrochat\(^\text{41}\) noted that all the elements of Jugurtha's speech in *oratio obliqua* to his soldiers at the battle near Muthul (BJ 49.2-3)
have been supplied by Phormio's exhortation to his men before the battle at the straits of Rhium (II.89). Let us examine these elements according to themes and in the order given by Sallust. Then we shall try to determine the significance of the borrowing in its context.

Both generals urge a defence worthy of their reputation for valor:

"monet atque obtestatur uti memores pristinae virtutis et victoriae sese regnumque suam ab Romanorum avaritia defendant" (BJ 49.2)

Both explain that the battle is against a foe conquered before:

"cum eis certamen fore, quos antea victos sub iugum miserint" (BJ 49.2)

A similar argument in both speeches, not cited by Perrochat, is that the enemy troops have been demoralized by the defeat, even if the leaders are eager for battle: "ducem illis, non animum mutatum" (BJ 49.2); Phormio mentions that the Spartan leaders are acting "for their own glory" (διὰ τὴν σφατέραν δόξαν) and that their men are "unwilling to face danger" (ἀκοντας... ἐς τὸν κίνδυνον, II.89.4).

The general himself has taken all possible precautions:

"quae ab imperatore ducerint omnia suis provisa" (BJ 49.2)

Both speakers note that the elements of strategic location, experience, and numbers are all in their favor:

"locum superiorem, ut prudentes cum imperitis, ne pauciores cum pluribus aut rudes cum belli melioribus manum conserrarent" (BJ 49.2)
In another section, not cited by others, Phormio also comments on Greek experience:...

"proinde parati intentique essent signo dato Romanos invadere" (BJ 49.3)

The crucial nature of the battle is recognized: "illum diem aut omnis haberes et victorias confirmaturum aut maximarum aerumnarum initium fore" (BJ 49.3); the same sense is found in Phormio's remark, ὃ δὲ ἡ γωνὶ μεγὰς κτλ. ... τῆς θαλάσσης (II.89.10), but the precise wording comes from Archidamios's comment, ἡ δὲ ἡ ἡμέρα τοῖς Ἑλληνικοῖς μεγάλων κακῶν ἀρξει (II.12.3), a phrase well known to ancient historians.42

The contexts of both speeches also reveal certain similarities.

The Numidian and Greek armies had defeated enemy forces once before (BJ 38; II.84). The army of Jugurtha and that of Phormio are defeated in the present battle (BJ 51-52.4; III.90). The enemy boasts proudly of its victory (BJ 53.8; II.91.2). The crucial difference in the latter similarity is that the Peloponnesians pursue in disorderly fashion (ἀτάκτως, II.91.4) whereas the Romans remain on the alert (instructi intentique, BJ 53.5), thus preventing a surprise counter-attack such as the Peloponnensians suffered. Finally, each battle is important in the context of the war as a whole. The battles mark the first defeat of the Athenian navy and of Jugurtha's forces. Neither battle is a disaster for the conquered, yet the victors gain great
confidence as a result of snatching a victory from near defeat. This change in attitude subsequently influences the course of the war to some degree.

The imitation is allusive, although none of the imitative passages are meant to be close translations of the Greek. Sallust probably found elements of Phormio's oration suitable to Jugurtha's situation and so put the ideas into Latin. The allusion may serve as an implicit lesson that experience, boldness, and previous victory do not insure defeat of the enemy, nor even after a victory does pride by itself without attendant good order keep the enemy at bay.

Marius as Leader and Demagogue

The final imitative passage which we shall examine is perhaps the most complex. Within the two chapters of the Bellum Jugurthinum in which Marius's character is first fully described, Sallust employs three probable imitations from Thucydides. The first of these is a thumbnail sketch of the popular leader who is described in terms of a Pericles (BJ 63.2; II.65.5). The other two suggest a comparison with Cleon when, during the famous "deprivation scene" with Metellus, Marius reacts in a way reminiscent of Cleon during his confrontation with Nicias over the command at Pylos (BJ 64.3-65.5; IV.27.3-28.5). Like the Thucydidean borrowings applied to Memmius and Jugurtha, Sallust uses Thucydides to aid his characterization of an individual. But unlike those former imitations, the characterization of Marius is rather a mixture of the qualities of leadership of Pericles and the demagogic temper of Cleon.
First, Marius is identified at this early stage in his career as a would-be Pericles. That is, he has a keen insight, patriotism, and is incorruptible by bribery:

"praeter vetustatem familiae alia omnia abunde erant: industrias, probitas, militiae magna scientia, animus bellii ingens, domi modicus, lubidinis et divitiarum victor, tantum modo gloriae avidus"

(BJ 63.2)

...ἐν τῷ εἰρήνῃ μετρίως ἐξηνείτο...ἐπείδη τε ὁ πόλεμος κατέστη, ὁ δὲ φαίνεται καὶ ἐν τούτῳ προγνοσὶ τὴν δύναμιν (II.65.5)

ἐκείνος μὲν δύνατος ὡν τῷ τῇ ἀξιώματι καὶ τῇ γνώμῃ χρημάτων τῇ διαφανώς ἀδωρότατος γενόμενος κατεῖχε τὸ πλῆθος ἔλευθέρως (II.65.8)

Sallust's isolation of these particular qualities, moderation in peace time, knowledge of warcraft, the ability to take action (industria), and superiority to bribes all suggest an imitation of Pericles's qualities. Sallust's concession that he was gloriae avidus, i.e. ambitious, of course contradicts Thucydides's picture of Pericles "who did not obtain power for selfish reasons (κτώμενος ἐξ ὧν προσηκόντων τὴν δύναμιν, II.65.8). Perhaps by this allusion to Marius's imperfect fulfillment of Periclean qualities Sallust suggests that Marius was only a potentially virtuous leader of the Republic. Sallust's ominous postscript to the passage supports this interpretation: "Tamen is ad id locorum talis vir - nam postea ambitione praeceps datus est" (BJ 63.6).

Next the ambitious rise of Marius as a somewhat demagogic leader is described through the scene in which Marius's ambitions are forestalled by Metellus. The scene can be compared to Cleon's usurpation of the command at Pylos from Nicias. Many of the dramatic elements of Sallust's scene are contained in the second debate on Pylos (BJ 64.3-65.5; IV.27.3-28.5). Both Marius and Cleon are popular leaders:
"simul ea tempestate plebs ... novos extollebat. Ita Mario cuncta procedere" (BJ 65.5)

Κλέων ... βιαιστάτως τῶν πολιτῶν τῷ τε δημῷ παρὰ πολὺ ἐν τῷ τότε πιθανώτατος (III.36.6)

The commanding generals, Nicias and Metellus, taunt their rivals:
Metellus insults Marius for ambitious aiming at the censorship (BJ 64.4);
Nicias, seizing Cleon's unfair criticisms of the Pylos command, tauntingly offers the command to Cleon (IV.28.1). "Passion and anger" feed both Marius's and Cleon's ambitions:

"Ita cupidine atque ira, pessumis consultoribus, grassari neque facto ullo neque dicto abstinere, quod modo ambitosum foret (BJ 64.5)
νομίζω δὲ οὗ τὰ ἐναντιώτατα εὐβουλία εἶναι , τάχος τε καὶ ὀργήν (III.42.1)

Both Marius and Cleon publicly criticize the progress of the war for secret, personal motives: "criminose simul et magnifice de bello loqui" (BJ 64.5); because Cleon is afraid that his earlier refusal of a Spartan peace offer will prove imprudent, he urges the Athenians to send another expedition to Pylos at once (IV.27.1). Both critics of the campaigns require only a small force to capture their respective enemies within a few days:

"dimidia pars exercitus si sibi permetteretur, paucis diebus Jugurtham in catenis habiturum" ( BJ 64.5)

λαβὼν ἐκ μὲν τῆς πόλεως οὐδένα ... ἐφι πρὸς τοῖς ἐν Πυλῶς στρατιώταις ἐντὸς ἡμερῶν εἰκοσιν ἢ δείξειν Λακεδαιμονίους ζῶντας ἢ οὕτω ἀποκτενεῖν (IV.28.4)

Both men criticize their commanders' slow and ineffective progress:

"ab imperatore consulto trahi, quod inanis et regiae superbiae imperio nimiris gauderet" (BJ 64.5)

ράδιον εἰςαι παρασκεψὶ ἐὶ ἀνδρεῖς ἐξεῖν οἱ στρατηγοὶ , πλεῦσαντας λάβειν τοὺς ἐν τῷ νῆσῳ (IV.27.5).
Finally, the bystanders approve of the demagogues' claims for base, greedy, spiteful reasons: the negotiatores in Marius's camp are pleased by animo cupienti since the duration of war caused them losses (BJ 64.6); the Athenian assembly, "as the crowd is wont to do," (ὁίον ὁχλός φιλεῖν ποίεῖν) encouraged Nicias to hand Cleon the command although Cleon tried to refuse it (IV.28.3).

Thus the major elements of Sallust's scene in which Metellus deprives Marius can be found in the sequence of events in Thucydides's narrative of the second debate on Pylos. The confrontation between Metellus and Marius has been recorded by other ancient historians, but it was given this specific, dramatic shape by Sallust, evidently with inspiration from Thucydides. Only the curiously foreign comment about Marius's fall to cupido and ira requires further explanation before we move on to consider the significance of the implied Marius-Cleon comparison.

As mentioned, both Marius and Cleon fall prey to "passion and anger, the worst of counsellors" (BJ 64.5; III.42.1). The "haste and anger" (τὸχος τε καὶ ὀργήν) of Diodotus's speech refer to Cleon's recommendation for taking swift vengeance on the Mytileneans. Cleon says, "after a lapse of time the injured party will proceed with less an edge of anger (ὀργήν) against the wrongdoer, whereas to take vengeance as quickly as possible is the best punishment" (III.38.1).46 By using a highly unusual phrase and one reminiscent of the criticism of Cleon, Sallust associates Marius with Cleon.47 The petulant character of Marius is nevertheless in keeping with the picture of him given by other historians.48 Yet the particular phrase, "desire and anger, the
worst of counsellors," as well as the clear similarity between Marius's confrontation with Metellus and Cleon's boast to Nicias and the Assembly suggest that Sallust intended Marius to be described in terms of Cleon.

The significance of the comparison between Marius and Cleon does not lie in the similarity of their greater historical situations since the outcome of each event is different. Both men eventually assume the command, but Marius does so willingly, Cleon unwillingly. Whereas Cleon's mad promise succeeds (IV.39.3), Marius captures Jugurtha only with much time and effort and Sulla's assistance (BJ 113.6). Nevertheless the purpose of Sallust's allusion to Thucydides's passage is to depict Marius as a demagogue driven by passions and trying to gain power through rash words. Marius is not, of course, portrayed only as a demagogue by Sallust. We need only refer to the "Periclean" image of the man given just before his encounter with Metellus.

Summary of Passages of the Bellum Jugurthinum

We first noted that these borrowings are used more or less as description or allusion. In the narrative borrowings, Sallust used Thucydides's colorful battle descriptions for dramatic effect, similarity of context, and perhaps to suggest personal sympathy with the Athenian general-turned-historian. Certain descriptive passages, such as that of the alarm at Rome caused by Aulus's defeat, seem to be deliberate allusions to the effect of Athenian defeat at Syracuse. In these narrative descriptions, Sallust's brevitas often surpasses that of Thucydides.
The borrowings which describe individuals draw upon Thucydides's speeches and character sketches. Sallust, like Thucydides, uses speeches and character sketches to describe individuals and to illustrate the historical, political or moral issues which each historian considers most important. Since the Bellum Jugurthineum, unlike the Bellum Catilinae, deals with the issues of foreign as well as domestic politics, it comes closer to Thucydides's work in its treatment of the conflict between states. Thus Jugurtha criticizes Roman imperialism with words that recall the Corinthians' criticisms of Athens (BJ 81.1; I.70).

Sallust's imitations of Thucydides suggest allusions which, due to the additional similarity of narrative context, can suggest comments on the role of an individual, e.g. Memmius's high ideals of leadership contrasted with subsequent leaders' factionalism, or Jugurtha's false confidence after a single victory, or Marius's brilliant potential, yet ominous demagogic rise to political power. But behind the allusions to Thucydidean individuals and events we find only generic depictions of characters or stock battle scenes: Pericles as statesman, Phormio as general and Cleon as demagogue. Sallust need not have had a deeper appreciation of their historical significance for his descriptive and allusive purposes. Sallust only finds these types useful to aid his own themes or to lend atmosphere to particular passages. The association of a Greek individual or situation with one of Sallust's is not meant to be a total identification of the two. The association is limited to the passage in which it occurs and does not, like thematic imitation, extend throughout the length of the work.
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CHAPTER IV

HISTORIAE

Introduction

Following the publication of the Bellum Jugurthinum in about 40 B.C., Sallust turned his attention to another crucial period of contemporary history, that interval of precarious peace at Rome between the two civil wars, from the death of Sulla (78 B.C.) to 67 B.C. Sallust possibly had this final subject in mind when he avowed toward the end of the Bellum Jugurthinum that he would avoid any treatment of Sulla's later deeds since L. Sisenna had already pursued that topic with the greatest competence and diligence: "neque enim alio loco de Sullae rebus dicturi sumus, et L. Sisenna, optime et diligentissime omnium, eas res dixere, persecutus, parum mihi libero ore locutis videtur" (BJ 95.2). The years 78-67 are rich in events and people relevant to Sallust's time. The period following Sulla's death was replete with themes familiar to one writing in the triumviral period: fierce factionalism at home and dangerous wars abroad, an interval of dubious peace, infida pax. There was the war against Sertorius (80-72), the revolt of Spartacus (73-71), the war against the pirates (78-67), and the beginning of the third Mithridatic war. Unlike the exemplars of virtus in the Bellum Catilinae, Cato and Caesar, the laudable leadership of Metellus and the hopeful beginnings of Marius's career in Bellum
Jugurthinum, there appear to be no paragons of virtus shining through the fragmentary remains of the Historiae: Pompey perhaps is the one character whose presence unifies the work, but the portrait of this prime detractor of the Republic is not altogether flattering (H 2.17). The abrupt ending of the extant sections of the work in 67 B.C is puzzling and must be attributed to the author's premature death. The question of where Sallust intended to end his work, whether in 63 or 60 B.C. or some other year, will not concern us here, but perhaps Sallust was not disappointed that his great work would too, like Thucydides's, lack a smooth ending.

The subject matter of the Historiae furthermore afforded much space for Thucydidean comments on human nature and its base passion for power and glory. Like Thucydides, he also treated the perverse semantics and ethics of civil strife, and how a nation split by factions fell victim to its self-spawned disease. The fragmentary nature of the Historiae is, however, disturbing to the critic in his attempts to interpret its themes and structure. We may note that the evident Thucydidean themes in the Historiae are the very ones which attracted Sallust in the Bellum Jugurthinum, where domestic discord and foreign wars were interlocked. There is no evidence of a lengthy disquisition on choice of subject amidst the fragments; we have only a brief notice of his annalistic task: "Res populi Romani ... militiae et domi gestas composui" (H 1.1). Yet even this can tell us much.

Sallust, like Thucydides, wrote by years and forged his own style from the start. Donatus comments that some people are disturbed by the order "primo rem, deinde personam" used both by Vergil, "arma virumque,"
and by Sallust, "Res populi" (Donati ad Verg. Aen. I.1). He might also have mentioned that by using "militiae et domi" Sallust has reversed the usual "domi militiaeque." It is this novel and disturbing approach to "annals" which suggests comparison of Sallust and Thucydides at the opening of the Historiae. Annals per se were familiar to the Romans from earlier Latin sources. Writing Res Gestas by year places Sallust near the font of that tradition first begun in Latin with the annales maximi and lately furthered by Tubero and Macer. Yet the arrangement for Sallust, as for his predecessor Sisenna, was not strictly bound by chronology but regrouped in sections according to topic, but within a larger chronological framework. Thus the events of party politics and foreign policy can be effectively juxtaposed and interlocked, but the fragments prohibit our evaluation of Sallust's success.

Perhaps the "composui" of the prologue is the first suggestion that Sallust has continued to emulate Thucydides's language: J. Wasse suggests that it is a recollection of ξυνεγραψε (Thuc. I.1.1). "Composui" cannot be found in a proemium before Sallust and not until Tacitus after him does it appear again similarly used in historical writing. Sallust himself used paucis absolvam (BC 4.3) and bellum scripturus sum (BJ 5.1) when introducing his former works, but his monumental work was dignified by the possible Thucydidean term which suggests a compilation from many sources and with some effort.

But if a Thucydidean reminiscence in that word cannot be proven, it has been widely recognized that Historiae 1.7 is a conscious imitation of III.82.2:
"Nobis primae dissensiones vitio humani ingenii evenere, quod inquies atque indomitum semper inter certamina libertatis aut gloriae aut dominations agit." (H 1.7)

καὶ ἐπέπεσε πολλὰ καὶ χαλέπα κατὰ στάσιν ταῖς πόλεσι, γιγνόμενα μὲν καὶ αἰτὶ ἐσόμενα, ἐως ὅλὴν ἡ αὐτὴν φύσιν ἀνθρώπων ἡ ... (II.82.2)

The wider implications of this borrowing will be analysed below in the examination of passages (p.28ff.), but it is sufficient at this point merely to note that both men shared a belief that dissent was firmly rooted in human nature and this fact should be prominent as an axiom in both works.

Thucydidean themes and verbal reminiscences in the proemium of the Historiae are supplemented by a continual dependence on Thucydidean stylistic devices. The inconcinnitas or variatio of the phrase militiae et domi has been noted in Historiae 1.1. 4 This variety in word choice, word order, or use of syntax has been observed as a common feature in both Sallust and Thucydides. 5 Thucydides, in I.1.1, for example, also frustrates the reader's expectation of balance by coordinating the dissimilar clauses, οὗτοι ... ἣδεν καὶ ... ὅρων, in his elaboration of why he expected the war to be great and noteworthy. As this variation in both proemiums suggests, Sallust employed Thucydidean devices formerly used in the monograph. Antithesis, variety, brevity, an harmonious concern for the general and the typical, a somewhat similar use of speeches, and an awareness of the need for objectivity characterize both authors' styles. Sallust's style, like Thucydides's, was foreign to the flowing, balanced prose of his day and Sallust's increasing estrangement in forging his new style, already noted in the Bellum Jugurthinum in
comparison to the Bellum Catilinae, becomes still more peculiar in the Historiae. For example a decrease in his use of syntactic pairing of like phrases, of alliteration, and of archaisms all point to a more independent style of writing which may be seen as an expression of his greater ethical and political alienation from his times.

Thucydides's views and expression also changed in the course of his writing. By his own account the exile gave him leisure for a better account of matters, "καὶ εὐνέβη μοι... καθ' ἁπαχίαν τι αὑτῶν μᾶλλον αἰσθεσθαι" (V.26.5). De Romilly detects a change in Thucydides's political, intellectual and historical outlook affected by the events in 404: Pericles, imperialism, and Athens are more strongly idealized; the eternal nature of events, their deeper meaning and their lessons were more widely developed; and the war was more clearly affirmed as the crisis of imperialism. Westlake also detects that in the second half of the History (V.25-VIII.109) Thucydides has enlarged his previous view of historical causation formerly resting on the reactions of the masses to include the personality of leading individuals as "a much more influential factor than he had been prepared to acknowledge." Critics may detect other changes brought on by the effects of external circumstances, exile, or the events of 404 upon Thucydides as he was formulating and writing his History.

Whatever the validity of these critics' observations, we may observe that for Sallust and Thucydides the change in style and content was one of a growing alienation from their times. Thucydides benefited from his exile by the leisure which afforded greater objectivity; perhaps the exile and the fate of Athens let him formulate his criticisms
and praise of Athens more clearly, and to follow his city's failure with an alien's helplessness, but an historian's sense of personal utility. Sallust observed events with similarly engaged yet helpless interest. That Sallust's mind was "free from hope, fear, and partisanship" was affirmed early in the Bellum Catilinae (BC 4.2: "mihi spe metu partibus rei publicae animus liber erat") and reaffirmed in the Historiae: "... parties opposed in civil war have not distracted me from the truth" (H 1.6: "neque me diversa pars in civilibus armis movit a vero"). The subject of his Historiae was one which personally touched Sallust, who observed the tense period of the first Triumvirate, Caesar's death and Octavian's rise. Pompey's rise to power, like Octavian's, encompassed "the whole interval of precarious peace between the two ages of civil war", and the death of a dictator and the violent rise of a popular leader. Sallust's late interests are implied in his choice of subject. His ideal Rome, like Thucydides's Athens, became more distant each year. This is evident from an examination of passages of the Historiae, their style and themes.

Themes

As in the earlier monographs, there are in the Historiae certain themes which are reminiscent of those found in Thucydides, namely human greed and ambition as a cause of strife, the turmoil caused by civil strife, the ambition of a ruling power, and the comparison of moral decay to a plague. Of course every adult in the 30's B.C. was acutely aware of the turmoil wrought by civil war and the inherent dangers in Rome's world power, but it is Sallust's expression of these contemporary truths in a Thucydidean manner which concerns us here.
Both the prologue and the speeches of the *Historiae* contain recurrent reminiscences of Thucydides's famous description of Corcyrean *stasis*. The prologue mentions that Rome's first dissensions arose from a fault in human nature, just as they had in Greece during the Peloponnesian War:

"Nobis primae dissensiones vitio huamni ingenii evenere..." (H 1.7)

The prologue goes on to say that during such civil war the few held sway over the many under the guise of respectable names:

"dum pauci potentes quorum in gratia plerique conesserant, sub honesto patrum aut plebis nomine dominationes affectabant" (H 1.12)

This Thucydidean analysis is carried over into Philip's speech in which the senator warns the senate that the normal nature of things has been upset and concord has been subverted:

"et queso considerate quam conversa rerum natura sit. antea malum publicum occulte, auxilia palam instruebantur, et eo boni malos facile anteibant; nunc pax et concordia disturbantur palam, defenduntur occulte" (H 1.77.13).

Compare especially III.82.4-7, where family ties, civil and religious laws are subverted for the party's own gain, and III.83.1, where noble simplicity, ὅ ἐνθὲς, is laughed out of existence. The common fault of the Roman senators and the noble Corcyreans as seen by Philip and Thucydides is the trust in wise counsel when armed action is necessary: *verbis arma temptabitis* (H 1.77.17); "ἔργῳ οὔδεν σφᾶς δεῖν λαμβάνειν ὄ γνώμην ἔξετιν" (III.83.4). The civil strife at Rome in 73 B.C. gave
rise to the speech of the tribune Macer who warns the people not to lose their liberties to the nobles by reversing the names of things: "neu nomina rerum ad ignaviam mutantes otium pro servitio appelletis" (H 3.48.13). This word/deed antithesis is almost a commonplace in Sallust and Thucydides, but here the reference to "changing the names of things" in the context of civil strife once again evokes the passage on Corcyrean stasis where the usual meaning of words ("η εἰωθυνα ὀξιωσις τῶν ὄνοματων") is charged to suit actions. Finally, Mithridates in a letter of 69 B.C. to Arsaces, king of Parthia, cautions the king that the Roman motive for war is an unscrupulous desire for power and riches: "una et ea vetus causa bellandi est: cupidus profunda imperi et divitiarum" (H 4.69.5). The context speaks of foreign war, but the verbal parallel to Thucydides's analysis of civil strife is striking: πᾶντων δαντων αιτιον ἀρχη η δια πληθυσιαν και φιλοτιμιαν (III.82.8). Perhaps the similarity is coincidental, but if it is intentional, perhaps Sallust saw in the Roman character something akin to the Greek source of civil strife. The second possibility would be supported by Sallust's analysis elsewhere of the phenomenon of Roman civil strife in Thucydidean terms, the difference here being that the terms are now applied to Roman foreign wars. Sallust had elsewhere acknowledged lubido dominandi as the source of the Athenian and Lacedaemonian war (BC 2.2). Although that causa does not conform exactly to Thucydides's analysis of the truest cause of the Peloponnesian war (I.23.6), it may have been read into the Athenian situation by Sallust and later applied in Historiae 4.69.5 to the Roman situation. Perhaps Sallust believed that the ambition (πλεονεξία) mentioned in III.82.8, was
closer to the true explanation for all strife civil and foreign, Athenian and Roman, since it was based on his own concept of human nature. Sallust's thematic use of Thucydides's treatment of Corcyrean stasis in the Historiae suggests that Sallust, like Thucydides, saw the origin of civil strife in human nature and that both historians recognized semantic turmoil as one of the chief effects of this strife. Finally, Sallust possibly departs from Thucydides's analysis on one point where cupido profunda is cited by Mithridates as the cause of Roman imperialism, whereas in Thucydides III.82.8, this "πλεονεξία καὶ φιλοτιμία" is, at least explicitly, limited to civil strife. This difference can be accounted for by the fact that Sallust describes human nature as "restless and untamed, always striving between contests of freedom or glory or mastery" (H 1.7). Thucydides's description of human nature, on the other hand, significantly distinguishes between its behavior in civil and foreign conflicts, as will be demonstrated later in an analysis of Historiae 1.7.

Civil Turmoil: Turba and Tumultus; Θόρυβος and Ταραχή

In their treatments of civil war, both historians necessarily describe the confusion or disorder within the afflicted state. There is a certain "vocabulary of disorder" in both Latin and Greek, terms which are normally used to describe the political confusion of civil strife, the psychological disturbance of those affected by the strife, or the physical manifestations of this confusion, namely shouts, mobs and violence. I now wish to focus on four words, turba, tumultus,
which evidence this theme of civil disorder in both authors.

The Latin words are not chosen to represent translations of the Greek, but merely to indicate an acknowledged theme of both authors and a theme of particular importance in Sallust's Historiae. Regarding the subject of the Historiae, Syme comments, "Not Caesar's invasion of Italy but the violent ascension and domination of Pompeius, that was the end of political liberty. Sallustus studied and imitated the classic document for the pathology of civil war, the sombre, intense and passionate chapters of Thucydid... Civil war, tearing aside words, forms and institutions, gave rein to individual passions and revealed the innermost workings of human nature...".13

One other fact leads me to a treatment of this theme of disorder in the context of the Historiae and not the monographs. Prior to the Historiae, turba occurs only once in the monographs and with reference to the origin of the plebs urbana: "turba atque seditionibus sine cura aluntur [plebes]" (BC 37.3). Turba does not appear again until the Historiae, where it occurs six times within the extant fragments and speeches. In five of those six occurrences, it is used in an abstract sense, synonymous with seditio, and only once in the more frequent, classical and concrete sense of multitudo (H 1.126). Similarly, tumultus seems to be more favored in the Historiae than in the monographs: it occurs 8 times in the extant fragments, or about once every 5 pages, as opposed to 8 times in the Bellum Jugurthinum, about once every 12 pages, and 3 times in the Bellum Catilinae, about once every 17 pages. Also, turbo (H 1.77.1) and turbamentum (H 1.55.25) first
appears in the *Historiae*, as does the adjective *inquies*, which occurs four times in all, once in reference to *humanum ingenium* (H 1.7), twice to Lepidus (H 1.77.11, 16). There is the danger of generalizing about the nature of the *Historiae* on the basis of word counting since the extant portions are heterogeneous, i.e. speeches and passages chosen by grammarians, but we may surmise that the author wished to make stronger and sharper statements about the prevalence of disorder due either to his own views on the Pompeian *infida pax* or to a growing bitterness toward the disturbed state of affairs under the contemporary Second Triumvirate.

In order to compare fairly both authors' uses of a vocabulary of disorder we must first ask in what sense, how often, and in what context the words are used. From this comparison we may then conjecture whether this linguistic analysis supports our earlier supposition that Sallust and Thucydides share the theme of disorder during civil strife.

*Tumultus* is a general term used to describe the phenomenon of civil war or a particular uprising or the actual results of such an uprising, as shouts or violence. Sallust uses it eight times in the *Historiae*, four times to describe the external manifestations of an uprising (H 2.45.7, 87.A.4, 87.C.19; 3.96.C.10-11), and four times to describe Lepidus's insurrection of 77 B.C. (H 1.69, 77.7 (bis); III.48.10). In one of the latter cases there is a revealing distinction between *tumultus* meaning a singular instance of civil sedition and *bellum* meaning a full scale civil war: "Hi [Lepidi satellites] tumultum ex tumultu, bellum ex bello serant" (1.77.7).

*Turba* is almost a synonym of *tumultus*, but it is properly only a type of *tumultus*, in its usual sense involving at least several people:
Turbam appellatam, Labeo ait, ex genere tumultus, idque verbum ex Graeco tractum ὀπὸ τοῦ ὥρῳβείν. Turbam autem ex quo numero admittimus? ... namque turbam multitudinis hominem esse turbationem et coetum, rixam etiam divorum" (Digesta Justiniani 47.8.4).

It may also have the concrete sense of a mob which incites the disturbance, although Sallust uses it only once in this sense (H 1.126).

In the other five occurrences in the Historiae, Sallust uses turba as a synonym for seditio, a violent secession in which the people break into factions and which leads to civil war: "postquam remoto metu Punico... plurimae turbae, seditiones et ad postremum bella civilia orta sunt" (H 1.12; cf. 1.55.16, 77.7, 18; 2.48.11). It also implies civil unrest, inquies sollicitudo (cf. 1.77.7 where turbae are contrasted to quies) and is associated with the slaughter which results (H 1.77.18, "turbas et caedes civium odisse ait").

Justinian's Digest, 47.8.4, just quoted above, indicates that turba was thought to be a cognate of ὥρῳβος/είν a word used fifteen times by Thucydides as a noun, nineteen as a verb. Like turba and tumultus it can refer concretely to the disorder of a crowd, troops or a fleet (e.g. VIII.10.4 re Lacedaemonian navy). In this sense ὥρῳβος expresses an external manifestation of ὀργή or ὑμός. Turba may also refer to internal trouble of the spirit in which cases it is roughly synonymous with φόβος/είσοθαι, e.g. VIII.96.3 where "it was disturbing (ἐθορυβεῖ) to the Athenians that the enemy might dare to sail to the Piraeus." Thus the word differs from turba and tumultus in that it may also refer to foreign wars, e.g. ὥρῳβος μέγας re the Lacedaemonians trapped on Sphacteria or IV.104.1 re the Amphipolitans threatened by Brasidas. But it does also refer to civil disorder, e.g. ἦν ὥρῳβος πολύς καὶ ἐκπληκτικός (VIII.92.7) re the noise of a crowded assembly;
cf. also Ar. Ach. 546) or "[Ἀγίς] ἐλεύσας ... κατὰ τὸ εἶκος γεωπομένου θόρυβον" (VIII.71.1 re turmoil within Athens precipitated by Agis). It is perhaps most significant for our study that is applied to the Corcyreans during stasis, a description which Sallust elsewhere admires and imitates: "οὐ δὲ πολλὰ θὸρυβαὶ καὶ πεφοβημένου" (III.77.1): cf. "cum magno tumultu invadit [plebs]" (H 2.45.7), a parallel but not a translation.

Ταραχὴ is likewise used to describe the process of an inter-state disturbance, e.g., the ταραχὴ οὐκ ὀλύν re the Thracian massacre at Mycalessus (VII. 29.5), or civil strife at Samos (IV. 75.1, or VII. 79.1). It can also be applied to the product of the disturbance, the confusion of troops (e.g. VII.44.1, 80.3) or the disturbance of ships, e.g. "πολὺς θὸρυβός καὶ ταραχῶδης ἤν ἡ ναυμαχία (I.49.4). Moreover ταραχή, like θὸρυβός, is associated with φόβος as is most clearly demonstrated in another part of the description of Corcyrean stasis in which the Corcyreans are described as "being in great disturbance and fear," ἐν πολλῇ ταραχῇ καὶ φόβῳ (III.79.3). Regarding the φόβος caused by disturbances, it is instructive to note Cicero's words, "quid est enim aliud tumultus nisi perturbatio tanta ut maior timor oriatur" (Phil. 8.1.3).

Judging from our analysis of turba and tumultus in the Historiae, civil war and its attendant disturbances were a more prevalent theme than in the monographs. This increased concern may have been due to the subject, or to Sallust's increasing disullisionment with contemporary promises of quies amidst turbae. Certainly Lepidus' uprising would remind Sallust of recent events like Mutina, Philippi and
Perusia. For whatever reason, Sallust resembles Thucydides with regard to his "vocabulary of disorder" which implicitly warns fellow citizens not to fall victim to the fear and violence bred by sedition.

Disdain for Crowds: Plebs and \(\Delta\eta\mu\omega\)

Sallust's disdain for plebian complacency, gullibility or rash action which constituted a sort of Thucydidean leitmotif in the monographs, is almost entirely absent from the extant Historiae, probably because the former references to plebeian habit were found mostly in the narrative. We are able to get a glimpse through the fragments of several politicians who seek popular favor, namely Cotta who seeks their longed-for favor (\textit{cupita voluntas, H 2.47.3}), Macer who criticizes plebeian complacency in the manner of cattle (\textit{more pecorum, H 3.48.6}), Pompey who seeks to give the people what they want (\textit{volentia plebi, H 4.42}) and Paliconus who promises to restore popular rights by their wishes (\textit{cupiditis, H 4.47}).

The Plague Metaphor: Mos ut Tabes

The "plague metaphor" also discussed in the context of the monographs is absent from the Historiae, again probably due to the great absence of narrative passages. There is a single reference in the oration (71 B.C.) of the tribune M. Palicanus who denounces the senatorial practice of usurping judicial powers as "a certain custom thrust upon the city like a plague," "quidem mos ut tabes in urbe coniectus" (H 3.46). The reference is too specific to classify it as any sort of allusion to Thucydidean social decay as we conjectured for the "vis morbi uti tabes" (BC 36.5) or the "vis avaritiae veluti tabes"
(BJ 32.4). There may be a hint of this connotation of **pestis** in **Historiae** 1.74 referring to Lepidus's revolutionary plans against Rome, or in **Historiae** 4.69.17 referring to Rome's existence as a bane to the world.

**Two Imperial States**

The themes of the **Historiae** discussed so far all pertain to Sallust's and Thucydides's views of civil strife and its turbulent effects. One final Thucydidean theme which we have observed in the monographs also appears in the **Historiae**, the ambitious nature of the imperial state. Thucydides compares Athenian and Lacedaemonian *φύσεως* throughout the **History**, notably in the speech of the Corinthians (I.70-71) early in the war and in his own estimation towards the end (VIII.96.5). The Athenians are innovators, *νεωτέροπολοί*, whose nature is, in sum, one of ambition (see *ὁρέξεσθαι*, IV. 17.4, 21.2, 41.4) and vigor (cf. Pericles II.63, 64.4; Alcibiades VI.87); the chief Spartan attribute is *βραδύτης*, and their virtues are *ποιχία*, *δεκαλοσύνη* and *σφοδρότης* (cf. Archidamos, I.84). Thucydides's explanation of the "truest cause" of the war, Athenian imperial growth and Spartan fear, ultimately hinges on the opposite natures of Athens and Sparta, which, Thucydides tells us, were most conveniently suited in fighting (*κάτων ὁδὲ ἑλιμφωρωτατος προσπολεμήσει*, VIII.96.5).

We have observed this sort of characterization of the imperial nation applied by Sallust in the **Bellum Catilinae** (especially BC 12.1) where the contemporary Roman *mores* are seen as corrupted by wealth and empire, and in the **Bellum Jugurthinum** (especially BJ 81.1) where Jugurtha calls the Romans "unjust ... the common enemy of all ... to
whom all kingdoms are a threat" ("iniustos ... communis omnium hostis ...
... quis omnia regna advorsa sint"). Similarly the Romans of the
Historiae are described as those who, after the destruction of
Carthage and the loss of maiorum mores, "by nature can neither maintain
their own possessions in peace nor suffer those of other" ("ut merito
dicatur genitos esse, qui neque ipsi habere possent res familiaris
neque alios pati," H I.16). Sallust thus alludes to Thucydides's
speech of the Corinthians (I.68-71) in which the Athenians are
described in similar language:

\[
\ldots \omega \tau e e' \tau e \xi \tau e \delta u t o u s \xi v u n \varepsilon \lambda \omega n \phi a i \nu \kappa e-
\nu k e v a l \varepsilon p l t w h \mu t e a u t o u s \varepsilon x e l u \nu n o u k l a v n \mu t e
\nu t o u s \alpha l l o u s \alpha n d r o \nu s \varepsilon d n, \delta r w \nu s a n \varepsilon p l o (I.70.9).
\]

It is significant that the hostile criticisms of Athenian imperialism
are here adopted by Sallust in the prologue of the Historiae where the
mores of the contemporary Romans are set forth in general terms.
Surely Sallust recognized the similar qualities of the two ruling
nations and in the borrowed description is an implicit warning that
Rome is liable to suffer the fate of Athens unless her mores are
restored at home and abroad. The narrative reveals no other traces
of the theme of imperialism, but Mithridates's letter makes several
references to the "Roman habit of overthrowing all kingdoms," "morem
suam omnia regna subvortundi" (IV.69.15). Mithridates attempts to
convince Arsaces that the Romans consider "everything not enslaved
and especially all kingdoms to be hostile" ("omniaque non serva et maxime
regna hostilia ducant," 4.69.17). He goes on to explain that
Roman methods are eminently violent: "Romani arma in omnis habent, acerruma in eos, quibus victis spolia maxima sunt; audendo et fallundo et bella ex bellis serundo magni facti" (4.69.20). The Roman mos described by Mithridates may be exaggerated in view of the king's perspective and intent, but it generally conforms to the description of Roman mores in the prologue (H 1.16) and it thereby also resembles the Corinthians' speech (1.70). The Corinthians note Athens' ambitious acquisition, hostile intentions and tenacious retention of imperial gains (especially 1.70.7). Sallust then recognizes some general similarity between Roman imperial mos and Athenian τρόπος.

So we find that Sallust continues to employ Thucydidean reminiscences in expressing his own themes, notably the turmoil of civil strife which is rooted in the restless nature of man, and characterization of ambitious imperialism. Yet, if in the Historiae Sallust wishes to suggest some identification of Athenian and Roman situations, the identification is not a philosophical dependence on Thucydides, but only an implicit warning that civil strife, perverse morals, and impatient, imperialistic ambition may similarly cause the fall of Rome. Sallust for example describes humanum ingenium as "quod inquies et indomitum semper inter certamina libertatis aut gloriae aut dominationis agit" (H 1,7) whereas Thucydides's Athenians argue that acceptance and retention of empire (δυναστεία) is in accordance with human character (ὁ ἀνθρώπου τρόπος) which is dictated by "fear, necessity, and profit" (τιμής καὶ δέους καὶ ὁφελίας, I.76.2).
Style

We have noted that the words of the proemium, "res populi Romani ... militiae et domi gestas composui," immediately remind the reader that in his 'annalistic' Historiae Sallust has continued to follow Thucydides's style. "Militiae et domi" at least show Thucydidean variatio, and composui recalls ξυνεγραψε. Sallust's independent, Thucydidean style which we observed in the Bellum Jugurthinum in digressions, antithesis and generic statements, is maintained in the Historiae, as far as we can reckon from its fragmentary state. We have noted that Sallust's style was becoming refined in the Historiae and that the Bellum Jugurthinum was less Thucydidean stylistically than the Bellum Catilinae. But what we cannot determine fairly in view of the nature of the fragments is the extent to which a stylistic dependence grows or lessens. The Thucydidean elements of style in the Historiae are generalization, brevity, antithesis, inconcinnity, digression, character sketches and Graecisms.

Sententiae and Gnomae

Sallust's style in the monographs has been characterized by its brief and generalizing expressions which correspond to the gnomae of Thucydides. We have noted that the ancients recognized these sententiae, associated them with Sallust's and Thucydides's brevity (Sen. Contr. IX.13.14; Ep. XIX.5(114), 17,18) and even called them by the Greek term gnomae: "gnomas egregie convertisti hanc quidem, quam hodie accepi prope perfecte ut poni in libro Sallustii possuit" (Frontonis Ep. ad M. Caes. III.11, p. 48 Nab.). Dionysius commenting on
Thucydides VI.78.3 (De Thuc. 48.407) refers to such a sententia by its rhetorical name (ἐπιϕωνία) and his particular example also illustrates the word/deed contrast which we have seen as a further trait of Sallustian-Thucydidean style.

These brief, apophthegmatic statements continue to characterize the Historiae. They may be stated in a single generalizing phrase of the author ("more humanae cupidinis ignara visendi," 1.103 re Sertorius's improvident desire to dwell in the Isles of the Blessed), or within the speech of an individual ("quoniam quidem unum omnibus finem natura vel ferro coeptis statuit neque quicquam extremam necessitatem nihil ausus nisi muliebri ingenio exspectat," 1.55.15).

Numerous examples of this rhetorical device can be cited from the speeches.

We have also seen how in the monographs both Sallust and Thucydides are fond of generalizations by their frequent and similar use of the verb, "to be accustomed to," solere or εἰσόδη and by Sallust's translation of φιλαξία by amat; these generalizations, we noted, often characterize the weaker tendencies of human nature. Amat does not occur in the extant portions of Sallust's Historiae. But where solere occurs, it often describes the deplorable tendencies of crowd psychology, as the comments on the disorder in Sertorius's ranks when they are upset by revolt: "malo, ut in terrore solet, generis aut imperii discrimine" (1.126); "diversa uti solet rebus perditis capessivit" (3.84); "ac tum maxime uti solet in extremis rebus sibi quisque carissimum domi recordari cunctique omnium ordinum munia eum extrema sequi"
The neuter of the participle used as a substantive, *suetum* and *solitum*, is found in a negative context to describe civil crimes: "at discordia et avaritiae atque ambitio et cetera secundis rebus oriri sueta mala post Carthaginis excidium maxime aucta sunt" (1.11); "his praeter solita vitiosis magistratibus" (3.46). The latter is a periphrasis for the usual Latin *insolenter* which is elsewhere avoided in the *Historiae* by such phrases as "insolens vera accipiendi" (4.57) and "ex insolentia avidus male faciendi" (5.12). Sallust's *praeter solita* seems to be a neologism and one which perhaps arose from the Thucydidean expression, παρὰ τὸ εἰμιθὸς (cf. Thuc. IV.17.2, 55.2; VII.60.5, 75.5). It occurs in Vergil's "praeter solitum dulcedini laeti" (Georg. 1.412) and Tacitus's *ultra solitum* (Ann. 4.64.1).

Thucydides's statements about "what is wont to happen" also frequently refer to the weak side of human nature, e.g. ἐκὼθε...ἐυπραγιά...ἐς ὅρην τρέπειν (III.39.4); τὴν τοὺς...ἐκὼθαμεν αἰτίοιςθαι (I.140.1); ἣ ανθρωπεία φύσις, εἰμιθυία καὶ παρὰ τοὺς νόμους ἀδίκειν (III.84.2).

The gnomic technique may also occur as a brief exclamatory statement summarizing the previous narrative: e.g. in Sallust's prologue ("tantum antiquitatis curaeque a maioris pro Italica gente fuit," 1.19, cf. also 1.3.58; 4.60), or in Thucydides's assessment of Pericles's success (τοσοῦτον τῷ Περικλεῖ ἐπερίσσευε τότε, II.65.13. Cf. I.23.5; II.13.17).

Sallust's affection for neuter adjectives as abstracts, e.g. *malum*, and for neuter participles, especially as an impersonal ablative absolute, have been recognized by others as Graecisms, particularly
phrases favored by Thucydides. Robolski makes the interesting suggestion that this force of abstracts (abstractorum vis) is more suited to philosophical vocabulary. That vocabulary is at home in both Thucydides and Sallust, he argues, since both men wish to describe the ways and natures of men, the causes and origins of events. This tendency which is also found in the Bellum Catilinae and Bellum Jugurthinum again appears in the Historiae in abstract neuter substantives like divina, humana (1.55.11, 4.69.17), honesta (1.55.8), serva (4.69.17), raptum (4.69.17), and dictum (2.98p.21, 4.69.13). In Thucydides it may also derive from adjectives, τὸ ἁμαρτίαν (IV.98.1; VI.69.3), τὸ ἁληθὲς (I.21.1; III.24.3, 53.2, 61.1 etc.), ἐς τὸν ὅμοιον ἄνθρωπον (VII.86.5), τὸ ἀγαθόν (I.121.4; II.41.4, 42.3, 43.1, 5, 44.2, etc.), or from participles, τὸ λεγόμενον (I.140.2; II.47.3, etc.). "Evil" (malum and τὸ κακὸν) is particularly favored by both Thucydides and Sallust as an expression of an abstract evil, one which is not theoretical but clearly applied to a danger which threatens individual or state: malum publicum (1.77.13, 4.51); interna mala (4.69.13); ἐπὶ κακῷ τῆς πόλεως (II.13.1), compare ὁ φθάσας τὸν μέλλοντα κακόν τι δρᾶν ἐπηνειτό (III.82.5); compare also Historiae 1.11, 2.47.4, 3.48.9, 4.69.2, 13 and Thucydides I.40.6, 137.4; II.12.3, 47.4, 52.3; III.113.5.

Brevity

Gnomic generalizations are, we have noticed in the monographs, closely allied to another stylistic technique favored by Sallust and Thucydides, namely brevity. In a single, brief gnomic statement we find allied the two recognized types of brevity, brevity of form and
brevity of thought. Of course this characteristic of two-faceted
certainty pervades the narrative and speeches of both authors, although
it is perhaps most readily viewed in their sententiae. Perrochiat, for
instance, notes that Sallust uses the prepositional phrase with in
adverbially as an approximate equivalent of Thucydides's ἐς or ἐπὶ,
e.g. Historiae 2.69, 3.14, in maius; Historiae 4.50, 69.19, in praesens;
Historiae 4.37 in medium; Historiae 2.24 in melius; Historiae 1.5 in
deterius; I.10.3, I.21.1, I.21.2, ἐπὶ τὸ μείζον; VI.34.7, ἐπὶ τὸ πλεῖον;
I.138.3, τὸ ἀμείζον; III.82.7, 112.7, IV.108.6, VII.42.2, ἐν τῷ αὐτίκα.
Other types of formal brevity used by both authors include the omission
of the verb to be understood from context. This omission is perhaps
a function of the paratactic and varied style of both authors,
which readily permits ellipsis in parallel clauses or sentences, e.g.
Historiae 2.87B.1ff., pars ... alii ... ceteris (supply est, sunt);
Historiae 3.98A.18, pars ... alii(i) ... (plu)rum (supply appetere);
II.40.2, ἐν τετοίς αὐτοῖς ... καὶ ἐτεροῖς (supply ἑστὶ); III.82.4
(supply ἐν υφίσταται). The constructio ad sensum, in which relative pro-
nouns modify the action of the main verb or singular collective nouns
are followed by plural verbs or modifiers, has also been recognized as
a type of this formal brevity in Thucydides and Sallust. Brevity of
thought is the final overall result of brevity of form, showing a
comparison achieved notably by a sequence of clauses or descriptive
phrases strung onto the main clause or onto a noun. For example,
Thucydides describes Athenian rule as a tyranny and expands the de-
scription by a relative clause containing two complementary infinitives:
ὡς τυραννίδα γὰρ ἡ τεξέτε παύτην (ἀρχὴν), ἦν λαβεῖν μὲν ἦδικον δοκεῖ
Antithesis

In addition to generic statements and brevity, the antithetical style characterizes both Sallust's and Thucydides's writing. We noted this imbalanced antithetical style in the monographs, particularly as it was manifest in the contrast of word and deed and we related this antithesis to the two authors' more basic suspicion of "fine phrases" and their desire to uncover the truth.

Two passages from the Historiae, both from Philippus's speech condemning the sedition caused by Lepidus, will serve to illustrate Sallust's antithesis: "homines omnium ordinis corruptissimi ... quibus quies in seditionibus, in pace turbae sunt," (H 1.77.7); "ante malum publicum occulte, auxilia palam instriebantur, et eo boni malos facile antebant; nunc pax et concordia disturbantur palam, defenduntur occulte. quibus illa placent, in armis sunt, vos in metu" (H 1.77.13).

The first passage recalls a similar antithetical description of the noble faction in the Bellum Jugurthinum: "sed haec inter bonos amicitia, inter malos factio est" (BJ 31.16), but the antithesis of quies and turbae and of pax and seditiones exhibits variatio in the number of each noun as well as the chiastic order. The second passage exhibits similar antithesis both within each sentence where occulte balances
palam and in armis balances in metu, and between the sentences themselves where antea balances nunc. This second passage is introduced as an explanation of "how perverse the nature of things has become," ("quam conversa rerum natura sit"). The phrase alludes to Thucydides's account of Corcyrean stasis, especially in III.82, which in its description of factionalism during sedition and of the subversion of morals stands as a masterpiece of antithetical prose.

Variatio

The variatio which relieves the monotony of Sallust's and Thucydides's antithesis is found in many similar forms. Those types of variatio and inconcinnitas listed by other scholars include change in the number of the verb, in the number of the substantive, in the number of the case, in the gender, in voice of verbs, in moods and in the syntax of parallel phrases. For example, the noun, plebes, often takes a singular verb (cf. H 1.55.24, 2.45.3, 2.47.3, 3.48.1, 28) since the people act more pecorum. Pars similarly may agree with a plural verb when the people act as individuals: "pars magna iustos dominos volunt" (H 4.69-18). Thucydides also admits of the variatio of a plural verb with a singular collective subject: τὸ στρατόπεδον (V.60.4), ναυτικά (I.31.1), δύναμις (III.72.3, 74.2, 80.1). Among other devices which lend variety, the pronoun may vary, e.g. from possessive to demonstrative, and a construction may vary, e.g. from prepositional phrase to a genitive of the gerundive to show cause: "non pro sua aut quorum simulat iuriuria, sed legum ac libertatis subvortundae" (H 1.77.10). This passage also clearly illustrates the obscurity of brevity since
eorum, understood with quorum, and an infinitive understood after simulat, e.g. vindicare, are dropped in the first clause and causa is omitted with the genitive of purpose in the second. Thucydides also varies prepositional phrases: μὴ μετά κακίας, δόξης δὲ μᾶλλον ἀμαρτία (I.32.5), ἐφθυμίῳ μᾶλλον ἢ πόνῳ μελέτη καὶ μὴ μετὰ ωσ‌ μων (II.39.4). The variety in all forms shows a desire to break from the smooth, flowing balance natural to antithesis. Some find even this artificial imposition of variety tiresome, e.g. pars ... alii ... plurimī."30

But fatigue is a natural result of work, and Sallust was known for the labor of his writing, as was Thucydides for his own ποιότης.31

Word/Deed Antithesis

We have pointed out Sallust's extensive use of the word/deed contrast in the monographs as one clear manifestation of the antithetical style and as perhaps an expression of sympathy with Thucydides's own distinctive, λόγος/ἔργον antithesis.

We first find this antithesis in the prologue where "the few exert a domination over the majority under the guise of the honest name of patres or plebs, who are named good and bad citizens not in view of merits ... but so that each ... was considered a good man" ("pauci ... sub honesto patrum aut plebis nomine dominationes affectabant, bonique et mali cives appellati non ob merita ... sed uti quisque pro bono dicebatur, Ἦ 1.12). The analysis is a close verbal and conceptual parallel to Thucydides's passage on stasis where "the leaders in cities each with seemingly honest names showed favor both to the political equality of the people and the prudence of the aristocracy"
(οἱ γὰρ ἐν ταῖς πόλεσι προστάντες μετὰ ὀνόματος ἐκάτεροι εὐπρεποῦς, πλῆθος τε ἱσοναμίας πολιτικῆς καὶ ἀριστοκρατίας σωφρόνος προτιμήσει, III.82.8). The contrast in both passages centers on the antithesis between honestum nomen and φύμα εὐπρεπες and the true motives of the greedy, ambitious few.

Leipidus similarly indicts Sulla for his proud tyranny carried on "under the pretext of concord and peace, which names he gives to his crime and parricide" ("specie concordiae et pacis, quae sceleri et parricido suo nomina indidit", H 1.55.24). The tribune Macer also warns the people "to be alert and not to call peace, slavery, by shifting the names of things according to cowardice" ("animadavortatis neu nomina rerum ad ignaviam mutantes otium pro servitio appeletis" H 3.48.13). These sentiments also agree with the truth-seeking analysis of stasis.

Pompey's letter to the senate also illustrates the word/deed contrast by its urgent appeal for reinforcements against Sertorius: 'res plus volet quam verba" (H 2.98.6), dicta factis sequubantur (H 2.98.10). Thucydides's λόγος/ἐργον contrast also emphasizes the necessity for action following deliberation. It is perhaps most evident in the characterization of Athens by the Corinthians: ἐπινοοῦσαι ὁξεῖς καὶ ἐπιτελεῖσαι ἐργῶ κὰ ἀν γνώσι (I.70.2), or in Pericles's words: πλούτῳ ἐργον μᾶλλον καιρῷ ἡ λόγου κόμμω χρώμεθα (II.40.1), but we also find it in Alcibbiades's exhortation: τὸ ἀμύνεσθαι οὐ λόγῳ ἀλλὰ ἐργῶ (VI.18.6).
The "rather-than" contrast has been cited in the monographs as a stylistic device used to show, by contrast, the difference between reality and desirable ideal. So Lepidus criticizes the people for avoiding danger rather than pursuing vengeance: "in tutandis periculis magis quam ulciscendo teneamini" (H 1.55.1); Philippus urges the nobles to act for peace not just pray for it idly: "pacem optatis magis quam defenditis" (H 1.77.3), "avidus pacem petieritis, tanto bellum acrius erit, quom intellegeat se metu magis quam aequo et bono sustentatun" (H 1.77.17). Mithridates in a letter to king Arsaces notes that what he supposed was peace was actually a prolongation of war due to Roman civil strife: "dilata proelia magis quam pacem datam intellexeris" (H 4.69.13). Thucydides draws the contrast between wish and reality with the same device. Nicias in a letter to Athens notes that mercenaries thought they would earn money rather than fight (VII.13.2); Pericles boasts that Athens prospers "by wealth of action rather than inflated words" and by "examining the power of the city in action rather than gazing at her achievements in word alone" (II.40.1, 43.1). Pericles also declares that war was begun only because the Spartans "preferred to settle their complaints by war rather than with words" (I.140.2). Both historians therefore attempt to reach for the truth behind words; this is particularly evident in their use of the "word/deed" and "rather-than" contrasts.

Digressions

The Thucydidean types of digressions which Sallust employed in the monographs to analyse civil strife are apparently absent from the
Historiae. Rather the sceptical concept of human nature and the schema of Roman moral decline is related in the Proemium which stands as the theoretical foundation of the remainder of the work. The character of the digressions is geographic and ethnographic which are more likely to be based on Poseidonius, but they also show an inclination to Catonian, "scientific" curiosity and a distaste for the normal antiquarian research on the origin of legal or religious institutions which was normal among contemporary prose authors. We must suppose that the purpose for the major digressions, on Sardinia and Corsica (H 2.1-4), Pontus (H 3.61-80), and Sicily (H 4.26-27), was for variety, information to set the scene, and for use as structural divisions. In this sense they ultimately spring from the same tradition of the Greek geographers as does Thucydides's digression on Sicily (VI.1-6).

Of particular interest, however, is Sallust's brief excursus on the Carian pirates, who had traditionally been conquered by Minos (H 3.15). Servius recognizes that this tradition is common to Sallust and Thucydides: "Carae insulani populi fuerunt piratica famosi, victi a Minoe, ut et Thucydides et Sallustius dicunt" (ad Aen. VIII.725). We can only assume that Sallust culled the information from Thucydides's archaeology, which he had used earlier as a model for Bellum Catilinae 6-13.

Character Sketches

The character sketches which serve to illustrate virtues or vices in each author's historical scheme have been classified as sorts of lengthy "funeral orations" delivered after the death of persons in the
course of the narrative, or as brief, usually introductory sketches which give only the essential qualities of the character to be filled in by later speeches or description.

The only discernable "quasi laudatio funebris" in the Historiae is that of Sulla, I.58-61 in which Sallust claims that his crimes are nearly unspeakable: "mox tanta flagitia in tali viro pudet dicere" (H 1.58). This criticism of a great man whose shadow darkens the remainder of the work was a device which later appealed to Tacitus in his Annales in the record of Augustus's death, but Tacitus used a more sophisticated medium of criticism, the comments of prudentes (Ann. 1.9-10).

Like Thucydides, Sallust also includes brief character sketches to introduce persons which select and isolate the relevant qualities of the individual. The criteria of the relevance of those qualities for Sallust of course differs from Thucydides's criteria since the aims of the two historians are different. But their methods are similar insofar as the qualities given are briefly stated and apparently relevant to their different aims. If Thucydides seeks to describe political, military and intellectual abilities relevant to the War, Sallust wishes to illustrate the turmoil of post-Sullan Rome by the vitium humani ingenii particularly of Roman leading figures. Yet Sallust, like Thucydides, isolates important military, political or intellectual abilities. So we saw that the portrait of Sulla (H 1.58-61) on his death was critical of the dictator's flagitia (H 1.58). Pompey is first seen as a shameless and ambitious character: "oris probi, animo inverecundo" (H 2.16); "modestus ad alia omnia, nisi ad dominationem" (H 2.17). Sertorius is introduced as a man "made dear by his moderate and discriminating use
of power" despite the base judgment and envious criticism of writers before Sallust: "modicoque et eleganti imperio percarus fuit" (H 1.94, cf. 1.88). Sallust's estimation of minor characters is equally sharp and to the point. Cn. Octavius is mild and fettered in his duties as consul of 76 B.C.: "mutem et captum pedibus" (H 2.26). Praecia, a female pawn of Lucullus, appears to be just another pretty, yet dangerous face, like Sempronia of the Bellum Catilinae: "cultu corporis ornata egregia" (H 3.18, cf. BC 26). M. Lollius Palicanus, who figured in the negotiations of 71 with Pompey and Crassus was more talkative than effective" "humili loco Picens, loquax magis quam facundus" (H 4.43). P. Clodius, a legate of Lucullus, was a master of insolence: "ex insolentia avidus male faciendi" (H 5.12). These character sketches all serve to introduce us to the individuals who make up the larger portrait of post-Sullan Rome in which the mores maiorum were crowded out and the ambitious struggles for liberty, glory, and power dominated the scene (H 1.7, 16). The introductory sketches are kept brief, but are later fleshed out by the indirect characterization of narrative and speeches, as in Thucydides. Lucullus, for instance, is denounced by the people in Rome for his inefficient handling of the Mithridatic war: "imperi prolatandi percupidus, cetera egregius" (H 4.70). It cannot be determined how greatly Sallust was influenced by Thucydides in this practice, and how much it derived from intermediate historians. But we may note that these character sketches conform to the explicitly stated interest in human nature in both historians' prologues (I.22.1; H 1.7); and their direct incisive manner of introducing people shows some similarity.
Passages

In the Historiae as in the monographs, Sallust imitates in sentiment certain passages from Thucydides or even translates them more or less verbatim. We have classified these passages either as allusive or descriptive imitations depending on whether they are to be understood respectively as allusions to Thucydides's greater context or merely as convenient adaptations of well expressed Thucydidean sentiments or descriptions. In the Historiae parts of the Proemium, the speeches, and the letters bear some deliberate resemblance to certain passages in Thucydides. I find few descriptive imitations in the Historiae probably due to its fragmentary narrative. The imitative passages and their significance can only be assessed individually before we can draw conclusions on the degree of Sallust's debt to Thucydides and the purpose of the association.

Vitium Humani Ingenii and Ἡ ὁφοσις ἀνθρώπων

It is of prime importance in our assessment of Sallust's historographical debt to Thucydides that we understand the significance of Sallust's allusion in vitium humani ingenii to Historiae 1.7 to Thucydides's concept of Ἡ φοσις ἀνθρώπων particularly in III.82.2 on Corcyrean stasis. The two passages have been much discussed by scholars, who in their analyses of the two authors' views of human nature have arrived at different conclusions. The two texts in question are as follows:

Nobis primae dissensiones vitio humani ingenii evenere, quod inquiess atque indomitus semper inter certamina libertatis aut gloriae aut dominationis agit. (H 1.7)
It is significant that Sallust models a section of his Proemium on this analytical section which occurs in Book 3 of Thucydides. Of course, Thucydides had also mentioned in his own Proemium that events of the past and future bore a certain resemblance "due to the agency of the human factor," κατὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπουν (I.22.4), but that phrase with its deliberately abstract and striking noun conveys none of the overt pessimism of Sallust's "through the fault of human nature," "vitio humani ingenii."\(^{37}\) Civil strife, which was an important theme for Thucydides but one subordinate to his chief subject, the κίνησις of the war, is acknowledged by Sallust as the main concern of his Historiae.\(^{38}\)

It is also significant that the two historians differ on their views of human nature and human causation, as is evident from the passages under examination. For Sallust the emphasis is laid upon the fault of human nature in the eruption of dissensions, and that nature is characterized as restless, untamed, and always striving for liberty, glory, and mastery. Furthermore vitium connotes a disease or deformity in the spirit, according to Cicero, and thus the "plague metaphor" of Roman moral decline used elsewhere by Sallust in the monographs and Historiae, and possibly inspired by Thucydides's Plague description, is rooted in human nature:

quomodo autem in corpore est morbus, est aegrotatio, est vitium: sic in animo...(vitium in corpore) ex quo pravitas membrorum, distortio, deformitas, (Tusc. 4.13.29)
So perhaps for Sallust, the flaw of human nature is a kind of spiritual deformity. For Thucydides, however, it is not human nature as a whole but only the division facets of it, namely greed and ambition, which are responsible for the love of power which broke out with stasis: \( \text{παντών \ δ' αὐτῶν α'τίων \ αρχή \ ή \ διὰ πλεονεξίαν καὶ φιλοτιμίαν} \) (III.82.8). "The changes of external circumstances," \( \text{αί μεταβολαι τῶν \ ζωντιχλῶν} \) give rise to these vices in human nature, and not vice-versa, as Sallust would have it. We find elsewhere in Thucydides a harsh, not to say explicitly condemning, assessment of human nature with its habitual tendency to seize and to maintain sovereignty \( \text{(αρχή)} \) over foreign nations when it can. \(^{39}\) But Thucydides is careful not to impose a moral interpretation on this fact of human behavior, and in any case this schema for the working of human nature is restricted to a discussion of how states wield power over other states. \(^{40}\) The unfortunate moral result of strife for Thucydides is that men are not afforded the usual sanctions of domestic, civil, or religious laws, and so human nature, which can heed better standards in peacetime, is forced to follow a more selfish course in times of civil turmoil (cf. II.53.4, III.82.2,8). Thus Sallust's concept of the always restless human nature bent on glory, liberty, and power, is in essence different from Thucydides's picture of a nature which primarily wishes to rule others and is driven to do so largely by external circumstances.

Finally with regard to these divergent views we should evaluate III.84 of Thucydides, which is usually, and from Gomme's arguments I think rightly, taken as spurious. If Sallust was familiar with this paragraph, it is likely that he accepted it as genuine. One may well
assume with Buchner that the precise description of human nature in III.84 is essentially Thucydidean. The ideas and language which show human nature as an unbridled, restless force accustomed to defy laws, and to subvert justice and authority, resemble the description of Historiae 1.7:

Now we may turn to a second significant difference between III.82.2 and 1.7, namely views of historical causation. Thucydides seems to distinguish between the relations among individuals within a state who are governed by laws and moral sanctions, and relations among states where the strong dictate to the weak, and utility, not morality, is law, e.g. in Diodotus's distinction between justice which is a consideration of the law courts and expediency which is one of the political assembly (III.44.4), or in the Athenians recognition that for the Spartans and themselves, moral virtue is only a luxury which the ruling state may or may not allow (I.76.3-77.3; V.105). Sallust's scheme in the Historiae, however, is that prosperity causes both individuals and states to grow insolent, whereas war, as exemplified in the case of metus Punicus, enforces domestic concord:

Optimis autem moribus et maxima concordia egit inter secundum atque postremum bellum Carthaginense...At discordia et avaritia et cetera secundis rebus oriri sueta mala post Carthaginis excidium maxime aucta sunt. (H 1.11)

Postquam remoto metu Punico simultates exercere vacuum fuit, plurimae turbae, seditiones et ad postremum bella civilia orta sunt... (H 1.12)
This scheme is basically the same as the one proposed in the
monographs (Cf. BC 10, BJ 41) but with the significant addition in the
Historiae that prior to the Punic Wars there existed bitter strife be-
tween patres and plebs, instigated by the servile imperium of the nobles
and culminating in the secessions of the plebs (H 1.11). This contrasts
with the picture of civil harmony before 146 B.C. as described in the
monographs: "iurgia, discordias, simulstes cum hosticus exercebant
[populi Romani], cives cum civibus de virtute certabant" (BC 92.);
"neque gloriae neque dominationis certamen inter civis erat" (BJ 9.2).
F. Klingner plausibly derives Sallust's original scheme of "optimi
mores et concordia, metus Punicus, discordia, ad postremum bella
civilia" from Polybius VI.57 on the Scipio Nascia-Cato Maior debate
and from Diodorus 34.33, possibly in turn derived from Posidonius, where
the advent of demagogues and civil wars are the aftermath of the des-
truction of Carthage. This original scheme is altered, or perhaps
merely more exactly articulated, in the Historiae by Sallust's addi-
tional mention of prior civil strife in a sort of "variation of light
and shadows." Thus the superbia nobilitatis in Early Rome had
roused the plebs to a violent, reactionary certamen libertatis. This
scheme of historical causation for the events of the earlier Republic
resembles that of the time of Marius described in the Bellum
Jugurthinum in which the superbia of nobiles at Numantia first roused
Jugurtha to ambitio and in which the superbia of Metellus first en-
couraged Marius in his ambitio to seek the consulship. So Sallust's
scheme of superbia nobilitatis followed by the strife of the plebs for
freedom can be construed also for Historiae 1.7 where we discover that
the common fault of human nature is the root cause for party strife at Rome.46 Sallust's scheme is, however, essentially different from the Thucydidean one in which human nature strives to rule and is otherwise subject to external circumstances of war, when hardships arise, or of peace, when nobler standards are permitted (III.82.2). Thucydides's scheme, in other words, illustrates the severity and perversity of human nature during war, and Sallust's how party strife is ultimately rooted in the common vitium humani ingenii of both nobles and plebs.

To account for the differences in each historian's attitude toward human nature is beyond the scope of this study, but we should at least recognize that each is derived from the contemporary cultural and philosophical tradition. Thus Thucydides's dictum (III.82.2) regarding the tendencies of human nature during war and other "changes of circumstances" (αὶ μεταβολαὶ τῶν εὐνυχεῖων) derives from the same Sophistic concepts which influenced Euripides when he wrote: μεταλλαγὰί συντυχίας (νεῶς) 'εξεκού̑ ἀοιδός (H.F. 766-77) or from the Pre-Socratic concept which prompted Heraclitus to use war as a metaphor for the dominance of change in the world (Fr's. 53, 80).47 Sallust's sentiment, on the other hand, conforms to the Roman concept stated by Terence: "ingenium est omnium hominum ab labore proclive ad lubidinem" (And. 1.1.150).

Scholars have duly appreciated these different views of human nature and historical causation in Historiae 1.7 and III.82.2,48 but what has been generally ignored is that, so far as we can judge from the apparent verbal similarity, Sallust himself wished to imply a conceptual similarity between his historical views and those of Thucydides. Sallust did not, of course, dissect Thucydides's historical
philosophy in the same ways that modern literary critics, historians, and philosophers do, but he must have felt that Thucydides's description of stasis, at least, and possibly the general picture of Athenian moral decay from the pinnacle of the Funeral Oration to the debacle of the defeat in Sicily (a decay most explicitly stated in the overview of II.65), was a suitable model for his own view of Roman decay. It was particularly apt for the period covered in the Historiae, if we rightly appreciate his allusions in the Proemium of the Historiae to the continuous agency of human nature and its destructive, partisan tendencies.

Speeches

Some common characteristics of Sallust's and Thucydides's speeches which we have considered in the discussion of the monographs are, first, that in content they attempt to reproduce only the "broad considerations" (tà δέοντα) and "general sentiment" (ευμηδεσα γνώμη) of what was actually said, and not the actual words (I.22.1), and that by the historian's critical selection, only the most crucial or characteristic speeches are reported in full in order to reveal the issues behind events or to characterize the speakers themselves. Sallust's adherence to this Thucydidean use of speeches will be seen in practice below.

We have noted that Sallust and Thucydides use brief character sketches when introducing persons, and that these, especially when preceding a speech, can be used to praise or demolish the speaker by contrasting actual intentions with his allegations in the speech itself, e.g. Pericles (II.59.3), Cleon (III.36.6), Memmius (BJ 30.3-4), Marius (BJ 84.5).
This use of the speeches, especially with reference to the sharp contrast of the speaker's word with his deed, cannot easily be assessed in the Historiae due to the fragmentary condition of the narrative. The speaker's deceit has been detected in the case of Lepidus (I.55), Pompey (II.98, actually a letter), and Macer (III.48) by the analysis of ancient testimony and Sallust's art. In the case of Cotta's oration, however, by the fortunate preservation of the introductory character sketch in palimpsests A and B, we can see Sallust's somewhat Thucydidean technique of undercutting: "quorum Octavius languide et incuriosae fuit, Cotta promptius sed ambitione tum ingentia largitione cupiens gratiam singulorum" (II.42); "Post paucos dies Cotta mutata veste permaestus, quod pro cupita voluntate plebes abalienata fuerat, hoc modo in contione populo disseruit" (II.47.1-5).

We have also seen that both Sallust and Thucydides used paired speeches to illustrate the contrasting major arguments of an issue, e.g. in the Cato-Caesar debate and the Mytilenean debate. So the antilogy of Philip and Lepidus can be cited in the Historiae (1.55, 77). This device, like the one of undercutting the speaker, uses contrast for illumination; the revered statesman, Philip, balances the revolutionary consul, Lepidus; both speak of freedom, but with different understandings of it.

Athenian and Sullan Tyranny in Lepidus's Speech

In 78 B.C. after Sulla had recently gone into voluntary retirement, Lepidus, as consul, addresses the people in order to rouse them to restore their rights curtailed by Sulla's tyrannical reforms. The
speech opens with a criticism of the peoples' self-destructive mercy and honesty. His words allude to the Corinthians' derogation of characteristic Spartan self-confidence in their own life style:

"Clementia et probitas vostra, Quirites, quibus per ceteras gentis maxumi et clari estis, plurumum timoris mihi faciunt adversum tyrannidem L. Sullae, ne quae ipsi nefanda aestumatis, ea parum credundo de aliis circumveniamini - praeertim cum illi spes omnis in scelere atque perfidia sit neque si aliter tutum putet, quam si peior aut intastabilior metu vostro fuerit, quo captis libertatis curam miseria eximat -- aut, si provideritis, in tutandis periculis magis quam ulciscendo teneamini." (H 1.55.1)

The speakers both find fault with the very characteristics which have made the two states great, i.e. Roman clementia et probitas and Spartan σωφροσύνη. It is also these virtues which have allowed tyranny to go unchecked, a tyranny which maliciously seeks to enslave. Lepidus is, of course, describing the dictatorship of Sulla; the Corinthians condemn the imperialism of Athens which is described explicitly later in their speech (I.68.3-4). Athenian rule is elsewhere characterized as a tyranny, τυραννίς, namely by Pericles (II.63.2) and Cleon (III.37.2).

The particular virtues of the two states, Roman clementia et probitas and Spartan σωφροσύνη, are not so important as the fact that, when exercised immoderately, they endanger even the virtuous. As Virginia Woolf remarked, moderation is the string through all the other pearls of virtues. More importantly, Sallust's allusion implicitly compares Sulla's reign to that of Athens. The comparison is not exact since Athens' tyranny endangers other states, Sulla's his own.
But the implied comparison is maintained elsewhere in Lepidus's speech. He calls on the people not to hope that Sulla will relinquish the tyranny at his own peril: "nisi forte speratis taedium iam aut pudorem tyrannidis Sullae esse et eum per scelus occupata periculosius demissurum" (Hist. 1.55.7). The same fact, namely that tyranny, however gained, is dangerous to relinquish, is stated by Pericles regarding Athens' imperial tyranny: ὑπὲρ τυραννίδα γὰρ ἡ ἡδονὴ ἔχετε αὐτὴν [ἀφοινῇ], ἥν λαβεῖν μὲν ἄδικον δοκεῖ εἶναι, ἄφεναι δὲ ἐπικύρωσιν (II.63.2). So Leipdus, as one suffering from oppression, sees the issue as a simple one of the people's rule or their enslavement: "hac tempestate serviundum aut imperitandum, habendus est metus aut faciendus" (Hist. 1.55.10). Pericles on the other hand, as one who endorses Athens' tyrannical empire, sees it not simply as an issue of freedom or slavery, but chiefly of their own survival: μὴ δὲ νομίζαι περὶ ἑνὸς μόνου, δουλείας αὐτῆς ἐλευθερίας, ἀγωνίζεσθαι, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀρχής στερηθῶσι καὶ κυριότων ὃν ἐν τῇ ἄφοινῇ ἀπήκροσθε (II.63.1). I cite these two passages to illustrate a contrast, and not an allusion, in the two speakers' views of tyranny, so that we may view the allusion in Historiae 1.55.7 with caution.

What does Sallust gain by these topical allusions in Lepidus's speech to Athenian tyranny as characterized in the speeches of the Corinthians and Pericles? Sulla's dictatorship was bloody and oppressive to the rights of the people; Sallust abhorred discussing it (BJ 95.4). Such a reign by an individual or by a state cannot but end in further repression to others and danger to the tyrant himself. Such was the lesson of history underscored by Sallust in the allusion to
Athenian rule, and likely felt in his own experience of Julius Caesar's self-endangered rule as well as that of the contemporary Second Triumvirate.

The Speech of Philip

If Lepidus stirs the people by pointing to tyranny, Philip seeks to counter the revolutionary consul by warning the Senate of the threat of civil strife. The warning is partially couched in terms reminiscent of Sallust's "plague metaphor"; the license of Lepidus's crime is the infectious madness of partisan strife: "neu patiamini licentiam scelerum quasi rabiem ad integros contactu procedere" (H 1.77.9). The perversity of the times and of Lepidus's followers recalls the moral upheaval during Corcyrean stasis: "ad eum [Lepidum] concurrere homines omnium ordinum corruptissimi ... quibus quies in seditionibus, in pace turbae sunt" (H 1.77.3); "et quaeso considerate, quam convorsa rerum natura sit" (H 1.77.13). Thucydides's report on stasis similarly notes its perverse values and persons (III.82-83).

Sallust's use of the description of stasis and the metaphor of the plague in Philip's speech may have become almost axiomatic for the author after the monographs, but if the allusion is consciously felt by the reader, Philip's warning to the Senate gains the strength of Thucydides's analysis of similar turmoil in the Greek world.

The Letter of Mithridates: Roman and Athenian Imperialism

The Historiae is also a document of Roman imperial policy and like the Bellum Jugurthinum it affords the opportunity to comment on Rome's
military and political expansion. So in Book IV after the report of Lucullus's great victory at Tigranocerta, the capital city of Greater Armenia, Sallust inserts a letter in which Mithridates asks the Parthian monarch, Arsaces, to join Tigranes and himself in opposing the Romans (H 4.69).

The opening of Mithridates's letter in which the King asks Arsaces to form a societas belli resembles the passage of Thucydides in which the Corcyreans ask for aid (ἐπικουρία) against the attacks of Corinth (I.32.1):

"Omnes qui secundis rebus suis ad belli societatem orantur, considerare debent, licetne tum pacem agere, dein, quod quaesiturn, satisne pium tutum gloriosum an indecorum sit." (H 4.69.1)

Δίκαιον, ὃ Αἰθηναῖοι, τοὺς μὴτε εὐρηγεῖας μεγάλης μὴτε εὐνομαχίας προφειλομένης ἤκοντας παρὰ τοὺς πέλας ἐπικουρίας, ὅπερ καὶ ἡμεῖς νῦν, δεησομένους ἀναδιδάξαι πρῶτον, μάλιστα μὲν ὡς καὶ ἐξομορφά δέονται, εἰ δὲ μὴν, ὅτι γε σοκ ἐπιξιημια, ἔπειτα δὲ ὡς καὶ τὴν χάριν βέβαιον ἐξουσία (I.32.1)

Clearly there are many differences in the historical situations, notably Rome, the aggressor in this situation, plays a different role from Athens, the protective ally. I shall argue below that Sallust intends to compare Rome with Athens in the body of this letter. But certain elements of the historical situation are similar: a formerly unallied state is begging for aid from a much wealthier and more powerful state to fight against what it considers unjust aggression. Yet we may note that the bases of the two arguments are different: Mithridates's rests on whether the alliance would be "right, safe, honorable, or dishonorable" ("pium tutum gloriosum an indecorum"), Corcyra's on whether it would be expedient (ἐξομορφα). Here Sallust's and Thucydides's divergent political philosophies are revealed as being respectively moralistic or
utilitarian. Nevertheless, Sallust saw the situations as similar in form at least, and thus the imitation is descriptive, but not allusive.

Later in the letter, Mithridates delivers a powerful condemnation of Roman imperial ambition, all traceable to one vice, "cupido profunda imperii et divitiarum" (H 4.69.5). The accusation recalls Thucydides's single cause of all evils during *stasis*, "desire to rule due to greed and ambition" (ἄρση ἡ διὰ πλεονεξίαν καὶ φιλοτιμίαν, III,82.8) and also the "certamina gloriae et dominationis" at the core of human nature cited in the proemium of the *Historiae* (1.7). If Mithridates is right in his diagnosis, then the Roman ailment is rooted in human nature.

Moreover, *lubido dominandi* is the same *causa bellii* which Sallust had recognized in the Persian and Peloponnesian Wars in Greece:

"postea vero quam in Asia Cyrus, in Graeca Lacedaemonii et Athenienses coeperse urbis atque nationes subigere, lubidinem dominandi causam bellii habere, maxumam gloriam in maxumo imperio putare, tum demum periculo atque negotiis compertum est in bello plurumum ingenium posse." (BC 2.2)

Mithridates continues his indictment of Roman imperialism with a detailed characterization of "mos suus omnia regna subvortundi":

"an ignoras Romanos ... pestem conditos orbis terrarum; quibus non humana uilla neque divina obstant, quin socios amicos, procul iuxta sitos, inopes potentesse trahant excidant, omniaque non serva et maxume regna hostilia ducant? ... Romani arma in omnis habent, acerruma in eos, quibus victis spolia maxuma sunt; audendo et fallundo et bella ex bellis serundo magni facti: per hunc morem extinguent omnia aut occident." (H 4.69.17, 20, 21)

The Romans are unscrupulous and merciless in waging war for profit and are not satisfied until all have been made subservient. Mithridates's condemnation echoes that sentiment in Jugurtha's letter to Bocchus:

"Romanos iniustos, profunda avaritia, communis omnium hostis esse"
We had earlier noted that Jugurtha's words are modeled on the speech of the Corinthians at Sparta in which Athenian ambition is criticized. Mithridates's letter also recalls that same speech, especially where the accusation against Athens is summarized, "by their nature they can neither abide in peace nor allow other men to do so" (περικεντότα τῷ μήτε αὐτῶν ἔχειν ηὐχίαν μήτε τοὺς ἄλλους ἀνθρώπους εἴν, I.70.9).

Thus Rome in her imperial motivation, lubido dominandi, and in her methods of ambitious encroachment is similar to imperial Athens, at least according to Sallust.

Conclusion on the Passages of the Historiae

Sallust includes several significant, allusive imitations within the extant portions of the Historiae and from them we can understand how he read Thucydides and used his ideas to express his own. Although Sallust's concept of human nature and its scheme of behavior in war and peace is, on our close analysis, significantly different from Thucydides's, perhaps Sallust interpreted Thucydides differently from us through his own dark view of the workings of vitium humani ingenii. Thus the lubido dominandi which Sallust found as the root cause of Roman civil and imperial strife as evidenced in his Proemium and the Letter of Mithridates (H 1.7; 4.69.5) is the same destructive passion which he saw at work in Thucydidean Athens and Corcyrean stasis (I.70; III.82.8; cf. BC 2.2). The tyranny which Athens exercised is comparable to that of Sulla, and the internal discord in Greece resembles that in Rome due to the treachery of men like Lepidus (I.68.1; 68).
Similar criticisms of Roman rule and politics were also conveyed through allusive imitations in the monographs. But what is lacking in the Historiae is any outstanding leader who might save Rome from her vices. Sallust along with Thucydides must have recognized Pericles as such a hope for the cause of Athens, and so certain Periclean words are translated into the context of the prologue of the Bellum Catilinae (e.g. 3.2 and Thucydides II.35.2; BC 6.5 and II.40.4), or into the speech of Memmius and the description of Marius in the Bellum Jugurthinum. If no single man fulfills for Sallust the role of the ideal statesman as Pericles did for Thucydides, yet a fragile hope is extended in the monographs that Sallust's contemporary Rome may find such leadership in the combined, somewhat antithetical qualities of Cato and Caesar (BC 53-54) or in a latter day Marius who might not fall prey to ambition (BJ 114.4, cf. 63.6).

If we are to judge from the remaining fragments of the Historiae, Sallust's hopes for leadership are muted still further, but they stop just short of complete pessimism. There is no leader described in the body of the narrative or in the speeches who exhibits any degree of Periclean excellence, although in the Proemium reference is made to the great ancestral leaders who flourished between the time of the founding of The City and the Macedonian War with Persius: "maximis ducibus, fortibus strenuisque ministris" (H 1.9). Great leaders of the period 78-67 B.C. can also be detected in what Funaioli refers to as the "schöne Gestalten von Menschen" of the Historiae, but these are the leaders of Rome's foes, not of Romans, e.g. Sertorius in his military
prowess (H 1.88, 90), Mithridates, who springs fully armed from his horse with his stalwart, 70-year-old vigor (H 2.74ff., 5.4ff.), and Spartacus in his mighty strength and spirit (H 3.90ff., 4.41). 60

Syme 61 notes that Livy also recognized the grave vitium humani ingenii of the time and that Tacitus later seemed to agree that the remedium for the vice was the rule of one man: "donec ad haec tempora quibus nec vitia nostra nec remedia pati possumus perventum est" (Livy, Praef, 9); "non alius discordantis patriae remedium fuisse quam ut ab uno regeretur" (Tac. Ann. 1.9.4).

Sallust did not live to witness the remedium in the form of Augustus, yet he continued to write of the past until his death in the hope that his contemporaries might heed his prognosis of Rome's ills, if they could not learn directly from Thucydides.
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CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

Previous chapters have demonstrated how Sallust's particular imitations of Thucydides imply a more general sympathy with the Greek historian as a writer and with the fate of Athens as one roughly similar to that of Rome. The present chapter reviews some of the general conclusions of those chapters and suggests possible reasons for the changes in Sallust's use of Thucydides from work to work.

Let us begin with the caution that Sallust's imitations should be viewed through his eyes and not our own, otherwise Sallust's implicit comparison of Rome with Athens, and of himself with Thucydides, cannot be fully appreciated. Sallust, as he would have it, is, like Thucydides, an historian of great talent who proclaims the deeds of his state and possibly wards off future disaster. He therefore wishes to be associated with Thucydides in his explicit concern for objectivity, brevity and accuracy. For Sallust, Rome after the fall of Carthage resembled Athens during the Peloponnesian War in the exercise of imperialistic power, the vicissitudes of civil war, the need for leadership, and the behavior of human nature.

As we saw in the first chapter, beneath the many apparent similarities in Thucydides's and Sallust's historical writings of course lie a plethora of differences in approaches, philosophies and values which
have been analysed by modern scholars. Therefore an acknowledgment of those differences most important to this study is presented in the first chapter. Thucydides, as we saw, is concerned with recording the greatest movement, the war between Athens and Sparta, so that his record may be of some service to future ages. Thucydides was interested both in domestic and in foreign struggles, in personal and in political motives. He describes Athenian and Spartan ideals, and shows how both states were confronted with the growing awareness that expediency often dictates actions in wartime, and that noble standards are affordable only in peace. Sallust, on the other hand, wrote history not to record a single movement, but to illustrate the historical experience of the Roman people by dealing with crucial episodes (BC 4.2). Sallust's chosen topics demonstrate his interest in the pathology of Roman moral decline since the fall of Carthage. His historical writings show a focal interest in individuals and events which illustrate crucial points in Rome's decline. But despite differences in approach, there are certain similarities, such as a concern for human nature, a desire to uncover the reasons for civil strife, and a disinterest in gods as historical agents. The general similarities are intentional, as is suggested by the more clearly identifiable, particular borrowings in each of Sallust's works.

The second, third, and fourth chapters of this study have examined Sallust's use of borrowings from Thucydides in the separate contexts of the Bellum Catilinae, Bellum Jugurthinum and Historiae. Within each work of Sallust we discerned certain themes, stylistic devices, and entire passages which are modeled on Thucydides's History. The
significance of borrowings ranges from purely descriptive ornament to subtle criticism or praise by intentional allusion. One of the chief advantages of this systematic analysis is that it allows us to see how Sallust's use of imitation changes and how it remains the same from work to work. What emerges is a picture of Sallust's decreasing dependence on Thucydides as a stylistic model, and yet his consistent identification of res Romanae after Carthage with the fate of Athens during the Peloponnesian War.

With regard to Thucydidean themes, we observed how the sentiments of Periclean wisdom, particularly of the Funeral Oration, which adorned the opening chapters of the Bellum Catilinae were absent from the later works. All three works do, however, show a consistent disdain for the crowd much in the manner of Thucydides. They all consistently refer to the Roman moral decline as a plague which besets the city much like the actual one in Athens. The Bellum Jugurthinum and Historiae demonstrate a greater concern with themes of partisan strife, and of imperialistic ambition. So criticism of idle citizens (ignavi, ἰγνατοί) who are a detriment to the state is expressed most strongly in the second monograph. The Historiae shows an increasing number of references to domestic uprisings spawned by fear, a type of tumult also well attested by Thucydides. If Sallust allowed for the noble sentiments of the Funeral Oration in his first work, these were apparently crowded out in the later ones which express a greater thematic interest in the kind of civil strife and human greed in Sallust's Rome which was also at work in Thucydides's contemporary Greece.
The influence of Thucydides on Sallust's style is most apparent in his crabbed, antithetical, or generalizing expressions which consistently appear in all three works. The lexical antithesis of word and deed is exploited by both authors as a means of uncovering the truth behind the allegation when there is a discrepancy between the two. Sallust's obstinate opposition to a flowing style and his use of constant contrast in order to reveal the truth is a bond which links the Roman historian to the Greek in all his writing. Yet a comparison of other elements of style reveals an important evolution in Sallust's use of Thucydides, notably a decreasing structural dependence on his model. The Bellum Catilinae, like Thucydides's History, is built upon certain structural elements like an Archaeology, a political digression, a crucial debate over capital punishment, and a brilliant eulogy of prominent leaders. The Bellum Jugurthinum also has certain structural elements which suggest Thucydidean influence, notably an exhortative speech to the people in a crisis, and another political digression. The Historiae apparently has several geographic but no political digressions. In his final work Sallust, as far as we can tell, relegated such political comments to the prologue in a manner foreign to Thucydides. It is also noteworthy that in the Historiae instead of a eulogy of a great leader early in the work, we find an incisive sketch of the tyrant Sulla. Although Sallust continues to use antithesis and brevity in a manner reminiscent of Thucydides, he departs from close structural dependence on his model in the two later works as his own style matures.
Like Sallust's themes, his passages or episodes modeled on Thucydides suggest a departure in later works from the bright image of Periclean leadership suggested in the *Bellum Catilinae*. In addition to Pericles's sentiments in the prologue of the first monograph, we find a glowing portrait of ideal leadership in the *syncrisis* of Caesar and Cato after their speeches before the Senate, much as Pericles was portrayed after his final speech in Thucydides's work. Memmius's speech in the *Bellum Jugurthinum* may be modeled roughly on Pericles's third speech, but the portrait of the Roman tribune is not so flattering and his role in the Jugurthine War is, of course, incommensurate with Pericles's in the Peloponnesian War. The fragments of the *Historiae* appear to give little praise to Roman leadership at all. Sentiments from Pericles whom Cicero judged as "flourishing with every type of virtue" ("Pericles, qui cum floreret omni genere virtutis...", Cic. *Brut.* 28) seem to be absent from Sallust's final work. The foreign wars of the *Bellum Jugurthinum* and *Historiae* allow for Sallust's display of talent in a Thucydidean manner as a military historian and former general. Certain battle descriptions of the second monograph resemble those in Thucydides. In such descriptions of conflicts on a foreign front and politics at home, Sallust, like Thucydides, exploits the opportunity to show how military and political events interact. The subject of Sallust's two later works also allows for indirect criticism of Roman imperialism through the speech of Jugurtha or letter of Mithridates, and the actual words criticizing ambitious Roman imperialism recall the words of the Corinthians criticizing the Athenian character as described in Thucydides. But the most striking and
controversial of all Sallust's passages modeled on Thucydides occurs in the prologue of Sallust's Historiae (H 1.7) where the fault of human nature is described as the source of Roman dissent, just as human nature is linked directly to the hardships of Greek civil strife by Thucydides. The two portraits of human nature may differ in detail, but Sallust's allusion to Thucydides in a prominent place in his Historiae is unmistakable. The significance, as we may surmise, is that the grim picture of human nature which brings in train the inversion of morals and perversion of languages was for Sallust both a relevant common thread linking the two historians' works, as well a dire threat to both historians' native states. This concept of human nature and the realization of the perversion inherent in all civil strife shows the most direct and original influence of Thucydides on Sallust's concept of history.
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