

Ancient Literature and Roman Historiography

For Greeks and Romans, historical narratives were hardly the products of scholarly inquiry in the modern sense. They were rather works of literature,¹ and for this reason an essential (though not decisive) approach to an understanding of ancient historiography lies in the history of ancient literature. It is standard practice today to investigate and interpret ancient literature for basic political, social, and intellectual contexts and developments. The object of this more than merely introductory chapter is to examine ancient, especially Roman, historiography as literature and to draw the lessons necessary for its proper understanding in the context of our own historiographical expectations. We seek here to establish what can and should be understood as *Roman* historiography as well as in what way this literary tradition was connected to Rome.

I.1 Roman Literature and its Relation to Greek Literature

For the development of Roman literature's formal qualities and peculiar subject matter, a variety of circumstances are of fundamental importance. Roman literature becomes accessible for us in the year 240 BC with the first performance (known to us) of a drama composed in the Latin language. A few decades earlier, Rome had unified the Italian peninsula by force of arms, even if not yet legally and administratively. A short time later, Rome was involved for the first time beyond Italy in a struggle over Sicily, and, likewise for the first time, with Carthage, which had long

been the primary maritime power in the western Mediterranean (the First Punic War: 264–241 BC). Acute awareness of their own success as well as of criticisms leveled against them by those suffering from or threatened with Roman expansion led Roman writers from the time of the Second Punic War (218–201 BC) to make self-justifying representations of themselves as a people the central focus of their developing literature. The genres of epic and historiography played a special role in these efforts (see below, Ch. 1.2 p. 12; Ch. 3, p. 41; Ch. 3.1.1, pp. 43ff.; Ch. 3.3 pp. 60f.).

Roman literature – like the visual arts and with the same general consequences – originated and unfolded (or, to put it more precisely, was methodically fashioned) from the third to first centuries BC in continuous and intensive contact with *Greek* culture. Such contact was made possible, of course, by the expansion of Roman power, which brought with it the extension of Roman diplomacy and Roman armies and Roman fleets into Greek territories, and eventually the establishment of Roman administration from Southern Italy to Asia Minor and Syria. This process necessitated repeated and rather lengthy stays of Romans in Greece and the Greek cities on the western coast of Asia Minor and also extended visits of Greeks to Rome. In its beginnings and in its first two centuries, Roman literature was contemporaneous with the third great cultural epoch in Greek history: the Hellenistic era. Romans became intimately acquainted with this culture directly and immediately through *live* contact. Knowledge concerning cultural epochs preceding this age, on the other hand, the archaic and classical periods, could be acquired only indirectly through *cultural* contact. For this reason, archaic and classical Greek culture long exerted a weaker influence on the Romans than did contemporary, and ubiquitous, Hellenistic literature and art. The general influences of this period as well as its peculiar generic preferences permeated Roman literature much more quickly, and, as a result, the sequence of generic developments in Roman literature differs from its model and we find a variety of Greek phases simultaneously present in the mix. We do not find a neat sequence of archaic, classical, and Hellenistic, but instead Hellenistic, then archaic and classical, or all three at the same time.² For this reason, Romans could in their reception of Greek literature simultaneously pursue modern, classical, and archaic versions. In general, this continuous contact between Romans and Greeks induced Romans not only to assimilate, but even more to compete with, Greek literature and art. In the process Roman literature naturally lost its own distinctive features. Only much later after the acquisition of Greek and as a consequence of long and complex interactions with Greek

literature could Roman writers once again fashion a literature of truly Roman stamp.

Many aspects of Greek culture came to Rome directly through the services of Greek-speaking slaves and personal tutors in the households of the wealthy and the political elite. Still, we must not forget that the first authors who wrote in Latin in Rome had come from southern Italy and therefore derived from areas in close proximity to Greek cities. Greek culture came to Rome from a variety of regions in the Italian peninsula and through various intermediaries, including Etruscans in particular, but also Italians linguistically related to Latin-speaking Romans, foremost among whom were Oscans. These cultural intermediaries had each adapted and appropriated Greek culture in their own way. Romans consequently sometimes imbibed their Greek not in the original, so to speak, but in an altered form.

The manner in which the Romans came to literary activity very much set the parameters for how they wished to shape it: they turned above all to concrete models and to readily available practices and theories (for rhetoric, see below, Ch. 1.3.1 pp. 18ff.). Their literary practices remained Greek for about three centuries, but, at later stages in the development of Roman literature (at least from the late Augustan period), their literary practices had become Roman and Latin in all essentials. This particular factor in the development of their literature required Romans to study models closely, quote them, and imitate them (this included making variations on originals), rather than invent original creations. The achievement of Roman literature lies in the intentional and experimental fashion in which authors joined elements derived from various periods in the history of the development of Greek literature into new combinations, together with features derived from contemporary practices. An eclectic attitude permitted literary practice to base itself on the principle of selection, and this is readily comprehensible, given the manifold varieties “on offer” in such a long literary tradition. The resulting syntheses, however, often subjected these appropriated and recombined elements to substantial modifications, especially when, as was not infrequently the case, they were drawn from assorted literary genres. Through such means Romans created a new and original literature both in sum total and in detail. And on this basis a Roman author self-consciously measured himself against predecessors and models, especially those whose works appeared similar to his own in genre or in purpose, but which, in comparison to his own, would appear less fully developed. Through such comparisons the Roman author was able to win the recognition he desired.

I.2 Roman Historiography and the City of Rome

We generally include under the rubric “Roman Literature” (of which our topic of Roman historiography constitutes a part) all Latin writings from antiquity, both pagan and Christian. In the Roman empire, however, two great literary languages were employed: Greek and Latin. We have just related (above in Ch. 1.1, p. 9) the impact that Greek literature had on Latin prose and poetry, especially in that period when Rome directly and indirectly spread its political power in Greece and the Hellenistic East, thereby incurring criticism of Roman policies. The effect of this situation on the development of early Roman historical writing was that its practitioners wrote their works in Greek for an essentially Greek-oriented audience. For this reason alone, we must discard the common notion that *Roman historiography*, as a branch of Roman literature, may be limited to the study of historical works in Latin.

We must also consider to what extent it may be meaningful, or perhaps even necessary, to include later historical works composed in Greek under the rubric of “Roman historiography.” In the Roman empire, along with other non-Italians, Greeks too (among whom we may include those who had adopted Greek culture) actively served emperor and empire at the highest levels of society and government. They belonged consequently to the two highest social classes: the senatorial and equestrian orders. Other Greeks relevant here may not have entered into state service or service of the emperor, but belonged to the political classes of their own cities where, as office holders, they came into close contact with provincial Roman governors and their administrative staffs. Many Greeks who could afford it also spent extended periods in the city of Rome and won friends and patrons among Roman senators and equestrians. In this way, complex factors and circumstances (that could become traditions in their own right within individual families) introduced Greek writers to Roman ways of thinking about state and society: Rome was the natural center from which to rule the Roman empire and Rome’s empire was conceived of as an equally natural unity.

Most historical writers of the imperial period, whether “Greek” or “Roman,” came from circles that were defined as senatorial or equestrian according to their specific political and administrative functions or from local political elites in provincial cities. And their readers too, at least those to whom their works mattered, derived from these same social classes. There developed moreover in republican Rome for both Latins and Greeks a formulaic basis upon which to build historical composition:

past events were narrated according to the annual consulship, republican Rome's highest political office. For each consular year external (foreign) and internal (domestic) events would be narrated separately. In other words, although the chronological principle was primary, it could be modified and refined according to thematic considerations. Unlike the practice of Greek historiographical tradition, this *annalistic* principle (*annus* = year in Latin) characterized historians' narratives even of pre-historic Rome,³ and was eventually adopted by such Greek authors as *Cassius Dio* (see below, especially Ch. 2.2, pp. 37ff.; Ch. 3.1.1, pp. 43f., Ch. 6.1.4, p. 153). Even if the number of those bilingually adept in Greek and Latin is estimated to be rather low, and did not include all senators and equestrians, it is nevertheless reasonable on the basis of the facts presented here, to include Greek authors of the imperial period on an equal footing in a history of Roman historiography and to this extent to follow Dihle's model [Bibl. §1.3].⁴ When we include Greek authors we concentrate most reasonably on those who wrote *Roman* history. This approach is hardly arbitrary; indeed, the impossibility of confining Roman historiography to *one* language compels us to attempt another definition according to content.

In the literary traditions of the *Greeks*, historiography was closely connected with *ethnography*, and for this reason did not deal exclusively with Greek history. It encompassed the history of other peoples, and not only near neighbors, as is natural in political history, but rather peoples who lived at great distances. This may have happened mostly in connection with events of the Greek past, but from time to time also as an object in itself. The Greeks had also never united even a majority into a single state. For this reason, Greek historiography was unable to narrate the past of a great political entity, "Greece," or to describe the events leading to such a development. Instead, historians had to narrate the stories of individual states or make the conflicts between them their theme. Nor could an internal Greek world be juxtaposed against a non-Greek external world. The situation of Greek authors changed fundamentally, however, when they adopted the basic subject matter of *Roman* historiography.

The historical writings of *Roman* authors dealt from beginning to end almost exclusively with the history of Rome and the consequent expansion of the Roman empire. As one may surmise from this observation, the topic of "Rome" was transformed materially and conceptually from a city-state to the central power within an empire and thus to empire itself. Whatever was "foreign" therefore figured primarily not only as opponents or allies of Rome, but also conceptually in Roman thinking

as the backdrop for Roman expansion and annexation. As soon as an area became part of the Roman empire politically, administratively, or culturally, its history became a part of the larger history of the Roman empire. Those peoples never subjected to Roman rule, as, for example, the “free” Germans, the empire of the Parthians and later the Sassanids, whose territories were never annexed by Rome, retained a place in Roman history as real or potential enemies, but, aside from such ethnological and cultural reflections as Tacitus’ *Germania* (see below, Ch. 6.1.3, p. 137), they did not become objects of historical inquiry in their own right. This point must consequently be stressed, because very few works of Roman historiography failed to place Rome at the center, and instead focused on “the other.” This is the case, however, only superficially: a more accurate examination soon reveals that those territories conquered and organized into an empire by Rome constitute the true point of departure even for these historical narratives, if not in theme, then in the assumed perspective of the contemporary reader (compare especially below, Ch. 5.2.3, pp. 116f., on Pompeius Trogus).

The historiography of the Roman empire (even if not from the pen of authors from Rome) kept its focus squarely on Rome as the site of government and administration. The quantity and concentration of historical representations decrease continuously as one moves from center to periphery. These proportions changed in the course of time when later emperors began to reside and rule outside Rome and Italy, and finally in the fourth century when other cities, most prominently Constantinople, became home to emperors and government, depriving Rome of these functions. Rome nevertheless played a special symbolic role in the preservation of the empire: an ideology that styled the city of Rome “Head of the World” (*caput mundi*) provided compensation for the loss of real political significance. For this reason it is not surprising that *Ammianus Marcellinus* not only wrote his Roman history in the city of Rome itself towards the end of the fourth century AD, but also in the parts of his historical narrative that survive devoted inordinate attention to the city far in excess of its contemporary political role (see below, Ch. 7.2, pp. 213f.). *Orosius* too made the city of Rome a pillar in his doctrine of the succession of empires when recounting the political history of this world as part of his universal history of Christian salvation (see below, Ch. 7.3.3, pp. 230ff.).

The central object of Roman history shifted over time. In the Republican period, we find the activities of leading Roman oligarchs as a group, in practice primarily those who belonged to the Senate as well as various outstanding personalities. In the imperial period, we find the

reign of the emperor in the context of family and advisors (see below, Ch. 3.1.1, p. 47; Ch. 4.5.1, pp. 88ff.; Ch. 6, pp. 123f.; Ch. 7, pp. 201f.). Monarchical government thus reinforced a trend toward historical biography as well as historiography that verged on biography (see below, Ch. 6, pp. 123f.). Subjects other than the ones mentioned here receded into the background. In part they belong perhaps more properly to marginal areas of historiography or, as in the case of the history of Alexander the Great, they became (not coincidentally during the imperial period) objects of renewed interest to a Roman historiography concentrated on monarchs (see below Ch. 6.4.1, pp. 178ff.). We may for this reason indeed characterize Roman historical writing in the widest sense as the *history of Rome*, its leading men and its monarchical rulers in the context of territories governed by Romans or bordering on Roman territories.

Roman historiography defined according to these material and geographical principles had both *classically religious* (or “*pagan*,” the derogatory term invented by their adversaries) and *Christian* phases. Neither the ancient world in general nor the Roman empire in particular simply disappeared upon conversion to Christianity. We cannot ignore the substantial changes to political, cultural, and social life that were direct consequences of Christianization, but in all areas of life many remained consciously committed (and stubbornly so, we might say from a modern point of view) to older, traditionally religious ways: radical denial of ancient tradition, although necessary according to Christian doctrine, actually remained the exception. For this reason, much that was very old was usually preserved amid the new. This observation is valid also for the literature of Christian late antiquity. Literary activity was extraordinarily lively from the fourth through sixth centuries AD. Proportionately much more has been preserved of Christian productions than from the previous and much longer ages of literature purely or predominantly classical in their religious orientation. Historiographical works of late antiquity have also survived to our age. Insofar as they treat or touch on more ancient epochs of Roman history, they rely of necessity on pre-Christian sources. Oftentimes they adopt the judgments of these sources to the extent that their points of view may be reconciled with Christian moral principles or they interpret them in a Christian sense. On balance, Christian historiography can explicitly serve Christian positions in necessarily and decidedly “anti-pagan” fashion or, on the other hand, simply continue traditionally religious historiography, but under cover of an inconspicuous Christian style (see below, Ch. 7, pp. 200f.; Ch. 7.7.3, pp. 217f.).

The best place for writing historical works that had “Rome” as the main theme was the city of Rome itself and its environs. Here an author found the *Tabularium* (archives) of the Senate and later the archives of the emperors. Here too were private libraries as well as public ones (after the transition to the Principate), and it was here that one found at any time the most abundant and reliable sources for recent events. Nowhere else could one encounter such a wealth and variety of possible sources for information about the past events, in which Rome, the city and the state, had been involved. Readers for accounts of Roman history could naturally be found most easily in the city of Rome. Social history illuminates too the extraordinary significance of the city of Rome as a site both for the composition and for the reception of Roman history: the typical author as well as the typical reader of such works was a Roman senator or equestrian (see above, p. 12). He was himself active as a magistrate or pro-magistrate or perhaps employed in the civil or imperial administration in any number of various capacities. As such, he performed additional duties in Rome itself and its vicinity, and in the not infrequent intervals between official duties he found himself (by reason of social ties and origins) with his own kind in and near Rome. Continual exchange of opinions and information took place between authors of works on Roman history and potential as well as actual readers. Historical writing was in antiquity above all literature, and, as such, followed the rules of rhetoric (see below, Ch. 1.3.1, pp. 18ff.). For this reason, it was beneficial for the historian that, as its political importance increased, the city of Rome became central (and for a time in the Latin-speaking world absolutely central) for authors, orators, and teachers of oratory. Rome offered circles for the discussion of works in progress of every literary genre. Potential literary patrons were also concentrated in the capital. Granted, this was decidedly more important for poets, who were not in general members of the ruling class, than it was for historians who belonged to the senatorial and equestrian orders. Even in late antiquity (as we just noted above), the ideology of Rome, which Christians too had made their own, could occasion an extended stay in the city by an historian of the late fourth century (see below, Ch. 7.2, p. 208).

We must, on the other hand, circumscribe to some extent the city of Rome’s significance as the site for composition and consumption of works of Roman historiography. Elsewhere too, above all in areas of Greek cultural influence and, in fact, especially there, where people found themselves in the crossfire of Roman campaigns of conquest and annexation, one took an interest (sometimes ill-omened) in Roman history.

Conscious of this, the first Romans made a point of writing in Greek, not Latin (see above, p. 12; below, Ch. 3, pp. 41ff.). The earliest traditions about Rome (which were utilized by Romans only much later) derived not from Roman, but from (Western) Greek pens, especially in Sicily and southern Italy, but elsewhere too in areas of Greek cultural influence. An unintended consequence of Romanization (insofar as it included adoption of the Latin language) was the growth of regional literary activity in Latin during the imperial period. We may note, for example, the rich cultural center of western North Africa and Carthage that, beginning in the second century AD, yielded a rich harvest of both traditionally religious and Christian literature and was served by important native schools of oratory and law. Because ancient historiography rested only in restricted circumstances and often not at all on the historian's own examination of primary sources, but instead generally turned to previous historical works (see below, Ch. 1.3.2, pp. 27f.), it was consequently possible to write about Rome and its empire in any location long-served by excellent libraries (as, for example, Alexandria in Egypt or Pergamum on the West Coast of Asia Minor). We should not conclude on this basis, however, that either historical works from the "provinces" (or, for that matter, works in other genres) were necessarily produced in isolation from each other. There was, on the contrary, regular and active contact between all genres and over long distances. People exchanged opinions through letters. They loaned, borrowed, and copied manuscripts. Those who were both wealthy and educated could use the entire Mediterranean as one large cultural space, and they could of course include the city of Rome or avoid it.

1.3 The Claims of Artistry and Truth in Ancient, especially Roman, Historiography

The Greeks assigned Clio, one of the nine Muses, to historiography. The Romans took the same view and continued to do so in late antiquity. According to ancient conceptions, the Muses wish to bring people *joy*, or, more simply and purely, to entertain, but also to *teach*. In these goals, which the ancient world ascribed to the Muses, we see mirrored nothing less than its conception of a cultivated life. Ancients saw the combination of pleasure *and* instruction as existentially important. Not only poets, but also historians (though hardly all of the latter) wanted to fulfill both aims, and often at the same time. Historians, depending on their object of inquiry, sometimes found the twin goals of "pleasure/entertainment"

and “instruction” contradictory or mutually exclusive. In such instances, Clio revealed herself as a rather peculiar Muse.

1.3.1 Literary artistry and moral preoccupations in ancient historiography

“Muse” (actually *mousiké techné*) signified “artistry” or “artistic skill.” The term refers to how one handled the means of a particular skill. Means consisted either of language (with all its characteristics) or the world of sounds or both at once.⁵ Complete mastery (or mastery as nearly complete as possible) of the respective means, but also the capacity to play with them, brought forth a “work of art(istry).” Truth (insofar as one wishes to employ this expression here) or validity rests for this reason on the accurate and sure application of formal rules (for their own sake) upon specific subject matter. This explains the high value placed on formal aspects of literary works in antiquity. In particular, the three categories that determined a “work of artistry” stood in clearly defined relation to one another, so that a given formal genre belonged to a specific object of inquiry or content, and to both of these were available a set menu of modes of expression, and in literature this involved, of course, command of the necessary linguistic level with corresponding adjustment of stylistic characteristics. Generic and formal boundaries could be transgressed, genres and forms could, for example, be mixed, and this resulted in new combinations of formal categories along with contents and objects of inquiry, though it was of course both possible and necessary to find a path within formally defined fields, subject areas, and genres without offending established rules (see above, Ch. 1.1, p. 11). On the other hand, artistic and stylistic conventions had for the most part been established in the near or distant past, had been handed down from generation to generation, and were thus traditional in every sense of the word (including etymologically). Traditions, however, were at all times causes for the development of new forces. Sometimes traditions served as occasions for rebellions against themselves, but above all, especially where they were considered sacrosanct, they were frequently liable to slight revisions that led over time to long-lasting and major transformations.

In general, two or even more genres could be closely associated. The ancients reckoned that the more recent genre of historiography represented *epic* in prose. For this reason, historians had the duty to describe “great” events and persons, the deeds and destinies of heroes, kings and leading statesmen, taking care not to forget the associated actions of gods, and, with such content in mind, to cultivate an elevated style

(which included darkly vague pronouncements as well). Given the close association between epic and historiography, it seems no accident then that the beginnings of Roman historiography and the first two Latin epics with Roman historical content were not only contemporaneous but also shared essentially the same subject matter: the most recent events of the Roman past. Nor does it seem coincidence that much later, in the Principate of Augustus, Roman historical self-portraiture once more produced almost contemporaneously two works that again derive from these two genres and that would become canonical: Vergil's epic, the *Aeneid* (which, of course, treats in the main not historical, but mythical, material) and Livy's *History of Rome from its Beginnings* (see below, Ch. 3.3, pp. 60ff.; Ch. 5.1, p. 100).

But Roman history was *drama* too, and very closely associated with tragedy:⁶ for this reason, one finds in ancient, and especially Roman, historical narratives sequences of events and plots that have been composed in accordance with dramatic rules concerning climax, *peripeteia* (reversal of fortune), and catastrophe (the so-called episodic style in drama; compare below, Ch. 6.1.3, p. 150). An historical work encompassing many generations and diverse scenes of action could not be conceived, however, as drama without some complication, inasmuch as the unities of place and person and the construction of a central conflict were simply not possible, especially in light of usual Roman historiographical practice: annalistic presentation required the conscientious description of each event's location and resulted too in the splintering of series of connected events that stretched over a number of years. This made it practically impossible to bring the material together dramatically, unless the writer were willing to depart at least partially from an annalistic scheme (see above, Ch. 1.2, p. 13; below, Ch. 6.1.3, p. 145). One genre of historical writing, however, did permit an easier formulation as drama: the *historical monograph*. A clearly outlined plot and a narrowly circumscribed number of (main) actors, whose success or failure manifests itself in the action, make possible the composition of the whole as a drama (see below, Ch. 3.2.2, pp. 58f.; Ch. 4.5.1, pp. 86f., 90, and 93).

The linguistic and compositional elements of Greek, and thus Roman, literary works had to follow the rules of *rhetoric*. These rules had emerged in the fifth century BC, had been intensively developed in the fourth century, and had, ever since, been continuously promulgated and refined through a variety of theoretical approaches as well as through the practice of public speaking. The application of rhetoric was, according to the occasion and purpose, supposed to convince, to persuade, and to move the emotions or induce wonder or amazement. One effective example is

the sudden reversal (*peripeteia*; Aristotle *Rhetoric* 1371.b.10, *Poetics* 1.1452.a.22–29), mostly from good to bad: the sudden overthrow or turning point became a customary and favorite rhetorical means for Roman historians from the time of Lucius Calpurnius Piso to explain the logic of a sequence of events or set of circumstances (see especially Ch. 3.2.2, pp. 56f.; Ch. 4.5.1, pp. 91f.). Commonplaces (Greek: *topoi*) were especially effective weapons in the arsenal of rhetoric. Commonplaces were designed to convince (*psychagogia*), and their universally plausible truths and seeming-truths would be illustrated concretely in particular cases (Latin: *exempla*) that generally counted as authentic or were represented as such by orators or writers. And, if one searched for illustrative examples, history was an almost inexhaustible treasure house. For this reason, rhetorical education included an historical component that modern readers would hardly expect to find in this area, and to such a comprehensive extent that, again, modern students would be astounded by its breadth. Historiography was for this very reason the subject of fundamental rhetorical discussions (Quintilian *Institutio Oratoria* [“Education of an Orator”] Book 10, especially 10.1.31–34). The transmission of history through instruction in rhetoric was thus the only sort of “historical study” undertaken by citizens, officials, and prospective literary writers, and – from a modern perspective – this was not unproblematic. This practice offered history exclusively in a form that carved it into individual stories, each of which supported some concretely instructive (and most often moralizing) purpose. History thus provided not the stuff of storytelling, but rather of argument. Moderns will find this appealing. But history as example was also applied directly to the present and near future, as if there were no qualitative difference between once upon a time and now. This, on the other hand, will appear questionable to us, because we observe here in embryo the dehistoricizing of history (see below, Ch. 6.6, pp. 197f.; Ch. 8, pp. 244f.). History as example to be followed or avoided is an idea, however, that offers a key to understanding ancient, especially Roman, historical thought.

The cultural influence of the Greeks on Romans and inhabitants of Italy was so powerful that their ruling class not only learned the Greek language, but also studied Greek literature and oratory as well as the rules that governed them, and they themselves learned to make use of these arts (see above, Ch. 1.1, pp. 9ff.). In the intensive phase of Hellenization in the second century BC, the study of rhetoric at Rome was thus at first tied to the use of the Greek language, even though Romans, thanks to their republican form of government, enjoyed a culture of public speaking. Instruction in Latin rhetoric – which made

use of Greek precepts in an analogous fashion – was undertaken in Rome only in the first century BC after overcoming some resistance in conservative senatorial circles. A specialized literature then quickly developed, and reached its first, perhaps even decisive, high point in some of Cicero's works. Until the end of the ancient world, the subject matter of rhetorical training represented for the upper classes "the epitome of culture" (von Albrecht [Bibl. §1.3], p. 9), and, after overcoming some resistance, it would once again find its way into the aesthetics of Christian literature and its production. The application of rhetorical knowledge and ability in the composition of historical works was thus in Rome – and this was no less true among Greeks – a given, a matter of course. Readers expected it.

Historical literature could shine with a rhetorical glow especially when main characters stated their views or announced their intentions. This is one of the two decisive reasons why ancient historians – the Romans no less than the Greeks – placed special value on the insertion of speeches and/or letters into the action of their narratives. The aesthetic need for such "illuminations" (Lat. *lumina*) led of course to the introduction of speeches and letters that had actually been preserved, whether in writing or by tradition, but these were of necessity artistically recast according to the prevailing literary rules and thus, we might add, given a tendentious spin. And this practice led quite naturally to placing another kind of speech and letter in place of those speeches and letters that had actually been delivered, but not preserved: free composition of a speech or letter that would with more or less historical plausibility fit the historical context. This content would fit the context more or less in accordance with the literary ability of the author to weave appropriate historical garb for his insertions. Even as intellectually sober an historian as Thucydides failed to refrain from the insertion of speeches he had heard about only at third hand and which he had composed to fit various moments of decision (*History of the Peloponnesian War* 1.22). Not only in Athens, a genuine democracy characterized by a popular assembly, but also in communities with other kinds of constitutions as well as in small ethnic states or also, for example, in the Spartan-led Peloponnesian League, all decisions were made through a lengthy process of debate before larger or smaller public audiences. This constitutes the second decisive reason for the reproduction of speeches in historical narratives first among the Greeks and later the Romans – and even Thucydides frequently did the same thing.

The needs of rhetorical instruction as well as general interest in "purple passages" had the further consequence that some works of ancient

literature, but especially historiographical ones, were not preserved in whole, but only in excerpts, specifically those parts in which one could observe especially impressive application of the rules of rhetoric, to wit: speeches and letters. For this very reason, we possess today almost exclusively just such passages from the *Histories* of *Sallust* (see below, Ch. 4.5.1, p. 90). On the other hand, there did exist some ancient writers of history, who censured their colleagues for their reproduction of speeches, and themselves avoided the practice. The reason for this was, however, not the problematic nature of the (defective) historicity of such speeches, but instead an aesthetic assessment of their worth: if one fit the speech to the historical speaker and context, as rules of rhetoric naturally demanded, then such a speech would disturb, if not destroy, the linguistic and stylistic unities that a work of literature – and thus of historiography – strove for. Historians of this tendency remained in fact the exception (see Ch. 1.3.2, p. 29). The practice of reproducing speeches which were never really fully preserved – or worse: their frequent wholesale invention was for ancient writers of history an unquestioned principle of composition. For modern historians of ancient history, this practice has become an utterly insoluble problem, unless, that is, one is willing to make a radical break, and to exclude all reproductions of speeches and letters from consideration as sources for ancient history on the grounds that they are ahistorical.

Although the Romans were confronted with highly developed rhetorical practices in Greek historiography and although they learned the details of rhetorical theory in the course of their instruction in Greek language and literature, nevertheless, there was, according to an assessment of *Cicero*, no Roman historiography that met high literary standards until well into the first century BC. Cicero saw the reason for this in the lack of a satisfactory *language* or *diction* for this kind of literature, that is, no thoroughly typical style that was generally obligatory for the genre (see below Ch. 4.3, p. 80). Only after Cicero's death did *Sallust* finally forge such a style, and only then much later was it adopted and then with certain modifications by *Tacitus* (see below, Ch. 4.5.1, p. 85 and 90; Ch. 6.1.3, p. 149). The singular conditions (described above) for the genesis of Roman literature can here be viewed clearly. *Sallust* essentially looked back on two models of very different origin and orientation: on the one hand, he looked to a literary model, the “classically” Greek Thucydides; on the other hand, in terms of diction and moral expectations, he looked to the “archaic” Roman *Cato* (see below Ch. 4.5.1, p. 90). Roman historiography in Latin developed more slowly as a literary genre than did other forms of Latin prose, but also much more slowly

than Latin poetry. Latin prose, in fact, reached a first pinnacle in the age (as well as in the person) of Cicero, and Latin poetry was even then undergoing extensive transformation, and would soon, in the Augustan age, reach its zenith above all in Vergil and Horace. Roman historiography, by way of comparison, reached its culmination either in the works of the first century AD (which, because lost, we cannot assess) or perhaps later still in the two great works of Tacitus in the early second century AD (see below, Ch. 6, p. 126; Ch. 6.1.3, pp. 136 and 150f.).

We may draw two conclusions from the fact that ancient literature wished in general not only to entertain, but also in particular to teach: first, such instruction was not at all scientific (in the modern sense) with regard to its approach to fundamentals, secondly, because historiography aimed at instruction, not as a science, but as a literary genre or as a “Muse,” it did so unsystematically, aiming rather, on the one hand, at the dissemination of generally conceived ethical values, and, on the other, at the simple gathering of information from previously published sources in diverse disciplines. The latter could in historiographical works either be inserted on some pretext occasioned by the text itself or simply appended in the midst of an ongoing chronological narrative as a so-called *excursus* (or digression). This was especially true for geographical topics, but also topics involving topography, ethnography, cultural history, and religion. Because of the conditions under which ancient historiography developed, *geography* was the most important of the disciplines associated with history (compare Lendle [Bibl. §1.3] pp. 6f. and 10ff. and Meister [Bibl. §1.3] pp. 15ff. and 19ff.). This remained the case through late antiquity, and, as a result, we frequently find that the same authors write both history *and* geography or that an historian introduces his work with a lengthy and detailed geographical description (compare, on the one hand, the geographer Strabo and, in his *Natural History*, Pliny; below, Ch. 5.2.1, p. 113; Ch. 6.1.2, p. 135, and, on the other hand, Orosius, below Ch. 7.3.3, p. 231). Although diverse areas of inquiry strove in the course of time to make separate disciplines of their subjects, their contents never became secret knowledge, and thus remained the property of the general culture, open to appropriation through self-study by any educated person with literary inclinations. Digressions into specialized areas of study could therefore bestow upon historical writers a coveted reputation for wide-reading and erudition. For this reason, such digressions became a fixed feature of ancient historiography (see below Ch. 4.3, p. 80). This practice reached its peak in the work of the Roman historian *Ammianus Marcellinus* (see below, Ch. 7.2, p. 210). Only exceptionally, however, do we find

the integration of geography as a causal factor when it would be relevant to an historical and chronological report. Here we may cite Caesar's *Commentaries on the Gallic War* (see below Ch. 4.2.2, p. 74).

Like poets, historians served as *moral* authorities among Greeks and Romans – or so at least they claimed over and over again. The historian pointed out good and bad conduct amid the individual examples served up by the past, and was thereby able to instantiate conduct (Latin: *mores*), and render it concrete. Historiography therefore included a great deal of description and evaluation of individual actions as well as a person's failure to act. Another substantial moral factor for Roman, as opposed to Greek, historiography included, of course, the original situation under which historical writing developed at Rome, a time when Rome was engaged in great wars subject to critical scrutiny abroad. Roman historians sought above all to justify morally the reasons for, if not to demonstrate the actual necessity of, entering the wars that left Rome the dominant power in the western Mediterranean. Morality went hand in hand with the political work of justification (see above, Ch. 1.1, p. 9, below Ch. 3.1.1, pp. 43ff.). After Rome consolidated its power in the Mediterranean and beyond, other general moral values became more prominent, replacing earlier concerns for self-justification. In Roman eyes, the establishment of Roman hegemony ushered in a mutually interdependent duality of freedom and political order that had come into existence through Rome, and whose guarantor would likewise continue to be Rome, thus providing a fundamental justification for the development and existence of the Roman empire, as it would also eventually under Christian auspices as well (see below, Ch. 5.1, p. 109; Ch. 5.2, pp. 110ff.; Ch. 6.2.2, pp. 162ff.; Ch. 7.3.3, pp. 233f.). The conduct of statesmen and the elite classes of society in conjunction with the prosperous or evil condition of Rome and its empire was likewise evaluated by Roman historians on a purely moral basis (see below, Ch. 4.5.1, pp. 88ff.; Ch. 5.1, pp. 106ff.; Ch. 6.1.3, pp. 146f.; Ch. 7.2, pp. 213f.). It was therefore the Roman historian's self-evident task (self-evident because it was not critically examined or doubted) to convey both individual and collective moral codes through past actions and conduct set in the context of a practical and above all politically oriented system of values.

Moral thinking among Romans was easily merged with *legal* categories. These tend principally to formalization. And it is in this very activity that the Romans have been recognized as the masters and teachers of the European legal tradition from antiquity to modern jurisprudence. In contrast to the more pragmatically oriented Greeks, the causes of the wars waged, and almost always won, by Rome, corresponded to moral

principles as well as legal norms. On the legal side, the theory was encapsulated in the doctrine of “just war” (*bellum iustum*), and it was the unavoidable duty of the authors of Roman history to demonstrate how closely Romans and their state agents acted in accordance with its principles. In such justifications we can observe the manifestation of the Romans’ fundamentally legalistic outlook no less in their historiography than we do in their jurisprudence. But this is not the end of the story. If the Romans won wars, it was, they were convinced, because they enjoyed better relations with the gods than did their opponents. The relationship between human beings and gods was no different from that among human beings themselves or between two states. The relationship was at once moral and formally legal in character, and it was just this sort of relationship that the Romans understood under the term *religio*. One needed to take into account, of course, that the gods were much more powerful than human beings and that within the context of the ongoing mutual obligations of human beings and gods, it was especially important for the individual or groups of people or (in particular) the state to recognize the will of the gods and to make the fulfillment of divine will the fundamental basis of one’s own, the group’s, or the state’s conduct. It was consequently incumbent on Roman historians to account for the indisputable successes of Roman arms and politics of the past by demonstrating that their Roman ancestors were far better in fulfilling the will of the gods than were all non-Romans of the time.

At first all this functioned smoothly, but, with the first signs of Roman misrule in subject territories, or, at the latest, at the beginning of the Romans’ civil war in 133 BC, visible contradictions arose, that could be used to argue against the Romans and their professed values (see below, Ch. 4, pp. 63ff.). On the other hand, one could explain manifest problems in the course of Roman development as the result of lapses from their own maxims of conduct, the keeping of which had brought such success and prosperity to earlier generations. This is precisely Sallust’s line of reasoning (see below, Ch. 4.5.1, pp. 88ff.). Although this did not sit as well with Rome’s skeptical (to the point of hostile) attitude toward innovation, one could also, on the other hand, recommend obedience to new moral values. And, in the final analysis, one could always plead helplessness and shock, while offering up the “the anger of the gods.” Tacitus used this anger to explain the vicious assaults of Roman emperors on the ruling class, which he saw as the last preserve of ancestral liberty (Tacitus, *Annals* 16.16). The Christianization of larger populations in the third century AD entailed another and no less explosive *conflict of moral values* that inevitably arose with the establishment of

Christianity in the fourth century as Rome's state religion: the new, all-inclusive doctrine demanded the adoption of its moral values by society and state. The intensity of this struggle was blunted by the fact that Christianity, as the state religion, tended to stress the equivalence or similarities of its ethical values to ancient moral values, and to argue that Christianity, in fact, provided a better realization of them than did the previous "heathen" establishment (see above, Ch. 1.2, pp. 14f.; Ch. 7, pp. 201f.). In general, we find clearly reflected in Roman historiography (much more clearly, in fact, than in the Greek historiography) both the social consensus, as well as the dissonant views, concerning the meaning, indeed the existence, of the society's fundamental values and their religious foundation. These values very early formed the basis for the view the senatorial class held of itself, they became traditional within Roman historiography among its first practitioners, and they were handed down from generation to generation with little or no change for an astonishingly long time.

1.3.2 "History is what actually happened" – ancient historiography and the modern science of history

Moral self-justification is indeed a special characteristic of Roman historiography as well as of its artistic aspirations, whereas morally instructive intent, and, from time to time, open partisanship characterize ancient historiography in general. Nevertheless, ancient historiography also included features that modern historians of ancient history recognize as constituent elements of their own more scientific practices. Chief among these was a *claim to truth* that rested on the investigation of facts, thus raising the expectation that the narrator was reliably able to recognize and describe past actions and situations as well as historical actors with conflicting points of view. This immediately imposes the necessity of linking and explaining past events logically in terms of material and motivation, and, in particular, requires an ability to reconstruct intent, causality, and consequences. According to our modern conceptions and understanding, we would characterize this as empirical research, because the historian, on the basis of past testimony concerning either its own time or an even earlier period, whether intentionally provided and preserved or not, examines the material critically for the purpose of extracting new insights, and thus practices *Quellenforschung* (the critical investigation of sources) as well as literary criticism.

The ancient conception of historical truth rested on two foundations. Firstly, the Greeks had already conceived of history as events that had

actually taken place and as the recounting of actual events, and they distinguished this from the general truths that could be conveyed through the fictions of literary composition. By at least the beginning of the first century BC, the rhetorical doctrines of the Romans made a threefold distinction: *historia* was what had actually happened, an *argumentum* was a literary invention that corresponded to reality (this, according to ancient conceptions, could include something along the lines of an historical drama), and a *fabula* was a literary creation with no claims to reality.⁷ The truth of history accordingly differs from the truth of literature, but does not stand diametrically opposed to it (see below, Ch. 3.3, p. 62). Young Romans of good families learned such distinctions during their literary and rhetorical training, as did those too, who would later decide to write history. For this reason, historiography's claims to truth were rooted in literary and rhetorical practice, and they were consequently recognized as a special characteristic of a literary genre distinct from the genre of poetry.

Secondly, *Thucydides* had in the fifth century BC established among the Greeks some methodological principles for investigating past events and their interconnections that remain valid to this day. Later, in the second century BC, *Polybius* had worked out this methodology in numerous details. For this reason, these two historians stand decidedly closer to the modern scientific practice of history than they do to the customary rhetorical and literary theory of their own day with its gradations of truthfulness. The postulates of both historians most likely remained unremarked and largely ignored even among the Greeks for this very reason. Roman historical writers, of course, read *Thucydides*' work from the middle of the first century BC, but they did so exclusively for its artistry and rhetoric. Turning to *Polybius*, we find an historical work whose very subject was of central importance to Rome's historians: Rome's rise to world power between the outbreak of the Second Punic War in 218 BC, the end of the Third Macedonian War in 168 BC, and the Third Punic War in 146 BC. The existence of *Polybius*' seemingly indispensable and detailed narrative led, however, to no discernible adoption of his historical methods: one merely needs to compare the *Polybian* original to *Livy*'s adaptation, which lacks his model's methodology (see below, Ch. 5.1, pp. 104f.). It makes little sense, therefore, to accuse Roman historians of defective investigation and critical assessment of their sources, techniques they could easily have improved through *Thucydides* or *Polybius*.⁸ Rather, we must content ourselves with the conclusion that the historical methodologies of *Thucydides* and *Polybius* resonated with neither Romans *nor* Greeks, as we, for our part, might

have expected as a matter of course. It is here precisely that we observe the enormous difference between our modern conception of the science of history and the ancient world's unambiguous majority view of historiography. This helps explain, for example, why the Roman historian *Sempronius Asellio*, who shared important principles with Polybius, enjoyed almost no influence whatsoever (see below, Ch. 3.2.2, pp. 59f.), why *Sallust* imitated Thucydides only on linguistic and stylistic levels (see below, Ch. 4.5.1, p. 90), and why *Livy*, who wrote a generation after Sallust, found a Greek model not in Thucydides, but in the previous generation and in an author whose historical work(s) Thucydides explicitly criticized: Herodotus (see below, Ch. 5.1, pp. 104f.).

As the very *absence* of a commonly used term for "source" in today's sense would suggest, consistent and systematic investigation of sources was for ancient historical writers not an expectation, but an exception. Above all, from a modern point of view accustomed to systematic source criticism, it always appears arbitrary where and how a Greek or Roman historiographer obtained his materials, and likewise, whether he shared any details of provenance with his readers or named the basis for his information (source) in any given instance. For the ancient historical writer, exemplary works mattered far more as models of style and moral content than they did for their perceived objectivity. In general, when dealing with the remote past, he simply (from our perspective) took an older narrative, and rewrote it according to his own stylistic conceptions, read perhaps one or at most a few parallel narratives, glancing now and again in one or the other, and taking this or that to incorporate into his own version. In this way his retelling, through the incorporation of various older versions in the same context, could take on the characteristics of a pastiche. The narrator of earlier times rarely made use of original sources or more general documents (see below, especially Ch. 5.1, p. 104). The most recent events of the past, or what we now call contemporary history, enjoyed great popularity in antiquity, especially among the Romans, and, quantitatively, it received the most attention in those historical works that attempted to narrate history from early times to the present. From the second century BC, a ready source for accounts of contemporary history lay in commentaries, memoirs, and autobiographies composed by politicians (see below, Ch. 4.2, pp. 69ff.). With their assistance, one could immediately write historical works, on basis of which others would soon compose their own histories of recent events (see below, Ch. 4.3, pp. 77ff.). In works of contemporary history, the investigation of documents naturally took on greater significance than it did for more distant times, and in regard to one's own

experiences and recollections of them, one could check them through interrogation of contemporary witnesses, a practice that Thucydides had himself engaged in, and raised to a first principle. These means, however, were required only of the author who was the first to write about some event in the recent past, and even he was under no obligation to do this consistently or systematically.

Still, it has been argued: “all traces of the work that he [the Roman historian Tacitus] obviously did in archives and libraries in order to check with great conscientiousness his determination of the facts were erased through the completely transformed literary presentation” (Dihle [Bibl. §1.3], pp. 231ff.). Indeed, the rules prescribed a literary and rhetorical form that required in particular the linguistic and stylistic unity of a work. For historical narratives this required the linguistic reworking of all sources incorporated into one’s own work, and correspondingly prohibited verbatim excerpts from the original, unless the quotation somehow fit the stylistic requirements of one’s own text; nor was it, strictly speaking, permissible even to name the source for content that had been reworked. According to a strict interpretation of the rules (as we may determine from the condemnation that the historian Pompeius Trogus heaped on his colleagues Sallust and Livy), it was forbidden to provide verbatim quotations in historiographical works even of speeches (Trogus at Justin 38.3.11; see above, Ch. 1.3.1, pp. 21f.; cf. below, Ch. 7.1, pp. 204f., on Zosimus). The premise to Dihle’s indirectly formulated conclusion is therefore correct. What we may question, of course, is a logic that beyond very little evidence or none at all posits a great deal: it is possible, but not necessary. We have no secure methodology that would allow us, on the basis of a few citations, to reckon on Tacitus’ exhaustive search for, and diligent use of, original source material in an historical narrative as stylistically unified as his *Annals*. On the other hand, modern source criticism has indeed reached the same conclusions, but using methods that preclude making reverse inferences along the lines of Dihle.

For this reason the general (and rather negative) conclusions we have drawn here from a modern perspective remain valid. Nevertheless, we must proceed from the assumption that a Roman (or Greek) historian could have conceived an obligation for truth that met today’s standards, including related historical methods. It is just this duty, and its concomitant maxims, that one ancient work studiously demonstrates and simultaneously evades. In fact, we find more doubtful material in it than in any other historical narrative that survives from the ancient world: dubious even in regard to its author (or authors), the late antique *Historia Augusta* deploys citations from “sources” precisely when it

invents, and the narrative oscillates in very sophisticated fashion between historical reality and fiction – of course, the work itself proclaims this very procedure as a characteristic feature of historiography (*Historia Augusta, Aurelian* 2.1–1; cf. esp. 1.2ff.)! In this way, the author (or authors) of this peculiar biographical historical narrative confound the seemingly well-known tripartite division, which we introduced above: *historia-argumentum-fabula* (“history”–“argument”–“fable”), just as in another place in the same work (*Historia Augusta, Probus* 2.6–7) the demand for truthfulness in historiography is formulated only so that it may be contradicted by the citation of mendacious and fraudulent authors (see below, Ch. 6.3.3, pp. 175ff.). This clever and insouciant game with the fundamental principles of historical investigation (as we would formulate them today) demonstrates quite clearly their non-binding status in antiquity.

Within the narrow limits we have outlined, we must also examine the efforts of ancient historians in *source criticism*. Once again, a gulf opens between the worlds of *Thucydides* or *Polybius* and the remaining throng of historians, and it is fitting here to refer to the achievements of a *Livy* (which were modest from a modern point of view; see below, Ch. 5.1, pp. 104f.). Modern philological and historical research has concluded that ancient historians evaluated source material more by feel than methodologically strict and intellectually rigorous criteria. Behind this conclusion stands the concrete fact that the average ancient writer of history would consider narratives of the past trustworthy, and thus take smaller or larger bits from them, especially when these narratives corresponded to his own ideology or political position and personal frame of reference. This frame would be established for Roman authors primarily and most frequently through social class and the similar political duties shared by earlier and later authors. When in this way authors found sympathetic agreement with predecessors in repeated succession, regular chains of identical narrative and similarly identical interpretation resulted. To this general practice over many generations we may attribute the demonstrable uniformity of the historical tradition respecting the Roman emperors. We may observe this especially in the almost never altered classifications of each emperor under the rubrics of “good” or “bad,” classifications retained even through the cultural transformation from classical religion to Christianity. The tradition permitted deviations by later authors in their presentations only in points of relatively minor detail (see below, Ch. 6, p. 126; Ch. 7, p. 201).

Such series of representations and interpretations generated according to the conditions we have just outlined lead to the conclusion that the

trustworthiness of a late author's account and evaluation rest not on independent sources and witnesses, but instead on one author, namely, the one who stood at the beginning of the series, the one who, frequently enough, is no longer immediately perceptible. Despite these negative assessments and conclusions from our modern perspective, we should nevertheless keep in mind that, like the modern historian of ancient history who came after him, the ancient historiographer already faced a sometimes hopeless struggle with a defective and often rather contradictory tradition, when he wished to write about a past more distant than his own, and could thus easily be inclined to loose handling of the tradition's available fragments (in the case of speeches and letters, compare above, Ch. 1.3.1, p. 21; for modern methods of handling the fragmentary historiographical tradition, see above, Introduction, pp. 5ff.).

We must finally consider in the face of all this what an *ancient historiographer* was, and, more importantly, what he was not. In general, we can say that historical research and the composition of historical works did not serve as a vocation suitable for earning a living, nor was this an occupation that one learned systematically through some prescribed course of training. One could study (in the rhetorical schools) the linguistic, literary, and moral aspects of historiography (see above, Ch. 1.3.1, p. 19ff.). One tended rather to become an historiographer by chance, through the vicissitudes of one's own life. We find active politicians who were ambitious to shape the opinions of their contemporaries and successors. We find perhaps even more frequently former politicians, either excluded by advanced age or rendered ineffective through domestic or foreign controversies, but also politicians driven into exile. We find too the independently wealthy, for whom the writing of history served as a substitute for an unrealized political career (for whatever reasons). On the other hand, we also find wealthy antiquarians interested above all in "antiquities" of a cultural and religious sort. They devoted themselves to otherwise unusually detailed researches that generally (though not always) kept clear of politics – a decided disadvantage from the modern point of view (see below Ch. 4.6, pp. 96f.). The Greek and Roman historiographer generally belonged in all events to a family and to the class that did not have to live by its own labor and that actively participated in local and national politics. As a result, we find, positively, the historiographer's (pre-) acquaintance with his material and, negatively, the prejudices and one-sidedness of his social and family circles.

Aside from such exceptions as Livy (see below, Ch. 5.1, pp. 100f.), the Roman historian was until well into the imperial period a *senator* (see above, Ch. 1.2, pp. 12f.): historiography was, in the first place, the only

kind of writing befitting a senator and it retained this exceptional position, especially vis-à-vis poetry, which senators began to practice only in the course of the first century BC, but which, however, never became a normal literary activity in senatorial circles. In the time of the Republic, one of the values a senator presupposed as universally binding was the political predominance of his social class in the Roman state, which was institutionalized in the Senate. As a consequence of this posture, the senatorial historiographer of the imperial period manifested palpable misgivings toward the imperial regime, inasmuch as the Senate, as an institution, had de facto lost any real possibility of reaching its own decisions independently of the imperial will, and the individual senator had, as a magistrate, been restricted to administrative and judicial functions. He did not, however, question the imperial system itself (see below, Ch. 6, pp. 121f.; Ch. 6.1, pp. 127f.). The second class (or order) of Roman citizens, the equestrian, trod mainly in the footsteps of the senators: equestrians too wrote Roman history, or perhaps Roman biography, and thereby either adopted the views of senatorial historiography or at least transmitted its perspectives (see below, Ch. 6.1.2, pp. 134f.; Ch. 6.3.1, pp. 168f.). If a free man who was the dependent of an important family through his ancestry and according to law (i.e., he was a client), wrote Roman history, his work was hardly independent of the traditions and political biases of his patron's family and clan. Still, however much a Roman historiographer pursued personal or political aims, he could not do so too openly, because, as an historian, he was nevertheless obligated, even if not very effectively, to practice the greatest possible objectivity. This was defined rather simply: the historian needed only to provide assurances that he wrote with regard for neither his own interests nor those of any associated groups, and that he had received no personal advantage from any of the historical personages described in his work (see below, Ch. 4.5.1, p. 86; Ch., 6, pp. 124f.; Ch. 6.1.3, pp. 139f.; also Ch. 4.3, pp. 79f.). Alas, this conception of objectivity found little support in the historiographer's materials and hardly any in his methods.