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INTRODUCTION

It has been known for some time that the Prologue of Sallust's *Histories* exercised a great influence on Livy's *Praefatio*. Indeed Sallust is its single clearly traceable source. But the investigation into this question has never been conducted in a systematic way. It consists of observations scattered in a number of articles and books. My preliminary research showed that the existing studies of the issue suffer from two major deficiencies: (1) They generally underestimate the extent of Sallust's influence on Livy's *Praefatio*. More specifically, the latter reflects borrowings and echoes not only from the *Histories* but also from the *Catiline* and the *Jugurtha*. (2) They misjudge Livy's intent in his choice of Sallust as a source. The prevailing opinion is that Livy was motivated by a polemic intent and that the *Praefatio* shows extreme distaste for the ideas of his predecessor. Thus, the initial aim of this study was to concentrate exclusively on Sallustian reminiscences in the *Praefatio*, their extent and their nature. But it gradually became evident that such

1See e.g. Amundsen; La Penna V 310. (Full references are found in the Bibliography at the end).

2See e.g. Amundsen; Vretska I 195; Oppermann 178; Syme V 290; Mazza 70 ff.; La Penna V 310.
an investigation would have to leave out those sections of the Praefatio where Sallust's direct influence is not detectable. This, of course, was not possible because the ideas in the Praefatio are closely interwoven. One would have, therefore, to analyse the whole text in relation to the works of Sallust. It turned out, however, that such an investigation was more complex in its nature than it initially appeared. The examination of Livy's attitude toward Sallust in the Praefatio is to a large extent dependent on two broader issues:

1. The date of its composition

The traditional date for the composition of the Praefatio is between 27 and 25 B.C. It is extracted from two passages in the first pentad (1, 19, 3 and 4, 20, 7), which contain references to Augustus and the closing of the temple of Janus. It is also extracted from an alleged reference in Praef. 9 (nec vitia nec remedii pati possimus) to Augustus' moral legislation of 28 B.C., a theory first proposed by Dessau (I). Thus the Praefatio is often seen as an Augustan composition reflecting and welcoming the moral or even constitutional (Syme IV 42) reforms of the new regime. Though a great number of scholars in recent years have pointed out the pessimism of the Praefatio with regard to Rome's present
and the immediate prospect of moral resurgence,\textsuperscript{3} it can be argued (Williams 33-34) that its pessimism is similar to that of Hor. Od. 3, 6, whose grim mood serves to promote, whether intentionally or not, the Augustan policy of the restoration of the temples. The perception of Livy's Praefatio as an Augustan composition in the narrow terms underlined above leads inevitably to the broader assumption that it is a product of a new ideology, in the light of which all of its ideas and statements are examined. As a result, studies of the Praefatio in relation to Sallust's works base their considerations and conclusions on the assumption that the Augustan ideology of the former stands in radical conflict with the Republican ideology of the latter (Mazza 71, 177). This is why the question of the dating of the Praefatio is so vital to a study which proposes to examine its ideas in relation to Sallust. It will be the aim of the first chapter to show that the Praefatio was composed before 30 B.C., in the years of civil war and acute crisis, that is in precisely the same climate in which Sallust composed all of his works.

2. The existence of ancient testimonia allegedly showing Livy's hostility towards Sallust

This question inevitably emerges every time one attempts a discussion of Livy's attitude to Sallust in the Praefatio.

\textsuperscript{3} Funaioli II 59-60; Amundsen 34; Vretska I 199; Walsh I 370 and VI 6; Syme IV 42; Leeman IV 208 etc.
Several studies of the latter issue have used these testimonia in relation to Livy's alleged polemic with Sallust in the prefatory remarks of the A.U.C. It is self-evident that such external information can be utilized to give any word of the Praefatio a specific twist or overtone, and that, with some ingenuity, any text can be made to say what one wishes it to say. It is, therefore, imperative to re-examine the evidence supplied by these testimonia. The aim of the second chapter will be to show that there is no solid external information supporting the widespread view that Livy disliked Sallust's morals and style.

In conclusion, this study of Livy's Praefatio and Sallust will inevitably have to deal first with an examination of its date of composition and of external evidence concerning the attitude of Livy towards his predecessor. It will then be demonstrated in the third chapter that the ideas of the Praefatio are in substantial agreement with Sallust's and that Livy pays his predecessor a tribute by adopting his concept of the general course of Roman history.

\(^4\text{e.g. Amundsen 33; Skard II 7; Syme V 289-90; Pasoli II 40.}\)
CHAPTER I

THE DATE OF LIVY'S PRAEFATIO

At the beginning of the century H. Dessau (I) attempted to extract the date of the composition of Livy's Praefatio from the text itself. He suggested that the phrase nec vitia nec remedia pati possumus (sect. 9) is an allusion to Augustus' abortive introduction of moral legislation in 28 B.C., about which we read in Propertius 2, 7, 1-4:

Gavisa est certe sublatam Cynthia legem
qua quondam edicta flemus uterque diu,
ni nos divideret: quamvis diducere amantis
non queat invitos Iuppiter ipse duos.

Scholarly opinion is divided in its assessment of the validity of this theory. It is important that the whole question be placed in the proper perspective. Dessau writes elsewhere (II 142) that Livy "... seine Feder direkt in der Dienst des Kaisers gestellt hat". The scholar saw the historian as a propagandist for the regime, and some of the later critics accepted his theory in this spirit. Along the line of Dessau's theory, though of broader scope, is also Syme's suggestion (IV 42) that remedia imply

5See e.g. Mazza 181 (in favor); Walsh V 11, 18 (against).
"the acceptance of centralised government as the only guarantee of Rome's salvation". The search for pro-Augustan, or even anti-Augustan, allusions in the A.U.C. has been a major trend in Livian scholarship. The issue of Livy's attitude towards the Augustan regime must, therefore, be dealt with before any attempt to reexamine the date of the Praefatio. But since the question is too broad to be treated in detail in the present study, I will limit myself to quoting certain key points made by Walsh (VI 6; see also Walsh IV), with a few additional comments:

(1) When we are told in Tacitus that Livy was pro-Pompeian, and generous in his praise of Brutus and Cassius, this is put forward as evidence of his independence of interpretation. (2) The Preface is markedly pessimistic about the immediate prospect of moral resurgence at Rome, so that for Livy the contemplation of earlier centuries is an anodyne. (3) The political attitudes reflected in Livy's account of the conflict of the orders suggest that he prescribes a return to the uncorrupted senatorial government of the Republic, and abhors autocracy. (4) The actual references to Augustus in the Ab Urbe Condita are respectful but not adulatory or apologetic. In short, Livy does not consciously lend his services as historian to the consolidation of the Augustan regime. [The notes on the text have been omitted].

The following examples from the meager remnants of Livy's lost account of recent Republican history can give us a glimpse of his ardent Republican feelings. He labels the first triumvirate a conspiratio (Per. 103). Of Cato the Younger, the virtuous exception in the corrupt times

---

6See Walsh's observations on the practices of the "symbolists" (V 15), of whom the most extreme example is Stübeler. For an analysis that shows Livy critical of the Augustan regime see Mette and Petersen.
portrayed in Sallust's *Catiline*, the principal symbol of opposition against the Julio-Claudians (see Pecchiura 45 ff.), Livy says: *... cuius gloriae neque profuit quisquam laudando nec vituperando quisquam nocuit, cum utrumque summis praediti fuerint ingenii.* Finally, about Caesar he writes: *... in incerto esse utrum illum magis nasci rei publicae profuerit an non nasci* (Sen. N.Q. 5, 18, 4).

Livy did not indulge in antiquarianism, contrary to the trend among his contemporaries. The bulk of his huge *History* covers the period between the Gracchi and Actium, i.e. the period of the most intense power struggle and the civil wars. The latter haunt him even when he gives an account of the politics of the early Republic. The struggle of the orders (Books 2-6) is given great prominence. For about 150 years the Republic is torn apart by incessant *discordiae*. The language is anachronistic and often reminiscent of Sallust. Livy provided the complete and definitive account of the history of the Republic and is recognised as

---

7*Jerome In Hoseam*, Migne 25, 861. By *utrumque* Livy refers to Cicero and Caesar.

8See Mssen 560-1, Momigliano 277; ch. III *passim*, esp. the discussion on sect. 7.

9For a comparison between the length of books and the span of years in the early and in the late books see Stadter, appendix I. It is erroneous to assume that the difference should be attributed to the fact that the material available for treatment by Livy was scanty in the first centuries of Rome and abundant in later years. A comparison with Dionysius' *Antiquitates* shows that Livy could have spent much more time on Rome's early history, had he wanted to.

10See the discussion on *Praef.* 6-9 in ch. III.
as "the last of the Republican writers". The Augustan period in his History could be seen as an appendix, whether this is meant literally, as Syme (IV 38) believes, or metaphorically. Periochae 133-142 are generally more brief than the previous ones, and the focus is more on external wars than on the internal political developments. The account of the period, and Livy's History, ends on a note of disaster: clades Quintilii Vari. It is characteristic that, in initiating the future emperor Claudius into the secrets of historiography, Livy advised him to begin his History post caedem Caesaris dictatoris, but the latter, following pressure from his family, had to make a fresh start a pace civili (Suet. Claud. 41). It can be concluded at this point that internal strife and civil war is the focus of Livy's huge History and that the historian consistently adhered to the Republican ideals under the Principate, as far as can be seen from the available evidence.

In the Preface to Book 6 Livy sums up the history of the Republic down to 387 B.C. as foris bella, domi seditiones.

11 De Sanctis 246; Klingner III 195; Syme IV 53.

12 See Syme IV 57 ff. A comparison with Cassius Dio may help to illustrate the nature of the Livian account, though Schwarz's opinion (III 1705) that Cassius Dio no longer follows Livy after Book 51 has been challenged. On this issue see Manuwald 168 ff.

13 This line is not an interpolation, as often suspected. It is supported by the termination of Julius Obsequens: multitudo Romanorum per insidias subjecta est.
After this brief examination of Livy's broader attitude to the Augustan regime, the next task is to see whether the Praefatio itself contains elements which tie it to the post-civil war period. Are there in it allusions to the end of the civil war, the honors conferred on the victor, the program of moral and religious reform on which he embarked soon after his return from the East, and, finally, any personal aspirations of his? The issue in question here is not whether the Praefatio bears traces of what is broadly known as "Augustan ideology", which was neither a one-man creation nor a sudden phenomenon, but rather whether or not there is anything in it which would prevent us from studying it without any reference to the post-Actium period.

In the first place, there is no mention in the Praefatio of an end to the civil wars. Livy's statement about haec nova quibus iam pridem praevalenti populi vires se ipsae conficiunt testifies to the opposite. This vague language conceals an allusion to the ongoing civil war. It is the same language we encounter in Hor. Epod. 16, 1-2 (from about 38 B.C.) and in the "prophecy" of Hannibal in Livy 30, 44, 8. Here are the two passages:

Altera iam teritur bellis civilibus aetas suis et ipsa Roma viribus ruit.

Nulla magna civitas diu quiescere potest; si foris hostem non habet, domi invent, ut praevalida corpora

14 On his reforms see Syme I ch. 29.

15 For the theme of the "self-destroying force" see Dutoit; Jal 251 ff.
ab externis causis tuta videntur, suis ipsa viribus onerantur.

In 27 B.C. the Senate conferred on Octavian the title Augustus and offered him a gold shield, which bore an inscription stating that it was given to him because of his virtus, clementia, iustitia and pietas. None of the Augustan virtues appears directly in the Praefatio. With regard to the title of Augustus, an attempt has been made to read an allusion to the ruler behind augustiora in sect. 7 (Stuhler 12). Such an interpretation was dismissed by Erkell (9 ff.), who conducted a systematic study of the word as it appears in Livy.

Augustus' program of moral and religious reform does not find an echo in the Praefatio either. Dessau's theory was discussed and rejected above. Syme's argument (IV 42) that Livy's concern cannot be restricted to a single legislative enactment is a valid reason for rejecting it. In addition to that, there is not the slightest verbal correlation between the Livian and the Propertian text to support such a theory.

The gens Julia claimed descent from the son of Aeneas and Creusa (Perret I 561 ff.). Here is Livy's treatment of the claim in 1, 3, 2-3:

Haud ambiguam--quem enim rem tam veterem pro certo adfirmet?--hicine fuerit Ascanius an maior quam hic, Creusa matre Ilio incolumi natus comesque inde paternae fugae, quem Iulum eundem Iulia gens auctorem nominis sui nuncupat. Is Ascanius, ubicumque et quacumque matre genitus--certe natum Aenea constat--...
The comparison with Aeneid 1, 267-70 offers an illuminating contrast:

> at puer Ascanius, cui nunc cognomen Iulo additur (Ilus erat, dum res stetit Ilia regno), triginta magnos volvendis mensibus orbis imperio explebit,...

In Praef. 7 the historian traces the divine parentage of the Roman people to Mars through Romulus (conditorisque) and not to Venus through Iulus and Aeneas. In the next section he states with emphasis that such issues as the claim to divine origins will be "of little importance" to his History.

The defense of Roman world dominion as the natural outcome of the moral strength of the Roman people and the excellence of its men (Praef. 9), the idealisation of the past and of its bona exempla (Praef. 10-11) are all components of the "Augustan ideology" (Levi). But they are also traditional Republican values. On the other hand, the announcement or the expectation of a New Age, is missing from the Praefatio. The historian dwells with particular emphasis on the gloomy picture of the present (sects. 4-5, 9, 11-12). There is really no comparison with the optimism of the Aeneid, to the extent to which the latter treats historical issues and not issues of broader human nature.

---

16 See Knoche III and the discussion on sections 9-10 in ch. III.

17 On the question of Livy's optimism with regard to the usefulness of the study of history see ch. III, sect. 10.

18 On these two aspects of the poetry of the Aeneid see Perret II.
It is sometimes assumed that Hor. Od. 3, 6 parallels the tone of the Praefatio (Williams 33-4). It seems likely that this ode was written after Actium (vv. 13-16) but before Octavian embarked on his program for the restoration of the temples in 28 B.C. It is probably one of the earliest odes in the collection, which explains, in part, its grim mood. But its pessimism is also conditioned by its relation to a specific official policy, which causes such a pessimism to sound, if not suspect, at least overstated. This is precisely what differentiates this ode from Livy's Praefatio.

The closest literary parallels to the tone of the Praefatio are Hor. Epod. 16 and Sallust Hist. 1 frs. 100-3 (= Plut. Sert. 8). These three compositions show an identical reaction to the crisis: retreat from a situation for which there is no remedy and refuge into a better world. In Epod. 16, whose opening lines were shown before to have been picked up in Praef. 4, Horace earnestly appeals to the people to abandon Rome, which is torn asunder by civil war, and sail to the Islands of the Blest. In Sallust we are told how Sertorius heard of these islands and

---

19 Grimal 137 suggests 29 B.C. Frankel II 261 and Dessau I 466 suggest 28 B.C. and 27 B.C. respectively. Against such late dating see Heinze I 678.

20 Compare the Bucolics and the Georgics, where the dark tones of the civil wars and their effects are either balanced or set off by optimism about the rise of a New Age.
"was seized by an irresistible desire to settle in them and live in peace and be rid of tyranny and ceaseless wars" (in Plutarch's passage). And here is Praef. 5, where Livy speaks of Rome's early history as an anodyne:

ego contra hoc quoque laboris praemium petam, ut me a conspectu malorum quae nostra tot per annos vidit aetas, tantisper certe dum prisca illa tota mente repeto, avertam,...

The examination of the text of the Praefatio and its parallels lead to the following conclusions: (1) There is nothing in it that ties it to the policies and the person of Augustus. (2) Its closest parallels are Sallust Hist. 1 frs. 100-3 and Hor. Epod. 16. (3) It was written in a climate of civil war. The Praefatio must therefore have been composed either in 31-30 B.C. or earlier. We will next see how its date can be determined even closer.

As will be shown in detail in Ch. III, the Praefatio echoes the Prologue of Sallust's Histories (= 1 frs. 1-18). Sallust was probably at work on the Histories in the early thirties and died in 35 B.C. Did he publish any portion of his work while he was still alive? It is possible that Book 1 was published separately. All the earliest instances of reminiscences from the Histories come from Book 1. The Praefatio was mentioned above. Next, there is the case of Asinius Pollio's letter to Plancus, in which he criticized

21See Klingner I and Amundsen.

22Syme V 13; Perl suggests 34, but see La Penna V 473 n. 3.
Sallust because in this Book of the Histories he used *transgredi*, instead of *transfretare*, for sea-crossing (Gell. *N.A.* 10, 26 = Hist. 1 fr. 104). The letter was written before 32 B.C. (André 87). Finally, it is often assumed that the theme of Hor. *Epod.* 16 was influenced by the Sertorius episode mentioned above. Epod. 16 probably dates from late 38 B.C., before Horace's second visit to Maecenas. It is also, possible, however, that Horace became familiar with Sall. Hist. 1 at such an early date not through publication but through recitationes.

Consequently, the *terminus post quem* for the composition of the Praefatio is either 38 B.C. (if Hor. *Epod.* 16 echoes Hist. 1) or 35 B.C. (date of Sallust's death). The *terminus ante quem* was set before at 30 B.C. (conclusion of the war), but needs further examination.

It is often suggested that the *scriptores* of Praef. 2-3 include Asinius Pollio. The analysis of these sections

---

23 Schörner 43; Fuchs I 11; Syme V 284-6. But see also Kiessling-Heinze 546 (cautious); Frankel II 49: "It is possible but not provable".

24 La Penna IV 35 f. For a survey of the dates proposed, which range from before Philippi to Actium, see Ableitinger-Grünerberger 60-65. A date around 31 B.C. is suggested e.g. by Hermann.

25 Barwick 67 suggests that Sallust published a section of his Histories around 39 B.C. On the other hand, recitation was well-known in Rome long before the thirties. Dalzell has shown that Seneca the Elder's statement about Pollio that *primus... omnium Romanorum hominibus advocatis scripta sua recitavit* (Contr. 4, Praef. 2) refers only to the formalization of the practice of recitations.
in ch. III will show that such an assumption is erroneous. Praef. 4, however, shows an awareness of writers of contemporary history.26 Hence it will have to be seen whether the proposed date for the composition of the Praefatio would have enabled Livy to become familiar with Pollio's Histories. Indirect evidence about the date of publication of part of Pollio's Histories can be extracted from Hor. Od. 2, 1. In this ode Horace issues a warning to the historian that the civil wars are a dangerous theme for history.27 The ode was probably written in 34 B.C. (Nisbet-Hubbard) or shortly before 30 B.C. (André 46). It is known that when Sallust died Pollio hired his assistant Ateius Capito, who gave him advice de ratione scribendi as he set about to write history (historiam componere aggressos: Suet. de gram. 10). Pollio composed a section of his work, therefore, between the death of Sallust and 30 B.C. To Livy and Horace it could have become known either through recitationes28 or through publication.

Oppermann (179) suggests that Praef. 13 was influenced by Georg. 1, 40-42:

da facilem cursum, atque audacibus adnue coeptis
ignarosque viae mecum miseratus agrestis
ingredere et votis iam nunc adsuesce vocari.

26In ch. III sect. 4 it is argued that this is not done with a polemic intent.

27See Nisbet and Hubbard's introductory remarks to this ode.

28On Pollio's recitationes see Dalzell's article.
It is known from the *Vita Donati* that Virgil started working on the *Georgics* around 36 B.C. and presented them to Octavian in a four-day reading marathon with the help of Maecenas in 29 B.C. From the *sphragis* of the poem it appears that it was completed while Octavian was still fighting in the East. The Preface to Book 1 may have been composed before, after or concurrently with the *Praefatio*. On the other hand, a parallel study of *Praef.* 13 and *Georg.* 1, 40-2 does not show that the former derives from the latter, as Oppermann suggests. In the first place, Virgil invokes Octavian, while Livy makes an indirect invocation to the gods. Secondly, Livy's mention of *poetae* echoes a long tradition of poetic proems (Ogilvie *ad loc.*), not just the Virgilian one. Finally, the phrase *da facilem cursum* is a sailing metaphor (Conington-Nettleship *ad loc.*) found also in Virgil's invocation to Maecenas (*Georg.* 2, 39-41) and in Ovid's invocation of Germanicus (*Fasti* 1, 2-3). The easiest way for Livy to acknowledge the borrowing would have been to pick up this metaphor. The historian, however, was not interested so much in a "smooth course" as in the "happy outcome" (*successus prosperos*)

29 About the dates of the *Georgics* see Büchner II 1057.

30 Syme (IV 57) believes that "the priority belongs to Livy with Book 1 at least to his credit while Virgil was still completing the *Georgics*". See also Rostagni.
of his *immensum opus*.\(^{31}\) The feeling both in the *Praefatio* and in the Preface to Book 31 is that Livy is oppressed by the magnitude of the undertaking.

The issue of the date of Livy's *Praefatio* has so far been studied without a linkage to the date of Books 1-5. It will now be seen how it relates to the date of composition and publication of the first pentad.

Was the *Praefatio* written after the completion of the first pentad, after the completion of Book 1 or at the very beginning? Syme (IV 43) accepts the first possibility, Jansen (73-4) vacillates between the first and the second. Both scholars argue that the practice in antiquity was that a preface be composed after a book or books of the specific work had been completed. Funaioli (II 43), Ferrero (I 3), Vretska (I 199) and Ruch (I 74) believe that the *Praefatio* was the very first part of the A.U.C. to be written.

The traditional date for the publication of Livy's first pentad is between 27 and 25 B.C. It is extracted from two passages, 1, 19, 3 and 4, 20, 7. The reference in both to Octavian as Augustus sets January 16 of 27 B.C. as the *terminus post quem*. In the former passage there is mention of the closing of the temple of Janus in 29 B.C., but no recording of the next closing in 25 B.C. The *terminus ante quem* for the publication must, therefore, be

\[^{31}\text{Cf. Praef. 4, 5, 12.}\]
25 B.C. A number of scholars have also suggested that Book 1 was published separately, because it is a complete account in itself and because Book 2 is introduced by a new Preface.  

If the Praefatio was written after Book 1, as I believe, could it still date from before 30 B.C. as previously suggested? In 1940 Bayet argued that the two crucial dating passages are insertions of a second, revised edition of 27-25 B.C. He suggested that there had been a first edition of the first pentad in two groups before 31-29 B.C.  

Syme (IV 46 ff.) rejected Bayet's theory of an early first edition but granted that some of the books in the first pentad may have been completed around 29 B.C. though the whole group was actually published between 27-25 B.C.  

Luce (I) accepted the two dating passages as later additions, and, after a most systematic examination of the dating issue, reached the following conclusions (238):  

Since he must have begun composition about the time of the Battle of Actium (possibly earlier), his decision to write the history of the Roman people a primordio urbis must have been taken before that date. Much background reading and large-scale planning also preceded regular composition.  

---

32 Bornecque III 17; Bayet p. XIX; Syme IV 47; Walsh V 6; Petersen 92; Mensching 22.  

33 See pp. XVI-XXII for his reasons. Bayet had been preceded by Soltau who suggested that several passages in Livy were later insertions.  

34 Cf. also his comments on Book 1 on p. 56.
The first pentad, therefore, can scarcely be termed "Augustan" either in inspiration or in execution; it was written in the years before the title was given to Octavian and before most of his policies and programs had been enacted.

Almost all critics have rejected Bayet's theory of a first edition of Books 1-5. But several scholars have welcomed the suggestion that the two dating passages are later insertions. The possibility that Livy started composing about 31 B.C. or earlier is a most likely one. Age does not appear to be a problem, esp. if he was born not in 59 but in 64 B.C., as Syme believes (IV 40-2). He would have had sufficient time to complete his formal education, to do background reading in Greek and Latin literature and acquire some experience in writing. It is not easy to calculate his actual rhythm of production over the years.

---

35 On corrections and additions to a text after its completion see Birt 342 ff. The second passage is unquestionably an interpolation (see Ogilvie 564).

36 It is clear from his work that he had received thorough training in rhetoric. For an analysis of the A.U.C. from an oratorical point of view see Taine. For assumed vestiges of declamatory influence on his work see Anderson 94-99. It is known that Livy composed philosophical-historical dialogues (Sen. Ep.100, 9) and an Epistula ad filium (Quint. 10, 1, 39). The dialogues probably preceded the History (Klotz II 817; but cf. Bornecque III 8-10).

37 It is believed that he must have composed a little over 3 books a year, but it is not easy to tell if he kept
But if the Praefatio was written after the completion of Book I, as suggested above, even by the strictest calculations it would still date from before the conclusion of the civil war.

Luce, Syme and Bayet make vague or conflicting suggestions concerning the date of the Praefatio. Luce rejects Dessau's theory but adds that, even if it is accepted, it does not necessitate composition as late as 28-27 B.C. (I 239 n. 86). He does not specify if he has a revision in mind. On the other hand, in his book on Livy published 12 years later he accepts Dessau's theory without any comment. Syme's dating is too flexible. In rejecting Dessau he makes the following observation (IV 42):

What the author [Livy] has in mind is the general condition of the Roman people over a tract of years. His words might apply to a time before the War of Actium or a time subsequent. Or even both.

I owe this point to Mason Hammond

A few pages later (49) he comes back to the same question:

The tone and sentiments of the Preface might even have been in harmony with the contemporary situation, had it been composed as late as 23 B.C., the critical year that witnessed the conspiracy of Varro Murena and

a steady rhythm of composition (Syme IV 41) neither do we know exactly when he started and when he finished his History, if indeed he finished it. For the opinion that he intended to carry his work to the death of Augustus in a projected Book 150 see Nissen 53B; Laistner 80; Wille 114 ff. About Per. 121, which bears the superscription quae editus post excessum Augusti dicitur, see Nissen 557-8; Bayet p. XVI; Syme IV 35ff; Stadter 299-300; Canfora I; Wille 81. For a survey of the proposed patterns of book arrangement in the History see Stadter 287; Wille 1-8.
a rift in the Caesarian party. The age is still "haec tempora quibus nec vitia nostra nec remedia pati possimus". Syme's approach to the dating of the Praefatio is refreshingly open-minded. It is rather unlikely, however, that the events of 23 B.C. would have appeared to Livy as ominous as the impending, or unfolding, clash between the two parts of a split empire.

Finally, Bayet categorically excludes the Praefatio from the hypothetical first edition of Books 1-5, arguing that it appeared with the edition of 27-25 B.C., which he considers a second, revised one (pp. XVII-XXI). He suggests that there may have been another Preface, which either is not extant today or has been incorporated into the Praefatio (p. XIX n. 4). He has a number of arguments in favor of the traditional date. He reiterates Dessau's theory (p.XX) and, also, makes the claim that the "maturity and firmness" of the style of the Praefatio appear first in the body of the A.U.C. at the end of Book 5 (p. XVII). It should be pointed out, however, that, as seen above (p.17), several scholars suggest that the Praefatio was composed at the very beginning, which indicates that Bayet's stylistic argument does not offer a safe dating lead. The critic proceeds with his argumentation in the following manner (pp. XIX-XX):

Or, son ton et ses allusions sont de caractère si particulier qu'ils fixent nettement un "moment" de la réflexion livienne: scépticisme désinvolte à l'égard des origines légendaires, qui est peut-être affecté
contre certains novi semper scriptores et qui s'accorde
avec la Préface particulière au livre VI et suivants;
volonté, qui s'excuse a demi, de poursuivre posément,
malgré l'impatience des lecteurs, le récit des temps
anciens, prisca, ce qui, suppose déjà une oeuvre étendue,
mais loin d'être achevée; notation de la curiosité du
public à l'égard des guerres civiles
(festinantibus ad haec nova), ce qui est normal si elles
paraissent bien achevées, quoique toutes récentes, et
assez pour qu'il ait encore difficulté, et peut-être
risque, a en ecrire avec serenité et liberté d'esprit;
enfin, pessimisme moral, insistant curieusement sur le
fait que Rome ne peut plus supporter "ni ses vices ni
leurs remèdes..." De toutes façons, et en soi, la Pré-
face se date donc bien du moment de la réédition des
livres I-IV. Mais certains indices permettent, par
ailleurs, de dater approximativement du même moment des
livres VII et IX. [The notes on the text have been
omitted].

Bayet's claim that Livy's skepticism towards the legendary
origins of Rome in Praef. 6-7 is comparable only with the
Preface of Book 6 is disproved by the fact that there are
numerous instances of such skepticism already in Book 1.
Secondly, the phrase tantisper certe dum prisca illa tota
mente repeto shows only, if indeed it does, that the histo-
rion has started his work, but without any hint at which
phase he is in. Thirdly, Livy makes it clear that reading
about the civil wars does not so much satisfy the curiosity
of the public as it gives them pleasure (voluptas). On the
other hand, the tense of vidit (Praef. 5), to which Bayet
draws the attention of the reader (p. XX n.3), does not
actually indicate that the civil wars are over but that
they have been going on for a long time. It is useful to

See Kajanto I 25 ff.
compare *iampridem... se ipsae conficiunt, iam...laboret* (Praef. 4) and *ad haec tempora... perventum est* (Praef. 9).

Finally, the fact that the Praefatio is echoed in Books 7, 9 and 31 is no solid criterion on which to base an argument about its date. When Livy writes in 31, 1, 2 etsi profiteri ausum perscripturum res omnis Romanas..., this is not an indication, as Bayet suggests, that the date of the publication of the Praefatio "n'en était pas extrêmement éloignée" (p.XXI). Literary memory should not be confused with normal memory.

It can be concluded that the Praefatio dates from before the termination of the civil war in 30 B.C. and not from 27-25 B.C. as generally assumed. It was composed after Book 1. This first unit of the A.U.C. may have been presented to the public through recitationes. The terminus post quem for the composition of the Praefatio is either 38 or 35 B.C. The tone of grave and gloomy pessimism throughout the Praefatio, the statement that praevalentis populi vires se ipsae conficiunt, the escapist attitude also found in Hor. Epod. 16 and Sall. Hist. 1 frs. 100-3, all strongly suggest a date before the years of peace.

39 About Livy's recitationes see Suidas s.v. Κερνουτος Κ and Cichorius 261-9.
"If Sallust's style was detestable, that was not the worst thing about him. The politician who turned moralist, the Sabine sermonizer of dubious conduct, the comfortable author of a pessimistic history, he was a disquieting figure."

This is how Syme describes Livy's feelings for Sallust in Tacitus 138. The statement is repeated in various forms in "Livy and Augustus" 54 and in Sallust 290. Strong terms, like "revulsion" and "repellent", are not spared. In spite of scattered voices of dissent in the more recent past, this is still the general picture, though in somewhat milder tones (McGushin 23). The tradition has deep roots. It was shaped primarily by Schwartz (III), continued uninterupted through the years and was reemphasized by Syme. Though both authors have been reevaluated individually, their mutual relationship has not. Very few people would believe today that Sallust is "ein echter revolutionär" (Schwartz III 582) or that Livy is a servile propagandist of Augustus (Cochrane 99). Yet it is still claimed that there is a "gulf" between them, and that they "appear to

\[1\text{Tränkle I 149 ff.; Lebek 199 ff.; Wilkinson 187} \]
inhabit a different world" (Walsh V 43; cf. Schwartz III 581: "Die Kluft zwischen beiden kann kaum gross genug gedacht werden"). Various issues are made to fit this picture. We have the case of Skard (II), who, after un-prejudiced research, collected material that established the direct influence of Sallust on Livy, but rejected the very conclusion of his own findings. It is generally argued that there is strong external evidence showing that Livy disliked Sallust's morals and style. It is the aim of this chapter to demonstrate that there is none.

---

2Although he found "ein recht umfassendes, charakteristisches Sprachmaterial" common to Sallust and Livy, which differentiates their language from that of Cicero and Caesar (7), yet he believed Norden (234) and Klotz (II 846) that Sallust could not have influenced Livy.
1. **Livy's alleged criticism of Sallust's morals**

In his book on Sallust's *Nachleben* Bolaffi (I 185) cites a passage from Cassius Dio, in which the historian is reported to have plundered the Numidians during his governorship of the province of Africa Nova and is accused of inconsistency between what he preached and what he practised. Bolaffi's comment is that "though Livy is not mentioned in the passage, it is very well known that he is the source". Here is the text:

... and taking over [sc. Caesar] the Numidians, he reduced them to the status of subjects, and delivered them to Sallust, nominally to rule, but really to harry and plunder. At all events this officer took many bribes and confiscated much property, so that he was not only accused but incurred the deepest disgrace, inasmuch as after writing such treatises as he had, and making many bitter remarks about those who fleeced others, he did not practise what he had preached. Therefore, even if he was completely exonerated by Caesar, yet in his history, as upon a tablet, the man himself had chiselled his own condemnation all too well (43, 9, 2-3).

It was the practice of ancient historians not to mention their sources except on rare occasions. Dio is no exception. Caution is the greatest virtue in Quellenfor-

---

3 All translation from Dio is by Cary (Loeb). Here is the Greek text:

καὶ τοὺς Νομάδας λαβὼν ἔς τε τὸ ὑπῆκοον ἐπήγαγε καὶ τῷ Σαλοουστίῳ λόγῳ μὲν ἄρχεν ἔργῳ δὲ ἄγειν τε καὶ φέρειν ἐπέτρεψεν. ἀμήλει καὶ ἐδωροδότησε πολλὰ καὶ ἤρτασεν, ὡστε καὶ κατηγορηθήναι καὶ αἰσχύνῃς αἰσχύστην ἄφθειν, ὅτι τοιαύτα συγγράμματα συγγράφῃς καὶ πολλὰ καὶ πλεῖρᾳ περὶ τῶν ἐκκατομμένων τῶν ἑκτῶν οὖν ἐμμην-σατο τῷ ἐργῷ τους λόγους. δὲν εἰ καὶ τὰ μάλιστα ἀφελήν ὑπὸ τοῦ Καίσαρος, ἀλλ' αὐτὸς γε ἐκατὸν καὶ πάνυ τῷ συγγραφῆ ἐστηλοκόπησε.
schung, esp. when there are different views about the source of a passage. In this case, four scholars before Bolaffi had already declared that they were uncertain about the source of the Dio passage or that the comments should be attributed to Dio himself. The question is whether or not anything in the summaries of Livy's lost books and in his epitomizers can support Bolaffi's claim.

The place to look is Per.114, which deals with the end of Caesar's African campaign in 46 B.C. As it appears from Schwartz's list of concordances between this Periocha and Florus, Orosius and Dio (III 1703), Dio probably used Livy's Book 114 as one of his sources for the account of these events. In the Periocha itself there is no reference either to Sallust's successful operation at Cercina or to his appointment to the post of governor of Africa Nova by Caesar. Naturally, given the brevity of the Periochae, this constitutes no evidence that Livy omitted them from his History. One would expect, however, to find some kind of confirmation of Dio's account in Livy's epitomizers, if Livy was indeed the source. There is none. This is at least an indication that the story about Sallust's misconduct as governor of Africa Nova, was not given prominence in Livy if we assume that it existed in the A.U.C. Outside Dio, the accusation that Sallust used his position to en-

---

4 Last 93; See1 89; Funaioli III 56 n. 2; Paladini I 15

5 See bell. Afr. 8, 3; 34, 1-3; 97, 1.
rich himself unlawfully is found in the Pseudo-Ciceronian
Invectiva in Sallustium 7, 19. This speech is a forgery of
probably the late first century or the second century A.D.
and constitutes, unfortunately, our major source for
Sallust's life. Its very purpose testifies to its lack of
reliability. Certainly, the accusation may not be entirely
unfounded but, to use Syme's words (V 38), "there is no way
of correctly estimating the behaviour of Sallust. Equity
and malice are alike baffled". It should be noticed,
however, that Appian, who also refers to Sallust's governor-
ship, mentions no misconduct. If Appian indeed used the
beginning of Book 114 of Livy (p. 109, 6-9 in Rossbach's
edition) as a source for the account of the operations of

---

6 For speculation on its date and author see Klotz I
82, and Kurfess's Praefatio to the 3rd(1958) and 4th
(1962) Teubner editions. For the surprising view that it is
a genuine Ciceronian speech see André-Hus 40. According
to the Invectiva, Sallust bribed Caesar to have the charges
of extortion dropped and used his riches to buy the notori-
ous gardens and Caesar's villa. The vita found in the edi-
tion of Sallust's works by Pomponius Laetus in 1490 (Funai-
oli III 59) is a mere medieval compilation of all the
charges for permissiveness and misconduct brought against
Sallust, with some spice added to them.

7 Bell. civ. 2, 100 ... καὶ τὴν ἡρήν τοῦ Ἰούδα Καίσαρ
ὑποστήρ Ρωμαῖοι ἔτούσεν Σαλλούστιλον Κρίσπον ἐγκαταστήσας.
Caecilius Bassus in Syria, it is not unreasonable to assume that he would have been familiar with the rest of the book, too. In that case, his silence about any abuse of power on the part of Sallust may be significant.

In the extant part of Livy and in the summaries, as well as in Florus and Eutropius, there is no reference to Sallust whatsoever. In Dio and Orosius, on the other hand, there is information about the historian that should normally have caused some criticism on the part of Livy (of which we might expect to see an echo in these writers), had he really detested his predecessor as much as it is claimed. It will be interesting to look at these testimonia in the light of Syme's words (IV 54):

The style of Sallust was repellent to Livy. Not less the man and his opinions— the turbulent politician expelled from the Senate but restored by Caesar and enriched by civil war; the comfortable author of a depressing history; the austere moralist of equivocal conduct.

Sallust's military career until the success at Cercina (which was, by the way, due more to luck than to superior tactics) had been a disaster. As a legionary commander in Illyria he was defeated by Libo and Octavius (Oros. 6, 15, 8). As praetor designate he was sent by Caesar to appease the mutinous troops in Campania, but

8Bell. civ. 3, 315 ἄδε μὲν τινε ἐνε περὶ τοῦ Βάσου δοκεῖ, Λύθων δ', οἰ τῆς Πολιτείας στρατάς γενόμενος...
Peter HRR 12 CCCLXXVIII; Schwartz I 226 and III 1703; Münzer I 884, all accept Perizonius' emendation of Λύθων to Λύρω ; Manuwald 206 n. 238 suggests caution.
failed and barely escaped with his life (Dio 42, 52, 1; Appian Bell. civ. 2, 92). This last incident, in particular, could have given Livy the opportunity for ironic comments about Sallust's incompetence. Nothing of this sort transpires in Dio, though he is assumed to have made extensive use of Book 113 of Livy (Schwartz III 1703). But the most significant piece of information for our purposes is Dio's account of Sallust's expulsion from the Senate in 50 B.C. The Invectiva (6, 16) openly charges that Sallust was expelled for promiscuous conduct. The same explanation is found much later in Pseudo-Acro (In Hor. Ser. 1, 2, 49). Dio, on the contrary, who again is assumed to have used sections of Book 109 of Livy as a source (Schwartz III 1700), reports the incident without such a comment:

Piso, who was in any case disposed to avoid trouble, and for the sake of maintaining friendship with his son-in-law paid court to many people, was himself responsible for none of the above acts, but he did not resist Claudius when he drove from the Senate all the freedmen and numbers even of the exclusive nobility, among them Sallustius Crispus, who wrote the history (40, 63, 4).

There is no way to establish if Dio omitted the names of the other Senators expelled or if he faithfully records what he found in his source. In either case, the prominence given to Sallust in this account, combined with the

---

9 Another name on record is Ateius Capito (Syme V 34).
reference to his writings, is strong evidence that, had there been any criticism of Sallust in Livy for improper conduct or for words at variance with deeds, Dio is not likely to have missed it.

The contrast between Sallust's allegedly equivocal conduct and the moralizing tone and content of his writings is one of the dominant features of his fame in antiquity. It is important for our discussion to try to establish how early such a contrast occurs. It is widespread among writers of the fourth century A.D. Lactantius accompanies a quotation from Sallust (Cat. 1, 2) with the comment: recte, si ita vixisset, ut locutus est (Inst. Div. 2, 12,12) Symmachus characterizes Sallust in the following way: scriptor stilo tantum probandus, nam morum eius damna non sinunt ut ab illo agundae vitae petatur auctoritas (Ep. 5, 68, 2). Finally, Macrobius cites a passage from

---

10 Dio uses Ἀστυπόκαυ in this passage, probably collectively for the monographs and the Historiae. The reference to Sallust "who wrote the history" functions as a distinguishing characteristic, but the mention of the writings is, anyway, there, and the association with Sallust's morals would have been possible.

11 Paladini I ch. 1; Olivieri Sangiacomo ch. 2; Syme V ch. 15; Pasoli II ch. 1; La Penna VI; Paananen 12 ff. With regard to the charge of extravagant luxury, Syme (V 283) has made the attractive suggestion that "ignorance or malice transferred to the historian the tastes and habits of the Augustan minister[ i.e. his adopted grandnephew]"

12 La Penna (VI 206) believes, I think without solid reason, that the theme "dev' essere nato già in tempi e in ambienti molto vicini a Sallustio,...".
the Historiae (2 fr. 70), in which Metellus Pius is severely censured, adding the following ironic comment: haec Sallustius gravissimus alienae luxuriae obiurgator et censor (Sat. 3, 13, 6-9). The charge of inconsistency between life and writings is also found in the Invectiva (1, 1 and 3), whose date, however, is not known. The earliest datable instance (mid-second century A.D.) is Gellius 17, 18:

M. Varro, in litteris atque vita fide homo multa et gravis, in libro quem inscrivit Pius aut De Pacce, C. Sallustium scriptorem seriei illius et severae orationis, in cuius historia notiones censorias fieri atque exerceri videmus, in adulterio deprehensum ab Annio Milone loris bene caesum dicit et, cum dedisset pecuniam, dimissum.

The section scriptorem... videmus is sometimes taken as a comment by Varro. It is much more likely, however, that it represents Gellius' own opinion.

No other author before Gellius, not counting the ignotus of the Invectiva, raises the issue of inconsistency. Sallust's contemporaries and many later generations are so impressed with, or shocked by, the novelty of his style and the literary aspects of his work in general, so eager to imitate or reject him as a model, that they seem to ignore the moralizing tone of his writings. The reason

13 It is attributed to Varro by Cichorius 229; Latte 56; Paladini I 10; Funaioli III 46, 57; Leeman V 181. It is thought to belong to Gellius by Last 93; Syme V 279 n. 19; Pasoli II 6; Whitehorne 425. Bolaffi I 315 is uncertain.

14 See the numerous testimonia in Bolaffi I 181 ff.
is probably that historiography in Rome had taken a moral-
izing approach to historical events since the days of Fa-
bius Pictor. Sallust struck a louder but not different
tone. What actually shocked some of his contemporaries
is what Pompeius Lenaeus, the freedman of Pompey the Great,
talks about in his acerbissima satura. He composed this
satura against Sallust, because the historian in the His-
tories had called his master oris probi animo inverecundo
(Suet. De gramm. 15 = Sall. Hist. fr. 16). This satura
represents the only certain case before Gellius where
Sallust's life and writings are placed side by side.
Lenaeus's motive, to defend the memory of his dead patron,
was undeniably very strong. He could have brought out
what was later thought to be a blatant inconsistency
between what Sallust did and what he said. Yet, this
theme does not appear in what is left of the satura. He
attacks Sallust as vita scriptisque monstruosum, praeterea
priscorum Catonisque verborum ineruditissimum furem. The
historian's life and writings appear equally abhorrent to
him. His style is shocking, he is an ignorant pilferer of
Cato. Sallust's critics and detractors prefer to target
their attacks against what they see as obscurity of style,
excessive archaism and plagiarism from Cato (Gell. 2, 26;
Suet. De gramm. 10; Suet. Aug. 86; Quint. 8, 3, 29).

15See esp. fr. 20, and frs. 27, 28 P. On the moral-
izing approach to History in Rome see Drexler II; Pöschl II.
It may be objected, however, that the search for scandal in the historian's private life, as it appears in Varro's *logistorius*, implicitly points to the desire of his detractors to show the contrast with the moralizing content of his writings. This is not necessarily true. Defamation was then, and still is, a powerful political weapon, which can function independently of such considerations. By showing that your opponent leads a life incompatible with his position and the social and moral code, you can eliminate him. You do not have to demonstrate that he does not practise what he preaches or vice versa. This would hardly constitute a case for public sanction.

To sum up, the available evidence shows that the theme of inconsistency between Sallust's life and writings is not used by any of Livy's contemporaries. The first datable occurrence is Gellius. The charge is probably a product of a later, different age. The thrust of criticisms against Sallust before that time is of a literary nature. If the theme of inconsistency had existed earlier, it should not have escaped the notice both of moralists and of Sallust's enemies. The probability, therefore, that Livy is the source of Dio 43, 9, 2-3 is very slight.

16 In the case of Sallust, his opponents had good reasons to desire his elimination. See Whitehorne.

17 For scandals involving Sallust see the discussions in the books and articles cited in n. 11 above.
The Dio passage presents a curious problem which has caused much discussion. The historian claims that Sallust said exactly the opposite. Gebhardt (11) used Dio's words in order to argue that the historian alludes to the *Epistolae ad Caesarem senem* and that his testimony constitutes proof for the authenticity of the two letters. His suggestion was, however, refuted by a number of scholars and today has been almost completely rejected (Ernout 15; Vretska III vol.I 39-40). A major argument against it is that either *συγγράμματα* or *συγγραφή* can hardly refer to the *Epistolae*.

Most scholars have seen in Dio's claim an inaccuracy due to ignorance or negligence on the part of the historian or his source. If this is the case, Livy should probably be eliminated as a source of the passage. It is hardly conceivable that a younger contemporary of Sallust would not have known that his predecessor was first governor of Africa Nova and wrote afterwards. Besides, the Prefaces of the *Catiline* and the *Jugurtha*, with which, as will be seen in the next chapter, Livy was very familiar, were there to remind him that they had been written by

---

18 Seel 88 ff.; Drexler I 279; Adcock 139; Syme II 49.

19 But see Chouet 7-8.

20 Last 93; Drexler I 279; Seel 89; Syme II 50. Adcock remarks that "the temporal sequence in *συγγράμματα* may be stylistic rather than strictly historical".
a man retired from public life. Finally, at the time Livy
was at work on Book 114, which would presumably have con-
tained the criticisms, his predecessor was already a classic
and much talked about. Neither ignorance nor negligence
is, therefore, justifiable in the case of Livy.

It may be objected, however, that a moralizing zeal
to make of Sallust an exemplum of inconsistency caused
Livy to invert the order of Sallust's governorship and
writings. This is, of course, possible but not probable.
The contrast of the past negotium with the present otium
is so prominent in the Prefaces that Livy is far more
likely to have attacked the "redeemed burglar who turned
policeman", as a modern critic unfortunately does (Laistner
48), than vice versa.

Can Dio himself, on the other hand, be found guilty
of ignorance? We have already seen that he is familiar
with events in Sallust's career, like the expulsion from
the Senate, the unsuccessful attempt to appease the muti-
nous soldiers in Campania and the governorship of Africa.
He may also have used Sallust as a source (Bolaffi 221).
He personally claims to have read nearly all work on Roman
history (Millar 34). Ignorance, therefore, cannot be the

---

21 The word has found favor with Livy's critics (see
Walsh II). We are sometimes reminded that Caligula called
Livy verbosum in historiam neglegentemque. Caligula's crit-
icism of Livy, however, is not worth even the reference to
it. He also referred to Virgil as nullius ingenii minima
que doctrinae (Suet. Calig. 34, 2). In defense of Livy see
Foucault.
cause of the error.

In discussing Dio's error, it is necessary to distinguish between the facts concerning Sallust's alleged misgovernment and the judgement passed on it. The former (plundering the province, charges of extortion, exoneration by Caesar) could easily have come from some source unknown to us or could be based on hearsay evidence. In the last instance, we would be talking about either "that vague area of knowledge about figures and events in the past, and anecdotes and legends, which would be common to any given society" or "knowledge derived from the historian or antiquarian reading of his [Dio's] friends" (Millar 36-7). Dio himself reports information on hearsay evidence dating back to 55 B.C. (39, 38, 4), 48 B.C. (42, 2, 5), 31 B.C. (50, 12, 5) and later. Besides, stories about Sallust's life and misconduct were in the air at the time he was composing his history. Why not one more? After all, Dio had a taste for scandal and anecdote. It is also possible that he got the information directly from the *Invectiva* (7, 19).

---

22 Porphyrian mentions the story about his adultery (*In Hor. serm. 1, 2, 41*) and another story about his gastronomic habits: he hired the cook of a friend for an enormous amount of money (*ibid. 1, 1, 101*; the confusion with Sallust's grandnephew is very probable here). About the probable time Porphyrian lived see Schanz-Hosius I (1935), 155-6.

23 Syme IV 73-4. Dio reports the story of Sallust's misgovernment with emphasis. He may have enjoyed it. The popularity of the story must have increased during the middle ages. It is found almost verbatim in Xiphilinus' epitome of Books 36-80 of Dio and in Sallust's *Vita* (see n. 6 above).
The two texts agree on everything with the exception of the allegation that Sallust got away with the trial for extortion by buying Caesar off.

Things are different, however, with regard to the criticism of inconsistency. The section ὅτι... λόγον appears to be reported from some source. I say "appears", because Dio may have himself supplied the reason for the disgrace Sallust incurred. On the contrary, the last section ( ἄλλον αὐτὸν... έπιτηδεύσας ) appears, with reservation again, to include his own judgement in reinforcement of the previous statement. Before Dio, the theme of inconsistency is found in Gellius and in the Invectiva, as previously mentioned. He could have picked it up from either of them. In the Invectiva it prominently opens the speech: Eademum magna voluptas est, C. Sallusti, aequalem ac parem verbis vitam agere... If Dio freely adapted from this source, the issue is again why he inverted the order ἐγραμµα - λόγον. Syme (II 50; cf. V 281) has made an attractive suggestion:

The best explanation is ignorance-- Dio had in mind the historical works of Sallust with their lavish denunciation of greed and rapacity. Indeed, and further, the epoch at which Dio wrote (and his own experience) predisposed him to make that unconscious assumption-- the Antonine practice of awarding public honours or provincial governorships to persons who had achieved distinction as authors.

Most of Syme's explanation seems plausible enough, except for the mention of ignorance, which I do no consider
likely, for the reasons indicated above. Somehow Dio was unconsciously carried away by his own experience and did not assume that it was truly so with Sallust. It would also be wiser to seek the explanation through a comparison on a one to one basis; Dio to Sallust, public career to public career, historian to historian. Sallust did not engage in writing history until his public career was over.24 Dio, on the contrary, did not achieve particular distinction in public life—at least as far as we know—until he had won Severus' favor as an author. I do not refer to the posts which he held late in his life,25 because by that time he had probably composed the bulk of his Roman history, including book 43, which contains the passage under discussion.26 What I had in mind are his earlier works, to which he refers in 72, 23:

24 Or rather he did not write anything that we know of before that time; against the authenticity of the Invevtiva in Sallustium and Epistulae see Last; Fränkel I; DiMle; Nisbet; Syme II and V appendix II; Ernout, Introduction; La Penna II. On the question of the authorship of the Empedoclea see Bächner III 15-6; Syme V 10-1; La Penna V 474.

25 See Millar 23 ff. and appendix II. He became Curator of Pergamum and Smyrna (218), Proconsul of Africa (223; like Sallust!), legate of Dalmatia (224-6), legate of Pannonia (226-8) and Consul II ordinarius with Severus Alexander (229).

26 Millar 23 ff. There is no reason to assume that 43, 9, 2-4 is a later insertion, like 49, 36,4.
The writings mentioned on this passage are a pamphlet of dreams and portents by which Septimius Severus was warned that he would ascend the throne, and a work on the Civil Wars of 193-97, which culminated with Severus’ great victory over Clodius Albinus in 197 A.D. (Millar 28 ff.). Dio’s career before 194 is a matter of speculation. He must have started his cursus under Commodus and must have been a Senator for a number of years (Millar 15-6). The first piece of information we have is that in early 93 A.D. he was appointed praetor for the following year by the short-lived Pertinax. Dio served his praetorship under Severus, but not until he had first submitted to him the pamphlet mentioned above. The work on the Civil Wars was probably presented to Severus in the summer of 197 A.D. (Millar 29). After that, Dio held a praetorian governorship, became an amicus of Severus and member of the imperial consilium and, finally, suffect consul in 205 or 206

27Portents and prodigies play a prominent role in Dio’s Roman History (Millar 77 ff.) and had traditionally been a part of Roman historical narrative. They could also be extracted from a work of history and published separately, as Julius Obsequens did with Livy. It would not be unreasonable, therefore, to view Dio’s pamphlet as a semi-historical composition, which served its purpose later, regardless of whether it was intended to be so from the beginning or not.
A.D. (Millar 17 ff.). Later, his historiographical activity ran parallel to his public career.

It can be concluded at this point that there is no solid basis for Bolaffi's statement that the source of Dio 43, 9, 2-3 "è notoriamente Livio". His certainty can be explained by the fact that he was writing these words in the tradition shaped by Schwartz. It was under the influence of the latter that Funaioli wrote in 1920 "Cassius ... wiederholt das alles aus Livius". This is how Schwartz portrays Sallust and Livy and refers to the Dio passage in his Hermes 1897 article "Die Berichte über die Catilinarische Verschwörung" (581-2), which was to exercise a paralyzing influence on Sallustian scholarship for many years to come:

"Über ein Menschenalter nach Sallust schrieb Livius. Die Klüft zwischen beiden kann kaum gross genug gedacht werden. Hier der bis ins Mark verdorbene Sohn der Hauptstadt, geistvoll, charakterlos, ein echter revolutionär, dort der Provinziale, der Schwärmer für die Grösse des freien Roms, der Romantiker, der vor einer gering erscheinenden Gegenwart in die Vergangenheit flüchtet... Ihm musste der leidenschaftliche, bitter Sallust mit seiner unbarmerzigen Kritik der Oligarchie im höchsten Grade unangenehm sein, und er hat auch nicht versäumt, ihm bei passender Gelegenheit einen kräftigen Denkzettel zu schreiben [he quotes the Dio passage].

That is all. Schwartz had no need to provide evidence for the claim that Livy was the source of the passage. Yet, in his RE article on Cassius Dio he did not forget to

---

28. i 1913. Later Funaioli changed his mind (above n.4)
caution the reader during the discussion of the issue of his sources: "Durch diese Konkordanzen ist allerdings die Annahme noch nicht ausgeschlossen dass Dio die livianische Erzählung aus anderen Gewährsmännern ergänzt und verändert hat"!
2. Alleged criticism against the style of Sallust

The following four passages have repeatedly been interpreted as expressing Livy's severe criticism, even aversion and hostility, against the style of Sallust:

Testimonium I

Fuit igitur brevitas illa tutissima quae est apud Livium in epistula ad filium scripta, legendos Demosthene- nen atque Ciceronem, tum ita ut quisque esset Demosthene- ni et Ciceroni simillimus (Quint. 10, 1, 39).

Testimonium II

neque id novum vitium est, cum iam apud Titum Livium inveniam fuisse praecipitum alioqne qui discipulos obscurare quae dierent iuberet, Graeco verbo utens skirts. Unde illa egregia laudatio "tanto melior:

ne ego quidem intellexi" (Quint. 8, 2, 18).

Testimonium III

Livius de oratoribus qui verba antiqua et sordida consectantur et orationis obscuritatem severitatem putant aiebat Miltiaden oratorem eleganter dixisse:

\[ \text{εἰς τὸ δὲξίουν μαλακῶς} \]

(Sen. Contr. 9, 2, 26).

Testimonium IV

Tunc rettulit aliquam Thucydidis sententiam deinde Sallustianam: res secundae mire sunt vitis obtentui. Cum sit praecipua in

29a.e.g. Funaioli I 1947 "... ausgesprochene Feindschaft ..."; Klotz II 846 "... in den Schrift an seinen Sohn lehnte er schroff den sallustischen Stil ab..."; Norden 234 "... Vorwurf... Abneigung gegen Sallust... Feind";

R. Ullman 4 "T. L. s'est déclaré nettement adversaire de sa maniere"; Amundsen 33 "It is on record that Livy strongly opposed the Sallustian style"; Skard II 7 "Und dass er der Sprache und dem Stil seines Vorgängers kritisch gegenübstand, ist zweifellos"; Walsh V 45 "... rigorously condemned by Livy". See also Borneoocique III 9; Syme V 289; Pasoli II 40; Leeman IV 191. Tränkle's (I) and Lebek's efforts to refute such interpretations (n. 1 above) have received either no attention at all (McGushin 23; Sussman 128, 148) or only partial attention (Aii I 122 ff.).
in Thucydide virtus brevitas, hac eum Sallustius vicit et in suis castris illum ecidit; nam in sententia Graeca tam brevi habes quae salvo sensu detrahas: deme vel ςυρμα vel συνκλάσαι, deme ἐκάρτων: constabit sensus, etiamsi non aequo comptus, aequo tamen integer. At ex Sallusti sententia nihil demi sine detrimento sensus potest. T. autem Livius tam iniquus Sallustio fuit ut hanc ipsam sententiam et tamquam translatam et tamquam corruptam dum transferat obiceret Sallustio. Nec hoc amore Thucydidis facit, ut illum praeferat, sed laudat quem non timet et facilius putat posse se Salvium vincit si ante a Thucydide vincatur (Sen. Contr. 9, 1, 13-14).

The first task is to establish in which of Livy's writings these statements were found. According to Quintilian, the first one comes from the Epistula ad filium, a literary letter written by Livy for his son. Many scholars assume that the other three were also contained in this letter. This is a reasonable assumption. T. II clearly comes from a written source and, because of its instructional contents, it must have been found in the Epistula. T. III is another exemplum for instructional purposes like II. Finally, T. IV discusses literary adaptation from Greek, a very appropriate subject for the education of the future orator, which must have been the aim of the Epistula. None of the last three testimonia is likely to have been included in Livy's historical-philosophical dialogues mentioned in Sen. Ep. 100, 9. Their

Footnotes:

30 For some speculation about the nature of the Epistula see Hirzel vol. II 24.

31 Norden 234; Klotz II 846; Bornecque III 9. Tränkle (I 150 n. 181) thinks that T. IV may have been an oral pronunciation.
description does not encourage the assumption that they treated rhetorical themes: *scripsit enim et dialogos, quos non magis philosophiae adnumerare possis quam historiae, et ex professo philosophiam continentis libros.*

The aim of the *Epistula* can be derived from the context of T. I. The discussion in Quintilian is about the authors an orator should read in order to acquire that *firma facilitas* which can make him a master of the *vis dicendi* (10, 1, 1). It is followed by recommendations on literary *imitatio* (10, 2). A second reference to the *Epistula* in 2, 5, 20 helps define its aim even more precisely:

Cicero, ut mihi videtur, et iucundus incipientibus quoque et apertus est satis, nec prodesse tantum sed etiam amari potest: tum quem ad modum Livius praecipit, ut quisque erit Ciceronii similimus.

The following two limitations of the letter must be stressed: first, the discussion is about rhetoric, not historiography; secondly, the advice is extended to the budding orator. With regard to the second limitation, it should be noticed that Quintilian recommends Livy, not Sallust, for the *pueri*, in spite of his high esteem for both.

The differences between the oratorical and the historiographical style, as understood by ancient critics,

---

32 Quintilian's recommendation is unfortunately interpreted as evidence that the critic gives the palm to Sallust. But he also recommends Cicero as the most appropriate orator for the *pueri*. On literary criticism in Quintilian see Bolaffi III.
must provide the broader context for the discussion of these testimonia. The definition of historiography by Cicero as opus oratorium maxime has been frequently misused and misinterpreted in modern discussions. Leeman (V 172) shows its true sense:

Why then opus oratorium maxime? We should realize that even in these factual aspects it was the orator who learned to apply the methods of inventio and dispositio, indispensable for any historian who wanted to present the essential facts in a well-ordered narrative. But this is still more true of the verborum ratio and the application of the principles of elocutio.

Ancient critics are never too hesitant to draw the line between history and oratory. Quintilian provides us with a very good summary statement:

Historia quoque alere oratorem quodam uberi iucundoque suco potest. Verum et ipsa sic est legenda ut sciamus plerasque eius virtutes oratori esse vitandas. Est enim proxima poetis et quodam modo carmen solutum est, et scribitur ad narrandum, non ad probandum, totumque opus non ad actum pugnamque præsentem sed ad memoriam posteritatis et ingenii famam componitur: ideoque et verbis remotioribus et liberioribus figuris narrandi taedium evitat. Itaque, ut dixi, neque illa Sallustiana brevitas, qua nihil apud aures vacuas atque eruditas potest esse perfectius, apud occupatum variis cogitationibus iudicem et saepius ineruditum captanda nobis est, neque illa Livi lactea ubertas satis docebit eum qui non speciem expositionis sed fidem quaerit.

Neither Livy nor Sallust is, therefore, recommended for

---

33 De leg. 1, 2, 5 through the mouth of Atticus. Cicero's historiographical theory has caused much debate in this century. The major issues are its sources, its unity, its consistency and the relation between theory and practice. Extensive survey and bibliography can be found in Kelly 1-34. For more recent studies see Petzold, Rawson.

34 10, 1, 31-2. Cf. also 10, 2, 22 on the lex generis
imitation by the orator. The statement that the Romans were practical people may be a banality but it perfectly illustrates the spirit of this passage. Eccentricities are considered appropriate for historians and their refined audience, but should be avoided by the orator who has to address an inattentive and very often ignorant audience. He must speak to their emotions, win them over, convince them, according to Cicero's definition of the *tria officia oratoris*.

Quintilian's words echo numerous statements by Cicero. To the orators who profess to imitate Thucydides he objects: *optime, si historiam scribere, non si causas dicere cogitabis* (Brut. 287; cf. Or. 30-2; De opt. gen. or). He never ceases to distinguish between the oratorical and the historiographical style in the same practical spirit as Quintilian. In discussing, for instance, the proper style for historiography, he specifically recommends: *verborum autem ratio et genus orationis fusum atque tractum et cum lenitate aequabiliter profluentes sine hac judiciali asperitate et sine sententiarum forensibus aculeis persecundum est* (De or. 2, 64; cf. Or. 61 and the passage above). In stressing that *huic [epideictico] generi historia finitima est* (Or. 66; cf. 207-9), Cicero does not contradict himself.

---

35Cicero's judgements on Thucydides are treated in several of the articles and books found in Kelly's survey (n. 33 above) and in Lebek 153 ff. The collected Ciceronian passages on historians and historiography can be found in Henze.
but underlines the difference between history and epideictic oratory on the one hand, whose aim is to please and/or improve the audience morally, and judicial and deliberative oratory on the other hand, whose aim is to steer the audience towards a course of action.

Finally, here is a well-known passage from Pliny (Ep. 5, 8, 9-11) to conclude this discussion on the distinction between history and oratory:

Habet quidem oratio et historia multa communia, sed plura diversa in his ipsis, quae communia videntur. Narrat illa narrat haec, sed aliter: haec pleraque humilia et sordida et ex medio petita, illi omnia recondita splendida excelsa conveniunt; hanc saepius ossa muscula nervi, illam tori quidem et quasi iubae decent; haec vel maxime vi amaritudine instantia, illa tractu et suavitate atque etiam dulcedine placet; postremo alia verba alius sonus alia constructio. Nam plurimum refert, ut Thucydides ait, κτῆμα sit an ἄγνωσμα; quorum alterum oratio, alterum historia est.

Pliny distinguishes in a sharp way between the two genres. They treat different themes. In terms of style, Pliny opposes the nervousness and vigor of oratory to the freedom and ease of history. Finally, he adds that they differ in vocabulary, rhythm and period-structure.

It can be concluded that Cicero, Quintilian and Pliny draw a distinction between history and oratory in similar terms. Quintilian and Pliny were both Ciceronians and

36 On the difference between epideictic and judicial oratory see also Aristotle Ars rhet. 1358b; Dionysius De Dem.44.

37 About problems involving the interpretation of this passage see Leeman V 332 ff.
orators. In view of the fact that Livy recommends Cicero to his son, urging him to become Ciceroni simillimus, it is reasonable to assume that the historian must have accepted the Ciceronian rhetorical theory, including the distinction between history and oratory.

One can thus do away with T. I. Whatever model Livy may have recommended to his son as a future orator has nothing to do with what he thought of Sallust as a historian.

---

The discussion above does not imply the existence in practice of an absolute separation between the two genres. On the contrary, critics felt that they had to issue such warnings because the boundaries between them were so often confused. The theory of historiography was never in antiquity studied as a separate field but was found primarily in rhetorical manuals (Strasburger 47). Also, history in Rome was in many ways assigned to play a role subservient to oratory, either as a source for exempla or as material for rhetorical exercise or in the name of Cicero's orator-philosopher. On ancient historiographical theory, including discussions on the deliberate or unintentional confusion of historiography with other genres see G. Avenarius; Homeyer II; Walbank I; Leeman III and V; Meister II.
and with the models he chose to imitate in composing the A.U.C. The conclusions above also apply to T. II and III, but these will be given some more attention during the investigation into the problems surrounding T. IV, the most important of all, to which we now turn.

The theme of Sen. Contr. 9, 1 is Cimon's ingratitude to Callias. Arellius Fuscus has just "translated" a sententia by Adaeus into Latin and is now defending the practice of "translation" (mutare, transferre) as exercitatio

---

39 Did Livy fulfill Cicero's historiographical program? This was, and still is, a very widespread assumption (Heinze II 96; Morden 234; McDonald 160). Other scholars have, however, suggested that it was Sallust (Rambaud) or Tacitus (Rawson) who actually carried out Cicero's program. With regard to style and diction it is very hard to tell what precisely Cicero's recommendation is. He has praises for almost every historian, including Herodotus, Thucydides, Theopompos, Duris, Timaeus and Caesar (see the collected passages in Leeman III). There is no reason to assume that he would have disliked Sallust's historiographical style, and neither would have Livy. The latter's narrative is full of archaisms, poetisms and harsh syntactical constructions (On the issue of the so-called "development" in his style see Stacey and Tränkle I). Finally, Livy's admiration for Cicero the man must not have been as high as for Cicero the orator. His famous necrology of Cicero (Sen. Suas. 6, 22) is now judged as reserved or negative (Leeman V 190; Lamacchia; cf. Homeyer I)
and as emulation with the Greeks: "I strive to rival the best epigrams", he says; "I do not try to spoil them (corrumpere) but to beat them (vincere). Roman orators, historians and poets have not stolen (subripuerunt) but vied (provocaverunt) with many epigrams of the Greeks".

At this point Seneca informs us about the quotation from Thucydides. The first problem we encounter is that the maxim is not found anywhere in the Greek historian. There are two known versions of it, one in Demosthenes and one in Pseudo-Demosthenes. Here they are, along with the Senecan version, Sallust's adaptation as found in Seneca and the original as found in the Oratio Lepidi:

\[ \text{ai γαρ εὑραξάμεν} \\
\text{συγκρύφοια τα τοιάυτα άνετόν.} \]  
(Dem. 01. II 20).

\[ \text{ai γαρ εὑραξάμεν} \\
\text{συγκρύφοια καὶ συκνώσαμεν τας} \\
\text{άμαρτίας των άνθρώπων εἰς τὸν} \]

\[ \text{δεσμόν.} \]  
(Pseudo-Dem. XI 13).

\[ \text{δεναι γαρ αι εὑραξάμεν} \\
\text{συγκρύφοια καὶ συκνώσαμεν τας} \\
\text{έκάστων} \\
\text{άμαρτήματα} \]  
(Sen. Contr. 9, 1, 14).

\[ \text{res secundae mire sunt vitiiis obtentui} \]  
(Sen. Contr. 9, 1, 14).

\[ \text{quia secundae res mire sunt vitiiis obtentui} \]  
(Sall. Hist. 1 fr. 55).

\[ ^{40} \text{On Arelliius Fuscus see Brzoska; on translation,} \]
\[ \text{theory and practice see Richter and Traina.} \]

\[ ^{41} \text{In ep. Phil. is not a genuine Demosthenic speech} \]
\[ \text{(Blass vol. III I, 346 ff; Wendland 419 ff.). Dionysius of} \]
\[ \text{Halicarnassus, the contemporary of Livy and Seneca the} \]
\[ \text{Elder, considers it a genuine one (Ad Amm. I 10). Didymos} \]
\[ \text{the grammarian, however, who also lived in the same period,} \]
\[ \text{mentions that some would attribute it to the historian} \]
\[ \text{Anaximenes of Lampsacus (Diels-Schubart col. 11, p. 51).} \]
It is immediately clear that Seneca's version stems from Pseudo-Demosthenes (Kiessling 398) with some minor changes due to his reporting by memory. But the imitation of the original by Pseudo-Demosthenes is patently poor.

Brevity was considered one of the fundamental qualities of maxims. Yet, in the second *sententia* one cannot fail to notice the pleonastic συσκλάσαλ, the replacement of ὄνειρον by τὰς ἀμαρτίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων and the addition of έκλύτρυ. As a result of the replacement, the alliterative word-play ὄνειρον - ὄνειρον is lost. The imitator did everything possible to "spoil" the Demosthenic γνώμη. On the other hand, it is also obvious that Sallust in the *Histories* adapted the original. Consequently, the praises extended to him by Arellius Fuscus and Seneca are not wholly deserved, though understandable within the context of *aemulatio* of the Greeks. Sallust's success actually lies in preserving the conciseness of the original. We thus find ourselves faced by a double error: Sallust is wrongly praised for surpassing a Thucydidean *sententia*, which actually comes from Pseudo-Demosthenes, while Sallust himself really "translated" from Demosthenes.

Who is responsible for the erroneous attribution of the Pseudo-Demosthenic *sententia* to Thucydid? It has traditionally been attributed to Seneca himself. But Bonner

---

42Bonsecque II vol. II 560; Edward 109.
(135) makes a better suggestion: "... one of the three Romans was wrong and misled the other two". If this is the case, Seneca should probably be eliminated from the list for the following reasons: First, his reliability in evoking declaimers, whether from memory or not, has not been seriously questioned. I know only of one clear instance of wrong attribution in Seneca, and it is interesting to see that he explicitly admits his uncertainty: quod puto etiam apud Herodotum esse. In the case under discussion he expresses no doubt whatsoever, and the error is of sweeping proportions, involving both Arellius Fuscus and Livy. One would have to assume that he misreports what he heard from two different sources, which is hardly likely. Second, when Arellius Fuscus observes that Sallust "defeated him on his own ground", Thucydides is easily understood from the context. Seneca, therefore, reports faithfully an inaccuracy and is probably unaware of the error.

If Seneca is excluded, we are left with Arellius Fuscus and Livy. The former seems to be convinced that he is comparing a Thucydidean and a Sallustian statement. Hence it is unlikely that he is the source of the error. As for Livy, if one believes Seneca, he, too, attributed

---

43 On his phenomenal memory and the issues involved see Contr. 1, Praef. 2; Bornecque I 25-9; Sussman 75 ff.

44 Suas. 2, 11. Seneca has a Greek quotation which is not found in Herodotus. For a discussion of this error see Bornecque II and Edward ad loc.
that very same maxim (hanc ipsam sententiam) to Thucydides. We have, therefore, two different sources making the same error. It is unlikely that they do so independently of each other. It is more probable that the error originated in the schools of declamation, where the ἔμνωμα of Thucydides with Sallust must have been a commonplace. Livy and Arellius Fuscus were contemporaries. The former had a formidable rhetorical training, probably declaimed himself (cf. Anderson 94-9) and married his daughter to a rhetorician named L. Magius (Sen. Contr. 10, Praef. 2). The latter was a declaimer.

How exactly did the error of attribution to Thucydides arise? The general belief is that it was caused by the close association of Thucydides with Sallust. One should add that the mention of brevitas and sententiae would automatically have triggered a comparison of Sallust with Thucydides, not Demosthenes. But there is also a more

---

45 Cf. Suas. 6, 21; Vell. Pat. 3, 36, 2; Quint. 10, 1, 101 and 10, 2, 7.

46 Sallust's brevitas (on which see Bolaffi II) was his best known quality as a stylist in antiquity (see the testimonia in Paladini II 21-22). On his brevitas in relation to Thucydides' see Perrochat 34 ff.

47 On the fame of Sallust's sententiae in antiquity see Fronto Ad M. Caes. 3, 11: gnomas egregie convertisti, hanc quidem quam hodie accipi prope perfecte, ut noni in libro Sallustii possit; Jerome Adv. Jovin. 2, 10 and Epist. 130, 12, 1. On the sententiae of Thucydides see Cic. De or. 2, 93 and Brut. 7, 29; Marcellinus Vita Thuc. 51; Meister I ch. 1 (full list; frequency; comparison with Demosthenes). For statistics of Sallustian sententiae see Castorina 358 ff.
specific reason why Thucydides was confused with Demosthenes. After 30 B.C. Dionysius of Halicarnassus was writing and teaching in Rome. A fervent admirer of Demosthenes and profoundly anti-Thucydidean, he proposed the theory that the Attic orator consciously combined all the perfections of his predecessors. "Like the mythical Proteus who easily transformed himself into every kind of shape" (De Dem. 8), Demosthenes could become Lysias or Isocrates at will. Had Dionysius stopped at this point, his theory would not have been exceptional. Only a few years before Cicero had turned Demosthenes into the super-orator and the super-statesman, probably in reaction to the Atticists, but also for political reasons. But Dionysius also claimed— for the first time as far as we know— that Demosthenes had also imitated the best of Thucydides, apparently in order to neutralize widespread Thucydideanism. Here is a passage from the De Thuc. 53:

Demosthenes, alone among orators, imitated Thucydides in many points as he imitated other writers who were thought to have achieved greatness and brilliance

Cf. esp. Brut. 9, 35 and 84, 289-91; Or. 104-5 and 110-11, and see Laughton; Wooten. On the Nachleben of Demosthenes see Drerup, esp. chs. 4 and 5.

On the influence of Thucydides on Demosthenes cf. also Marcell. Vita Thuc. 56; Οὐλπιάνος ὁ πρώτος προλεγόμενος εἰς τοὺς Ὀλυμπιακοὺς καὶ Φιλαδέλφους λόγους (Dindorf, Demosthenes vol. VIII). See also Schäfer vol. I 314 ff., vol. II 468 ff; Blass vol. III 1, 18 ff; Pearson I; Pearson II 24 ff. and 112 ff; Anastassiou.

The translation is by Pritchett.
in their speeches. He added to his own political speeches merits received from Thucydides which were possessing neither Antiphon nor Lysias nor Isocrates, the foremost orators of the time. The qualities I refer to are swiftness, concentration, intensity, pungency, firmness and vehemence that rouses emotion.

It is this kind of climate that bred and fostered the confusion between Demosthenes and Thucydides. It was probably also facilitated by the fact that the declaimers of Seneca the Elder do not show great familiarity with the works of either of them (Bonner 134-5). And Livy had no reason to go back and do his own research. Finally, of the qualities of the style of Thucydides which are indicated by Dionysius as having been taken over by Demosthenes, the first three are particularly apt for sententiae.

The more specific issue is to try to explain why the particular Pseudo-Demosthenic sententia found in Seneca was mistaken for Thucydidean. Word study can be helpful in this respect. Neither \( \text{συγκρότω} \) nor \( \text{συγκλάξω} \) occur in Thucydides. In Demosthenes they are extremely rare. The

\[51\] Mazzarino vol. II 2, 3-5 emphasizes the moralizing tone of the Sallustian sententia and heaps excessive criticism on Livy for not realizing that it could not have come from Thucydides. I think that Mazzarino overlooks the general moralizing trend of Roman historiography. Sallust himself understands and interprets Thucydides according to a moralizing way of thinking. Equally erroneous is Mazzarino's claim that Sallust borrowed the sententia from the historian Anaximenes (ibid. 4; on Anaximenes see above n. 41), since Sallust actually adapted the original Demosthenic sententia.

\[52\] \( \text{συγκλάξω} \) occurs only in the Pseudo-Demosthenic sententia. \( \text{συγκρότω} \) is found 4 times: II, 20; XI, 13 (Pseudo-Dem.); XVIII 248; XXXVII 1 (prooemium).
answer probably lies with εὐπραξία. It is very prominently placed at the beginning of the maxim. In Thucydides εὐπραγία - εὐπραξία are found nine times. In Demosthenes, however, εὐπραξία occurs only four times (including the imitation), in an oeuvre twice the length of Thucydides, and can hardly be considered to be prominent. Out of the nine occurrences in Thucydides, five are in speeches and one in a reflective passage. Four out of the five are found in gnomic utterances. It should also be noticed that in all six cases εὐπραγία - εὐπραξία (welfare, prosperity, success) is seen from the point of view of its fragility, its precariousness and the hybris which it generates, which is precisely the context of the Sallustian sententia in the Oratio Lepidi and of the Demosthenic and Pseudo-Demosthenic γνώμη in the Second Olynthiac and in the Answer to Philip's Letter. Anyone whose knowledge of Demosthenes and Thucydides was rather vague was likely to

53εὐπραγία - εὐπραξία are virtually interchangeable in Greek writers (Lobek on v. 759). The Demosthenic occurrences of εὐπραξία are II 20; XI 13; XX 162; XLIII 2. The Thucydidean occurrences are 1, 33, 2 (Corcyreans); 1, 84, 2 (funeral oration); 3, 39, 4 (Speech of Cleon); 4, 17, 5 (Speech of Spartan envoys in Athens); 5, 46, 1 (Speech of Nicias); 4, 65, 4 (Thucydides's comment after the speech of Hermocrates at the Gela Conference); 7, 46, 1; 7, 81, 5; 7, 86, 4. The one occurrence not in a gnomic utterance is 5, 46, 1. On the various forms of gnomic utterances in rhetorical theory see Lausberg vol. I 431-4.

54For a comparison of the context of the sententia in Sallust and in Demosthenes see Guilbert. Even in the remaining 3 cases in Thucydides "prosperity" is viewed as something unexpected, precarious or hoped for.
have been confused.

On the other hand, Bonner (135) correctly observes that the double synonyms (συγκρίζων καὶ συσχείδαζον) are characteristic of the style of the orators. One should more precisely say that they are especially favored by Demosthenes. No wonder that Pseudo-Demosthenes imitated the original sententia by exaggerating a well-known feature of the style of his model, which has always been the practice of forgers.

It can be concluded at this point that the association of Sallust with Thucydides, their stylistic affinities, esp. brevity and use of maxims, Dionysius' theory about the influence of Thucydides on Demosthenes and the use of εὐρωγία in Thucydides were all factors which caused the Pseudo-Demosthenic sententia to be mistaken for Thucydidean. The only prominent Demosthenic feature in the sententia, i.e. the use of double synonyms, was apparently outweighed by all the other factors.

It now remains to see why Livy finds fault with Sallust's adaptation of the "Thucydidean" sententia. One opinion is that Livy is accusing Sallust of plagiarizing Thucydides. But nowhere in the passage is there any

55 Dionys. De Dem. 58; Blass vol. III 1, 93-5; Ronnet 71-3; Laughton 47.

56 Funaioli I 147; Bolaffi I 185. On imitation and plagiarism in antiquity see Kroll II 139 ff; Stemplinger; Russell.
mention of plagiarism. Seneca attributes to Livy the terms *translatam* and *corruptam* and reports his criticism with the word *obiceret*. Plagiarism is mentioned by Arelius Fuscus a few lines above. Seneca could easily have used either *subripere* or *furari* instead of *transferre*, which means "adapt, render freely, imitate creatively". On the other hand, plagiarism was a common charge in controversy (Russell 11). Indeed, both Lenaeus and the unknown epigrammatist in Quint. 8, 3, 29 accused Sallust of plagiarizing Cato. Apparently, Livy could not have been as hostile to Sallust as generally assumed. It would also have been absurd to accuse Sallust of plagiarizing a Greek historian at the moment when in his own history Livy made a large scale adaptation of historical material from Polybius.

If plagiarism is not the case, why does Livy object to the imitation of Thucydides? It is important to recall the context for the discussion of the testimonia, which was provided at the beginning. Livy is giving advice to his son as a future orator. Thucydides is a good model for historians but not for orators. There is no evidence

---

57 Richter 10-11; Traina 57; Samberale 112.

58 On his adaptation of Polybius see Pianezzola; Tränkle II

59 The excessive presence of sententiae in Thucydides is another reason that makes him inappropriate as a model for orators in the eyes of Cicero (De or. 2, 93; Brutus 7, 29). On the proper frequency of sententiae in orations see Ad Her. 4, 17, 25; Quint. 8, 5, 8.
that Livy disliked Thucydides as a model for historians. On the contrary, it has been known for a long time that there are traces of Thucydidean influence in his History.

What exactly is wrong with Sallust's adaptation according to Livy? The majority of scholars believe that Livy is blaming him for excessive brevity to the point of obscurity. Ancient rhetorical theory records a number of factors which can cause obscurity (Lausberg vol. I 513-4). The only ones which could possibly apply to this case are obscurity through brevity (Quint. 8, 2, 19; 3, 50), as it has been suggested, and obscurity through archaisms (Quint. 8, 2, 12). T. II is an example of the former and T. III an example of the latter. Sallust was accused of obscurity through brevity by Seneca the Younger (Ep. 114, 17). An accusation of obscurity by Sallust's former assistant Ateius Capito is of an unspecified nature. Scholars indicate that density in thought or elliptical phrasing in Sallust may produce obscurity.

60 The main issue is if that influence is direct (Kornemann; Stübner 113-6 and 152-61; Erkell 169; Pasoli IV 16) or indirect through Coelius Antipater (Strebela 32-3; Kajanto I 95). No systematic study of the question exists at the moment. About Livy's "indirect" historiographical method and its relation to Thucydides see Bruns Einleitung.

61Norden 234; R. Ullman 4; Leeman V 191.

62Suet. De gramm. 10; but see Lebek 320-1.

63Kroll I 283 ff.; Bolaffi II 54.
Unfortunately, it is not possible to determine what exactly Livy meant by corruptam. When applied to sententiae by Seneca, corrumpere is a very vague term. But let us assume that Livy had in mind obscurity through excessive brevity. There is certainly brevity in the Sallustian maxim but not obscurity. And brevity in sententiae is specifically recommended by rhetoricians. According to the author of Ad Her. (4, 17, 24), it produces delectatio to the reader. Demetrius (De eloc. 9) also insits particularly on μακρολογία in γνωμολογεῖν. Livy himself has a sententia that can vie with Sallust's in terms of brevity: maximeae cuique fortunae minime credendum est (30, 30, 18).

But here is a whole passage from the A.U.C. (22, 39, 19-22) showing the typical Sallustiana brevitas:

Veritatem laborare nimis saepe aiunt, exstingui nunquam. Gloriam qui spreverit, veram habebit. Sine timidum pro cauto, tardum pro considerato, imbellem pro perito belli vocent. Malo te sapiens hostis metuat quam stulti cives laudent. Omnia audentem contemnet Hannibal, nihil temere agentem metuet. Nec ego ut nihil agatur 'hortor' sed ut agentem te ratio ducat, non fortuna; tuae potestatis semper tuaque omnia sint; armatus intentusque sis; neque occasione tuae desis neque suam occasionem hosti des. Omnia non properanti clara certaque erunt; festinatio improvida est et caeca.

There would appear to be no reason, therefore, why Livy would have objected to Sallust's brevitas in the Historiae. But Sallustiana brevitas as a model for orators

---

64 The passage is cited by Wilkinson (187), who sees Livian style in part as a development of Sallust's.
could be dangerous: first, there were rhetoricians who taught their students to obscure their speech deliberately (T. II); secondly, there was widespread imitation of Sallust's *obscura brevitas* (Sen. Ep. 114, 7); finally, the *sententia* was found in a speech recently delivered by a Roman Consul. There is no doubt that Livy discouraged his son as a future orator from imitating the style of any historian, including his own. His explicit recommendation was to imitate Cicero and Demosthenes. In oratory there is no room for great density of thought. Everything has to be clear: *Satiusque aliquid narrationi superesse quam deesse* says Quintilian (4, 2, 44), and continues:

> Quare vitanda est etiam illa Sallustiana (quamquam in ipso virtutis optinet locum) brevitas et abruptum sermonis genus: quod otiosum fortasse lectorem minus fallat, audientem transvolat...

If Quintilian could say that Sallust's brevity was a virtue in historiography but a vice in oratory, could not Livy have said the same to his son?

The other alternative is to look for obscurity in the *sententia* caused by archaism. Lebek (320-1) argues that Sallust's obscurity of style was never in antiquity associated with his archaizing manner. He is probably right. Still, *obtenuit*, conspicuously placed at the end of the *sententia*, could be the reason why Livy thought that Sallust had "spoiled" the original. Lebek (303)catalogues it among a number of other words "unter denen
sich mancher sprachlicher oder stilistische Archaismus, manches im lebenden Latein sallustischer Zeit schon seltene Sprachgut finden mag". Becker (750) labels it a poeticism. This is hardly true. The word is used predominantly by prose writers. Its first occurrence is in our *sententia*. It is found again in Livy (1, 56, 8), Valerius Maximus (6, 5, 4) and Tacitus (*Hist.* 1, 49, 3; 2, 14, 24; *Ann.* 1, 10, 1). The great majority of the rest of occurrences are in later writers. It is clear that Sallust's choice found favor with Livy and Tacitus. And it is impossible to understand why Livy would have criticised in Sallust a word he used himself.

Archaisms in oratory are considered *ornamenta dicendi* by Cicero. If used rarely, they can add *dignitas* to the speech. In terms of desired frequency, they are placed third in order after the *verba translata* and the *verba novata*. Similar recommendations are found in Quintilian, but also stronger warnings. In addressing the *pueri* he strongly discourages them from indulging in the reading of Cato the Elder and the Gracchi. In his view, the *pueri* are too young both to appreciate their *vis* and to watch against their archaic style. They may end up imitating it.

---

65 The word is also found in Pseudo-Sallust (*Ep.* 2, 11, 5). The choice betrays the forger; cf. Syme V 332.

66 2, 5, 21-22. The passages on archaism in oratory are found in Lebek 23 ff.
Is it not possible that Livy also applied *corruptus* to the use of *obtenui* in the *sententia* in order to caution his son against an archaizing manner in oratory?

Irregular prose rhythm as an explanation for the criticism implied by *corruptam sententiam* is not a likely possibility either. The basic clausula ___ here employed is favored, with extensions, by Cicero, Sallust, and Livy (Aii 63, 79, 101). What remains is only the question of the general use of *sententiae* in speeches. Aristotle (*Ars. rhet.* 1395a) and Quintilian (8, 5, 7) recommend that they be put in the mouth of a person of a certain age, experience, and auctoritas. All three certainly apply in the case of M. Aemilius Lepidus. Quintilian (8, 5, 8) also recommends a moderate use, and so does the author of *Ad Her.* (4, 17, 25). Livy observes the rule with strictness. In Sallust there is greater but not excessive use of *sententiae*. It has also been observed that he progressively reduced their number from one work to the next (Castorina 358 ff.). This *sententia* figures almost alone in the *Oratio Lepidi*.

It has been established that Livy could not have leveled criticisms against Sallust, as one historian against another, either for imitating Thucydides or for his brevity or for the use of archaisms. *Corrupta*, as applied to the *sententia* of T. IV, has no explanation unless it is

---

67 *Canter* 130 ff.; R. *Ullman* 24 ff.
understood in the context of advising and cautioning a future orator. It is likely that Sallust would have approved of such advice. We have no valid reason to believe that Sallust spoke in the same mannerist style in which he wrote. Cicero at least would have known, and would have derided him in the *Pro Milone*. At any rate, Seneca's indignation (*tam iniquus...*) is exaggerated, misleading and based on the false assumption that Sallust adapted the *sententiae* from Thucydides. It should not be carried over to Livy (cf. *Tränkle* I 150), especially when Seneca himself tells us elsewhere that Livy imitated Sallust in the matter of funeral eulogies (*Suas. 6*, 21). But there may be some element of truth in his suggestion that the criticism of Sallust's *sententiae* was actually a smokescreen, Livy's real motivation being to excel (*vincere*) over his great predecessor. Thus the criticism would be placed in the context of Livy's *aemulatio* with him and would not indicate any sort of dislike (cf. *Lebek* 201).

The use of archaisms in oratory and historiography has already been discussed. But T. III mentions also *verba*

68*Lebek* 75 ff. *Fränkel* I 194 writes, with regard to the *Pseudo-Sallustian Epistulae ad Caesarem*, that "if young Sallust had tried to employ that peculiar language for the purpose of a political pamphlet he would have made a fool of himself". *Steidle* (95 ff.) objects that archaism had been widespread in oratory since 55 B.C. The question, however, is not if some orators occasionally used archaic words, but rather if they could go beyond an acceptable degree of affectation (cf. *La Penna* II 471: "ci sarà stata una patina arcaica in funzione di una *senvdntn* tucididea").
sordida. It is not generally agreed if the verba antiqua et sordida are one and the same thing or two different things (Isebek 202, 135). Leeman (V 103) thinks that sordida is corrupt. Verba sordida are, however, mentioned a few lines above. The examples show that they are vulgarisms. Now, Sallust was never in antiquity accused of using vulgarisms. It was only in the last century that Wölfflin (146) started the myth of "vulgärem demokratienlatein". His theory was very popular until successfully refuted by Kroll and is now no longer accepted by the great majority of scholars. As Syme brilliantly put it, "Let it pass that Sallust was anything but a democrat in politics or society" (V 261). One should add that the very essence of Sallust's style is to avoid the trite and the ordinary. Livy's criticism of verba sordida cannot, therefore, have been directed against Sallust.

It can be concluded that there is no solid external evidence supporting the widespread view that Livy disliked Sallust's morals and style. The theory that a passage in Cassius Dio actually conveys Livy's criticisms was found to have no foundation. The stylistic criticisms attributed to Livy, on the other hand, apply more to oratory than to historiography. In the one case in which the historian is reported to have expressed disapproval of Sallust's

69 See Kroll I 280; Bächner III 197, 276; Syme V 261. For a different view see Bolaffi II 84 ff.
imitation of a Thucydidean sententia, it was found that the sententia actually comes from Pseudo-Demosthenes and that the criticism can make sense only if interpreted as advice extended to a future orator, not as a rejection of Sallust's historiographical style per se. Any assumption, therefore, of Livy's hostility against Sallust is found in every case to be without support. And since this chapter began with Syme's claim that Sallust's style was detestable to Livy, it may be appropriate to conclude it with a judgement on Sallust's style by a Ciceronian like Quintilian (10, 1, 32):

... illa Sallustiana brevitas, qua nihil apud aures vacuas atque eruditas potest esse perfectius...
CHAPTER III

LIVY'S **PRAEFATIO** AND SALLUST

Before a detailed study of Livy's **Praefatio** in relation to Sallust, a few preliminary remarks are necessary. First, the Prologue of the *Histories*, a major source of the **Praefatio**, is in a fragmentary state. The order and the exact sense of the fragments in Maurenbrecher's edition have been challenged by a number of scholars and different reconstructions have been suggested. It is obvious, therefore, that great caution is needed in a parallel study that utilizes these fragments. And there is already a kind of vicious circle in a study relating them to Livy's **Praefatio**, given that the **Praefatio** has been used for the reconstruction of the Sallustian text.

Another concern is the technical nature of prose prefaces in antiquity. The rules for the composition of **exordia** were laid down in rhetorical manuals. Every one of these prefaces can be dissected and reduced to bits and pieces of rhetorical theory. Where does that leave the

1Klingner I; La Penna III; Flach; Pasoli III

2For the **Praefatio** see Ferrero I. For historical prefaces see G. Avenarius 113-8; Janson 64 ff.
the reader and the scholar? If one looks at the **Praefatio** from this point of view, there is virtually nothing original in it. Yet, from another perspective, the **Praefatio** is a very original composition. It is suggested, in other words, that the fact that a statement in it may fall within the requirement of procuring the **attentio** or **benevolentia** of the reader is not so important. What is important is the expression which such a statement is given and the context in which it is found. The intent of this study is to avoid becoming absorbed in the minutiae of rhetorical theory, but without overlooking the fact, on the other hand, that the learned reader in antiquity must have recognized stock themes and rules in a preface.

A third issue is that of the relation of the **Praefatio** to the rest of Livy's **History**. In ch. I it was suggested that the **Praefatio** was probably composed before 30 B.C. and after the completion of Book 1. Livy's **History** had a total of 142 books and was written during a period of over forty years. In the course of this analysis, it will often become necessary to relate the ideas in the **Praefatio** to the rest of the work, in order to acquire an overall view of Livy's ideas in relation to those of his predecessor. One is, therefore, faced with the question of the unity of Livy's thought. The ideas expressed in the **Praefatio** could be distinguished into three kinds: (1) those that can be followed throughout the work,
possibly even distinguishable in the Periochae. (2) those that were modified in varying degrees in the course of the work. (3) those of topical nature regarding problems of the time the Praefatio was composed. It will have to be determined which ideas belong to which category, in full awareness of the fact that there have been different interpretations.

The last and most important issue is that of literary imitation as affecting Sallustian reminiscences in the Praefatio. The rules of imitatio dictated that a writer, on the one hand, acknowledge the borrowings by making them evident to the learned reader and, on the other hand, absorb them into a new context and give them an original treatment. But there was also a kind of imitation that had a polemic intent. In such cases a writer would undermine the sense of the words of his model and use them as a means to attack him. Does anything of this kind transpire in Livy's Praefatio? This is also a question which this chapter will try to answer.

3One should not, however, demand great detail from the general plan of the History found in the Praefatio. In this respect, Walsh's attempt (VI 9) to base the division into decades of Books 51-80 on the assumption that Praef. 9 outlines stages of decline in very specific terms should be viewed with great caution. Cf. Wille 71 f.

4On all these issues see Kroll II 139 ff.; Stempler 202 ff.; Russell. The distinction between imitatio and aemulatio is not very clear.
Sections 1-2

Livy opens the *Praefatio* by announcing his theme. This provides the first link with the Prologue of Sallust's *Histories*, which has a similar beginning. But Livy had also in mind *Cat.* 4, 2, where Sallust announces the theme of the Catiline, and *Hist.* 1 fr. 8, which probably refers to the period when there was no historiography in Rome.

Here are the passages:

Facturusne operae pretium sim si a primordio urbis res populi Romani perscripserim nec satis scio nec, si sciam, dicere ausim, ... (*Praef.* 1).

Res populi Romani M. Lepido Q. Catulo consulibus ac deinde militiae ac domi gestas composui (*Hist.* 1 fr. 1).

... statui res gestas populi Romani carptim, ut quaeque memoria digna videbantur, perscribere, ... (*Cat.* 4, 2).

Nam a principio [Servius; a primordio Priscianus] urbis ad bellum Persi Macedonicum (*Hist.* 1 fr. 8).

It is immediately clear that Livy has combined material from three different Sallustian passages into a new context. If the reading *primordio* is accepted, the relation between *Praef.* 1 and *Hist.* 1 fr. 8 becomes even closer. Priscianus' reading is the *lectior difficilior*. Also, the fact that *primordium* in the *A.U.C* occurs only

---

6 For the parallels between this Prologue and the *Praefatio* see Amundsen.
7 See Klingner I 170; La Penna V 64; Pasoli III 370; cf. Flach 79 ff. According to earlier interpretations it indicates a phase in the growth of Rome.
here and in Praef. 7 (primordia urbiun) makes it probable that Livy found the word in Sallust.

Perhaps the most significant word found in Praef. 1 is perscripserim. Before Livy, perscribere with reference to historiography is found only in the passage from Sallust cited above and in Sempronius Asellio fr. 1 P. Because of its importance for our discussion the fragment of Asellio is quoted in its entirety:

Verum inter eos, inquit, qui annales relinquere voluissent, et eos, qui res gestas a Romanis perscribere conati essent, omnium rerum hoc interfuit: annales libri tantum modo quod factum quoque anno gestum sit, ea demonstrabant, id est quasi qui diarium scribunt, quam Graeci έφημερία vocant. nobis non modo satis esse video, quod factum esset, id pronuntiare, sed etiam, quo consilio quaque ratione gesta essent, demonstrare.

In this passage Asellio strongly opposes a concept of historiography as a mere cataloguing of facts and events (annales relinquere), in favor of one which considers also causes and connections (res gestas perscribere). In the next fragment he says of the former: id fabulas pueris est marrare, non historias scribere.

Perscribere, therefore, is an essential word in Asellio's polemic against annalistic historiography.

---

8 Orationem perscribere in Jug. 30, 4 is different.

9 Asellio's polemic has Polybian flavor. A survey of the issues involved and a bibliography are found in Gentili-Cerri 69 ff.

10 For the precise sense of perscribere see Canfora II 109-10; Pasoli III 375. It is used for contemporary (Asellio) and near-contemporary history(Sallust), as well as for the history of Rome from the beginnings (Livy). It is not found in Tacitus.
With him it entered the historiographical tradition of and was picked up by Sallust, from whom Livy got it. Livy chooses to employ the *perscribere* of the *Catiline* in place of the *componere* of the *Histories* not just because the latter is a neologism in this sense but mainly in order to put on record from the very beginning that he is determined to re-write the history of Rome in a manner decidedly different from that of the Annalists. It is also very important that Sallust is not in any way criticized by Livy but used by him against annalistic historiography.

The crisis of annalistic historiography is more clearly established in sect. 2:

... quippe qui cum veterem tum volgatam esse rem videam, dum novi semper scriptores aut in rebus certius aliquid allaturos se aut scribendi arte rudem vetustatem superaturas credunt.

But in sect. 3 Livy refers to the same *scriptores* no longer with criticism but with praise:

...et si in tanta scriptorum turba mea fama in obscuro sit, nobilitate ac magnitudine eorum me qui nomini officient meo consoler.

Is there a contradiction here? In order to understand better these statements, it will be necessary to turn again to the Prologue of Sallust's *Histories*. It was pointed out in the Introduction to this chapter that there

11 Pasoli III 376. Livy never applies *componere* to historiography.

12 See also sects. 6-7. On the crisis of annalistic historiography see also Ferrero I passim.
is something of a vicious circle in attempting a parallel study between that Prologue and the Praefatio when the latter has been used for the reconstruction of the former. With this caveat let us note the assumption made by many scholars that Sallust, after announcing his theme (fr. 1) and referring to the period when there was no historiography in Rome (fr. 8), passed judgement on his predecessors (frs. 4 and 5). Such a judgement must not have been very favorable, at least as it can be recovered from fr. 5: *in quos longissimo aevo plura de bonis falsa in deterius composuit.* Sallust probably concluded this section with fr. 3: *nos in tanta doctissimorum hominum copia.* It is immediately clear that this fragment is echoed in Praef. 3 quoted above. In spite of the fact that Livy avoids naming his predecessors, the pattern that emerges appears to be the same in both historians: they are more or less critical of previous historians but conclude their surveys by offering the

---

13 On the arrangement of these fragments see Klingner I; La Penna III; Pasoli III.

14 The target of the criticism (Cato the Elder?) is uncertain. With regard to fr. 4 Pasoli (I 27-8) observes: "... davvero poco favorevole doveva essere il giudizio complessivo riservato alla storiografia precedente, se, nel IV secolo d.Cr., ... Vittorino non ha potuto ricordare se non che Sallustio ivi riconosceva il pregio della veritas all'annalista Gaio Fannio, il fautor dei Gracchi fino al 122, e della brevitas a Catone,...".

15 We know that Sallust mentioned Cato and Fannius (fr. 4). Lack of specific references is one of the characteristics of the Praefatio.
conventional "topos of modesty".

Who are these scriptores mentioned by Livy in sects. 2 and 3? They are sometimes understood to be the Annalists or Varro or Nepos, at other times to be Pollio and Sallust, or all of them at the same time. In my view the latter two should be totally excluded. Livy has most probably in mind the Annalists. In sect. 1 perscribere points to Asellio's attack on them. The reference in the next two sections is to historians who wrote a primordio urbis. In sect. 2 this type of historiography is described as cum veterem tum vol-gatam... rem. The dum-clause that follows is one of time and cause explaining these characteristics (Heurgon ad loc.) In sect. 3 the phrase in tanta scriptorum turba obviously refers to the same people.

It should be emphasized at this point that Livy does not have in mind a total rejection of annalistic historiography. He will have to rely on the Annalists as sources and for a general framework, which is absolutely necessary to provide chronological clarity. He will also inherit from them some stylistic elements (McDonald 155 ff.). But within this general framework he intends to follow

16 Oppermann 170; or, in rhetorical terms, officii sine adrogantia laudatio (Ad Her. 1, 5, 8).

17 See e.g. Ferrero I 30 ff.; Leeman IV 202; Ogilvie ad loc.; Mazza 70 ff.

18 For the nobilitas of the Annalists see Ogilvie ad loc.
Ciceronian, hellenistic and, as will later be seen, Sallustian principles.

The criticisms he launches against annalistic historiography are of two kinds. In sect. 2 he draws a distinction between *in rebus* and *scribendi arte*, which correspond to Cicero's *rerum ratio* and *verborum ratio*. In modern terms they can roughly be rendered as "content" and "style". With regard to the former, he polemically hints at the claim (credunt) of the Annalists *certius aliquid allaturos*. What Livy has in mind is *Annales* *relinquere* as depicted by Asellio, historiography as a mere accumulation of data. Commenting on the sense of *certius* Ferrero (I 37) writes:

> il certius equivale sostanzialmente ad un *perfectius*, ad un criterio cioè di completezza materiale ereditato da una storiografia nata da quella sorte di *acta* ufficiali che erano gli annali. Dal tono con cui Livio si pronuncia... si percepisce un senso di sfiducia.

The other claim of the Annalists was *scribendi arte rudem vetustatem superaturos*. In order to understand Livy's sarcastic remark, it is necessary to view it in the light of Cicero's pronouncement that the Annalists *non exornatores rerum, sed tantum modo narratores fuerunt* (De or. 2, 54). In other words, if we consider the significance of *ornate dicere* for Cicero, their claim amounts to a

---

19 *De or.* 2, 63; see Leeman IV 201.

20 A second target of Livy may be the antiquarians, whose erudite research was similarly motivated. For direct criticisms against them see sects. 6-7 below.
mockery.

So far it has been seen that Livy is using Sallustian borrowings to criticize the Annalists. In sects. 11-12 he will again use Sallustian language to fight off the attacks of the enemies of Rome. Livy is imitating Sallust in an exciting way. Among his innovations two more deserve notice. First, the opening of the Praefatio strikes a personal, intimate note with the sincere or affected modesty of facturusne... ausim. Second, Livy gives us the first specimen of his tendency to measure res gestas perscribere in terms of operaæ pretium. In two other instances he applies operaæ pretium to the treatment of foreign affairs, and either declines to treat them (41, 25, 8) or apologizes for having spent time dealing with them (35, 40, 1). What we have in these two instances is a reflection of the ultra-nationalistic nature of Roman historiography.

\[21\] On the issue of his modesty see Kerényi 106 ff.

\[22\] On this characteristic of Roman historiography see De Sanctis and Knoche II.
Section 3

Within that Sallustian framework which, as seen above, covers sects. 1-3 of the Praefatio, Livy introduces a new theme. The real or rhetorical doubts of facturusne... are removed with a plain iuvabit. Writing the history of Rome is for Livy a question of personal pleasure. But prodesse and delectare had not co-existed harmoniously in the best historiographical tradition since the days of Thucydides. Does Livy go against such a tradition? Not at all. "Pleasure" and "usefulness" had previously been applied to the relation of a historian to his public. Livy strikes an entirely new note. Within that very personal context, which constitutes one of the major characteristics of the Praefatio, he re-defines delectatio by having it affect himself and his task. Such a feeling will be echoed in the Preface to Book 31, where Livy expresses his relief at having concluded the account of the second Punic war: me quoque iuvat, velut ipse in parte laboris ac periculi fuerim, ad finem belli Punicī pervenisse.

For Sallust, however, writing history is not an emotional issue. In the Prefaces to the monographs he

---

23, 22, 4. See also Lucian, How to Write History 9; G. Avenarius 22 ff.; Homeyer II 188 f. Polybius, however, in spite of his repeated emphasis on usefulness, on two occasions (1, 4, 11; 15, 31, 3) assigns a place to pleasure at its side.

24 Funaioli II 53: "Non esiste prima di Livio nella storiografia un proemio di contenuto si personale, d'un io prorompente a note così intime".
engages in a long, rational analysis of his decision to write history, before he can finally say statui... perscribere (Cat. 4, 2) and bellum scripturus sum... (Jug. 5, 1). On the issue of delectatio as affecting the historian and his readers, however, both Sallust and Livy follow the Thucydidean tradition. In sect. 4 Livy shows distinct awareness of the fact that the beginnings of Roman history will be a theme hardly pleasing to his audience: et legentium pleisque haud dubito quin primae origines proximaque originibus minus praebitura voluptatis sint. In sect. 10 he dwells with strong emphasis, as will be seen later in greater detail, on the salubre ac frugiferum effect of the study of history. Livy does not even hint at pleasing his audience. And neither does Sallust. For the latter the writing of history is strictly an issue of magno usui, utili labori, maius commodum (Jug. 4).

The fact that Livy places himself on this last issue in the tradition of Sallust deserves some more attention. It is a well-established opinion among Livian scholars that the historian adhered to theoretical principles of the so-called tragic school of historiography. The best known member of this school, Duris of Samos, declares in a programmatic statement that the primary aim of historiography should be ἡσονὴ ἐν τῷ ὑπάρχει (FGrH 75, 1). Livy's Praefatio

25 See the analysis of sect. 10 below
with its emphasis on the "wholesome and fruitful advantage" coming from the study of history and the rejection of voluptas is in open contrast with such a pronouncement.
Section 4

It was pointed out above that one of the major characteristics of the Praefatio is that very personal, intimate tone (whether real or affected). The historian gets emotionally involved with his task and his audience. And in order to make such an attitude even clearer he manipulates both the order of his thoughts and grammatical construction, as the analysis of this section will clearly demonstrate.

In the opening statement of the Praefatio Livy expressed doubts whether his would be a worthwhile undertaking. The question was dismissed in the previous section but now is picked up again:

Res est praeterea et immensi operis, ut quae supra septingentesimum annum repetatur et quae ab exiguis profecta initii eo creverit ut iam magnitudine laboret sua; et legentium plerisque haud dubito quin primae origines proximaque originibus minus praebitura voluptatis sint, festinantibus ad haec nova quibus iam pridem praebamentis populi vires se ipsae conficiunt:...

Livy introduces the first reason with a genitive (et immensi operis) but fails to follow up the construction with another genitive in the second half (Heurgon ad loc.). On the other hand, the first half opens with a reference to the magnitude of his own task (immensi operis) but ends up with Rome being burdened by its own greatness (magnitudine laboret sua). This clever twist in the parallelism creates the impression of Livy becoming one with his work. Such a feeling finds an echo in 31, 1, 1 velut ipse in parte laboris ac periculi fuerim. Also, Pliny reports that in
a later Preface the historian declared that he would be prepared to put an end to his work nisi animus inquies pasceretur opere (N. H. 1 praef.; notice the Sallustian inquies).

All this is new and different from what we find in Sallust. The attitude of the latter is more impersonal and detached. This further transpires from the way in which he and Livy treat the theme of the first half of section 4, i.e. the difficulties of the task. The emphasis on the magnitude of the work, though not entirely new (cf. Diodorus 2, 3, 3-6) is repeatedly stressed in the Praefatio and in tones that suggest that Livy is being oppressed by what he is undertaking. In the Preface to Book 31 such a feeling reaches the point of hopelessness:

... iam provido animo, velut qui proximis litori vadis inducti mare pedibus ingrediuntur, quidquid progressor, in vastiorem me altitudinem ac velut profundum invehii, et crescere paene opus, quod prima quaeque perficiendo minui videbatur.

For Sallust, on the other hand, the difficulty is of another order. It is the broader issue of the role and position of historiography in a society where the attainment of gloria is understood primarily within the sphere of political and military activity.

In ch. I (11-13) the issue of the pessimism of the Praefatio was briefly discussed, in connection with the

26 See Cat. 1-4; 8; Jug. 4; Vretska IV ad loc. and the discussion on sect. 10 below.
dating question. In this section we see the first, emphatic appearance of this pessimism. Rome is shown to us as "being burdened by its very greatness". The Romans are "exhausting their strength". The language is Livian with Horatian reminiscences (ch. I 9). But the whole attitude brings the historian closer to Sallust than probably anything else in the Praefatio.

In an openly polemic statement Livy condemns the taste of the public for accounts of contemporary events. "They make haste" he says "to reach those present events through which the strength of a people long dominant is exhausting itself". The greatest of ironies is, of course, that Livy in the course of his work does exactly what here he disapproves of, i.e. festinare ad haec nova. He spends as little time as possible on the primae origines, gives great prominence to the internal strife in the early Republic and from the fourth decade onwards plunges into the account of the decline of morality in Rome. Also, the greatest misinterpretation of this passage would consist in viewing it as a polemic against the writers of contemporary and near-contemporary history, like Pollio and Sallust. This section should be interpreted in the light of the next one, which deals more specifically with Livy's

---

27 See the discussion on sects. 9-12 below.

28 See ch. I 7-8 and the discussion on sects. 5-7 below.
escapism, and also in the light of his strong emotional involvement with the crisis of his days. It is an emphatic reaction of desperation, prudently directed, however, not against any *scriptores* as before, but against the tastes of the public. In view of the fact that he has already spent only 16 chs. of Book 1 on the events down to the death of Romulus, Livy has not in essence derived much *voluptas* out of the *primae origines*. As a matter of fact, in sect. 8 he tells exactly what he thinks of that period: *haud in magno equidem ponam discrimine!*
Section 5

The themes in this section are the so-called escapism of Livy and his assurance of impartiality. Ogilvie (24) regards the historian's escapism as one of the singularities of the Praefatio. In ch. I (12-13) a parallel was drawn among the historian's escapism, Horace's appeal in Epode 16 to abandon Rome and flee to the Islands of the Blest, and Sertorius's desire in Sall. Hist. 1 frs 100-103 to settle in those same islands in order to "live in peace and be rid of tyranny and ceaseless wars". The conclusion there was that all three compositions were written in an atmosphere of grave crisis. They show the same kind of reaction: retreat from a situation for which there is no remedium and refuge into a better world. This is the true dimension of Livy's escapism. And it must not be confused with his motivation to write the history of Rome a primordio. His motivation and decision were enunciated in sect. 3 in very clear and plain terms: iuvabit tamen rerum gestarum memoriae principis terrarum populi pro virili parte et ipsum consuluisse. It has already been stated that Livy was not an Antiquarian indulging in self-rewarding studies of Rome's early history. In sects. 6-7, as will be seen below, he comes out with a categorical statement against the widespread Antiquarianism of his days. But Livy has already announced his decision to write a primordio urbis. And he will have to deal first with the early phases in
the rise of Rome. Such a necessity provides him with an ideal opportunity to show how averse he is to the long standing crisis of his days:

ego contra hoc quoque laboris praemium petam, ut me a conspectu malorum quae nostra tot per annos vidit aetas, tantisper certe dum prisca illa tota mente repeto, avertam...

The essential point in such a statement is the consciousness that the res publica is going through a most critical period. And this consciousness of the crisis provides the link that brings Livy's Praefatio close to Sallust's Prefaces. It shows the debt of the historian to his predecessor and places him in the broader trend of the pessimism of Roman historical thought.

In Jug. 4, 9 Sallust voices his disgust at the moral decadence of his days in these terms:... me civitatis morum piget taedetque. As was shown in ch. I approximately ten years separate this statement from Livy's ut me a conspectu malorum... avertam. Important military and political developments have taken place in the meantime. But the atmosphere of crisis is still there. One is at a loss to decide which of the two reactions carries greater intensity.

But in spite of what was said above, there remains a deep-rooted impression that Livy's complaints about the crisis are merely words, while Sallust is actually the one

29 On the issue of pessimism in Roman historiography see the discussion on sect. 9 below.
who undertakes to come to grips with the problem. How solid a basis is there for such a view? The problem is often obscured by the fact that Livy wrote a *primordio urbis* but Sallust treated near-contemporary history, and also by the differences between continuous history and monograph. These are, of course, elements that differentiate the works of the two historians at a certain level. But how much weight do distinctions in form actually carry when one turns to look at the content? In the first place, both historians place the present crisis in the broad perspective of the rise of Rome and its subsequent moral decline. Sallust, following the Thucydidean model, chooses to do so in the form of digressions, esp. the *Archaeology* of the *Catiline*. The latter shows him undoubtedly as the first Roman historian who *das ganze römische Schicksal als einen einheitlichen Vorgang hat auffassen können* (Klingner II 17). In these terms, who could deny Livy's debt to him? In the second place, both Sallust and Livy investigate the roots of the crisis. For his part Sallust does not choose to write directly about the civil wars. This task will be left to Pollio. He opts for accounts that

---

30 On continuous history and monograph see Canfora II

31 This tendency will later become such an obsession with Tacitus that he will never make good his promise to write about the *testimonium praesentium bonorum* (*Agr.* 3, 15; cf. *Hist*. 1, 1).
have a paradigmatic value. The *Catiline* and the *Jugurtha* show in condensed form the complete moral disintegration of Roman society, from the *plebs* to the *nobiles*. The aspect he is interested in is not the account of the civil wars but the rise of the protagonists of the conflicts: Marius and Sulla (*Jugurtha*), Pompey (*Histories*) and Caesar (*Catiline*). The fact that the war between Marius and Sulla had been treated by Sisenna is of lesser importance in the light of the trend that seems to define the historical thought of the Amiernian. On the other hand, Livy offers a more complete picture. He deals both with the actual crisis (in the lost books) and with its symptoms and the forces behind it. With regard to the latter, it is worth noticing that Livy not only plunges after Book 1 directly into an account of the struggle of the orders which is anachronistically depicted in the tones of the civil wars of the late Republic, but he also proceeds to describe, esp. from the fourth decade onwards, the beginnings and downward course of the progressively declining Roman *mores* (*Iuice II* 250 ff.).

In the second part of section 5 Livy gives the reader the traditional assurance of impartiality. His words echo similar statements by Sallust:

32 On this theme in historical prefaces see G. Averna­rius 40 ff.
It is immediately obvious that Livy's words carry reminiscences from Sallust. *Flectere a vero* recalls *movit a vero* (Amundsen 34). Also, *omnis expers curae* could be seen at a verbal level as a condensation of *spe metu partibus reipublicae animus liber erat* (cf. Leggewie 349).

It is interesting to see how in Sallust the public career and the active part in the civil war between Caesar and Pompey surface immediately (cf. Tacitus Hist. 1, 1). Twice he assures the reader of his non-partisanship as a historian. Cicero (De leg. 1, 3, 8) sets two prerequisites for the writing of history: *et cura vacare et negotio*. The latter never has been a problem for Livy and for Sallust is no longer a concern. The main issue is *cura*. Sallust understands it as mentioned above. But Livy defines it at a different level because he has not had a public career nor, as far as we know, active participation in the civil wars. *Cura* for him is that grave concern about the current crisis of the *res publica* that pervades the Praefatio.
It cannot make the historian swerve from the truth (flectere a vero) but might, nevertheless, disturb him (sollicitum efficere posset). This is a novel and exciting way of offering an assurance of impartiality. The historian leaves the door open to the writing of contemporary history. After all, he will eventually arrive at his own times. And he promises to treat them impartially. But, for the moment, he intends to spare himself the sorrow of dealing with the present. As in the case of his escapism before, however, he does not exactly keep himself out of the anxiety of his days. In fact, as seen above, he carries his cura into Rome's early history.

Does Livy actually have respect for the truth? One can answer the question with another question: does Sallust have respect for it? does Caesar? Tacitus? None of these historians has been spared the most severe criticisms in this respect. The idea that Livy "distorts" history is widespread. It is not the aim of this study to spend time defending him. It will suffice to quote von Fritz on Sallust's account of the Jugurthine war:

Yet by all sorts of innuendo, by putting some facts in the foreground and leaving others unexplained, by reporting statements made by party politicians of the

---

33 For the view that Livy deliberately evades the profession of truth so that he can distort at will see Walsh V 36.
34 See esp. Walsh I
past without pointing out that these statements were at least in part unfounded, he succeeds in creating a false impression of the meaning of the facts reported, and gives a distorted picture of the events in a very artful fashion".

Of course, the truth is that neither Livy nor Sallust treats history in such a way. It is imperative to separate modern standards and methods from those of ancient historiography. 35

35 A good number of Livy's criticisms of other historians for lack of veracity can be found in Hellmann and in Wiehemeyer (esp. important is Livy 8, 40).
Sections 6-8

These sections deal with the historian's approach
to the mythical origins of Rome. Unlike Sallust, Livy enunciates methodological principles of work. Here are the points he makes:

(1) the period of history around the foundation of Rome is more suitable for treatment by poets than by historians;

(2) Livy will record the traditional account as it stands without accepting or rejecting it;

(3) antiquity concedes the license of rendering the foundation stories of cities more venerable by mingling human with divine agents;

(4) the Romans, above any other people, should be allowed to treat their origins as sacred and trace them back to divine authorship;

(5) their fame in war is such that, when they claim Mars as their sire and sire of their founder, the nations of the world accept their claim as calmly as they accept their sovereignty;

(6) questions like the above and similar ones, whatever criticisms or opinions are expressed about them in the course of the work, will be held of small account.

The first point that Livy makes involves a distinction between incorrupta rerum gestarum monumentis and poeticae fabulae, which is not found in any other Roman historian. The distinction goes back to Thucydides (1, 21) and to Aristotle's separation of history from poetry (Poetics 1451b). But it appears that a so-called tragic school of historiography in the hellenistic period disregarded the

36 See Tiffou 27-34.
distinction, transferring the Aristotelian concept of mimesis from tragedy to history. Once again, however, Livy sets himself against the principles of the school to which he presumably adhered. His explicit dissociation from poeticae fabulae does not square with his role of "il poeta della storia". Most importantly, however, it takes us back to points made at the beginning of this chapter. We are reminded that Sempronius Asellio called annalistic historiography fabulas pueris narrare and that Livy opened the Praefatio by subscribing to that verb (perscribere) which Asellio used against this type of historiography. In sects. 2 and 3 Livy's attack against the Annalists became direct. His target here is the same. The Annalists uncritically accepted into their narrative legendary material suitable for poetic treatment. But incorruptis

37See Walbank I for a survey of the issues involved and bibliography. The question of a Peripatetic school of historiography was first raised in modern times by Schwartz and the debate raged for over sixty years. Main stages are the works and articles by Scheller, Reitzenstein, B. Ullman, von Fritz and Walbank. The existence of such a school is still in dispute, but scholars have eagerly seized the opportunity to try to prove (or disprove) its influence on Roman historians, from Fabius Pictor to Tacitus. On Sallust see Reitzenstein, Paladini I ch. III, Perrochat ch. II and La Penna V 375. On Livy see Burck and a reaction by Jumeau. For a broader perspective of the whole issue see Gomme. Finally, for the distinction made by grammarians between fabula, historia and argumentum, which may have a bearing on the Livian passage, see Walbank I.

38Cf. the discussion on pleasure as aim of historiography on pp. 79-80 above.
... monumentis also contains an attack on the notorious lack of veracity in their accounts. Such a lack of veracity will later repeatedly be Livy's target (n. 35 above).

The criticisms of section 6 are also directed against the Antiquarians. The formula he uses against them is nec adfirmare nec refellere. In order to fully grasp its significance, it will be necessary to place it in a broader perspective. The attitude of relata refero was introduced into historiography by Herodotus 7, 152 ἐγὼ δὲ ὁφείλω λέγειν τὰ λεγόμενα, πεσάσαν γε μὲν οὖν οὐ παυτάπασαν ὁφείλω. Different historians used the formula for different purposes. In Curtius Rufus (9, 1, 34), for instance, it is merely a cover-up for his uncritical attitude. In Tacitus it becomes a part of his art of innuendo. The historian reports, e.g., the rumor that Tiberius had poisoned his son Drusus with the comment: neque tamen occulere debui narratum (Ann. 3, 16). In Livy the formula serves a double purpose. On the one hand, it serves him to criticize the Antiquarians. Livy's argument against their practices is that they sought certainty in an area where there could be none. It is admirably illustrated in 1, 3, where Livy discusses the identity of Ascanius-Iulus. His comment there is: haud ambiguous—quis enim rem tam veterem pro certo adfirmet hicine fuerit Ascanius an maior quam hic, ... Though

39On Tacitus' art of innuendo see Scott Ryberg.
Livy must have utilized material from Varro, he would have nevertheless been against the methodological principle on which the latter's *De familiis Troianis* or *De gente populi Romani* were based.

On the other hand, such a formula also allows Livy to stay within the pragmatic context of Roman thought and Roman historiography in particular. Rationalism in Rome was conditioned by moralism, traditionalism and conservatism. A historian like Tacitus has a whole digression on the issue of whether human events are guided more by *fatum* or by *fortuna*. The ridicule of divination in Cicero's *De divinatione* did nothing to change, and probably was not intended to, Roman attitudes. Livy will have to accept the inclusion of legendary material into his text, but to a limited extent and accompanied by the qualifying expressions *fertur, traditur, tenet, fama* etc. He will give a most brief survey of the events down to the death of Romulus. This is probably as far as his, and Roman, rationalism could have gone. But within the above-mentioned context it represents a radical dissociation from the practices of the Antiquarians and the Annalists. The limitations of Livian rationalism run parallel with those of

---

40 See Hellmann 8 ff.

41 Compare 16 chs. out of the 60 of Book I in Livy against a total of 2 Books (=156 chs.) in Dionysius of Halicarnassus. Obviously Livy chose to utilize in his account as little material from what was available as possible.
Sallustian rationalism. The digressions in the *Histories* (on Sardinia 2 frs. 1-11; Crete 3 frs. 10-15; Pontus 3 frs. 61-80) contain several myths and legends.

In Livy legendary material is rarely an end in itself, as was the case with the Annalists and Antiquarians, but functions within the plan and aim of his *History* that are outlined in Praef. 9-10. In the Archaeology of the Catiline we detect a similar approach. This brief sketch of Roman history breaks totally away from the traditional annalistic account. Such a survey underlies a specific aim and concept of history, to show in other words the virtues and institutions through which Rome achieved its greatness and the vices that brought about its decline (Cat. 5, 9). Sallust approaches the foundation story (6, 1-3) with the comment *sicuti ego accepi*, a foreshadowing of Livy's *traditur*. His version of this story, different from all other extant traditions, according to which Rome was founded by the Trojans together with the Aborigines, must have been motivated, as the text eloquently shows, primarily by his desire to illustrate how *concordia* led into the quick merging of two peoples of such disparate origins and ways

---

42 On the latter see LaPenna V 302 ff.

43 Compare, however, *Hist.* 4 fr. 27, where he rationalizes the myth of Scylla.

44 See Vretska IV ad loc.
of life. It is the paradigmatic value of such a story which is important to Sallust, not any claim to certainty about the foundation account.

In their attitudes towards prehistory Sallust and Livy rank together against Thucydidean principles. Thucydides had stated that, though there could be no sapientes in prehistory, one could nevertheless disentangle fact from legend through the use of τεκμήρια (1, 1, 3). A passage from Thucydides and one from Sallust illustrate their conflicting methodological principles:

The relation of Sallust to Thucydides is often skin-deep, and this is not generally recognized. Sallust is in many respects better understood within the context of Roman, not Greek, rationalism. The two passages could not offer a sharper contrast. The choice of the Carthaginian tradition by Sallust was made not on the merit of its veracity, which is left open, but for its paradigmatic value, functioning,

45 On concordia in Sallust see Earl I passim.
that is, as an interesting parallel to the legend about the foundation of Rome. Sallust and Livy display a surprisingly similar attitude. As a matter of fact, Livy's nec adfirmare nec refellere is practically a comment on fides eius reipenes auctores erit.

The final blow against the Annalists and the Antiquarians is given in sect. 8. Livy's comment on the themes that absorbed them is sed haec et his similia... haud in magno equidem ponam discrimine. Before that, however, Livy does not miss the opportunity for one more attack against them during the discussion in sect. 7. Miscere humana divinis, he says, should be avoided in a historical account. Indeed, as will be seen in sect. 9, the course of events in the A.U.C. is determined more by man than by fatum, fortuna or the gods. Livy adds, however, that "mingling human with divine agents" is permissible when dealing with foundation stories, which lie outside the scope of historical investigation. He establishes as a general principle that it is permissible for a nation to treat its origins as sacred. This is the first step in an elaborate, well-calculated argument that goes beyond the justification of his intent to include legendary material in his narrative. The reader is first skillfully led to think of foundation stories of other cities of venerable antiquity. But the historian's intent is not innocent, only innocent-seeming. In what follows he uses very strong language to denounce
what in his day were widespread attacks by foreigners against the origins of Rome. But in order to appreciate what he is doing it will be useful to compare first this section of the Præfatio with Cicero De rep. 2, 2, 4. The two passages have been compared before (Alfonsi), but only in order to show Cicero's influence on Livy, not the differences between them. Here is the text:

Quod habemus, inquit, institutæ rei publicae tam clarum ac tam omnibus notum exordium quam huius urbis condendae principium prefectum a Romulo? qui patre Marte natus (concedamus enim famæ hominum, præsertim non inveteratae solum, sed etiam sapienter a maioribus proditae, bene meriti de rebus communibus ut genere etiam putarentur, non solum esse ingenio divino)... The similarities with Praef. 7 are obvious: Rome's origins are placed above those of any other city in fame, Romulus' divine origins are rationalized, but at the same time it is proposed that the tradition about his parentage should be preserved. We encounter again the limitations of Roman rationalism described above. The differences between the two texts, however, are of far greater importance to our discussion than the similarities. The way in which Rome's origins are placed in context with those of other cities is conspicuously polemic in Livy but not in Cicero. Livy elaborates at length in order to demonstrate that Rome has a right beyond any other city to treat its origins as sacred, and that, consequently, the peoples of the world

46On the political significance of the choice of Romulus and Mars by Livy see ch. I 11.
must calmly accept its claim; in Cicero it is simply stated that the *rei publicae exordium* is the most famous of all. In the second place, Cicero accepts the legend about Romulus' divine parentage (*concedamus famae*) in the name of antiquity and, primarily, of the sound judgement of the *maiores*, who decided that great patriots should be deemed actual descendants of the gods. We have, in other words, a variant form of the main point of the *Somnium Scipionis* that great Roman patriots earn a place in the heavens and eternal happiness. Cicero's argument is addressed more properly to a Roman audience. In Livy the polemic is evident. The claim to the divine parentage of Romulus is explicitly related to Rome's subjects. If any city, he says, has the right to treat its origins as sacred, Rome has it even more. Her subjects recognize her *gloria belli*. They accept the idea of Romulus' divine parentage as calmly as they accept her *imperium*.

Here are, on the other hand, some passages in which Rome's origins are ridiculed by non-Romans:

> έτι γὰρ ἀνυσεται παρὰ τοῖς Ἡλληνων ὀλύγου δεκα παθει καὶ παλαιὰ τῆς Ῥωμαίων πόλεως ἑτορία, καὶ ὅτως τινες οὐκ ἀλλητεῖς... ἦς ἀνεστὼς μὲν τινῶς καὶ κλήνης καὶ παράῤῥους καὶ οὐδὲ τούτως ἐλευθέρους σκοτάς παρεχομένους, ... (Dion. Ant. 1, 4)

> Quos autem homines Romanos esse? nempe pastores, qui latrocinio iustis dominis ademptum solum teneant, qui uxores cum propter originis dehonestamenta non invenirent, re publica rapuerint, qui denique urbem ipsam parricidio condiderint murorumque fundamenta fraterno

---

47 About these attacks see Fuchs I.
sanguine adsperserint (Justinus Epit. Trogi 28, 2, 8-10 Ruehl; speech of the Aetolians).

... scilicet quia ipsi tales reges habuerint, quorum etiam nominibus erubescent, aut pastores Aboriginum, aut aruspices Saginorum, aut exules Corinthiorum, aut servos vernasque Tuscorum, aut, quod honoratissimum nomen fuit inter haec, Superbos; atque ut ipsi ferant conditores suos[ notice the verbal parallelism with the Praefatio] lupae uberibus alitos, sic omnem illum populum Luporum animos inexpleres... (Ibid. 38, 6, 7-8; speech of Mithridates in the original words of Trogus).

It is immediately obvious that Praef. 7 was written in defense of Rome. The Livian passage foreshadows the attack against the levissimi ex Graecis in the digression on Alexander the Great (9, 17-19).

Livy places the whole issue of Rome's claim to divine origins in the perspective of Roman imperialism. It is within this context that one should try to answer the question of Sallust's attitude towards Rome's subjects, their rights and their accusations. But, first, it is necessary to say a few words about the Roman expansionistic and imperialistic ideology. Imperialism was inherent in the system of values of the Roman nobilitas. Here is what Earl (II 21) says:

Virtus, for the republican noble, consisted in the winning of personal pre-eminence and glory by the commission of great deeds in the service of the Roman state. It had to manifest itself in military success and the holding of office.

Other evidence shows that down to 142 B.C. the censors

\[48\] See also Badian ch. I.
prayed by custom to the gods for an increase in the possessions of the Roman people (Valerius Maximus 4, 1, 40). The praise inscribed on the monuments of the greatest generals was finis imperii propagavit (Cic. De rep. 3, 15, 24). Cicero reserves the best place in the heavens for those Romans who proved themselves true imperialists (Ibid. 6, 13 qui patriam... auxerint). Ruling over other people was for Rome the way of Nature, as "God rules over man, the mind over the body and reason over lust and anger" (Ibid. 3, 27, 37 optimo cuique dominatum ab ipsa natura cum summa utilitate infirmorum datum). The last of the classical Latin poets, Rutilius Namatianus, praises the pax Romana as the greatest service to mankind (De reditu suo 1, 63-66):

fecisti patriam diversis gentibus unam:
profuit iustis te dominante capi.
dumque offers victis proprii consortia iuris urbem fecisti quod prius orbis erat.

In the Archaeology of the Catiline Sallust discusses the complex of virtues that promoted Rome to a world power down to the fall of Carthage. The period covered is approximately the same as in the extant part of Livy's History, which stops in 167 B.C. According to Sallust, Rome's greatness was the result of its moral strength. In his view Rome possessed in that period an imperium iustum, that is, one founded on iustitia and aequitas, fides and amicitia, beneficium and clementia. Here are some of the

49 See Pöschl I 89-109.
most important passages:

... sociis atque amicis auxilia portabant, magisque
dandis quam accipiundis beneficiis amicitias para-
bant (Cat. 6, 5).

in pace vero quod beneficiis magis quam metu impe-
rium agitabant et accepta iniuria ignoscere quam per-
sequi malebant (Cat. 9, 5).

ad hoc populo Romano iam a principio imperi melius
visum amicos quam servos quaerere, tutiusque rati volen-
tibus quam coactis imperitare (Jug. 102, 6; speech of
Sulla to king Bocchus).

Roman expansion and rule was, therefore, according to
Sallust motivated exclusively by high principles and impe-
cable moral standards. The third passage, where the state-
ment is placed in the mouth of Sulla, eloquently indicates
that for Sallust the imperialistic ideology extended beyond
"party" affiliation and dislikes. Cicero in the De repu-
Blica, where he undertakes the most systematic defense of
Roman imperialism in all Roman literature, and Livy speak
exactly the same language:

noster autem populus sociis defendendis terrarum
iam omnium potitus est (3, 23, 35)

... et imitaretur populum Romanum, qui caritate
quam metu adiungere sibi socios mallet (39, 25, 15;
speech of Thessalian envoys to Philip).

But the passage which best illustrates Sallust's
attitude is Cat. 10, 1:

sed ubi labore atque iustitia [= complex of quali-
ties described in the previous chapters] res publica

50 On Sallust's feelings about Sulla see Jug. 95, 4.
For commentary on these passages see Vretska IV and Koes-
termann.
crevit, reges magni bello domiti, nationes ferae et
populi ingentes vi subacti [viz Hannibal, Philip, An-
tiochus, Perseus etc.], Carthago aemula imperi Romani
ab stirpe interiit [notice the crudeness of the lan-
guage], cuncta maria terraeque patebant [= lay open
and defenseless], saevire fortuna ac miscere omnia
ccepit.

Rome's history is, therefore, depicted as a drive
towards limitless expansion because of its moral strength.
Fortuna is blamed for stopping this process to the undoing
of the Roman nation. The phrase cuncta maria terraeque
patebant could have been spoken by Virgil.

In Hist. 1 fr. 11 Sallust claims that between the
second and the third Punic war the Romans lived optimis
moribus et maxima concordia. This is precisely the period
of Rome's expansion in the eastern Mediterranean. We
observe no development in his thought. He is making the
same point as before, that Rome expanded its territory
because of its virtue.

After all that, Livy's language strikes very familiar
tones. We discern the same viewpoint that Rome's greatness
was the reward of its moral excellence and the same passion-
ate dream of world conquest:

ad illa mihi pro se quisque acriter intendat animum,
quae vita, qui mores fuerint, per quos viros quibusque
artibus domi militiaeque et partum et auctum imperium
sit (Praef. 9).

... neque ea tantum in praemium vestrum cessura,
quae nunc in regis castris [those of Antiochus] sunt,

51Aen. 1, 278-9 his ego nec metas rerum nec tempora
pono: imperium sine fine dedi.
sed illum quoque omnem apparatum, qui in dies ab Epheso expectatur, praedae futurum, Asiam deinde Syriamque et omnia usque ad ortum solis ditissima regna Romano imperio aperturos. quid deinde aberit, quin ab Gadibus ad mare rubrum Oceano finis terminemus, qui orbem terrarum amplexu finit, et omne humanum genus secundum deos nomen Romanum veneretur? (36, 17, 14-15; speech of M. Acilius Glabrio to his troops before the battle of Thermopylae).

But one might object that we are misled by theoretical pronouncements in Sallust, which are never seen in practice. What better course is there, then, than to take a quick look at Sallust's account of the Jugurthine war? La Penna (V 292) calls such an account "una netta difesa dell'intervento romano". If one wants to examine the minutiae of Rome's intervention in Africa, Timpe's article shows that the imperialistic ideology has imbued Sallust's mind to such a degree that it unconsciously conditions his pronouncements and interpretations of events. Without concerning ourselves with the historicity of the account of the war, we can examine strictly Sallust's own statements.

Adherbal has just made an emotional appeal to the Senate for help against Jugurtha (14). What follows is Sallust's praise of the attitude of some of the senators (15, 3):

At contra pauci quibus bonum et aequom divitiis carius erat, subveniendum Adherbal et Hiempsalis mortem severe vindicandum censebant.

52 On this issue see von Fritz; Bächner I; Vretska II; and the relative chapters in Syme V and La Penna V.
A similar situation occurs some time later. Adherbal is besieged at the town of Cirta by Jugurtha (21 ff.). A letter of his asking for help has just been read at the Roman Senate (24). Sallust comments:

Sed ab eisdem illis regis fautoribus summa ope eni-
sum est ne tale decretem fieret. Ita bonum publicum,
ut in plerisque negotiis solet, privata gratia
devictum (25)

To Sallust Roman intervention in Africa is bonum
publicum. There is no hesitation, no discussion, simply
because to him, and to his Roman contemporaries, the right
to intervene is self-evident. And it is inconceivable
and irritating to him that a group of individuals should
be bribed and seek to promote their own interests, and
would prove incompetent to carry out the war successfully,
at the expense of public interest so defined. Metellus,
Marius and Sulla are better than Bestia and Albinus,
because they succeed where the latter have failed through
venality or incompetence.

Syme (V 290) writes that "Sallust's revelations about
Roman imperialism would not be at all to his [= Livy's]
liking". Let us take a closer look at them. The main item
is the Letter of Mithridates (Hist. 4 fr. 69), which is
addressed to king Arsaces. It is one of the fiercest
attacks against Roman imperialism. There has been an iso-
lated attempt to demonstrate that its anti-imperialistic
ideas "correspondaient à un courant d'opinion très fort
à Rome à l'époque des guerres civiles et plus tard encore" (Bikerman 150). Today very few scholars would share such an opinion. These attacks against Rome originated in the East as a reaction to conquest. They had existed long before Sallust, at least since the famous visit of Carneades in Rome in 155 B.C. They are found in Sallust, Trogus and Tacitus, in the form of letters or speeches. They are part of the Roman historiographical convention. What Syme passes over in silence is that they are frequent in Livy, too. Here are a few passages:

Cruelissima ac superbissima gens sua omnia suique arbitrii facit; cum quibus bellum, cum quibus pacem habeamus, se modum imponere aequum censet (21, 44, 5; speech of Hannibal to his troops).

an imitari... Romanorum licentiam, an levitatem dicam, mavultis?... cum Italiae urbes Regium, Tarentum, Capuam, ne finitimas, quorum ruinis crevit urbs Roma, nominem, eidem subjectas videant imperio. Capua quidem, sepulcrum ac monumentum Campani populi, elato et extorri eicto ipso populo, superest, urbs trunca sine senatu, sine plebe, sine magistratibus, prodigium, relictà crudelius habitanda, quam si deleta foret (31, 29; speech of the Macedonian envoys at the Conference of the Aetolian league).

Venire eos ad omnia regna tollenda, ut nullum usquam [orbis] terrarum nisi Romanum imperium esset; Philippum, Nabim expugnatos; se tertium peti;... (37, 25, 4-5; Letter of Antiochus to Prusias. The comparison with Polybius shows that Livy made significant additions in condemnation of Roman imperialism).

---

53 See La Penna V 290 ff.
54 On these attacks see Fuchs I
55 A long list can be found in Hoch 94 ff.
It is worthy of notice that all these attacks are placed in the mouths of notorious enemies of Rome, like Mithridates or the Aetolians. The portrait of Mithridates in Sallust is self-condemning. He fits the portrait of Catiline by being animi atrox (2 fr. 74) and corpore ingenti (fr. 77) but, as his actions show, ingenio malo pravoque: he obtained the throne by poisoning his mother (fr. 75) and killing his brother and sister (fr. 76).

Does this mean that there is no difference of opinion between Livy and Sallust regarding the nature of Roman imperialism? Yes, there is absolutely none. Whatever differences do exist are stylistic. Livy draws more attention, because he is more emotional and vociferous in his pronouncements. He is more rigid. Sallust is more subtle. And perhaps there is in him, deep down under his imperialistic ideology, a sense of the tragedy of mankind that embraces foes and friends alike. For an example that will better illustrate their differences, we may note that Sallust sees in Jugurtha and Catiline Rome's great enemies. He fights them bitterly in the course of the narrative. But at the conclusion of both monographs there is no sense of triumph. The Catiline ends on the sad note of people searching with mixed feelings through the bodies on the battlefield of Pistoia for relatives and friends. The conclusion is reminiscent of the abrupt end of the Lucretian epic. Similarly, at the end of the Jugurtha there
is no reference to Jugurtha being paraded in Rome and to his death by strangling in the Tullianum:

Sed postquam bellum in Numidia functum et Jugurtham Romam vinctum adduci nuntiatum est, Marius consul absens factus est et ei decreta provincia Gallia, isque kalendis Ianuariis magna gloria consul triumphavit. Et ea tempestate spes atque opes civitatis in illo sitae (114, 3).

But Livy's account (Per. 67) shows a different picture:

In triumpho C. Marii ductus ante currum eius Jugurtha cum duobus filiis et in carcere necatus est.

We have seen that Livy does not believe in the truth of the statement that Rome's subjects aequo animo... imperium patiuntur. We cited numerous examples in his History of reaction against Roman rule. Why then does Livy make this pronouncement in the Praefatio? The aim is probably propagandistic. Indeed, his words are echoed in the Prologue of Dionysius's Antiquitates among arguments in defense of Rome (1, 5, 15):

Ενα τούς μαθησας την ἀλήθειαν ἀ προσθήκην περὶ τῆς πόλεως τηθὸς παραστή γρονεῖν... καὶ μήτε ἀχθενθαν τῇ ὑποτάξει κατὰ το εἴκος γενομένη... μήτε κατηγορεῖν τῆς τύχης ὡς ὁυκ ἑκτηθεὶς πόλει τηληκάτην ἡγεμονίαν καὶ τοσούτου ἡδὲ χρόνου ἱκονίω ἰκροία διωμα-μένης. (Dion. Antig. 1, 5, 15).
Section 9

Sections 9-12 are more heavily dependent on Sallust than any other section of the Praefatio. In sect. 9 the historian announces the general plan of the A.U.C. As it appears to him, Roman history could be graphically depicted as one rising line peaking at some point, then starting downwards and increasing speed as it descends. The language in which this pattern of the rise and decline of Rome is expressed suggests a debt to Sallust in very specific terms. This has been seen for some time, but the relation has been confined between the second part of this section (labante... perventum est) and Sallust Hist. 1 fr. 16. Only Leeman (IV 204) has, to my knowledge, ventured outside the trodden path and compared ...quibusque artibus et partum et auctum imperium sit with Cat. 2, 4 nam imperium facile eis artibus retinetur quibus initio partum est, but without any elaboration. Here is the complete list of parallel passages:

ad illa mihi pro se quisque acriter intendat animum, quae vita, qui mores fuerint, per quos viros quibusque artibus domi militiaeque et partum et auctum imperium sit; labente [MSS; labante Gron.] deinde paulatim disciplina velut dissidentes [MSS; desidentes Philo-fus; discendentes Bayet] primo mores sequatur animo, deinde ut magis magisque lapsi sint, tum ire coeperint praecipites, donec ad haec tempora quibus nec vitia nostra nec remedia pati possimus perventum est(Praef.9)

56 For the theme of the rise and decline of Rome in Roman historiography see Pöschl II; in Roman thought, see Kroymann.

57 See Klingner I 179 n.1; Amundsen 33 etc.
res ipsa hortari videtur, quoniam de moribus civitatis tempus admonuit, supra repeterae ac paucis instituta maiorum domi militiaeque, quomodo rem publicam habuerint quantamque reliquerint, ut paulatim inmutata ex pulcher-ruma <atque optuma> pessuma ac flagitiosissuma facta sit disserere (Cat. 5, 9; cf. 10, 6 ... civitas inmutata, imperium ex iustissimo atque optumo crudele intolerandum-que factum).

nam imperium facile eis artibus retinetur, quibus initio partum est (Cat. 2, 4).

Ex quo tempore maiorum mores non paulatim, ut antea, sed torrentis modo praecipitati; adeo iuventus luxu atque avaritia corrupta, ut merito dicatur genitos esse qui neque ipsi habere possent res familiaris neque alios pati (Hist. 1 fr. 16).

After having attributed to the legendary section of Roman history a role of minor importance (haud in magno... ponam discrimine), Livy now turns to draw the attention of the reader to what will be the focus of his history: ad illa mihi pro se quisque acriter intendat animum...

Every single word or phrase in this passage is designed to stand out sharply: ad (antithesis in form of asyndeton); illa (contrasts haec above); mihi (notice the dativus ethicus); pro se quisque ( according to Ferrero I 40: "entro i limiti delle proprie capacità, e specialmente in corrispondenza alle proprie esigenze ed esperienze"); acriter (emphatic); intendat animum (emphatic). And what could be a greater tribute to Sallust than the fact that so much attention is drawn to what is his concept of Roman history? On the other hand, we encounter again in this passage that acute awareness of an audience we have seen before and
which is one of the characteristics of the Praefatio. Livy becomes once again involved, drawing a quick parallelism between his attitude in sect. 3 (pro virili parte) and that of his readers here (pro se quisque). The impression is one of parallel efforts and of the same degree of intense participation. Sallust's attitude, however, is impersonal and detached as he introduces the reader to the Archaeology: res ipsa hortari videtur... In general, this direct appeal to the public, so prominent in Livy's Praefatio, is missing from Sallust's works.

The striking similarities between Praef. 9 and Cat. 5, 9 are obvious. Both historians see in Roman history an ascending and a descending course. They do not opt to ignore one in favor of the other. Both of these aspects of historical development are closely interrelated in their minds. Not so much because, from a strictly logical point of view, one cannot exist without the other, but mainly because, as will be seen later in this section, the Roman historical experience is very much like a religious one. If one could use Judaeo-Christian terminology to describe such an experience, he would have to say that it has a paradise, a fall, a sense of guilt and an unceasing desire to regain the paradise. There is a dialectic here which is congenial to the Roman but does not find, as far as we know, its full expression before Sallust. For these very
same reasons, it is wrong to claim, as Ferrero does (I 38-39), that in the Praefatio

... le considerazioni sulla decadenza ed il rilassamento dei costumi... hanno un valore puramente aggiuntivo, e, oltre a costituire una tipica espressione di moralismo intelletualistico, sono soprattutto strumenti onde dare rilievo ed attualità ai pregi delle età trascorse.

These words do injustice to the unity of Livy's concept of Roman history. His considerations on the moral decline are not an addition of any sort, an extraneous body, but an essential element of his "philosophy" of history. As will be seen later, the pessimism persists through the extant part of his work. His History is going to comprise omnis exempli documenta, whether worthy of imitation or not.

The ascending phase of Roman history is presented through the same format in Sallust and Livy: quomodo..., quantamque... in the former; quae..., quae..., per quos..., quibusque... in the latter. The polyptoton in Livy enhances the effect. In both historians there is a deliberate avoidance of specifics and characterizations. By comparison, the other extant (at least in part) survey of Roman history before Livy, Cicero's De rep. 2, offers a different format:

facilis autem, quod est propositum consequar, si nostram rem publicam vobis et nascentem et crescentem et adultam et iam firmam atque robustam ostendero...

The strength of of Rome is moral strength. According to Livy, the greatness of Rome is due to four factors:
vita, mores, viri, artes. They are usually understood as pairs, the latter functioning as the concrete realization of the former.

The course of events in Livy is mostly determined by man, his institutions, policies, virtues and vices. There is in his History a tremendous interest in human beings, their motives and their reactions. Factors like fatum, fortuna and the gods play a relatively less important role as agents. According to Polybius, the Roman world-dominion was in part a handiwork of τύχη. But Livy is silent about fortuna in the Praefatio, probably in reaction to the attacks of foreigners that Rome did not become mistress of the world through its virtue but ἄνεμη τύχη καὶ τύχην δόξοι καὶ ὁμιλητική ἀνομομακρύνει τὰ μέγαστα τῶν ἀγαθῶν τῶν ἀνεμητολογίτων (Dic. Ant. 1, 4). And we should also be reminded that it was only in later times that fortuna was assigned in Rome a position of equal rank with that of virtus, as a factor that brought about the greatness of Rome.

58 For a discussion of these terms in greater detail see Funaioli II 63 ff.; Ferrero I 41 ff.; Kajanto II 59 ff.; Mazza 107 ff.; Ruch III 835; and the discussion below on vita and artes.
59 See Walsh V 168 ff.
60 See Kajanto I
61 On τύχη in Polybius see Walbank II 58 ff.; For fortuna and virtus in Livy see Kajanto I 63 ff.
For Ennius and Cicero the rise of Rome to greatness had been caused by two factors: viri and mores:

Moribus antiquis res stat Romana virisqve,
quem quidem ille versum vel brevitate vel veritate
tamquam ex oraculo mihi quodam esse effatus videtur.
nam neque viri, nisi ita morata civitas fuisset, neque
mores, nisi hi viri praefuissent, aut fundare aut tam
diu tenere potuissent tantam et tam fuse \[Halm; iuste MSS\] lateque imperantem rem publicam (Cicero De rep. 5, 1).

In Livy the list is expanded to include vita, mores, viri and artes. This is the first time, as far as we know, that these four factors are placed side by side in a single document. This is a new consciousness, an important synthesis.

Of the four factors mentioned by Livy vita needs some clarification. It is sometimes understood in an Herodotean or Varronian sense (Ferrero I 41 ff.). There may be some relation between Varro's De vita populi Romani and the use of the term vita in the Praefatio. But one should not disregard the fact that ethno logical research for its own sake, which is what Herodotus and Varro did, is alien to Livy.

To be sure, he must have utilized material from the Antiquarians. But vita in Livy is normally to be understood in relation to, or at the service of, mores, viri and artes. And if occasionally it functions independently, it is merely to fill in the gaps of the inexorable year-by-year recording of events. Syme (IV 56) accurately describes his

\[Pöschl I 55\] calls the verse from Ennius the basis of Roman political thinking.
attitude:

Livy was no antiquarian—he lacked the passion for facts or the collector's mania. Nor did he exploit, as he might have, the rich stores of Varronian learning. But the earliest history demanded a certain veneer of antiquarianism—and a style in keeping, with archaic formulae here and there to suggest the immemorial past. There were also curious or picturesque episodes to be exploited...

Sallust speaks of *instituta maiorum domi militiaeque, quomodo rem publicam habuerint...* The sense of the phrase is illustrated in *Cat. 6-9*, the first part of the *Archaeology*. From the historian's account in these chapters it appears that the ground covered is approximately the same as that implied by *Livy's vita, mores and artes*. Artes are also mentioned in *Cat. 2, 4* cited above (p. 111). The verbal parallelism between this passage and *Praef. 9* (*imperium-imperium, eis artibus-quibusque artibus, partum-partum*) makes the case of direct influence of Sallust on Livy a likely one. Thematically, too, there is a close correspondence between the two passages. *Ars* in the plural corresponding to Ciceronian *virtutes* but with an emphasis on conduct (a blending of quality and activity) is a key word in Sallust. Frequently found in the expression *bonae/malae artes* the usage seems to be his own innovation.

The context of *Cat. 2, 4* suggests a concept very similar to

---

63 Specifically on *instituta* see Vretska IV ad loc
64 See Vretska IV ad loc.; Earl I 11 f.
Praef. 9. If we remove the marginal appearance of *fortuna*, the passage below could very well be placed side by side

with the Livian text:

nam imperium facile iis artibus retinetur, quibus initio partum est. verum ubi pro labore desidia, pro continentia et aequitate lubido atque superbia invade-re, fortuna simul cum moribus inmutatur.

One of the major characteristics of chs. 6-9 of the Archaeology is the collective nature of growth and progress in an atmosphere of *concordia* and *boni mores*. The *viri* do not stand out at all. It is remarkable that Livy reproduces that very same pattern of evolution in the *Præfatio*. *Mores, viri* and *artes* are balanced against each other. Also, Livy does not say *a quibus viris* but *per quos viros*. This is sometimes viewed either as a concealed reference to the Polybian *τύχη* (Ferrero I 43) or as an expression of the workings of a creative force (Ruch III 836). But it may very well be a debt to Sallust.

It would be an error, however, to try to interpret Sallust or Livy in the light of this delicate balance between *mores* and *viri* established in the programmatic part of their works. The fascination of ancient thought, and especially of ancient historiography, with great personalities is well-known. It was, therefore, to be expected that Livy would, in the course of his work, have given

\[65\] On *artes* cf. also *Aen*. 6, 852.
greater prominence to personalities (Mazza 112 ff.). What about Sallust? Does he ever realize the Catonian ideal of the *Origines*? Indeed, he does not. In terms of Roman thought that ideal was so unrealistic that he will eventually be forced to offer a very painful palinode in Cat. 53, 4-6, following the speeches of Caesar and Cato:

> ac mihi multa agitanti constabat paucorum civium egregiam virtutem cuncta patravisse eoque factum, uti divitias paupertas, multitudinem paucas atque superaret. sed postquam luxu atque desidia civitas corrupta est, rursus res publica magnitudine sui imperatorum atque magistratum vitia sustentatibus ac, sicuti effeta paren-
> tum <vi> multis tempusstatibus haud sane quisquam Romae virtute magnus fuit.  

Two more points deserve our attention in this parallel study of the first half of Praef. 9 and the Sallustian passages cited above (pp. 110-11). First, both Sallust and Livy share the same conception of the biological growth of the Roman state. Livy uses terms like *vita*, *partum* and *auctum*. Sallust uses *partum* (Cat. 2, 4) and elsewhere such terms as *creverit* (Cat. 7, 2) and *crevit* (Cat. 10, 1). In contrast to Cicero (*De rep.* 2, 3), however, they are careful to avoid the complete parallelism with man's life which is common in later Roman historians (Seneca the Elder, 

66 For the text of effeta parentum see Vretska IV ad loc; for the sense compare viorum penuria in Cicero *De rep.* 5, 1, 2. With regard to the prominence given to personalities in Sallust's works Eisenhut (480) observes: "... ein wesentliches Prinzip der Komposition ist ausserdem die Gruppierung der Ereignisse um bedeutende Männer".

67 For an analysis of this theme see Ruch II and III.
Florus, Ammianus). The second point concerns the function of *domi militiaeque* in the *Praefatio*. Sallust's tendency to break clichés is notorious. This tendency increased in the later phases of his historiographical activity. In *Hist. 1 fr. 1* he writes *militiae et domi*. It has been suggested that the usage of the *Praefatio* represents a reaction. Our analysis has shown, however, that Livy here imitates *Cat. 5, 9*, where Sallust writes *domi militiaeque*.

The second half of *Praef. 9* paints the process of the decline of Roman *mores* in very gloomy tones. The dark pessimism of the *Praefatio* (sects. 4-5, 9, 11, 12) about Rome's recent past and present is its most important Sallustian feature. This pessimism is today acknowledged by a great number of scholars with or without limitations. His somber view of the present persists throughout the extant part of his work. In fact, all references to the present are invariably pessimistic. Here are the most important passages:

Sed nondum haec quae nunc tenet saeculum neglegentia deum venerat... (3, 20, 5).

*adeo in quae laboramus sola crevimus, divitias luxuriamque* (7, 25, 9).

---

68 See Pasoli I 37; III 373

69 See e.g. Amundsen 34; Walsh I 370; Vretska I 199; Syme IV 42; Kajanto II 62.
... ut in hanc magnitudinem quae vix sustinetur erigi imperium posset (7, 29, 2).

Nondum erant tam fortés ad sanguinem civilem...(7, 40)

Id, qui tum pudor hominum erat, visum, credo, vinclum satis validum legis: nunc vix serio ita minetur quisquam (10, 9, 6).

... vix ut veri simile sit parentium quoque hoc saeculo vilis levisque apud liberos auctoritas fecit (26, 22, 15).

Non sum nescius ab eadem negligencia, qua nihil deos portendere vulgo nunc credant, neque nuntiari admodum ulla prodigia in publicum neque in annales referri (43, 13, 1).

Pessimism is one of the major characteristics of Roman historical thought. And it is essentially different from the pessimism of Greek historical thought, which derives from a rational analysis and interpretation of events. The pessimism of the Roman thought is the product of an emotional and schematized approach to history. It results from that tense relation of the present to the past, the latter being perceived as an era of exemplary mores. The present is invariably corrupt, disintegrating, chaotic. The usefulness of history is detected in the fact that it stirs in man the memoria virtutis. The only escape from the crisis of the present is precisely a "return" to the past. It is a crisis perceived in uniform

70 See Pöschl II 193, 202 ff.; for a different view see Ferrero II 53 ff.

71 See the discussion on sect. 10 below.
terms and calling for a uniform answer. During the greatest crisis of the Greek world, on the other hand, which was connected with the appearance of the sophistic movement and the decline of the city-state, the intellectuals of the 4th century proposed a number of solutions. A return to an idealized 5th century was just one among many others.

But the pessimism of Roman thought has an even broader dimension. It can be grasped as one looks at the Preface of Florus: *ita late per orbem terrarum arma circum-tulit [sc. populus Romanus], ut qui res illius legunt non unius populi, sed generis humani facta condiscant.* National history is ecumenical history. Polybius, who was the first historian to underline this phenomenon, proceeded nevertheless to place the existence of Roman empire in a pattern of ἀνακάλωσις. But to the Roman the end of Rome is the end of the world: *quippe si morbo iam aut fato huic imperio secus accidat, cui dubium est, quin per orbem terrarum vastitas bella caedes orientur?* (Pseudo-Sallust Epist. 2, 13, 6). Quite characteristically, the absence of universal history from Rome, with the exception of Pompeius Trogus, is total. One of the great merits of Herodotean history is the emphasis on the rise and fall of empires. Thucydidean history rests on the concept or recurrence of events and situations κατὰ τὸ ἀνακάλωσις. But to the Roman historian there is only a Roman perspective.
Ex quo tempore in Sall. Hist. 1 fr. 16 needs to be dated. From fr. 11 we know that the Romans lived optimis moribus et maxima concordia between the second and the third Punic war, that is between 202-149 B.C. The fall of Carthage is the turning-point in Roman history in the Catiline, the Jugurtha and the Histories (fr. 12). Ex quo tempore represents probably 82 B.C., the time when, according to Sallust, avaritia and luxuria chiefly spread in Rome with the return of Sulla's army from Asia and his dictatorship (Cat. 11, 4 - 12, 3). In other words, non paulatim, ut antea (fr. 16) points to a phasing out of the decline between 146 and 82 B.C. The phasing of the decline after the capital year 146 is a recurrent theme in the Catiline:

ut paulatim inmutata... (5, 9)

haec primo paulatim crescere,... (10, 6)

Sallust even applies such a phasing of moral decline to the policies of the regime of the Thirty Tyrants in Athens:

Post ubi paulatim licentia crevit... (Cat. 51, 30)

In attempting to compare fr. 16 with the second half of Praef. 9 we are faced with a difficulty. The Sallustian fragment starts with the time of Sulla's dictatorship, while the Livian text describes the whole process

72 The discussion on the dating of the decline in Sallust and Livy will be conducted in greater detail in sects. 11-12.

73 Earl I 105; Vretska IV n. 566; but cf. Klingner I
of decline in general terms. In other words, the phases of non paulatim, ut antea are missing, though clearly hinted at. If we use fr. 12 as partial evidence, there is again reference to a phased decline: ... plurimae turbae, seditiones et ad postremum bella civilia orta sunt, ...

Surprisingly, however, it has been customary to compare, with regard to fr. 16 and Praef. 9, a picture of "sharp antithesis" in Sallust to a "phasing of decline" in Livy. Livy may simply have further improved on what very probably was already there.

The parallel study of the two passages must be placed on a new basis. Non paulatim, ut antea in Sallust corresponds to labente [labante] ... lapsi sint in Livy. The pattern that develops is similar. Primo and deinde in the Livian text echo the probable phasing of decline in Sallust. Paulatim occurs in both texts. On the other hand, tum ire coeperint praecipites... clearly picks up Sallust's ex quo tempore maiorum mores... torrentis modo praecipitati.

The image of rapid decline in both passages is that of a swollen river (Vretska IV 218). The distinction of a new phase by Livy in this last period of Roman history (donec ad haec tempora) is understandable. It is the new perspective gained by a man who started writing shortly before 30 B.C. as compared to someone like Sallust who embarked on

---

74 See Klingner I 179 n. 1; Wille 72
his historiographical activity probably in the late forties.

Because of two textual problems in the first part of the second half of Praef. 9 we are unable to grasp the full impact of the Livian imagery. If we read labante, Livy's image is that of "a house tottering, breaking up, and collapsing". If we read labente, the image is that of "a large object beginning to slip downhill and gathering momentum for the final plunge". The reading of the MSS is probably preferable to the emendation, because it is echoed in lapsi sint and because it gives more movement to the passage. On the other hand, the MSS have dissidentes (or dissidentis) = "falling apart", which was emended to desidentes = "subsiding". Bayet suggests discedentis.

On the whole, the somewhat irregular construction of the second half of Praef. 9 underlines again what has been seen before (above p.81), Livy's emotional involvement, whether real or a literary affectation, with the crisis of the res publica.

A key word in the first phase of the decline in the Livian passage is disciplina. Since we do not possess the corresponding part of the Sallustian text, it is not possible to say whether it comes from him or not. In the A.U.C. it is a very important word occurring 68 times.

---

75 On this and the next textual problem see Ogilvie
76 For its importance see Walsh I 381 ff.
The decline of military discipline must have been a major theme of Book 43, describing the events of 171-169 B.C. (Luce II 267 f.). There may may be a link here with the dating of the beginning of the moral decline in Livy.

Concerning the role of disciplina in Sallust, the following episode from the Jugurthine war should be mentioned. When Metellus arrived in Africa (44), complete disintegration of discipline was evident in the army, which had been under the command of Sp. Albinus. His first job was to restore the ancestral military discipline: ... non prius bellum attingere quam maiorum disciplina milites laborare coegisset (44, 3). His action set the basis for military victory in Africa. His first victory by the river Mothul was greeted in Rome with great rejoicing: Interim Romae gaudium ingens ortum cognitis Metelli rebus, ut seque et exercitum more maiorum gereret (51).

Finally, it is possible that the presence of disciplina in Praef. 9 is attributable to the influence of a Cicero-nian passage on a very similar theme: Sensim hanc consuetudinem et disciplinam iam antea minuebamus, post vero Sullae victoriam penitus amisimus (De off. 2, 27).

77 For a definition of disciplina see Mazza 115 n. 18.
78 See Koestermann ad loc. He cites a similar instance from Livy 28, 24, 5.
79 For disciplina in Sallust see Pöschl I 38.
The part donec... perventum est represents the final phase in a series of imitations. It is first found in Thucydides (1, 70, 9), in a passage where the Corinthians warn the Lacedaemonians of Athenian imperialism: ὅσις εὖ τις αὐτοῦς ἐξουσίων φαίνει περικάκαιον ἐπὶ τῷ μὴ τῷ αὐτοῦ ἔχειν ἑυρίσκων μὴ τοὺς ἄλλους ἄνθρωπος εἶναι, ὅρθος ἄν εἴποι.

Sallust (fr. 16 adeo iuventus...) absorbed the Thucydidean passage into his pattern of decline imbued with Roman moralizing, focusing specifically on his favorite theme of the corruption of youth and on the motif of destructive behavior. Finally, Livy widened the theme, still in the context of Roman moralizing thought, so that it would include not just a corrupt iuventus but the whole Roman people, in order to describe what Leeman (IV 208) calls "den Tiefpunkt der bisherigen römischen Geschichte".

---

80 See Latte 17
81 On Sallust's concern with this theme see Vretska IV 166.
82 Cf. the discussion on perundì perendique omnia (Praef. 12).
Section 10

Drexler (II 172-3) calls Valerius Maximus' collection of *exempla* "der adaequateste Ausdruck des römischen Geschichtsbewusstseins". According to the same scholar, history to the Romans was the Golden Book of paradigmatic deeds of the national heroes serving as models for the descendants. He considers the A.U.C a long series of *exempla* and the Catilinarian conspiracy a single great *exemplum* of vice (Catiline) and virtue (Cato and Caesar).

The historiography of Sallust and Tacitus, according to Drexler, is

> eine notwendige Konsequenz dieser Geschichtsauffassung, dass man die *exempla* aus ihrer zeitlichen Ordnung, in der sie ja nicht mit letzten Notwendigkeit standen, herausnahm und sie nach sachlichen Geschichtspunkten ordnete.

One should also point out, however, that this type of historiography described by Drexler may easily degenerate into a mere succession of episodes or portraits of heroes, which is not uncommon in lesser historians. Needless to say, on the other hand, that patriotism, moralizing and didacticism are Roman attitudes strictly related to this *exempla*-oriented historiography, as well as deep pessimism. The latter, one of the fundamental characteristics of Roman

---

83 For a discussion on *exemplum* with good bibliography see Lind 11 ff.

84 As e.g. in Velleius Paterculus; for a discussion in his defense see Woodman 28 ff.
historical thought, as seen during the analysis of sect. 9, results in part from the constant comparison of the attitudes of the present with the noble exempla of the past.

According to Livy the usefulness of the study of history lies in the fact that it offers "examples of every kind set out on a conspicuous monument":

Hoc illud est praecipue in cognitione rerum salubre ac frugiferum, omnis te exempli documenta in instri posita monumento intueri; inde tibi tuaeque rei publicae quod imitare capias, inde foedum inceptu foedum exitu quod vites (Praef. 10).

Livy's statement about omnis exempli documenta in in-lustri posita monumento recalls many interesting parallels, like the shield of Aeneas, the statues of Roman duces dedicated by Augustus in the exedrae and colonnades of his forum (Suet. Aug. 31, 5) and the parva Troia of Book 3 of the Aeneid. Most importantly, however, it recalls the ancestral imagines placed in the atrium of Roman houses, this concrete representation of exempla constantly present in the eyes of the living, a "visible symbol of the continuing and watchful presence of their forefathers directing their own life". The imagines could be seen as an

85 For a discussion of the terms in this statement see Ferrero I 20 ff.; Foster; Ogilvie ad loc.

86 For all these parallels see Oppermann 172 ff. They are here cited purely for the interest they present and are not intended to link the Praefatio to any specific date or ideology.

87 Collingwood 34; cf. Klingner II 2 ff.
expression of the Roman historical consciousness of continuity. It is this last parallel which provides a striking link between Praef. 10 and Jug. 4, 5-7. In ch. 4 of the Jugurtha Sallust focuses upon the theme of the usefulness of history. He spends some time defending his historiographical otium as the only course open to him in view of the corruption of political life (sects. 3-4). He concludes sect. 4 of this chapter claiming that maliusque commodum ex otio meo quam ex aliorum negotiis rei publicae venturum.

Then he adds:

Nam saepe ego audivi Q. Maximum, P. Scipionem, praeterea civitatis nostrae praecarios viros solitos ita dicere, quom maiorum imagines intuerentur vehementis-sume sibi animum ad virtutem ascendi: scilicet non ceram illam neque figuram tantam vim in sese habere, sed memoria rerum gestarum.

What Sallust does here is set forth the usefulness of history by drawing a parallel with the emulation of ancestral imagines. The opening of Praefatio 10, placed as it is in the midst of Sallustian reminiscences (sects. 9-12), must be considered an imitation of the above passage. There are even verbal parallels: intueri-intuerentur. No other Roman historian describes the usefulness of history in these terms. And as one looks deeper, he discovers that the affinities between the two passages go beyond the initial impression. Indeed, the rest of Praef. 10 follows closely Jug. 4, 7: quod imitere capias picks up probitate et industria... contendet; quod vites corresponds to
divitiis et sumptibus... [contendet].

On the other hand, Livy treats the borrowing from Sallust with conspicuous originality. In the first place, he underlines the idea of completeness, in this case the inclusion of both good and bad exempla (omnis exempli documenta), in a more definite way than Sallust. He also establishes a careful balance between these two types of exempla. Sallust, on the other hand, both here and in Cat. 8, understands the commodum of history as resulting primarily from the memoria virtutis. In the passage cited above the bad exempla enter into the picture in a way which may be called "parenthetical" (Steidle 110). His statement somehow resembles Tacitus' ne virtutes sileantur (Ann. 3, 15, 1) (Vretska II 159). Of course, both Sallust andTacitus eventually place greater emphasis on the prava exempla than on the virtutes. In effect, Livy's attitude is not very different from that of the other two historians. In the next section, as will be seen later, he throws the balance between the good and the bad exempla overboard by stressing the former. And, like Sallust and Tacitus, he spends more time in the course of his work treating the days of decline than the early days when Rome was bonis exemplis ditori (Praef. 11).
Both Sallust and Livy give a high place to historiography. The former actually ranks it above political activity. This is surprising for a tradition that considered historiography a leisure-activity for senators, as it appears from Cato fr. 2 P: clarorum hominum atque magnorum non minus otii quam negotii rationem exstare oportere. But who exactly is the beneficiary of its usefulness and how hopeful are the two historians about the actual effectiveness of their work? As far as the former issue is concerned, Sallust speaks specifically of the res publica, whose crisis is also the determining factor in his decision to take up the writing of history. Livy, always on closer terms with his readers than Sallust, addresses a direct invitation to them: inde tibi tuaeque rei publicae quod imitere capias, inde foedum inceptu foedum exitu quod vites. The historian is probably thinking of the later Romans rather than the non-Romans. The balance which he establishes between the noble and the base exempla is properly addressed to a Roman audience. But in the next section he will have to defend such a statement against foreigners.

With regard to the latter issue, both historians, in spite if their deep pessimism about the present, appear to imply that the exempla of history found in their work

89Jug. 4, 4 maiusque commodum... See Tiffou 241.
can affect the future, either by encouraging or discouraging imitation. Sallust appears to be even more confident than Livy when he speaks about the commodum... rei publicae venturum. The claim that Jug. 4, 7 actually undermines the previous statement is not necessarily true. This passage is simply describing that well-known situation of moral decline and of disregard for the noble exempla maiorum which Sallust has just declared that his history may help to change. The question is, of course, if either Livy or Sallust ever declare that their effort is beginning to bear fruit. As far as we can tell from the surviving part of their work, the answer is no. If this should be the criterion on which to base a judgement about their hopeful programmatic statements, then such statements might as well be viewed as pessimistic.

---

90 On this claim see Leeman II 47; Koestermann ad loc.
Sections 11-12

It has already been pointed out (p.110) that these sections are heavily dependent on Sallust. With regard to stylistic features, Skard (II 7 n. 2) notes the following: the pair *avaritia-luxuria* comes from Sallust, and in Livy it is found again only in Cato's speech (34, 4, 2); the alliterating pair *per luxum atque libidinem* is also Sallustian (he compares *lubido atque luxuria* in Cat. 28, 4 and Jug. 89, 8); finally, the pair *paupertati ac parsimoniae* is also found again only in 34, 4, 13 (Cato's speech).

Leeman (IV 202) compares the sect. *nuper... invexere* with *igitur ex divitiis iuventutem luxuria atque avaritia cum superbia invasere* (Cat. 12, 2).

But the Sallustian influence extends beyond these elements and, on the other hand, what has been noticed needs further clarification. *Per* with the accusative as a prepositional phrase of manner (*per luxum atque libidinem*) is rare in Cicero, not so common in Livy but very frequent in Sallust. A pair of nouns joined with *atque* or *et* or *ac* is also characteristic of Sallustian style (e.g. *per luxum et ignaviam: Jug. 2, 4*). Alliteration (*paupertati ac parsimoniae, tantus ac tam diu, per luxum atque libidinem, pereundi perendique*) is common to both

---

91 Fighiera 163; Kähnast 365.
historians and carries an archaic and poetic flavor.

But the presence of atque as a connective of alliterating 92 pairs, in combination with many typical Sallustian words, lends it overtones which are more Sallustian than Livian.

Livy shows himself a master of the style and thought of his predecessor by composing a text whose general features are Sallustian though none of the individual words is found in Sallust in exactly the same combination. The pair avaritia-luxuria, for instance, is found only in the Catiline but always in the form luxuria atque avaritia (5, 8; 12, 2; 52, 7; 52, 22; the variant luxu atque avaritia occurs in Hist. 1 fr. 16). Livy here writes avaritia luxuriaque and in 34, 4, 2 avaritia et luxuria. The clause nec ubi tantus ac tam diu paupertati ac parsimoniae honos fuerit is probably fashioned after such phrases as neque virtuti honos datur (Jug. 3, 1); paupertas probro haberi, divitiae honorii esse coepere (Cat. 12, 1-2). The phrase per luxum atque libidinem, in spite of its Sallustian flavor, is not found anywhere in Sallust. One of Sallust's favorite clichés is self-destruction and the destruction of everything else around: Cat. 36, 4 fuere tamen cives, qui semque rempublicam perditum irent;

---

92 Fighiera 252; Kühnast 330; Kroll I 300; Skard I 72; Skard II 37; Bolaffi II 95.

93 Kroll I 301; Fighiera 216.
Cat. 37, 9 rei publicae iuxta ac sibi consuluisse. Livy's variant is desiderium pereundi perdendique omnia. Finally, though Livy has replaced the invasere of Cat. 12, 2 with invexere, the sound and prefix recall the original.

The suspicion is there, however, that Livy may in reality be twisting Sallust's thought by these changes. It will, therefore, by necessary to look at the content of sects. 11-12. The main thrust of them is that avaritia and luxuria are essentially bad influences from abroad, imported (immigraverint) at a very late date. Prior to that, there was a long period of boni mores, unsurpassed by any other nation on earth.

The use of immigraverint calls for a few general remarks. Perhaps the most ironical aspect of Roman imperialism is that the blame for the decline of the mores maiorum was placed on the shoulders of the conquered nations. Not only did the latter suffer military defeat and occupation but they were also held accountable for the Sittenverfall of their conquerors. The Romans claimed either that corruption was introduced into Rome from abroad, especially the East, or that the destruction of an enemy, Carthage primarily, the disappearance of the metus hostilis and the ensuing peace caused them to undergo a moral decline. This already shaky argument is carried by Seneca

---

94 On the historicity of such views see Lintott.
the Philosopher to an absurd point, when he claims (De ira 3, 18, 1) that even *ira* was a *vitium adventicium*. The second great irony is that the Romans never bothered to debate the historicity of such views but their only concern was to establish the exact date when the moral decline began. The dates seem to fall primarily in the first half of the second century B.C., the time of Rome's expansion into the East. The general pattern is, as in Livy, that a long period of *boni mores* was followed by a sudden decline.

The first extant, fully expanded version of the theme is found in Sallust (Archaeology of the Catiline, Jugurtha 41-42, Hist. 1 frs. 7, 11, 12, 13, 16). The picture which he presents in the two monographs shows, in broad lines, a moral Golden Age which was upset by the removal of the *metus hostilis*, i.e. Carthage, in 146 B.C. Peace and prosperity brought decadence. This date is later than that given by most authors. As a matter of fact, Sallust places

---

95 A detailed examination of all the dates can be found in Knoche II.

96 The Prologue of the Histories will be studied separately.

97 On this concept in antiquity see Fuchs II. It can be applied not only to peoples but also to individuals. Curtius Rufus explains through it the deterioration of the character of Alexander the Great. With regard to Sallust's dating of the decline, modern debate has centered primarily on its sources, its historicity, and on Roman foreign policy towards Carthage in the Second century:
the date even closer to the present by suggesting that avaritia, and mainly luxuria, spread in Rome chiefly at
the time of the return of Sulla's army from Asia and his
dictatorship, that is, around 83-82 B.C.:  

Sed postquam L. Sulla armis recepta re publica
bonis initiiis malos eventus habuit, rapere omnes, tra-
here, domum alius, alius agros cupere, neque modum
neque modestiam victores habere, foeda crudelitatem
in civis facinora facere. huc accedebat, quod L. Sulla
exercitum, quem in Asia duceret, quo sibi fidum
faceret, contra morem maiorum luxurioso nimisque
literaliter habuerat. loca amoenis, voluptaria facile
in otio ferocium militum animos molliverant. ibi primum
insuavit exercitus populi Romani amare potare, signa
tabulas pictas vasa caelata mirari, ea privatim et
publice rapere, delubra spoliare, sacra profanaque omnia
polluere.

The issue of Livy's dating of the beginning of the
moral decline is complex. One view, perhaps the most
widespread, is that he ascribes the crisis to the return
of Manlius Vulso's army from Asia in 187 B.C.:  

luxuriae enim peregrinae origo ab exercitu Asiatico
invecta in urbem est. iii primum lectoris aeratos, vestem
stragulam pretiosam, et quae tum magnificae supellecti-
lis habebantur, monopodia et abacos Romam adduxerunt.

The parallel with the Sallustian passage cited above
suggests that Livy is pushing Sallust's date further back
into the past. But the closest parallel to the Sulla

See Klingner I; Gelzer; Knoche I; Hampl; Hoffmann; Bonamen-
tte.

98 See Earl I 14-15; Vretska IV ad loc.
99 See Lintott 628 ff.; Luce II 250 ff.
100 Compare the invexere of the Praefatio.
passage, very probably a direct influence from Sallust, is found in 25, 40, 1-2 and refers to the capture of Syracuse by Marcellus in 212 B.C.:

... ornamenta urbis, signa tabulasque quibus abundabant Syracusae, Romam devenit, hostium quidem illa spolia et parta belli iure; ceterum inde primum initium mirandi Graecarum artium opera licentiaeque hinc sacra profanaque omnia volgo spoliandi factum est,...

Livy again seems to be suggesting that Sallust's dating had been a very late one. Furthermore, in 34, 1-7 he describes a debate between Cato the Elder and L. Valerius about the repeal of the lex Oppia, which had been passed in 215 B.C. ad coercendam luxuriam muliebrem. One should assume that luxuria had spread in Rome some time before that law was introduced. The direct reminiscences of Praef. 11-12 in Cato's speech (cf. p. 133 above) may constitute evidence about the date of the beginning of the moral decline in these sections of the Praefatio.

Finally, examples of avaritia can be found even in Rome's earliest history, such as the case in which Camillus was condemned because of his attempt to deprive the plebs of some of the booty they had acquired from the capture of Veii (5, 32, 8-9).

Nuper and tam serae in Praef. 11-12 are vague references. The former, however, is used three more times in

\[101\] For more examples see Lintott 630.
Livy's work, in connection with events closely connected with the present. The similarity between Cat. 12, 2 (igitur ex divitiis iuventutem luxuriam atque avaritiam cum superbiam invaseres) and Praef. 12 points to the time of Sulla's dictatorship. Finally, tum in Praef. 9 may also refer to the same time (pp. 122-3 above).

There is no reason to see the conflict between the senatorial tradition and the tradition that emphasized the fall of Carthage as a turning point continuing into the work of Livy, as Luce (II 250 ff.) suggests. We have evidence to assume that 146 was a capital year for Livy, too (cf. Walsh vi 9). It is mentioned both in Orosius and in Florus 1, 47, 2 cuilus aetatis superioris centum anni sancti pi...dumque Poenorum hostium imminens metus disciplinam veterem continent... The mention of disciplina refers us directly to Praef. 9.

It can be concluded at this point that Livy and Sallust agree to a large extent that the spread of avaritiam and luxuriam in Rome was due to external influence. With regard to the dating of the beginning of the decline, there are two possibilities:

I. nuper and tam serae refer to dates earlier than those of Sallust in the monographs on the basis of the following evidence:

102 See Steele 36.
1. direct Sallustian reminiscences in Livian passages suggest that Livy is actually correcting the dates of his predecessor by moving them back.

2. echoes of the Praefatio in Cato's speech may be an indication that Livy is thinking of 215 B.C. (time of the introduction of the lex Oppia) or even earlier.

3. the linkage of the beginning of decline to the relaxing of disciplina in sect. 9 and the emphasis on decline in military discipline in Book 43 may point to a date around 170 B.C. (p. 125 above).

II. nuper and tam sereae refer to dates contemporary with those of Sallust in the monographs on the basis of the following evidence:

1. Florus places the beginning of the relaxing of disciplina in 146 B.C.

2. nuper in Livy is used for dates well within the first century B.C.

3. Sallustian reminiscences in Praef. 9 and 12 refer us to the time of Sulla.

Consequently, the suggestions that nuper and tam sereae represent dates later than those of Sallust in the monographs and that Livy engages here in a polemic against the dating of the beginning of the decline found in his predecessor should be excluded.

One of the most widespread views, however, is that sects. 11-12 are really targeted not against the monographs but against the Histories, which presumably display a much darker picture of earlier Roman history. Such an assumption raises these questions: (1) is the portrayal of

103 See Amundsen 34; La Penna V 301; cf. also Vretska I 199; Kajanto II 64.
earlier Roman history in the *Histories* distinctly different from that of the monographs? (2) was the change in Sallust's views radical enough to provoke Livy's protest? (3) is the depiction of earlier Roman history in the Prologue of the *Histories* essentially different from what we find in the *A.U.C.?*

In the first place, in view of the fragmentary state of the Prologue, it is not easy to reach any firm conclusions on these issues. Statements out of context can be utterly misleading. Second, there is considerable disagreement among Sallustian scholars on the question of the alleged increase in Sallust's pessimism. There are those who see in the Prologue a total, desperate pessimism. Others accept the idea of a change but object that it is not very radical. W. Avenarius, for instance, points out that there are still optimistic statements in the Prologue and that the *mores maiorum* continue to be paradigmatic. Finally, there are scholars who completely reject the idea of a development in Sallust's pessimism. Earl (I 42) comments: "... the central point remains. The period of idealization is limited but the idealization

104 Survey and discussion in W. Avenarius 68-71; La Penna I 109-115.

105 See e.g. Klingner I; Tiffou 311-23. At the other end is Egermann's optimistic view of all three Prologues.

106 W. Avenarius *ibid.*; La Penna I *ibid.*
continues". Some point to passages in the *Catiline*, which indicate, in their view, that Sallust had had the same degree of pessimism about earlier Roman history from the very beginning.

We should be reminded, at this point, that the issue under consideration is not modern but inherited from antiquity. Saint Augustine in the *De civ. Dei* (2, 18 Dombart-Kalb) deliberately plays what he sees as a picture of extreme idealization of early Roman history in the *Catiline* against what he perceives as its opposite in the Prologue of the *Histories*. Now, if we possessed the Prologue in its entirety, his view would be just one among many others. Also, in the light of the polemic nature of the *De civ. Dei*, its significance would remain within the context of the work itself. The irony is, however, that we owe the major fragments of the Prologue (11, 12, 16) to Saint Augustine and that these passages were selected not only as weaponry against the pagans but, more importantly, on the criterion of an assumed evolution in Sallust's thought,

---

107 See Steidle 13-14; Vretska IV passim. Important passages are *Cat*. 6, 7; 9, 1; 10, 3; 37, 10-11.

108 Cf. *Retractions* 2, 69. The work was written after the sack of Rome by Alaric in 410, in order to answer the charges that the Christian religion was in effect responsible for the disaster. In Books 1-5 the author uses the works of ancient Roman writers as evidence that the decline of Rome had started before the Christian era. On the sources of the work, including Sallust, see Maier chs. 6-7; specifically on Sallust see Klingner I; Bolaffi I 237.
which we have no means to go back and check. It would be
wrong to claim that Saint Augustine deliberately distorts.
But one cannot ignore the existence of a vicious circle
when analyzing fragments whose selection was motivated by
a very specific ancient interpretation of a text which in
its greater part is lost to us.

In the light of all this, it is very hard to answer
questions (1) and (2) above with a categorical "yes". The
theory of a radical change in Sallust's concept of Roman
history remains very questionable. Even on the basis of
what can be recovered from the scantly fragments we possess,
the *mores maiorum* continue, within certain limits, to be
paradigmatic. Frs. 11, 12 and 16 have essentially the
same point of departure as Praef. 11.

Though the theory of a radical change in Sallust's
thought should be rejected, it is, on the other hand, un-
realistic to claim that the depiction of earlier Roman
history in this Prologue is exactly the same as in the
*Archaeology* of the Catiline. Most conspicuous, whether in
its novelty or in its emphasis, is the appearance of *discordia*
in Rome no longer after the fall of Carthage but at the
very beginning:

Nam *injuriae validiorum et ob eas discessio plebis
a patribus aliaque dissensiones domi fuere iam inde
a principio... (fr. 11).

---

109 See the correct observations of Pasoli ( I 32-4).
Nobis praeae dissectiones vitio humani ingenii evenere, quod inquiex atque indomitum semper inter certamina libertatis aut gloriae aut dominationis agit (fr. 7)

There is nothing more "Livian" than the picture of early Rome torn apart by dissectiones. From the expulsion of the last of the Tarquini to the voting of the Licinian-Sextian rogations in 367 (and even later) Roman history develops as an alternation of externa bella and internal discordiae, the former functioning as metus hostilis, whose elimination brings about the latter. Livy sums it up himself in the Preface to Book 6: foris bella, domi seditiones. The pattern is so frequent that it becomes boring. But it is essentially not much different from what we find in Hist. I fr. 11. And even during the regal period, the episode of the murder of Servius Tullius by Tullia and Tarquinius (1, 46-48) strongly emphasizes the worst in human nature (vitio humani generis in fr. 7 above) in a struggle for dominatio. From Book 2, 23 onwards discordia in Rome is at work with increasing force. Livy may not 110 speak about the workings of ambitio, as Sallust does, having kept himself out of the power struggle of the res publica, and may choose to describe the conflict in psychological terms like odium, ira or furor. But he certainly shares his predecessor's great concern about the danger that discordiae and certamina represent for the res publica,

110 Ogilvie (24) attributes polemic intent to the absence of ambitio from the Praefatio.
as can be seen from the following passage:

Inde ad Veiens bellum prefecti, quo undique ex Etruria auxilia convenerant, non tam Veientium gratia concitata quam quod in spem ventum erat discordia intestina dissolvi rem Romanam posse. Principesque in omnium Etruriae populorum conciliis fremebant aeternas opes esse Romanas nisi inter semet ipsi seditionibus saeviant; id unum venenum, eam labem civitatibus opulentis repertam ut magna imperia mortalia essent (2, 44, 7).

This passage finds an echo in the "prophecy" of Hannibal at the end of the second Punic war (30, 44, 8):

Nulla magna civitas diu quiescere potest; si foris hostem non habet, domi invenit, ut praevaclada corpora ab externis causis tuta videntur, suis ipsa viribus onerantur.

The verbal and thematic parallels of this passage with Praef. 4, bring us back to our point of departure. The theme of discordia is, therefore, present in the Praefatio, along with that of avaritia and luxuria.

Livy's Preface to Book II (1, 6 Dissipatae res nondum adultae discordia forent,...) and the conclusion of the Alexander digression (9, 19, 17 Mille acies graviores quam Macedonum atque Alexandri avertit avertetque, modo sit perpetuus huius qua vivimus pacis amor et civilis cura concordiae) again underline his concern about the discordiae.

In one instance (2, 57, 3), he uses unmistakably Sallustian phraseology. Here are the words in which the Senate warns Appius Claudius:

Ab Appio petitur ut tantam consularem maiestatem esse vellet quanta esse in concordi civitate posset; dum consules tribunique ad se quisque omnia trahant,
nihil relictum esse virium in medio; distractam laceratamque rem publicam;

And here is the well-known passage from the \textit{Jugurtha} (41, 5) which must have been known to Livy:

\begin{quote}
Namque coeipere nobilitas dignitatem, populus libertatem in lubidinem vertere, sibi quisque ducere trahere rapere. ita omnia in duas partes abstracta sunt, res publica, quae media fuerat, dilacerata.\footnote{For a comparison of this passage with Thuc. 3, 82, 8 see \cite{Perruchat}.}

When it came to the preservation of the \textit{res publica}, Sallust, Livy and Cicero \footnote{Cf. \textit{De off.} 1, 85 Qui autem partii civium consulunt, partem neglegunt, rem perniciosissimam in civitatem inducunt, seditionem atque discordiam; ex quo eventit, ut ali populares, aii studiosi optimi cuiusque videantur, pauci universorum.} \footnote{On \textit{res publica} understood as \textit{Gemeinnutz} see Drexler III.} adopted very similar attitudes, \footnote{Cf. \textit{De off.} 1, 57 and Pro \textit{Mil.} 24.} regardless of "party" allegiance. There is here a curious mixture of partisanship and non-partisanship, which is understandable only within the context of Roman thought and Roman historiography.

Consequently, as far as the beginning of \textit{discordiae} is concerned, Livy would hardly be the man to criticize Sallust for placing it too early in Roman history in the Prologue of the \textit{Histories}. What about \textit{avaritia} and \textit{luxuria}, Livy's primary concern in \textit{Praef.} 11-12? As far as it can be recovered from the fragments we possess, the picture...
is almost unchanged. There is only one reference to *avaritia* in the period prior to the destruction of Carthage.

But the significance of its presence is offset or balanced by the following factors: (1) though Sallust suggests that *avaritia* existed in Rome before 146 B.C. (*fr. 11 At discordia et avaritia... post Carthaginis excidium maxime aucta sunt*), he does no elaborate and there is no way to determine if it was there *a principio*; (2) in Cat. 9, 1 he speaks of Rome's Golden Age as a period in which there was *cordia maxima, minuma avaritia* (it is hard to tell if *minuma* means "least" or none at all"); (3) Livy's account, as seen before, projects the appearance of *avaritia* into Rome's early history. As far as the rest of Sallust's theory is concerned, the historian still assigns an important role to the destruction of Carthage (*frs. 11, 12*) and to Sulla's dictatorship for the spread of *luxuria* and *avaritia* in Rome (*fr. 16*). Certainly, the claim that the period between 202 and 149 was characterized by *optimis moribus* et *maxima concordia* is both unhistorical and contrary to what we find in Livy's account of the same period. But this is not relevant to the present study. The important thing is the idealization, since the claim in the *Præfatio* is that *avaritia* and *luxuria* were imported *nuper* and *tam serae*.

Question (3) above (p. 141), therefore, has to be answered in the negative.
The evidence collected so far about Livy’s dating of the decline in sects. 11-12 can lead to the following alternative conclusions. First, nuper and tam serae applied to the spread of avaritia and luxuria in Rome represent Livy’s own dates as found in the extant part of the A.U.C. These dates are in general earlier than those of Sallust in the monographs. One case of avaritia in the Histories cannot be dated precisely. Livy’s trend is to reject Sallust’s dates as being too late. If this conclusion is adopted, then nuper and tam serae should be viewed as having a relative value, functioning, that is, within the context of the A.U.C. Any connection with Sallust’s dates should be excluded. The Sallustian reminiscences would serve to bring to the attention of the reader that the theme of moral decline had been admirably treated by Livy’s predecessor. The second option is that nuper and tam serae refer to a time after 146 B.C., especially the period of Sulla’s dictatorship. In this case, Livy would be paying Sallust a tribute by adopting his dating.

If the latter conclusion were preferred, we would be faced with the problem of explaining a self-contradiction in Livy concerning the dating of the decline in the Praefatio and outside it. One hypothesis is that he later changed his mind, but this does not seem very likely. As suggested in ch. I, the Praefatio was written after Book 1.
Livy was now in the midst of planning and preparation for Books 2-5. But, as noted before (p. 138 above), avaritia makes its appearance already in the first pentad. On the other hand, it is possible that Livy is here expressing himself in the spirit of a historiographical tradition, which, as pointed out in section 10 (p.130 above), used programmatic statements to place the emphasis on the memoria virtutis, though the rest of the work displayed a different picture. In this case, Livy would be following the Sallustian precedent.

But there is also a third possibility. Sections 11-12 may be a polemic against those foreigners who discredited Rome's earliest history, like sect. 7 above. They would have, in other words, a different function from the descriptions of decline in the rest of the work. Livy would be showing the bright side of things, leaving the other to the Romans. In terms of propaganda, there is a difference between him and Sallust. Livy is speaking with the air of someone whose native city acquired Roman citizenship only in 49 B.C. and can thus play the role of a propagandist and defender of Rome with greater flexibility and from a more advantageous position than Sallust.

We can now turn again to the Prologue of Dionysius' Antiquititates, which contains both the attacks against Rome found in Greek sources and Dionysius' reply, and compare
it with Praef. 11:

Πρέπει να γράφεται παρά το τόσο "Ελλησπόντον ολύσαν δεξὶ πάσιν ή παλαιά τῆς Ῥωμαίων πόλεως ἱστορία, καὶ ὁδές τινὲς οὐκ ἄλλητες,
... οὐ δὲ εὐθέως δὲ καὶ οἰκωτούσην καὶ τὴν ἄλλην ἀρετὴν ἐπὶ τὴν ἄτανταν ἡγεμονίαν σὺν χρόνῳ πραγματεύσῃ, ἀλλὰ οὐ αὐτοματωμὸν τινα καὶ τῆς δόλων...
(Dion. Antig. 1, 4, 13)

... μηρίδαι ήνεγκεν ἄνδραν ἀρετὰς εὐθὰς ἐξ ἄρχης μετὰ τὸν οἰκνο-σμὸν, ἐν οὗτ' εὐσεβεστέρους εὔτε ἐκκλησίαν εὔτε ὑποῦσαν πλείον
νοί παρὰ πάντα τὸν βίον χρησιμένους οὐδὲ γε τὰ τολέμα κρεώττος
ἀγωνιστὰς οὐδεμία πόλεις ήνεγκεν...
(Dion. Antig. 1, 5, 15-16)

nulla unquam res publica nec maior nec sanctior
nec bonis exemplis ditior fuit, nec in quam civitatem
tam serae avaritía luxuriaque immigraverint, nec ubi
tantus ac tam diu paupertati ac parsimónias honos fuit.

Praef. 11 and the passage above it display the same format. They may also have the same target. Since Dionysius wrote this passage in 8 B.C., direct influence by Livy on him should not be excluded. One more case of parallel passages was mentioned above (p. 169). Of course, it is always possible that Dionysius found the format in Livy but supplied the intent himself.

The possibility that sects. 11-12 represent a polemic against the Greeks who attacked Rome's early history appears, therefore, to be a likely one. And perhaps the most remarkable thing about this polemic is that Livy is using here Sallustian language, the same kind of language he used in sects. 1-3 against the Antiquarians.
Section 13

Livy has again been dragged into his interminable complaints about the present crisis. But the conclusion of the Praefatio calls for a different spirit:

Sed querellae, ne tum quidem gratae futurae cum forsitan necessariae erunt, ab initio certe tantae ordiendae rei absint: cum bonis potius omnibus votisque et precationibus deorum dearumque, si, ut po-etis, nobis quoque mos esset, libertius inciperemus, ut oris tantum operis successus prosperos darent.

It is first important to correct a frequent misinterpretation of these lines. According to certain scholars, they are targeted against the complaints of Sallust's Prologues. It should, however, be clear from the context that the mention of querellae here involves self-criticism. Sed functions as an antithetic transition from the previous sentence, where Livy paints a grim picture of present day Roman morals. Also, in a broader function, it recalls all the other instances so far, in which the historian has voiced his dark pessimism and expressed strong disapproval of the climate of moral disintegration reigning in Rome. In short, in an openly ironic gesture he places ab initio at the end of a long sequence of lamentations. And the observant reader cannot fail to notice that Livy's last moment self-checking is done in a Sallustian fashion. Indeed, after having harshly censured in Jug. 4, 7-8 the

114 See Leeman IV 205; V 193; Pasoli I 38; Canfora II 148.
corrupt practices and moral decline of his days, Sallust restrains himself in this manner: *verum ego liberius altiusque processi, dum me civitatis morum piget taedetque.* Nunc ad inceptum redeo. The substance of what Livy is saying is precisely *verum ego liberius... processi.* In pouring out his remonstrances, he was carried away, just as Sallust had been. Both historians hasten to correct the situation—in the context, of course, of literary affectation. But Livy knows that it is too late to completely efface the gloomy impression of the preceding sections. This is one reason why he uses the imperfect subjunctive: *... libentius inciperemus,*...

Livy projects the pessimism of the Praefatio into the rest of the work. At some point, he says, lamentations may be necessary. We have already noted that all his utterances about the present in the extant part of the work are invariably pessimistic. His effort in the Praefatio is to inject in his statement a tone of vague uncertainty: *Sed querellae,... cum forsitan necessariae erunt,...* But this is done for the reasons explained above. The first complaints occur already in Book 3 (p. 119 above).

Livy characterizes his complaints as "unpleasant". To whom—to himself or to his audience? The latter seems to me a more likely possibility. It underlines Livy's constant communication with his public throughout the
Præfatio, an attitude different from that of Sallust. It also picks up a theme from sect. 4, where it was pointed out that his relation to his readers is not based on delectatio. It takes us back to sect. 10, where the aim of the writing of history was found to be "usefulness", not "pleasure". Let no one be misled by the fact that his public seems actually to like contemporary accounts, as the historian told us in sect. 4. Livy is here talking not about theme but about tone and attitude. No audience in the world would have liked being systematically censured for corrupt morals.

The historian concludes the Præfatio on a note of piety. It is a traditional Roman gesture at the beginning of an immense and important undertaking. We shall vainly look for something similar in Sallust. It is not because Sallust lacks piety, but because the period he treats hardly encourages rejoicing. His only comment can be nunc ad inceptum redeo (Jug. 4, 9). Livy would probably have shared his feelings.

Does Livy have reason to rejoice at this moment? It has been noted on several occasions before that the historian eventually carries his anxiety into the early history of Rome. But in the Præfatio he can afford to be optimistic about this period of Roman history (cf. sect. 5). After all, its positive features outweigh the negative ones. It
is not comparable to _haec tempora quibus nec vitia nostra nec remediam pati possumus_. Also, as pointed out above (p. 120), the broad idealization of the past is a major characteristic of Roman historical thought. The schematized opposition past-present proves stronger than the details of the narrative. In spite of Marcius Coriolanus and Manlius Capitolinus _mores maiorum_ invariably means one thing: noble examples.

Livy takes care not to overstep the _lex generis_: _si, ut poetis, nobis quoque mos esset_. Notice the caution. The Preface of Valerius Maximus eloquently shows the gulf that separates Livy and his time from later writers. Valerius Maximus retains the broad format of Praef. 13 but alters its substance. He turns a contrary-to-fact condition into a real one and addresses a direct invocation to Tiberius as a divinity on earth:

> te igitur huic coepto, penes quem hominum deorumque consensus maris ac terrae regimen esse voluit, certissima salus patriae, Caesar, invoco,... nam si prisci oratores ab Iove optimo maximo beneorsi sunt, si excellentissimi vates a numine aliquo principia traxerunt, mea parvitas eo iustius ad favorem tuum decucurrerit, quo cetera divinitas opinione colligitur, tua prae senti fide paterno avitoque sideri par videtur, quorum eximio fulgore multum caerimonii nostris in- clitae claritatis accessit: reliquis enim deos accepimus, Caesares dedimus.

Ogilvie (29) comments on Praef. 13 that Livy "saw himself as a creative artist, as a poet rather than a

115 For Oppermann's claim that this statement contains an allusion to Georgics 1, 40-42 see ch. I 15-16.
researcher". There is no question that Livy did not view himself as a researcher (cf. sects. 6-7 above). But did he indeed view himself as a poet? We have his categorical statement that he did not:

Quae ante conditam condendamve urbem poetici magis fabulis quam incorruptis rerum gestarum monumentis traduntur,... (Praef. 6).

During the discussion of this section of the Praefatio we dwelt at length on his attack against the Annalists and the Antiquarians for confusing the boundaries between history and poetry. Certainly, the Praefatio has a hexametric opening; but so do the Annals of Tacitus. Livy's language is full of poeticisms; but so is the language of Sallust and Tacitus. It is the language of the historiographical genre. It is suggested that the style of Livy has affinities with tragedy; but the same suggestion is made about Sallust, Tacitus and other historians (n. 37 above). If, on the other hand, we choose to call Livy an "artist", in the sense that style was far more important to him than it is to modern writers, then this category is large enough to include not just Livy but almost all ancient prose-writers.

This chapter was introduced with some preliminary remarks. It was first pointed out that the Prologue of Sallust's Histories is in a fragmentary state. In the course of this analysis of the Praefatio the Prologue was
approached with caution (pp. 73-4; 141-3). Next, attention was drawn to the danger of viewing the Praefatio as the product of an impersonal rhetorical manual. The effort in this chapter was to steer clear of the minutiae of rhetorical theory, taking into consideration mostly conventional historiographical themes.

A third issue raised at the beginning of ch. III was that of the relation of the Praefatio to the rest of the A.U.C. It was an issue constantly present during this discussion. Some of the ideas were shown to run through the extant part of the work, like the historian's considerations about the moral decline (p. 113) and his pessimism about the present (pp. 119-20). About others it was demonstrated that they function purely within the context of the Praefatio, like the claim that Rome's subjects "calmly accept her sovereignty", which was interpreted as an attack on foreigners. Livy's so-called escapism was interpreted as a temporary reaction (sect. 5). A particularly thorny issue was that of the dating of the moral decline in sects. 11-12, where a number of options were considered (pp.148 ff.).

The most important question raised at the beginning of this chapter was whether Livy used Sallustian reminiscences in the Praefatio to attack his predecessor. Livy was never caught in the act of undermining the text of
Sallust. It was found that Livy borrowed extensively not only from the Prologue of the *Histories*, as generally assumed, but also from the monographs. The extent of the borrowings can hardly justify the alleged polemic intent. It was also demonstrated that in sects. 1-3 Livy uses Sallustian language to attack the Annalists and that in sects. 11-12 he uses the same language probably to defend Rome's early history against attacks found in Greek sources. Livy imitates Sallust with originality by assimilating the borrowings into a new context. After rejecting the methods and style of the Annalists and the Antiquarians (sects. 1-3, 6-8), he informs us of his intent to write a true national history by adopting Sallust's view of Roman history (sects. 9-12). Throughout the *Praefatio* runs a deep consciousness of the crisis of the *res publica*, which is inherited from Sallust but given a new tone of emotional involvement.
SUMMARY

This study examined Livy's Praefatio in relation to Sallust. It has been known for some time that the Praefatio reflects borrowings from Livy's predecessor. But studies of the issue are not systematic and, also, suffer from two major deficiencies: (1) they restrict Livy's use of Sallust to the Prologue of the Histories alone; (2) they detect in Livy's imitation of his predecessor a distinct polemic intent. This study showed, on the contrary, that Livy adapts material not only from the Histories but also from the monographs, and that the historian's borrowings from Sallust reveal admiration for him.

Chapter I dealt with the issue of the date of the Praefatio. The traditionally accepted date for it is between 27 and 25 B.C. The Praefatio is often seen as reflecting and welcoming moral or constitutional reforms of the Augustan regime. It is assumed that its Augustan ideology stands in radical conflict with Sallust's Republican values. This chapter showed that the Praefatio was composed before the conclusion of the civil war in 30 B.C., in the years of crisis in which Sallust composed all of his works. No trace of relation to the Augustan regime was
detected in it. It is grimly pessimistic about the present and the future of Rome. Livy's escapist attitude presents affinity of reaction with Horace Epod. 16 and the Sertorius episode in Sallust Hist. 1 frs. 100-03.

Chapter II dealt with ancient testimonia allegedly revealing Livy's profound dislike for Sallust's morals and style. Livy's attitude to Sallust in the Praefatio is very often examined in the light of this external evidence. In this chapter it was demonstrated that these testimonia are misinterpreted. The theory that a passage in Cassius Dio (43, 9, 2-3) conveys Livy's criticism against Sallust's misconduct as governor of Africa Nova was shown to be without foundation. Livy's stylistic criticisms found in Sen. Contr. 9, 1, 13-14 and 2, 26, and in Quint. 8, 2, 18 and 10, 1, 39, which are believed to express strong disapproval of, or even aversion for, Sallust's style were shown to apply to oratory and not to historiography.

A detailed analysis of the Praefatio in relation to Sallust conducted in chapter III revealed extensive borrowings from the Histories, the Catiline and the Jugurtha. Livy expresses strong disapproval of the style and methods of the Annalists and the Antiquarians in sects. 1-3 and 6-8. He uses Sallustian language to attack the former. In view of the bankruptcy of annalistic historiography Livy proposes to create a true national history by
adopting Sallust's concept of Roman history. The claim that sections 11-12 contain a protest against Sallust's views expressed in the Prologue of the Histories was shown to have no basis. Their idea of Roman imperialism (sect. 7) was found to be almost identical. Livy imitates Sallust in the Praefatio with true originality by assimilating the borrowings into a new context. The Praefatio reveals emotional involvement with the crisis of the res publica and constant communication with an audience, elements which are not found, or are not prominent, in Sallust. The treatment that Livy reserves to his predecessor shows recognition of his excellence as a historian. His pride in him should be viewed in the light of Cicero's constant complaint: abest historia litteris nostris.
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