

## NOT THE CONSULAR YEAR: PERVERTING ANNALISTIC TIME IN SALLUST

---

*Abstract:* The consular dating formula situates a work of historiography in the annalistic tradition (or alludes to it from outside) and evokes a complex of Republican norms. Time becomes Republican time and is organised according to the reassuring rhythms of the regular elections, tenures, and relinquishments of magistracies. Scholars have shown how Livy and Tacitus manipulate the formula's associations to dramatise the disruption or obsolescence of these constitutional forms. Throughout his three works, Sallust produces an even wider range of effects by ironic deployment and radical deformation of the formula.

---

*Keywords:* Sallust, time, chronology, consuls, *Catilina*, *Iugurtha*, *Historiae*, ideology

Structuring its narrative by consular year and articulating that structure with the names of the consuls were key formal and ideological features of annalistic historiography.<sup>1</sup> To begin a book or a narrative block with a formula like *T. Aemilius et Q. Fabius consules fiunt* (Livy 3.1) or *M. Valerio et Q. Apuleio consulibus* (10.6) was to situate one's work in a particular branch of historiography and to evoke a complex of Republican norms.<sup>2</sup> Time becomes Roman time, more specifically Republican time, and it is organised according to the reassuring rhythms of the regular elections, tenures, and relinquishments of magistracies.<sup>3</sup> Because it carried these normative associations, the formula could also be suppressed, manipulated, or incongruously deployed.<sup>4</sup> Ginsburg's influential study of Tacitus' use of the formula showed how the

<sup>1</sup> On annalistic structure and the consular year, see esp. Ginsburg (1981), Rich (2011), Feeney (2007) 190–3, id. (2009) 148–50, Levene (2010) 34–63. On annalistic history more generally, Frier (1979), Verbrugghe (1989), Rich (2018).

<sup>2</sup> Walter (2004) 345: 'Zum einen trug der annalistische Jahresbericht eine positive semantische Ladung, brachte er doch die erwünschte und Sicherheit schaffende Kontinuität und Tektonik der *libera res publica* zum Ausdruck. Das geschah erstens durch die literarische Inszenierung des die Freiheit symbolisierenden und sie zugleich sichernden Annuitätsprinzips.'

<sup>3</sup> Kraus (1994) 11: 'a textual rhythm is thus established which corresponds to the rhythm of the state, which is likewise subject to annual change in the form of elections and change of military command.'

<sup>4</sup> Throughout, I shall refer to 'the consular dating formula' in the singular and with the definite article, but it should be made clear that I refer thereby to various formulations, including those where the names of the consuls are in the ablative absolute with *consulibus* as predicate, in the nominative 'becoming consuls', 'entering the consulship', or undertaking some other action for the first time 'as consuls', or in the accusative when an *interrex*, dictator or other consul 'elects them consuls'. These formulations sometimes carry distinct additional connotations and associations, but all share those set out in this introduction.

‘annalistic form was traditionally associated with the Republican past, and Tacitus wanted to evoke that past, if only to deny its application to the present’.<sup>5</sup> A particularly striking example occurs at the beginning of *Annals* 4, which opens with two parallel dating formulae, the consular in the ablative absolute and the regnal in the main clause: *C. Asinio C. Antistio consulibus nonus Tiberio annus erat compositae rei publicae ...* The consuls are grammatically relegated to the status of attendant circumstances along with the construction of annalistic time and Republican constitutionality that the formula represents. The monarchy is the only meaningful criterion by which to conceptualise time.<sup>6</sup>

Of course, we should be cautious about constructing too monolithic or normative an employment of the consular dating formula and concomitant construction of time in Livy and the (largely) lost earlier annalists.<sup>7</sup> As Feeney puts it, ‘Tacitus ... needs to posit a hyper-Republican and hyper-annalistic Livy in order to heighten his own ironic contrasts between Republican sham and imperial reality in the period he is treating’.<sup>8</sup> Livy himself manipulates the formula on several occasions to dramatic effect, perhaps most radically in the period 375–371 BCE, when the tribunes of the plebs, L. Sextius and C. Licinius, by suspending consular elections, effectively suspend the mechanisms of consular dating and annalistic narrative.<sup>9</sup> As Kraus notes, ‘by eliminating the authorities by whom time is measured the tribunes effectively take control of narrative authority as well, while the state and its record simply stop—a splendid illustration of Croce’s *dictum*, “where there is no narrative, there is no

<sup>5</sup> Ginsburg (1981) 100; cf. 10–17. Cf. Grethlein (2013) 169: ‘play with the annalistic form effectively underlines the fact that the institutions of the *res publica* have been superseded in their significance by the affairs of the royal family’.

<sup>6</sup> Martin and Woodman (1989) 78 ad loc.: ‘While paying lip-service to the republican tradition of consular dating, [Tacitus] employs a construction which logically and syntactically detaches the phrase from the main action of the sentence, thereby underlining the limitation of the consuls’ role under the principate and the anachronism of their use for dating purposes ... The point is driven home by the juxtaposed reference to the year of Tib[erius]’s reign.’ Woodman (2018) 59–60 ad loc.: ‘Dating by regnal year is only here in the *Annals* and is used “for abnormal emphasis” ... the synchronism with the consular date adds to the effect and invites the question of their relative importance.’

<sup>7</sup> Rich (2011) 21 argues that as late a historian as Valerius Antias was Livy’s model for ‘the chronological framework of the consular year’.

<sup>8</sup> Feeney (2009) 149.

<sup>9</sup> Livy 6.35.10: *Licinius Sextiusque tribuni plebis refecti nullos curules magistratus creari passi sunt; eaque solitudo magistratum et plebe reficiente duos tribunos et iis comitia tribunorum militum tollentibus per quinquennium urbem tenuit.*

history”’.<sup>10</sup> Nevertheless, there are sufficient normative examples preserved in Livy and the fragments of earlier annalists to constitute ‘a Republican norm’, so that it is possible for ‘Tacitus [to] carefully remind ... his readers of the Republican annalistic norm by creatively transgressing it’.<sup>11</sup> Even if one were to take a hypersceptical position and imagine that ‘essential annals’ were as much of a non-existent, self-conscious generic construct as the ‘all-male, all-war, all the time’ idea of ‘essential epic’, that construct was clearly well-enough established to be creatively transgressed by Livy and Tacitus.<sup>12</sup> This article will argue that it was even more radically manipulated by Sallust.

Although the *Historiae* was Sallust’s final work, it will be treated first, since it was his only annalistic work and hence the place where the consular dating formula is generically most at home. The loss of so much of this work severely limits the extent to which we can draw general conclusions about his use of the formula in it, but the five examples that survive offer a remarkably rich and varied picture of the ways in which Sallust could use it to play with annalistic form *within* an annalistic history. The *Catilina* contains three clear examples of the formula itself and two strong evocations of it, but is most interesting for a more radical manipulation, which alludes to consular dating, but only to deny it. It is this perversion and rejection of the formula and of the conception of time that it represents which dominates the *Iugurtha*’s hostile engagement with annalistic form and enables it to assert a rival construction of historical time.<sup>13</sup>

### **The Consular Year, with a Twist, in the *Historiae***

That Sallust was fully aware of the potency of the consular dating formula is clear from his decision to open his own annalistic *Historiae*, in marked contradiction to his earlier monographs, as follows (I.I M):

res populi Romani M. Lepido Q. Catulo consulibus ac deinde militiae et domi gestas composui.

<sup>10</sup> Kraus (1994) 281. Cf. Levene (2010) 39 on the narrative of the end of 216 and start of 215 BCE in Livy 23.21–32: ‘Livy appears to be manipulating and subverting the formulae, repeatedly appearing to close the year only to reopen matters with a new crisis’.

<sup>11</sup> Feeney (2007) 191–2. This point stands, even if Rich (2011) is correct about its being a comparatively recent development by Valerius Antias (above, n. 7).

<sup>12</sup> For ‘essential epic’, see Hinds (2000).

<sup>13</sup> On time in Sallust: Papaioannou (2014); in classical historiography more broadly, Momigliano (1966); Möller and Luraghi (1995); O’Gorman (2007); Feeney (2009); Grethlein and Krebs (2012); Grethlein (2013).

The activities of the Roman people in war and at home when Marcus Lepidus and Quintus Catulus were consuls and thereafter I have put together.<sup>14</sup>

Unambiguously, ‘Sallust here identifies his genre as *annales*, history organized by the series of annual magistrates (*consulibus*)’.<sup>15</sup> It is tempting to detect an intratextual signal of the shift from monographic to annalistic form in the echo of his equally programmatic declaration of intent at *Cat.* 4.2 to ‘write thoroughly about the activities of the Roman people selectively’ (*res gestas populi Romani carptim ... perscribere*), with *carptim* replaced by the consular dating formula almost as if the latter were an adverb describing the manner in which the *res gestae* would be narrated.<sup>16</sup> Yet even here it is possible to detect subtle ironies in his deployment of the formula. Feeney observes that the ‘consuls not only provide a backbone for the city’s dating system together with an organizing principle for the events of a given year; they also generate the action that is the material for the historian’.<sup>17</sup> This would surely have been the case with Sallust’s narrative of the year 78 BCE, which was dominated by Lepidus’ challenges to the Sullan settlement and Catulus’ resistance to those challenges, leading to the former’s revolt and his defeat by the latter when both were proconsuls in 77.<sup>18</sup> The consular dating formula implies constitutional regularity, notable exploits by the consuls, and a degree of

<sup>14</sup> The text of Sallust throughout is that of Reynolds (1991), and, for fragments of the *Historiae* not found there, of Ramsey (2015), but with consonantal *u* for consistency. The numeration of fragments follows Maurenbrecher (= M), with reference to the editions of McGushin (McG), Ramsey (R), and LaPenna–Funari (LF). Where all follow the same enumeration, only that of Maurenbrecher is given. All translations are my own.

<sup>15</sup> Kraus (1997) 31; cf. Rich (2011) 24. On the annalistic quality of the *Historiae*, see also Scanlon (1998); Gerrish (2019) 8.

<sup>16</sup> For *res gestae* as a historical formula here, see Feeney (1994) 140 n. 5; for *res gestae populi Romani*, cf. Cic. *Arch.* 31, Livy 2.1.1. Levene (2000) 172 n. 17 suggests an allusion to Cato *Orig.* (*FRHist* 5 F 1) and raises the possibility that *carptim* ‘likewise suggests a Catonian mode of writing’ (cf. *FRHist* 5 T 1).

<sup>17</sup> Feeney (2007) 190. Cf. Lushkov (2015) 6: ‘republican magistracy possessed a double valence in Roman political thought: not only were the magistrates the actual, historical players who enabled political action by the Roman people, they were also the unit according to which Roman time was divided and Roman history narrativized.’

<sup>18</sup> La Penna and Funari (2015) 119–20 ad loc.: ‘I console provenivano ambedue dalla *nobilitas*, ma erano di tendenze politiche opposte: Lepido sarà il capo della rivolta che Sallustio narra nei libri I e II; Catulo era di famiglia patrizia e schierato nettamente dalla parte degli *optimates*’, though, as one of *Histos*’ anonymous readers observes, it was Lepidus, not Catulus, who came from a patrician *gens*. On Lepidus and the events of 78–77, see Seager (1994) 208–10 and now Rosenblitt (2019) 45–79.

collegiality between them.<sup>19</sup> The opening of Sallust's *Historiae* presents the first of these, with an implied contrast to the recent dictatorship of Sulla, but the consuls' exploits, so far from demonstrating collegiality, escalated into a minor civil war which briefly threatened the very constitutional stability they embodied.<sup>20</sup>

Sallust also deploys the consular dating formula a little later in Book 1 (according to the generally accepted reconstruction). Here he does so, not to introduce the narrative block of a year in his own annalistic structure, but within a prefatory excursus on the political condition of Rome and its decline owing to the loss of *metus hostilis*. It identifies the year 51 BCE as the time of Rome's greatest geographical dominion (1.11 M = 1.9 McG, R = 1.15 LF):

res Romana plurimum imperio ualuit Ser. Sulpicio et M. Marcello consulibus omni Gallia cis Rhenum atque inter mare nostrum et Oceanum, nisi qua paludibus inuia fuit, perdomita. optumis autem moribus et maxuma concordia egit inter secundum atque postremum bellum Carthaginense ...

The Roman state had its greatest strength in empire when Servius Sulpicius and Marcus Marcellus were consuls, when all Gaul this side of the Rhine and between the Mediterranean and the Ocean, except where it was impenetrable because of swamps, had been thoroughly subjugated. However, it acted with the best morals and the greatest harmony between the second and the final Punic Wars ...

McGushin acutely describes this as 'a typically Sallustian antithesis', noting the 'ironic contrast between the acme of Roman imperial expansion and a concurrent almost total degeneration of moral and political ideals'.<sup>21</sup> The irony is intensified by the use of the consular dating formula. There may be specific, subtle significances to the fact that the previous year had witnessed the highly irregular appointment of Pompey as sole consul, and that one of the two

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Kraus (1994) 246 ad Livy 6.27.6–8: 'The ideal situation, both from the historian's and the magistrates' standpoint, is a narrative of exciting wars conducted by a peaceful, regularly functioning state.'

<sup>20</sup> Tempting though his conclusion is, Scanlon's (1998) 199–200 claim ('The strikingly unidiomatic order of *militiae et domi* suggests Sallust's self-conscious break with tradition in his own narrative; it mirrors the confused events of 78 B.C.') probably attaches a little too much specific significance to an instance of characteristic Sallustian *variatio*. Cf. Ter. *Ad.* 495; Cic. *Pis.* 1 (*aut militiae aut domi*).

<sup>21</sup> McGushin (1992) 77 ad loc.; La Penna and Funari (2015) 131 ad loc.: 'Sallustio vuol mettere in rapporto l'espansione dell'impero e la corruzione politica: con la conquista di tutta la Gallia l'impero è arrivato alla sua massima espansione in una fase in cui la corruzione morale e politica della *res Romana* è gravissima.' Cf. Scanlon (1998) 218–19.

consuls for 51, Marcellus, expended many of his consular energies on trying to recall Caesar from the very command that was expanding the Roman empire to its greatest extent.<sup>22</sup> Most importantly, however, the formula's well-established association with constitutional regularity renders it a jarring way of dating a period of constitutional chaos.

There are only two surviving fragments which show Sallust using the names of the consuls to mark the beginning of the year and his narration of it, in keeping with his annalistic structure.<sup>23</sup> Although the text and context of each is uncertain, there remains a strong sense of how Sallust could manipulate and pervert the consular dating formula and its connotations. The first marks the beginning of the year 75 (2.42 M = 2.40 McG = 2.38.2 R):

dein L. Octavius et C. Co<t>ta consulatum ingress<i>, quorum Octavius langu<i>de et incuriose fuit, C<ot>ta *p*romptius sed ambiti<on>e tum ingenio largit<or et> cupiens gratia sing<ul>orum ...<sup>24</sup>

Then Lucius Octavius and Gaius Cotta entered into the consulship, of whom Octavius was in a state of sluggishness and carelessness, Cotta with more alacrity but he was by ambition and by nature a briber and craving the support of individuals ...

The consuls for 75 are presented in the nominative, actively entering into their consulship, apparently ready to 'generate the action that is the material for the historian'.<sup>25</sup> Although there are extant parallels for *ingredi*, instead of the more usual *inire*, in the sense of entering into a magistracy, none of them is earlier than Sallust and indeed all are substantially later, in Velleius, Quintilian, and (if 'entering into the principate' can be considered analogous) Solinus.<sup>26</sup> While it is perilous to risk anachronism by suggesting that Sallust is departing from a norm reflected primarily in Livy, it is striking how often—no fewer than fifteen times—the latter uses the formula *consulatum ineunt* or *inierunt*, and does so with the pre-Sallustian precedent of Cicero and Caesar for using *inire* in the sense

<sup>22</sup> For a concise narrative of the main political events of 52–51, with full references to the ancient sources, see Wiseman (1994) 410–14.

<sup>23</sup> I am indebted to one of *Histos'* anonymous readers for suggesting that I include discussion of these two fragments.

<sup>24</sup> I print Reynold's text, closely based on Maurenbrecher, with further supplements by Perl, but the details of the readings do not radically affect the treatment of the consular dating formula.

<sup>25</sup> Feeney (2007) 190, quoted in full above, p. 73.

<sup>26</sup> *OLD* s.v. *ingredior* 3; *TLL* 7.1.1571.81–4; Vell. 2.6.2; Quint. *Inst.* 6.1.35; Sol. 1.32.

of entering into a magistracy.<sup>27</sup> The possibility that Sallust's use of *ingredi* instead of *inire* is a defamiliarising technique to suggest the vigour and energy of new incumbents embarking on office is certainly consistent with Sallust's other two uses, of Mithridates entering into the kingship when a mere boy by (aggressively and proactively!) poisoning his mother, and of Metellus entering into the consulship and setting his mind to prosecuting the war with Iugurtha energetically, in marked contrast to his predecessors.<sup>28</sup>

The consular dating formula thus sets up the normative expectation of consular activity within the annalistic narrative block of the consular year, an expectation intensified by the choice of the 'nominative consuls entering office' formula and perhaps further by the defamiliarising use of *ingredi*. However, Sallust immediately frustrates and perverts these expectations.<sup>29</sup> Octavius, so far from energetically entering into his consulship, is in exactly the opposite state, one of sluggishness and indifference. Sallust's use of predicate adverbs with *esse*, a construction of which he is fond, further conveys Octavius' inertia.<sup>30</sup> The adverbs lead the reader to expect that, whatever it is that he does sluggishly and carelessly, he at least does something, only for that expected action to be revealed as merely an inactive state of being. Cotta is presented as more in tune with the dynamism implied by the consular dating formula (*promptius*), even if only in comparison with Octavius. However, even that qualified virtue of dynamism is both overshadowed by his ambition and corruption, and shown in fact to be so warped by them as to become a vice. As Rosenblitt puts it, '[t]he implication is not just that the negative outweighs

<sup>27</sup> *Consulatum ineunt*: Livy 2.28.1, 54.3; 3.6.2, 8.3; 10.24.1; 24.9.7; 25.3.1; 27.36.10; Tac. *Ann.* 15.48.1. *consulatum inierunt*: Livy 2.33.4; 27.22.1; 28.38.12; 39.45.1, 52.6; 41.8.4; Vell. 2.17.1; Tac. *Hist.* 4.38.1. Singular *iniit* occurs at Livy 21.15.6; Vell. 2.31.1, 65.2; Suet. *Nero* 43.2; Tac. *Ann.* 13.34.1. *OLD* s.v. *ineo* 5; *TLL* 7.1.1297.41–54. In Cicero, it is usually the tribunate that is entered into (*Ver.* 30; *Att.* 11.9.1), but Caesar, in a context precisely marking the date of the *SCU* that began the civil war, writes: *itaque V primis diebus, quibus haberi senatus potuit, qua ex die consulatum iniit Lentulus* (*BC* 1.5.4).

<sup>28</sup> *Hist.* 2.75 M = 2.61 R: *sed Mithridates extrema pueritia regnum ingressus, matre sua ueneno interfecta. Jug.* 43.1–2: *post Auli foedus exercitusque nostri foedam fugam Metellus et Silanus, consules designati, prouincias inter se partiuerant, Metelloque Numidia euenerat, acri uiro et, quamquam aduorso populi partium, fama tamen aequabili et iniuiolata. is ubi primum magistratum ingressus est, alia omnia (communia) sibi cum conlega ratus, ad bellum quod gesturus erat animum intendit.* See below, pp. 96–8 for more detailed discussion of the latter passage.

<sup>29</sup> I am grateful for *Histos'* anonymous reader's acute analysis that the 'consuls are introduced in the nominative, but, eschewing routine matters, Sallust supplies mordant character assessments of the consuls of 75', but I feel that Sallust's manipulation of the formula is more complex still.

<sup>30</sup> Koestermann (1971) 318 ad *Jug.* 87.4: 'Die Verbindung von *esse* mit einem Adverb kehrt bei unserem Historiker immer wieder'—*laxius licentiusque futuros*, itself a suggestive image of undisciplined Roman soldiers ceasing to do and beginning to be.

the positive, but ... that there is some active perversion of the positive by the negative'.<sup>31</sup> The consular activity signalled by the dating formula and the dynamism suggested by its form are partly dissipated into idleness and partly perverted into a malign, destructive energy.

The following year, 74, also opens with a form of the consular dating formula, as both outgoing and incoming consuls react to Pompey's letter from Hispania (2.98D M = 2.86.11–12 R):

hae litterae principio sequentis anni recitatae in senatu. sed consules decretas a patribus prouincias inter se parauere: Cotta Galliam citeriorem habuit, Ciliciam Octavius. dein proximi consules L. Lucullus et M. Cotta litteris nuntiisque Pompei grauiter percussi, cum summ(a)e rei gratia tum ne exercitu in Italiam deducto neq(ue) laus sua neque dignitas esset, omni modo stipendium (e)t su(p)plementum parauere, adnitente maxime nobilitate, cuius plerique iam tum lingua ferociam suam (ostentabant) et dicta factis seque(bantur).<sup>32</sup>

This letter was read out in the senate at the start of the following year. But the consuls assigned between themselves the provinces that had been decreed by the senators; Cotta took Cisalpine Gaul, Octavius Cilicia. Then the next consuls, Lucius Lucullus and Marcus Cotta, seriously dismayed by the letter and messengers of Pompey, both for the sake of the *res publica* and fearing that, if the army were led back into Italy, neither glory nor respect would be theirs, by all means available prepared wages and reinforcements, with the nobility very greatly assisting, many of whom then too displayed their characteristic ferocity with their tongue and followed up their words with deeds.

Caution must be exercised when reading decontextualised (or perhaps recontextualised) fragments, and there is a danger that this paragraph's survival as an appendage to the substantial letter of Pompey and separated from the subsequent narrative may distort its interpretation.<sup>33</sup> However, even allowing for this possibility, there is a great deal in the surviving text to show how Sallust undermines the expected associations of this instance of the consular dating formula. The formula normatively marks the beginning of a coherent unit of

<sup>31</sup> Rosenblitt (2011) 400, comparing the similarly negative depictions of apparent virtues in Catiline (*Cat.* 5.1) and Pompey (*Hist.* 2.17 M).

<sup>32</sup> To Reynolds' text I add in the final sentence Hauler's supplement *se<quebantur>* and Shackleton Bailey's *ostentabant*, but not his emendation of the subsequent *et to nec*, though the text here does not affect my argument.

<sup>33</sup> It is worth noting, however, that Bloch (1961) 74–6 believed this chapter was the end of Book 2.



narrative and historical time, identifies the consuls, and indicates some significant action that is undertaken by those consuls and that constitutes the subject-matter of that unit. All three elements are perverted in this passage. The beginning of the year 74 is subordinated to the events of 75, to the extent that the distinction between them is blurred. Pompey's letter of 75 is read out in the senate 'at the start of the following year'. The beginning of the year 74, which ought to be a new temporal block initiated by the consuls and concerned with senatorial activity, is instead chronologically defined in terms of its subsequence (*sequentis anni*) to Pompey's letter of 75, and its content dominated by a (re-)reading of that letter. The way in which narrative and historical time is shaped around the letter reflects both the solipsistic egomania with which Sallust characterises Pompey's epistolary style and the way in which, for others as well as himself, he is beginning to dominate the structures of the *res publica*, at least in the *Historiae*.<sup>34</sup>

When mention *is* made of 'the consuls', the reader is in for another surprise. For these are not the consuls of 74 but those of 75, so that again the distinction between the two years is blurred and the constitutional and narrative regularity of the year-beginning disrupted.<sup>35</sup> The actions of Octavius and L. Cotta are, perhaps unexpectedly, not dominated by Pompey or his letter, and indeed on the surface seem to constitute a reassertion of constitutional regularity. Not only are proconsular provinces apportioned but they are the provinces that had been appropriately decreed by the senate. However, Sallust depicts this moment of constitutional and historiographical normality, not as a principled resistance to Pompey's incipient political and narrative *dominatio*, but rather as the consuls' renegeing on their duty to address the crisis and the interrelated threats to Rome that Pompey describes, makes, and constitutes. The pregnant *sed* that introduces the (ex-)consuls' (non-)actions speaks volumes: one might have expected vigorous action to tackle the crisis and protect Rome, *but* Octavius and Cotta concerned themselves with their own self-enriching and self-glorifying agendas and retreated, physically and

<sup>34</sup> Meyer (2010) 105, on the letter: '[Pompey] is not just self-centred but a pathological egomaniac. Everything is about him, overshadowing the situation in Spain, the situation of the army, even the Roman Republic itself; everything will take second place to his own needs and desires, and this will make him very dangerous indeed.' Rosenblitt (2019) 105, on the wider *Historiae*: 'The future of Pompey hangs ... over Sallust's *Historiae*, where Pompey becomes "the autocrat who wasn't"'. On Sallust and Pompey, see also Syme (1964) 201–2, La Penna (1968) 275–80, Katz (1982), Kraus (1997) 36–7, and Gerrish (2019) 82–8.

<sup>35</sup> The anomaly is reflected, though not fully acknowledged, by the elucidations of McGushin (1992) 247 ad loc. ('Namely the consuls of the preceding year') and Ramsey (2015) 197 n. 16 ('Those of the previous year, 75, now proconsuls').

politically, from both Rome and Hispania.<sup>36</sup> The year begins (or rather continues, after the reading of Pompey's letter) with the wrong consuls acting (or indulging in inactivity) in an unconsular manner.

When the consuls for 74, L. Lucullus and M. Cotta, are belatedly named, their expected state of primacy, initiating the year's narrative, is further and doubly undermined as their first action is subordinated to what has gone before in a chain of events (*dein*) and they themselves are designated as merely the next (*proximi*) in a similar chain of insignificant magistrates. Time is not defined by the consuls but rather they are defined by their lowly position in a temporal sequence that has its beginning and most significant moment in Pompey's writing of his letter. Like their predecessors Octavius and C. Cotta in 2.42, Lucullus and M. Cotta are introduced in the nominative, generating the expectation that, however belatedly, they will exert some syntactical and political agency as actors in the year's narrative. Instead, the first verb applied to them, the passive participle *perculsi*, marks them as passive objects of the agency of Pompey through his messages and letters, and unable even to exert manly self-control over their own panic. Nevertheless, that panic does initially seem at least to be motivated by a patriotic concern for the affairs of the Roman state (*summ(a)e rei gratia*).<sup>37</sup> As so often in Sallust, that admirable motivation is paired with a less noble impetus, whose placement second and greater length mark it structurally as the more significant and perhaps only true cause.<sup>38</sup> Even when these consuls do take some action, it is driven by selfish motives of personal glory and influence, and that action itself is only the ancillary service of ancillary figures in providing money and reinforcements to the main actor, Pompey. The support of the nobility gestures towards a unified and concerted action by the often divided and divisive orders, but it too is both

<sup>36</sup> Cf. Meyer (2010) 110: 'a selfish or business-as-usual (non-)response, the impropriety of which Sallust emphasizes by using the conjunctive *sed* to begin the sentence'.

<sup>37</sup> I follow McGushin ('because of the interests of the state') in taking *summa res* in this sense (cf. *OLD* s.v. *res* 16: 'The affairs of a State as a whole, (often virtually = the body politic)'), rather than Ramsey's 'on account of the seriousness of the matter' (likewise Meyer (2010) 10: 'because the situation was critical'). It is more idiomatic and provides a better antithesis with the consuls' other motivations, which were surely serious enough to them, if to no one else. Rosenblitt (2019) seems to take it in both senses ('the welfare of the *res publica*', 105; 'the gravity of the situation', 136) and indeed there is considerable overlap in their implications.

<sup>38</sup> E.g., *Jug.* 89.6: *eius* [sc. Capsa] *potiundi Marium maxuma cupido inuaserat, quom propter usum belli tum quia res aspera uidebatur et Metellus oppidum Thalam magna gloria ceperat, haud dissimiliter situm munitumque* ... The technique is closely related to the 'loaded alternative', on which see Kraus (1997) 34–5, citing *Hist.* 4.53 M (*incertum uero an per negligentiam*), and even more closely to the 'stinging negation', on which see Rosenblitt (2011) 399–400, citing *Cat.* 5.1 (*magna ui et animi et corporis sed ingenio malo prauoque*) and noting '*sed* can be very damning indeed. Positive qualities are acknowledged, and the final verdict carries all the more force.'

driven and marked by vicious passions, here *ferocia*. The final sentence is corrupt, so that it is unclear whether the nobles did or did not follow up their words with deeds but, as Rosenblitt puts it, ‘it is not a flattering picture, whether the final words were negated or not: that is, whether it is a picture of empty words and ... or of action through fear’.<sup>39</sup> In a staggeringly complex dismantling of the expectations associated with the narrative of the start of the year, Sallust blurs the distinction between old year and new, between old consuls and new, shows the evils attendant on both constitutional and unconstitutional behaviour, both action and inaction, excludes some normative elements, while inverting and perverting others. The growing dominance of Pompey produces a destabilising effect on Roman institutions, on time, and on the narrative of the *Historiae*.<sup>40</sup>

The fifth and final surviving use of the consular dating formula among the fragments of the *Historiae* comes from the speech of the tribune C. Licinius Macer, where he offers a potted history of Sulla’s removal of tribunician power and the subsequent conflict over its restoration (3.48.9–10 M = 3.34.9–10 McG = 3.15.9–10 R):

Sulla mortuo, qui scelestum inposuerat seruitium, finem mali credebatis: ortus est longe saeuior Catulus. tumultus intercessit Bruto et Mamercio consulibus. dein C. Curio ad exitium usque insontis tribuni dominatus est.

With Sulla dead, who had imposed the wicked slavery, you began to think there was an end to this misfortune: there arose the far crueller Catulus. Revolt intervened when Brutus and Mamercus were consuls. Then Gaius Curio played the tyrant to the extent of destroying an innocent tribune.

As with 1.11, the formula is not used here as a dating marker within the structure of Sallust’s own overarching narrative. However, it is so used within the immensely compressed history of the early seventies which Macer deploys to persuade his audience. As such, it acts as a sort of meta-annalistic *mise-en-abîme* for Sallust’s own technique. It is surely no coincidence that, as well as being a distinguished orator and tribune, Macer was well-known as the author

<sup>39</sup> Rosenblitt (2019) 136. Cf. Meyer (2010) 111: ‘The response to the letter is, in short, depicted as wrong and fractured, moving from proconsuls to new consuls to nobility to a majority of the nobility, with an emphasis on personal motivations and bad behaviour rather than on statesmanship and group strength.’

<sup>40</sup> Cf. Rosenblitt (2019) 110: ‘Pompey’s rise may have functioned in the text not just as a topic, but as an exploration of the breakdown of Roman political order’.

of a polemically *popularis* history of Rome, and so he is a particularly appropriate figure to act as a historian-within-the-history.<sup>41</sup> Yet he acts not simply as a generalised historian figure, but rather as a specifically *popularis* historian figure, an ideological colouring which affects his use of the consular dating formula.<sup>42</sup>

At first glance, the formula seems to be operating in the same way as in the other four fragments, as an ironically (mis)placed symbol of constitutional regularity in a maelstrom of constitutional chaos. However, *Bruto et Mamerco consulibus* takes its place in a chain of pithy narratives of years identified and dominated by their consuls. Q. Lutatius Catulus (cos. 78) was, as we have seen, an optimate opponent of his colleague Lepidus' attempts to undo Sulla's constitutional changes, including the restoration of tribunician powers, a position Macer tendentiously interprets as manifesting his extreme *saevitia*. C. Scribonius Curio (cos. 76), one of Sulla's legates and father of the notorious tribune of 50, is accused of ruining the tribune L. Sicinius because the latter tried to restore tribunician rights.<sup>43</sup> The consuls do not merely identify the years 78 and 76 but, to repeat Feeney's formulation again, 'they also generate the action that is the material for the historian'.<sup>44</sup> However, here that action is

<sup>41</sup> Here and in the discussion of the *Iugurtha* below, I use the terms *popularis* and optimate in a broadly ideological rather than party-political sense, similar to that set out by Arena (2013) 8: 'These intellectual traditions provided late Republican politicians with a weaponry of terms, ideas and values that, attached to political behaviour either favourable to the *populus* or in support of senatorial *auctoritas* and combined with a certain political strategy or method ... might gain them the description of *populares* or *optimates*. Of these opposing alignments, composed of socially homogeneous politicians, the latter designated politicians who stood up in defence of the status quo and thereby resisted new reforming measures, whilst the former described those who advanced demands for change. However, they did not constitute firmly established political groupings, much less entities more or less akin to modern political parties.' The analysis does not presuppose, require, or entail a broadly *popularis* orientation for Sallust's own complex and ambivalent attitude to politics, but it would be consistent with such an orientation.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. Gerrish (2019) 57: 'By granting him a prominent and (apparently) positive role in the *Histories*, Sallust rehabilitates Macer's memory and reaffirms his conception of Roman history.' Syme (1964) 200 speculates that, for the speech, Sallust 'may have drawn on speeches in Macer's historical work'. On Sallust's Macer, see also La Penna (1968) 280–7, Blänsdorf (1978), Büchner (1982) 221–9, Latta (1999), Schmal (2001) 87–9, Pani (2006), Rosenblitt (2016), and ead. (2019) 118–20. On Macer's historical works: Hodgkinson (1997); Walt (1997); Chassignet (2006); Wiseman (2009c); *FRHist* I.320–31 (S. P. Oakley). Cornell (2018) 186–98 disputes the identification of the politician and the historian.

<sup>43</sup> Sicinius is named, without mention of Curio, earlier in the speech at 11.8: *et quamquam L. Sicinius primus de potestate tribunicia loqui ausus mussantibus uobis circumuentus erat* ... He is mentioned (with the praenomen Gnaeus) as mocking Curio's exaggerated oratorical gesticulations at Cic. *Brut.* 216–17 and Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.129.

<sup>44</sup> Feeney (2007) 190, quoted in full above, p. 73.

not patriotic, military victory over Rome's enemies, but partisan, political victory over Rome's people and their champions. Annalistic history is structured not merely by the annual magistracies of consuls but by consuls' annual persecutions of the popular cause.<sup>45</sup> In contrast to the active subjects, Catulus and Curio, the formula itself, in an almost Tacitean manner, relegates D. Junius Brutus and Mam. Aemilius Lepidus Livianus to the syntactical and political irrelevance of the ablative absolute. However, Brutus and Livianus are politically irrelevant, not because of the realities of a principate that lies fifty years in the future, as with Asinius and Antistius in *Annals* 4, but because 'revolt intervened', specifically the attempt of the previous year's consul, Lepidus, to march on Rome. The reference to intervention clearly implies that, without such an intervention, these consuls in this consular year would have behaved just as tyrannically and oppressively as their predecessors and successors.<sup>46</sup> And with an exquisitely ironic pun, Sallust's Macer uses the word *intercessit*, the *vox propria* for the tribunes' intervention (usually by exercising the power of veto) to protect the people's interest. In post-Sullan time, when annual consuls mean annual persecutions and the hamstrung tribunes have lost their power of *intercessio*, only revolt can intervene.

### **Dead Consuls Walking: The Consuls Without the Year in the *Catilina***

Sallust's first work, the *Catilina*, is not, of course, a work of annalistic history. Indeed, as we have seen, it is self-consciously 'not-annalistic' and justifies its monographic structure by asserting the utility of treating history 'selectively' (*carptim*, 4.2). The three occasions in the monograph where Sallust uses the consular dating formula are not, therefore, merely the routine, normative inclusion of a generically expected formal feature. Each instance is generically marked as dramatising and interrogating the monograph's relationship with its annalistic kin, as well as fulfilling its by-now familiar role of playing with the political and ideological associations which the formula conjures. However, it is not the three instances of the formula itself, nor even its evocation in reports of consular elections, but a more radical perversion of it that will be the main focus of this section.

<sup>45</sup> One of *Histos'* anonymous readers notes that the chain continues into 74, as Macer in 73 reminds his audience (3.48.11): *Lucullus superiore anno quantis animis ierit in L. Quintium uidistis* ('With what animosity Lucullus attacked Lucius Quintius last year, you have seen').

<sup>46</sup> McGushin (1994) 90 ad loc. sensibly and correctly explains that an 'attempt to restore by a process of legislation the powers of the tribunate did not take place in 77 because of the outbreak of the rebellion led by Lepidus' but the context and perspective of Macer's speech constructs this same event, not as an absence of tribunician activity, but as an absence of consular suppression of it.

Two of the three examples of the consular dating formula in the *Catilina* occur in analepses, filling in essential backstory for the main narrative of the conspiracy of 63. In purely practical terms, each of these formulae serves an important function in pinpointing a date that stands outside the range of the main narrative and therefore cannot be designated with a simple *eodem anno* or *insequenti anno*. Generically, they open up a vista on the centuries of annalistic time and events that stand outside the ‘selective’ focus of the monograph. However, it is in their perversion of the formula’s political associations that these passages are most striking. The first flashback interrupts the narrative of Catiline’s first address to the gathered conspirators with a two-chapter digression on the so-called ‘First Catilinarian Conspiracy’ of 66–65 (18.1–2):<sup>47</sup>

sed antea item coniurauere pauci contra rem publicam, in quis Catilina fuit; de qua quam uerissime potero dicam. L. Tullo et M. Lepido consulibus P. Autronius et P. Sulla, designati consules, legibus ambitus interrogati poenas dederant.

But earlier, in the same way, a few, among whom was Catiline, conspired against the state, a conspiracy about which I shall speak as truthfully as I can. When Lucius Tullus and Manius Lepidus were consuls, Publius Autronius and Publius Sulla, the designated consuls, were prosecuted and punished according to the laws concerning electoral corruption.

The ‘textual rhythm ... which corresponds to the rhythm of the state’, with consuls succeeding consuls in harmonious polyptoton, rapidly unravels as Autronius and Sulla are shown by the defamiliarising inverted word-order to be not official ‘consuls designate’ but merely ‘designated as consuls’, a designation which is promptly cancelled following their conviction for *ambitus*.<sup>48</sup> The constitutional regularity of consular succession will be further disrupted by Catiline’s frustrated bid to stand for election and by his and Autronius’ subsequent attempt to attain the consulship by unconstitutional, violent means, an attempt to which we shall shortly return in more detail. The dissonant juxtaposition of the consular dating formula heightens the sense of normality out of joint.

<sup>47</sup> Consideration of the controversial details and even historicity of this conspiracy is beyond the scope of and not directly relevant to the present argument. For discussion, see Syme (1964) 83–102, Seager (1964), Gruen (1969), and McGushin (1977) 298–301.

<sup>48</sup> Quotation from Kraus (1994) 11 on Livy, given in full at n. 3 above. Ramsey (2007) 110 ad loc., on *designati consules*: ‘S. deliberately reverses the word order in this standard expression’, *pace* the scepticism about *inconcinnitas* of McGushin (1977) 16 and esp. 124 ad loc.: ‘the order may have been chosen to avoid the unpleasant jingle *designati ... interrogati*’.

The second instance of the formula in an external analepsis is part of the excursus on the deplorable state of political society in Rome at the time of the ('second') conspiracy in 63, and its causes in events over the previous two decades, including the restoration in 70 of the tribunician powers removed by Sulla and the abuse of those powers by a new generation of ambitious tribunes (37.11–38.2):

id adeo malum multos post annos in ciuitatem reuorterat. Nam postquam Cn. Pompeio et M. Crasso consulibus tribunicia potestas restituta est, homines adulescentes summam potestatem nacti, quibus aetas animusque ferox erat, coepere senatum criminando plebem exagitare, dein largiundo atque pollicitando magis incendere: ita ipsi clari potentesque fieri.

So great an evil as that had returned to the state after many years. For after tribunician power was restored when Gnaeus Pompeius and Marcus Crassus were consuls, young fellows acquired the greatest power, men who had a savage age and attitude, and began to stir up the people by accusing the senate, then enflaming them more by bribing and making promises: in this way they themselves became renowned and powerful.

The consulship of Pompey and Crassus in 70 reads like a regular dating formula, but the very names of the consuls undermine the constitutional regularity it evokes. This was Pompey's first consulship, under-age and without traversing the *cursus honorum*. The year was one of tension and conflict between the colleagues, and their names evoke less their magisterial activity than their unconstitutional prominence as dynasts.<sup>49</sup> Indeed, the only other dating formula employed in the excursus is the dating of the resurgence of the optimates at the expense of the people 'after Gnaeus Pompeius was sent to the wars with the pirates and Mithridates'.<sup>50</sup> Shifts in partisan political dominance and the periodisation of historical time around such shifts depend not on who is consul (except, perhaps, when it is Pompey and Crassus who are consuls), but on when an exceptionally charismatic and powerful individual embarks on a

<sup>49</sup> Sallust had earlier referred to their ongoing rivalry and Crassus' alleged willingness to let the conspiracy succeed as a way of outmanoeuvring Pompey (17.7).

<sup>50</sup> 39.1: *sed postquam Cn. Pompeius ad bellum maritimum atque Mithridaticum missus est, plebis opes imminutae, paucorum potentia creuit*. I exclude vaguer references to 'Sulla's victory' (*Sullanae uictoriae*, 37.5; *uictoria Sullae*, 37.9). Although there can be overlap, in context these references relate to the fact and results of the event (common soldiers becoming senators, proscriptions) rather than using it as a date.

special command of dubious constitutionality.<sup>51</sup> Moreover, the restoration of tribunician power heralds a period (or rather a return: *reuorterat*) of the abuse of that power, an abuse which threatens the very consular authority that restored it and that is used to date it.<sup>52</sup> The juxtaposition *consulibus tribunicia* dramatises the conflict and the transition of power within the very structure of the sentence. Once again, the associations of the consular dating formula jar with its context.

The third instance of the consular dating formula does occur within the main narrative of the monograph, or rather it marks the beginning of the narrative proper following the methodological prologue, the pen-portrait of Catiline, the excursus on earlier Roman history, and the scene-setting of Catiline's corruption of himself and others (17.1):<sup>53</sup>

igitur circiter Kalendas Iunias L. Caesare et C. Figulo consulibus primo singulos appellare; hortari alios, alios templare; opes suas, inparatam rem publicam, magna praemia coniurationis docere.

Therefore, around the Kalends of June when Lucius Caesar and Gaius Figulus were consuls he first addressed them individually; encouraged some, tried out others; told them about his own resources, how unprepared the state was, the great rewards of conspiracy.

On the surface, the monograph here begins a narrative block—arguably the narrative block which constitutes the whole of the monograph's 'selective' subject matter—with what appears to be a conventionally annalistic gesture, opening on the Kalends with the consular dating formula.<sup>54</sup> However, the

<sup>51</sup> Paul Roche reminds me of Philippus' *bon mot* supporting Pompey's command but simultaneously emphasising how it disrupts the system of magistrates and, by implication, the construction of time based on that system: *L. Philippus dixisse dicitur non se illum sua sententia pro consule sed pro consulibus mittere* (Cic. *Man.* 62).

<sup>52</sup> McDermott (1978) 50 insists that '[t]he passage in Sallust ... has been cited as a reference for the passage of the law by both consuls, but here the two names are no more than the standard device for dating an event'. Whatever its limitations as historical evidence, Sallust is surely using the formula to connect the law with the two consuls.

<sup>53</sup> One of *Histos'* anonymous readers judiciously suggests that the narrative block begins at 16.4, when the generalised, long-term corruption depicted over 14–16.3 crystallises into the more specific conspiratorial plans of 63 developed in 16.4–5. There is undeniably a progressive 'zooming in' from the broader background to the more immediate situation leading to the conspiracy, but 17 still marks a shift in narrative mode as real-time action is described.

<sup>54</sup> 'The year (64 B.C.) is specified in the usual fashion in the following abl. absol. by the names of the two consuls', Ramsey (2007) ad loc., correctly, but not observing that this is not 'usual' in *Cat.*



resemblances end there. The distorting mirror which is applied to the formula tropes the distortion of annalistic form, Republican time, and constitutional stability. The ‘textual rhythm’ is immediately disturbed by starting on a downbeat: this is not the regular, specific starting date, but only vaguely approximate (*circiter*), as is to be expected in the murky narrative of a murky conspiracy.<sup>55</sup> The Kalends are not those of January, but of June. Since this is an approximate date, Sallust need not have chosen the Kalends, but the frustration of the reader’s expectations of the Kalends of January reinforces the date’s status as emphatically *not* the Kalends of January. The consuls are, once again, reduced to the status of an ablative absolute, attendant circumstances, mere date. Time is structured not around their assumption of office but around Catiline’s initiation of his plot. *He* is the subject of all the historic infinitives as well as of the indicatives (*conuocat*, *inierat*, even the relative clause’s *uoluit*) in the next sentence. That he is the *unexpressed* subject (he is not named in this chapter except as the genitive of *Catilinae inceptis* at 17.6) makes his dominance the greater. There is no need to specify the subject, because it could only be the antihero of this history, the eponymous Catilina.<sup>56</sup> The consuls do not ‘generate the action that is the material for the historian’ and the frustration of the expectation, set up by the dating formula, that they do so amplifies a series of interrelated antitheses. The protagonists of narrative and history are not the consuls but Catiline; this is not annalistic history of the SPQR but a monograph written about one man, Catiline; historical time is structured not around the consular year, which is threatened with dissolution along with the constitution it represents, but around Catiline’s plans to make himself not only the one man in the narrative, but the one man in Rome.

Before turning to Sallust’s radical perversion of the consular dating formula in the *Catilina*, it is worth looking briefly at its evocation in the monograph’s two announcements of consular elections.<sup>57</sup> In July 64, despite widespread snobbery towards the *nouus homo*, clear and present danger (*ubi periculum aduenit*, 23.6) leads to the election of Cicero as consul for 63, with C. Antonius Hybrida as his colleague (24.1):

<sup>55</sup> Cf Pagán (2004) 30 on the ‘First Conspiracy’: ‘Secrecy and silence so tightly envelop the events as to obscure them permanently; such is the essence of conspiracy’.

<sup>56</sup> His name was the final, climactic word of the previous chapter, as the security and tranquillity at Rome were altogether opportune for Catiline (*ea prorsus opportuna Catilinae*, 16.5). With no specified change of subject, it is not unnatural to take Catiline as the subject of the next sentence. Nevertheless, the requirement to ‘understand’ the subject of a new narrative block still magnifies his centrality.

<sup>57</sup> Once more, I am indebted to *Histos*’ anonymous reader for suggesting I do so.

igitur comitiis habitis consules declarantur M. Tullius et C. Antonius, quod factum primo popularis coniurationis concusserat. neque tamen Catilinae furor minuebatur, sed in dies plura agitare.

Therefore, when the elections had been held, Marcus Tullius and Gaius Antonius were declared consuls, an event which at first had shaken the accomplices of the conspiracy. However, the frenzy of Catiline was not diminished, but day by day he undertook more actions.

The phrase *consules ... M. Tullius et C. Antonius* is not a consular dating formula and indeed does not serve as a chronological marker, but it does carry the formula's associations of constitutional regularity and anticipates the designation (which Sallust never uses) of the year 63 as *M. Tullio et C. Antonio consulibus*. This evocation of constitutional regularity is reinforced by the use of routine, technical language for the conduct of the election and declaration of the result.<sup>58</sup> Although it is of course the identity of the consuls designate, and the fact that Catiline is not one of them, which shakes the conspirators, the formulaic language gives the impression that it is the constitutional regularity itself which is so dismaying to its enemies and polar opposites in the conspiracy. In any case, its impact is brief and limited, and does not extend to the *furor* of Catiline, almost personified as the subject of *agitare* or suggesting an epic periphrasis like βίη Ἡρακλῆος. The monograph's dominating, driving principle of mental, ethical, and political disorder is set in antithesis to constitutional order. Its acolytes can be briefly discombobulated by the reassertion of that order, but *Catilinae furor* cannot be so easily overcome.

By the time of the elections of July 63 for the consuls of 62—a year of time, but only two chapters of the narrative later—the outcome is so totally focalised through Catiline that the victorious candidates are not even named (26.5):

postquam dies comitorum uenit et Catilinae neque petitio neque insidiae, quas consulibus in campo fecerat, prospere cessere, constituit bellum facere et extrema omnia experiri, quoniam quae occulte temptauerat aspera foedaque euenerant.

<sup>58</sup> Ramsey (2007) 130 ad loc.: 'the technical expression for conducting an election and declaring the victors whose names were announced by the presiding magistrate'—though he does not provide parallels, which might include, for *comitiis habitis*, Cic. *Phil.* 2.81, Livy 21.57.4 (many more examples with finite and infinitive forms of *habere*). The exact collocation *consules declarantur* occurs only here, but the perfect passive (whether true participle or elliptical indicative) *declarati* is more common, including *Jug.* 27.4 (discussed below), alongside Livy 27.6.11 and 40.7.6, as are variations with active verbs and/or a singular consul.

After the day of the election arrived and for Catiline neither his candidature nor the plots which he had made against the consuls in the Campus Martius turned out favourably, he decided to make war and try all extreme measures, since what he had attempted secretly had panned out unfavourably and foully.

Although the focalisation is explicit rather than ‘deviant’, signalled by the dative of reference *Catilinae* and the dependence of the subordinate clauses on Catiline’s decision (*constituit*), nevertheless the association of the adverb *prosperere* with the planned assassination of a consul and *foeda* with its failure constitutes an extreme and troubling, almost Corcyrean, perversion of language and values.<sup>59</sup> The use of the indicative *euenerant* in the causal clause, where one might have expected a subjunctive of alleged reason or implied indirect speech, further blurs the distinction between Catiline’s focalisation and the narrative voice. Two chapters after the regular reporting of the result of the regular consular election in 64, the reader is primed to expect the same for the election in 63 and to feel its absence as a marked one. Both for Catiline and for the narrative that is now dominated by his conspiracy, it is of no moment who did win the election, only that Catiline did not. The absence of the phrase *consules declarantur D. Silanus et L. Murena* reflects Catiline’s and Sallust’s focus on *res Catilinae* over *res publica* as subject-matter, but also the text’s shift from annalistic form and its associations with constitutional order to the monographic, monomaniacal disorder of a conspiracy narrative.<sup>60</sup>

Sallust’s most remarkable engagement with the consular dating formula in the *Catilina* is also an allusion to it, but an even more distorted one. It occurs during the analeptic narrative of the First Conspiracy in 66–65 and comes shortly after the two uses of the formula proper which open chapters 17 and 18, discussed above. It could even be argued that Sallust included those two formulae specifically to trigger the allusion and, at the point of reception, their proximity certainly makes the diachronic reader even more susceptible to recognising their perversion in the passage below.<sup>61</sup> Following Catiline’s failure to enter the rearranged elections for the consulship of 65, a quaestor named Gnaeus Piso plots with him and the disgraced former consul designate Autronius (18.5):

cum hoc Catilina et Autronius circiter Nonas Decembris consilio  
communicato parabant in Capitolio Kalendis Ianuariis L. Cottam et L.

<sup>59</sup> Deviant focalisation: Fowler (1990).

<sup>60</sup> On *Cat.* as conspiracy narrative, see Pagán (2004) 27–49.

<sup>61</sup> I am indebted to one of *Histos*’ anonymous readers for encouraging me to be less diffident about this possibility.

Torquatum consules interficere, ipsi fascibus conreptis Pisonem cum exercitu ad optinendas duas Hispanias mittere.

Catiline and Autronius shared the plan with [Piso] around the Nones of December and were preparing to kill Lucius Cotta and Lucius Torquatus, the consuls, on the Capitol on the Kalends of January, they themselves to seize the fasces and send Piso with an army to take control of the two Spains.

The evocation of the consular dating formula is here reinforced by the reference to the Kalends of January, not only the day on which the new consuls would enter office (and on which the conspirators planned to murder them), but the start of the year which would be annalistically identified by their names. However, these consuls are not in the ablative absolute, men under whose magisterial governance great deeds were performed, like the victories in Hispania won when Q. Fabius Maximus and M. Claudius Marcellus were consuls in 214.<sup>62</sup> Nor are they in the nominative, entering into office with the full agency of principal magistrates and grammatical subjects, like Verginius and Vetustus (coss. 494).<sup>63</sup> Instead, they are the accusative objects of others' agency.<sup>64</sup> The verb following *consules* does not, as it usually does, have them entering into office (*magistratum inierunt*), but rather has others jarringly plotting to murder them (*interficere*). If the plot were successful, this year would not be named after Cotta and Torquatus, but after the pair of names that begin the sentence, *Catilina et Autronius*.

Catiline's and Autronius' simultaneous usurpation of consular power and narrative structure is made explicit by the three words that open the next sentence. They themselves (*ipsi*), not Cotta and Torquatus, will now possess the *imperium* to dispatch armies to Spain, and the historical record will define

<sup>62</sup> Livy 24.43.1: *haec in Hispania Q. Fabio M. Claudio consulibus gesta*. One of *Histos'* anonymous readers encourages me to make clear that Fabius and Marcellus were not commanding the armies in Hispania, but the association between their occupation of the supreme magistracy and Rome's contemporaneous military success remains.

<sup>63</sup> Livy 2.28.1: *A. Verginius inde et T. Vetustus consulatum ineunt*.

<sup>64</sup> One of *Histos'* anonymous readers helpfully notes that consuls appear in the accusative in Livy in unmarked contexts, citing the consular tribunes at 6.1.8, to which may be added the actual consuls at: 3.8.2; 4.7.10; 8.3.5, 23.17, 37.1; 9.7.15; 10.11.10, 47.5; 25.2.4, 41.11; 29.38.3; 32.27.5; 34.42.3; 38.35.1; 39.56.4; 40.35.1; 42.9.8. In all these passages, an *interrex*, dictator, or consul in the nominative *creat* or *creavit* the consuls (or consular tribunes) in the accusative. Although these consuls could be thought of as objects of another's agency after a fashion, the contrast between the appropriate magistrates constitutionally electing them and conspirators plotting to kill them is if anything even more pointed. *Histos'* other anonymous reader cites Livy 36.1.1, where the senators' command that the consuls perform sacrifices before the allotment of provinces is also marked by religious and political regularity.

this year as that in which *they* were consuls. They achieve this by seizing the fasces (*fascibus conreptis*), illegally appropriating the magistracy, its title, and its role in the annalistic structure. However, Catiline and Autronius are not merely inserting their own names into the fasti and the historiographical narrative in place of Cotta and Torquatus, while leaving the Republican system and its narrative embodiment otherwise intact. The assassination of Cotta and Torquatus and usurpation of their power constitute a fatal attack not just on two specific individuals, but on the whole Republican constitution, as well as its calendrical and historiographical manifestations. They are plotting not only to kill ‘Lucius Cotta and Lucius Torquatus, the consuls’ but to deal a fatal blow to the formula that exemplified and symbolised Republican, annalistic order.

Indeed, in the previous sentence, Sallust introduced Piso as someone spurred on by a combination of moral flaws and empty pockets ‘to throw the *res publica* into confusion’ (*ad perturbandam rem publicam*). This is exactly what the plot and Sallust’s narration of it do. Even the date around which the plot is shared with Piso contributes to the perversion of Republican time. The Nones of December were when the quaestors, including Piso, entered office. The structuring of political time and of the narrative is perverted from the annalistic norm by being based not only on when the consuls were killed rather than when they took office, not only on the illegitimate formula ‘when Catiline and Autronius were consuls’, but also by starting the year a month early when, not the consuls, but an insignificant, ruthlessly ambitious quaestor entered office.

Of course, none of this comes to pass. Both the lexical sense and the imperfect tense of *parabant* reduce this usurpation of political and narrative power to the realms of counterfactual history.<sup>65</sup> The plot is delayed and expanded to involve a mass-murder of senators, but that too becomes ‘virtual history’ because Catiline is premature in giving the signal (18.6–8):

ea re cognita rursus in Nonas Februarias consilium caedis transtulerant. iam tum non consulibus modo, sed plerisque senatoribus perniciem machinabantur. quod ni Catilina maturasset pro curia signum socii dare, eo die post conditam urbem Romam pessimum facinus patratum foret.

When that plan was discovered they had postponed the plan to slaughter back to the Nones of February. At that point, they were

<sup>65</sup> On counterfactual history in Roman historiography, see Suerbaum (1997), Morello (2002), Pagán (2002), O’Gorman (2006), Grethlein (2013) 242–4, and Cowan (2018) 95–6. Sallust himself offers a counterfactual scenario of what would have happened if Catiline had been successful in the first battle (39.40). On these Sallustian examples: Gerrish (2019) 127–9.

plotting destruction, not only for the consuls, but for numerous senators. But if Catiline had not been premature in giving the signal to his confederates in front of the senate-house, on that day the worst crime since/after the foundation of the city of Rome would have been committed.

The unfulfilled past condition, with pluperfect (and sometimes, as here, imperfect) subjunctives, is the classic means of expressing a near-miss counterfactual event, in epic and in historiography.<sup>66</sup> Here it is significant that Sallust alludes to another dating system, that from the foundation of the city.<sup>67</sup> The phrase *post conditam urbem* is used here primarily in its hyperbolic sense of ‘since God was in short pants’, meaning effectively ‘ever’, but with the added Romanocentric and political flavour that is produced by measuring ‘forever’ by the lifespan of the city. This is the sense when Cicero asks Vatinius whether a tribune has ever ‘since the foundation of the city’ conducted business with the people when the sky was being watched, and, alluding to our passage, when Tacitus describes the burning of the Capitol in 69 CE as the saddest and foulest crime ‘since the foundation of the city’.<sup>68</sup>

However, in this context so full of dates—quite apart from subtler allusions, three of the five specific dates in the whole of the *Catilina* occur in chapter 18<sup>69</sup>—and following the words *eo die*, not to mention the *iam tum* with which the Nones of February sequence begins, there is inevitably an evocation of the phrase’s use as a dating formula.<sup>70</sup> While *ab urbe condita* is more common, both

<sup>66</sup> E.g., Sall. *Jug.* 21.2: *et ni multitudo togatorum fuisset, quae Numidas insequentis moenibus prohibuit, uno die inter duos reges coeptum atque patratum bellum foret*; Virg. *A.* 9.757–9: *et si continuo uictorem ea cura subisset* [sc. Turnus], | *rumpere claustra manu sociosque immittere portis*, | *ultimus ille dies bello gentique fuisset*.

<sup>67</sup> On dating *ab urbe condita*—and its relative rarity—see Feeney (2007) 140–1. One of *Histos*’ anonymous readers notes the further echo of *Urbem Romam, sicuti ego accepi, condidere* at *Cat.* 6.1.

<sup>68</sup> Cic. *Vat.* 17: *num quem post urbem conditam scias tribunum plebis egisse cum plebe, cum constaret seruatum esse de caelo*. Tac. *Hist.* 3.72: *id facinus post conditam urbem luctuosissimum foedissimumque rei publicae populi Romani accidit*. For the allusion, see Keitel (2010) 351. On the Capitol episode as a whole, see Ash (2007a), esp. 232–3 on how, with this phrase, ‘in one awful moment [Tacitus] broadens out his narrative focus temporally to contextualise this event within a huge chronological sweep of Roman history. Now, Roman citizens climactically destroy the Capitoline Temple and thus “decapitate” their own empire in a way that has not happened before.’ Cf. Cic. *Cat.* 4.14; *Dom.* 50; *Vat.* 34; *Phil.* 5.17.

<sup>69</sup> Ramsey (2007) 103 ad 17.1.

<sup>70</sup> Vretska (1976) I.297 ad loc. curiously (but suggestively) takes it straightforwardly as a dating formula: ‘die Gründung als Zeitangabe bei S[allust] nur hier’.

*post urbem conditam* and *post conditam urbem* are also frequently so employed.<sup>71</sup> Velleius uses it three times in combination with both the consular formula and with the reckoning by the number of years *before* his history's composition in the consulate of Marcus Vinicius in 30 CE. All three years are marked by this overdetermined precision of dating as of epoch-defining significance: the outbreak of civil war in 49 BCE, the Young Caesar's first consulship in 43 BCE, and his adoption (now as Augustus) of Tiberius in 4 CE.<sup>72</sup> Tacitus uses it to date (approximately) the starting-point of his *Histories* in the year of four emperors, 69 CE, 820 years after the foundation of the city.<sup>73</sup>

Sallust conflates these dual associations of the phrase with magnitude (usually of disaster) and with dating. In the alternative universe where Catiline's plan came to fruition, the Nones of February would have been a day that would live in infamy, a single day which became a recurring date, like that of the Allia. More than that, it would have marked an endpoint to the history of Rome that started with its foundation. *Patro* has the specific nuance of not merely 'doing' but 'bringing to completion' and it is notable that Sallust uses it in the *Iugurtha* in specific antithesis to *coepi*, describing 'the war between two kings that would have been started and finished on a single day' (*uno die inter duos reges coeptum atque patratum bellum foret*, 21.2).<sup>74</sup> Not only the worst crime, Sallust implies, but Roman history itself would have been brought to completion and would have found its end date, bookending the span of Roman history with the city's foundation.<sup>75</sup>

<sup>71</sup> *Ab urbe condita* is only used to identify a year by Livy himself once (31.5.1) three times in the *Periochae* (47, 49 *bis*; an instance in 31 is deleted by editors), once each by the Elder Pliny (35.22; he uses it to measure a period of time rather than mark the endpoint at 16.216 and 18.107) and Florus (2.34) and three times by Frontinus (*Aq.* 6.1; 7.1; 4.1, as in Pliny, measures the duration).

<sup>72</sup> Vell. 2.49.1, 65.2, 103.3. The first two date from the present using the formula *ante annos ... quam tu, M. Vinici, consulatum inires*, the last *abhinc*. For the relevance of the first date for Velleius' tendentious dating of the duration of the civil war, see Cowan (2019) 249–52.

<sup>73</sup> Tac. *Hist.* 1.1: *nam post conditam urbem octingentos et uiginti prioris aevi annos multi auctores rettulerunt*. For the problems surrounding Tacitus' apparent slippage between the year of four emperors and that of Actium as the end point of free and eloquent historiography, see Marincola (1999). The book (and hence the work) also starts with a problematic employment of the consular dating formula (*initium mihi operis Seruius Galba iterum Titus Vinicius consules erunt*) which adheres to annalistic time before reverting to an analepsis of the six months of Galba's principate in 68, while Galba's and Vinicius' consulship was, of course, extremely short. On the opening, see Cole (1992).

<sup>74</sup> It is also relevant that, as McGushin (1977) ad loc. notes, *patratum* is 'a solemn archaic verb'.

<sup>75</sup> One of *Histos'* editors, Rhiannon Ash, makes the attractive suggestion that Florus' sole use of *ab urbe condita*, at the very end of his epitome, constitutes a comparable but contrastingly optimistic image of the end of Roman history, with the young Caesar's

### The Unconsular Year in the *Iugurtha*

In the *Iugurtha*, Sallust produces a different and, if anything, still more radical manipulation of the formula. In *Catilina* 18, Sallust uses the consular dating formula to represent a normative and broadly positive construction of Republican time, constitutional regularity, Roman history and its narration, so that the attempted perversion of that formula by Catiline, Autronius, and Piso dramatises their disruption and appropriation of time, politics, history, and historical narrative. Three uses of the formula in the *Iugurtha* operate in a broadly comparable way. Each seems to inaugurate a new narrative block in which consular integrity and industry are restored in contrast to the prevailing senatorial torpor, but each is tainted, qualified, and perverted to reflect the rotten state of the body politic. On two other occasions, Sallust alludes to the formula as representing, not a broadly Roman or Republican construction of time, history, and narrative but rather one that is specifically senatorial, aristocratic, and optimate. We have already (albeit later in Sallust's career) seen his Macer producing a similar construction in the *Historiae*. But while Macer exposes annalistic time as optimate time and deprecates it, he inevitably reproduces it to make that point. In the *Iugurtha*, by contrast, Sallust's narratorial perversions of the consular dating formula offer an alternative construction of time, history, and narrative, one that is popular and even *popularis*, and one which moves inevitably away from the collaboration of two consuls to the domination of one man.

Unlike the *Catilina*, and perhaps surprisingly for a monograph which spans a much wider period of time, the *Iugurtha* includes few straightforward examples of the consular dating formula itself. Nevertheless, it does contain three significant instances and three more where the formula is evoked and perverted.<sup>76</sup> The early stages of the narrative are marked by senatorial inaction, the result of corruption and the pernicious influence of 'Jugurthine disorder'.<sup>77</sup> The failure of the constitutional system to operate properly or to take any meaningful action is reflected in the absence of the consular dating formula or indeed of any reference to the consuls, who certainly do not generate any action worthy of historical record. Public outrage over the massacre at Cirta

teleological closing of the doors of the temple of Janus in 29 BCE: *aususque tandem Caesar Augustus septingentesimo ab urbe condita anno Ianum geminum cludere* (2.34).

<sup>76</sup> A further minor example is when Spurius Albinus' persuasion of Massiva to claim the Numidian throne is convolutedly dated to the year of his consulship in 110 BCE, but there is no obvious evocation of the annalistic formula nor any detectable manipulation of it (35.2): *huic Sp. Albinus, qui proximo anno post Bestiam cum Q. Minucio Rufo consulatum gerebat, persuadet ...* ('Spurius Albinus, who was holding the consulship in the next year after Bestia [cos. 111] with Quintus [*sic*, for his brother Marcus] Minucius Rufus, persuaded him ...').

<sup>77</sup> The phrase from Kraus (1999).



in 112, however, forces the senate to act, though even then the intervention of the tribune designate Memmius to stir up the people and pressure the senate is required to overcome the influence of Iugurtha's bribery. Senatorial action, when finally taken, is swift, and this is reflected in a rapid, condensed narrative (27.3–5):<sup>78</sup>

sed ubi senatus delicti conscientia populum timet, lege Sempronia prouinciae futuris consulibus Numidia atque Italia decretae; consules declarati P. Scipio Nasica, L. Bestia Calpurnius; Calpurnio Numidia, Scipioni Italia obuenerit. deinde exercitus qui in Africam portaretur scribitur, stipendium aliaque quae bello usui forent decernuntur.

But when the senate, conscious of its crime, grew afraid of the people, by the Sempronian law the provinces of Numidia and Italy were decreed to the incoming consuls; Publius Scipio Nasica and Lucius Calpurnius Bestia were declared consuls; Numidia fell to the lot of Calpurnius, Italy to that of Scipio. Then an army was enrolled to be shipped to Africa, and wages and the other things which are useful for war were decreed.

Annalistic language is employed to evoke the political and military action appropriate to annalistic history, and it is further compressed to produce an even greater impression of speed and efficiency. The consuls are declared but the moment of their entry into office is not specified, as if the narrative and the activity of which it is so closely mimetic could not pause for such details.<sup>79</sup> The brief explosion of senatorial activity and annalistic regularity throws the previous corruption and stagnation of magistrates and narrative into relief, and promises to mark the beginning of a new period of historical time, but it also proves a false dawn. Bestia has many admirable qualities but, like almost everyone in Sallust, he has a fatal flaw, in his case, avarice.<sup>80</sup> Despite a few minor successes in Numidia, Bestia is bribed by Iugurtha and makes a dishonourable peace. Bestia and his narrative follow parallel arcs. For the situation is not as simple as that the annalistic language of 27.3–5, including the gesture towards the consular dating formula, is a sham, reflecting the senate's

<sup>78</sup> I am indebted to one of *Histos'* anonymous readers for pointing out the relevance of this passage and for some of the subsequent analysis.

<sup>79</sup> *Histos'* anonymous reader notes that this also occurs in the later books of Livy, e.g., 35.20.1–3; 38.42.8; 39.23.5–7.

<sup>80</sup> 28.5: *in consule nostro multae bonaeque artes (et) animi et corporis erant, quas omnis avaritia praepediebat* ('In our consul there were many good qualities both of mind and of body, all of which avarice obstructed').

pretence of action to placate Memmius and the people.<sup>81</sup> Rather the senate with their decrees, Bestia with his expedition, and the narrative with its annalistic language, all genuinely try to step up to an appropriate historiographical register of style and action, but their good qualities are outweighed and corrupted by their innate vices and the external influence of Iugurtha.<sup>82</sup>

The two consuls who demonstrate appropriate vigour in their prosecution of the war with Iugurtha and an ability to withstand his bribery are each introduced with evocations of the consular dating formula that reflect their greater conformity to Republican and annalistic norms of consular behaviour but, as ever, with a twist. Q. Caecilius Metellus, later given the cognomen Numidicus in reflection of his achievements in the war, was elected consul for 109 alongside M. Iunius Silanus at a particularly low point in Rome's dealings with Iugurtha. The narration of his entry into the consulship in *Jug.* 43 immediately follows the excursus on civil strife between the orders (41–2). As such, it is structurally marked as the beginning of a new section of the narrative and of the war against Iugurtha.<sup>83</sup> However, the chapter also demands to be read in the light of that excursus and its subject matter of aristocratic *superbia* and oppression of the people. The resumptive formula that Sallust uses to return from the excursus to the main narrative disingenuously suggests a discontinuity between the two (42.5):

sed de studiis partium et omnis ciuitatis moribus si singillatim aut pro magnitudine parem disserere, tempus quam res maturius me deseret; quam ob rem ad inceptum redeo.

But if I were to prepare to discourse about the partisanship of the parties and the morals of the whole state one by one or in proportion to their magnitude, time would run out for me sooner than subject matter; for that reason I return to what I have started.

The clear implication is that, because Sallust does not have world enough and time to expend on the excess material illustrating the partisanship of the factions, he will instead return to the topic he has already undertaken. This impression of discontinuity is undercut by the fact that Sallust's *inceptum*—the Numidian War, its mishandling by the nobles, and the resulting rise of

<sup>81</sup> *Contra* Parker (2004) 117: 'Now the reader grasps the situation. Once again, all has been for show ... Forced into action, the venal nobles only pretend to do the right thing, for behind the scenes they prepare to sell Rome again.'

<sup>82</sup> Cf. Kraus (1999) 221: 'the narrative itself exhibits the flexibility and disorder that it rehearses'.

<sup>83</sup> Wiedemann (1993) 50: 'The three digressions separate off and introduce phases of the war under various Roman commanders who represent different ethical states'.

Marius—is itself part of the history of the *studia partium* and illustrates the *mores omnis ciuitatis*. Indeed, in the prologue, he explicitly states as the second (and implicitly more important) reason for his choice of the Iugurthine War as subject matter that it constituted the first instance of opposition towards aristocratic *superbia* and led to the subsequent series of civil conflicts (5.1–2).<sup>84</sup> With a final twist, that very justification of his theme is introduced by the identical formula *ad inceptum redeo*, the paradoxical resumption of a narrative that has not yet begun after an ‘excursus’ on human morality.<sup>85</sup> Sallust’s *inceptum* is both the Iugurthine War and the longer optimate-*popularis* struggle of which that war is a (synecdochic) part. So, the transition from the excursus on that struggle to the consulship of Metellus constitutes simultaneously the beginning of a new segment in the periodisation of historical and narrative time, and a continuation of the class war that dominated the centuries preceding 109 BCE and the chapters preceding 43.

This tension between continuity and discontinuity is articulated by Sallust’s manipulation of the consular dating formula(e) in his narrative of Metellus’ entry into the consulship (43.1–2):

post Auli foedus exercitusque nostri foedam fugam Metellus et Silanus, consules designati, prouincias inter se partiuerant, Metelloque Numidia euenerat, acri uiro et, quamquam aduorso populi partium, fama tamen aequabili et inuiolata. is ubi primum magistratum ingressus est, alia omnia <communia> sibi cum conlega ratus, ad bellum quod gesturus erat animum intendit.

After Aulus’ treaty and the shameful flight of our army, Metellus and Silanus, the consuls designate, had divided the provinces between themselves, and Numidia had been allotted to Metellus, an energetic man and, although an opponent of the party of the people, nevertheless one of steady and untainted reputation. He, as soon as he entered into the magistracy, considering that all other duties were shared by him with his colleague, focused his mind on the war that he was about to wage.

<sup>84</sup> See Marincola (1997) 40 on Sallust’s variation on the historian’s traditional amplification of his subject matter: ‘The war is magnified ... by association’.

<sup>85</sup> Kraus (1999) 219: ‘The preface ends with *nunc ad inceptum redeo* ... a digression-ending formula (as at 42.5, 79.10, Tac. *Ann.* 4.33.4). Yet at this point there exists no narrative for Sallust to have digressed from—unless we imagine ourselves to have started in the middle, that is, of a narrative of which only this fragment remains. The author’s explicit insistence that we look beyond the work at hand comes immediately thereafter with the announcement of his subject.’

Metellus' consulship and the narrative of his command in Numidia are periodised as constituting a new phase emphatically *after* the punningly shameful treaty (*foedus* ~ *foedam*) struck by the brother of the previous consul, Sp. Postumius Albinus.<sup>86</sup> As with Bestia and Nasica in 112, a sense of urgency and energy is conveyed by the assigning of provinces to the consuls designate rather than those already in office. The impression is not that constitutional procedure is being distorted, but rather that it is being expedited, that annalistic time is accelerating from the anomalous torpor of consular inaction to the normative speed of consular action. The pen-portrait of Metellus supports this impression, as he is energetic (*acri*), takes immediate action (*ubi primum*), and focuses his attention on his future military achievements worthy of historical record (*bellum quod gesturus erat* being proleptic of *res gestae*). As was suggested above, with regard to Cotta and Octavius' entry into the consulship for 75 at *Hist.* 2.42, even the unusual form of the consular dating formula using *ingredi* rather than *inire* may suggest an energetic entry into office, partly ironic and partly perverted there, but apparently 'straight' here. Even Metellus' belief that 'all other duties were shared by him with his colleague' superficially evokes the consular and annalistic ideal of collegiality which we have so often seen to be at best problematised in, and at worst absent from, other Sallustian uses and evocations of the consular dating formula.<sup>87</sup> The evocation of the consular dating formula and its frequent narrative accompaniments thus mark chapter 43 as a discontinuous, new beginning in narrative structure and historical time characterised by the constitutional regularity and consular activity that are typical of the annalistic ideal.

However, the discontinuity of the fresh start in the narrative of the war stands in counterpoint to the continuities with the larger narrative of the digression on civil strife. Even that final evocation of collegiality is undermined by its context and the subsequent main clause. For it instantly becomes clear that Metellus' belief in the principle of collegiality does not mean that he is willing to share all privileges, duties, and responsibilities with Silanus, but on the contrary that he feels justified in leaving 'everything else' to his colleague while he focuses exclusively on the war in Numidia.<sup>88</sup> Metellus' energy is a

<sup>86</sup> Paul (1984) 132 ad loc.: 'sarcastic wordplay'. Cf. Montgomery (2004) 81 on the 'deliberate narrative contrast between Sallust's version of the pre-Metellan campaign and that of Metellus' actual command', though his emphasis is on not on periodisation but on the narratological mimesis of Metellus' single-mindedness ('just as Metellus has adopted his singlemindedness in response to his command and the threat of his enemy, so Sallust himself has adopted a narrative technique to complement Metellus' focus').

<sup>87</sup> Reynolds prints Ernout's supplement *communia*, though the same sense can be extracted from the unaltered paradosis, as can be seen from Ramsey's translation and Koestermann's note ad loc. ('der Begriff auch so schon implicite im Ausdruck steckt').

<sup>88</sup> Paul (1984) 133 ad loc.: 'i.e. they did not claim Metellus' full attention'. Montgomery (2004) 80 (original emphasis): 'Sallust shows Metellus focusing his entire attention upon the

welcome contrast to the apathy of Albinus and his predecessors, but, as so often in Roman history and in Roman thought, such energy is entwined with the agonistic, solipsistic drive towards individual success in a zero-sum game. In Metellus' case, that preoccupation with personal distinction is also interwoven with class partisanship, and the two together lead to characteristically aristocratic *superbia*.<sup>89</sup> The pen-portrait of Metellus is carefully balanced, emphasising his positive qualities while subtly adumbrating the negative, conceding the latter (*quamquam*) but apparently compensating with the former (*tamen*). However, as Levene notes, it is the positioning of the reference to his opposition to the popular party immediately following the digression on the conflict of the orders that draws particular attention to this one vice among so many virtues.<sup>90</sup> The characterisation of Metellus and of the pseudo-annalistic narrative run in parallel. He is the quintessential consul of annalistic historiography, a doer of deeds and generator of material, whose (almost) formulaic entry into office marks the start of a new, normative narrative block. He is also the quintessential aristocrat of the digression's alternative history, a haughty opponent of the popular party, whose entry into the consulship constitutes a continuation of the nobles' use of that office to oppress the people, as they did in the digression and will do in Macer's speech in *Hist.* 3.48. Commencement and continuity, the two principal connotations of the consular dating formula, are set in opposition.

Metellus' class prejudice eventually manifests itself in his mocking attitude to Marius' candidature for the consulship (64.1–4). In a pointed inversion of his introductory pen-portrait, it is now his good qualities that are in the concessive clause (*Quoi quamquam uirtus, gloria atque alia optanda bonis superabant ...* ('Although he had valour, renown and other things desirable by good men in abundance ...')), and his solitary but ruinous flaw that is given the full emphasis of the main clause (*tamen inerat contemptor animus et superbia, commune nobilitatis malum* ('Nevertheless, there was in him a spirit of contempt and arrogance, the shared flaw of the nobility'), 64.2). Metellus' *superbia* proves to be not only the most important facet of his character but the one that marks him as almost a synecdoche for his class.<sup>91</sup> His subsequent reaction to Marius' election dramatises the overcoming of consular industry by aristocratic *superbia*, of annalistic

war effort, *to the point* of leaving all other matters of state to his consular colleague, Silanus. This characteristic is not accidental or temporary. The consulship is a shared office. Metellus pays no attention to his colleague.'

<sup>89</sup> Cf. Montgomery (2013–14) 37–8 on the delayed revelation of Metellus' *superbia*.

<sup>90</sup> Levene (1992) 60: 'Metellus comes out of this looking nearly perfect ... Sallust has provided one discordant note in the reference to his hostility to the popular cause: this comes directly after the digression on party strife, and hence surely indicates a major flaw.'

<sup>91</sup> Cf. Papaioannou (2014) 122: 'the arrogance of the nobility is represented ... by Metellus'. Montgomery (2013–14) 38 notes that 'Metellus is the only Roman who is *explicitly*

new beginnings by the continuities of *popularis* history (82.2–83.1). The narrative block of Metellus' command, which began so promisingly with energetic consular activity, ends with the same consular torpor that had characterised the preceding block, as the 'war was drawn out, untried, in accordance with the will of Metellus' (*ex Metelli uoluntate bellum intactum trahi*, 83.3).<sup>92</sup> Ring composition brings the Metellus-narrative to a close, but the larger narrative of the war insistently resists closure, drawn out and dragged on by the final word *trahi*. The even larger narrative of aristocratic *superbia* also continues with this latest instantiation of it, but it is about to be challenged.

The opening words of the following chapter explicitly mark another disjuncture, as the narrative shifts to the dominant figure of the next and final section, Marius (84.1–2):<sup>93</sup>

at Marius, ut supra diximus, cupientissima plebe consul factus, postquam ei prouinciam Numidiam populus iussit, antea iam infestus nobilitati, tum uero multus atque ferox instare, singulos modo, modo uniuorsos laedere, dictitare sese consulatum ex uictis illis spolia cepisse, alia praeterea magna pro se et illis dolentia; interim quae bello opus erant prima habere, postulare legionibus supplementum, auxilia a populis et regibus arcessere, praeterea ex Latio sociisque fortissimum quemque, plerosque militiae, paucos fama cognitos, adire et ambiundo cogere homines emeritis stipendiis secum proficisci.

But Marius, as we said above, with the strongest desire of the plebeians elected consul, after the people had ordered the province of Numidia to him, already hostile to the nobility before, then indeed much and fiercely laid into them, wounded now individuals, now them as a whole, kept saying that he had taken the consulship from them, defeated, as spoils, and other things beside which were aggrandising for him and hurtful to them; meanwhile he considered of the first importance those things which were needed for the war, he demanded reinforcements for the legions, summoned auxiliaries from the nations and kings, and in addition he summoned all the bravest men from Latium and the allies, most known from military service, a few by reputation, and by canvassing he cajoled fellows who had completed their military service to set out with him.

referred to as possessing *superbia*, the single vice identified in the prologue as initiating the process leading to civil war' (original emphasis).

<sup>92</sup> E.g., *statuit sibi nihil agendum* ('[Albinus] decided that nothing should be done by him'). Cf. Levene (1992) 62: 'This was more or less the state in which the previous commanders had left things when Metellus took over'.

<sup>93</sup> For ch. 84 as the start of the final section of the *Iugurtha*, see Büchner (1953) 54.

The emphatic *at* signals the change of focus from Metellus to Marius and with it from aristocratic *superbia* to the *popularis* challenge to it. The analeptic cross-reference *ut supra diximus* reminds the reader of the brief narrative of Marius' election in chapter 73, but in such a way as further to emphasise how that vignette was embedded as part of the Metellus-narrative.<sup>94</sup> Sallust could have commenced his narrative then, but the decline of Metellus had still to run its course and the historian chose to begin the new block with Marius' actual entry into the consulship. This new beginning is marked, unsurprisingly, with an evocation of the consular dating formula.

When *at* has signalled the transition, *Marius ... consul factus* marks the annalistic beginning of the new narrative block. As with Bestia (abortively) and Metellus (with greater but only partial success), the new consul immediately begins to generate material for the historian in a flurry of activity that contrasts sharply with the consular and narrative inertia immediately preceding it. The succession of asyndetic historic infinitives offers an impression of intense industry, further compounded by the detail that everything is being conducted *interim*, at the same time as Marius' series of vigorous attacks on the nobility.<sup>95</sup> In these respects, the consular dating formula is serving its normative function by evoking its normative associations. It is precisely these normative elements that make its departures from the norm serve Sallust's thematic ends so effectively. The formula itself, *Marius ... consul factus*, is interrupted and modified, not only by the aforementioned cross-reference, but by the jarring ablative of attendant circumstances, almost of agent, *cupientissima plebe*. The consulship, which in the *Iugurtha*, as often elsewhere in Sallust, is both the preserve and the oppressive instrument of the nobility, has here been awarded with or even *by* the extreme desire of the people.<sup>96</sup> This prominence of the people in the shaping of consular action is reinforced by their role in assigning provinces. Numidia had been assigned to Bestia, at least implicitly, by the senate, while Metellus and Silanus had divided up the provinces between themselves. In pronounced contrast, here it is the people who do not merely

<sup>94</sup> The election-narrative's status as subsidiary is further signalled by the synchronising transition to the 'main' narrative in Numidia (74.1): *eodem tempore Iugurtha ...*

<sup>95</sup> La Penna (1968) 214: 'sono sottolineate (anche stilisticamente con l'incalzare di infiniti storici) l'energia e l'alacrità con cui il console prepara la guerra'.

<sup>96</sup> Historians dispute the role of the *plebs* in Marius' election, asserting the importance of senatorial and/or equestrian support. The reality is not of direct relevance, but if Sallust has tendentiously exaggerated or invented the people's influence, that may be more thematically significant than if he were more closely following an established tradition. On the election, with full discussion of Sallust's narrative, see Yakobson (1999) 13–19. More briefly: Syme (1964) 173.

assign but command (*iussit*) that Numidia be assigned to Marius.<sup>97</sup> The consulship and the annalistic form structured by consular time are not here, as in Macer's speech in the *Historiae*, rejected as inextricably intertwined with optimate power and an optimate conception of historical and narrative time, though this is a move that Sallust has made earlier in the monograph and that will be discussed below. Rather Marius and the people appropriate the consulship and consular annalistic time to serve their own ideological agenda and to change it into *popularis* time, structured around the consulship of their champion.<sup>98</sup> This appropriation is made all-but-explicit when Marius keeps saying that he has captured the consulship from the defeated nobles like spoils. Not only the consulship but its narrative function has been wrested from optimate control and claimed by the people, or at least by their current champion.

The violence of this military image inevitably conjures thoughts of the actual civil wars to come in which Marius would play so bloody a part, and this sombre mood pervades the passage. Aristocratic *superbia* has been successfully challenged but the narrative is at best ambivalent about what has replaced it. Sallust's narrative voice has mixed feelings about Marius and he is depicted in this chapter with strongly pejorative terms such as *ferox*, intertextual connections to Thucydides' Cleon, and perhaps most tellingly by describing his speeches as *magnificus*, which, as Koestermann puts it, '= *superbus*'.<sup>99</sup> Perhaps it is not only the consulship but also its defining vice that Marius has appropriated.<sup>100</sup> However, it is beyond the scope of this article to analyse fully Sallust's depiction of Marius even in this chapter. In terms of the consular dating formula, the most striking feature of that depiction is that, unlike the many

<sup>97</sup> The contrast is even sharper in 73.7, where the people vote Numidia to Marius and the senate decrees it to Metellus, the latter 'in vain' (*frustra*). It is tempting to see a meta-textual reference in the tribune Mancinus' question as to whom the people wanted 'to wage the war with Iugurtha' (*cum Iugurtha bellum gerere*), or to be the protagonist of the *Bellum Iugurthinum*.

<sup>98</sup> Cf. Levene (1992) 63: 'Sallust has consistently made it clear that what he does is closely related to the overall class struggle at Rome, as the nobles attempt to keep a "novus homo" from office.'

<sup>99</sup> La Penna (1968) 214, discussing the duality of *Jug.* 84: 'il giudizio di Sallustio appare complesso e forse incerto'. Koestermann (1971) 290: 'Die Persönlichkeit des Marius betrachtet Sallust offenkundig mit gemischten Gefühlen'; '*ferox* hat bei Sallust selten einen guten Klang', *ibid.* 291, with parallels in *Cat.* and elsewhere in *Jug.* Cleon: Paul (1984) 204 comparing *tum uero multus instare* (84.1) with *πολὺς ἐνέκειτο* (Thuc. 4.22.2). *magnificus*: Koestermann (1971) 291 *ad loc.*

<sup>100</sup> Cf. Levene (1992) 63: 'Marius has been drawn into class hatred: before he was hostile only to Metellus as an individual, now he hates all the nobility ... just as with Jugurtha and Metellus, it is the corruption of the city as a whole which is a substantial cause of Marius' behaviour here.' Syme (1964) 170: 'All too often in the past the nobility had been evilly elated by success, and now it was the turn of the plebs', citing 40.5 and with direct reference to the *quaestio Mamiliiana*, but in the context of a discussion of Marius' election.



occasions where Livy uses a similar formula with the consuls in the plural (e.g., *L. Quinctius et Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus consules facti*, Livy 35.10.10), Marius here is elected consul, *consul factus*, in the singular. Livy does on three occasions use the formula *consul factus* in the singular, but all of them significantly include the addendum ‘along with X’ as a colleague, as at 2.48.1: *K. Fabius cum T. Verginio consul factus*.<sup>101</sup> As ever, we must exercise caution about treating Livy as representative of a norm from which others (especially predecessors) significantly depart, but in this instance the Livian formulae reflect the essence of the consulship, its duality, its dyarchy, and its collegiality. Scipio Nasica fades from view in Sallust’s narrative of 111 BCE as the focus inevitably follows Bestia to Numidia, but his election (or at least declaration) is marked by the pairing of his name with that of his colleague, and even his responsibilities in Italy are briefly mentioned. Metellus’ colleague for 109, Silanus, is still included in the dating formula and the consuls together divide up the provinces but Silanus’ province is not named. Metellus’ single-mindedness, ambition, and *superbia* lead him to leave the mundane business of ‘everything else’ to his colleague and to abrogate the prestigious conduct of the war for himself alone, a form of collegiality, but very much a debased one, and a step on the path to the domination of a single leader. Marius’ colleague for 107, L. Cassius Longinus Ravilla, is never mentioned, either in the election narrative of chapter 73 or in the description of the events of 107 itself.<sup>102</sup> The programmatic note struck by the anomalous consular dating formula *Marius ... consul factus* produces the impression that Marius is that oxymoron (at least until 52 BCE), a sole consul. The impression continues as Marius is repeatedly referred to in the narrative

<sup>101</sup> The other instances are 7.27.5 and 10.15.12. The apparent exceptions to this tendency are either illusory or significant. 39.56.5 refers to the election of M. Aemilius Lepidus after two defeats (*a quo consule quintus annus erat, is ipse Lepidus post duas repulsas consul factus esset*), but only as a detail specifically about Lepidus, as a convoluted way of indicating the surprising length of time between L. Aemilius Paullus’ aedileship in 193 (alongside Lepidus, who went on to be consul in 187) and his consulship in 182. Lepidus’ colleague, Flaminius, is not excluded but irrelevant. 10.5.14 suggestively appears to set up M. Valerius Corvus as becoming (ostensibly) sole consul for 300 from that other sole magistracy, the dictatorship, (*consul ex dictatura factus M. Valerius*), but even here, after a brief excursus on variant traditions, the one fact of which Livy is confident is revealed as being that Corvus’ colleague was Q. Appuleius Pansa (*id unum non ambigitur consulatum cum Apuleio Pansa gessisse*). The one actual exception is 6.42.10: *L. Sextius de plebe primus consul factus*. The election of the first ever plebeian consul in the face of aristocratic opposition bears obvious similarities to that of the first *novus homo* for many years with the same opposition, and it may be significant that Sextius’ colleague, L. Aemilius Mamercinus, is neither named nor mentioned. The phrase is repeated almost verbatim in P. Decius Mus’ speech of 300 at 10.8.8 (*L. Sextius primus de plebe consul est factus*), but as with Lepidus, Decius’ point is about Sextius as an individual and one item in a list of ‘firsts’.

<sup>102</sup> His role as praetor for 111 in bringing Iugurtha to Rome to be questioned by Memmius is narrated in 32–33.1 and his *fidēs* praised.

of his Numidian campaign simply as *consul*, the (singular) consul.<sup>103</sup> It is not merely the association with optimate power that is conspicuously absent from this instance of the consular dating formula. Its evocation of constitutional regularity is also diminished as two become one and the first step is taken on the path to the monograph's final chapter, which will be discussed below.

Turning from actual instances of the consular dating formula to evocations and perversions of it, we may move just a little further ahead in the narrative to a moment in Marius' speech to the people (85.12):

atque ego scio, Quirites, qui postquam consules facti sunt et acta maiorum et Graecorum militaria praecepta legere coeperint: praeposteri homines, nam gerere quam fieri tempore posterius, re atque usu prius est.

And I myself know, my fellow-citizens, of men who, after they have become consuls, begin to read the deeds of our ancestors and the military treatises of the Greeks: these fellows put the cart before the horse, for to act [as consul] is later than to be elected in terms of time, but in reality and experience it is earlier.

Marius is here of course setting up a series of interrelated polarities between nobles and *noui homines*, civilians and soldiers, book-learning and practical experience, words and deeds, even Greek and Roman. His rhetorical position is subtly strengthened by a sophisticated evocation of the consular dating formula. The argument of this passage is as much about time as it is about action, not just what consuls should do but when they should do it. The consular dating formula *consules facti sunt* (the names have a veil drawn over them by the generic relative pronoun) ought to mark the beginning of these consuls' military achievements as they generate material for annalistic historiography. Instead, it is only *after* (*postquam*) the beginning of that narrative block that they even begin (*coeperint*) to mug up on tactical theory and precedent. By strict logic, Marius' formulation suggests that these *praeposteri homines* ought to be reading Roman history and Greek handbooks before they are elected consul. However, the emphasis on *gerere*, in explicit antithesis with *fieri* but also

<sup>103</sup> *Jug.* 87.1; 89.1; 90.1; 92.3; 97.4; 100.3; 101.2; 102.1; 103.4. Bestia (28.3), Albinus (35.3), and Metellus (*bis*: 47.2, 4) are also referred to simply as *consul*, but in all four instances this is simple *uariatio* immediately following a sentence in which they have been named. In 39.2–4, in three successive sentences, *consul Albinus* disingenuously refers a decision to the senate, the senate makes a decree, and the unnamed *consul* sets out for Africa. The awkwardness of repeating Albinus' name so soon and the antithesis set up between *senatus* and *consul* sufficiently account for this instance. Marius is named in the vicinity of some of the passages cited above, but by no means in all, and the sheer number of occasions on which he is identified simply as *consul* remains significant.

in implicit contrast to *legere*, indicates that these fellows are doubly belated. Only after they are elected consuls do they even start to *read* about warfare, whereas before that election (*quam fieri ... prius*) they ought to be not just reading but doing. In normative annalistic structure, to act (*gerere*) is indeed later than to be elected (*fieri*). The consular dating formula *consules facti sunt* marks the beginning of a narrative of the consuls' *res gestae*. However, it can only do this if those consuls have garnered enough practical experience beforehand. As it is, when their block of annalistic narrative has begun, these consuls are not generating material for the historian but reading the historical narratives of others' deeds (*acta maiorum*). This minor instance of Sallust's manipulation of the consular dating formula is nevertheless significant because it shows him, almost in a *mise-en-abîme*, depicting one of his own characters manipulating it for rhetorical ends.

The other two perversions of the formula carry greater resonance for the monograph's overarching themes. The first occurs in the pen-portrait of Lucius Opimius, when he heads a commission to Numidia in the aftermath of the senate's arbitration between Adherbal and Iugurtha in 117 or 116 BCE (16.2):

quoius legationis princeps fuit L. Opimius, homo clarus et tum in senatu potens, quia consul C. Graccho et M. Fulvio Flacco interfectis acerrume uictoriam nobilitatis in plebem exercuerat.

The leader of this commission was Lucius Opimius, a fellow who was distinguished and at that time powerful in the senate, because as consul when Gaius Gracchus and Marcus Fulvius Flaccus were killed he had prosecuted the victory of the nobles against the people with extreme prejudice.

Sallust's designation of Opimius as *homo clarus* has been taken as a mildly positive description, setting up the antithesis with the verdict on his brutal treatment of Gracchan supporters.<sup>104</sup> It is true that *clarus* in Sallust can carry the lustre of the admirable qualities for which someone is renowned or distinguished, as Caesar was for his gentleness and pity, or the qualities of the adjective with which it is paired, as with the near-hendiadys of the renowned and great Cato. Even there, however, as Batstone notes of the first of these passages, 'the opposition [sc. of *clarus* with Cato's *dignitas*] ... opposes external

<sup>104</sup> Koestermann (1971) 85 ad loc.: 'Das klingt wie eine positive Wertung, aber es gehört zu den Besonderheiten der Technik Sallusts, daß er das für ihn entscheidende negative Element oft überraschend zur Beseitigung eines günstigen Vorurteils nachfolgen läßt'; Hands (1959) 57: 'Opimius ... escapes very lightly as *homo clarus et tum in senatu potens*'; Beness and Hillard (2001) 139 n. 17: 'according Opimius the status of a *homo clarus*, but one who *acerrume uictoriam ... exercuerat*'.

recognition to internal worth and in so doing raises questions about the moral orientation of *clarus* and *misericordia*.<sup>105</sup> On its own, *clarus* need carry no intrinsic positive implications, as can be most clearly seen in the description of the bad crowd of Romans at Numantia who lead Iugurtha astray, *clari magis quam honesti* ('distinguished rather than honourable').<sup>106</sup> Santoro L'hoir has further argued that Sallust's choice of the word *homo*, in contradistinction to Cicero's laudatory references to Opimius as *uir*, constitutes a disparagement in itself.<sup>107</sup>

Opimius is thus introduced with at best muted praise, possibly with criticism, as *clarus* and *potens*. Crucially, he possesses these two qualities in a specific time, *tum*, then, 117 or 116 BCE, almost a decade before Marius' first consulship.<sup>108</sup> He also possesses them in a specific space and within a specific political grouping, *in senatu*, in the senate, among senators, among those who enforce the rights of the senatorial classes over the plebs, within a senatorial conception of historical time. The reason he possesses renown and power lies in the plupast, because of what he *had* done (*exercuerat*), and because he had done it in his capacity as consul on behalf of his political class to the detriment of its perceived enemies.<sup>109</sup>

However, the precise location of that action within the plupast is not identified by the consular dating formula. There is instead a gesture towards that formula which dramatises its own failure and draws attention to its absence: *quia consul ...*, 'because, as consul, ...', 'because, *when* he was consul, ...', but there is no annalistically correct mention of his colleague for 121 BCE, Q. Fabius Maximus Allobrogicus. Indeed, so far from the consulship of

<sup>105</sup> *Cat.* 54.2: *ille mansuetudine et misericordia clarus factus.* *Cat.* 53.1: *Cato clarus atque magnus habetur.* Batstone (1988) 18.

<sup>106</sup> *Jug.* 8.1: *factiosi domi, potentes apud socios, clari magis quam honesti, qui Iugurthae non mediocrem animum pollicitando adscendebant.* Kraus (1999) 227 n. 35: '*clari magis quam honesti* significantly contrasts appearance with inner worth'. Cf. the same combination of *potens* and *clarus* in the description of the ambitions of the worthless young men (notably called *homines*) who abuse the restoration of tribunician power at *Cat.* 38.2: *ita ipsi clari potentesque fieri.* For *magis quam* as 'a staple of the declaimers' paradoxical language' which 'reaches its full potential in Tacitus', see Kraus (1994) 146 ad Livy 6.10.9 and cf. Ash (2007b) 103 ad Tac. *Hist.* 3.10.1 and ead. (2018) 312 ad *Ann.* 15.71.3.

<sup>107</sup> Santoro L'hoir (1992) 49: 'Had Sallust any regard for Opimius, Bestia or Scaurus, they would be *vir*, as they are in Cicero ... Sallust's and Cicero's divergent approaches demonstrate the use of *homo* and *vir* in the framework of factional opposites.' It should be noted that Cicero himself frequently uses *homo clarus* and *clarissimus* of figures such as Pompey (*Ver.* 1.44; 2.102), Crassus (*Ver.* 2.3), and Marcellus (*Lig.* 37), but Santoro L'hoir's point about the contrasting designations of Opimius stands.

<sup>108</sup> One of *Histos'* anonymous readers notes that Opimius' mission is usually dated to 116, but Sallust's vagueness leaves the date uncertain, and 117 is equally possible.

<sup>109</sup> For the plupast in classical historiography, see the papers in Grethlein and Krebs (2012), esp. the editors' own introduction and Feldherr (2012) on Sallust's *Catilina*.

Opimius serving to identify the year, Sallust on the contrary immediately uses a rival dating mechanism to establish in which year Opimius was consul. Sallust's failure, or rather refusal, to use Opimius' consulship as the means of identifying the year 121 is finally underlined by his use of a phrase which closely alludes to the consular dating formula, but antiphrastically: *C. Graccho et M. Fulvio Flacco interfectis*. The pair of names, joined by a conjunction and set apart from the rest of the sentence in the ablative absolute, strongly evokes the traditional formula. But in place of *consulibus*, 'when they were consuls', is the brutal *interfectis*. The tribunes Gaius Gracchus and Fulvius Flaccus were colleagues in death. This is the event and these are the names by which Sallust chooses to identify the year and to structure the historical time leading up to the narrative present of Opimius' commission.

It is very probable that, even for Romans hard-wired to think of years in terms of the consuls, the year that we call 121 BCE *was* most easily identified as 'when Gaius Gracchus and Marcus Fulvius Flaccus were killed'. Regardless of that unverifiable possibility, the death of Gaius Gracchus, along with that of his brother Tiberius, was undeniably a key event, an epoch-defining moment, a landmark in Roman history.<sup>110</sup> More specifically, they were landmarks in a *popularis* conception of Roman history. Sallust has Memmius urge the people to refrain from violent insurrection by offering a thumb-nail sketch of their history periodised around the secession of the plebs (*nihil secessionis opus est*, 31.6), the death of Tiberius (*occiso Ti. Graccho*, 31.7), and those of Gaius and Flaccus (*post C. Gracchi et M. Fulvi caedem*, *ibid.*) Sallust's own excursus on the conflict of the orders (41–2) includes the careers and deaths of the Gracchi as periodising markers (*nam postquam Ti. et C. Gracchus ...*, 42.1).<sup>111</sup> Of course, one of his own professed reasons for choosing the war against Iugurtha as a subject for his history is because 'then for the first time opposition was made to the arrogance of the nobility' (*quia tunc primum superbiae nobilitatis obviam itum est*, 5.1). Again, Roman time is divided, defined, and conceptualised, not according to the senatorial criteria of who was consul, but by pivotal moments in the history of the people and their struggle against the nobility.<sup>112</sup> Sallust does not shy away from the problematic aspects of either the Gracchi or the long-term consequences of Marius' consulship.<sup>113</sup> Nevertheless, the fundamentally pro-

<sup>110</sup> Rosenblitt (2016) 680, discussing Sallust's depiction of Memmius in *Jug.* 30–4: 'In the first century B.C.E., Roman thinkers had a tendency to locate watersheds in the second century: notably, the defeat of Carthage and the turmoil surrounding the Gracchi.'

<sup>111</sup> On Memmius' speech: Syme (1964) 166–7; Büchner (1982) 190–7; Miller (2015); Rosenblitt (2016).

<sup>112</sup> On aristocratic *superbia* and popular opposition to it in the *Iugurtha*, see esp. von Fritz (1943), Wiedemann (1993), Montgomery (2013–14), and Miller (2015).

<sup>113</sup> 42.2: *et sane Gracchis cupidine uictoriae haud satis moderatus animus fuit* ('and to be sure, in their lust for victory, the Gracchi had an insufficiently temperate spirit'); 5.2: *quae contentio*

*popularis*, or at least anti-optimate, agenda of his monograph finds one of its means of expression in its promotion of a popular conception of Roman time.<sup>114</sup>

The *Iugurtha* closes with another perversion of the consular dating formula, or rather two such (114):

per idem tempus aduersum Gallos ab ducibus nostris Q. Caepione et Cn. Mallio male pugnatum. quo metu Italia omnis contremuerat. illique et inde usque ad nostram memoriam Romani sic habuere, alia omnia uirtuti suae prona esse, cum Gallis pro salute, non pro gloria certare. sed postquam bellum in Numidia confectum et Iugurtham Romam uinctum adduci nuntiatum est, Marius consul absens factus est et ei decreta prouincia Gallia, isque Kalendis Ianuariis magna gloria consul triumphauit. et ea tempestate spes atque opes ciuitatis in illo sitae.

About the same time there was a defeat against the Gauls suffered by our generals Quintus Caepius and Gnaeus Mallius. With this fear all Italy had trembled. Then and all the way down to the period of our own memory, the Romans have considered matters to be thus, that all other engagements are straightforward for their own valour, but that with the Gauls they compete for safety, not for glory. But after it was announced that the war in Numidia had been finished and that Iugurtha was being brought to Rome in chains, Marius was elected consul in his absence and the province of Gaul was assigned to him, and he as consul on the Kalends of January triumphed with great glory. And at that time the hope and resources of the state were situated in him.

This final chapter is full of references to time (*per idem tempus*, *illi[que]*, *postquam*, *Kalendis Ianuariis*, *ea tempestate*), as might be expected at the end of a narrative. Closure is of course a function of time and the end of a narrative, especially a historical narrative, tends explicitly or implicitly to mark its status as constituting the concomitant end of a meaningful period of time. Levene has shown that the *Iugurtha* resists this closural tendency, so that the ‘overall effect of the ending is not to round the work off as something completed and whole, but instead to place the emphasis away from what we have seen within the work,

*diuina et humana cuncta permiscuit eoque uecordiae processit, ut studiis ciuilibus bellum atque uastitas Italiae fnem faceret* (‘This conflict threw into total confusion everything divine and human and advanced to such a pitch of madness that it was war and the devastation of Italy that put an end to civil partisanships’).

<sup>114</sup> Cf. Wiseman (2009b) 38: ‘Sallust prides himself on his non-partisan approach, but he knows that here the balance of blame falls more on one side than the other’.

and onto what is to come outside it'.<sup>115</sup> Sallust's double manipulation of the consular dating formula contributes to this prolepsis of Marius' future and the future of one-man rule at Rome by marking the point when consular time became Marius-time.

The chapter opens with the defeat of Caepio and Mallius at Arausio on 6 October 105 by the Cimbri and Teutoni, Germanic tribes whom Sallust calls Gauls to facilitate the link with Rome's traditional *metus Gallicus* and the foreshadowing of Caesar's campaigns.<sup>116</sup> The pairing of two names in the ablative clearly evokes the consular dating formula, and even the fact that they are ablatives of agent rather than absolute is occluded by their being in apposition to *ducibus nostris*. Moreover, Quintus Servilius Caepio and Gnaeus Mallius Maximus *were* consuls. However, they were not colleagues whose names could date the year 105, since Caepio had been consul in 106. Indeed, their names are not supplied to provide the date, but rather their encounter with the Gauls is dated through its synchronicity (*per idem tempus*) with Marius' final defeat of Iugurtha. It is not that, like so many of Tacitus' consuls, they are reduced to the status of being merely the date. Rather, like Opimius, they are denied the status of marking the date within a senatorial construction of time, and instead their (inglorious) actions are dated according to a rival system. The fact that Caepio and Mallius are depicted as actors rather than mere dating mechanisms could conceivably elevate their narrative status, as it does with Tacitus' emperors. However, theirs are not the characteristic actions of annalistic conquerors, victories (*res [bene] gestae*), but quite the opposite, defeat (*male pugnatum*).<sup>117</sup> They are not even granted the fully active role of grammatical subjects but relegated to exceptional ablatives of agent qualifying an impersonal passive. Consular status, achievements, and time are all evoked so that their failure can be thrown more sharply into relief.

Nevertheless, unlike the 'tribunician martyr dating formula' employed in chapter 16, the date for the following year *is* tied to the name of the consul. *Marius consul* evokes, even though the following *absens factus est* keeps the reader

<sup>115</sup> Levene (1992) 55. Kraus (1999) 245: 'the end, which famously teases us with its lack of closure'.

<sup>116</sup> For the date, see Paul (1984) 257 ad loc. He notes that 'the two people were not always clearly distinguished' but considers 'S's terminology surprising after the distinction made between Gauls and Germans by Caesar'. He does not make the explicit link with *metus Gallicus* but does hint at a connection with Caesar's campaigns. Cf. Malcovati (1971) 261 ad loc., who thinks Sallust writes 'secondo l'errata opinione del suo tempo' but notes more explicitly that 'quel nome doveva richiamare alla mente di Romani il ricordo delle vittoriose campagne del dittatore da poco scomparso'. Since this is a discussion of Sallust's historical presentation of events rather than the events themselves, I shall refer to the tribes as Gauls throughout.

<sup>117</sup> On *res gestae* as an annalistic and more broadly historiographical formula, see above, n. 16.

strictly in the dying days of 105, the year of his second consulship, 104. However, this is not the reassertion of optimate power and optimate time that would have been signified by identifying 121 as *C. Opimio et Q. Allobrogico consulibus*. Marius has been set up since his first appearance in the monograph and especially in his great speech as the *popularis, nouus homo* opponent of the aristocratic status quo. Even without this wider context, it is notable that 104 is identified by the name of the consul, singular, just as was the year of Marius' first consulship, 107, discussed above. There is no mention of Marius' colleague, C. Flavius Fimbria. Indeed, the emphatic repetition of *consul* twice within the same sentence, the second time dated to the Kalends of January, when the consular year began, almost seems to designate the year 104 as *C. Mario et C. Mario consulibus*. The power of the consul, reflected in the use of his name to structure historical time, continues, but its nature has radically changed. Consular power and time are no longer inextricably connected to aristocratic and optimate power and time, as Marius and his *popularis* successors appropriate both for their faction. Perhaps more significantly, Roman politics and time is no longer structured around the collegiality (or the checks and balances provided by conflict) between two consuls. 104 is Marius' year, Marius-time, and this situation will continue for the following five years (inclusive) in which he held successive consulships. 'At that *time*, the hopes and resources of the state were situated in him.' 104 is *Mario consule* not, or not primarily, because he is consul, but because he is Marius. The shift to structuring historical time around the dominance of one man has begun and eventually that dominance will not even require the consulship.<sup>118</sup> The first step has been taken on the path to the Tacitean principate and the year 21, when *C. Asinio C. Antistio consulibus nonus Tiberio annus erat compositae rei publicae ...*

### Coda

Sallust's manipulation of historiographical form and style to generate historical meaning is well established. On the microscopic level, his stylistic *inconcinntas* produces a dissonant mimesis of the corruption, decline, and disorder that it is simultaneously describing.<sup>119</sup> On the middle level, 'Jugurthine disorder' distorts the structure of the monograph, which thus in turn acts as a mimesis of its subject-matter, while, in the *Catilina*, 'discord is explored and revealed in

<sup>118</sup> Goodyear (1982) 276: 'the shift of power from an oligarchy to a succession of dynasts is directly reflected in historical writing'.

<sup>119</sup> Balmaceda (2017) 80: 'Sallust had to create his own style: contorted, abrupt, even harsh, to be able to reproduce his view of the world, to mirror the conflicts and paradoxes of late republican Rome.' See also Syme (1964) 240–73, Woodman (1988) 117–28, Kraus (1997) 11–13, Marincola (1997) 16–17, Schmal (2001) 137–9, and O'Gorman (2008).



the linguistic instability of Sallust's text'.<sup>120</sup> Tragic structures and allusions are present in both monographs.<sup>121</sup> On the highest level, taking the works as a whole, Levene has argued for reading the *Iugurtha* as a 'fragment'. As he writes in defence of his claim, 'by doing so [Sallust] is not playing games'.<sup>122</sup> So it is with Sallust's manipulation of the consular dating formula for thematic ends. His practice is consistent with his own other manipulations of stylistic and formal features, and with Livy's and Tacitus' of the formula itself, even if he goes a good deal further than scholars have hitherto found in those authors. The principle that form is meaning needs little defence, perhaps least of all when dealing with Sallust. Accepting his sophisticated, metatextual use of the consular dating formula does not require making Sallust into a prosaic Ovid, but it does add another significant way in which he was the forerunner of Tacitus.<sup>123</sup>

*The University of Sydney*

ROBERT COWAN  
bob.cowan@sydney.edu.au

<sup>120</sup> Kraus (1999) 245: 'The historian's subject infects his task: disorder and corruption rule at Rome, compromising Sallust's very control over his material, while the military narrative is threatened by political influence and conflicting versions of the story, many of them going back, like Jugurtha himself, to that core experience at Numantia.' *Catilina: Batstone* (2010) 54.

<sup>121</sup> *Iugurtha*: Dué (2000); *Catilina*: Späth (1999).

<sup>122</sup> Levene (1992) 70.

<sup>123</sup> The idea for this article grew from standing in to teach a section of the *Iugurtha* which included chapter 16.2 to Paul Roche's Latin Republican Prose class at the University of Sydney in September 2019. Paul more than repaid the hour's teaching by kindly discussing and reading a draft of the whole article, as did Elly Cowan. I am particularly grateful to *Histos*' two anonymous readers for their exceptionally generous and extensive, as well as insightful and helpful comments.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arena, V. (2013) *Libertas and the Practice of Politics in the Late Roman Republic* (Cambridge).
- Ash, R. (2007a) 'Victim and Voyeur: Rome as a Character in Tacitus' *Histories*', in D. H. J. Larmour and D. Spencer, edd., *The Sites of Rome: Time, Space, Memory* (Oxford) 211–37.
- , ed. (2007b) *Tacitus: Histories Book II* (Cambridge).
- (2018) *Tacitus: Annals Book XV* (Cambridge).
- Balmaceda, C. (2017) *Virtus Romana: Politics and Morality in the Roman Historians* (Chapel Hill).
- Batstone, W. (1988) 'The Antithesis of Virtue: Sallust's *Synkrisis* and the Crisis of the Late Republic', *ClAnt* 7: 1–29.
- (2010) 'Word at War: The Prequel', in B. Breed, C. Damon, and A. Rossi, edd., *Citizens of Discord: Rome and its Civil Wars* (New York and Oxford) 45–67.
- Beness, L. and T. H. Hillard (2001) 'The Theatricality of the Deaths of C. Gracchus and Friends', *CQ* 51: 135–40.
- Blänsdorf, J. (1978) 'Populare Opposition und historische Deutung in der Rede des Volkstribunen Licinius Macer in Sallusts *Historien*: zur Ideologie Sallusts und seiner Interpreten', *AU* 21: 54–69.
- Bloch, H. (1961) 'The Structure of Sallust's *Historiae*: The Evidence of the Fleury Manuscript', in S. Prete, ed., *Didascaliae: Studies in Honor of Anselm M. Albareda* (New York) 59–76.
- Büchner, K. (1953) *Der Aufbau von Sallusts Bellum Jugurthinum* (Wiesbaden).
- (1982) *Sallust<sup>2</sup>* (Heidelberg).
- Chassignet, M. (2006) 'Licinius Macer: du *triumvir monetalis* à l'antiquaire', in J. Champeaux and M. Chassignet, edd., *Aere perennius: en hommage à Hubert Zehnacker* (Paris) 115–24.
- Cole, T. (1992) '*Initium mihi operis Servius Galba iterum Titus Vinius consules ...*', *YCLS* 29: 231–45.
- Cornell, T. (2018) 'Which One is the Historian? A Neglected Problem in the Study of Roman Historiography', in Sandberg and Smith (2018) 182–201.
- Cowan, E. (2019) 'Velleius Paterculus: How to Write (Civil War) History', in C. H. Lange and F. J. Vervaet, edd., *The Historiography of Late Republican Civil War* (Leiden) 239–62.
- Cowan, R. (2018) 'Sideshow Actium: Counterfactual History in Lollius' *Naumachia* (Horace *Epistles* 1.18)', *Antichthon* 42: 90–116.
- Dué, C. (2000) 'Tragic History and Barbarian Speech in Sallust's *Jugurtha*', *HSCPh* 100: 311–25.
- Feeney, D. (1994) 'Beginning Sallust's *Catiline*', *Prudentia* 26: 139–46.

- (2007) *Caesar's Calendar: Ancient Time and the Beginnings of History* (Berkeley).
- (2009) 'Time', in A. Feldherr, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to the Roman Historians* (Cambridge) 139–51.
- Feldherr, A. (2012) 'Magna mihi copia est memorandi: Modes of Historiography in the Speeches of Caesar and Cato (Sallust, *Bellum Catilinae* 51–4)', in Grethlein and Krebs (2012) 95–112.
- Fowler, D. P. (1990) 'Deviant Focalisation in Virgil's *Aeneid*', *PCPS* 36: 42–63.
- Frier, B. W. (1979) *Libri Annales Pontificum Maximorum: The Origins of the Annalistic Tradition* (Rome; repr. with new introduction, Ann Arbor, 1999).
- Fritz, K. (1943) 'Sallust and the Attitude of the Roman Nobility at the Time of the Wars Against Jugurtha (112–105 B.C.)', *TAPhA* 74: 134–68.
- Gerrish, J. (2019) *Sallust's Histories and Triumviral Historiography: Confronting the End of History* (London and New York).
- Ginsburg, J. (1981) *Tradition and Theme in the Annals of Tacitus* (New York).
- Goodyear, F. R. D. (1982) 'Sallust', in E. J. Kenney and W. V. Clausen, edd., *Cambridge History of Classical Literature II: Roman Literature* (Cambridge) 268–80.
- Grethlein, J. (2013) *Experience and Teleology in Ancient Historiography: Futures Past from Herodotus to Augustine* (Cambridge).
- and C. B. Krebs, edd. (2012) *Time and Narrative in Ancient Historiography: The 'Plupast' from Herodotus to Appian* (Cambridge).
- Gruen, E. S. (1969) 'Notes on the "First Catilinarian Conspiracy"', *CPh* 64: 20–4.
- Hands, A. (1959) 'Sallust and *dissimulatio*', *JRS* 49: 56–60.
- Hinds, S. (2000) 'Essential Epic: Genre and Gender from Macer to Statius', in M. Depew and D. Obbink, edd., *Matrices of Genre: Authors, Canons, and Society* (Cambridge, Mass.) 221–44.
- Hodgkinson, M. (1997) 'John Malalas, Licinius Macer, and the History of Romulus', *Histos* 1: 85–92. <https://research.ncl.ac.uk/histos/documents/1997.07HodgkinsonMalalasLiciniusMacer8592.pdf>
- Katz, B. R. (1982) 'Sallust and Pompey', *RSA* 12: 75–83.
- Keitel, E. (2010) 'The Art of Losing: Tacitus and the Disaster Narrative', in Kraus–Marincola–Pelling (2010) 331–52.
- Koestermann, E., ed. (1971) *C. Sallustius Crispus: Bellum Iugurthinum* (Heidelberg).
- Kraus, C. S. (1997) 'Sallust', in ead. and A. J. Woodman, *Latin Historians* (Oxford).
- (1999) 'Jugurthine Disorder', in ead., ed., *The Limits of Historiography: Genre and Narrative in Ancient Historical Texts* (Leiden) 217–47.
- , ed. (1994) *Livy: Ab Vrbe Condita Book VI* (Cambridge).
- , J. Marincola, and C. Pelling, edd. (2010) *Ancient Historiography and its Contexts: Studies in Honour of A. J. Woodman* (Oxford).
- La Penna, A. (1968) *Sallustio e la 'rivoluzione' romana* (Milan).

- and R. Funari, edd. (2015) *C. Sallusti Crispi Historiae I: Fragmenta 1.1–146* (Berlin).
- Latta, B. (1999) ‘Die Rede des Volkstribunen C. Licinius Macer in den *Historien* des Sallust (III-48)’, *Maia* 51: 205–41.
- Levene, D. S. (1992) ‘Sallust’s *Jugurtha*: An “Historical Fragment”’, *JRS* 82: 53–70.
- (2000) ‘Sallust’s *Catiline* and Cato the Censor’, *CQ* 50: 170–91.
- (2010) *Livy on the Hannibalic War* (Oxford).
- Lushkov, A. H. (2015) *Magistracy and the Historiography of the Roman Republic: Politics in Prose* (Cambridge).
- McDermott, W. C. (1978) ‘*Lex de Tribunicia Potestate* (70 B.C.)’, *CPh* 72: 49–52.
- McGushin, P. (1977) *C. Sallustius Crispus Bellum Catilinae: A Commentary* (Leiden).
- ed. (1992) *Sallust: The Histories*, vol. 1 (Oxford).
- ed. (1994) *Sallust: The Histories*, vol. 2 (Oxford).
- Malcovati, E. ed. (1971) *Sallustio: Bellum Iugurthinum* (Turin).
- Marincola, J. (1997) *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography* (Cambridge).
- (1999) ‘Tacitus’ Prefaces and the Decline of Imperial Historiography’, *Latomus* 58: 391–404.
- Martin, R. H. and A. J. Woodman, edd. (1989) *Tacitus: Annals IV* (Cambridge).
- Meyer, E. A. (2010) ‘Allusion and Contrast in the Letters of Nicias (Thuc. 7.11–15) and Pompey (Sall. *Hist.* 2.98M)’, in Kraus–Marincola–Pelling (2010) 97–117.
- Miller, J. (2015) ‘Idealization and Irony in Sallust’s *Jugurtha*: The Narrator’s Depiction of Rome Before 146 B.C.’, *CQ* 65: 242–52.
- Möller, A. and N. Luraghi (1995) ‘Time in the Writing of History: Perceptions and Structures’, *Storia della Storiografia* 28: 3–15.
- Momigliano, A. (1966) ‘Time in Ancient Historiography’, *History and Theory* 6: 1–23.
- Montgomery, P. A. (2004) *The Limits of Identity in Sallust’s Bellum Iugurthinum* (diss., Iowa).
- (2013–14) ‘Sallust’s Scipio: A Preview of Aristocratic *superbia* (Sal. *Jug.* 7.2–9.2)’, *CJ* 109: 21–40.
- Morello, R. (2002) ‘Livy’s Alexander Digression, 9.17–19: Counterfactuals and Apologetics’, *JRS* 92: 62–85.
- O’Gorman, E. (2006) ‘Alternative Empires: Tacitus’s Virtual History of the Pisonian Principate’, *Arethusa* 39: 281–301.
- (2007) ‘Intertextuality, Time and Historical Understanding’, in A. Macfie, ed., *The Philosophy of History* (London) 102–17.
- (2008) ‘The Politics of Sallustian Style’, in J. Marincola, ed., *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography* 2 vols (Malden) I.796–807.

- Pagán, V. E. (2002) 'Actium and Teutoburg: Augustan Victory and Defeat in Vergil and Tacitus', in D. S. Levene and D. P. Nelis, edd., *Clio and the Poets: Augustan Poetry and the Traditions of Ancient Historiography* (Leiden) 45–59.
- (2004) *Conspiracy Narratives in Roman History* (Austin).
- Pani, M. (2006) 'Libertas e diritto delle genti: una lettura del discorso di Licinio Macro nelle *Historiae* di Sallustio', in M. Silvestrini, T. Spagnuolo Vigorita, and G. Volpe, edd., *Studi in onore di Francesco Grelle* (Bari) 193–9.
- Papaioannou, S. (2014) 'Matrices of Time and the Recycling of Evil in Sallust's Historiography', *Epekeina* 4: 113–39.
- Parker, V. (2004) 'Romae omnia venalia esse: Sallust's Development of a Thesis and the Prehistory of the Jugurthine War', *Historia* 53: 408–23.
- Paul, G. M. (1984) *A Historical Commentary on Sallust's Bellum Jugurthinum* (Liverpool).
- Ramsey, J. T., ed. (2007) *Sallust: Bellum Catilinae*<sup>2</sup> (Oxford).
- (2015) *Sallust: Fragments of the Histories. Letters to Caesar* (Cambridge, Mass.).
- Reynolds, L. D., ed. (1991) *C. Sallusti Crispi: Catilina. Iugurtha. Historiarum Fragmenta Selecta. Appendix Sallustiana* (Oxford).
- Rich, J. (2011) 'Structuring Roman History: The Consular Year and the Roman Historical Tradition', *Histos* 5: 1–43 (revised; orig. *Histos* 1 (1997)).
- (2018) 'Fabius Pictor, Ennius and the Origins of Roman Annalistic Historiography', in Sandberg and Smith (2018) 17–65.
- Rosenblitt, J. A. (2011) 'The *Devotio* of Sallust's Cotta', *AJPh* 132: 397–427.
- (2016) 'Hostile Politics: Sallust and the Rhetoric of Popular Champions in the Late Republic', *AJPh* 137: 655–88.
- (2019) *Rome After Sulla* (London and New York).
- Sandberg K. and C. Smith, edd. (2018) *Omnium Annalium Monumenta: Historical Writing and Historical Evidence in Republican Rome* (Leiden).
- Santoro L'Hoir, F. (1992) *The Rhetoric of Gender Terms: 'Man', 'Woman', and the Portrayal of Character in Latin Prose* (Leiden).
- Scanlon, T. F. (1998) 'Reflexivity and Irony in the Proem of Sallust's *Historiae*', in C. Deroux, ed., *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History IX* (Brussels) 186–224.
- Schmal, S. (2001) *Sallust* (Hildesheim).
- Seager, R. (1964) 'The First Catilinarian Conspiracy', *Historia* 13: 338–47.
- (1994) 'The Rise of Pompey', *CAH IX*.208–28.
- Späth, R. (1998) 'Salluste, *Bellum Catilinae*: un texte tragique de l' historiographie?', *Pallas* 49: 173–195.
- Suerbaum, W. (1997) 'Am Scheideweg zur Zukunft: alternative Geschehensverläufe bei römischen Historikern', *Gymnasium* 104: 36–54.
- Syme, R. (1964) *Sallust* (Berkeley).

- Verbrugghe, G. P. (1989) 'On the Meaning of *Annales*, on the Meaning of Annalist', *Philologus* 133: 192–230.
- Vretska, K., ed. (1976) *C. Sallustius Crispus: De Catilinae coniuratione*, 2 vols (Heidelberg).
- Walt, S. (1997) *Der Historiker C. Licinius Macer: Einleitung, Fragmente, Kommentar* (Stuttgart).
- Walter, U. (2004) *Memoria und res publica: zur Geschichtskultur im republikanischen Rom* (Frankfurt am Main).
- Wiedemann, T. (1993) 'Sallust's *Jugurtha*: Concord, Discord, and the Digressions', *G&R* 40: 48–57.
- Wiseman, T. P. (1994) 'Caesar, Pompey and Rome, 59–50 B.C.', *CAH* IX.368–423.
- (2009a) *Remembering the Roman People: Essays on Late-Republican Politics and Literature* (Oxford).
- (2009b) 'The Fall and Rise of Gaius Geta', in Wiseman (2009a) 33–58.
- (2009c) 'Licinius Macer, Juno Moneta, and Veiovis', in Wiseman (2009a) 59–80.
- Woodman, A. J. (1988) *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography: Four Studies* (London, Sydney, and Portland).
- , ed. (2018) *The Annals of Tacitus: Book 4* (Cambridge).
- Yakobson, A. (1999) *Elections and Electioneering in Rome: A Study in the Political System of the Late Republic* (Stuttgart).