

Lucretius is shown *doing* with these that matters most. Examples include his controlled manipulation of Greek and Latin intertexts; his continual invention and renewal of Latin metaphors (since the Epicureans did not, as often claimed, demand that words always be used in their primary senses); his strategic imposition of quasi-Greek features on Latin phraseology and word-formation, well exemplified by the deployment of compound adjectives to underwrite a complex intertextuality with the ancestral Latin poetic tradition and with his Greek literary-cum-philosophical model Empedocles.

To quote one example, Lucretius' repeated insistence that the earth deserves the name 'mother' is explicated as an instance of the device Taylor calls 'unnecessary metaphor'. He develops the point less in terms of a well-known intertext from Euripides' *Chrysippus* than via the following skilful reformulation in theoretical Epicurean terms (65):

[M]others share certain ineliminable properties [= Lucretian *coniuncta*], which are bundled together in the preconception of mother (the primary conception subordinated to the word 'mother'). Enough of these ineliminable properties are shared by the earth to warrant using the term 'mother' in a secondary, metaphorical sense to refer to it. A reader, encountering the phrase 'mother earth', may profit by looking to the primary conception subordinated to the word 'mother', which would convey to him or her valuable information about the earth's historical generative and nurturing powers.

This is a characteristically acute contribution to the understanding of Epicurean semantic theory. It still, however, like the rest of the book, leaves a key question unasked: even if we can sometimes use etymology diachronically, to trace a word back towards its historical roots, how could we ever identify which (if any) items in our present vocabulary are survivors from the original, naturally uttered words? A tempting answer on Lucretius' behalf might begin with the example of *mater* itself — a word whose first syllable, or regional variants thereof, still manifests itself in the instinctive utterances of infants.

Detailed engagement with the Latin tradition of etymological scholarship is among Taylor's leading assets. Much that might otherwise go down as routine assonance or superficial word-play in the *DRN* is shown instead to embody a range of seriously meant etymologies independently attested by Varro and others. Consider the recurrent derivation of Latin *letum* ('death') from Greek λήθη ('forgetting'). Even readers not already familiar with that etymology might notice it at 3.674–8, where Lucretius argues that staying alive without memory would barely differ from *letum*. In principle this same etymology could have returned as a live one a few pages later, in Lucretius' similar contention (3.847–60) that if after death you were atomically reconstituted, the disruption of memory would leave your old self of no concern to your new one — which is presumably why Taylor classes this passage too under 'implicit etymologies'. Yet the latter passage neither mentions *letum* nor, as far as I can see, implies any etymology at all.

The diagnostic tool-kit that Taylor constructs in this outstanding monograph will be a boon to future Lucretian studies. If it also turns out that some of the tools themselves need sharpening, that will be all to the good.

University of Cambridge

dns1@cam.ac.uk

doi:10.1017/S0075435822000922

DAVID SEDLEY

© The Author(s), 2022. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies.

ANDREW FELDHERR, *AFTER THE PAST: SALLUST ON HISTORY AND WRITING HISTORY* (Blackwell/Bristol lectures on Greece, Rome and the classical tradition). Chichester: Wiley Blackwell, 2021. Pp. x + 318. ISBN 9781119076704. £35.99.

Amongst the 'Sallusts' that 'Sallustian scholars' had fashioned by the 1960s, D. C. Earl listed 'the moralist, pure artist, philosopher, imperialist, [and] political propagandist' (*JRS* 52 (1962), 276, abbreviated); to Karl Büchner, whose 'lengthy work' Earl reviewed politely rather than unfavourably, Sallust appeared to be a 'politician and ... historian'. These two would also occupy

Ronald Syme, whose 1964 *Sallust* is considered the most important English-language contribution of the last century (given that La Penna's *Sallustio e la 'rivoluzione' Romana* appeared in 1968, this was a golden decade for *Sallustiani*). But the differences were striking: whereas Büchner relied on his literary expertise to pursue an often philosophical interest (e.g. 1982 [2nd edn], 11), Syme mustered his prosopographical astuteness and kept his eye 'on the political scene within and behind the works' (A. D. Leeman, *Gnomon* 39 (1967), 57).

It is a testament to Syme's importance that he is mentioned repeatedly on the first page of Andrew Feldherr's *After the Past*; but, as becomes clear quickly, rather by way of contrast. For F.'s reading of the monographs — he excludes the *Historiae* (14) — is informed by theories that were largely developed after *Sallust*: intertextuality, narratology and the historiographical turn; and it is animated by Sallust's ambiguous role(s) as political participant and historical writer, the temporal distance between which ultimately contributes to his awareness of 'the historicity of history, of the temporal situatedness of the historian in relation to events' (3). This awareness 'fundamentally structures Sallust's representation of the past' (3), and not the least in the ways that it makes his readers experience that open space between event and word (hence the title *After the Past*): if history is contingent, so is historiography, so is its reception. F.'s Sallust is a hermeneut who wants his readers to participate in his hermeneutics.

Following the Introduction, which is primarily concerned with the narratological dimension (and develops J. Grethlein's *Experience and Teleology in Ancient Historiography* (2013), emphasising the audience's involvement in balancing these two poles), F. approaches Sallust and his readers in six chapters that cover familiar topics — but in this new perspective and with unusual evidentiary supplements. Ch. 1 contrasts the general philosophical beginning with the particular descriptive ending of the *Cat.* and illuminatingly juxtaposes the latter with the conventions and themes of three of Brutus' lost works, i.e. a historical epitome, an epideictic life, a philosophical treatise on *uirtus* (25), while exploring various conceptions of historiography and similarities between Brutus and Catiline. Ch. 2 revisits the uneasy relationship between history and rhetoric, in part via a detailed discussion of A. J. Woodman's *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography* (1988). Here F. deepens our understanding of Sallust's dialogue with Cicero's historiographical theory and suggests that Sallust wants his readers to scrutinise (71) the (rhetorical) writing in the *writing* of history and, furthermore, renegotiates the boundary in *neg/otium*, when he highlights the complexity and consequences of historical writing. Ch. 3 studies *miseriordia* and *inuidia* in the *Cat.*, moving from Caesar's inhibition of emotions (*Cat.* 51.1) through Polybius' discussion of the role of pity in historiography to Sallust's thematic and programmatic (116) use thereof to alert his readers, once more, to its ambiguity and ambiguous effects on historical agents, the historian and the readers themselves ('ambiguous' may well be the word that describes Sallust best, in F.'s opinion). The function of *inuidia* is studied especially in the context of Fulvia's revelation of the conspiracy, which leads to a parallelisation of her to Sallust (134). Ch. 4 discusses how Sallust 'constructs an ongoing contest with tragedy in his work' (137) and how his readers would have responded to his tragic elements. F. focuses on 'three characteristics of tragedy' (140): its 'emphasis on changes of condition', its foreignness and facilitation of exchange (between cultures) and 'its accentuation of history's connection with truth'. Adherbal resembles Medea, Jugurtha is both a 'dangerous foreigner' and one whose downfall provokes Roman reflection on their own precariousness (151) and Sulla, tragically, 'conflates final victory with the beginning of the end of Rome' (162). Few will deny tragic elements in the *BJ*; but F.'s interpretations are complicated by the blurry line between our modern concept of 'tragic' and the Roman one — which he acknowledges (139 n. 6) but does not entirely maintain. Nor am I convinced that *fortuna*, as an 'analogue to Greek *tyche*' (145), 'like tragedy ... emerges in Roman historiography as a borrowed idea' (146), given how complex were the concept and the deity in Rome and beyond (D. Miano, *Fortuna: Deity and Concept in Archaic and Republican Italy* (2018), esp. 3–14): would a contemporary really have thought of capricious Fortuna as foreign? Ch. 5 deals with facets of Sallust's 'imaginary geography', whereby he alerts his readers to the 'tension' between 'universalizing moral claims' and representations of events in 'particular places and times' (169). At the Muthul river, space is represented so as to symbolise Jugurtha's intentions; where Caesar's *Gallia* is neatly surveyed, Africa appears in '[i]ts infinite subdividability' (177); and the present absence of Carthage in the African 'chronoscape' invites reflection on impermanence and historical patterns. Ch. 6 focuses on how Sallust draws attention to his histories as written texts, so when the readings of Bomilcar's conspiratorial letter (*BJ* 70–32) become a way of Sallust's 'mak[ing] his audience aware of the fundamental doubleness of his

own record of the past' (223). The historian's stylistic hallmark, *brevitas*, rather unsuitable for oral delivery (Quint. 4.2.45), is a constant reminder of the text in writing, as is the inclusion of a version of Lentulus' letter; and however much Sallust's Marius rails against (historical) texts, his *virtus* lives on in the historian's writing. The epilogue completes the Sallustian temporality, addressing the fascinating topic of Sallust's future.

After the Past is not for the faint of mind; and there is — at least for this reader — the occasional round too many along the hermeneutical circle. But F.'s interpretation, supported by an admirable engagement with the secondary literature, offers nuance and fresh perspectives; and it succeeds in making Sallust come alive in his two alluring works, as raw and quizzical, open and challenging — even if the lines between the two hermeneuts, the ancient, the modern, are blurry. Then again, aren't they always?

Stanford University
cbkrebs@stanford.edu

CHRISTOPHER B. KREBS

doi:10.1017/S0075435822000892

© The Author(s), 2023. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies.

E. H. SHAW, *SALLUST AND THE FALL OF THE REPUBLIC: HISTORIOGRAPHY AND INTELLECTUAL LIFE AT ROME* (Historiography of Rome and its empire 13). Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2022. Pp. x + 506. ISBN 9789004501713. €132.00.

While Thomas Wiedemann (*G&R* 40.1 (1993) 48–57) demonstrated thirty years ago that Sallust's digressions have tight thematic links to the narratives of his monographs, Edwin Shaw has now gone further, claiming that those digressions are where Sallust's historiographical vision is most evident. According to S., Sallust uses the digressions, which reach beyond the chronological confines of his texts' subjects, to develop his interpretation of Roman history on a grander scale. In so doing, Sallust expands the intellectual possibilities of historiography by engaging with other modes of inquiry. S.'s Sallust is a wide-ranging intellectual actively participating in cultural debates centering on Roman identity at a time of extreme political and social turmoil. Far from being the resentful senatorial reject who grinds his axe in literary form, this Sallust is a detached historian and an innovator in Roman historiography whose work bears closer resemblance to Cicero's philosophical works, Varro's *De Lingua Latina* and juristic writing than had previous Roman historiography. Indeed, Sallust's incorporation of geography, etymology and myth reveals a project of generic enrichment which even bears a resemblance to the early poetry of Vergil and Horace.

S. makes three major arguments across the book's introduction and five chapters. First, he asserts that digressions are 'central *loci* of the historian's articulation of the ideas developed in his historiography' (425). One reason for their significance, he argues, is that they clearly reflect the oratorical practice of *dispositio*, the speaker's purposeful ordering of material for a compelling speech. This useful emphasis on *dispositio* allows S. to work with the rhetorical nature of Sallust's historiography without conceding a primary focus on historical truth. Second, S. claims that the digressions are key to understanding Sallust's analysis of Roman history. They illustrate the supposed terminal decline which Sallust outlines on three levels, the highest of which is the theory of *translatio imperii*. S. sees the inexorable shift of power from the weaker to the stronger as the crucial insight of the *archaeology* in the *Bellum Catilinae* instead of the disappearance of *metus hostilis* — which, he notes (as others have) is not explicitly articulated until the *Bellum Jugurthinum*. S. identifies the next level of Sallust's analysis of Rome's first-century B.C. crisis as the *malum publicum* of factional strife, based on a Thucydidean model (3.82–4) but with crucial variation. Unlike Corcyrean politics, which came apart under external threat, Roman politics maintained an uneasy equilibrium so long as there was pressure from outside; it was the absence of external threat that resulted in destabilising ambition, greed, and factional strife. The lowest level of Sallust's analysis of Rome's supposed decline is individual psychology. S. shows that Sallust's moralising about individual vice is the final manifestation of much larger processes of decline. The third argument of the book locates Sallust within the intellectual milieu of his time, and demonstrates the rich, creative period in literature when authors were sharing their work in artistic circles.