

## I. INTRODUCTION

The word ‘history’ is ambiguous: it can refer both to events and to the account of events as written by a historian. Historians may be eye-witnesses of the events which they describe; more often they rely on sources in the form of text, whether written or oral (stories, inscriptions, documents, the accounts of other historians). Thus writing history, for which the term ‘historiography’ is often used, generally involves the act of reading as well as that of interpretation. Yet ‘historiography’ is itself an ambiguous term, since it may also denote the study both of the historian’s written work and, more generally, of the theory and history of historical writing. These various overlaps of terminology underline the fact, which scholars have come increasingly to realize, that in practice it is very difficult to separate the ‘history’ of a given period (i.e. the events, the things that happened) from its ‘historiography’ (i.e. the texts in which those events are (re)told and analysed), a difficulty which in its turn gives rise to various further problems.

Original events<sup>1</sup> no longer exist, except insofar as they leave traces, either physical (a temple, a coin, an aqueduct) or literary, in the form of texts written either soon afterwards (a commemorative inscription, the text of a law) or long after (the history of the early Roman republic written several centuries later by a middle-republican historian).<sup>2</sup> It is from these traces that modern historians construct their stories about what happened in the ancient world. And these stories are essentially no more than possible models of a vanished world, whether they take the form of what may be called analytical history (the study of a particular topic or period from one of a number of different viewpoints, concentrating on e.g. economic or social or cultural aspects) or narrative history (retelling the history of a given period or people in story form, using conventions similar to those of a traditional novel). But texts, be they ancient or modern, are slippery things, both physically (crucial ancient texts may be lacunose, corrupt, or exist only as a paraphrase by a later author) and philosophically (the meaning of words is not fixed, and any given text will be interpreted differently by different generations of readers).<sup>3</sup> Even if we believe (and not all scholars do) that with care we can come close to knowing how an original audience might have understood an ancient text, we are still left with the fact that that text is not a piece of plate glass through which to view the ancient world but

is only one version of that world, one writer's interpretation, now filtered through centuries of copying, scholarly attention, and our own expectations, levels of knowledge, and ways of reading.

Because so much of the evidence for vanished events is itself contestable, and because any story that a historian writes itself forms a text that may later be used to construct a new model of these vanished events, the *form* of a text can contribute as much to its meaning as does its content. And if under 'form' we include such intangible elements as the political context in which the text was written, the likely bias of the author (though, as we shall see, this is often a matter of continuing debate), the literary expectations of any original audience, and finally the norms and codes of the genre of history-writing itself, then it becomes clear that the *way* a story is told is as important as (indeed, is part of) the story itself.<sup>4</sup> The situation outlined generally here obtains for anyone trying to read or reconstruct the history of ancient Rome: as T. J. Cornell points out in his new and monumental history of early Rome, 'The most important evidence for the early history of Rome comes from literary sources.'<sup>5</sup>

If the history and historiography of Rome are thus interdependent, it is clearly of great importance to know how the Romans wrote their history. A historian such as Livy, who lived several centuries after many of the events which he purports to describe, relied on a succession of earlier historians writing in both Latin and Greek: Fabius Pictor, Gaius Acilius, Postumius Albinus, the elder Cato, Polybius, Cassius Hemina, Calpurnius Piso, Gaius Fannius, Gnaeus Gellius, Coelius Antipater, Sempronius Asellio, Claudius Quadrigarius, Valerius Antias, Cornelius Sisenna, Licinius Macer, Aelius Tubero, Asinius Pollio, and Sallust.<sup>6</sup> Not all wrote the same kind of history. Among them they represent two different types: (i) history of a relatively short, well-defined period (often a war), such as that of Coelius (on the second Punic war) or of Sisenna (on the Social war and after) and (ii) history of Rome from its founding (history *ab urbe condita* or *a Remo et Romulo*), such as the annals of Antias and Macer. There was also a third type, universal history, which treated all parts of the inhabited world (the *oikoumene*); since Roman history was at heart local history, this genre developed late at Rome, though Polybius (whose work covers the period 220–146 B.C.) thought of himself as a universal historian (see also below, p. 54).<sup>7</sup> Nearly all of this work either is lost or survives only in fragmentary form; we do know, however, that the careers of these writers cover the period from (roughly) 200 B.C. to 35 B.C. But, since the traditional date for the foundation of Rome is the mid-eighth century B.C., we are left with

## INTRODUCTION

3

an interval of over five hundred years during which no history was written in Rome at all. Where, then, did the earliest historians derive their information for the earliest centuries of Rome?

The traditional story of how history grew at Rome is that told by Cicero and elaborated by later critics: it is a dismal tale of plain, unadorned, thin narratives, a mere ‘compilation of chronicles’ (Cic. *De orat.* 2.52 *annalium confectio*) even up through the orator’s own lifetime (he imagines his friend Atticus begging him to remedy the situation by writing history himself: *Leg.* 1.5–9, cf. also *Att.* 16.13.2).<sup>8</sup> According to this picture, Roman history began with the (lost) *Annales maximi*, a year-by-year chronicle that is said to have been posted for public view on white boards (*tabulae dealbatae*), later codified in some form, perhaps as a large inscription, and maintained by the *pontifex maximus* (high priest). It is said to have dated back (perhaps) to the fifth century B.C.<sup>9</sup> and to have contained the names of annual magistrates and other officials, and notices of famines and eclipses and of primarily ritual material.<sup>10</sup> Yet, even if the earliest historians had access to a record which pre-dated themselves by so long a time, there still remains a period of about three centuries from the founding of the city for which no information other than some form of traditional memory was available, but which Livy nevertheless took four books (more than 300 pages of Oxford Text) to describe.<sup>11</sup>

Nor should we be optimistic about the reliability either of the information transmitted by the *Annales maximi* or of the use which historians may have made of its information. A recent investigator of the *Annales* concludes as follows:<sup>12</sup>

We ought, I think, to envision the pontifical chronicle as a gigantic, poorly formatted, difficult to read, inscription on bronze, probably consisting of several individual bronze *tabulae* [‘plates’] incised by a variety of hands, which may well have been awkwardly positioned, and perhaps, in the later stages of its life, even plagued with gaps. At some point, it is quite possible that some sort of restoration was carried out, which may have adulterated the original records. One visualizes a conscientious consulting historian, standing before this mass of data, with wax tablet in hand. As he reads on, he finds that it is loaded with uninteresting prodigies, famines, eclipses and the like, all listed under eponymous magistrates. Eventually, perhaps, he gives up in disgust . . . : as the more interesting (and certainly more easily and comfortably consulted) accounts of the first annalists (who had been forced to consult the chronicle) became available, people ceased standing in the elements craning their necks to read a lot of banal entries.

Two points in this conclusion deserve emphasis. The first is the ‘uninteresting’ and ‘banal’ nature of the record, which in both content

and form is far removed from even the minimum requirements of narrative history.<sup>13</sup> The second is the extreme difficulty of consulting the record. The consensus of modern research is that the Romans had a persistent disregard for the retrieval of information,<sup>14</sup> which no doubt explains the commonly accepted view that ‘Roman historians did not, as a general rule, carry out original research.’<sup>15</sup> As far as we can tell, in fact, from the very beginning historians of early Rome primarily used other written histories as sources, modelling their own work on, and polemically engaging with, their precursors’ in ways generally familiar to us from the work of poets (see below, p. 48 n. 110). The earliest Roman historian, Fabius Pictor, who wrote in Greek, looked, as Cornell has remarked, to the canons and methods of Greek historiography, using Greek accounts of early Rome as his source;<sup>16</sup> later writers reacted both to Greek historians and, once Cato the Elder had invented a prose style for Latin and written history in it, to the growing prose tradition in their own language.

Roman historians did on occasion consult the research of others, conveniently grouped under the general heading of ‘antiquarians’.<sup>17</sup> Even here, however, it does not follow that their methods were the same as ours: for instance, Livy famously refers to ‘sources’ (*auctores*) in the plural when he means a single source; and it has been argued that many other ‘scholarly’ conventions of historiographical narrative are purely mendacious.<sup>18</sup> What is more, as Cicero and Livy knew, antiquarian genealogical research was itself often characterized by distortion and free invention (Cic. *Brut.* 62, Livy 8.40.4–5). Finally, none of these possible sources for early Roman history provided more than a bare-bones structure, nothing like the elaborate narratives we find in Livy and others.<sup>19</sup> It is certainly true that by the time Fabius Pictor wrote, the Romans had a ‘highly developed sense of their past’, and it has been argued that the remarkably coherent account of early Roman history found in the extant sources can only be explained as relying on the ‘collective, and accepted, oral memory of the nation’: that is, oral tradition and the fierce Roman sense of identity themselves constitute an important source for early Rome.<sup>20</sup> As Cornell has reminded us, however, this sense of the past is not unproblematic: ‘the historical tradition of the Roman Republic was not an authenticated official record or an objective critical reconstruction; rather, it was an ideological construct designed to control, to justify, and to inspire.’<sup>21</sup> So, although the problem of the content and form of the *Annales* did not arise for authors writing the history of their own time, the fact that ancient

historians were not researchers, the often problematic status of the research which they sometimes consulted, and the markedly nationalistic and ideological nature of the tradition in which they lived and worked have profound implications for our understanding of the kind of literature they produced.

It is fairly safe to assume, however, that until about twenty years ago, the fundamental differences between ancient and modern historians, especially with regard to their respective assumptions about the truth value of their narratives, were largely ignored. A classic example is provided by Cicero's dialogue *De oratore* ('On the orator'), produced in 55 B.C. but set in 91. Cicero, surveying the early Roman historians (2.51–4), found them deficient when compared with their Greek predecessors and he therefore set out the methods by which 'proper' history should be written (2.62–4). Everyone accepts that Cicero's passage provides crucial evidence for the nature of Roman historiography, and, when discussing it in 1979, the distinguished Oxford historian P.A. Brunt concluded as follows:<sup>22</sup> 'Cicero is not expressly advocating a type of historical exposition different from that commonly employed by modern political historians.' Such an attitude was entirely typical of its time: in studies such as those of S. Usher (1969) or M. Grant (1970) or C. W. Fornara (1983) it was stated or implied that 'history has altered but little' over the course of time.<sup>23</sup> And the same attitude underlies what modern historians themselves wrote about the history of the Roman republic and empire.

In the same year as Brunt's statement appeared, however, T. P. Wiseman published *Clio's Cosmetics*, a book which has since become a landmark in the study of the Roman historians. Wiseman argued that the Romans practised (in our terms) 'unhistorical thinking', that their historians were profoundly different from ours in that they assimilated historiography to poetry and oratory, and in particular that the early Roman historians (upon whom the later ones were so dependent) resorted to invention on a large scale. If we compare the paucity and unreliability of the evidence for early Roman history with the scale of Livy's work (above, p. 3), Wiseman's conclusions seem not only reasonable but almost inevitable; yet so disquieting an argument could not fail to provoke a reaction. In 1982, while acknowledging that the book 'raised important and challenging questions', Cornell offered an extended critique and explicitly gave his support to Brunt and the traditional view.<sup>24</sup> But Wiseman stuck to his guns and, although Cornell

returned to the issue in 1986 and afterwards, has maintained his position in his subsequent writing.<sup>25</sup>

In 1988 the traditional view as elaborated by Brunt was confronted directly by A. J. Woodman in his book, *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography*. He argued that, when Roman historians in their prefaces profess to be telling the ‘truth’, they are denying bias and not (in our terms) ‘fabrication’; and he provided a systematic analysis of *De oratore* 2.62–4 which showed that Cicero was recommending for historiography the oratorical techniques, including *inuentio* (‘invention’), which were advocated in rhetorical handbooks.<sup>26</sup> Although Woodman’s book too enjoyed something of a mixed reception, its detailed exposition of ancient historiographical theory corroborated Wiseman’s hypothesis and ensured that the debate on the nature of Roman historical writing continued.<sup>27</sup>

Yet this debate has been conducted largely in the pages and footnotes of scholarly monographs and academic periodicals, with only a severely restricted impact, if any, on material which is readily accessible to teachers and students in schools.<sup>28</sup> The present book is not the place to repeat arguments which have already been made elsewhere; but it is of great importance that readers should be aware that the very nature of Roman historiography has been subjected to severe questioning and that the debate continues. In the following discussions of Sallust, Livy, Tacitus, and others it is taken for granted that the views broadly associated with Wiseman and Woodman are correct. It is also taken for granted that since these ancient texts are as much literary as historical, a literary approach, in which one reads for structure, style, and theme (among other things), can offer new insights into the way these historians saw their past and their present, and indeed into the use which we today can make of their work.

Finally, as a sort of postscript, we turn to a brief consideration of what, if anything, can be said about the now fragmentary work of the early historians. From the often exiguous remains we can sometimes see points of contact (and of difference) with extant texts. The best-known examples of overlap concern Piso’s story of the aedile Gnaeus Flavius (27P, also told by Livy at 9.46) and Quadrigarius’ story of Manlius Torquatus’ single combat with a fourth-century Gaul (10<sup>b</sup>P, also told by Livy at 7.9.6–10.14): the comparison of the latter pair is the textbook analysis of stylistic development found in many discussions of Latin prose style.<sup>29</sup> Many of the fragments show that the earlier historians



## INTRODUCTION

7

shared concerns with the later; indeed, these early writers, working with native Roman or Italian traditions and with the great texts of Greek historiography, defined the parameters and questions with which their genre would concern itself. These are then taken up, challenged, and modified by later authors, who nevertheless keep quite close to the general outlines of the field as laid out by their precursors. Primary among those concerns are questions of self-definition, firstly of the historian: what form is his history to take, annals or monograph or an account of the foundation of cities? what items is he to include, and what to avoid? of what value is his own experience in politics or war? and of what value is the work he is producing? Roman culture put considerable pressure on intellectuals in all fields to show that their work had practical justification and application; for literature to be taken seriously, it had to be useful. Of what use was the story of Rome?

Secondly, these historians addressed the question of the self-definition of Rome itself. The history of Rome was essentially the history of one city which grew in 1000 years to include within its boundaries most of the known world: the resulting influx of foreign peoples, languages, and ideas, already an issue by the middle Republic, posed problems of self-identity. What did it mean to be Roman?<sup>30</sup> A more specific concern, especially from the perspective of the earliest historians, who were to a man engaged in politics and the military, was public life and the *res publica*: the relations between the ruling élite and the populace, and the shifting boundaries of the ruling class, which like the empire it controlled gradually grew to encompass more and more outsiders, were of paramount importance. Politics and the military continued to hold centre stage, though, as the empire grew, individual actors became increasingly important: these powerful new leaders can be seen emerging already in earlier historiography, but especially in Sallust, Livy, and of course under the Empire, in Tacitus.<sup>31</sup> Whatever the focus, however, the structure of the state itself was always visible, as the historians reported – with varying degrees of emphasis or belief – religious ritual and prodigies, the annual change of magistracies, the diplomatic interaction between Rome and its allies or enemies, the development or change of institutions, the passing of laws and decrees. It is in these passages, with their often simple, list format and reporting of information basic to the functioning of the state, that the ‘origins’ of Latin historiography, the *Annales maximi*, make their spirit, if not their actual influence, felt.<sup>32</sup> In what follows, we will trace many of these themes

and questions as they were elaborated in the historians whose work survives.

## NOTES

1. On the problematic notion of 'event' see e.g. P. Veyne, *Writing History* (Manchester, 1984) s.v. 'events' and 'facts' (Index) and L.O. Mink, *Historical Understanding* (Ithaca, 1987) s.v. 'event' (Index). On sources as texts which reflect reality only indirectly, see e.g. Veyne, 4–5 'in no case is what historians call an event grasped directly and fully; it is always grasped incompletely and laterally, through documents and statements, let us say through *tekmeria*, traces, impressions . . . Of the text of man, the historian knows the variations but never the text itself.' It is possible to take the further step of asserting that there are no past events beyond texts: that all history is in fact only events under a description.

2. Given our concern exclusively with texts, we have consciously ignored archaeological remains in our discussion. Such remains can confirm or challenge the historical model built from textual sources; it is worth noting, however, that archaeological data mean nothing *by themselves*: they too must be contextualized and interpreted. For examples of that process see M. Beard and J. Henderson, *Classics: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford, 1995).

3. For an introduction to modern critical approaches such as 'reader-response' theory and their application to the classics see the essays and suggestions for further reading in de Jong-Sullivan (1994); for an introduction to the chief concepts of literary criticism see F. Lentricchia and T. McLaughlin, ed., *Critical Terms for Literary Study* (Chicago, 1990).

4. On the distinction between the story and the way it is told see S. Chatman, *Story and Discourse* (Ithaca, 1978); on historical narrative, in addition to the items cited in nn. 1 above and 13 below, see H. White, *Metahistory* (Baltimore, 1973). The fundamental texts for the discipline of narratology (the study of how stories work) are G. Genette, *Narrative Discourse: an Essay in Method* (Ithaca, 1980) and M. Bal, *Narratology* (Toronto, 1985); others are listed in the General Bibliography to de Jong-Sullivan (1994), 282–3.

5. Cornell (1995), 1–2.

6. For more on the early historians see bibliographical Appendix; for Livy's sources see Oakley (1997), 13–20.

7. Livy's annalistic history of Rome from its founding will have become universal in its later books (now lost) as Rome conquered the *oikoumene*; other representatives of the genre include Diodorus Siculus (an Augustan historian writing in Greek) and Pompeius Trogus (also Augustan, whose work was epitomized in the third century A.D. by Justin). For the three types of history see Wiseman, 'Practice and theory in Roman historiography,' (1987), 246–8 (orig. published 1981).

8. Evaluation of this picture, which has not been seriously challenged at least in so far as it refers to the style of the early historians (but see Goodyear, *CHCL* 2.269–70), is made extremely difficult by the loss of pre-Sallustian Latin historiography. For a sketch of the evolution of history from Fabius Pictor onwards see Leeman (1963), 187–90, and A. S. Gratwick in *CHCL* 2.149–52; for the techniques of the annalists see Oakley (1997), 72–99.

9. So, cautiously, Oakley (1997), 25. The standard study is B. W. Frier, *Libri Annales Pontificum Maximorum* (Rome, 1979), although almost everything concerning the *Annales* is controversial. In French see now M. Chassignet, ed., *L'Annalistique Romaine: Tome 1, Les Annales des Pontifes et l'Annalistique Ancienne (fragments)* (Paris, 1996), xxiii–xlii.

10. For the character of the *Annales* see Cato 77P (famines, eclipses), Cic. *Leg.* 1.6 ('nothing can be more jejune'), *De orat.* 2.52–3 (lists), Servius on Verg. *Aen.* 1.373 (names of magistrates).

11. His Greek contemporary Dionysius of Halicarnassus was even more detailed on this period; on him see E. Gabba, *Dionysius and the History of Archaic Rome* (Berkeley, 1991).

12. Bucher (1987 [1995]), an excellent discussion (quotation from p. 38).

13. For a highly illuminating discussion of the differences between such lists and narrative history see H. White, *The Content of the Form* (Baltimore/London, 1987), 1–25.

14. Purcell (1993), 141, Bucher (1987 [1995]), 20; in general P. Culham, 'Archives and alternatives in republican Rome,' *CP* 84 (1989), 100–15.

15. Cornell (1995), 4.



## INTRODUCTION

9

16. Cornell (1995), 5, 7–9.
17. Rawson (1985), 233–49.
18. See D. Fehling, *Herodotus and his 'Sources'*, trans. J. G. Howie (Leeds, 1989; orig. published 1971), a highly controversial study but one which has effectively rocked the boat.
19. Scholars often speak of a 'hard core' of factual information that was preserved, to be elaborated by freely invented details: *RICH*, 77–8, 90–3, Oakley (1997), 21.
20. Oakley (1997), 22–3. We hear of historical ballads and other kinds of oral tradition: see Cornell (1995), 10–12.
21. 'The value of the literary tradition concerning early Rome,' in K. A. Raaflaub, ed., *Social Struggles in Archaic Rome* (Berkeley, 1988), 58.
22. 'Cicero and historiography,' in *Miscellanea di Studi Classici in Onore di Eugenio Manni* (Rome, 1979) 1.318=*Studies in Greek History and Thought* (Oxford, 1988), 188, often cited as a standard discussion of the subject.
23. S. Usher, *The Historians of Greece and Rome* (London, 1969, corrected repr. Bristol, 1985); M. Grant, *The Ancient Historians* (London, 1970, repr. 1995). The quotation is from Fornara (1983), 200.
24. Review of Wiseman (1979) in *JRS* 72 (1982), 203–6.
25. See T. J. Cornell, 'The formation of the historical tradition of early Rome', in *PP*, 67–86; Wiseman (1987), esp. 293–6 (reply to Cornell's review, orig. published 1983) and 384, and *Historiography and Imagination* (Exeter, 1994).
26. *RICH*, 70–116. Cf. also T. J. Luce, 'Ancient views on the causes of bias in historical writing', *CP* 84 (1989), 16–31.
27. See e.g. C. B. R. Pelling, 'Truth and fiction in Plutarch's *Lives*', in *Antonine Literature*, ed. D. A. Russell (Oxford, 1990), 19–52 and the essays by Wiseman and Moles in C. Gill and T. P. Wiseman, ed., *Lies and Fiction in the Ancient World* (Exeter, 1993).
28. For example, Michael Crawford, in the second edition of his standard introduction to the Roman republic, acknowledges that Wiseman's 'determined assault' may result in 'a prudent agnosticism' about the early period of Rome but says that Woodman's argument is based on 'a misconception of the nature of history' – evidently taking it for granted that the nature of historical writing has not changed in the course of the last two thousand years or more (*The Roman Republic* (London, <sup>2</sup>1992), 220).
29. E.g. Leeman (1963), 78–81; von Albrecht (1989), 86–101. Other fragments which overlap with Livy's text are Coelius 11P (~ Livy 21.22.5) and 20P (~ Livy 22.3.11, 5.8); the story of Maharbal promising Hannibal dinner on the Capitoline (Cato 86P ~ Coelius 25P ~ Livy 22.51.1–3); and another single combat, Livy 7.26 ~ Quad. 12P (though the latter is thought not to be by Quadrigarius). For full discussion of, and commentary on, the passages in Livy's first decade see Oakley's forthcoming volumes of commentary; on literary comparisons see A. D. Vardi, *CQ* 46 (1996), 492–514.
30. For recent discussions and extensive bibliography see E. Gruen, *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome* (London, 1993) and E. Dench, *From Barbarians to New Men: Greek, Roman, and Modern Perceptions of Peoples from the Central Apennines* (Oxford, 1995). Livy retrojects the problem of immigration into early Roman history: it is the process both by which Rome grows (beginning with the asylum: 1.8.4–6) and by which it is threatened with corrupting influences from outside (e.g. *Praef.* 11).
31. Woodman (1977), 30–45.
32. On these elements see also below, pp. 61–2; the classic study of their contribution to historiographical style is A. H. McDonald, 'The Style of Livy', *JRS* 47 (1957), 155–72.

## II. SALLUST

Though history had been written at Rome since the third century B.C., the earliest historiographical works in Latin to have been preserved in their entirety are, aside from the Caesarian *commentarii*,<sup>1</sup> the two monographs of Gaius Sallustius Crispus (86–35 B.C.).<sup>2</sup> Whether or not Cicero's is a fair description of the now lost histories written before the death of Caesar (above, p. 3), some time in the 40s B.C. Sallust published two short works that were good enough to last. In the *Bellum Catilinae* (= *BC*) Sallust narrates the career of the revolutionary Catiline in the years 64–62 B.C.; the *Bellum Jugurthinum* (= *Bĵ*), a work of almost twice the length, explores the intertwined themes of Rome's war in north Africa against the Numidian leader Jugurtha and the concomitant political upheavals in Rome (118–105 B.C.). A third work, the *Historiae*, a five-book annalistic history of the period 78–67, was in all likelihood left unfinished at the author's death and survives only in fragments.<sup>3</sup>

The personality conveyed by Sallust's prefatory remarks, both in the *BC* and the *Bĵ*, is of a man writing history for 'delectation in disillusionment'.<sup>4</sup> In his *apologia* for intellectual activity he claims that history-writing is almost as good as political action; indeed, in these corrupt times, it is the only possible course for a moral Roman to take.<sup>5</sup> Sallust's historical works, speeches and narrative alike, bear out the truth of the dictum that 'rhetoric is the medium of thought about politics';<sup>6</sup> his detached approach assures that both sides of the political scene are treated with the same mistrustful, more than slightly jaundiced eye.<sup>7</sup> Yet his insistence in these prefaces on the utility of history, and on the possibility of learning morally sound behaviour from observing the past, makes demands on the reader beyond simply that of listening to the voice of doom. This is history that is meant to teach, even to inspire:<sup>8</sup> 'for I have often heard that Q. Maximus, P. Scipio, and other extremely eminent men besides were accustomed to say that when they looked at the *imagines* [portrait masks] of their ancestors, their spirit was enthusiastically fired with a desire for *uirtus*. It is evident that the wax shape itself does not have such power in it, but because of the memory of their deeds this flame grows in the breasts of outstanding men, and does not die down before their *uirtus* has equalled the reputation and glory of their ancestors.'<sup>9</sup>