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

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

Stanford University CHRISTOPHER B. KREBS
cbkrebs@stanford.edu
doi:10.1017/S0075435822000892

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

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

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

The introduction places Sallust in a context of intellectual experimentation as a historiographical innovator. The first chapter defines digressions and applies the concept of *dispositio* to them. Ch. 2 interprets the *archaeology* (*Cat.* 6–13) and the digression on Africa at *Iug.* 17–19. The third chapter looks at the political digressions that come at the low points of the monographs, *Cat.* 36.4–39.5 and *Iug.* 41–2. For S., Sallust's historical analysis is schematic and reflects his use of history to illustrate political philosophy. The fourth chapter examines Sallust's character sketches to demonstrate that those digressions produce individual examples of larger historical patterns. Contrary to most previous Roman historiography, S. shows that the charismatic individuals in Sallust are reflections of historical forces rather than the true causes of events. Ch. 5 provisionally interprets the geographical digressions in the fragmentary *Historiae*. The conclusion offers a summary of the book and a brief consideration of Sallust's impact on the later historiographical tradition.

S. offers comprehensive coverage of Sallust's historiography and provides many new interpretations of long-discussed passages. His bibliography is exhaustive and draws together strands of research that have not yet made a significant impact on Classicist-dominated historiographical scholarship, including, for example, recent work by political theorists like D. Kapust (2011) and D. Hammer (2014). He also takes into account recent monographs (both published in 2019) by A. Rosenblitt and J. Gerrish (A. Feldherr's was published too late for consideration), but it is above all the work of A. Wallace-Hadrill and C. Moatti on intellectual exploration of Roman identity in the first century B.C. that serves as his touchstone. S. generally does not find common cause with scholars who emphasise Sallustian uncertainty. He often seeks to resolve tensions and ambiguity, whereas others such as W. Batstone and D. Levene have seen those qualities to be the point. S. insists, for instance, that *fortuna* is paramount in the famous sentence at *Cat.* 10.1 where Sallust asserts that Roman history started its decline after Rome had conquered all its rivals, including Carthage (155–8). He is right to note, as others have, that Carthage is merely on the list in a subordinate clause while *fortuna* is the subject of the sentence. But just as it is overreading to import the concept of *metus hostilis* into the sentence, it is likewise underreading to suggest that the disappearance of any external threat is just a matter of *fortuna*. Likewise, S. (271–4) twists himself up in denying the significance of Sallust's application of *superbia* to Metellus in the *Bellum Iugurthinum*, since its meaning conflicts with his more expansive interpretation of the dynamics of class conflict in that part of the monograph. Though its readings of individual passages will naturally spark disagreement, with its coverage of the entire Sallustian corpus and a compelling thesis of Sallustian historical vision, this is an excellent book.

Emory University JONATHAN MASTER
jmaste2@emory.edu
doi:10.1017/S0075435823000515

AARON J. KACHUCK, *THE SOLITARY SPHERE IN THE AGE OF VIRGIL*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2021. Pp. xiii + 316. ISBN 9780197579046. £64.00.

Anyone scanning academic titles over the last fifty years might get the impression that everything was always already 'invented': a search of the titles category in my university library catalogue gives me 1640 hits for 'The Invention of …'! Mercifully, Kachuck eschews this trend. As he puts it, 'The age of Virgil did not invent the solitary sphere … but it did heighten that sphere's contradictions to a pitch of unprecedented, and long unparalleled, clarity' (246). Nevertheless, the historical claim is important: 'Writers of this [Virgil's'] age struggled to give form to an idea that would go on to prove immensely influential thereafter: that literature might serve as a space of one's own for writers and readers, for dancers and spectators, for rulers and ruled alike.' K. lists as the conventional candidates for the 'inventions' of solitude: Augustine's monasticism; Petrarch's humanism; Montaigne's scepticism and Romanticism; he is generous throughout with comparisons and allusions to the 'solitary' culture of later periods. Within the Roman world, Seneca might be a more obvious candidate for a study of the solitary sphere, but K.'s subject is, at its broadest point, 'the solitude of literature itself', which, together with the contradictions of