

SALLUST'S *JUGURTHA*: AN 'HISTORICAL FRAGMENT'*

By D. S. LEVENE

The ancient historian is used to dealing with texts that are fragments through the accident of transmission. This paper is concerned with a deliberate fragment: a work that is notionally complete, in that it is written and presented as something finished and whole, but which at the same time draws the reader's attention in a more or less systematic fashion to the fact that it is incomplete; it shows itself to be only part of the whole. The mode was especially popular in the Romantic period; the best-known example for English readers is Coleridge's *Kubla Khan*, but it also revealed itself in such diverse forms as the aphoristic writings of thinkers like Friedrich Schlegel,¹ or the widespread admiration of the ruins of ancient buildings.² I intend to argue that Sallust's *Jugurtha* is a work of this sort.

It has always, of course, been obvious that the *Jugurtha* shows an interest not only in the Jugurthine War itself, but also in the part that it played in the development of, or rather, as Sallust saw it, the decline in Roman political life. It is obvious mainly because Sallust, at several key points in the work, refers back to the events of the past or forward to those of the future, and seeks to relate them to the events of the war. Most of these passages are very well known: the most famous is the long digression at 41–2 on party strife, which sets out the decline from early harmony to the loss of *metus hostilis* after the Punic Wars, which in turn leads to the nobility using arbitrary power, and the struggles with the Gracchi. Likewise, Memmius' speech at 31 continually harks back to the same events, while Marius' speech at 85 does the same more obliquely, by consistent adverse comparisons between the degeneracy of the contemporary nobility and the virtue of their ancestors. There are also briefer references to the past, for example at 16.2 and 81.1.

So too there are several passages that refer to the still greater degeneration that will occur in the future: this theme lies at the centre of the second half of the preface, and when Marius and Sulla are each introduced Sallust concludes their character sketches with a sinister reference to their future actions (63.6 and 95.4). There is also at 103.6 a brief hint at the moral decline that is to come. I want to suggest, however, that Sallust's attempt to relate the *Jugurtha* to the wider field of Roman history goes beyond this: that he in various direct and indirect ways plays down the importance of the events of the period, and in the very structure of the work shows it as incomplete. The reader is invited to focus his attention away from the written 'fragment', and direct it instead towards the putative unwritten whole.

I

In the creation of a 'fragment' the end of a work is likely to play a central role. This is because it is above all the end which is able to leave readers with a sense of completeness and satisfaction, so that they go away from the work feeling that it has been properly rounded off. Alternatively, if this sense is lacking, readers may feel that something more needs to be told, and that the work feels in some way incomplete. The study of how works end, the theory of 'closure', has burgeoned in recent years, with much discussion of what elements contribute to 'closure', an impression of completeness, or 'anti-closure', the sense of incompleteness.³ With

* Versions of this paper were delivered to meetings in Oxford and to the Classical Association in Warwick, and I should like to thank those present for their contributions. I should also like to thank Helen DeWitt, Sally Horowitz, Andrew Laird, Raymond Lucas, and Bernard Richards for their help on specific points; and above all Doreen Innes, Chris Pelling, Leighton Reynolds, and the Editorial Committee for reading and commenting on earlier drafts. I am grateful to Dr Innes also for allowing me to read her lecture notes on the *Jugurtha*.

¹ On the relationship between Schlegel's aphoristic form and his theory of the narrative fragment, see H. Gockel, 'Friedrich Schlegels Theorie des Fragments',

in E. Ribbat (ed.), *Romantik* (1979), 22–37; H. Eichner, *Friedrich Schlegel* (1970), 47–8.

² See T. McFarland, *Romanticism and the Forms of Ruin* (1981), 25. Compare Schlegel's aphorism: 'Many works of the ancients have become fragments. Many modern works are already so when they are created' (*Athenäums-Fragmente* 25).

³ The essential modern discussion of closure is B. H. Smith, *Poetic Closure* (1968); while for ancient texts see above all D. P. Fowler, 'First thoughts on closure: problems and prospects', *MD* 22 (1989), 75–122, which also has a substantial bibliography.

regard to Sallust, I shall consider most of the relevant factors at the appropriate points, but a couple of preliminary issues should be emphasized. First, it must be stressed that closure is a relative matter: no text can be totally closed, and it is a question of how weak or strong the closural elements are.⁴ Second, it is clear that a large number of narrative and dramatic works end with references to the future. This in itself does not substantially diminish the sense of closure. However, when the future referred to is not simply the aftermath of the story, but involves the direct introduction of a substantial and important new topic, this is an anti-closural device — far from finishing, the story seems to be recommencing.⁵

What then of Sallust? The first point to observe is that the *Jugurtha* has no clear climax. The final battle at Cirta (101) is told in fairly vivid terms, and immediately after it Marius is described as 'now indubitably victorious' (102.1), but it is hardly recounted in the dramatic manner that would emphasize that it forms the conclusion of the whole war. Moreover, after the battle about a tenth of the work is still to come; and this is entirely taken up with a detailed account of the delicate negotiations between Sulla and Bocchus to achieve the capture of Jugurtha. This whole section, too, is curiously muted, and the final betrayal and handing over of the king are described in an extremely low-key and perfunctory manner (113.4–7). One perhaps feels it appropriate that the work ends with the taking of Jugurtha, given that it is with Jugurtha himself that the narrative began, and given the earlier stress on the importance of capturing him (e.g. 46.4, 47.3–4, 61–2). But this thematic closure is at least partly negated by the lack of stylistic closure: Sallust seems to be placing absolutely no emphasis on it.

Moreover, despite superficial appearances, the story of Jugurtha is not entirely complete: unlike, for example, Livy (*Per.* 67) and Plutarch (*Marius* 12.4–5), Sallust mentions nothing of his imprisonment and death. Of course, the *Jugurtha* is a monograph about a Roman war, not a biography. However, the Romans saw the death of Jugurtha as something that mattered to the war: at Lucan IX.600 it is 'breaking the neck of Jugurtha' that is an example of the glorious deeds of the past. Nor are we even told that Jugurtha was led in Marius' triumph, though other writers treat this too as a key part of the victory.⁶ To have given such information at the end would not have made the work a biography, but it would have provided a sense of closure comparable to that found in biography.⁷

The overall result is that the precise point at which the work ends seems arbitrary; the narrative simply stops rather than being properly rounded off.⁸ In short, it appears incomplete. The Jugurthine War's continuity with the events that followed it is brought out, and hence the fact that it forms only part of a much larger sequence. Let us now turn to the famous last paragraph:

per idem tempus advorsum Gallos ab ducibus nostris Q. Caepione et Cn. Manlio male pugnatum. quo metu Italia omnis contremuerat. illique et inde usque ad nostram memoriam Romani sic habuere, alia omnia virtuti suae prona esse, cum Gallis pro salute, non pro gloria certare. sed postquam bellum in Numidia confectum et Iugurtham Romam victum adduci nuntiatum est, Marius consul absens factus est et ei decreta provincia Gallia, isque Kalendis Ianuarii magna gloria consul triumphavit. et ea tempestate spes atque opes civitatis in illo sitae. (114)

Around the same time our generals Caepio and Manlius fought unsuccessfully against the Gauls. All Italy was terrified by this; and since then up to recent times the Romans have reckoned that, while everything else was open for their courage, with Gauls one fought for life, not for glory. But after news came that the war in Numidia was over and that Jugurtha was being brought to Rome a prisoner, Marius was made consul in his absence, and was put in charge of Gaul, and he triumphed as consul with great glory on 1 January. And at that time the hopes and resources of the state were placed in him.

Clearly there are elements of closure here. For example, it matters that Sallust ends with the key figure Marius, and with a reminder of the important theme of the relationship between the Roman plebs and its leaders. We can add the penultimate sentence's accumulation of perfects, and the words 'bellum' and 'Iugurtham' beginning successive cola, perhaps echoing the initial statement of the theme at 5.1. All of these contribute to the sense that the work is reaching its conclusion.

⁴ Smith, op. cit. (n. 3), 211; Fowler, op. cit. (n. 3), 80.

⁵ M. Torgovnick, *Closure in the Novel* (1981), 13 calls this a 'tangential ending'. Cf. also Smith, op. cit. (n. 3), 120.

⁶ Propertius IV.6.66, Livy, *Per.* 67, Valerius Maximus VI.9.14, Plutarch, *Marius* 12.3–4; cf. *CIL* I².1 p. 195.

⁷ See below, Section V.

⁸ cf. Smith, op. cit. (n. 3), 1–2; A. A. Kuzniar, *Delayed Endings* (1987), 3.

But against this are other elements that work considerably more powerfully to defeat the impression of closure. No one, I think, can be in much doubt that the last sentence is looking to the future. Sallust ends his work with an ironic contrast between the present, when Marius represents the hope of the state, and the future, when he will bring it close to destruction. It is a reminder that we are, in a sense, still only near the start of the story, and that most of the disasters are still to come. So too, Sallust only brings his account of the African war to a close with, as it were, a preface to an even more damaging sequence of wars that is to follow. The two references to 'gloria' in the passage reinforce this position:⁹ the Jugurthine War, in which Marius is triumphing 'magna gloria', is, by implication, one of the lesser wars contrasted with the apparently life-and-death struggles that still lie ahead.¹⁰ The future referred to is not only a new topic, but a significant one: what happens after the end of the work is not just 'another story', without relevance for the themes of the work, but is central to our understanding of them.¹¹

It is worth adding that Sallust not only directly introduces anti-closural devices, but also avoids some of the most typical elements of closure. For example, there is no reference to any 'standard' closural themes, such as death:¹² indeed, as we have seen, Sallust even fails to mention the death of Jugurtha himself. Nor is the final sentence 'epigrammatic', as Smith defines the term.¹³ Fowler is also suggestive: 'There is a tendency for final words to be *important* words, and nouns seem to occur more frequently at points of closure than one would expect from the rules of word-order in ancient languages.'¹⁴ Sallust's last word, 'sitae', is a verbal adjective of no particular importance for the meaning of the sentence: it could be replaced by 'erant' without significant loss. 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, and onto what is to come outside it.

II

Hence the end of the *Jugurtha* is set up so as to create the impression that the work is incomplete, and that its most important themes are not resolved within it. But not only the ending, but also other parts of the work contribute to this effect. We can see this from the start, where Sallust sets out his programme:

bellum scripturus sum quod populus Romanus cum Iugurtha rege Numidarum gessit, primum quia magnum et atrox variaque victoria fuit, dehinc quia tunc primum superbiae nobilitatis obviam itum est; quae contentio divina et humana cuncta permiscuit eoque vecordiae processit ut studiis civilibus bellum atque vastitas Italiae finem faceret. (5.1-2)

I am about to write of the war which the Roman people fought with the Numidian king Jugurtha, first because it was a great and terrible war with successes on both sides, secondly because then for the first time the arrogance of the nobility was opposed; this struggle threw into confusion all things, human and divine, and went to such a point of lunacy that it took war and the destruction of Italy to put an end to the civil strife.

Sallust here provides two reasons for his selection of the Jugurthine War as a topic, the first the significance of the war in itself, the second its importance for future events. The striking thing here is the relative emphasis given to the different reasons. The first, by the standards of such programmatic statements, is somewhat muted, making no reference at all to the uniqueness or unprecedented greatness of the subject.¹⁵ The comparable statement in the *Catiline* is more

⁹ T. F. Scanlon, *Spes Frustrata* (1987), 61.

¹⁰ It is perhaps also relevant that Sallust refers to Gauls here, when Marius was in fact due to fight the Cimbri, who were Germans. The terminology should be used loosely (G. M. Paul, *A Historical Commentary on Sallust's Bellum Jugurthinum* (1984), 257); at the same time, the inexactitude serves a purpose, as there was a longer history of Romans fighting Gauls, up to and including Caesar's recent conquest. The end thus refers all the more clearly to the wider pattern of Roman history. The 'gloria'

contrast also needs Gauls, since only they, and not the Germans, could be plausibly presented as the 'real enemy'.

¹¹ cf. Smith, *op. cit.* (n. 3), 120.

¹² *idem*, 101-2, 172-82.

¹³ *idem*, 196-210.

¹⁴ Fowler, *op. cit.* (n. 3), 122 n. 166.

¹⁵ On the theme in general, cf. E. Herkommer, *Die Topoi in den Proömien der römischen Geschichtswerke*, unpub. dissertation, Tübingen (1968), 164-71.

typical;¹⁶ we can see the theme originally in Thucydides, who spends a lot of time proving the point, and who is often cited as Sallust's chief model.¹⁷ Other similar statements appear, for example, in Polybius 1.1–2, or later in Livy, *Praef.* 11, XXI.1.1–2,¹⁸ XXXI.1.7, and Tacitus, *Hist.* 1.2–3. True, Tacitus eschews the theme in the *Annals*, doubtless because he wished to show Rome as having declined from its glorious past, and hence not at all providing grand and magnificent subject matter; but it may also be worth noting that the preface to the *Annals* shows clear Sallustian influence.¹⁹ All of this serves to emphasize how little Sallust is making of the Jugurthine War; indeed, even Florus' brief summary of Roman history makes more of it.²⁰

Not only is Sallust's first reason played down in itself, but it is also overshadowed by the prominence given to the second reason. It is allotted more space, and describes the future in such extravagant terms as to accentuate still further the contrast with the actual subject of his monograph: it is all, Sallust implies, relatively unimportant compared with what it led to. Once again, we are pointed beyond the boundaries of the work itself.

The same conclusion may be drawn if we examine the passage in its context. It comes at the end of the philosophical preface, which falls into two distinct parts.²¹ The first part (1–2) examines the question of what counts as virtue; the second (3–4) is a defence of the writing of history as the activity that gives the most scope to the moral man. The only reason that Sallust gives for this — and he gives it at some length — is that his Roman contemporaries are so degenerate that political activity does more harm than good. In fact, he rather paradoxically suggests (4.7), they are so degenerate that even the study of history does them no good, unlike their ancestors, who were inspired to virtue by the glorious deeds of their own ancestors. The paradox is especially striking: after all, usually the moral point of history was thought to be precisely its capacity for improving its readers.²² All of this serves to set up the following sequence of thought: we see a moral theme in the abstract, and then are led to apply that theme initially to historiography as an occupation, but more centrally to the specific case of Rome, which is shown to be in a state of terminal decline (the preface to the *Jugurtha*, unlike that to the *Catiline*, does confine itself entirely to specifically Roman examples). At the end of this we find the programmatic statement discussed above; we see it now against the background of a large-scale Roman decline, and we are prepared for the idea that the important thing about the Jugurthine War is the way in which it relates to that past and future decline.

Next, where does Sallust place his major discussion of earlier events? Not at the start, but in the centre, at 41–2. This highlights its importance: it now serves as a climax to the whole of the first part of the work. Equally, it is now taken to refer to something beyond the boundaries of the monograph. Had it stood at the start, the natural way of reading it would have been as part of the war itself: in effect, the reader would have felt that the work began with the beginning of Rome, but dealt with the period up to the Jugurthine War very rapidly, as in the opening of Tacitus' *Annals*.²³ By holding it up so long, Sallust ensures that the boundaries of the work are established essentially as those of the war, and hence that this passage is seen as looking beyond those boundaries. It also means that the many references to these same events in Memmius' speech (31) are themselves seen as looking outside the work, since at that point Sallust has not had his account of the past at all. Once again, it is made clear that the monograph is not self-sufficient.

¹⁶ *Cat.* 4.4: 'That crime I consider among the most memorable because the evil and the danger were unprecedented.' Cf. *Cat.* 36.4: 'At that time the Roman Empire seemed to me far and away at its most wretched.'

¹⁷ Thucydides e.g. 1.1.1–2, 1.21.2, 1.23.1. On Thucydides as a model for Sallust in general, see P. Perrochat, *Les modèles grecs de Salluste* (1949), ch. 1; T. F. Scanlon, *The Influence of Thucydides on Sallust* (1980).

¹⁸ Note in particular Livy XXI.1.1: 'I can begin a part of my work by saying what most historians have proclaimed at the start of the whole: that I am about to describe the war that is the most memorable of all that have ever been fought.' Livy clearly regards this way of introducing one's story as standard to the point of cliché.

¹⁹ A. J. Woodman, *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography* (1988), 167–8.

²⁰ Florus 1.36.2: 'And in Jugurtha the Romans had the one thing that was to be feared after Hannibal.'

²¹ I assume here what is still occasionally denied: that the preface is not intended to be unrelated to the narrative, but is there to govern the way in which we are to read the work. For various defences of this position, see F. Egermann, 'Die Proömien zu den Werken des Sallust', *SAWW* 214.3 (1932), 16–23; M. Rambaud, 'Les prologues de Salluste et la démonstration morale dans son oeuvre', *REL* 24 (1946), 115–30; A. La Penna, *Sallustio e la 'rivoluzione' romana* (1968), 16–18. D. C. Earl, *The Political Thought of Sallust* (1961), chs 1, 3–5, shows more generally the continuity of ideas between the preface and the body of the work.

²² A. D. Leeman, *Mnemosium* 8 (1955), 46–7; E. Lefèvre, *Gymnasium* 86 (1979), 257–8.

²³ There is, of course, a little historical background at the start (*By* 5.4–7), but it is very brief, and moreover focuses closely on providing the information necessary for us to understand the personal background of Jugurtha, with whom the narrative begins.

It may be objected that most of the events being referred to in the digression and by Memmius are technically contemporary with the early life of Jugurtha. Sallust, however, obscures this fact. The only point where Jugurtha's early career touches Rome is with the Numantine War and Scipio Aemilianus, and neither is mentioned in the historical digression or indeed anywhere else (apart from a few brief references back to Jugurtha's service). Moreover, and more significantly, Sallust telescopes his chronology at the start, and makes it appear that only a short time elapses between Jugurtha's return from Numantia and Micipsa's death (in fact it was at least fourteen years). After his return, Micipsa 'immediately . . . adopted him' (9.3), then Micipsa dies 'a few years later' (9.4), referring on his deathbed to Jugurtha 'recently returning from Numantia' (10.2). Then Hiempsal says that Jugurtha 'within the last three years was adopted into the ruling household' (11.6).²⁴ So too Sallust in 20.1 fails to mention the four- and five-year gap between the division of Numidia at the beginning of the sentence and the attack on Adherbal at the end.²⁵ The overall result is that Jugurtha's link with Rome is presented as having come relatively shortly before the beginning of the Jugurthine War, and, correspondingly, the historical digressions appear to refer to events outside the temporal boundaries of the work.

Not only the position of the central digression, but also its ending is significant:

sed de studiis partium et omnis civitatis moribus si singillatim aut pro magnitudine parem disserere, tempus quam res maturius me deseret; quam ob rem ad inceptum redeo. (42.5)

But if I were to discuss episodes of party strife and the behaviour of the whole state individually or in proportion to their importance, I should run out of time before running out of material. So I return to my task.

The first thing to observe is that, as before, Sallust is here emphasizing the importance of what lies outside the work, by suggesting that it is that very importance that makes it impossible to treat; the work itself, which is manifestly tractable, is implicitly diminished. But more generally, this is an example of another technique that Sallust uses at several points in the *Jugurtha*: the direct indication that there is more to be said, about which he is, however, silent. It is, of course, a standard topos, related to the so-called 'praeteritio';²⁶ but Sallust employs it to a surprising degree and at key moments of his narrative. We see this in his digression on Africa (17–19): when he reaches the subject of Carthage, all he says is 'nam de Carthagine silere melius puto quam parum dicere, quoniam alio properare tempus monet' ('For concerning Carthage I feel it is better to be silent than to say too little, since time warns me to hurry elsewhere'). Carthage is significant for Sallust, as it is the defeat of Carthage which led to the loss of the *metus hostilis* and Roman decline (41.2–3), and moreover the Punic Wars and the Carthaginians provide several of his examples of heroic figures of the past (4.5, 5.4, 14.5, 14.8–10, 42.1, 79), with whom the degenerates of the present are to be contrasted. Yet here he declines to discuss it directly, again pointing to an important and relevant matter that his work does not cover.²⁷ A similar thought, though less directly stated, may be seen with Memmius' speech, before and after which Sallust stresses that it was only one example of many such speeches:

sed quoniam ea tempestate Romae Memmi facundia clara pollensque fuit, decere existumavi unam ex tam multis orationem eius perscribere, et potissimum ea dicam quae in contione post reditum Bestiae huiusce modi verbis disseruit. (30.4)

But since at that time at Rome the eloquence of Memmius was famous and influential, I have thought it appropriate to write out one speech out of so many, and I should say that the most suitable are the things which he discussed at a meeting after the return of Bestia, speaking in the following manner.

haec atque alia huiusce modi saepe dicundo Memmius populo persuadet. (32.1)

By often saying these and other things of this sort Memmius persuaded the people.

²⁴ See K. von Fritz, *TAPhA* 74 (1943), 140–2; also Paul, *op. cit.* (n. 10), 40–2, though his attempt to save Sallust's historicity is implausible.

²⁵ E. Koestermann, *C. Sallustius Crispus Bellum Jugurthinum* (1971), 97.

²⁶ We may compare the topos of 'more later', which similarly draws attention to the fact that there are topics

not covered by the current work. Cf. C. W. Macleod, *CR* 24 (1974), 294; A. J. Woodman, *Velleius Paterculus: The Tiberian Narrative* (1977), 108; also Woodman, *CQ* 25 (1975), 287, who refers to this as a 'conventional method of relegating or omitting material that is unwanted for one reason or another'.

²⁷ cf. T. F. Scanlon, *Ramus* 17 (1988), 141–3.

There is little significance in the phrase 'huiusce modi' alone; Sallust regularly introduces his speeches like this.²⁸ Here, however, and only here, it is combined with a substantial indication that Sallust is not only paraphrasing, but also selecting one of many possibilities, and that, once again, the rest remains unsaid. Admittedly, unlike the other cases that we have been discussing, the material that is said to be missing here does not lie outside the boundaries of the *Jugurtha* in time, but this difference is only a superficial one, for the theme of this speech, and hence by implication of the other speeches to which Sallust refers, is the Roman degeneration that lies at the heart of Sallust's presentation of his overall historical theme. In each of these cases Sallust indicates the restrictions of his own work, and points out that he is failing to cover various topics fully, indeed the very topics that are central to his work. The reader might have thought that a two-page digression on party strife was enough; on the contrary, Sallust tells us, he has only scratched the theme's surface.

But most important of all is the final passage where Sallust directly indicates that his work is incomplete: his account of the character of Sulla.

sed quoniam nos tanti viri res admonuit, idoneum visum est de natura cultuque eius paucis dicere; neque enim alio loco de Sullae rebus dicturi sumus et L. Sisenna, optime et diligentissime omnium qui eas res dixere persecutus, parum mihi libero ore locutus videtur. igitur Sulla gentis patriciae nobilis fuit, familia prope iam extincta maiorum ignavia, litteris Graecis atque Latinis iuxta eruditus, animo ingenti, cupidus voluptatum sed gloriae cupidior; otio luxurioso esse, tamen ab negotiis numquam voluptas remorata; . . . nisi quod de uxore potuit honestius consuli; facundus, callidus et amicitia facilis, ad simulanda ac dissimulanda negotia altitudo ingeni incredibilis, multarum rerum ac maxime pecuniae largitor. atque illi felicissimo omnium ante civilem victoriam numquam super industriam fortuna fuit, multique dubitavere fortior an felicior esset; nam postea quae fecerit, incertum habeo pudeat an pigeat magis disserere. (95.2-4)

But since the subject brings us to such a great man, it seems appropriate to speak briefly about his qualities and trappings. For I am not going to speak about Sulla's career elsewhere, and Sisenna, the best and most careful of all those who have covered this, seems to me to write too circumspectly. So Sulla was a noble of a patrician clan, but his family had been almost wiped out by his ancestors' sloth; he was equally learned in Greek and Latin literature, was eager for pleasure, still more so for glory; he spent his leisure in luxury, but pleasure never kept him from business; . . . except that he could have behaved more honourably concerning his wife; he was eloquent, clever, and ready in friendship; for invention and deception his mind was unbelievably deep; he was generous with many things, especially money. And his supreme luck was matched by his energy until his victory in civil war, and many have been unsure whether he was luckier or braver. I am not sure whether I would be more ashamed or sickened to discuss what he did afterwards.

In this passage Sallust explicitly says that he is not going to discuss Sulla elsewhere: this worries some scholars,²⁹ who point out that in fact Sallust did spend a substantial amount of time discussing Sulla in his *Histories*,³⁰ and they are led to deduce that at the time when he wrote this he had not yet planned the later work. But it seems more fruitful to suggest that this says nothing one way or the other about the author's career plan as an historian, and that the point is rather to indicate yet again the incomplete nature of the current work, and so to make it clear that this whole passage refers to something that lies outside it. Its very brevity reinforces this: the rather oblique reference, for example, to Sulla's wife; a reference which, even taking the possible lacuna into account,³¹ is somewhat obscure, since Sulla was married five times, and there were suggestions in antiquity that in different ways he behaved badly to at least the last three of his wives.³² Once again, the limitations of the monograph are stressed.

Similar is the final sentence, where Sallust hints darkly at Sulla's evil deeds after he achieved sole power. Manifestly he had in fact no moral objections to recounting them more

²⁸ So too Thucydides usually introduces speeches with τοιαύδε: cf. S. Hornblower, *Thucydides* (1987), 53-4.

²⁹ e.g. R. Syme, *Sallust* (1964), 177; Koestermann, op. cit. (n. 25), 33-4, 339.

³⁰ *Histories* 1.24-53, 58-61.

³¹ There are probably no more than a couple of words missing: D. R. Shackleton-Bailey, *Mnemosyne* 34 (1981), 355-6, suggests 'erga suos humanus'.

³² Plutarch, *Sulla* 6 and 35-6; cf. Sallust, *Histories* 1.60-1. Paul, op. cit. (n. 10), 236, claims that 'uxore' is a generic singular, and hence means 'wives'. This looks like wishful thinking; such a generic singular in such a context would be unparalleled in classical Latin. It is especially improbable in an author who only very rarely uses generic singulars in any context (Leumann-Hofmann-Szantyr, *Lateinische Grammatik* 11 (1965), 13).

fully: he had already given such an account at *Catiline* 11.4–8, and it looks as if he went on to give a still longer one in the *Histories*.³³ Rather, we can see the reasons for this statement as twofold: first, by treating the nadir as something too awful for description, it shows us the depths to which in the future the Romans will sink; at the same time, it shows that future as something that the work will not cover.

III

I have thus shown that there are various passages in the *Jugurtha* that together create the cumulative impression that it is a 'fragment'. I now intend to argue that its overall narrative structure points to the same conclusion. In particular, I shall examine how the leading characters, Jugurtha, Metellus, Marius, and Sulla, fit into the work. Sallust's attitude to these has been much discussed: which does he support, and to which is he opposed, and how does this fit his general political views? Perhaps the analysis that I shall now establish can help resolve this vexed question: I shall argue that the chief object in Sallust's portrayal of these four characters is to show them linked to one another in a single chain of personal and general moral degeneration.

I showed above that the philosophical preface was so set up as to give us a moral theme in general, then to show the decline of Rome as a specific instance of that general theme, and finally to set the work against that background of Roman decline. Directly after this, we are introduced to Jugurtha, whose character is sketched as follows:

qui ubi primum adolevit, pollens viribus, decora facie, sed multo maxume ingenio validus, non se luxu neque inertiae conrumpendum dedit, sed, uti mos gentis illius est, equitare iaculari, cursu cum aequalibus certare, et quom omnis gloria anteiret, omnibus tamen carus esse . . . plurimum facere, minimum ipse de se loqui. (6.1)

When he first grew up, he was strong, handsome, but above all powerful of mind; he did not give himself to be corrupted by luxury or sloth, but, in the manner of his people, to the horse and the javelin; he competed at running with his contemporaries, and although he surpassed them all in glory, they all loved him . . . He did much, and spoke little of himself.

This is an entirely favourable assessment: in particular, luxury and sloth are precisely the areas that in the preface Sallust has identified most closely with vicious behaviour and decline.³⁴ It is true that this passage is followed by an account of Micipsa's fears that Jugurtha will usurp his throne (6.2–3), but in context these fears must appear unjustified:³⁵ there is nothing in what we have been told about Jugurtha's character to make one think of him in such terms. Micipsa then sends Jugurtha to fight alongside the Romans in Spain in the hope that he will be killed in battle (7.2), but instead Jugurtha covers himself with glory, and we are once again given an entirely favourable account of his character:

nam Iugurtha, ut erat inpigro atque acri ingenio, ubi naturam P. Scipionis, qui tum Romanis imperator erat, et morem hostium cognovit, multo labore multaque cura, praeterea modestissime parendo et saepe obviam eundo periculis in tantam claritudinem brevi pervenerat ut nostris vehementer carus, Numantinis maximo terrori esset. ac sane, quod difficillimum in primis est, in proelio strenuus erat et bonus consilio . . . huc adcedebat munificentia animi et ingeni sollertia, quis rebus sibi multos ex Romanis familiari amicitia coniunxerat. (7.3–7)

³³ No fewer than twenty of the surviving fragments of the *Histories* (1. 32–51) cover the last stages of the Civil War and Sulla's dictatorship. Cf. the attack on Sulla's dictatorship in Lepidus' speech (1.55), and also Augustine, *CD* 11.18, 'Sallust then says more about the vices of Sulla', and *CD* 11.22, 'Who would not shudder when reading Sallust's account of the life, morals, and deeds of Sulla?'

³⁴ Paul, *op. cit.* (n. 10), 29.

³⁵ This is denied by K. Vretska, 'Studien zu Sallusts *Bellum Iugurthinum*', *SAWW* 229.4 (1955), 29–30, who regards Micipsa's fears as Sallust's indirect characterization

of Jugurtha. However, Vretska relies on the false assumption that the ancients could not conceive of a genuinely changing character, and hence that Sallust must be presenting Jugurtha as vicious from the start; against this see C. Gill, 'The question of character-development: Plutarch and Tacitus', *CQ* 33 (1983), 469–87. Moreover, to attribute Micipsa's views uncritically to the author is to overlook the implicit irony: not only do his ideas conflict with the tenor of the context, but at the same moment as he fears treachery in another, he is displaying it in himself (6.3–7.2).

Jugurtha's mind was tireless and keen, and so, when he got to know the character of Scipio (who was then the Roman general) and the behaviour of the enemy, by his hard work and diligence, by his sensible obedience and willingness to go into danger, he soon became so famous that he was greatly loved by the Romans and feared by the Numantians. Indeed, he was that most rare thing: a doughty fighter and shrewd counsellor . . . In addition, he was generous of heart and highly intelligent, and hence became close friends with many Romans.

Still, there is plainly nothing here for Micipsa to be worrying about, and this provides confirmation that we were meant to see those earlier fears of his as unreasonable. Jugurtha is quite the paragon. But now the crunch comes:

ea tempestate in exercitu nostro fuere complures novi atque nobiles quibus divitiae bono honestoque potiores erant, factiosi domi, potentes apud socios, clari magis quam honesti, qui Jugurthae non mediocrem animum pollicitando addebant: si Micipsa rex occidisset, fore uti solus imperi Numidiae potiretur: in ipso maxumam virtutem, Romae omnia venalia esse. (8.1)

At that time there were in the Roman army many parvenus and nobles, for whom wealth counted for more than goodness or honour, who were factious at Rome, powerful among the allies, and famous rather than honourable; they fired Jugurtha's high spirits by promising that if King Micipsa died, he would gain sole power in Numidia: that he was a man of the highest qualities, and that at Rome everything was for sale.

So Micipsa's fears were justified after all — but for the wrong reason! Indeed, we might even say that it was his own fault. This whole passage is set up so as to make it clear that until now Jugurtha had been free from vice; but now he has been corrupted, and, most important of all, the corruption has come from Rome. From here on, although Sallust always recognizes Jugurtha's fine qualities of mind and body, he consistently shows these as overshadowed by his vices, and above all by the bribery and treachery that were taught to him here by his Roman friends. Sallust shows us in these opening sections the corruption of Jugurtha; and he does so directly after his presentation, first of the theme of virtue versus vice in the abstract, and then of the corruption of Rome as a whole, which is the key example of this. With Jugurtha we see the same theme focused still more narrowly: we have here the paradigm of the corruption and decline of a perfect individual, to match the corruption and decline of the perfect state. The state's corruption leads to the individual's corruption, and the latter then feeds back into the state by corrupting it still further. Moreover, Sallust never tells us the names of those who corrupted Jugurtha: this adds to the impression that it is a general malaise at Rome that is at fault, rather than particular individuals.

Let us now turn to Metellus. He is introduced in the following manner:

Metelloque Numidia evenerat, acri viro et, quamquam advorso populi partium, fama tamen aequabili et inviolata. (43.1)

Numidia fell to Metellus, a keen man and, despite being opposed to the popular factions, universally seen as of unblemished reputation.

in Numidiam proficiscitur, magna spe civium quom propter artis bonas tum maxime quod advorsum divitias invictum animum gerebat et avaritia magistratum ante id tempus in Numidia nostrae opes contusae hostiumque auctae erant. (43.5)

He set off for Numidia; the people had great hopes in him because, along with his other fine qualities, his mind was unconquered by wealth, at a time when hitherto the greed of officials had been the reason why our forces in Numidia had been weakened and those of the enemy strengthened.

Metellus comes out of this looking nearly perfect. Unlike in the portrait of Jugurtha, 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.³⁶ Nevertheless, he is respected even by his opponents, and his manifest incorruptibility is the area on which Sallust places the greatest stress — after all, bribery has so far been the chief cause of the Roman failure.

³⁶ Vretska, *op. cit.* (n.35), 94–5 claims, somewhat perversely, that the fact that Metellus is said to be the opponent of 'populi partium', not 'populi', shows that he is free of party strife, and hence that he is being praised here;

but see W. Steidle, *Sallusts historische Monographien: Themenwahl und Geschichtsbild*, *Historia Einzelschriften* III (1958), 67–8.

The subsequent narrative confirms this favourable assessment. Metellus restores the discipline and morale of the army (44–5), and in the course of this Sallust again praises his virtue:

sed in ea difficultate Metellum nec minus quam in rebus hostilibus magnum et sapientem virum fuisse conperior: tanta temperantia inter ambitionem saevitiamque moderatum. (45.1).

But I reckon that in that difficulty Metellus showed himself as great and wise as he was in battle: he kept his course between ambition and harshness with such good sense.

And directly after this he refers to his 'innocentia' (46.1); and then shows his relative success against Jugurtha, first in battle and then, when it becomes clear that this alone will not finish the war, in stratagems to persuade Jugurtha to surrender.

We do, however, begin to see some small disquieting features in Sallust's presentation. He twice directly compares Metellus to Jugurtha, first at 48.1, where Jugurtha, seeing Metellus' trickery, 'se suis artibus temptari animadvortit' ('realized that he was being assailed with his own devices'), and secondly at 52.1:

eo modo inter se duo imperatores, summi viri, certabant, ipsi pares, ceterum opibus disparibus. (52.1)

Thus two great commanders were competing, personally matched, but unequal in resources.

This second passage invites us to see Metellus and Jugurtha as matched, apparently favourably, but 48.1 has already shown us a negative side to their similarity. And a comparable point emerges more subtly later on:

neque id tempus ex aliorum more quieti aut luxuriae concedit, sed, quoniam armis bellum parum procedebat, insidias regi per amicos tendere et eorum perfidia pro armis uti parat. (61.3)

Nor did he spend that time, as others do, in rest and luxury, but instead, since the war was going too slowly on the military front, made ready to plot against the king through his friends, and to use their treachery rather than weapons.

Metellus, as before, shows himself incorruptible, but in abandoning straight warfare for treacherous devices, he once again seems uncomfortably close to Jugurtha in behaviour.³⁷

So far these hints of problems with Metellus have only represented very minor features of an almost entirely favourable account; but after the introduction of Marius it is quite another story. The hatred of the commons which we were told about when he was introduced now becomes the dominant trait of his character, as he does everything in his power to prevent Marius becoming consul. 64.1 reminds us of the initial character sketch:

quoi quamquam virtus, gloria atque alia optanda bonis superabant, tamen inerat contemptor animus et superbia, commune nobilitatis malum. (64.1)

Though he surpassed the upper classes in virtue, glory, and other good qualities, he had a contemptuous disposition and arrogance, the usual fault of nobles.

There is no indication in Sallust that Metellus' dislike of Marius is anything other than class hatred; we may contrast Plutarch, who says (*Marius* 4) that Metellus had originally been Marius' patron, and had been betrayed by him. Plutarch also says (*Marius* 8) that he hated Marius because he had arranged the death of Turpilius, who in Plutarch's version was Metellus' client. In Sallust Turpilius is executed by Metellus himself (69.4).³⁸ All this demonstrates that Sallust is here showing Metellus in a bad light, attributing his hostility to Marius entirely to his class arrogance.³⁹ Indeed, for the whole of this section it is this arrogance that we see to the fore; and similarly, when at 82.2–3 Marius is elected, and is given the command, Metellus responds extremely badly:

quibus rebus supra bonum aut honestum percussus neque lacrimas tenere neque moderari linguam, vir egregius in aliis artibus nimis molliter aegritudinem pati. quam rem alii in superbiam vortebant, alii bonum ingenium contumelia adcesum esse, multi quod iam parta victoria ex manibus eriperetur: nobis satis cognitum est illum magis honore Mari quam iniuria sua excruciatum neque tam anxie laturum fuisse si adempta provincia alii quam Mario traderetur. (82.2–3)

³⁷ Koestermann, op. cit. (n. 25), 189.

³⁸ Though, unlike Plutarch, Sallust does not suggest that Turpilius was really innocent, and he has earlier

harshly criticized him for his escape (67.3).

³⁹ Lefèvre, op. cit. (n. 22), 266–8.

He was overcome by this far more than is good or honourable; he could not restrain his tears or control his tongue; though a fine man in other respects he bore grief too effeminately. Some reckoned this was arrogance, others that it was that his noble mind was inflamed by the insults; many said it was because he had all but won the victory, and it was being snatched from his grasp. But I am satisfied that he was more tormented by Marius' honour than by his own wrongs, and that he would not have been so worried if he had lost the province and it had gone to anyone except Marius.

Though Sallust still tells us that he was 'vir egregius in aliis artibus', it is clear from this passage that Metellus' faults now go beyond mere upper-class arrogance. The moderation that was praised earlier has now vanished; moreover, the phrase 'nimis molliter' is significant, as it carries overtones of the 'luxuria' that Metellus has previously resisted.⁴⁰ The final explanation that Sallust gives us for his reaction should also be noted: to resent wrongs done to oneself might be quite acceptable in Roman eyes, but to grudge honour to someone else was 'invidere'.⁴¹ It is significant that this is the explanation behind which Sallust places his own authority, and hence the one that the reader is encouraged to find most plausible. Moreover, the growth of vice in Metellus also affects his conduct of the war. In 83 he decides that it is not worth going on, and instead wastes time in a long correspondence with Bocchus; the section ends with the phrase, 'ex Metelli voluntate bellum intactum trahi' ('it was deliberate on Metellus' part that the war dragged on with nothing done') (83.3). This was more or less the state in which the previous commanders had left things when Metellus took over. True, when he returns home at 88.1 he finds his popularity restored, but there is no indication that his character has been restored with it.

So the picture of Metellus is comparable to that of Jugurtha: an originally noble figure, but one who falls into vice. The reasons are, of course, different, but the pattern is the same; the similarity is reinforced by the earlier comparisons between them, and also the fact that, in each case, it is the decline of Rome as a whole that is a major cause of the decline of the individual, for Metellus' arrogance, as we have seen, is presented as the fault of his whole class. That this is Sallust's aim in his portrait of Metellus may perhaps be seen also from a striking omission. We have seen that at various points in the monograph he looks forward to the future. Nowhere, however, does he even hint at what was far and away the most famous event in the life of Metellus, even surpassing his actions here: his later opposition to Saturninus (and, in most versions, Marius), and his consequent exile. This is invariably treated as an example of the highest virtue; Cicero alone refers to it as such numerous times (especially, unsurprisingly, in the *post reditum* speeches, because of the obvious parallels that he wished to draw with his own exile).⁴² But for Sallust even to mention such a future would spoil the schematic nature of his account: he would have to admit directly that his character's greatest moment was later than the decline we have seen here.

Marius is the next major character to be introduced, and, like Jugurtha and Metellus before him, he is given a character sketch:

per idem tempus Uticae forte C. Mario per hostias dis supplicanti magna atque mirabilia portendi haruspex dixerat: proinde quae animo agitabat fretus dis ageret, fortunam quam saepissime experiretur; cuncta prospere eventura. at illum iam antea consulatus ingens cupido exagitabat, ad quem capiendum praeter vetustatem familiae alia omnia abunde erant: industria, probitas, militiae magna scientia, animus belli ingens domi modicus, lubricitatis et divitiarum victor, tantummodo gloriae avidus. (63.1-2)

Around the same time by chance while Marius was sacrificing to the gods at Utica a soothsayer had informed him of a great and remarkable future: henceforth he should rely on the gods and do what he was thinking over; he should try his luck as often as he could — everything was going to turn out well. He had already greatly desired the consulship, and had every quality for it except an ancient lineage: diligence, honesty, great knowledge of warfare, a mind powerful in war and moderate in peace, unaffected by pleasure and wealth, eager only for glory.

⁴⁰ cf., e.g., *Cat.* 11.5: 'loca amoena, voluptaria facile in otio ferocis militum animos molliverant.'

⁴¹ cf. Cicero, *Tusc.* 4.16: 'invidentiam esse dicunt aegritudinem susceptam propter alterius res secundas, quae nihil noceant invidenti.'

⁴² Cicero, *Red.* 25; *Quir.* 9; *Dom.* 82; *Sest.* 37, 130; *Pis.* 20; *Balb.* 11; *Planc.* 89. Also Velleius II.15.3-4; Valerius Maximus III.8.4; Seneca, *Ep.* xxiv.4; Florus II.4.3; Plutarch, *Marius* 28-9; Appian, *BC* 1.29-32.

And the passage later contains the following comment:

tamen is ad id locorum talis vir — nam postea ambitione praeceps datus est — consulatum adpetere non audebat. (63.6)

But he, though so virtuous up to then — for later he was destroyed by ambition — did not dare to seek a consulship.

This, once again, is a largely favourable portrait. A couple of points in it, however, should give us pause. It is ambition that is said to be the cause of Marius' ultimate downfall, and the seeds of his ambition are implicit right through the passage. Moreover, we will perhaps recall that Sallust centres the first part of the preface on an attack on those who rely on fortune rather than on virtue; and, of course, that is precisely the position that Marius decides to adopt here.⁴³

We have already seen Metellus' response to Marius' ambitions. Now let us see how Marius reacts to that:

quae res Marium quom pro honore quem adfectabat tum contra Metellum vehementer adcenderat. ita cupidine atque ira, pessumis consultoribus, grassari; neque facto ullo neque dicto abstinere, quod modo ambitiosum foret. (64.4–5)

This violently fired Marius both for the office he desired and against Metellus. So he raged with desire and anger, the worst possible advisers; and he left out no word or deed that fostered his ambition.

Sallust then describes how Marius gives full rein to his 'ambitio', intriguing against Metellus in the army (64.5–65.5). When he reaches Rome, he throws himself fully into the class strife (84); note especially the first part:

antea iam infestus nobilitati, tum vero multus atque ferox instare, singulos modo, modo universos laedere, dicitare sese consulatum ex victis illis spolia cepisse, alia praeterea magna pro se et illis dolentia. (84.1)

He was already hostile to the nobles, but now attacked them with the greatest violence; he assailed them individually and *en masse*; he said that he had won his consulship as spoils from them, and said other things to glorify himself and upset them.

This is far more violent even than his speech that follows in 85 — I shall discuss the significance of this shortly. For the moment, we can see how Marius has been drawn into class hatred: before he was hostile only to Metellus as an individual, now he hates all the nobility. It may be added that, 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. 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.

In war, of course, Marius' virtues are still dominant, and it is true that most of his battles come later; but it is worth observing the way in which Sallust describes his capture of the Muluccha fort (92–4). He consistently refers to the victory coming 'forte' or through 'fortuna', thus turning the disquieting point from the soothsayer's prediction into a dominant trait. Two passages in particular should be mentioned:

at Marius multis diebus et laboribus consumptis anxius trahere cum animo suo ommitteretne inceptum, quoniam frustra erat, an fortunam opperiretur, qua saepe prospere usus fuerat. (93.1)

But Marius spent much time and effort debating internally whether he should give up the attempt, since it was useless, or wait for luck, which had often favoured him.

sic forte correcta Mari temeritas gloriam ex culpa invenit. (94.7)

Thus Marius' rashness was put right by chance, and he found glory out of his wrongdoing.

The first reminds us that Marius now regularly relies on fortune; the second that he did not deserve his victory, and that reliance on chance, as we were told at the start, is not compatible with reliance on virtue.

⁴³ Scanlon, *op. cit.* (n. 9), 55–7.

Directly after this we come to Sulla (95.2–4, quoted above). This is again by and large a favourable portrait; but by comparison with those of Jugurtha, Metellus, and Marius the disquieting elements have multiplied. Sulla is marked by both 'luxuria' and 'voluptas', though he does not usually let them interfere with his business; he is attractive, intelligent, energetic and generous, but deceitful. And, of course, there is his most famous quality of all, his 'felicitas', which Sallust here explicitly identifies with 'fortuna' — the very quality which he criticized in his preface, and on which we have just seen Marius placing an excessive reliance.⁴⁴ What then? Does Sulla decline, like his predecessors? Certainly he does; we are told so in this very passage. But nothing of this decline is seen within the work.

Let us put all of this together. We are shown across the work four major figures. In each case, there are general elements of synkrisis between each character and his predecessor that invite us to examine the one character in the light of the other.⁴⁵ When we make the comparison, we find that each of the four is relatively good at the start, but each at the same time is from the start less good than his predecessor. Each is in his own way in decline, and in each of the last three cases an initial element of the decline is picked up from his predecessor: thus Metellus employs the treachery and double-dealing of Jugurtha, Marius the factionalizing of Metellus, and Sulla the reliance on fortune of Marius. There is through the whole work a chain of individual corruption which is linked to and which matches the corruption of Rome as a whole, which I discussed at the start. But whereas with Jugurtha and Metellus the pattern is completed, and we see each of them reach bottom, with Marius and Sulla we are told from the start that the pattern will remain incomplete, and their decline will continue beyond the end of the work; and indeed Sulla's decline never begins in the monograph at all. So here too the 'fragment' lies at the heart of Sallust's structure: he prepares the way, and sets up our expectations, but makes us aware that he is never going to fulfil them.

IV

I now want to look at a different area. There is one rather unusual feature of the *Jugurtha* that commentators have made very little of: its lack of dialectic. No one argues in the *Jugurtha*. There are no paired speeches, except for the brief negotiations and exchange of compliments between Sulla and Bocchus at the end. Nor are there even any speeches that are implicitly paired, for instance by presenting different views on comparable situations. There are three major speeches; one by Adherbal at 14, one by Memmius at 31, one by Marius at 85. Each analyses the state of Rome in terms of virtue and vice and corruption and decline in almost exactly the way that Sallust does when he is speaking with his own voice, for example in the preface or the digression on party strife. Not that we take any of the speakers entirely at face value.⁴⁶ Adherbal is weak and self-pitying, Memmius and Marius violent in class hatred, and Marius is boastful and over-confident to boot; and in each case these qualities come across in the speech. But in none of the cases does this affect the substance of their analysis.⁴⁷ The same thing applies to the shorter speeches: not a single one offers a different view of the basic situation. On the rare occasion that an alternative view is put forward, as, for example, with the reply of Jugurtha's envoys to Adherbal at 15.1, it is kept extremely brief and placed in indirect speech: Sallust reports in summary that this is what the characters say, but we can hardly see it as challenging the substantial and lengthy arguments of the author and his spokesmen. We have even seen this happening with Marius: his most violent expressions of class hatred are reserved for a brief account in indirect speech, and are excluded from his speech proper.

Jugurtha himself provides a particularly interesting example of this. He has a couple of short statements in indirect speech, but never any opportunity to put across his case in his own words. At 33.4 Memmius invites him to reply to the charges against him, but when at 34.1 he is

⁴⁴ The juxtaposition of Marius' *fortuna* with Sulla's is observed by H. C. Avery, 'Marius Felix (Sallust, *Jug.* 92–94)', *Hermes* 95 (1967), 324–30; however, he does not examine it in the light of Sallust's earlier discussion of *fortuna*, and so misses its significance.

⁴⁵ In addition to what I have discussed above, on the Metellus/Marius comparison, see T. F. Scanlon, *Spes*

Frustrata (1987), 53–5, 58, and *Ramus* 17 (1988), 144–51, 153–61; on Marius/Sulla see Scanlon, *Spes Frustrata*, 57–8 and *Ramus* 17 (1988), 151–3.

⁴⁶ K. Büchner, *Sallust* (2nd edn, 1982), 202–4.

⁴⁷ Paul, *op. cit.* (n. 10), 99 observes that the language of Memmius' speech is rather more violent than the actual positions set out in it would seem to warrant.

about to do so he is kept from speaking by the corrupt tribune Baebius. Only once in the whole work are we given Jugurtha's words in direct speech:

sed postquam Roma egressus est, fertur saepe eo tacitus respiciens postremo dixisse: 'urbem venalem et mature perituram, si emptorem invenerit.' (35.10)

But after he had left Rome, he is said to have looked back at it repeatedly in silence and finally to have said: 'A city for sale and soon about to perish, if it finds a buyer.'

This is quoted by others and is clearly a famous phrase, though it must be possible that it was Sallust who made it so, since the other sources for it are all later.⁴⁸ More to the point is that it too supports Sallust's analysis of Rome: everything in his account has led us to believe that the city is indeed corrupt and rushing to its destruction.⁴⁹ Thus, on the one occasion on which Jugurtha speaks, he too shows himself as a spokesman for the Sallustian viewpoint.

This absence of dialectic may seem at first sight to work against the establishment of a 'fragment'. Avoiding closure at the end of a work, while perhaps not essential to create a 'fragment', is, as I said above (1), in practice likely to form a major part of it. Theorists of closure, moreover, argue that there is a connection between (i) 'closure' in the sense discussed above — how far a work has a satisfying ending — and (ii) what can be called 'closure of interpretation' — the degree to which a work allows new readings. These two are, of course, conceptually distinct, but it is often held that they are related in practice, and that a work which has an open ending in the first sense will be open in the second sense, rejecting clear meanings and simple solutions.⁵⁰ Dialectic's natural affinities are with this latter type of openness. It is true that there are degrees of dialectic: a work can possess other voices, while apparently clearly rejecting their point of view. But even such a work will be more open than a comparable work in which the other voices find no place, not least because it will require the active contribution of the reader, who will have to recognize which side of the argument comes out on top. There will always, to a greater or lesser degree, be the possibility that the reader will resist taking that step, and that he will find one of the 'opposing' voices at least partially persuasive.

Hence, by offering alternative viewpoints, dialectic would appear to encourage multiple interpretations. It is therefore surprising to find a work like the *Jugurtha*, which has an open ending, but seems to be obsessively excluding all competing voices. And the comparison with the Romantics increases one's disquiet. For them, dialectic and fragments were generally, though not invariably, closely linked: both were held to represent the breaking of an idealized perfection.⁵¹ Why should Sallust be so different?

The answer may be seen if we consider precisely what kind of 'fragment' Sallust is producing. 'How can a fragment be identified as a fragment unless there is also the conception of a whole from which it is broken off?', asks one critic.⁵² Were Sallust, for example, to have ended his work in the middle of a battle, there would be no difficulty: this 'whole' would be a putative work in which the battle was completed. But he could hardly adopt such a solution, involving as it does an unreasonably drastic break with his historical predecessors. In the absence of such extreme methods, he can set the work up as a 'fragment' only by showing that there is a larger scheme of history of which the *Jugurtha* forms a part.

This is indeed what he does. He presents a clear and prominent pattern to Roman history: of decline in the past heading on to greater decline in the future. It is the fact that we accept this analysis which enables us to see much of the incompleteness in the work. It is this which allows Sallust to emphasize at the start the relatively minor role of the war itself; it is this which provides most of his opportunities to look back to the past and forward into the future; it is at least partly this which enables us to read the ending as open. And it is this which creates the possibility of having the chain of characters linked in their decline (for which I was arguing earlier), and of seeing that chain as still unfinished at the end of the work.

⁴⁸ Livy, *Per.* 64, Florus 1.36.18, Appian, *Num.* 1, Augustine, *Ep.* 138.16, Orosius v.15.5.

⁴⁹ Florus 1.36.18 gives us an idea of how Sallust could have shown Jugurtha up as misguided here, had he wanted to; after quoting Jugurtha, he comments: 'Now, had it been for sale, it had a buyer; but when it had escaped him, it was certain that it was not about to perish.'

⁵⁰ Fowler, *op. cit.* (n. 3), 78.

⁵¹ M. H. Abrams, *Natural Supernaturalism* (1971), 141–95; McFarland, *op. cit.* (n. 2), 337–9.

⁵² McFarland, *op. cit.* (n. 2), 50. More generally, McFarland, 50–4, discusses the connection (and the consequent tension) between fragments and a desire for wholeness. Cf. also Kuzniar, *op. cit.* (n. 8), 48–9.

Thus Sallust is using the historical concepts and the historical analysis that he develops within the *Jugurtha* itself in order to establish the idea of a 'whole', and hence to show the work as a fragment broken off from that whole. Paradoxically, in such a work dialectic could only undermine the sense that one is dealing with a 'fragment', because it would invite the reader to challenge the very historical analysis upon which its 'fragmentariness' depends. If the reader were always questioning whether he is really meant to be accepting Sallust's 'pattern' at face value, he would tend to discount this pattern's apparent lack of completeness. Indeed, the reader might even take this apparent incompleteness simply as a further indication of complexity: perhaps it is not that the pattern is incomplete, but that he has misidentified or misinterpreted the pattern, which is really more complex than it superficially appears to be. The single-minded intensity of the monograph — the very thing which makes it so powerful to read — is thus a vital part of its fragmentary nature.

Hence we have a strong reason to suppose that not only the *Jugurtha*, but any work within the broad generic norms of ancient historiography will have difficulty in setting itself up as a 'fragment' unless it avoids dialectic. This is a major difference between it and the Romantics, since for them, as I discussed above, 'fragments' and dialectic usually went hand in hand. On a more general level one may see certain analogies among the Romantics for this feature in Sallust too: they often set up teleologies, and desire completed stories and themes, but then employ the fragmentary form to subvert them.⁵³ But in Sallust the overall pattern is of far greater importance than it is for them: it must remain unchallenged, or else the 'fragment' itself would break down.

None of the arguments of this section, however, should be taken as denying that there is complexity in the *Jugurtha*. For example, we may observe that Sallust uses the digression at 41–2 to refocus the analysis, and make it less partisan than what had gone before. This, however, is far removed from dialectic: any complexity is achieved by shifts of nuance and emphasis rather than direct competition of ideas. It is still easy to discern a single unchallenged (though slightly developing) line of thought throughout the work.

V

The argument so far has demonstrated that the work is a 'fragment'. But this fact in itself might seem to have relatively little importance. To demonstrate that Sallust's *Jugurtha* more or less conforms to a theory of art that was employed a couple of thousand years later, and perhaps for completely different reasons,⁵⁴ may be interesting in itself, but has it any real significance? Since monographs by definition cover only limited topics, is it not likely that authors will employ such methods in them?

There is, of course, the problem that we lack ancient historical monographs with which to compare the *Jugurtha*. Yet we do have the *Catiline*; and the *Catiline*, like the *Jugurtha*, is filled with references to the past and the future, and seems, at least at times, to be attempting to illustrate the general problems of Rome through a single symptomatic episode. In other respects, however, it does not seem to be aiming at the sort of effects that we have seen here. The philosophical preface is not nearly so obviously inviting us to see a pattern in Roman history in particular: it draws its examples from Greece and Asia. I have already indicated (above, n. 16) the more conventional way in which the subject of the work is introduced. There are no direct references to all the things that Sallust is not saying, and the subjects he is not treating. The main historical digression comes not in the centre, but right at the start, directly after the introduction of *Catiline*.⁵⁵ There is a moral digression in the centre, which is often compared to the one in the *Jugurtha* (*Cat.* 36.4–39.5), but its account of the state of Rome is much more obviously contemporary, and it looks back to the past only relatively intermittently. The end of the work has sometimes been thought abrupt,⁵⁶ but it is considerably closer to closure than is the *Jugurtha*, ending as it does with the final battle and the death of *Catiline*.

⁵³ See Kuzniar, *op. cit.* (n. 8), 4, 48–67.

⁵⁴ For example, Abrams, *op. cit.* (n. 51), 100–1, 123, 141–95, 209–14, argues that the Romantics' interest in fragments had a theological origin, and was connected with the idea of the fragmentation of an Edenic unity. No such dimension is apparent in Sallust.

⁵⁵ The *Histories*, too, seem to have had their main historical digression near the start (1.11–12).

⁵⁶ e.g. P. McGushin, *C. Sallustius Crispus, Bellum Catilinae: A Commentary* (1977), 289; but cf. M. J. Wheelon in A. M. Cameron (ed.), *History as Text* (1989), 54–5.

When it comes to dialectic, it may be pointed out that the last part of the work is dominated by the opposing speeches of Caesar and Cato, and that Catiline himself puts his case in two major speeches and a letter. It is true that, as dialectical works go, the *Catiline* is relatively straightforward, and it is possible for the reader to extract a central political analysis not far removed from that in the *Jugurtha*. However, there are still many respects in which the dialectic complicates the historical pattern, and would hence hinder any attempt to create a 'fragment'. To select just one limited example, both Caesar⁵⁷ and Cato⁵⁸ appeal to ancient precedents, and indeed each spends part of his speech in discussing the development of the Roman state.⁵⁹ Cato's views are close to those expressed by Sallust in the narrative, but it is far from obvious that we are to reject the rather different analysis of Caesar; indeed, the synkrisis at *Cat.* 53–4 encourages us to treat them as equals. If Cato is right to suggest that the conspirators should be executed, as Sallust seems to indicate, then what of Caesar's demonstration that such a punishment would be contrary to ancestral precedent? These complications undercut the clear pattern of decline, and would make it harder for Sallust to show the work as an incomplete section of such a pattern. For all of these reasons, it can hardly be said that the *Catiline* is a 'fragment', nor, consequently, can it be argued that the 'fragment' is an inevitable consequence of the monograph form.

If not inevitable, might it not at least be a fairly standard way of going about things? Here we run up against the paucity of our evidence; but we are offered a clue by Polybius:

For how much easier it is to get hold of and read through forty books just as if woven from a single thread . . . than to read or get hold of the narrative of those who write piecemeal. For apart from the fact that they are many times longer than my history, it is impossible for readers to grasp anything from them with certainty; first because most of them do not write the same things about the same events; secondly because they leave out parallels to events, which we can look at and judge side by side, allowing each thing to be accounted for better than if we formed our opinions in isolation; and thirdly they are not able even to touch what is far and away the most important thing. For I say that above all the most vital part of history is the study of immediate and remote consequences of events and especially the study of causes . . . All these things one can recognize and learn from those who write general history, but one cannot do so from those who write of the wars themselves, such as the war with Perseus or that with Philip. (Polybius III.32.2–8; cf. I.4, VIII.2)

One cannot, of course, prove the point, and we must recognize that Polybius is writing polemically, in order to advocate his particular brand of universal history, but it is perhaps unlikely that he would have said these things had writers of monographs made a habit of systematically seeking to show their work as part of a wider historical pattern. We may add that Polybius at VII.7.6 and XXIX.12.2–4 claims of monographs that, far from playing down the significance of their own topics, as we have seen Sallust does in the *Jugurtha*, they tend to exaggerate, and make a great deal of rather minor events. Moreover, there is some negative evidence for the same conclusions. When Cicero discusses monographs in his letter to Lucceius (*Fam.* v.12.2–7), he assumes that the chief point of writing them is that they offer great opportunities for pathos and decoration. The idea that in them one might indirectly link the particular subject with wider history is never mentioned, although it is precisely to a man engaged in such a wider work that Cicero is seeking to advocate the form.

Our evidence is better for history writers in general than it is for writers of monographs, and it is perhaps here that we should look for parallels to Sallust. Little case can be made for the view that Herodotus is a 'fragment'; the fact that he has no clear movement through time, but instead continually loops and digresses through different areas of the past, means that one is not left with any sense that there are particular episodes that he has failed to cover. Indeed, it is striking that Dionysius of Halicarnassus specifically praised him for his complete coverage of his theme, and his uniting of disparate subjects into a satisfying whole.⁶⁰ Moreover, for his ending he goes back in time to relate an episode which can be seen as providing the moral for his history as a whole, and hence rounding it off with a satisfactory conclusion.⁶¹

⁵⁷ *Cat.* 51.5–6; cf. also 51.32–4.

⁵⁸ *Cat.* 52.30–1.

⁵⁹ *Cat.* 51.37–42; 52.19–23.

⁶⁰ *Ep. Pomp.* 3.14; cf. 3.4, 3.8.

⁶¹ cf. D. Lateiner, *The Historical Method of Herodotus* (1989), 44–50.

Thucydides is often considered the major Greek influence on Sallust, and we can see in him one or two of the features that we have been examining in the *Jugurtha*: in particular, Thucydides, like Sallust, has an extensive historical digression relatively late on in his first book. But the book had begun with a digression which surveyed an even greater period of time; in any case, the first book as a whole has a prefatory character, and in the subsequent books it is extremely rare for Thucydides to look back in time in any substantial way. Moreover, his history is unfinished, and he almost never looks beyond its conclusion.

Nor is the field of Roman history any more promising. Many of Sallust's predecessors wrote multi-book annals, and this in itself would suggest that they were not writing 'fragmentary' works: such authors seem to have aimed at a comprehensive treatment within a strictly chronological framework. We can see something of this in their surviving successors. With Livy even individual groups of books appear more 'complete' than the *Jugurtha*; for example, the first five seem pretty well self-sufficient, and they have a strongly closed ending. So too Tacitus' *Annals* and *Histories* seem to aim at covering events comprehensively in a way that Sallust implicitly rejects.

At least it might be expected that Sallust's open ending would find analogies in other historians. Fowler suggests that such endings may be typical of history: 'More than any other genre, history may need to suggest the simultaneous presence of a "proper" ending and the continuance of the historical process.'⁶² This also finds partial support from Hayden White,⁶³ who argues that one type of historical writing, which he calls 'chronicles', narrates events comprehensively but organizes them chronologically, and is marked by such endings, suggesting an infinitely extensible process of time; he distinguishes these 'chronicles' from 'histories' proper, which impose on a sequence of events completed and coherent stories with strong endings. He further argues that the distinguishing feature of the latter is moralism, without which one cannot create a real ending.

Indeed, we do find works with endings that seem open. Xenophon's *Anabasis*, like the *Jugurtha*, ends one war with a reminder of the next, while his *Hellenica* ends at an apparently arbitrary moment with an invitation for someone else to take over, just as it began at the point where Thucydides happened to break off. But in neither case are the anti-closural elements as strong as they are in Sallust; nor do they link with other aspects of the work to form a principle which dominates it. Other historians, too, picked up their work where predecessors had finished; but this does not mean that they were treating that work as a piece broken off from the whole. Thus Polybius explicitly states that he begins his account of Greek history where Aratus had ended, but he also says that his main reason for beginning then is that 'Fortune had then as it were built the world anew' (IV.2.1-4) — in effect, he is beginning a new subject.⁶⁴

Moreover, the works surveyed do not seem to bear out White's general analysis. It is true that none of these histories are quite 'chronicles' as he would understand the term; however, a number of them, such as the *Hellenica* and Livy, exhibit many of the qualities that he wishes to ascribe to 'chronicles'. However, even though these works are considerably closer to 'chronicles' than is the *Jugurtha*, which bears most of the marks of an organized 'history', it is the *Jugurtha* where the opening of the ending and the suggestion of continuity seem to matter most. Moreover, the *Jugurtha* is the work that is most clearly organized around a moral conception of history; hence we cannot see the straightforward correlation between moralism and closure that White claims.

We have so far failed to find an historical work that is at all closely analogous to Sallust. Biography at first sight looks more hopeful: we do at least there have a substantial body of material to work with, and the works tend to be much the same sort of length as the *Jugurtha*. Tacitus' *Agricola* was influenced by Sallust and there we can see some of the elements that we saw in the *Jugurtha*, such as the references to earlier and later events; the former, at any rate, come out of sequence as Tacitus narrates the earlier history of Britain. The work, however, is in no sense a 'fragment', not least because of its emphatic, panegyric closure. Indeed, the problem with biography in general is that authors tend to keep pretty closely to the limits

⁶² Fowler, op. cit. (n. 3), 117.

⁶³ *The Content of the Form* (1987), 1-25.

⁶⁴ See A. J. Woodman in A. Seldon (ed.), *Contemporary History: Practice and Method* (1988), 152-4.

circumscribed by the lives of their subjects.⁶⁵ It is normal to discuss their family history at the start, and one may sometimes end with an account of their descendants (as with Plutarch, *Cato Major*), or with some anecdote which summarizes their achievements (as with Plutarch, *Cicero*), or some other topic relevant to their death, such as the fates of their killers (as with Plutarch, *Caesar* and *Pompey*).⁶⁶ But only relatively rarely do writers go beyond those limits. The example closest to Sallust is perhaps Plutarch's *Cimon*, the ending of which includes a very brief summary of subsequent Greek failures against the Persians. But it is very different from the *Jugurtha*. The point in Plutarch is not to set the life against the background of Greek history, but to emphasize and magnify Cimon's own achievements. It is part of a general tendency in Plutarch to end with a rehabilitation of his characters.⁶⁷ Moreover, the final paragraph returns to Cimon, and the work concludes with an account of his burial and posthumous honours (*Cimon* 19.5). Even when the strict biographical limits are transgressed, it is usually in order to provide essential background information, or to give a final perspective on the subject. Authors do not shift the focus of the work away from the subject himself, or try to negate the sense of completeness implicit in the description of someone's whole life.

VI

We seem to have reached the rather uncomfortable conclusion that, so far as our evidence allows us to judge, Sallust's *Jugurtha* is unique: it is the only work of historical narrative in the whole of pagan antiquity that even comes close to fitting our definition of a 'fragment'. This leads to the obvious question: why should Sallust choose to write in such an exceptional manner?

One obvious answer might be to look back at Polybius (Section v above). He criticizes writers of monographs for their failure to relate the subjects of their works to other events, and indeed claims that this failure is due to the defects of the form itself. Perhaps Sallust is taking up the challenge, and is showing that it is possible to write a monograph that is not circumscribed so narrowly. Possibly, but this is not a complete answer. The *Catiline*, too, attempts to relate its events to the wider themes of Roman history, and thus essentially fulfils Polybius' requirements; but Sallust does not, as he does in the *Jugurtha*, manipulate its structure so as to set it up as a 'fragment'.

Of course, we do not have to assume a single cause: there may be many factors working in tandem. Another factor might be the period of the *Jugurtha*'s composition: it was almost certainly being written in the early years of the Second Triumvirate, and it might be argued that a writer at a time of such profound and overwhelming social and political dislocation might feel impelled to respond to this in his work. For example, perhaps it is precisely because of the chaos around him that Sallust wrote as he did: on the one hand, he strives to impose a clear and exact pattern on Roman history,⁶⁸ to make sense of a world that is breaking down; but at the same time he shows that pattern as something whose completion is deferred: the chaos still continues, and ultimately he is disillusioned about any such overall clarity and completeness. This, then, would explain the lack of dialectic, and his treating the Jugurthine War as part — but only a relatively minor part — of a grand overall design, which, however, he never directly shows brought to fruition.

Something along these lines would be attractive, and is supported by the comparison with the Romantics. It is sometimes argued that the comparable features of their works are related to the effect of the French Revolution, which created both a great desire for and a great distrust of the view of history as something complete and total.⁶⁹ Similarly, White observes that historical writings that eschew fullness and completion are especially likely to be produced at

⁶⁵ Fowler, *op. cit.* (n. 3), 116, seems to deny this. However, his one counter example, Plutarch, *Antony*, where the subject dies well before the end, is not a good one: uniquely, Plutarch turns the *Life* in effect into a double biography of Antony and Cleopatra together, and their joint lives now provide the limits. On differences and similarities between biography and history, cf. J. L. Moles, *Plutarch: The Life of Cicero* (1988), 32–4.

⁶⁶ cf. C. B. R. Pelling, *Plutarch: Life of Antony* (1988), 323–5.

⁶⁷ *idem.*, quoting J. L. Moles.

⁶⁸ Indeed, other literature of the period, while not 'fragmentary' by our definition, shows an interest in patterns of Roman decline: for example, Horace, *Epodes* VII, XVI.1–14, Virgil, *Georgics* 1.501–14.

⁶⁹ See Kuzniar, *op. cit.* (n. 8), 16–21.

times of political and social instability.⁷⁰ It is true that he explains this with reference to his claim that such writings are not as strongly informed by moralism, which we have seen is not the case with Sallust; but the accuracy of the specific observation is not affected by the flaws of the overall analysis.

However, the huge gaps in our knowledge of the literature of the period should lead us to hesitate before too readily accepting this account. We cannot with any confidence postulate such a *Zeitgeist* as an explanation when our evidence consists of just one out of a couple of works. The *Catiline* is written under comparable circumstances, but does not come out the same way; and if, as has been argued,⁷¹ Livy's first pentad was originally composed in the late 30s, we have there another work which does not conform to this type.

But there is another possibility. One can find many 'fragments' of this sort in the ancient world: in verse. There are many writers of short poems who simply select a scene or two from a longer mythological story, and not necessarily the most important scene at that: the reader is expected and desired to recognize the incompleteness of the story as it appears in the poem. When one comes to slightly longer poems, the so-called 'epyllia', there are several examples that are even closer to Sallust, in so far as they are written on a more comparable scale. Catullus 64, for example, looking forward to the future life of Achilles and the Hesiodic ages,⁷² or Moschus' *Europa*, setting up the obvious aetiology and then failing to give it,⁷³ or Lycophron's *Alexandra*, where the bulk of the poem is a lengthy and obscure prophecy of mythological events that will only be fulfilled outside it. We could even add to our parallels the *Aeneid*, with its prefiguring of the whole of Roman history, and its astonishingly abrupt ending. Sallust, of course, handles it differently: a poem can directly fragment a story in the way that a history cannot, and hence does not require the abandoning of dialectic, or the employment of regular narrative patterns. But, I should like to suggest, Sallust has transformed an essentially poetic structure so as to create an *historical* 'fragment'.⁷⁴ And by doing so he is not playing games: he subliminally relates the rather sordid events of late Republican history to the grand tragedies of poetic myth.

Brasenose College, Oxford

⁷⁰ White, op. cit. (n. 63), 3, cf. 13–14.

⁷¹ T. J. Luce, 'The dating of Livy's first decade', *TAPhA* 96 (1965), 209–40; Woodman, op. cit. (n. 19), 128–35.

⁷² See G. B. Townend, 'The unstated climax to Catullus 64', *G&R* 30 (1983), 21–30.

⁷³ U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, 'Die Textgeschichte der griechischen Bukoliker', *Philologische Untersuchungen* 18 (1906), 100–1, in fact claims that the *Europa* is genuinely incomplete, and that the aetiology would have appeared in the missing conclusion, but see W. Bühler, *Die Europa des Moschos*, *Hermes Einzelschriften* XIII (1960), 201–3; N. Hopkinson, *A Hellenistic Anthology* (1988), 214–15.

⁷⁴ History and poetry frequently fertilized one another:

apart, obviously, from historical poems, such as those of Ennius, Naevius, and Lucan, there were the 'tragic historians' criticized by Polybius (e.g. 11.56). For a discussion of this controversial issue, and more generally of the use of 'poetic' emotions and sensationalism in history (on which such borrowings from verse are usually held to centre), see e.g. C. W. Fornara, *The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome* (1983), 120–34. It is claimed by R. Reitzenstein, *Hellenistische Wundererzählungen* (1906), 84–90 (see also B. L. Ullmann, *TAPhA* 73 (1942), 42–53), that monographs were less bound by requirements of accuracy, and hence were especially likely to show poetic influence; but against this see La Penna, op. cit. (n. 21), 312–20. On Sallust's use of these 'poetic' techniques see e.g. Vretska, op. cit. (n. 35), 146–58.