

FUNARI, Pedro Paulo Abreu; GARRAFFONI, Renata Senna. *Historiografia: Salústio, Tito Lívio e Tácito*. Coleção Bibliotheca Latina. Campinas: Editora da Unicamp, 2016. ISBN 978-85-268-1331-1*

Filipe N. da Silva¹

Published in five chapters as part of the collection *Bibliotheca Latina* of Editora da Unicamp, the book *Historiografia: Salústio, Tito Lívio e Tácito*, written by Professors Pedro Paulo Abreu Funari (Universidade Estadual de Campinas) and Renata Garraffoni (Universidade Federal do Paraná), presents and analyzes the origins, connections and purposes (sometimes political, but also moral purposes) of some of the main works of Latin historiography produced between the end of the Roman Republic and the first two centuries of our age, at the time of the Roman Principate.

Despite the fact that the book examines particularly the writings of Sallust, Titus Livius and Cornelius Tacitus, Funari and Garraffoni interpret these historical texts in the light of a socially and ethnically heterogeneous ancient world, marked by cultural exchanges between different peoples and traditions. This approach is observed from *Chapter I: Considerations on historiography* (pp. 17-30), in which the authors comment the rise of modern historiography as a discipline in the 19th century in its relation to the ancient manner of writing history, but offering a wider picture of ancient historiography by comparing Greek, Latin and Hebrew narratives, keeping a critical distance from the idea that the cradle of history is found in ancient Greece only, in the writings of Herodotus and Thucydides.

In *Chapter II: Latin Historiography* (pp. 31-42), Funari and Garraffoni present the origins, the authors and the legacy of Latin historiography. In their discussion about the origins of the genre, the authors argue that the contact of Romans with texts originally produced in Greece was crucial to the development of a remarkable cultural exchange between these peoples. It is worth noting that concepts such as “Hellenization” or

* Translation: Fernando Dantas Pesce and Patricia de Freitas Camargo.

¹PhD Student, University of Campinas, São Paulo, Brazil. E-mail: filipe.hadrian@gmail.com.

“Romanization” were not used by the authors in their interpretation of this historical experience.

In their comment to political and intellectual uses of Sallust, Titus Livius and Tacitus during the Middle Ages and Renaissance, for example, Funari and Garraffoni indicate paths to historical research that could be further explored by the reader. At the end of the chapter, taking advantage of relevant contributions from Archaeology, the authors (following Géza Alföldy and Richard Hingley) emphasize the importance of material culture for the understanding of the Roman imperialist enterprise. Thus, the territorial expansion of the Roman Empire, the wars and the rise of the *princeps*’ government with Augustus are regarded as decisive historical events for a proper understanding of Latin historical narratives.

Chapters III, IV and V present and analyze the works of Sallust (pp. 43-65), Titus Livius (pp. 67-88) and Tacitus (pp. 89-126) respectively, following the same structure for each: 1. biographical presentation; 2. the role of the historian as a writer; 3. narrative style of the historian; 4. sources used by the historian; 5. conception of history in the works of the historian. The authors call the attention of the reader to the fact that these works have a historical character themselves, as products of a particular time and thus subject to political, moral and philosophical conceptions and aspirations of each historian. This connection that links each work to the time and conditions of its production is the distinctive aspect of the interpretations offered by Funari e Garraffoni to the works they analyze.

Beyond the detailed description of *Historiae*, *The Conspiracy of Catiline*, and *Jugurthine War*, and the analysis of bilingual excerpts of these works, Funari e Garraffoni give particular attention to the character of Gaius Sallustius Crispus in Chapter III. According to them, the political position of Sallustius as a supporter of Caesar and adversary of Catiline in a decaying Republic is the key element for the understanding of the historical meaning of his works. Even archaisms observed in the language used by Sallustius (p.57) could be read as products of rivalry in his public life, such as his remarkable confrontation with Marcus Tullius Cicero. Following a tradition rooted in the work of Thucydides, which emphasizes war and politics as main topics, Sallustius’ narrative is organized by the antagonism of vices and virtues of the characters, pictured in the context of the political conflicts of the Roman Republic.

In their comments about Titus Livius, presented in Chapter IV, Funari e Garraffoni acknowledge that little is known about his life, career and death, except for a few references found in the works of other authors,

produced in later times. In relation to Titus Livius's works, the authors examine the only work that survived to our days: *Ab Vrbe Condita*. They analyze excerpts from this work with the aim of revealing its rhetorical characteristics, moral conceptions, and mainly the idea of history that underlies that work. Being composed at the time of Emperor Augustus, the text reveals Titus Livius as a supporter of Roman traditions (*mos maiorum*), and his conception of history as cyclical – and thus *magistra vitae*. The emphasis on religious elements and the proximity to Cicero's narrative style are, according to the authors, the elements that distinguish Titus Livius' narrative as unique, very different from Sallust's works.

Chapter V is dedicated to the detailed analysis of the works of Cornelius Tacitus. Funari e Garraffoni opted to go beyond the historical narratives, which were produced at a later time of his life, and analyze works such as *Agricola* (composed around 96 and 98 AD) and *Germania* (composed in 98 AD), together with *Historiae* and the *Annals*. In relation to *Agricola*, the authors call the attention of the reader to the biographical character of the text (*uita*) dedicated to Tacitus' father-in-law, and to the ethnographic traits in the description of the German people found in *Germania*.

Familiarity with epigraphy, in turn, provides Funari and Garraffoni with information about the life of Cornelius Tacitus and with important elements for the understanding of the political context that permeates his work. Being raised in a rival branch of the imperial autocracy, Cornelius Tacitus should be regarded as responsible for the depiction of Roman emperors in their most vicious aspects. They are presented in the exercise of power, both in public life and in familiar relations. The use of anecdotes, however, does not make him a Suetonius – who made use of rumors to compose his *uitae* (p. 123).

Final Words (pp. 127-129), the chapter that closes the book *Historiografia: Salústio, Tito Lívio e Tácito* is followed by a briefly commented bibliography (pp. 131-132) and a short anthology (pp. 133-142), in which readers can find some passages of the works analyzed, both in their original form and in translation. In an overall view, the book reveals that there are significant differences in the way ancient historians wrote history – even the language used for the composition of ancient works whose authors were contemporary and shared the same cultural background sometimes differ from one author to the other. The book also acknowledges all contributions of ancient historians to 19th century historical science, but with a clear view of decisive points of rupture, such as aspirations, concerns and the treatment given to sources and historical documents (p. 109).

Written in a clear style, the book is also interesting for non-specialists in Classical Studies: it presents Latin historiography in dialogue with up-to-date bibliography in a concise and pleasant form. The long and rich experience of the authors as professors and their innumerable published works in Brazil and abroad resulted in a well-written and rigorous academic book. It is worth mentioning that right from the start (p. 11) Funari and Garrafonti explicitly reject any pre-conceived idea of Ancient productions as heritage or legacy to Modernity: their book is rooted in the present time, raising issues related to the place of history in our society – and, particularly, the place of Ancient history and its role as a discipline in our society. If Josep Fontana's words – which say that historians "(...) are convinced that they limit themselves to the investigation of the past without passion, free from any cultural or political prejudice" (Fontana, 1998: 10) – may seem valid to some scholars in our days, they do not find any shelter in the book *Historiografia: Salústio, Tito Lívio e Tácito*.

Work cited

FONTANA, Josep. *História: análise do passado e projeto social*. Bauru: EDUSC, 1998.