The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

The Citations from Sallust's *Histories* in Arusianus Messius

C. M. MacDonald

The Classical Review / Volume 18 / Issue 03 / April 1904, pp 155 - 156
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00209554, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00209554

How to cite this article:

C. M. MacDonald (1904). The Citations from Sallust's *Histories* in Arusianus Messius. The Classical Review, 18, pp 155-156 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00209554

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

χείρα προσοίσει, and so 307 (with *ιστήλη*); *ib.* 308 is correct, as to the relative and the case after *ποιεῖν*, ὃς ἂν κακῶς ποιήσῃ τὸ ἥρῳον. Τίς for ὅστις in *JHS* xxi. 227 (i/) Ἐρενία . . . καὶ υἱὸς αὐτῆς . . . [χαίρετε], καὶ σὺ πολλά, τίς ποτ' εἰ.

In late papyri etc., as in MGr, the article becomes a relative once more. BU 948 (4/5, very illiterate) πρὸς τὸ δύνουμε. Wilcken in *Archiv* i. 164 has some exx. from BM papyri of 346 A.D. :—p. 292 τό μοι δέδωκες, 301 τὴν ἀγάπην τὴν ποιεῖς, 304 τὴν χίρα τὴν δέδωκεν. Cf. Justin M. *apol.* i. 5 and Gildersleeve's note (p. 116). Τί relative in BU 948 (*supr.*), οὐδὲν ἔχω τί ποιήσω σοι, has exact NT parallels, as *Lc* 17⁸ (contr. 11⁶). Cf. ποῦ relative in NP 75 (3/4) τόπον αὐτοῖς παράσχες ποῦ μίνωσιν : cf.

Lc 9⁵⁸, but the deliberative question there is still discernible.

Compounds meaning *whatsoever* show a fine variety. *ὀρωδῆτινι* FP 21 (2/), *οὐντινούν* TbP 5, 124 (ii/) *ῶντινούν* OP 491 (2/), *ἡνδηποτοῦν* TbP 27 (ii/), *ὀνδηποτοῦν* *ib.* 124 *al.*, FP p. 49 (Ptol.), *οὐντινοσοῦν* OP 100 (2/), *οἰωδῆποτε* BU 895 (2/), and so on.

Πᾶς = *any* (in negative clauses).—Add TbP 105 (ii/) *ἀννεύθνοι παντὸς ἐπιτίμου*, *ib.* 11 (ii/) [*ἀνευ δίκης*] καὶ κρίσεως καὶ πάσης..., BU 920 (2/) *χωρὶς παραδοχῆς πάσης*, *ib.* 908 (2/) *δίχα πάσης ἐξουσίας*, *al.* Plutarch *Cons. ad Uxorem*, *δίχα πάσης περιεργίας*, will serve as a literary ex. I have not looked for more.

JAMES HOPE MOULTON.

Dielsbury College, Manchester.

THE CITATIONS FROM SALLUST'S *HISTORIES* IN ARUSIANUS MESSIUS.

FROM the method followed by Verrius Flaccus¹ and Nonius Marcellus² in the arrangement of their citations from Latin authors, it has been found possible to infer that this or that citation from a lost work followed or preceded in that work this or that other citation. For example, we now know that in the third book of Sisenna's *Histories* the fragment numbered 14 in Peter's edition really stood later in the book than the fragment numbered 33 by Peter; also that in the fourth book Peter's frag. 81 came after frag. 83 and before frag. 82.

Did Arusianus Messius follow any dis-

coverable method of arranging his 'Exempla Elocutionum,' which would enable us to infer the true position of this or that citation in the lost *Histories* of Sallust or the lost speeches of Cicero? Arusianus Messius, who lived at the end of the fourth century, derived his examples of Latin constructions (*exempla elocutionum*) from four authors, Virgil, Sallust, Terence, and Cicero. His book (sometimes called the 'quadriga Messi') is arranged in alphabetic sections, an A-section, a B-section, a C-section, and so on, but within the sections themselves alphabetic order is not followed. It begins, for example, in this way:—

Abundans	illius rei, Virg. <i>Ecl.</i> ii. 20.
	illa re, Cic. pro Cornelio ii.
(abundat)	illa re, Cic. pro Cluentio 184.
(abunde est)	huius rei, Virg. <i>Aen.</i> vii. 552.
Ardet	illa re, Virg. <i>Aen.</i> xi. 782.
	illam rem, Virg. <i>Ecl.</i> ii. 1.
	in illa re, Sall. <i>Cat.</i> 5, 4.
	in illam rem, Virg. <i>Aen.</i> vii. 623.

Then follow :—Avertit, Accingo, Appulit, Avidus, Abnuo, Amicus, Adhibet, etc. From the order of the citations under Abundans and Ardet it will be seen that Arusianus does not follow so transparent

an arrangement as Nonius. His arrangement of the citations under each lemma seems to be at hap-hazard. At least I can find no tangible clue. He follows no definite order of the cases. Constructions with the Gen. precede constructions with the Abl. almost as often as they follow them. It is true that in the majority of instances a construction with a simple Case

¹ See Reitzenstein, 'Verriane Forschungen' (*Breslauer Philologische Abhandlungen*, vol. i. 1887).

² See Lindsay, 'Nonius Marcellus' (*St. Andrews University Publications*, No. I. 1901).

precedes a construction with a Preposition and a Case (as in the lemma *Ardet*, above), but since this rule is violated in about 28 and observed in about 75 instances, the number of the exceptions is too great to permit us to regard this clue as of much

value. There is indeed one clue that seems more reliable. In those instances in which we find more than one example of exactly the same construction, the second (or third) example follows the natural order, *e.g.* (p. 463 Keil, vol. vii. s. l. *Dignus*):—

dignus fieri . . . Virg. Ecl. v. 54, et puer ipse fuit cantari dignus;
Virg. Ecl. v. 85, et erat tum dignus amari;

or again (p. 479 Keil, s. l. *Indutus*):—

indutus illis rebus . . . Virg. Aen. xi. 83, indutosque iubet truncos hostilibus armis;
Virg. Aen. xii. 947, tune etiam spoliis indute meorum?

However, against 33 instances of this rule stand some 8 exceptions, which (unless they can fairly be referred to some scribe's error of transposition) destroy the infallibility of the clue.

To one rule only, so far as I can see, there is no exception whatever. When two examples of exactly the same construction are drawn from the same book of the same

author, they are quoted in the natural order of sequence (as in the lemma *Dignus*, above).

Using this clue we can locate, relatively to each other, two passages in the second book of Sallust's Histories; also two passages in the fourth. We find under the lemma *Suetus* (p. 510 K.):—

suetus his rebus . . . Sall. Hist. ii (fr. 88 Maur.) genus militum suetum a pueritia latrocinii;
Sall. Hist. ii (fr. 85 Maur.) genus hominum vagum et rapinis suetum magis quam agrorum cultibus;

and under the lemma *In Praesentia* (p. 487, K.):—

in praesens . . . Sall. Hist. iv (frag. 50 Maur.) quod in praesens modo satis cautum fuerat;
Sall. Hist. iv. (fr. 69, 19 Maur.) quid ab illis nisi dolum in praesens et postea bellum exspectans?

We may therefore infer that in the text of Sallust Hist. ii the fragment numbered 88 by Maurenbrecher held some place prior to the fragment numbered 85, and similarly

in the text of Book iv. fragment 50 M stood earlier than fragment 69 M.

C. M. MACDONALD.

University of St. Andrews.

NOTES ON THE *SILVAE* OF STATIUS.

In lecturing on some of the *Silvae* this winter, I have found that I sometimes arrived at a more or less decided opinion in favour of one reading or interpretation and against another. Much has been done for Statius of late, and the disputable passages are fewer than they were. It is in the hope of helping to make them fewer still that I venture to send these notes to the *Classical Review*. I have used the elaborate edition of Dr. Vollmer with increasing distrust: it seems to me a very unsafe guide. Sometimes Dr. Vollmer admits with good

reason a reading that is not in the MSS (*e.g. certent* in I. iv. 13 and *carpsi*, for *carpsit*, *ib.* 105 seem certain or all but certain): sometimes he keeps the reading of the MSS when it is impossible (*quis caneris*, I. iv. 23) or ludicrous (*leones*, V. iii. 99). '*Quis caneris*' has been condemned by Mr. Housman in his Prolegomena to Manilius (p. xlviii) and Mr. Housman with equal justice rejects Dr. Vollmer's interpretation of I. iv. 40 (a passage which I touch upon below, partly to discuss the use of '*ignarus*').