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](#)

On the Construction *Sanus Ab*

John C. Rolfe

The Classical Review / Volume 13 / Issue 06 / July 1899, pp 303 - 305

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00080598, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00080598

How to cite this article:

John C. Rolfe (1899). On the Construction *Sanus Ab*. The Classical Review, 13, pp 303-305
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00080598

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

the Caledonians are meant. Of course they are. Agricola posted troops somewhere in hope of invading Ireland later, not from fear that Irish seamen might plunder the Roman coasts. The words proclaim aloud that the invasion was a *spes*, not a fact. This is, of course, the usual way of taking the words. I do not see why it is ignored and a straw theory set up to be demolished.

(9) Lastly, Mr. Gudeman meets the objection that Tacitus carefully avoids saying that Ireland was invaded. He claims to rebut it easily: I do not think he has really faced it all. He calls the invasion a fiasco, not remarkable enough to claim long notice, and so forth. The fiasco is a pure assumption, disproved by the context (*crebris ac prosperis proeliis*), but if it were fact and the invasion ever so futile, the objection would remain just the same. Tacitus might, of course, wholly omit a fiasco, or be brief over a trifle: he does neither. He says Agricola successfully attacked certain tribes hitherto unknown, and prepared for an invasion of Ireland: he goes on to point out in detail the ease of such an invasion. That seems an extraordinary and utterly unintelligible way of saying that Agricola unsuccessfully attacked the Irish or even of glossing it over.

On the other hand, the ordinary interpretation raises no such difficulties: after the pause of the fourth year (ch. xxiii.) Agricola again advanced northward, conquered some (unnamed) tribes and also took the first

steps towards invading Ireland. The whole passage is quite well explained by, for instance, Mr. Furneaux. *Nave prima transgressus* remains anyhow a difficulty: I will confess that since I printed my own view, the comments of others have seemed to me largely to confirm it, but in no case can it affect the question of the invasion of Ireland. Prof. Gudeman's own interpretation of *prima* does not involve that invasion. It may also be doubted what part was garrisoned with a view to invading Ireland. Mr. Purser has pleaded ably for the Mull of Cantire. To me *copiis instructis* implies something more permanent than would have been possible there, and the fact that Agricola did not invade Ireland in his next campaign suggests preparation for a remote future rather than for a few months off. Hence I incline to the coast of Cumberland or North Wales. Why the invasion never came off, is not stated by Tacitus and cannot be found out now. There are indications that the central Government disliked the general progressive policy of Agricola and recalled him before that policy had gone its full length. But there is no indication that it specially forbade an invasion of Ireland or interrupted Agricola in preparations for it. Without such indication it may be safer to admit that Agricola may have himself postponed the conquest till he should have finished on the mainland.

F. HAVERFIELD.

ON THE CONSTRUCTION *SANUS AB*.

KIESSLING on Hor. *Sat.* 1, 4, 129, *sanus ab illis*, compares with this construction *aeger ab animo*, Plaut. *Epid.* 129, and *valere ab oculis*, Gell. 13, 30, and translates 'gesund im Hinblick auf diese grösseren *vitia*.' So too the Lewis and Short Lexicon, s.v. *sanus*, has 'sound as respects them.' Klotz and Georges on the other hand translate 'rein von,' and the Forcellini-De Vit is still more explicit, citing the example from Horace under the caption '*sanus ab aliqua re, liber, immunis, remotus*.' Kirkland, in his edition of the Satires and Epistles, apparently combines the two interpretations, for he says: '*sanus*: construed with *ab* because of the idea of separation involved in it. Plautus has even *aeger ab animo*, and Gellius uses *valere ab oculis*.' Many editors do not comment on

the construction at all, though it is in any event a rare one in Horace, and if *sanus* is taken in the sense of 'free from,' is apparently unique in the classical literature.

Although presumably all the uses of *ab* came originally from the idea of motion from or separation, we find in the earliest literature such distinct categories as, for example, that of time, and for lexicographical purposes at least the various uses must be separated and classified to a degree which to some may seem to approach hairsplitting. In the case in question it seems to me that we have a choice between two radically different interpretations, and that if *sanus* is regarded as in the same class with *liber* and *immunis*, that is, if it is to be rendered approximately 'free from,' the

examples from Plautus and Gellius should not be cited as parallel.

Aeger ab animo, to my mind, has nothing directly to do with the idea of separation, but is connected rather with the idiomatic use of ab and the ablative with verbs not implying motion from or separation, to denote 'the side or direction from which an object is viewed in its local relation.' This appears fully developed in the earliest literature. Examples are Plaut. *Asin.* 260 picus et cornix ab laeva, corvos, parra ab dextera consuadent; Cic. *ad Brut.* 1, 10, 5, firmos duces habemus ab occidente; and in the same way a meridie, ab oriente, a dextro cornu, &c.

This construction is frequently used of the parts of the human body, e.g. Plaut. *Cist.* 60 doleo ab oculis; Men. 1011, eripe oculum isti ab umero qui tenet te. With this use I should connect aeger ab animo and the like. The construction was extended by analogy to such a degree that ab with the ablative came to be used with very nearly, if not quite the same force as the ablative of respect. So Varr. *L. L.* 9, 40 verbum a significatione simile; Cic. *Fam.* 10, 8, 6, ab omni re sumus paratiores; Suet. *Tib.* 68, latus ab umeris et pectore; *C. I. L.* vi. 13352, a natione Trax. The construction is not very common, being confined for the most part to early Latin and to poetry. Cicero uses it in his *Letters*, and in the *Brutus*, 63, Graecus ab omni laude felicior. Draeger is apparently right (1², 623) in saying that it does not occur in Sallust, Livy, and Tacitus. Horace has one example in *Odes* 2, 16, 27, nihil ab omni parte beatum, which Kiessling might have cited to defend his interpretation of sanus ab illis, though in common with many editors he makes no comment at all on this interesting and rare use of ab.

It is therefore possible to take sanus ab aliis (vitiis) in the sense of 'sane in respect to other faults,' although the rendering of Klotz and Georges seems to me a better one.

The construction with liber, unlike the one just considered, arises directly from the idea of separation, and is parallel with liberare ab, e.g. Cic. *Quint. Frat.* 3, 1, 3, 9, te ab eo vindico et libero. After the analogy of liber and adjectives of kindred meaning the usage was extended to such words as casta, mundus, pudicus, securus, quietus, tranquillus, &c. So Plaut. *Poen.* 1186, ut decet nos esse a culpa castas; Liv. 1, 44, 4, ut puri aliquid ab humano cultu pateret soli. Draeger (1², 620) derives the construction from the idea of

separation, but does not cite sanus ab. Horace, *Satires* 1, 6, 82, has (me) pudicum servavit ab omni non solum facto verum opprobrio turpi, where Zangemeister, in his Index, connects ab with servavit, as do Kiessling, Kirkland, and others. Draeger, however, cites the line as an instance of pudicus ab, and this interpretation seems to me to be required by the sense of the passage, and to be probable on account of the frequent use of ab with adjectives of a similar meaning. Thus Cic. *Phil.* 13, 8 res familiaris cum ampla tum casta a cruore civili; Lucan 10, 370 a quo casta fuit (Cleopatra)? cf. Plaut. *Cure.* 51, a me pudicaster. Cf. also Catull. 15, 5, conserves puerum mihi pudicum, non dico a populo, according to the reading of Bährens.

Servare ab, on the contrary, is comparatively rare. Virgil has, *Aen.* 5, 699, servatae a peste carinae; 5, 476 qua servetis revocatum a morte Dareta, and Gellius, 17, 2, 14, quotes from Claudius Quadrigarius Capitolium servasse a Gallis: otherwise the construction seems to be post-Augustan. Georges and the Forcellini-De Vit do not cite it at all, except for the late and special use in Legal Latin.

But a stronger argument for this interpretation is the frequent use of servare with predicate adjectives of the class under consideration. So Cic. *Verr.* 2, 1, 68, pudicitiam liberorum servare ab eorum libidine tutam (where Georges connects ab with tutam) and without ab and the ablative, Cic. *Cat.* 3, 10, 25, urbem et civis integros incolumisque servavi; *Tusc. Disp.* 1, 30, 72, qui se integros castosque servavissent, &c. The difficulty of taking (ab) opprobrio turpi with pudicum, if there be any, is much less than that of separating pudicum from servavit. Conservare with the ablative does not seem to occur, and the verb, like servare, is frequently used with a predicate adjective of the pudicus type. See, for instance, Cic. *Fam.* 13, 50, 2, M' Curium ab omni incommodo sincerum integrumque conserves. Even if we read pudice in Catull. 15, 5, I cannot feel, with Riese, that a populo is to be detached from pudice. Cf. C. Semp. Gracch. ap. Gell. 15, 12, cum a servis caste me habuerim.

With sano and verbs of kindred meaning ab is apparently not used in Classical Latin, but we find in Tertullian, *Res. Carn.* 6, deus vivus...quaecumque materiae vilitatem non de sua operatione purgasset et ab omni infirmitate sanasset; Scap. 4, quanti viri aut a daemoniis aut a valetudine remediati sunt.

For *sanus ab* the Lexicons cite only the example from Horace, but we find Act. Mart. 642, a cunctis (febribus) *sanus*, and Aug. *Contr. Jul.* 6, 18, 55, *sanitas ab eis malis quibus eramus rei*. It is possible that *sano* and *sanus* with *ab* belonged to the language of everyday life.

Sanus non est ex amore illius, Plaut. *Merc.* 443, and *insanior ex amore*, *Merc.* 447 are not parallel with *sanus ab*, but *ex amore* denotes cause, as *ex* with the ablative often does. See Draeger, 1², 637.

JOHN C. ROLFE.

University of Michigan.

ON *EQUES* FOR *EQUUS*.

EQUUS EQUES—Gellius xviii. 5 tells us that a litterateur of the second century, Antonius Julianus, declared that Ennius and Virgil both used *eques* in the sense of 'horse' and the idea is recorded also by Servius and other commentators on Virgil. The scholarship of the Empire was acute and laborious: it was also, I am afraid, inclined to search out new views and startle contemporaries with novelties. In this it resembled the scholarship of the present day, and it is not surprising that several recent writers have backed up Antonius Julianus and provided new instances of *eques* used for a horse (Wölfflin's *Archiv.* x. 286, 452; xi. 275). The passages alleged are, in all, the following.

1. Ennius 237 Vahlen (247 L. Müller) *quadrupes eques*. For this we have only the evidence of Antonius Julianus recorded by Gellius and others borrowing from him. Nothing but *a priori* arguments are therefore possible. The ordinary editions in the time of Julianus seem to have had *quadrupes equus*. Julianus professed to have found *eques* in an ancient MS. which went back to Lampadio and the second century B.C.

2. Virgil, *G.* iii. 116, *equitem docuere sub armis Insultare solo*. Here also Julianus wished to take *eques* as 'horse.' But as Conington observes, this 'would only produce a platitude.' As in Horace's *eques sonante verberabit ungula*, the rider is said to do what the horse does.

3. No one I think has accused Horace of using *eques* for *equus*, but an instance has been detected in the *Bellum Hispaniense* iii. 6, *iubet binos equites conscendere*. The context shows that there were present an equal number of cavalry and infantry and that two men were to mount on each horse. The passage is clumsy; but I do not see that it is helped by making *equites* = horses. The writer of the pamphlet had certainly read Ennius, for he twice quotes him by name, but I think that if he had taken *eques* from

Ennius for *equus*, we should have had *quadrupes eques* in full and not the odd use uniquely introduced by itself. Elsewhere his use is normal.

4. Frontinus, *Strat.* ii. v. 31, in *prima parte leves Hispanos . . . ponerent, paulo interius scutatos, in remotissimo equites, ne fremitu eorum cogitata proderentur*. No doubt *fremitus equorum*, the reading of the worse MSS., would be a little more logical here, but the fact that the best MSS. have *eorum* does not justify us in taking *equitum* to mean 'horses,' as is solemnly proposed. The idea would land one in many puzzles. Three kinds of soldiery are enumerated, all of them having been mentioned in the sentence before. It is not credible, in such a case that a writer would say 'the Spaniards, the heavy infantry and the horses' when he meant the cavalry. *Fremitus eorum* is plainly a bit of loose writing, which has the merit of being quite ludicrous.

5. Minucius Felix, vii. 3, *Curtius equitis sui vel mole vel honore hiatum profundae voraginis coaequavit*. Curtius jumped in himself. It is rather unkind to say that it was the size or the dignity of his horse which did the work: besides 'the dignity of his horse' is nonsense. What Minucius wanted to say was that the size or dignity of horse and man was effective, size referring to the horse and dignity to the man: *equitis sui*, I suppose, is simply 'of himself mounted' i.e. of self and horse. It is short, and oddly put, but clear enough.

I think I am justified in saying first that none of these passages which can be tested by their sense and context, bear the weight laid on them by recent writers. Secondly, I am inclined to conclude that *eques* in the sense of 'horse' is a literary invention of Julianus or some one before him. Possibly it began with the error of some scribe who wrote *quadrupes eques* as *homoeotelenta*, and the over-subtle litterateur, lighting on the blunder, pronounced it correct. From