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AN INTRODUCTION TO SALLUST


Schmal in his preface (p. 7) claims that his book is not intended to offer a comprehensive summary of scholarly knowledge about Sallust, but rather to set up a signpost to guide readers through the historian’s writings, his historical and literary context, and the most important aspects of the secondary literature. In so doing, he proposes to use bold, concise strokes and to give his readers an incentive to read more broadly. In these respects, S. has similar aims to C. S. Kraus and A. J. Woodman, Latin Historians (Oxford, 1997), preface; cf. p. 120 ‘A good general book on Sallust in English is badly needed, although there is much characteristic perception and apt comment in Syme (1964)’. His approach, however, is rather different. Critical tools such as narratology do not feature, although the book would certainly provide useful anchorage for anyone wanting to construct a reading of Sallust along these lines, and caution is a keynote (e.g. p. 17 on why Caesar chose to appoint Sallust as first proconsular governor of Africa Nova).

S. succeeds in producing a narrative which is sensibly embedded in contemporary scholarship and in the ancient sources, but which is also lively, engaging and accessible. There are eleven chapters: (1) ‘Sallust’s Life and Times’, (2) ‘Disputed Early-Writings’, (3) ‘Coniuratio Catilinae’, (4) ‘Bellum Iugurthinum’, (5) ‘Historiae’, (6) ‘Geography and Ethnography’, (7) ‘Philosophy and Historical Thinking’, (8) ‘Language and Style’, (9) ‘Predecessors and Models’, (10) ‘Reception’, and (11) ‘Research’. In addition, S. provides an index locorum from Sallust and an extensive bibliography. One item which should be added, since it is relevant to S.’s discussion on pp. 145–6, is D. S. Levene’s
article, 'Sallust's Catiline and Cato the Censor', CQ 50 (2000), 170–91. Passages from Sallust are given in German, though salient phrases which are especially relevant to the subsequent discussion are supplied in Latin in brackets within the translation. The only exception to this practice is (oddly) in the chapter on language and style, where some (but not all) extracts are translated in footnotes. Perhaps S. envisages a somewhat different readership for chapter eight.

There are some areas where more detailed discussion is perhaps called for. In Chapter 8, for example, S. ends by acknowledging the influence of Sallust on Tacitus’ style and thinking (p. 139), but postpones further discussion until the chapter on reception (p. 156). This effectively means that S. does not really illustrate the stylistic cross-fertilization in any detail. Yet S.’s discussion of Sallust’s reception in the Middle Ages and beyond was particularly enjoyable (pp. 158–67). Furthermore, although the individual categories for discussion of language and style are well-chosen (archaism, brevitatis, variatio, grauitas, and grecisms, pp. 129–37), S. could in addition have selected for analysis one passage from Sallust where readers could see the cumulative impact of these stylistic techniques in action and in context (cf. the close reading of Livy 36.10–11 in K. and W., pp. 62–70).

S. has succeeded in producing a sensible introduction to Sallust, his life and times and the genre of historiography. For a student unfamiliar with the field, his discussion should be clear without being unsubtle, and challenging without being confusing. The overall clarity of the book and S.’s tendency carefully to explain important background as he makes his arguments suggests that he has thought carefully about his audience’s needs. In many ways, S. has written precisely the good general book on Sallust of which K. and W. felt the absence in 1997.
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