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This thesis examines the construction of Roman identity in Sallust’s *Bellum Iugurthinum*. In this monograph, Sallust writes about a war that occurred approximately seventy years before the date of composition (respectively, 112-105 BCE and 41 BCE), yet he intends his narration to comment on the present day. Sallust’s approach to historiography is not scientific, like modern historiography, in which exact dates and accuracy of facts are of utmost importance. Instead, Sallust concerns himself with the power history has on its readers. Sallust’s moral agenda is patent and has already been the subject of much study, but this thesis proposes that his aim extends further into a national agenda. This thesis takes a literary approach based on post-colonial theories on nationhood and psychoanalytical theories on identity.

I present a theory of narrative time called homogeneous, empty time, as developed by Benedict Anderson and improved on by Homi Bhabha. Sallust employs homogeneous, empty time through the construction of the “meanwhile.” He establishes the “meanwhile” by employing various temporal adverbs and clauses. In this way, Sallust narrates events in sequence, but as if occurring in the same instant. He draws his readers into the narrative as they gaze directly on vivid action. Homogeneous, empty time allows him to divorce events from their
historical reality and place them side-by-side. By thus conflating past, present, and future, Sallust comments directly on his own time by narrating the past.

I then continue the study of Sallust’s narrative voice on a larger scale, as he unites passages together to develop over-arching themes. He also directly engages the readers through continual reference to the first person plural, thereby creating the illusion of a dialogue between himself and his audience. Furthermore, his deliberate distortion of chronology, previously considered an act of carelessness, proves to be a narrative tool by which he focuses the readers’ attention onto actions that highlight his moral and national agenda.

Finally, I show how Sallust constructs the anti-hero Jugurtha, against whom the Romans fight, as the Other. He presents the Roman Self as the opposite of Jugurtha. Jugurtha is a nomad, whereas a Roman ought to be stable and ought to adhere to the customs of his ancestors. Jugurtha subverts the Rome/client kingdom relationship, whereas a Roman ought always to promote harmony by upholding the patron/client relationship. Whenever a Roman strays from the correct Roman behavior, he loses touch with his Roman identity and fails in his endeavors. I also show that Sallust presents Roman identity as liable to subversion because Rome no longer has an enemy worthy of fear. Rome lost such a fear when Carthage was destroyed. Here, I incorporate Michel Foucault’s theory that states only exist in permanent competition and Ernest Renan’s belief that a common hatred of the enemy unites a nation in the desire to do great things. Sallust instructs his Roman readers to combat the decline that has followed the destruction of Carthage by restoring harmony between the classes in Roman society. To do so, Romans must cease to be motivated by ambition and greed, and must instead pursue virtue.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

In 41 BCE, Sallust published the *Bellum Iugurthinum*. Civil war dominated the previous decade, culminating in the assassination of Caesar in 44, but the discord did not end there. The Second Triumvirate had recently defeated Brutus and Cassius at Philippi in 42, effectively bringing an end to the very thing to which Romans clung for their sense of identity: the Republic. With most of the leaders of the Republic dead, the average Roman had no idea what was to follow, war or peace, Republic or tyranny. Rome had only seen peace once since the end of Numa’s reign (Liv. 1.19.2),¹ and an end to strife seemed a distant possibility, though in reality the Peace of Brundisium would soon follow, and from there Actium and the Pax Romana. Roman identity was challenged on every level as civil war divided families, neighbors, and friends. Meanwhile, the Italians, recently enfranchised during the Social War by the *Lex Julia* in 90, were already struggling to assimilate into Roman society.²

We must imagine that many “Romans” struggled to understand what it meant to be Roman. Sir Ronald Syme writes, “At Rome they spoke loudly and warmly of ‘tota Italia.’ An aspiration, not a fact.”³ How might the leaders of Rome turn this aspiration into fact? One solution was the Octavian’s encouragement of the *Aeneid*,⁴ but Vergil had not yet published his

---

¹ In 235 BCE at the end of the First Punic War. Livy says the gates of the temple of Janus have been closed twice, but the second time is in 29 BCE, during the reign of Augustus, and postdates the *Bellum Iugurthinum*. Ogilvie 1965: 93-94 *ad* 1.19.1-4 posits that closing the temple of Janus to mark peace was not a recognized practice in the late Republic, but was reinstituted by Octavian for propaganda.


³ Syme 1964: 5.

⁴ For the *Aeneid*’s role in shaping Roman identity, see Syed 2005.
Eclogues when Sallust is writing.\(^5\) I propose that Sallust, himself a municipal man,\(^6\) takes on this momentous task in writing the *Bellum Iugurthinum*. In his preface, Sallust states:

> Bellum scripturus sum quod populus Romanus cum Iugurtha rege Numidarum gessit... 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)\(^7\)

I am about to write about the war which the Roman people waged with Jugurtha, king of the Numidians... because then for the first time the arrogance of the nobility faced opposition. And this struggle threw all divine and human affairs into a confusion and produced such a frenzy that only war and the devastation of Italy could make an end to civil strife.\(^8\)

The war and devastation (or by hendiadys, the devastating war) of Italy to which Sallust refers is the Social War, and this extends further into the resulting civil war between Marius and Sulla. A clearer parallel to the current struggles in Rome did not exist. Sallust narrates his own time through the medium of the Jugurthine War. Ultimately, the Social War united Italian and Roman; now, the Romans of Sallust’s day have the opportunity to unite once more in *concordia* and reassert their Roman identity in the face of powers that threaten to divide.

This paper proposes that Sallust uses his narrative voice to represent Jugurtha as the Other and that he narrates the failure of the major Roman figures in the war in terms of Jugurtha’s Otherness. This reading of Sallust as a national historian results in a holistic view of Sallust that accounts for his often overbearing narrative voice and his errors of place and time. Those very qualities that bring him censure from the modern historiographic perspective become

---

\(^{5}\) The *Eclogues* were probably published individually or in pairs, and Vergil either began writing or published the first of his *Eclogues* in 42 or 41 BCE. They were not complete until 39. See Bowersock 1971, Coleman 1977: 14-16, Van Sickle 2004 [1978]: 24-27, Tarrant 1978, and Bowersock 1978. Bowersock and Tarrant deal specifically with *Eclogue* 8.

\(^{6}\) Jerome 151h; On Sallust’s origins, Syme 1964: 14 notes that Jerome’s statement that Sallust was from Amiternum does not mean he was born or raised there. Nevertheless, he was first generation Roman at best.

\(^{7}\) All Latin text from the *Bellum Iugurtinum* are from Reynolds 1991.

\(^{8}\) All translation are my own and are translated fluidly with attention to the original Latin.
virtues for the narrator of a national history. The first chapter discusses Sallust’s construction of homogeneous, empty time—a concept derived from modern theories on nationalism—through the use of temporal adverbs and clauses. The second chapter shows how Sallust asserts his narrative voice in three ways: (1) through first person plural verbs denoting cross-references within the text and expressions of uncertainty, (2) through first person plural pronouns and possessive adjectives, and (3) through deliberate distortions in his chronology. The final chapter concerns the characterization of Jugurtha, Sallust’s anti-hero. Sallust develops Jugurtha as the Other by casting him as a nomad and as a client who fails to understand his status in relation to Rome. I argue that Jugurtha’s Otherness pollutes the Roman political scene, and that this corruption of Roman identity was made possible by the destruction of Carthage and the subsequent loss of *metus hostilis*.
CHAPTER 2
HOMOGENEOUS, EMPTY TIME AND THE HISTORICAL NARRATIVE

Homogeneous, Empty Time and the Imagined Community

In 1940, Walter Benjamin coined the term “homogeneous, empty time” in his “Theses on the Philosophy of History” when he wrote about Social Democratic theory, “The concept of the historical progress of mankind cannot be sundered from the concept of its progression through a homogenous, empty time. A critique of the concept of such a progression must be the basis of any criticism of the concept of progress itself.”9 Unfortunately, he does not define homogenous, empty time, and his immediate death later that year left the term undefined and his essay unpublished until 1968. Benedict Anderson adopts Benjamin’s homogeneous, empty time and casts his imagined community within it.10 He describes homogeneous, empty time as time “in which simultaneity is, as it were, transverse, cross-time, marked not by prefiguring and fulfillment, but by temporal coincidence, and measured by clock and calendar.”11 For Anderson, homogeneous, empty time is the temporality of the novel and the newspaper, two print mediums that unify the imagined community. Anderson’s definition for the nation depends on an imagined community reinforced by the novel and the newspaper, and therefore by homogeneous, empty time. Anderson does not account for Benjamin’s critical view on homogeneous, empty time and on the progress of mankind through such time. Anderson alters homogeneous, empty time into a positive construct. For Benjamin, it was destructive, as it allowed the Social

---

9 Benjamin 1968: 264, published posthumously, but written in 1940, while Benjamin was in Paris awaiting a flight out of Europe. His friends circulated these theses among themselves until publication in 1968.

10 The imagined community is Anderson’s definition for the nation: “I propose the following definition for the nation: it is an imagined political community—and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign,” Anderson 1983: 5-6. The imagined community is imagined because the members of a nation, unless consisting of 150 members of fewer, will never know every other member though they imagine themselves as living in a community together, Anderson 6. It is limited because even the most powerful nation has borders and competes against other nations, Anderson 7. It is sovereign because it is because it opposes divinely-ordained kingdoms, Anderson 7.

Democrats to assert cultural superiority by narrating their progress through homogeneous, empty time.

Anderson conflates homogeneous, empty time with the temporality of the “meanwhile,” specifically in reference to print-capitalism. Print allows the members of an imagined community, of a nation, by engaging in the same daily act of reading the newspaper to develop an awareness of the hundreds of thousands of people participating in the same activity. This allows them to identify with these people whom they may never meet but nevertheless interact within the imagined community. The idea is that each person reading the newspaper imagines that meanwhile, other members of his community are doing the exact same thing. Anderson sees the same process at work in narratives.

Anderson’s conception of homogeneous, empty time is not complete and even admits some error. Homi Bhabha picks up on Anderson’s concept of the “meanwhile” and develops a more accurate understanding of its function in establishing national identity. Anderson depends too heavily on synchrony and ignores iteration and instantaneity, which Bhabha believes are the true functions of the “meanwhile” and which incorporate the sense of “profound ambivalence” central to Benjamin’s original conception. The difference is between (1) two or more actions occurring at the same moment within a continuous sequence of actions and (2) any number of actions transpiring and/or coinciding external to any established duration of time with no regard to actions prior or following. Anderson offers continuous action, and Bhabha responds

12 Print-capitalism refers the availability of novels and newspapers to the masses as commodities.
13 Anderson 1983: 44.
14 Bhabha 1994: 157-161 addresses the misconceptions promoted by Anderson and aims at elaborating on Anderson’s claims to create a more complete understanding of homogeneous, empty time.
15 On synchrony as opposed to iteration and instantaneous time, see Bhabha 1994: 159; on the ambivalence of narrative, ibid. 161.
with alienated succession. Prior and following actions do exist, but they do not necessitate the instant in which the “meanwhile” manifests itself. Within homogeneous, empty time, the past, present, and future coexist, and the historical reality is rewritten to fit the present reality. Time is chopped up, events placed side-by-side, as if the passage of days, weeks, months, and years mean little and affect nothing. The clock and calendar lend a false sense of progress and, by defining time, actually homogenize it: each minute on the clock, each day on the calendar weigh the same. The “meanwhile” presents temporal succession without continuity, and even those events that happen simultaneously in real life must be represented on the page in a succession bereft of real time. In a way, homogeneous, empty time replaces timelessness as a means by which we separate events from reality and assign them new meaning without disregarding reality. Events in homogeneous, empty time do not exist outside of time as timeless events do.

Furthermore, Anderson fails to separate the homogeneous, empty time of narrative from the here-and-now—Benjamin’s *Jetztzeit*—of political reality. Partha Chatterjee writes, “People can only imagine themselves in empty homogeneous time; they do not live in it.... It linearly connects past, present, and future, creating the possibility for all of those historical imaginings of identity, nationhood, progress, and so on.... But empty homogeneous time in not located anywhere in real space.” This is critical to an understanding of narrative history. People do not live in a national community; they imagine themselves in one, and this fantasy is constantly threatened by reality. Therefore, national identity must be continually reinforced to combat the

---

16 Anderson’s faults, especially his misreading of Benjamin, are the subject of Kelly (2000). Kelly: 848 writes, “For Benjamin, the idea of living in homogenous, empty time is pathetic, and the agents promoting it were evil.” Anderson diverged from this idea by making homogeneous, empty time the utopian ideal while still asserting its existence in the real world.

17 Chatterjee 2005: 928.
overwhelming weight of a reality dominated by heterogeneous time.\textsuperscript{18} Narratives, whether historical or novel, aim at such reinforcement. Here, Anderson shines again: “The idea of a sociological organism moving calendrically through homogeneous, empty time in a precise analogue of the idea of a nation, which also is conceived as a solid community moving steadily down (or up) history.”\textsuperscript{19} The progress of the individual is the progress of the nation. Mass media and the dissemination of narratives throughout an imagined community unite the members of that community “by the horizontal camaraderie of the page.... [and constitutes] the sense of being and belonging in an empty, homogeneous temporality of progression.”\textsuperscript{20}

Concerning homogeneous, empty time, we can now say that (1) it allows members of an imagined community to experience their shared identity via the narrative and the shared experience of reading that narrative; (2) it is reinforced by the “meanwhile,” in which events occur in succession and instantaneously, but not necessarily simultaneously, while still allowing time to me measured by clock and calendar; (3) it allows events to be divorced of their historical reality, placed side-by-side, and narrated without continuity; (4) it is a construct in which people can imagine themselves, but in which they cannot actually live; (5) it is essential to the establishment and reinforcement of a national identity, as the characters moving in homogeneous, empty time mirror the nation moving in history. With this understanding, I will now show how Sallust uses the “meanwhile” and the narrative voice to create a sense of homogeneous, empty time for his Roman readers.

\textsuperscript{18} Foucault 1998 discusses the burden of heterogeneous time and its effect on modern national identity.

\textsuperscript{19} Anderson 1983: 26.

\textsuperscript{20} Nelson 2005: 131.
The “Meanwhile” in Sallust’s *Bellum Iugurthinum*

Sallust depends on two main tools to establish the “meanwhile” in his *Bellum Iugurthinum*: temporal adverbs and *cum* (*quom*) temporal clauses. Here, we see Sallust operating on the small scale. In contrast, the narrative devices to be discussed in the following chapter show how he integrates larger units of text within the framework of homogeneous, empty time. The temporal adverbs and clauses mentioned here function to unify individual clauses and phrases, not passages distant from each other within the text. Among the vast quantity of temporal adverbs at Sallust’s disposal, I focus on *simul*, *interim*, and *interea*. The *cum* temporal clauses at which I look are those that specifically indicate instantaneous time and define or date the time of the main action on Anderson’s clock and calendar, but I will also look at conditional and explanatory *cum* temporal clauses.

**Simul**

*Simul*, which appears forty times in the *Bellum Iugurthinum*, draws particular interest because of its etymological connections with our own *simultaneous*. I will show, however, that Sallust does not use *simul* to construct simultaneity, which would conform to Anderson’s misreading of homogeneous, empty time, but instead to illustrate instantaneous action and to narrate events in succession. *Simul*, however, does not always indicate instantaneous time, but can represent *both... and* in one word. Sallust uses *simul* nineteen times to mark such simple connection. For example:

---

21 I pass over *dum*, *interdum*, and *ubi*, but they function similarly to the examples given for *interea* and *interim*. *Donec*, *quoad*, and *interibi* do no occur.

22 For *cum* conditionals see Allen 2001 [1903]: 542; for explanatory, ibid 549.a.

23 *B/4.2, 24.5, 25.5, 47.2, 53.7, 64.5, 70.5, 73.2, 76.2, 84.5, 91.1, 92.2, 94.1, 97.1, 97.5, 102.5, 103.7, 106.1, and 108.3.*
apud negotiatores, quorum magna multitudo Uticae erat, criminose simul et magnifice de bello loqui. (64.5)

Among the traders, of whom there was a great number in Utica, [Marius] spoke about the war slanderously and at the same time boastfully.

One could just as easily, and accurately, read “both slanderously and boastfully.” Sallust does not link two actions together in succession, but merely connects two adverbs. Similarly, when simul appears in BI 91.2, it marks simple temporality and does not relate events. Marius orders his soldiers to prepare to march out simul cum occasu solis, at the same time as the setting of the sun.24 These uses of simul add nothing to the establishment of homogeneous, empty time.

Simul in conjunction with undique, however, functions prominently to allow Sallust’s Roman readers to visualize action occurring across large expanses of space and performed by multiple people, perhaps hundreds or thousands.25 Sallust writes about the Romans at the battle of Zama:

Igitur Metellus pro tempore atque loco paratis rebus cuncta moenia exercitu circumuenit, legatis imperat ubi quisque curaret. Deinde signo dato undique simul clamor ingens oritur. (57.2-3)

Therefore Metellus, having made his preparations in accordance with the circumstances and the nature of the place, encircled all the walls with his army and assigned to each legate his own post of command. Then, when the signal had been given, a unnatural battle-cry arose from everywhere at the same time.

Sallust creates a powerful image as we-the-Roman-readers imagine a vast Roman army bonding together in one act to frighten the enemy.26 He floods his audience’s imagination with the din of swords on shields and the loud voices of thousands of soldiers raising the battle-cry. The

---

24 This use of simul, though purely temporal, does not mark calendrical time. This is not temporal coincidence measured by clock and calendar of Anderson 1983: 24.

25 BI 57.3, 101.1, 113.6; in passage 113.6, the number of people mentioned is probably only a few.

26 “We-the-Roman-readers” borrows from Anderson 1983: 27, “we-Filipino-readers,” and refers to the members of the Roman imagined community who constitute Sallust’s audience.
language and especially the historical present verbs remove the action from the past and place is 
in the immediate, instantaneous present.

Similar to this is *simul* in 99.1, when Marius orders all the horn-blowers of the cohorts to 
sound at the same time. Across the breadth of the battlefield, people who do not stand face-to-
face still engage in the same activity and through this participation feel a sense of belonging with 
their comrades. This is a concept at the heart of the imagined community.\(^{27}\) Likewise, we-the-
Roman-readers imagine ourselves participating, standing on the battlefield defending Rome as 
the horns resound around us. Sallust allows no pause between the giving of the order and the 
sounding of the horns; the horn-blowers do not blow their horns one at a time as the sound 
slowly builds into a cacophony. Sallust takes us from quiet and still to boisterous and dynamic 
in one instant, from nothing to overwhelming.

Sallust also employs *simul* to imply cause and effect. This will be more clear with other 
temporal adverbs, but Sallust does offer one example:

\[\text{Nam ubi mare magnum esse et saeuire uentis coepit, limum harenamque et saxa} \]
\[\text{ingentia fluctus trahunt: ita facies locorum cum uentis *simul* mutatur. (78.3)}\]

For when the sea begins to swell and rage with the winds, the waves drag along 
mud and sand and massive rocks so that the face of the places is changed at the 
same time as the winds.

Sallust says that the landscape changes at the same time that the winds change, but the reader 
imagines that the winds cause the landscape to be changed; the winds must shift first to effect 
this reconfiguration of the terrain.

---

\(^{27}\) Anderson 1983: 6 says “all communities larger than primordial villages of face-to-face contact (and perhaps even 
these) are imagines,” and, “members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, 
meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion.”
The remaining examples of *simul* represent an instant in time in which Sallust narrates events in quick succession as if occurring simultaneously, though they do not.\(^{28}\) He places events side-by-side in an additive sequence divorced from real time. The most compelling example presents four actions in one instant:

Perfugae, minume cari et regionum scientissumi, hostium iter explorabant. *Simul* consul quasi nullo inposito omnia prouidere, apud omnis adesse, laudare et increpare merentis. (100.3)

The deserters, because they were valued least and knew the land best, were reconnoitering the path of the enemy. At the same time, the consul [Marius], as if no one else had been placed in command,\(^{29}\) was looking after everything, was present among everyone, and was praising and rebuking where each was warranted.

Four snapshots flash in the reader’s mind. The scouts occupy half the scene, while triplex Marius, in command of every detail, omnipresent, and responsive to his men’s actions, consumes the rest of the field of vision. Action is imbedded within action, as Sallust forces us to imagine three levels of action: the deserters reconnoiter, Marius moves throughout the army, and his men perform acts of glory and dishonor. The first verb, *explorabant*, establishes the tense, and the historical infinitives following *simul* adopt this imperfectness, thereby emphasizing the vividness and action of the narrative.\(^{30}\)

*Interim* and *Interea*

Now I turn to words that expressly indicate the “meanwhile,” *interim* and *interea*.\(^{31}\) The first time Sallust uses *interea* presents a compelling example of the “meanwhile:”


\(^{29}\) Paul 1984: 242 ad loc. suggests for *quasi nullo inposito* “as if no one had been entrusted with such duties;” Watkiss 1971: 324 ad loc. “as though no officers had been put in charge.”

\(^{30}\) Infinitives also appear in 51.4, 52.6, 101.6, 101.7.

Itaque tempus ad utramque rem decernitur, sed maturius ad pecuniam distribuendam. Reguli *interea* in loca propinqua thesauris alius alio concessere. (12.2)

And so a time was settled for each item, with the earlier time being for the division of the money. Meanwhile, the princes each departed on separate paths to places near the treasury.

Here, the “meanwhile” fills an unknown amount of time and encompasses the activities of three people, Adherbal, Hiempsal, and Jugurtha. How long their journeys took and what the princes were doing is irrelevant. Only two facts matter: they traveled during this homogeneous, empty time and they arrived at the unidentified places near the treasury. These ambiguities of place and time might bother a modern historian, but Sallust concerns himself with the narrative facts, which allow him to draw attention to the issue of the money without bogging down the reader with petty details.32

In 87.1-2, Sallust presents another aspect of the “meanwhile” as Marius assumes command of the Roman troops in Africa:

omnia ibi capta militibus donat; dein castella et oppida natura et urbis parum munita adgreditur, proelia multa, ceterum leuia, alia aliis locis facere. *Interim* novi milites sine metu pugnae adesse, uidere fugientis capi aut occidi, fortissumum quemque tutissumum, armis libertatem patriam parentisque et alia omnia tegi, gloriam atque diuitias quaeri.33

There, [Marius] gave the soldiers all the booty; then he attacked small fortresses and towns insufficiently protected by nature and men, fighting many battles, but trivial ones all over the place. Meanwhile, the new recruits learned to approach battle free from fear and saw that deserters were captured or killed, that the bravest men were the safest, that by the force of arms were their liberty, country, and parents–and everything else–protected and glory and riches sought.

---

32 For the role of money within the narrative and especially for the characterization of Jugurtha, see Kraus 1999: 221-232.

33 *N.b.* the historical infinitives *facere*, *adesse*, and *videre*.

34 Watkiss 1971: 310 ad loc. suggests this translation for the historical infinitive.
Here again, the temporal adverb indicates cause and effect, and it also fills up the empty time with complementary, yet competing action. Marius is leading his men in battle, among whom the new recruits learn through experience and observation how a Roman ought to behave in battle. Consequently, we-the-Roman-readers also observe how a Roman ought to behave. The sense of homogeneous, empty time bonds Marius with his soldiers, and the readers with Marius and his soldiers.

**Cum Temporal Clauses**

*Cum* temporal clauses represent Sallust’s most sophisticated construction of the “meanwhile.”35 Some of these clauses represent the type of temporal coincidence discussed above in reference to temporal adverbs, but others allow Sallust to date the action of the main clause. Unlike the narrative *cum* clause with the subjunctive, which is much more common, the *cum* *temporal* clause does not describe general circumstances, but defines and dates. Sallust can therefore use these clauses to fit events within the framework of homogeneous, empty time measured by clock and calendar. Sallust employs fourteen *cum* temporal clauses throughout the 114 sections of the *Bellum Iugurthinum*, with their use steadily increasing as the action of the narrative approaches climax in 101.36

Sallust’s *cum* temporal clauses fall into four general categories: (1) of temporal coincidence, (2) explanatory, (3) conditional, and (4) of exact time. This last group separates into two subcategories: those of exact time that cannot be equated to the clock or calendar and

---

35 Sallust uses the antiquated spelling *quom*, which I will maintain in quotations, but the standard *cum* will be used in the text since all grammatical reference are to Allen 2001 [1903], which uses *cum*.

36 *Cum* temporal clauses: 12.5, 31.20, 31.22, 49.4, 51.2, 60.6, 62.7, 85.21, 91.1, 92.8, 98.2, 101.8, 102.5, 106.5; On the climax at 101, Levene 1992: 54 says that the *BI* has no clear climax, but acknowledges that the battle at Cirta comes closest. I disagree. 101 marks a clear turning point in the narrative. Jugurtha puts his hope back in peace and Marius’ success leads Bocchus to ally with the Romans. It also marks the switch in emphasis from Marius to Sulla. The action ceases to rise and begins to decline. Jugurtha fades from the narrative, and Sallust quickly mops up the details to arrive at the denouement, which he narrates without any pomp and circumstance. As Levene himself comments, Sallust places no emphasis on the capture of Jugurtha.
those that can. Within this second subset, a distinction arises between clock and calendar. Those of the first category—temporal coincidence—occur with interim and function in accordance with the examples for interim above.37 Of the second type, Sallust writes an explanatory once:

‘Rex Bocche, magna laetitia nobis est, quom te tam uirum di monuere uti aliquando pacem quam bellum malles...’ (102.5)

‘King Bocchus, we take great pleasure in that the gods have advised such a man as yourself to finally prefer peace to war...’

The temporal relationship here is one of cause and effect, as with simul in 78.3 and interim in 87.2.

Sallust offers two examples from the third category, conditionals. The iterative nature of cum translated as “whenever” coincides within Bhabha’s understanding of homogeneous, empty time.38 The iteration is clear when Marius berates the nobles while addressing his countrymen:

Atque enim, quom apud vos aut in senatu uerba faciant, pleraque oratione maiores suos extollunt: eorum fortia facta memorando clariosse sese putant.

(85.21)

And even when they speak among you or in the senate, [the nobles] are always praising their own ancestors for most of the oration: they think that they are made more famous by calling to memory the brave deeds of others.39

The homogeneous, empty time of the action underscores the audacity of the nobiles. Sallust writes no beginning or end to this action. Through cum, Marius’ audience and Sallust’s readers imagine these nobiles speaking, depending on the virtues of others instead of their own, over and

37 BI 12.5 & 49.4; If Sallust had disregarded the interim, a cum circumstantial would probably have suited the situation better, but the adverb fixes the homogeneity of the temporality.

38 Bhabha 1994: 159, “Anderson misses the alienating and iterative time of the sign. He naturalizes the momentary ‘suddenness’ of the arbitrary sign, its pulsation, by making it part of the historical emergence of the novel, a narrative of synchrony. But the suddenness of the signifier is incessant; instantaneous rather than simultaneous. It introduces a signifying space of iteration rather than a progressive or linear seriality. The ‘meanwhile’ turns into quite another time, or ambivalent sign, of the national people. If it is the time of the people’s anonymity it is also the space of the nation’s anomie.”

39 In order to accommodate enim, I translate cum as “when” and insert “always” into the main clause. Just as easily, we might read, “And also, whenever they speak..., they are praising....” The meaning is the same.
over, in constant iteration. Therefore, Marius’ listener should follow his proposed course of action—enlisting in his army—to combat such superbia at every instant.

In 31.22, *cum* introduces the protasis of a future more vivid condition. Memmius addresses the people of Rome:

\[
\text{et uobis aeterna sollicitudo remanebit, quom intellegeatis aut serviendum esse aut per manus libertatem retinendum.}
\]

And everlasting anxiety will remain for you, *as soon as* you understand that you must either be slaves or preserve your liberty by force.

*Cum* is much stronger than *si*; it makes the condition even more vivid. Memmius, and Sallust, intend the force of the condition to imply present fulfillment, an act which breaks down the barriers of time and space and joins the past, present, and future. This passage exemplifies how homogeneous, empty time allows Sallust to involve his readers in the narrative. Memmius is not just addressing his fellow Romans, but also Sallust’s fellow Romans and the future generations of Rome. His words exist outside of historical, temporal reality.

The most powerful *cum* temporal clauses, however, indicate exact time, whether measured by clock and calendar or not.\(^{41}\) The two passages showing exact time divorced of clock and calendar create a snapshot of an instant in time:

\[
\text{Et iam scalis egressi mlites prope summa ceperant. quom oppidani concurrunt, lapides, ignem, alia praeterea tela ingerunt. (60.6)}
\]

And already our soldiers, scaling on ladders, had nearly seized the top of the wall, *when* the townspeople charged forward and began throwing stones, fire, and other missiles thereafter.

\(^{40}\) Memmius has just abused the nobility for oppressing the Roman people and this is the cause of their present and future dilemma, *BI* 31.1-21.

\(^{41}\) Exact time without measure: 60.6, 92.9; time measured by clock: 51.2, 98.2, 101.8, 106.5; by calendar: 31.20, 62.7, 91.1.
Ea uineae cum ingenti periculo frustra agebantur, nam *quom eae paulo processerant* igni aut lapidibus corrumpabantur. (92.8)

The siegecraft were being led forward with great danger and in vain, for *as soon as* they had advanced but a little, they were being destroyed by fire and stones.

Both passages present single, pivotal moments in battle in a snapshot full of static movement. Movement is implied by present and imperfect verbs, but the words themselves are immobile on the page. Both *cum’s* homogenize the time. If we were to paint these scenes, men would seem to struggle forward, and fire and stones to hang in the air in suspended rain. In this way, the Roman soldiers are always struggling and the enemy are always assailing them with missiles.

Clock and calendar come into play when Sallust references the action of the *cum* clause to a specific event in the main clause or vice versa. At 106.5, Sallust marks the time of day in the main clause and narrates the clocked action with a *cum inversum*:

*iamque nocturno itinere fessis omnibus Sulla pariter cum ortu solis castra metabatur, quom equites Mauri nuntiant Iugurtham circiter duum milium intervallo ante eos consedisse.*

And now Sulla, when all his men were worn out by the nighttime march, was drawing the perimeter of his camp at sunrise, when the Moor horsemen announced that Jugurtha had pitched camp about two miles ahead of them.

We as readers can fix a time for Sulla’s measuring of the camp. In fact, Sallust actually offers us *cum ortu solis*, specifying where exactly on the narrative clock we might place the messengers’ announcement. As for calendrical time, Sallust offers passages such as 62.7:

*Eorum magna pars, uti iussum erat, adducti; pauci, quom primum deditio coepit, ad regem Bocchum in Mauretaniam abierant.*

Most [of the deserters], as was ordered, were led to [Metellus]; a few, as soon as the surrender began, fled to King Bocchus in Mauretania.
The date of the surrender is a fixed moment, an instant in time which may have even been recorded in the annals at Rome. It anchors the flight of the deserters not only in this instant, but also in homogeneous, empty time.

Sallust has carefully related events on a small scale in such a way that he has homogenized time. He traps we-the-Roman-readers within this imagined homogeneous, empty time, in which the past, the War with Jugurtha, the present, Rome on the brink of another civil war, and the future, the unknown fate of Rome in the hands of unknown leaders of unknown virtue, are one and the same. Instantaneous moments of action hang in the air threatening to iterate. On the one hand, he offers images of the Roman army assailed by fire and missile and of nobiles haughtily asserting their right to power based on the deeds of their ancestors while their own merits are lacking. On the other, he provides hope as the army rouses to the battle cry and as citizens in Rome preserve their liberty, even by force.
CHAPTER 3
SALLUST’S NARRATIVE VOICE

The previous discussion of homogeneous, empty time assumes that the *Bellum Iugurthinum* is a narrative, and that Sallust serves as both author and narrator. It is absurd to pretend that an author who interjects so much of his own voice into the history and who begins with a clear moral agenda (1-4) could step back and relate events in a modern historical fashion. This would not be history to a Roman. For Sallust, history is not a record of events, but a narrative account with a purpose. He is writing the history of the winners, but winners on the brink of self-destruction. I will discuss how Sallust uses first person plural verbs indicating cross-references and uncertainty, first person plural pronouns and possessive adjectives, and chronological distortion as narrative tools to establish the homogeneous, empty time in which he sets his narrative.

**Cross-References**

Each time Sallust writes *diximus*, he creates cross-references within the text that imply a chronological sequence between scenes. These cross-references relate events and create a cohesiveness within the text, but they also do much more. *Diximus* directly involves the reader,

---

42 On the narrative voice in general, see Genette 1993, 54-84; on Sallust as narrator, Dué 2000, who discusses tragic and poetic elements in the Jugurtha, especially in Adherbal’s speech to the Senate (*BI* 14). Grethlein 2006 shows how Sallust asserts his narrative voice (1) through reference to his sources and cross-references within the text, which draw attention to his presence and to his shaping of the narrative, and (2) through expressions of uncertainty, which draw in the reader, which show that the story does not naturally unfold, but is shaped by a narrator, and which adopt the perspective of his Roman characters.

43 See Earl 1961: 5-17. Sallust’s moral agenda is to show *virtus* in decline and urge its restoration through the pursuit of “*gloria* by the exercise of *ingenium* in such a way that [one] carries out *egregia facinora*,” 8.

44 On ancient historiography and its narrative elements, see Hawthorn 1969: xxxv-liii and Walsh 1961: 21-45. He notes that since philosophy and history were the main prose genres in Rome, history functioned as the literary (narrative) prose, 20n.

45 Walsh 1961: 44: “Sallust... embraces the ethical preoccupations of earlier Roman chroniclers, so that he views all history in terms of man’s duty to gods and fellow-men.

46 Grethlein 2006: 303-304 discusses how these cross-references establish the narrative voice.
as if Sallust were speaking with us-the-Roman-readers. He actively engages us and forces us to agree with whatever statement he is referring back to, as if together we had settled on this interpretation of characters and events. The first person plural is more than mere convention. Sallust is saying that we, I Sallust and you-the-Roman-reader, have said these things. He uses *diximus* eight times, seven in conjunction with *supra* and once with *paulo ante*.  

Sallust compounds the cross-references at 33.2 and 34.1. The second refers back to the first, which in turn refers to the numerous crimes of Jugurtha that Sallust has narrated thus far:

Ac tametsi in ipso magna uis animi erat, confirmatus ab omnibus quorum potentia aut scelere cuncta ea gesserat quae supra diximus, C. Baebium tribunum plebis magna mercede parat, quoius inpudentia contra ius et injurias omnis munitus foret. (33.2)

And although there was great assurance in himself, encouraged by all those men by whose power or wickedness he had done all those things which I (we) mentioned above, he bought the support of Gaius Baebius, tribune of the plebs, with a substantial bribe, so that he would be protected by this man’s shamelessness against justice and all abuses.

and then:

C. Baebius tribunus plebis, quem pecunia corruptum supra diximus, regem tacere iubet. (34.1)

Gaius Baebius, tribune of the plebs, whom I (we) said above was corrupted by money, ordered the king to be quiet.

Through this intratextuality, Sallust deliberately links Baebius’ corruption with Jugurtha’s crimes outlined in 29, the passage referred to in 33.2. He first recalls the crimes, placing them in the forefront of the reader’s mind, and then not two sections later, he recalls the corruption of a

47 Cf. Anderson 1983: 27 on the first person plurals in the beginning of *Noli me Tangere*. The “we” are we-Filipino-readers. Likewise, here, the “we” are we-Roman-readers. By using the first person plural, Jose Rizal and Sallust posit their respective imagined communities.

48 With *supra*: 30.3, 33.2, 34.1, 37.3, 52.5, 75.6, 84.1; with *paulo ante*: 38.6; Grethlein 2006: 304 deals with the cross-reference between 36.4 and 37.3, which he calls particularly striking because of the close proximity between the passages. In addition to *diximus*, Sallust also uses *ostendimus*, 67.3, and *docuimus*, 40.4 and 49.1, in a similar fashion.
Roman tribune which secured protection against these crimes. Sallust almost makes us wonder which is worse: Jugurtha’s deeds or Baebius’ acquiescence to them. He also connects Baebius’ office with the *potentia* and *scelus* of 33.2. With such a display of the narrative voice, Sallust makes it impossible for his manipulation of the text not to be felt. Consequently, it is impossible for us-the-Roman-readers to disassociate ourselves from an active reading. Sallust demands reflection on these events, demands an imagined dialogue between him and us.

Even more powerful, but used more sparingly is *memorauimus*. Both instances, 25.4 and 28.4, refer to M. Aemilius Scaurus, whom Sallust paints in unflattering terms. 25.4 refers back to 15.4, when Sallust first introduces Scaurus:

> sed ex omnibus maxume Aemilius Scaurus, homo nobilis inpiger factiosus, auidus potentiae honoris diuitiarum, ceterum uitia sua callide occultans.

But among all these men Aemilius Scaurus stood out most, a noble, factious, and energetic man, greedy for power, honor, and wealth, but skilled at hiding his own vices.

Sallust describes him in compounding tricolon. He defines Scaurus with three general terms, of which the first two are further broken down into three subcategories. Scaurus is (1) a man (a) noble, (b) energetic, and (c) factious; (2) greedy of (a) power, (b) honor, and (c) riches; and (3) skilled at hiding his own faults. With the reinforcement on the cross-referencing passages, especially 28.4, which specifically mentions his *natura* and *habitus*, this portrait of Scaurus is complete. Sallust, however, has constructed this specious representation of Scaurus for us to remember. We are obliged to forget whatever details Sallust leaves out.49

---

In shaping the reader’s perception of Scaurus, the hand of the narrator is clearly at work. Sallust does not alter those facts that can be checked against Scaurus’ personal memoirs, but instead focuses on the motivation behind Scaurus’ actions. For instance, when he refuses Jugurtha’s bribe, Sallust attributes it to fear of popular resentment at such an obvious bribe, not to virtue (15.5). Cicero presents quite a different Scaurus, as one of the most upright figures in Roman history, though he no doubt engages in his own act of forgetting, and the reality is most likely somewhere in between Sallust’s and Cicero’s estimations.

Whatever Sallust’s motivation for defaming Scaurus, the important fact is that he shapes the reader’s memory to fit this specious characterization. The memory he creates is of a noble who abuses his power, who turns from honor and virtue to criminal behavior (29.2). As soon as Sallust has established this portrait of Scaurus, Memmius rises to speak to the people (31). His speech aims at moving the plebs to reassert their political power and to restore the *concordia* that had dominated in Rome prior to the fall of Carthage. Anthony Smith dismisses the idea that Rome constituted a nation: “the narrow patrician circumspection of rights... indicate[s] that Rome and Latium fail to conform to the ideal-type of the modern ‘nation’.” This is the very thing Sallust fights against by championing *concordia*.

---

50 Cic. *Brut.* 29.112


52 Hands 1959 attributes Sallust’s prejudice towards Scaurus to parallels Sallust drew between Scaurus and Cicero; von Fritz 1943: 145-156 to political hatred towards a prominent aristocratic leader.

53 Sallust considers the removal of this *metus hostilis* to be the cause of Rome’s current decline (41.2-5). Memmius’ speech closely parallels Sallust’s own opinions on the origin of factional politics (41-2). See Earl 1964: 68-69 for an account of the similarities.

54 Smith 2004: 132; Smith 129 establishes seven criteria for a nation: geographic borders; a legal community with a single law code; a mass participant (all class) community; a culture propagated by mass education; an autonomous community in which all members are citizens; sovereignty within an international framework; and ideology.
Expressions of Uncertainty

In addition to such cross-references, Sallust makes his narrative voice heard through expressions of ambiguity or uncertainty. I do not wish to dwell on this tool, as Jonas Grethlein has given it extensive attention, but I will draw on one particular example to elucidate the point. Sallust marks this expression of uncertainty with *parum conperimus*. At 67.3, he comments on Turpilius’ escape from Vaga:

> saeuissumis Numidis et oppido undique clauso, Turpilius praefectus unus ex omnibus Italicis intactus profugit. Id misericodiane hospitis an pactione aut casu ita euenerit *parum conperimus*, nisi, quia illi in tanto malo turpis uita integra fama potior fuit, inprobus intestabilisque uidetur.

Although the Numidians were especially fierce and the town was completely closed off, one man out of all the Italians escaped unharmed, the prefect Turpilius. We have been unable to determine for sure whether this happened because of the mercy of his host or a secret agreement, or because of chance; except he seems too shameful and detestable, since in such a wicked affair, he preferred a shameful life to a untarnished reputation.

Sallust opposes the *intactus* Turpilius to his loss of *integra fama*, and the choice of *turpis* to describe Turpilius’ life is striking. Sallust’s shaping of the narrative inflames the reader at the actions of Turpilius and his diction marks which possibility he believes to be true. *Parum conperimus* is a deceptive pretense. Sallust has determined, even if he has not discovered it through inquiry, that Turpilius had secret dealing that ensured his safety, and he guides the reader to the same conclusion.

First Person Plural Pronouns and Possessive Adjectives

The first person plural verbs just mentioned directly engage the reader and establish narrative voice through cross-references and expressions of uncertainty, but they are not the only

---


56 He uses the same phrasing when he questions whether Bocchus’ hesitation to agree to deliver Sulla to Jugurtha was feigned of genuine (113.1).
references to we-the-Roman-readers. Sallust regularly inserts first person plural pronouns and possessive adjectives, which directly engage the reader by building upon a sense of an imagined community and by breaking down the barriers of time separating the historic past from the reader’s present.

During his preface, Sallust writes:

Nam saepe ego audiui Q. Maxumum, P. Scipionem, <alios> praeterea ciuitatis nostrae praeclaros uiros solitos ita dicere, quom maiorum imagines intuerentur, uehementissum sibi animum ad uirtutem adcendi. (4.5)

For often I have heard the Quintus Maximus, Publis Scipio, and other famous men of our state were accustomed to say that when they beheld the masks of their ancestors, their minds were most ardently inflamed towards the pursuit of virtue.

He goes on to clarify that it was the memoria rerum gestarum of their ancestors, not the wax itself, that aroused such feelings (4.6). This passage functions on multiple levels. Nostrae draws attention to the community to which Sallust, we-the-Roman-readers, Quintus Maximus, and Publius Scipio belong. We feel a sense of belonging to this imagined community; thus, the pride felt by these great men upon seeing the imagines transfers to us. This action of remembering the deeds of the ancestors becomes exclusive to the Romans, as nostrae civitas admits no external viewers. Sallust limits the gaze to we-the-Roman-readers.\(^{57}\) The subsequent reference to memoria rerum gestarum directly links the power of imagines to spur one to virtue to the power of Sallust’s own historical narrative to do the same. Therefore, even if one of his readers does not have imagines of his own to inspire him, he still has the memory of great deeds recorded in history.

\(^{57}\) Syed 2005: 53 write on “gaze,” “ancient thinking about the self held that influence over a person’s mental images brought with it influence over his/her emotions as well.” For more on “gaze,” see Syed 44-50, Davidson 1991, and Feldherr 1998: 1-50 (who refers to “gaze” as “vision”).
Memory comes into play again during Sallust’s third digression (79). Sallust narrates the story of two Carthaginian brothers, the brothers Philaeni, who sacrifice their lives for their country over a border dispute. Sallust begins this excursus:

*Sed quoniam in has regiones per Leptitanorum negotia *uenimus*, non indignum uidetur egregium atque mirabile facinum duorum Carthaginiensium *memorare*: eam rem *nos locus admonuit*. (79.1)

But since we have come to these regions by the affairs of the people of Lepcis, it seems not unworthy to remember the exceptional and extraordinary deed of two Carthaginians: the place reminds us of this affair.

This memory, however, is external to Roman identity. Sallust casts himself and the reader as the object of *admonuit*. In a way, Sallust makes Lepcis the narrator, and he steps back. The deeds of two non-Romans are intended to arouse the spirits of the Romans. At first, this seems to work against the establishment of a Roman Self versus a foreign Other, but in truth, Sallust is allowing an intermediary group to emerge. The Philaeni brothers are mimics of the Romans. These brothers represent fraternal cooperation, “the highest moral virtue.” Additionally, they give their lives for their country, which Sallust brands *res publica* (79.9). When this excursus is read in light of the surrounding action, why Sallust allows the mimetic element to manifest itself becomes clear. The cooperation between Metellus and Marius is breaking down. These mimics feign the Roman identity that Metellus and Marius fail to maintain. Furthermore, the respective *superbia* and *ambitio* of Metellus and Marius have supplanted their concern for the *res publica*. Still, this mimetic memory threatens the Roman Self, so Sallust does not dwell long on it. The

---


59 So argued by Weidelmann 1993: 55.

60 Scanlon 1987: 51-52 notes that this digression not only highlights Metellus’ *superbia* and Marius’ *ambitio*, but also falls exactly between the beginning of Metellus’ command and the end of Marius’ and divides the achievements of Metellus from those of Marius.
brothers Philaeni consume one section. Then Sallust returns to his subject and reasserts his narrative voice (*Nunc ad rem redeo*, 79.10).

Sallust’s voice shines once more during the battle of Zama (57-60). Though the Romans do not succeed in besieging the city, they perform valiantly in this battle because Marius and Metellus are still cooperating. Metellus has refused to pursue the nomadic Jugurtha through the countryside (56.1) and begs for Marius’ help *lacrimans per amicitiam perque rem publicam* (58.5). 61 While the Roman cavalry are guarding the Roman camp and Metellus moves out to besiege Zama,

> Iugurtha ex occulto repente nostros inuadit: qui in proxumo locati fuerant, paulisper territi perturbantur, relicui cito subueniunt. (59.2)

Jugurtha suddenly attacked our men from a hiding place: those who were nearest were for a short time frightened and terrified, but the rest quickly came to help them.

By placing the identity of *nostros* on the Roman soldiers, Sallust once again directly involves the-Roman-readers readers in the battle. We experience the fear and terror of the soldiers; we feel relief when our comrades rush to our aid. The near defeat (*ita sui hostis paene victos dare*, 59.3) consumes our thoughts as we gaze upon our fellow Romans in the bitterest strife (*eo acerrume niti*, 60.1). Then, Sallust shows our soldiers scaling the walls while the townsmen assault them with stones, fire, and other missiles (60.6). 62 As he continues, Sallust evokes even stronger emotions as we gaze upon the following:

> nostri primo resistere; deinde, ubi unae atque alterae scelae conminutae, qui supersteterant adflicti sunt, ceteri, quoque modo potuere, pauci integri, magna pars uolneribus confecti abeunt. (60.7)

61 This *amicitia* is the same bond of friendship that collapses following Marius’ election to the consulship, about which Sallust comments with the story of the brothers Philaeni.

62 This is the same passage discussed in chapter 2 as engaging the reader through the use of a *cum* temporal clause. This passage offers an excellent example of how the various functions of the narrative voice come together to produce dramatic effect.
At first our men resisted; but then, when one after another ladder was shattered and those who were standing on them were crushed, the rest fled in whatever way they were able, a few unharmed, but most consumed by wounds.

The rapid succession of clauses dominated by participles and historical infinitive builds upon the tension. We look in horror as our comrades fall from heights or attempt to flee until night finally brings an end to battle (60.8). Sallust makes us forget that he narrates a battle that occurred about seventy years before—he empties time of its meaning—and we imagine ourselves standing helpless on the battlefield. This struggle occurs right now in the memory of every Roman.

**Chronological Distortion**

When historians judge the “value” of Sallust, a regular complaint concerns his errors of chronology.63 These errors, however, are unimportant within the Sallustian framework of homogeneous, empty time. A glaring distortion arises at the beginning of the *Bellum Iugurthinum* when Sallust narrates Micipsa’s adoption of Jugurtha and his subsequent death. Scipio Aemelianus conquered at Numantia in 133 BCE.64 Jugurtha then returned to Numidia with a letter from Scipio extolling his *maxima virtus* (9.2). Sallust narrates Micipsa’s response:

Igitur rex, ubi ea quae fama acceperat ex litteris imperatoris ita esse cognouit, quom uirtute tum gratia uiri permotus flexit animum suom et Iugurtham beneficiis uincere adgressus est statimque eum adoptauit et testamento pariter cum filiis heredem instituit. (9.3)

Therefore, the king, when he understood from the general’s letter that the rumor which he had heard was true, moved by both the virtue and the influence [of Jugurtha], changed his plans and attempted to win Jugurtha over with kindness. He immediately adopted him and in his will made him an equal heir with his sons.

Sallust clearly states that Micipsa immediately (*statim*) adopted Jugurtha. He continues:

---

63 Canter 1911 and Syme 1964: 142-147 lists these errors and works out as much of the chronology as possible.

64 App. *Hisp.* 96-98.
Sed ipse *paucos post annos* morbo atque aetate confectus quem sibi finem uitae adesse intelleget, coram amicis et cognatis itemque Adherbale et Hiempsale filis dicitur huiusce modi verba cum Iugurtha habuisse. (9.4)

But after a few years [Micipsa], consumed by sickness and old age, when he realized that the end of his life was approaching, is said to have spoken to Jugurtha in the presence of friends and relations, including his sons Adherbal and Hiempsal, and the conversation went something like this.

A speech follows in which Micipsa urges Jugurtha, Adherbal, and Hiempsal to remember their filial affection after his death (10). Then, *paucis post diebus*, Micipsa dies (11.2), and the princes hold a meeting in which Hiempsal says that Jugurtha was adopted *tribus proxumis annis* (11.6). Sallust has established a rapid chronology in which Jugurtha returns from Numidia, Micipsa adopts him, a few years, but no more than three, pass, and Micipsa dies. At most, Sallust permits four years between the destruction of Numantia and Micipsa’s death, but Micipsa died in 118 BCE, at least fifteen years after the destruction of Numantia.

Ronald Syme believes, “This is perhaps careless rather than artifice.” I disagree. Gérard Genette has established that narrative pacing represents efficiency, economy, and the narrator’s judgment concerning the importance of events. What transpired during the intervening years does not matter and placing these events side-by-side in rapid succession heightens the tension and focuses on the impiety of Jugurtha’s subsequent murder of his two

---

65 Syme 1964: 149, citing specifically the contradiction of *tribus proxumis annis*.

66 So too does von Fritz 1943: 141: “The unsuspecting reader, unless he has a very exact knowledge of the chronology from other sources, must certainly come to the conclusion that the interval between Jugurtha’s stay in Spain and the troubles which broke out immediately after the death of Micipsa was little more than three years, and not sixteen, as was actually the case. He will therefore receive the impression that Jugurtha’s attitude towards his co-rulers was the direct result of his presumed conversations with the young Roman noblemen who took part in the siege of Numantia.” These “presumed” conversations are those in 8.2, when the *novi atque nobiles* convinced Jugurtha that if Micipsa were to die, he might become sole ruler of Numidia and that all things can be bought in Rome. Later, he says that it is difficult to believe this is carelessness or unintentional, *ibid.* 142.

67 Genette 1993: 63-64.
adoptive brothers. In Sallust’s chronology, Jugurtha brings his family prestige only to immediately shatter it.

If Sallust were a scientific historian in the modern sense and not a narrator, he would not be able to move his readers, nor provide them with a sense of unity. His ability to interweave events and draw attention to characters and characteristics depend upon his narrative voice. His cross-references, expressions of doubt, use of first person plurals, and chronological distortions allow him to invest us-the-Roman-readers in this imagined community so that we directly experience shock, fear, pride, and inspiration.
CHAPTER 4
JUGURTHA: THE OTHER

Jugurtha is the central figure in Sallust’s monograph. The Roman players change from Bestia to Metellus to Marius to Sulla, but Jugurtha remains throughout.\(^6^8\) Jugurtha functions as an anti-hero, and he is not alone in Roman historiography. Livy has such figures as Sextus Tarquinius and Hannibal, Cicero and Sallust himself have Catiline, Tacitus has Tiberius, Sejanus, and Nero. These figures, who either are not Roman or fail to uphold their Romanness, offer a negative image of what it means to be Roman. No Roman from the Jugurthine War could serve as a model Roman in Sallust’s estimation because they all eventually give in to one major character flaw or another, so instead he offers Jugurtha. Unable to define the Self, he defines the Other. He then describes the failure of the major Roman players in terms of their mimicry of the Other, which results in a loss of their Roman status and is ultimately responsible for the decline Sallust narrates.

**Geography, Nomads, and Aborigines**

When we first meet Jugurtha, illegitimacy defines his identity (5.7). Sallust then briefly describes his youth, marked by excellence of mind and body (6.1), but soon shifts to a different view of Jugurtha. Sallust implies that Jugurtha is a man without a home. Though Micipsa *Iugurtham... domi habuit* (5.7), he has not accepted him as a member of that family. Sallust shows this through the mistrust Micipsa places in his adoptive son. Jugurtha offers no reason for alarm, yet:

\[
\text{postquam hominem adulescentem exacta sua aetate et paruis liberis magis magisque crescere intelligi, uelhementer eo negotio permutus multa cum animo suo uoluebat. Terrebat eum natura mortalium auida imperi et praeceps ad}
\]

\(^6^8\) Kraus 1999: 239-240 marks Jugurtha’s “relative absence” in sections 84-114, when Marius dominates the scene. This is, however, only a relative absence, and Jugurtha still figures in the plot, though Sallust has shifted the focus to Marius. His presence is reasserted in 101, discussed in Chapter 1 as the climax of the narrative.
explendam animi cupidinem, praeterea opportunitas suae liberorumque aetatis, quae etiam mediocris uiros spe praedae transuosos agit, ad hoc studia Numidarum in Jugurtham adensa, ex quibus, si talem uirum dolis interfecisset, ne qua seditio aut bellum oriretur anxius erat. (6.2-3)

After [Micipsa] realized that the man was young and was thriving more and more while his own age was wearing on and his sons were young, he was very much disturbed by this situation and constantly dwelling on it. The nature of mortal men, greedy for power and zealous towards fulfilling its heart’s desire, frightened him, as did the opportunity provided by his own age and that of his children, which leads astray even men of ordinary ability with the hope of spoils, and in addition to this was the increasing favor of the Numidians towards Jugurtha, from whom, if he were to kill such a man through treachery, he feared some rebellion or war would arise.

This is the view of the Numidians Sallust has painted thus far: a people fearful of their own relations. The mistrust runs deep, and we might even read Jugurtha’s behavior as a response to the obvious lack of faith placed in him. After all, Micipsa is the first to consider an attack on his own family member.69 Jugurtha quickly sees through Micipsa’s feigned regard for him: regem ficta locutum intellegebat (11.1). This familial strife culminates in the slaughter of Hiempsal (12.5). Whatever home Jugurtha might have had is now completely destroyed and his identity as a nomad is fixed.

Sallust has given us a nomad, and now he highlights the difference between the nomad Jugurtha and the stable Roman in his excursus on African geography (17-19). This digression has bothered scholars, as a circumspect glance shows little connection with Sallust’s theme.70

69 On the battle imagery and vocabulary of motion and attack in Sallust’s description of Micipsa’s reaction to Jugurtha’s early display of virtus and popularity among the Numidians, see Kraus 1999: 232-233.

70 Levene 1992: 57 discusses the digression in terms of its contributions to the fragmentary nature of the BI by allowing a brief mention of Carthage that implies more to the story. Scanlon 1980: 126, 131-132 considers the digression mere imitation of Thucydides and a feature of style. Grethlein 2006: 313 views the digressions as an opportunity to establish the narrative voice through reference to his source (the Punic books of King Hiempsal, 17.7). Syme 1964: 152-153 calls the digression appropriate, but also “Greek erudition and fancies,” and seems to think the digression useful as a jumping off point for a discussion of Sallust’s sources. Paul 1984: 72 ad loc assigns a structural function to mark the passage of five or six years between the partition of Numidia and the start of the war. Hawthorn 1969: 6 excludes the digression from his text. Wiedemann 1993: 53 comes closest with, “it is a statement about the difference between the well-ordered state, and the anarchy of division,” and here he speaks specifically about Hercules’s death and the dispersal of the peoples in his army.
This might be an accurate conclusion if his theme were merely the decline of Roman morality, but a nationalistic agenda sheds new light on the function of this excursus. Sallust literally casts Numidia in the position of the third world in contrast to the first world Rome. First, he establishes all Africa as a third continent, separate from Asia and Europe:

In divisione orbis terrae plerique in parte tertia Africam posuere, pauci tantum modo Asiam et Europam esse, sed Africam in Europa (17.3)

In the division of the earth, almost everyone has established Africa as a third part, and just a few think there is only Asia and Europe, Africa being in Europe.

Sallust sides with the *plerique*. His specious expression of uncertainty involves we-the-Roman-readers and influences us to agree with the *plerique* as well. For Sallust, to whom third world is an unknown construction, Africa is nevertheless a third world. He places little stock in the misconception that Africa could be part of Europe, for he immediately describes the physical separation between Europe and Africa created by the Mediterranean Sea—*nostri maris*—and the Strait of Gibraltar (13.4).

These are separate worlds, and the repetition of *nostri mare* at 18.5 and 18.12 further reinforces the distinction. When Jugurtha comes to Rome (33-35), his third world status pollutes the Roman political scene. His discordant presence and attempt to mimic Roman behavior result in the success of his bribes in ensuring his personal safety and the escape of Bomilcar to Africa despite the open assassination of Massiva. His Otherness has torn asunder the Roman political system that should have prevented such crimes. Jugurtha emits the only words issued directly from his mouth in the entire monograph as he leaves the city:

“urbem uenalem et mature perituram, si emptorem iuenerit.” (35.10)

“That is a city for sale and ready for ruin, if it finds a buyer.”

---

71 Sallust attributes Jugurtha’s influence to bribery, but Allen 1938 reveals how Sallust purposefully misrepresents the political reality. Jugurtha’s influence in the Roman senate was based on his amicitia with the Scipios.
His presence in Rome, his belief in this sentiment, which was inspired by the *novi atque nobiles* Romans with whom he served in Numantia (8.1),\(^{72}\) and his actions in accordance with that belief result in its fulfillment, the successful bribe of the tribune Gaius Baebius (33.2). Baebius is now infected by Jugurthine Otherness and has lost touch with his Roman identity. The reference back to this bribery at 34.1, as mentioned in chapter two, strengthens this association and further links Baebius’ crime with Jugurtha’s.

Homi Bhabha writes, “Each cultural naming represents the impossibility of cross-cultural identity.”\(^{73}\) By labeling Jugurtha a nomad, Sallust thus implies that the Roman identity is the opposite, fixed and stable. Sallust establishes that the Gaetulians and Libyans are indigenous to Africa and are

\[\text{vagi, palantes, quas nox coegerat sedes habebant. (18.2)}\]

...a roving, wandering people, who made their resting places those which night had compelled them to take.

The Persians, having come to Africa after the death of Hercules, intermarried with the native Gaetulians to create a race of nomads now known as Numidians. Though the Libyans, Medes, and Armenians soon established towns, the Numidians took longer to settle, but eventually absorbed their neighboring populations in northern Africa. Because Sallust composes his narrative in homogeneous, empty time, he can relate unknown centuries of activity by multiple peoples in just three sections.

\(^{72}\) *qui Iugurthae non mediocrem animum pollicitando ascendebat:... Romae omnia venalia esse.*

\(^{73}\) Bhabha 1994: 130 means that by labeling a group with a name different from your own, you make it impossible to identify and sympathize with the other group. The civilized cannot identify with the barbarous, the British with the Indians, and so forth. In our case, the Romans cannot identify with the nomadic Numidians. Each repetition of the sign, which here is the name placed on the Other, reinforces the impossibility of cross-cultural identification.
The Romans, however, according to their own mythic tradition, are in essence aboriginal. Although Livy 1.1-3 draws a distinction between the *aborigines* and the *Troiani*, the Trojans were but a few men quickly assimilated into the aboriginal tribes. Also, their ultimate descent form Dardanus and Saturn allows them some degree of aboriginal status on their own. The Gaetulians, on the other hand, migrated to north Africa from further south (*Gaetuli sub sole magis, haud procul ab ardoribus*, 18.9) and a group of Persians and Gaetulians separated from the larger group. Under the name ‘Numidians,’ they took over the area next to Carthage (18.11). Furthermore, if we accept the Aeneas myth, then the Romans are aboriginal through the eponymous hero Romulus, as well as through the marriage of Aeneas, ultimately descended from Dardanus, and Lavinia.\textsuperscript{74} Alternately, we might select one of the multiple eponymous heroes from Plutarch’s *Life of Romulus* (1-2). Within the homogeneous, empty time of the nation’s memory, conflicting accounts pose no problem. The distance by which Romans are removed from the historical reality of their origins allows the accepted truth to become truer and any confusing or problematic details to disappear into the emptiness.\textsuperscript{75} Thus, the Romans view themselves as a stable society and assume a degree of cultural superiority.

In contrast to this, Sallust continuously emphasizes the nomadic lifestyle of the Numidians and their parent races. Since Sallust writes from the point of view of the winner, he is free to inscribe his version of history on the Other.\textsuperscript{76} Fortunately for Sallust, the very name

\textsuperscript{74} The existence of competing myths of descent is a defining feature of the nation, Smith 1999:86-87. For Aeneas’s Roman identity, see Syed 2005. Syed 175 says that Lavinia’s “Latinness is inscribed in her and her father’s name,” which Vergil emphasizes with the words *Laviniaque venit / litora* (*Aen. I.2-3*) and *genus unde Latinum* (*Aen. I.6*). Also, Livy writes that when the Trojans came arrived in Italy, *Latinus rex Aboriginesque qui tum ea tenebant loca ad arcendum vim adventarum armatì ex urbe atque agris concurrunt* (1.1.5).

\textsuperscript{75} Bhabha 1994: 74 writes, “The myth of historical origination–racial purity, cultural priority– produced in relation to the colonial stereotype functions to ‘normalize’ the multiple beliefs.” This helps explain why competing myths pose no problem within the framework of Roman national memory.

\textsuperscript{76} Bhabha 1994: 95, “Western national discourse... normalizes its own history of colonial expansion and exploitation by *inscribing the history of the other in a fixed hierarchy of civil progress*” (emphasis my own).
Numidian, derived from the Greek νομάς—one who roams about for pasture—strengthens this association.\(^{77}\) Thus, whenever he refers to Jugurtha as *Numida* or refers to him as king or leader of the Numidians, he recalls Jugurtha’s nomadic heritage and underlines his characteristic instability.\(^{78}\) Throughout the narrative, Jugurtha is constantly in motion. During Aulus’ campaign, Jugurtha is described as follows:

\[
\text{ipse quasi uitabundus per saltuosa loca et tramites exercitum ductare. (38.1)}
\]

He himself, as if taking evasive action, was leading his army through wooded places and footpaths.

This action is not even worthy of a nomad, who by definition searches for pastureland. Jugurtha is merely wasting time and frustrating the Roman command. Sallust reduces Jugurtha to a sub-nomad status. When Aulus determines to follow Jugurtha, the Numidians attack his camp at night and he is forced into surrender and a peace treaty (38.4-10). By behaving as a nomad—that is, by mimicking Jugurtha’s behavior, the behavior of the Other–Aulus fails to uphold his own Roman identity.

A further failure follows when Aulus’ brother Albinus breaks down the barriers of filial affection and declares void his brother’s treaty (39.2-3) amid a war caused by the collapse of familial bonds in the Numidian royal house. Clearly, Jugurtha’s murder of his brothers outshines Albinus’ slight against Aulus, but for a Roman to lay aside *pietas*,

\[
ex delicto fratris inuidiam ac deinde periculum timens (39.2)
\]

fearing hatred on account of his brother’s offense and the consequent danger,

---

\(^{77}\) cf. Polybius *Hist.* 1.19.2-3.  

\(^{78}\) Jugurtha’s movement and resulting disorder are the subject of Kraus 1999.
is to violate fundamental principles of Roman family life.⁷⁹ Aulus and Albinus represent a breakdown of the *mos maiorum*, which ought to stand in fierce opposition to Jugurtha’s constant state of flux.

When Metellus assumes command of the Roman army from the Albinus, who has lost touch with his Romanness, the army has devolved into a nomadic state. Though Albinus had tried to maintain a permanent camp (44.4), nevertheless,

\[
\text{lixae permixti cum militibus diu noctuque uagabantur, et palantes agros uastare, uillas expugnare, pecoris et mancepiorum prædas certantes agere eaque mutare cum mercatoribus uino aduecticio et aliis talibus. (44.5)}
\]

Camp followers along with soldiers wandered about day and night, and wandering about in packs they devastated the countryside, plundering villas, fighting with each other to take sheep and slaves as booty, and trading these things with merchants for imported wine and other such things.

Sallust describes the soldiers using the same terms he used of the Gaetulians and Lybians in 18.2: *vagor* and *palor*. They wander about aimlessly and in separate units, having fully assumed the role of nomads. Metellus must restore order, must restore Roman identity. Moreover, Sallust describes Metellus’ own movements (45.2) as clearly purposeful: to strengthen the army by keeping the soldiers from doing wrong (45.3). In this way, he restores the rank and file and makes the army as incorruptible as he is (46.1).

At this point in the narrative, Metellus represents the true Roman,⁸⁰ though Sallust prepares us for the future manifestation of his *superbia* towards Marius (*contemptor animus et superbia*, 64.1). Once that *superbia* takes hold of Metellus, Sallust introduces an external character who furthers Metellus’ decline:

---

⁷⁹ On the Roman family, see Saller 1984; Rawson 1986; Bradley 1991.

⁸⁰ Sallust says that the entire Roman state (the Senate, allies, Latin cities, and kings) all rallied to the war effort under Metellus (63.4) and calls Metellus a spirited man of unblemished repute (63.1). As Syme 1964: 151 remarks, despite Sallust’s apparent distaste for the nobility, he narrates Marius’ successes “without deprecation of Metellus.” Earl 1961: 70-76 discusses Metellus’ adherence to Sallustian *virtus*. 4
Erat praeterea in exercitu nostro Numida quidam nomine Gauda, Mastanabalis filius, Masinissae nepos, quem Micipsa testamento secundum heredem scripserat. (65.1)

In addition, there was a certain Numidian by the name of Gauda in our army, the son of Mastanabal and the grandson of Masinissa, whom Micipsa had made a secondary heir in his will.

Sallust creates an immediate division between we-the-Romans and Gauda, whom he primarily identifies as Numida, as if his name were of secondary importance. With the arrangement of exercitu nostro Numida... Gauda, Sallust juxtaposes nostro to Numida and establishes Gauda as first and foremost a nomad. When this figure of the Other asks Metellus to grant him a seat of honor and a guard of Roman equites, Marius seizes upon Metellus’ refusal, an act of the latter’s superbia, to further his own ambitio (65.2-4).

Metellus’ refusal to grant Gauda a seat of honor beside him (65.2) recalls Hiempsal’s initial refusal to yield the seat of honor to Jugurtha during their meeting following Micipsa’s death (11.3). This collapse of familial bonds, in light of the story of the brothers Philaeni (as discussed in chapter three) and the early successes of Metellus and Marius as they worked together, mirrors the collapse of amicitia between the Roman commanders, which manifests itself in Metellus’ refusal to support Marius as candidate for consul (64.4). Sallust uses Gauda’s Otherness to reinforce the increasing sway of superbia over Metellus. The nomadic figures Jugurtha and Gauda are pernicious influences.

**Slave and Master, Client and Patron, Numidia and Rome**

According to Homi Bhabha, the dialectic at the heart of colonial discourse is one of self/other, master/slave. Rome offers a perfect example. In Roman society, this colonial discourse manifests itself in reproducing on the international scale the domestic patron/client

---

81 Bhabha 1994: 72.
system. Patron/client represents a Roman’s personal identification in relation to those with whom he interacts. The patron cannot exist without a client. On the international stage, the corresponding master/slave dialectic becomes Rome/client kingdom. This is the status of Numidia following the Punic Wars:

populus Romanus quascumque urbis et agros manu ceperat regi dono dedit. Igitur amicitia Masinissae bona atque honesta nobis permansit. (4.4-5)

The Roman people gave as a gift to the king [Masinissa] whatever cities and territories he had taken. Therefore the bond of friendship with Masinissa remained honest and true for us.

We have already seen how important personal bonds are within the Bellum Iugurthumin, and I will return to the specific case of amicitia soon, but for now let’s examine how Sallust represents the Rome/client kingdom dialectic between Numidia and Rome. Amicitia... bona atque honesta reveals that Masinissa understands his subservient position to Rome, but he dies, leaving the kingdom in the hands of his son Micipsa (4.5-6). Micipsa too recognizes his duties to Rome and sends cavalry and infantry, along with Jugurtha, to aid Scipio Aemelianus in Numantia (7.2).

Early in the narrative, even Jugurtha acts in accordance with his position as a representative of the client kingdom. Jugurtha performs valiantly in war, and as a result, Scipio relies on him in nearly all difficult affairs and considers him among his friends (7.6). In fact, he forms friendships with many Romans (7.7). Unfortunately, while in Numantia, the seeds are

---

82 On clientela, see Badian 1984 [1959]: 1-14.

83 On Masinissa and the relationship between Rome and Numidia, see Walsh 1965. Badian 1984 [1959]: 125-140 fleshes out this relationship between Numidia and Rome. Masinissa understands his subservient position, but like many rulers of client kingdoms, he does not fully understand what clientela means. In Liv. 45.13.12, Masinissa’s son Masagaba says to the Roman senate Masinissam meminisse <se> regnum a populo Romano partum auctumque et multiplicatum habere; usu regni contentum scire dominium et ius eorum, qui dederint, esse.

84 Igitur imperator omnis fere res asperas per Iugurtham agere, in amicis habere.
placed in Jugurtha’s mind which will lead him to attempt to subvert the Rome/client kingdom dialectic.\textsuperscript{85}

Ea tempestate in exercitu nostro fuere complures novi atque nobiles quibus diuitiae bono honestoque potiores erant, factiosi domi, potentes apud socios, clari magis quem honesti, qui Jugurthae non mediocrem animum pollicitando ascendebant: si Micipsa rex occidisset, fore uti solus imperi Numidias potiretur; in ipso maxumam uirtutem, Romae omnia uenalia esse. (8.1)

At that time, there were many men, both new men and noble,\textsuperscript{86} to whom riches were more important than virtue and honesty, partisan men at home, influential among the allies, notorious rather than respectable, who inflamed the ambitious mind of Jugurtha by persistently promoting the hope that if king Micipsa should die, he could gain sole control over Numidia; in him there was the greatest virtue, and all things were for sale in Rome.

Immediately after this, Scipio Aemelianus warns Jugurtha to seek \textit{et gloriem et regnum} through the cultivation of \textit{amicitia} with the Roman people (8.2), but Jugurtha disregards this advice. Instead he seeks his glory and kingdom by murdering his brother Hiempsal (12.5), a clear violation of familial \textit{pietas}.

When the matter of Hiempsal’s murder comes before the Roman senate, Sallust draws a clear distinction between Jugurtha and Adherbal: Jugurtha relies on bribes, whereas Adherbal begins his address by explicitly mentioning his subservient status:

‘Patres conscripti, Micipsa pater meus moriens mihi praecepit uti regni Numidiae tantummodo procurationem existumarem meam, ceterum ius et imperium eius penes uos esse.’ (14.1)

‘Conscript fathers, my father Micipsa warned me as he was dying that I should consider myself only a steward of the kingdom of Numidia, but that right and power are in your hands.’

\textsuperscript{85} The danger of the dialectics of colonial discourse of master/slave and self/other, which I have extended to patron/client and Rome/client kingdom is that such relationships can be subverted by being inverted. As Bhabha 1994: 72 remarks, though, this is also a necessity of a symmetrical or dialectical relationship.

\textsuperscript{86} Koestermann 1971: 50 takes \textit{novi} as “young” and reads hendiadys. This places all the blame in the \textit{nobiles}. I think new men and noble men is correct as Sallust seems concerned with the decline of both \textit{novi homines} and \textit{nobiles}, cf. Paul 1984: 32 \textit{ad loc}, Watkiss 1984: 88 \textit{ad loc}, and Kraus 1999: 227.
Regardless of his actual feelings on the matter, Adherbal’s life depends on promoting the Rome/client kingdom dialectic. He continually appeals for the help owed to him as a good client by his patron Rome and frequently mentions the *amicitia* between himself and Rome. In this way, he makes the crimes against the client sins against the patron. As Adherbal concludes his appeal to the senate, he brings together his client status and Jugurtha’s contempt for their family:

‘nolite pati regnum Numidiae, quod uostrum est, per scelus et sanguinem familiae nostrae tabescere.’ (14.25)

‘Do not allow the kingdom of Numidia, which is yours, to waste away through the wickedness and bloodshed of our family.’

Unfortunately for Adherbal, Jugurtha has already begun his pollution of the Roman political scene with his bribery. The senate votes to divide Numidia between Jugurtha and Adherbal (16.2), but as soon as Jugurtha is settled in his new kingdom, his mind stretches towards Adherbal’s (*in regnum Adherbalis animum intendit*, 20.1). Adherbal once again relies on his *amicitia* with the Romans and attempts diplomacy (20.5), but Jugurtha continues his assault on Adherbal, hoping to finish the war before the Romans can intervene (21.3). After various dealings with the Romans, Jugurtha refuses to yield to Scaurus and continues his siege of Cirta, where Adherbal has taken refuge (25.10-11).

At this moment, Jugurtha completely abandons all pretense of respect for Rome, shatters any lingering *amicitia*, and succumbs to his depraved nature. In Cirta, the Italian merchants defending the town advise Adherbal to trust in the power of the senate and surrender to Jugurtha under the condition that his life be spared (26.1). Adherbal does not wish to trust Jugurtha, but yields to the Italians. Massacre ensues:

---

87 Adherbal uses *amicitia* at 14.1, 14.5 (twice), 14.12, 14.17, 14.18, 14.20 and *amicus* at 14.2, 14.10, and 14.15. Badian 1984 [1957]: 11-13 argues that *amicitia* oringally represented a specific type of *clientela* that did not require a treaty and may have referred only to non-legal relationships between equals. Eventually, this distinction was lost and *amicus* became “a polite term for an inferior (or, conversely, a superior).”
Iugurtha in primis Adherbalem excruciatum necat, deinde omnis puberes Numidas atque negotiores promiscue, uti quisque armatus obuius fuerat, interficit. (26.3)

First, Jugurtha tortured Adherbal to death, and then he killed all adults who were found in possession of weapons, with no discrimination between Numidians and foreign traders.

With this total subversion of the Rome/client kingdom dialectic, Jugurtha effectively declares war on Rome. Armatus obuius implies that the victims of this massacre were resisting Jugurtha. Perhaps the Italians had changed their mind or only some Italians, those that resisted, were killed. Whatever the case, Sallust moves quickly to the Roman response: Gaius Memmius seizes upon the slaughter of the Italians to inflame the plebs to demand war (27 and 31-32.1).

The relationship between patron and client is of supreme importance to Sallust. Although he has been variously identified as a popularis, Sallust’s true concern seems to be maintaining concordia. He is just as critical of the plebs when they overstep their bounds as he is of the nobles. He attributes Marius’ successful election as consul to Gauda’s influence and to the zeal of the common people to advance new men (plebs...novos extollebat, 65.5), not to Marius’ own virtus. Marius’ virtus has been slipping since he subverted his own patron/client relationship and violated his amicitia with Metellus by seeking the consulship against his patron’s wishes. From

88 Jugurtha, however, is surprised when Rome declares war: At Iugurtha contra spem nuntio accepto, quippe quoi Romae omnia uenire in animo haesperet... (28.1).

89 Morstein-Marx 2000 argues that this massacre was hardly a massacre at all, and that the death of the Italians was not the true cause of the war. Livy Per. 64 attributes the cause to the murder of Adherbal. Rich 1976: 51-55 compares this declaration of war to that against Carthage following the siege of Saguntum, and believes that the senate had already decided to go to war with Jugurtha if he did not cease his aggressions against Adherbal and his siege of Cirta by the start of the new consular year.

90 Earl 1961: 2 gives a brief overview of the history of scholarship on the question of Sallust’s political allegiance with the populares and especially with Caesar. Earl successfully shows that Sallust’s real concern is with concordia between the orders, not the dominance of one over the other, ibid 68-69.
this point forth, Marius’ driving force is *ambitio*. Like Jugurtha, he seeks power and glory no longer *per virtutem*, but instead by subverting the patron/client relationship.

**Roman Identity and the Metus Hostilis**

Jugurtha’s effects on Roman identity beg one important question: why was Roman identity liable to subversion? For Sallust, the answer is the destruction of Carthage:

> Nam ante Cathaginem delatam populus et senatus Romanus placide modesteque inter se rem publicam tractabant, neque gloriae neque dominationis certamen inter ciuis erat: metus hostilis in bonis artibus ciuitatem retinebat. (41.2)\(^{91}\)

> For before the destruction of Carthage, the people and the Roman senate mutually governed the republic peacefully and with restraint, and between citizens there were struggles neither for glory nor for power: the fear of the enemy was maintaining the state in good morals.\(^{92}\)

The loss of the *metus hostilis* results in the slow decline of those Roman morals that characterized national identity for Sallust. Ernest Renan defined a nation as a group of people who have done great things and wish to do more, united by a mistaken view of the past and a hatred of their neighbors.\(^{93}\) This hatred of the enemy and a fear of the enemy unite a people.

Prior to the destruction of Carthage, the senate and the people governed the state *inter se*.

Afterwards,

> coepere nobilitas dignitatem, populus libertatem in lubidinem uortere, sibi quisque ducere trahere rapere. Ita omnia in duas partis abstracta sunt, res publica, quae media fuerat, dilacerata. (41.5)

> The nobility began to turn their rank, the people their freedom, into lust, each person was appropriating, taking, and plundering for himself.\(^{94}\) And thus

---

\(^{91}\) cf. BC 10.1: *Sed ubi labore atque iustitia res publica creuit, reges magni bello domiti, nationesferae et populi ingentes ui subacti, Carthago aemula imperi Romani ab stirpe interiit, cuncta maria terraeque patebant, saeuire fortuna ac miscere omnia coepit.*

\(^{92}\) For Sallust, the *bonae artes* are *fides, probitas, industria, aequitas, continentia, and abstinentia* (BC 10.4). Sallust believed that the exercise of *bonae artes* was a fundamental necessity to achieve *virtus* (Earl 1964: 11).

\(^{93}\) “Avoir des gloires communes dans le passé, une volonté commune dans le présent; avoir fait de grandes choses ensemble, vouloir en faire encore, voilà les conditions essentielles pour être un peuple,” Renan 1996: 240.

\(^{94}\) Paul 1984: 125 *ad loc* thinks this may be a reference to the Gracchan land reforms.
everything was divided into two parties, and the republic, which was their common possession, was torn to pieces.

Sallust describes the collapse of *concordia*. Temporary *concordia* between Metellus and Marius produced their initial successes as they stood together against the enemy, but Jugurtha does not represent a true threat to Rome and so does not inspire *metus hostilis*. The corrupting forces of *superbia* and *ambitio* confound this *concordia*, and Metellus slows in his progress against Jugurtha. Rome finally conquers Jugurtha when Marius and Sulla work together to effect the Bocchus’ betrayal of Jugurtha. ⁹⁵ Michel Foucault states, “Government is possible only when the strength of the state is known: It is by this knowledge that it can be sustained. The state’s capacity and the means to enlarge it must be known. The strength and the capacity of other states, rivals of my state, must also be known.”⁹⁶ If we apply this to Sallust’ view on the *metus hostilis*, the destruction of Carthage becomes the factor that caused the government itself of Rome to collapse. If only the Romans were to find a new enemy worthy of *metus hostilis*, they might once again unite, as they did against Carthage. Such an outlook draws particular focus to the subject of remembering and forgetting. This is the legacy Sallust promotes, but we know from Livy that the politics were not so harmonious as Sallust would have us believe. We-the-Roman-readers are obliged to forget that Scipio appealed directly to the Centuriate Assembly when the senate, led by Fabius Maximus, refused him command in Africa (Liv. 28.36-48); we are obliged to forget that a number of Italian town revolted and joined Hannibal (Liv. 22.61).⁹⁷ As a narrator, Sallust is allowed–according to Renan, required–to distort history. Sallust has rewritten history to fit the present reality.

⁹⁵ Sallust says that Sulla won the men of the army over to his side without injuring the consul’s reputation (*neque interim, quod parva ambitio solet, consulis aut cuiusquam boni famam laedere*, 96.3).

⁹⁶ Foucault 1988: 151.

⁹⁷ On Rome’s Italian allies, see Reid 1915.
CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSION

In the preface to both of his monographs, the *Bellum Catilinae* and the *Bellum Iugurthinum*, Sallust establishes a clear moral agenda tied closely to his experiences in Roman political life. Previously, scholars have focused on Sallust’s narrative presence in these monographs only in terms of this moral agenda, but a deeper look shows that this moral agenda masks a greater national agenda, especially in the *Bellum Iugurthinum*. All around him, Sallust sees Rome in decline. Not only is the state constantly torn apart by civil war, but also individuals lay aside what Sallust sees as their Roman identity in order to pursue *gloria* through base means: *avaritia* and *ambitio*. Resorting to such means subverts the established patron/client relationship at the heart of Roman social and political life. Sallust wants to maintain these relationships through the restoration of *concordia*, in which both patron and client understand and respect their respective positions. Sallust narrates the collapse of *concordia* in his own day through the medium of major figures in the Jugurthine War. The patron ought not to show contempt for his client and assume a haughty attitude, as Metellus does when Marius seeks the consulship, nor should the client under the influence of ambition defy his patron, as Marius does when he refuses to wait for Metellus’ consent.

By divorcing the events of the Jugurthine War from their historical reality and placing them side-by-side in homogeneous, empty time through the construction of the “meanwhile,” Sallust involves his readers in the narrative and creates a sense of belonging among his Roman readers, who gaze directly on scenes of battle and political intrigue and share in the emotions of Romans who lived seventy years before. By conflating past, present, and future, Sallust applies the lessons of the past directly to the present and implies the future results of a continued collapse of Roman identity and *concordia*. 
Sallust furthers this aim by asserting his narrative voice. One means is the use of first person plural verbs, by which he creates intratextual cross-references and expresses uncertainty. Closely related is the use of first person plural pronouns and possessive adjectives. These first person plurals engage the Roman readers in the “we” as if Sallust were having a dialogue with them. The third way in which Sallust asserts his narrative voice is with deliberate chronological distortion. In this way, he draws the reader’s focus to certain events, such as the murder of Hiempsal, which are directly important to Sallust’s moral and national agenda.

Sallust develops his sense of Roman identity in contrast to the identity he inscribes on the Other, in this case, Jugurtha. Jugurtha is a nomad, characterized by movement and neglect for familial pietas, whereas the Roman ought to be stable, ought to adhere to the mos maiorum, and ought to respect familial bonds. When the Roman assumes a nomadic persona, he loses touch with his Roman identity and fails in his endeavors. Jugurtha is also a client of Rome, but he fails to understand, or at least to acknowledge, his status as client and attempts to subvert the relationship between Rome and her client kingdom Numidia. This brings him in direct conflict with Rome, just as Marius’ subversion of his status as Metellus’ client results in conflict and failure. Only when Marius and Sulla briefly restore concordia does Rome conquer Jugurtha. At the root of the loss of Roman identity through the actions of Bestia, Albinus and Aulus, Metellus, and Marius is the loss of the metus hostilis, the direct result of the destruction of Carthage. Romans needed a threatening Other against whom they could bond together in concordia, Without this enemy, Roman identity began to slip and Romans turned on each other. The result were the civil wars to which Sallust alludes in his preface (5.1-2).

One must always be careful when applying modern theories to the ancient world, but viewing Sallust’s Bellum Iugurthinum as a narrative aimed at restoring or defining national
identity allows us to better understand some of the subtleties at work in text, the cross-references, the errors of place and time, and the overbearing presence of the author. Sallust views his history as a timeless force, narrating the past, written in the present, and relevant to the future. He could not have understood that he was writing in a way that theories that developed two millennia later could elucidate more fully; nevertheless, these theories prove useful in analyzing the *Bellum Iugurthinum*. 
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