HISTORIARUM LIBRI QUINQUE: HEGESIPPUS BETWEEN JOSEPHUS AND SALLUST*

Abstract: This article examines the influence of Sallust on Hegesippus, the fourth-century historian and adaptor of Josephus (commonly referred to as pseudo-Hegesippus). Analysis of the structure of his work reveals that Hegesippus strove to write in five books to mirror the *Histories* of Sallust. Consideration of the lengths of those books and of other evidence then shows that Sallust's *Histories* were themselves written in five substantial books of *ca.* 20,000 words. Finally, it is suggested that comparison of writers in the Sallustian tradition may be able to expand our knowledge of Sallust's largely lost *magnum opus*.

Keywords: Sallust, Hegesippus, Latin historiography, manuscripts, codex, paratexts

The spell of Sallust was powerful. Despite his numerous detractors—on parade, for example, in the *Noctes Atticae* of Aulus Gellius—many subsequent historians strove to write, with varying success, in a Sallustian mode.[1] 'Lucius Arruntius, a man of uncommon frugality, who wrote

---

This article is one of a series of studies of later Latin works of history. Others include Stover and Woudhuysen (2017), (2015 [2020]), and (2021).

We use the following abbreviations:

Bischoff, *Katalog* = B. Bischoff (with B. Ebersperger) *Katalog der festländischen Handschriften des neunten Jahrhunderts (mit Ausnahme der wisigotischen)*, 4 vols (Wiesbaden, 1998–2017). Cited by volume and manuscript number.

CCSL = *Corpus Christianorum Series Latina*.

CLA = E. A. Lowe, *Codices Latini Antiquiores*, 11 vols (Oxford, 1934–71). Cited by volume and manuscript number.

GLK = H. Keil, ed., *Grammatici Latini*, 8 vols (Leipzig, 1857–80). Cited by volume and page.

LGPN = *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names Database* http://clas-lgpn2.classics.ox.ac.uk/

PL = J. P. Migne, ed., *Patrologia Latina*.

[1] For detractors in Gellius, see, e.g., *NA* 10.26 (Asinius Pollio and others). On Sallust's reputation in antiquity, see Syme (1964) 274–301; cf. the second part of Bolaffi (1949) for coverage which extends into much later periods. See also the interesting paper by Trovato (2010) for the reception of Sallust's *Histories* in third- and fourth-century imperial panegyric. For antiquity, the collection of *testimonia* in Kurfess (1972) xxii–xxxi, remains useful. The whole subject remains ripe for further work.

---

         28 January 2022

Histories of the Punic War was a *Sallustianus*, and a splendid example of the type', noted Seneca the Younger of an historian whose works are lost to us— Arruntius was far from the only one.[2] Leaving Tacitus—the most obvious and most famous example—to one side, Sallust's later imitators include Velleius Paterculus, the shadowy L. Septimius, translator of Dictys of Crete, Lactantius, Sex. Aurelius Victor, Julius Exuperantius, Sulpicius Severus ('the Christian Sallust'), and the mysterious author of the *Excerptum ex Gallica historia*, to name only some of those whose debt was more obtrusive.[3] It was possible to borrow ideas from Sallust, especially a moralising emphasis on the selfish ambition of the powerful, but it was perhaps more popular to adopt his style: to quarry his works for epigrams and archaic words, to imitate his famous *brevitas* or his pointed judgements, even to make almost a *cento* of his works.[4] Though less remarked upon, it is also clear that some looked to Sallust for inspiration in structuring their works, in matters both large and small. This essay investigates one such case, examining the size and shape of books—the paratextual divisions of ancient works—through close attention to Sallust and one of his followers.

[2] Sen. *Ep.* 114.17: *L. Arruntius, vir rarae frugalitatis, qui historias belli Punici scripsit, fuit sallustianus et in illud genus nitens.* On Arruntius, see Hoyos (1989) and *FRHist* 58 (Levick).

[3] Velleius Paterculus: Woodman (1969), Oakley (2020). L. Septimius: Pratje (1874) (a very useful compilation), Brünnert (1883) (ditto), cf. La Penna (1963) 63–5. Lactantius: Nicholson (2017) 127–37, esp. 136. Aurelius Victor: see Stover and Woudhuysen (2015 [2020]). Julius Exuperantius: see Zorzetti (1982), who though inclined to minimise Exuperantius' historiographical debt to Sallust (in a perhaps exaggerated way) still concedes (xvi): *Salustii tamen studiosissimus Exuperantius fuit* (a conclusion amply confirmed by an extensive *apparatus*). Sulpicius Severus: Pratje (1874); Senneville-Grave (1999) 40, 44; van Andel (1976) 69–74; Fontaine (1975). The Sallustianism of the *Excerptum ex Gallica Historia* (so-called, edited in Pertz (1874) 385–99) has received no attention, but is marked. To cite only two of the more significant examples: (1) *cum is dies deae Cizae apud barbaros celeberrimus* **ludum et lasciviam magis quam formidinem ostentaret** (Pertz (1874) 389) ~ *Jug.* 66.2, *quod is festus celebratusque per omnem Africam* **ludum et lasciviam magis quam formidinem ostentabat**; (2) *duo principes oppidanorum Habino et Caccus* **in primis pugnantes cadunt** (ibid.) ~ *Cat.* 60.6, *Manlius et Faesulanus* **in primis pugnantes cadunt**. Mere use of Sallust does not a *Sallustianus* make: the category includes those who consistently and obtrusively imitated him. Ammianus Marcellinus neatly illustrates the distinction: he had certainly read Sallust and alludes to his works (Stover and Woudhuysen (2021) 164; Ross (2016) 105–22; Kelly (2008) 74, 211–12; Fornara (1992) 429–33; Owens (1958) 152–91), but no one would ever mistake a line of the *Res Gestae* for one by Sallust.

[4] On Sallust's political thought, the classic work is Earl (1961). On his style, see (e.g.) Syme (1964) 240–73 and on some of its political implications, see O'Gorman (2007).

Sallust and Hegesippus

Among the *Sallustiani* of the late Empire, one of the most interesting and successful is the elusive fourth-century Christian historian, called in the manuscripts Hegesippus.[5] Hegesippus was the author of a Latin adaptation of Josephus' *Jewish War*, commonly (but perhaps not accurately) referred to as the *De excidio Hierosolymitano*.[6] His pages bristle with Sallustianisms.[7] Take, for example, the work's first sentence (1.1) after the prologue:

> **bello** Parthico, **quod** inter Macchabeos duces gentemque Medorum diuturnum ac frequens **variaque victoria fuit** incentivum dedit sacrilegii dolor …

[5] Throughout, we refer to the author as Hegesippus for convenience, without necessarily implying any view of the fraught question of authorship. We would note only that there are perhaps three explanations for the name: 1) It is authentic (the name was perhaps less rare than is sometimes implied: *LGPN* lists eighty-one instances, to which add *CIL* VI.19184, 22761 and two entries in Foraboschi (1967–71) 121); 2) It is a corruption of Iosippus (as most commonly supposed; Leoni (2007) 483 and n. 16 shows the idea dates back to the eighteenth century at least); 3) It arose through confusion (or perhaps conscious identification) with the second-century Christian author called Hegesippus, who wrote a work in five books on the early Church (cited frequently in Eusebius' *Historia Ecclesiastica*, but see especially 4.8.1–2, 22). In none of these cases is the traditional lumbering appellation pseudo-Hegesippus appropriate: whoever wrote the text had no intention of falsely leading his readers to believe that he was Hegesippus (whoever that might have been), a situation that contrasts with genuinely pseudonymous texts, such as the works of pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite. Pollard (2015) 78 suggests that the name Hegesippus appears in the manuscripts only in the ninth century and in a Carolingian context (98–9, though cautiously). There is some reason to be sceptical on this point. In Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana C 105 inf (a composite manuscript of the s. V–VI + VIII, per *CLA* III.323a–b, probably from Bobbio (Everett (2003) 281 n. 73)—available online http://213.21.172.25/0b02da8280137c00), at the end of the first book and opening of the second (f. 67v) are found the words: EGESIPPI LIB(ER) PRIMUS EXPL(ICIT) INC(I)PIT SEC(UN)D(US). AMBROSI(US) EPI(SCOPUS) DE GREGO TRANSTULIT IN LATINUM. Originally, this seems to have read IOSIPPI LIBER, but the correction is in an early hand. As with the use of the name by Paul Albar of Cordoba (Pollard (2015) 87–8), this suggests something more complex is going on.

[6] The text was edited by Ussani (1932) and (1960) (with a preface by Karl Mras). Bell (1987) (cf. id. (1980)) provides a helpful introduction, as does Leoni (2007) (cf. id. (2009) 154–6), both citing earlier literature. After a flurry of activity in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century (much of it devoted to issues of authorship), the work of Hegesippus was relatively neglected: the theses of Bell (1977) (with a historiographical focus) and Estève (1987) (a substantial introduction, translation of Books I–IV, and selective commentary) were the only sustained treatments (neither easy of access; the overview in Schreckenberg (1972) 56–8 and the short essay by Bammel (1993) might also be mentioned). Recently, however, it has begun to receive the attention it deserves. Somenzi (2009) offers a sustained analysis (partly in the service of making once again the case for the authorship of Ambrose of Milan)—there is a useful review article by Raimondi (2011). Pollard (2015) offers a rich

> Anger at sacrilege provided grounds for the Parthian war, which—
> waged between the generals of Maccabees and the race of the Medes—
> was long-lasting and constant, and in which victory was uncertain …

This obviously harks back to the famous programmatic statement in Sallust's *Jugurtha* (5.1):

> **bellum** scripturus sum, **quod** populus Romanus cum Iugurtha rege
> Numidarum gessit, primum quia magnum et atrox **variaque**
> **victoria fuit** …

and learned account of Hegesippus' reception in the early Middle Ages. Bay's (2018) thesis is a focused analysis of a particular chapter (5.2), with a wealth of material on Hegesippus more broadly—he has also published an important series of interesting articles: (2019), (2020), (2021a–f). See also MacRae (2021) (a welcome example of treating Hegesippus as a Latin author in his own right) and Molinier-Arbo (2020). A comprehensive and up-to-date monographic treatment in English is a major *desideratum*. On the work's date (after the foundation of Constantinople: 3.5.2), generally given as *c.* 370 or 375, see the crisp summary by Bell (1987) 350 (cf. id. (1977) 2–3). The lengthier discussion in Callu (1987) argues for a slightly earlier date (*termini* of 350–65: 133; written between 353 and 358: 136), but rests on some rather forced comparisons of allusions in Hegesippus to contemporary events. Building on a suggestion by Bell ((1977) 3, 207 and (1987) 350), recent scholarship has tended to regard Julian the Apostate's attempt to reconstruct the Temple at Jerusalem as the event that set Hegesippus to work: Somenzi (2009) 10, 153–7; Bay (2021a) 276–9). Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen (2020) 77–8 offer some bracing scepticism on the date, arguing convincingly that various fourth-century *termini post* and *ante quem* identified in the text have been over-interpreted and suggesting that it might have been composed at any point between 325 and the sixth century. They ignore, however, the use of the text in the *De situ Hierusolimitanae urbis* of Eucherius of Lyons (*c.* 450, ed. *CCSL* 175; 235–43). The authenticity of the *De situ* has sometimes been doubted, primarily on the grounds that it appears to have been used by Adomnán and Bede, neither of whom mentions it as a source (it of course being unimaginable that either of these saintly scholars might have used something without naming the author). There are ample philological, historical, and manuscript grounds to accept the traditional attribution to Eucherius (Gorman (2006) 39–41 and O'Loughlin (2007) 212–22; cf. O'Loughlin (1995)); moreover, standard stylometric techniques (cf. Stover and Kestemont (2016) and (2017)) show there is no reason whatsoever to doubt Eucherian authorship. In the debate over Hegesippus' date (and in other matters), insufficient attention has perhaps been paid to his connections to other Latin historians of the fourth century. His statement that Caligula wished to appear and be referred to as *dominus et deus*, which would appear to derive from Aurelius Victor, *Caes.* 39.4, is one significant link. The overlap of content and wording (which suggests a common Latin source) between Hegesippus 3.5.2 and Amm. Marc. 23.5.3 is another. On the title of Hegesippus' work, see further below n. 15.

[7] The easiest place to grasp this is the *index locorum* in Ussani (1960) 430–1, by no means a comprehensive list. Amongst Latin authors, Vergil might have had an equal or greater lexical influence on Hegesippus, but his intellectual contribution is clearly much smaller. The only real rival to Sallust is the Bible.

> I will write about the war that the Roman people waged against Jugurtha, king of the Numidians, first, since it was a great and savage war, and victory was uncertain …

At points, the allusions and imitations come thick and fast, as a few lines later (1.1.2–3) in describing the instructions given by Mattathias on his deathbed:

> sed **cum sibi supremum diem adesse intellegeret**, vocatis civibus atque adsistentibus liberis hortatus est, ut tuerentur patriam templique religionem, ducemque his Iudam Macchabaeum curae ac sollicitudinis suae successorem reliquit. qui **bello strenuus, consilio bonus** ac prae ceteris fide promtus quam frequenter **innumeras hostium copias parva manu fuderit**, persequi non est negotii praesentis. quod tamen brevi colligere datur, saepe prosperis usus successibus excitavit in se magnam **hostium** multitudinem, qua **circumfusus undique**, dum cedere pudori existimat, refugientibus sociis in proelium ruit. **caesisque quos adversum ierat, a latere** circumventus sed tamen ultus propriam mortem occiditur.

> But **when he understood that his last day had come**, he exhorted the citizens who had been summoned and his children who were standing near to defend their homeland and the worship of the temple, and he left to them Judas Maccabeus as leader, the successor to his duty and his anxiety. It is not the task at hand to relate how frequently this man—**vigorous in war, honest in deliberation**, and manifest in faith compared to the others—**routed innumerable forces of the enemy** with a small band. Since, however, it may be permitted to sum up his deeds briefly: having often enjoyed successful outcomes, he roused against himself a great crowd of the **enemy**. **Surrounded by them from every side**, esteeming it shameful to yield, he rushed into battle as his allies ran away. **When those against whom he had advanced had been slaughtered**, he was assailed **from the flank**, but still he died having avenged his own death.

This paragraph gathers *flores* from five different passages in Sallust's two monographs, the *Jugurtha* and the *Catiline*: *Jug.* 9.4: *cum sibi finem vitae adesse intellegeret*; *Jug.* 7.5: *proelio strenuus erat et bonus consilio*; *Cat.* 7.7: *maxumas hostium copias populus Romanus parva manu fuderit*; *Jug.* 97.5: *hostes numero plures et undique circumfusi*

erant; and *Jug.* 101.8: *profligatis eis quos advorsum ierat, rediens ab latere*.[8] This is an extraordinary density of allusion, even to works so canonical as those of Sallust.

The Sallustianism of Hegesippus is not a novel observation, though it has yet to receive a more detailed treatment than the index to Ussani's edition.[9] Seemingly not remarked upon, however, is the fact that this imitation extends to the structure of his work. The principal source of Hegesippus was Josephus' *De bello Iudaico*: this is in seven books, but the adaption contains only five.[10] This was clearly a deliberate decision by the author, rather than the result of chance. In his prologue, Hegesippus shows himself attentive to the number of books that a work contains.[11] As Karl Mras pointed out long

---

[8] See Ussani (1932) 4–5, to which we have added the parallel to *Jug.* 97.5. Note in the passage above that *promtus* is what Ussani prints.

[9] The connection was recognised in the Middle Ages. Paris lat. 6256 (s. IX²ᐟ⁴ per Bischoff, *Katalog* 4399) contains excerpts from both Sallust and Hegesippus, along with Justin and the Latin Josephus (we thank one of the reviewers for *Histos* for pointing this out to us). Roger Bacon claims that *Hieronymus dicit libro locorum et Hegesippus in Historia Hierosolymitana quod Sallustius est auctor certissimus* (*Mathematicae in divinis utilitas*, ed. Bridges 1.315). Bacon knew the work of Hegesippus fairly well, citing him by name several times, but these words are not to be found in our text of his work, though they are in Jerome's *De situ et nominibus locorum Hebraicorum* (ed. Klostermann (1904) 83). On Hegesippus and Sallust, see also Vogel (1878) 348–65; Klebs (1895); Brakman (1932) 324–34 (who offers a useful list of *loci similes* not included by Ussani, including a good deal from Sallust); Bolaffi (1949) 239; Bell (1977) (who comments intermittently on Sallustian features); Somenzi (2009) Chapter 2 (though her suggestion, 16–17 and n. 27, that Hegesippus owes much of his Sallustianism to the grammatical tradition drastically understates the extent and sophistication of his engagement); and Stover and Woudhuysen (2015 [2020]) 105–6. In general, it is remarkable how little attention work on Hegesippus has paid to his constant imitation of Sallust. The subject is by no means exhausted by what we say here. The following intertexts, none of which seem to have been previously marked and all of which use phrasing otherwise rare in ancient Latin literature, give some sense of how much remains to be discovered: Hegesippus 5.27.1: *qui se **pro patria pro liberis** pro religione morti devoverint* ~ *Cat.* 59.5: ***pro patria, pro liberis**, pro aris atque focis certare*; Hegesippus 3.3.4: *ut **miles cibum** sibi **et arma portaret*** ~ *Jug.* 45.2: *ut cum signis frequentes incederent, **miles cibum et arma portaret***; Hegesippus 1.45.4: *quoniam ipsos quoque Antipater **dolis atque fallaciis** suspectos patri fecerat* ~ *Cat.* 11.2: *sed ille vera via nititur, huic quia bonae artes desunt, **dolis atque fallacii** contendit*; Hegesippus 1.41.1: *et concubina, cui Pannychi nomen erat, **dono datur atque accipitur*** ~ *Hist.* 2.43.5 [Ramsey; Maurenbrecher 2.47], *ut sine dedecore cum civibus fama et fortunis integer agas id **dono datur atque accipitur***.

[10] On the structure of Josephus' work, see Mason (2016) 17–23. As he points out (18) their wildly varying length shows that Josephus consciously chose to structure the work in seven books (one might wonder about the influence of Thucydides). Josephus himself says that the work is in seven books (*Jewish War* 1.30; cf. the cross-reference at *Jewish Antiquities* 13.298). He was attentive to book lengths, as the count of books and στίχοι at the end of the *Jewish Antiquities* (20.267) shows.

[11] See below, p. 9, for *quattuor libros Regnorum*. We thank Duncan MacRae for pointing this out to us.

ago, he has also shaped the *termini* of his second and final books, so that they end more dramatically than their source material in the more leisurely Josephus, *Jewish War* 2 and 7.[12] Indeed, examination of how the books of Josephus map on to those of Hegesippus shows very clearly that care has been taken by the latter in structuring his divisions. The first four books by Hegesippus correspond quite neatly to the first four books of the *Jewish War*. The last three books of Josephus, however, were crammed together by Hegesippus into one massive book, almost as long as Books 2, 3, and 4 of his work combined (*ca.* 27,000 words in Book 5, vs. 34,000 in 2–4 combined). While Sallust did not apparently divide his two monographs into books (in spite of the length of the *Jugurtha*), he also wrote *Historiae*, now mostly lost, but enormously influential in antiquity.[13] This work consisted of five books.[14] In an author so lexically and intellectually indebted to Sallust, this can hardly be coincidental: Hegesippus was clearly cutting his cloth to a Sallustian model. In this connection, it is worth noting that while his work is conventionally referred to as the *De exicidio Hierosolymitano*, there are actually fairly good reasons for thinking that the author meant it to be called *Historia(e)*.[15] This is a superficially colourless title that might now seem more

---

[12] Mras (1960) xliii–xliv.

[13] For a suggestion that the *Jugurtha* may in antiquity have circulated in two rolls of papyrus, see Stover and Woudhuysen (2015 [2020]) 110.

[14] On the *Histories* in general, see Syme (1964) 178–213 and Gerrish (2019). The work has been unusually well served by editors, commentators, and translators. The foundation remains Maurenbrecher ((1891) and (1893)), to be used now with Ramsey's magnificent Loeb (2015). See also Funari (1996), Reynolds (1991), McGushin (1992–4), and La Penna and Funari (2015), the first of several promised volumes. There seems to be a general belief that the fifth book of the *Histories*, and thus the entire work, was incomplete (e.g., Funaioli (1920) 1929; Bauhofer (1935) 112; Tiffou (1974) 517; Kraus and Woodman (1997) 10; La Penna and Funari (2015) 46): Syme (1964) 190–2, offers various possible intended *termini* for the *Histories*, with varying numbers of books to accommodate them. For our purposes, however, all that matters is that the work as actually circulating in antiquity was in five books. In any case, the motivation for this belief (not always stated) seems to be the paucity of fragments from Book 5 (e.g., Tiffou (1974) 520; Ramsey (2013) xxxiii–xxxiv) or the fact that they do not extend close enough to a logical end-point (Syme (1964) 190). Neither of these is a secure criterion for reconstruction. The grammarians who provide the vast bulk of fragments ascribed to books were more interested in Sallust's style and language than the historical significance of the events he covered and they showed a predictable preference for citing the earlier parts of a work (see Skutsch (1975) 232–3). Certainly, no one in antiquity seems to have understood the *Histories* to be incomplete.

[15] So Ussani titled the work in his edition (1932). The manuscript evidence is assembled in Mras (1960) xxiii–xxv (cf. the helpful discussion in Pollard (2015) 77 and n. 65; see also Gitner (forthcoming)). Our two earliest witnesses (M = Milan, Ambrosiana C 105 inf, s. V–VI + VIII per *CLA* III.323a–b, and C = Kassel, Landesbibliothek Mss. Theologici 65, s. VI per *CLA* VIII.1139) have no title (neither is complete). The rest tend to call it either the *Historia* (Z = Besançon Bibliothèque Municipale MS 833, s. X/XI (Mras (1960) xv) and V

resonant.[16]

This structural link between the two works also explains the pronounced intertexts and parallels of arrangement between Hegesippus' prologue and the fragments of that to Sallust's *Histories*. These have, as far as we know, never before been spotted (Ussani offers no parallels for the prologue), but they are striking:

quattuor libros Regnorum quos scriptura complexa est sacra, etiam ipse stilo persecutus usque ad captivitatem Iudaeorum murique excidium et Babylonis triumphos historiae in morem **composui**.[17]	*Fr.* 1.1 {1.M} res populi Romani M. Lepido Q. Catulo consulibus, ac deinde militiae et domi gestas **composui**.

= Rome, Vat. Pal. Lat 170, s. VIII/IX per Bischoff, *Katalog* 6645, cf. the extract *de historia Iosippi* in Paris lat. 13367 f. 235v, s. VII per *CLA* V.658, our earliest evidence for the title) or *Historiae* (B = Bern, Bürgerbibliothek MS 180, s. IX²/⁴ per Bischoff, *Katalog* 549, and A = Karlsruhe, Landesbibliothek Aug. perg. 82, s. IX²/⁴ per Bischoff, *Katalog* 1618, neither of which, we might note, attribute the work to Ambrose). These slightly different titles cut across the families identified by Mras (1960) xxiii. Bell (1987) 350 (cf. id. (1977) 3) accepted *De excidio Hierosolymitano* as the title, on the strength of T (Turin, Biblioteca nazionale D. IV.7, copied from M before its mutilation). According to Mras (1960) xi, however, this is an annotation in a later hand (*non vidimus*). It seems more likely that this usefully descriptive title emerged in the course of transmission than that it was lost only to reappear in one manuscript. For example, A opens Book 5 with *incipit eiusdem historiographi liber V de clade et excidio urbis hierosolymae*, which is a correct description of the contents of that book that might easily have migrated to the work as a whole (for which it is less appropriate). Pollard (2015) 80 lists significantly more pre-1000 MSS than were used by Ussani and those that can be checked easily tend to support *Historiae* as the title. Paris lat. 12512 f. 1r: *in hoc corpore continentur Egesippi Historiae libri numero quinque* (s. IX³⁻⁴/⁴, Bischoff, *Katalog* 4838; compare Paris lat. 12513—s. IX²/⁴ per Bischoff, *Katalog* 4839—and Nouv. Acq. Lat. 1490, s. IX³/⁴ per Bischoff, *Katalog* 5086; this opening formula is identical to that in B). St. Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek 626 (s. IX¹/⁴, Bischoff, *Katalog* 5823) is imperfect (starting partway through Book 5), but has *finit liber quintus historiae Iosephi de bello Iudaico. feliciter* on p. 311 (the presence of the verses mentioning Cyprian on p. 312 suggest it is connected to A, which also has them). To this evidence might be added the testimony of Haimo of Auxerre (*Homilia* XII, *PL* 118.78cd— attributed there to Haimo of Halberstadt, but see Barré (1962) 148 no. 8), who mentions the *Historiae Iosephi et Hegesippi*, and Notker 'the stammerer', who advises that *Iosephi vero Iudaici historias et Hegesippi nostri legendas* (*De interpretibus divinarum scriptarum* 12, *PL* 131.1004a).

[16] It is worth noting here that other writers in the Sallustian tradition also opted for *Historia(e)* as their title: most famously, Tacitus. Though their titles have received less attention, the same seems to have been true of Velleius Paterculus (*Historiae ad M. Vincium*; see Woodman (1977) 95 citing earlier literature), Aurelius Victor (see Jerome, *Ep.* 10.3), and perhaps Arruntius (above, n. 2).

[17] The text of this first sentence is a little challenging: *stilo per/prosequi* is a rare but attested idiom (cf. Symmachus, *Ep.* 3.30; Augustine, *De praedestinatione sanctorum PL* 44.964; Paulinus, *Vita sancti Ambrosii* 1.1). MS B of Hegesippus (see n. 15) reads instead *stilo brevi prosecutus sum*,

Macchabaeorum quoque res gestas propheticus sermo **paucis absolvit**; reliquorum usque ad incendium templi et manubias Titi Caesaris relator **egregius** historico stilo Iosephus, utinam tam religioni et **veritati** attentus quam rerum indagini et sermonum sobrietati … **unde nobis** curae fuit non ingenii ope fretis sed fidei intentione in historia Iudaeorum ultra scripturae seriem sacrae paulisper introrsum pergere …	[2] {8.M} nam a principio urbis ad bellum Persi Macedonicum, … [3] {4.M} *Sallustius … dat Catoni breviatem* Romani generis **disertissimus paucis absolvit** … Fannio **veritatem**.[18] [5] {3.M} **nos** in tanta doctissimorum hominum copia.[19]
Having myself drafted the four books of Reigns, which are included in the holy scripture, down to the captivity of the Jews, the destruction of the wall, and the triumph of Babylon, **I have arranged** them in the fashion of a history.[20] The prophetic discourse has also **summed up** the deeds of the Maccabees **in a few words**. In the style of a historian, Josephus was the **outstanding** reporter of the rest, as far as the burning of the temple and the booty of Titus Caesar: would that he had been as heedful of religion and the **truth** as the ferreting out of events and temperance of language … **For this reason it was our** duty to proceed from the inside into the history of the Jews, a little beyond the chain of the holy scripture, trusting not to the might of our talent, but to the exertion of our faith …	**I have arranged** the deeds of the Roman people, both on campaign and at home, for the consulship of Marcus Lepidus and Quintus Catulus, and thenceforth. For from the beginning of the city to the Macedonian war with Perseus, … {Sallust attributes concision to Cato} 'the most eloquent man of the Roman race **summed things up in a few words**', but **truth** to Fannius. **We** amidst such a quantity of the most learned men.

which might be an ingenious supplement, but could contain truth. Future editors of Hegesippus should pay close attention to this point.

[18] Bell (1977) 58 did identify *paucis absolvit* as a phrase taken from Sallust or Livy, preferring the former. The important point to note is that while Livy used the collocation once in the voluminous portions of his work that survive (33.12.2), Sallust deployed it (or something very similar) here and three other times in his monographs (*Cat.* 4.3; 38.3; *Jug.* 17.2): it is clearly a Sallustian phrase, not a Livian one.

[19] The fragments are taken from Ramsey (2015) with Maurenbrecher's numeration in brackets.

[20] On this earlier work, see Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen (2020) 78–80. Note the use of the Septuagint title of the biblical source, *Libri Regnorum*, 'Book of Reigns', against the Vulgate *Libri Regum*, 'Book of Kings'.

Both passages begin with a sentence describing the chronological boundaries of their work with a main verb *composui*. Both then go on to discuss their forebears in the writing of history, characterised by their brevity (*paucis absolvit*), their outstanding quality (*egregius ~ dissertissimus*), and by a particular emphasis on their regard for *veritas*. Both finally position themselves, with an obtrusive first-person pronoun, in this tradition (*nobis curae fuit ~ nos in tanta doctissimorum hominum copia*). These allusions come thick and fast: they are especially revealing given how paltry the scraps of Sallust's prologue that have come down to us are. If we had the whole, how many more resonances might we detect? Perhaps comparison with other works imitating Sallust might be revealing. If we look at the prologue to the *Chronicon* of Sulpicius Severus (as we have seen, one of the *Sallustiani*), we find far fewer resonances with the fragments of Sallust's *Histories*, but it is striking that both texts began with the word *Res* (*Chron. praef.* 1: *Res a mundi exordio*). If we then turn to the very end of Sulpicius' prologue, we find a phrase parallel to the end of that of Hegesippus: Severus, *praef.* 3: *nunc initium narrandi faciam ~* Heg. *Prol.*: *hinc igitur sumam exordium*.[21] It is tempting to think that Sallust concluded his prologue in a similar way. Comparisons like these might offer the possibility of deepening our knowledge of Sallust's fragmentary work and sharpening our sense of how to arrange the fragments.

The transformation of a seven-book Greek source into a five-book Latin history was a neat way for Hegesippus to signal his twin allegiances to Josephus and Sallust. That said, a consequence of this decision to imitate the architecture of Sallust is that the historical work of Hegesippus seems (as we have already intimated) rather structurally inconsistent.[22] The first of his books is extraordinarily long: approximately 26,500 words, or 173,000 characters. It is one of the longest books of a multibook Latin work from antiquity, rivalled only by its companion fifth book, some grammarians (Nonius Marcellus, Book 4, Diomedes 1, and Charisius 1), Tertullian, *Adv. Marcionem* 4, Cicero, *De oratore* 2, and Augustine, *Contra Faustum* 22. The next three books are much shorter, indeed very much of normal length for ancient books: the second and fourth *ca.* 11,000 words, or 72,000 characters, the third *ca.* 12,000 words, or 77,000 characters. The fifth book is then also extremely long, slightly longer even than the first, at 27,000 words, or 174,000

---

[21] Severus: 'I will now make a beginning of my narration' ~ Hegesippus: 'From this point therefore I will take up my beginning'. For *intium narrandi faciam*, cf. Sall. *Cat.* 4.5.

[22] The contrasts, for example, with Hegesippus' contemporary Ammianus Marcellinus, who composed books of extremely consistent length (*ca.* 46,500 characters, with a standard deviation of 7,500, or 7,000 words, with a standard deviation of 1,150). For Hegesippus, the average book is 113,600 characters, with a standard deviation of 54,000, 17,500 words, with a standard deviation of 8,400. On the study of book-lengths, and the insights they can provide, see Stover (2021).

characters. The result is a work in five books (*ca.* 568,000 characters or 88,000 words) that is longer than the thirteen of Augustine's *Confessions* (*ca.* 459,400 characters or 83,000 words). This imbalance is no doubt partly due to the nature of the source. The first book of Josephus is also very long, at *ca.* 171,000 characters, but even so Hegesippus' treatment (which, it should be noted, covers a significant amount of background not in Josephus) is slightly longer.[23] The next three books of Josephus are also shorter, at *ca.* 131,000, 81,500, and 102,000 characters respectively; Hegesippus' treatments are anywhere from 5 (the third book) to 45% (the second) shorter than these. Finally, Josephus' last three books come in at *ca.* 235,000 characters together, while Hegesippus' fifth book, though very long, is still 25% shorter than the three of them together.

What are we to make of these unusually long books? It might be tempting to make them merely a mechanical consequence of the decision to stuff the content of seven original books into a frame of five. That temptation, however, ought to be resisted. Hegesippus could indulge his Sallustianism with such massive books because, of course, he was writing in the era of the codex. In the potentially expansive codex-format, book divisions were (within reason) a compositional device and not a (soft) physical constraint, as they had been in the age of the papyrus roll, when works could be only so long if they were to be read comfortably.[24] It was open to an author writing for a codex to slice up his material into books in any way he chose, subject to the conventions of genre and style that seem to have played a major role. For example, the fourth-century historian Eutropius put the content of his *breviarium* into ten miniature books, because that was a sufficiently impressive number for a dignified genre like history. Perhaps he was motivated by a desire to imitate the stately decades of Livy?

What models might have inspired Hegesippus? If we look just at works from the age of the roll (defined here as before AD 200), the only Latin books even in the same region as Hegesippus' first and fifth are Cicero, *De oratore* 2, as mentioned above, Velleius Paterculus, *Historia* 2 (23,000 words, or 143,000 characters, with, n.b., a possibly substantial lacuna at 2.29.5), and Sallust's own *Jugurtha*, if indeed it circulated as a single unit.[25] In other words, amongst the *comparanda* for Hegesippus, one is a book by Sallust and another a book by a historian in the Sallustian tradition. In addition, we also have the confounding factor of Book 1 of Velleius, which as it survives is very short

---

[23] We use characters as a measurement since that produces comparable figures across Latin and Greek, unlike words.

[24] See Stover and Woudhuysen (2015 [2020]) 109–10; and Stover (forthcoming) for the impact of the codex on the structure of books in antiquity. On book divisions in the age of the roll, see Higbie (2010).

[25] On the lacuna in Velleius' second book: Rich (2011) 76.

(less than 4,000 words or 22,000 characters). It is, however, imperfect at the beginning (although probably not drastically so) and it has a massive gap in coverage after 1.8.6, one that stretches from the rape of the Sabine women under Romulus to 167 BC. This suggests, unavoidably, that the first book of Velleius was almost certainly as long as the second and may indeed have been longer.[26] Such long books were not normal in Velleius' day. Had Velleius followed the same model as his exact contemporary Valerius Maximus, whose nine books average *ca.* 57,000 characters, or 8,900 words, he could have structured his work into as many as five books.[27] If he preferred the style of his younger contemporary Seneca *iunior* (38,000 characters, 6,700 words), then his *Histories* might have been in as many as seven books.

The Sallustian Book

That two works in the Sallustian tradition have very long books may well be significant. It seems not yet to have been pointed out that the attention Sallust's *Histories* received in antiquity does not sit all that easily with a work of just five books. The reception of the *Histories* suggests it was a major piece of historiography, yet five books was generally more appropriate for a school-summary or epitome: Florus, for example, would compose his own epitome in

---

[26] This account of the structure of Velleius has been challenged by Rich (2011) 7, who argues on the basis of 2.121.1 and 1.14.1 that Velleius envisaged his work as a single very substantial papyrus roll (or *volumen*) that happened to fall into two *partes*, with an excursus (1.14–18) separating them. This was later (in antiquity) split into two rolls, hence the modern book division. This is not possible in any straightforward sense: had Velleius really written his work in one physical *volumen*, it would have been the longest book in all of antiquity. The origin of this idea goes back to Birt (1882) 320–1, who suggested that Velleius' work was an opisthograph, or a roll written on both sides. This is highly unlikely, however: such a reconstruction would require Book 1 to have been exactly as long as Book 2, or even longer, and could not have been maintained in circulation. It is much more likely that Velleius simply uses *volumen* as a synonym (or synecdoche) for *opus*. This is a rare, but attested sense: Cic. *Brut.* 191 (Antimachus reading *volumen suum*, though he wrote in multiple books), Val. Max. 8.7.10 on Chrysippus (compare Diog. Laert. 7.16), and Juv. 14.100–2 on the *volumen* of Moses (however ignorant Juvenal was, nobody thinks the work of Moses was in one *volumen*). Moreover, Priscian (VI, *GLK* II.248) cites Velleius by a book number and Sulpicius Severus, who was an imitator of Velleius (Klebs (1890) 288–98), begins his two-book *Chronicon* with a reference to it as a *volumen* (1.2.1).

[27] There is some evidence that Valerius Maximus' work (universally transmitted in nine very well-defined books) was known in antiquity in ten books (see Briscoe (1998) 1.xx). This difficulty might be resolved, if the *Facta et dicta memorabilia* originally had a (now lost) index, counted as the first book (as it is with Pliny's *Natural History*), which gave details of the individual *exempla*—something more substantial than the *capitulatio* that was transmitted (Briscoe (1998) I.1–6).

four books roughly two centuries later.[28] If we look at a contemporary five-book Latin work, Cicero's *Tusculan Disputations*, which is transmitted mostly complete, we find it consists of only *c.* 48,000 words or 276,000 characters. Indeed, even if we look at a contemporary quasi-historical work, Caesar's *De bello Gallico*, in seven books, we find it only comes in at 47,000 words, or 285,000 characters. A five-book work of the same average length would contain 33,500 words, or 204,000 characters, a mere one-and-a-half-times the length of the *Jugurtha*. This is difficult to reconcile with what ancient readers of the *Historiae* seem to have encountered.

The resolution of this paradox might lie in the Sallustian book: a subject that has not received sufficient attention.[29] The lone scholar to explore this question in any detail was Gerhard Perl.[30] Examining the remains of the Fleury manuscript of the *Histories* (Orléans MS 192), which straddle Books 2 and 3, Perl put forward a two-step argument: (1) the manuscript was composed of quinions, not quaternions, as earlier scholars had supposed; and (2) on the last verso of the gathering (now f. 15v), he thought he made out the mark *Q. X* in the lower margin.[31] Hence, the first two books must have taken up a hundred folios, which he suggested would work out to approximately fifty Teubner pages each, or roughly the same as a book of Livy.[32] Since the quantity of text on any given page varies considerably both within and between editions, this method of reckoning by Teubner pages is not reliable:

---

[28] The four-book structure of Florus is widely attested in manuscripts (including, as pointed out by Reeve (1988) 479, the only one to include an ancient subscription—a significant detail), as opposed to the two-book structure, which is found only in Bamberg Class. 31 (E.III.22), but which contemporary editions have adopted (cf. Marshall (1983) 164).

[29] It is difficult to demonstrate a negative, but there seems to be no consideration of the length of Sallust's books in Maurenbrecher (1891–3), Funaioli (1920), Schur (1934), Bauhofer (1935), Bloch (1961), La Penna (1963), Syme (1964), Tiffou (1974), Büchner (1982), Reynolds (1991), McGushin (1992–4), Funari (1996), Kraus and Woodman (1997), Ramsey (2013) and (2015), La Penna and Funari (2015), and Gerrish (2019). Nothing on the subject is listed by Leeman (1965).

[30] Perl (1967–8). On the manuscript, see also the foundational article by Hauler (1887), the pioneering analysis of Bloch (1961), and Konrad (1995) 162–5 (whose conclusions need some revision in light of what we say here about Perl). Briefly: the leaves from a fifth-century Sallust manuscript were recycled at Fleury in the seventh or eighth century. Some were used as binding material, some were cut down and reused to copy St Jerome's commentary on Isaiah, which was in turn later recycled for binding material. Portions are now in the Vatican, Orléans, and Berlin, the latter fragments having been purchased (interestingly) in Toledo in 1847. See further below, n. 56.

[31] Perl (1967–8) 32–5. The folio can be viewed in high resolution and with a built-in suite of tools at https://mediatheques.orleans-metropole.fr/ark:/77916/FRCGMBPF-452346 101-01A/D18011385/.

[32] A quinion consists of five sheets, which yield ten folios: ten quinions thus contain 100 folios.

we can refine these calculations by looking at characters. There are *c.* 1,680 characters per folio—21 lines averaging 20 characters in two columns per page—which would give us approximately 84,000 characters per book. This is 7% shorter than Livy's books, which average 90,000 characters each. In any case, Perl's argument is not defensible. First, the marks are so faint that a considerable degree of divination and a little imagination is needed to see 'Q. X', as Perl himself admitted. Second even if a quire mark 'Q. X' could be divined on f. 15v, strictly speaking that would only mean that the quire number *began* with X, as there is no way to know whether it was followed by further characters now irrecoverable. In other words, it could be any number from 10 to 49 (XLVIIII). Third, if it did say 'Q. X' that would contradict his idea that the manuscript was in quinions, since (as Lowe tells us) *q.* was an abbreviation for *quaternio* and as far as we know there is no evidence it was used for *quinio*.[33] Fourth, and finally, whatever mark is there, it cannot be a quire signature, since, as Lowe determined (and he would know), 'the ancient custom manifestly is to place the quire mark in the extreme right-hand corner of the lower margin of the last page', and that part of the original folio has long since disappeared.[34] Whatever mark is there, it almost certainly cannot be a quire signature. Hence, as valuable as the testimony of the Fleury manuscript is, it cannot tell us the original length of Sallust's books, nor the length of the work as a whole. To make progress on that question, we need to try a different approach.[35]

Sallust's monographs are never cited in antiquity with book numbers, which suggests that they were conceived as single-book compositions. This is despite the fact that one of them is very long: the *Catiline* is a relatively normal book at *c.* 12,000 words (*c.* 66,000 characters), but the *Jugurtha* is almost twice as long at 22,000 words (*c.* 128,000 characters). What if, then, the *Histories* contained very long books? If Sallust's books were like those of his imitators Velleius and Hegesippus, or indeed like his own *Jugurtha*, a five-book work would still be a substantial 120,000 words or around 650,000 characters. This would have made it longer than the whole *Corpus Caesarianum* in fourteen books (*c.* 116,000 words) and nearly as long as a whole decade of Livy (compare *c.*

---

[33] Lowe (1928) 60.

[34] Lowe (1928) 59–60. The illustration in Bloch (1961), fig. 2 makes this obvious. For comparison with other manuscripts in capitals, one could look at the Bembine Terence, Vat. lat. 3226, f. 20v (https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Vat.lat.3226), or the Prudentius in Paris lat. 8084, f. 15v, or especially f. 22v, where 'q. III' is so far down in the lower margin that it has been mostly trimmed (https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b52508669w).

[35] All this makes us sceptical that Perl was correct when he suggested the manuscript was in quinions (*contra*, Bloch (1961) 66, 69 who argued for quaternions, a much more natural assumption), though the matter is impossible to resolve without physically inspecting the manuscript.

135,000 words for the fourth decade, e.g.). The *Histories* would have been more than twice the length of the ten books of the *De architectura* (*c.* 58,500 words) by Vitruvius, who implicitly contrasts the short books demanded by technical subjects such as his with the long books of historians (5.*praef.*1–3):

> qui amplioribus voluminibus, imperator, ingenii cogitationes praeceptaque explicaverunt, maximas et egregias adiecerunt suis scriptis auctoritates. quod etiam velim nostris quoque studiis res pateretur, ut amplificationibus auctoritas et in his praeceptis augeretur; sed id non est, quemadmodum putatur, expeditum. non enim de architectura sic scribitur uti historia aut poemata. historiae per se tenent lectores; habent enim novarum rerum varias expectationes … id autem in architecturae conscriptionibus non potest fieri … non minus cum animadvertissem distentam occupationibus civitatem publicis et privatis negotiis, paucis iudicavi scribendum, uti angusto spatio vacuitatis ea legentes breviter percipere possent.

> Those authors, O emperor, who have unfolded the ruminations and lessons of their talent in larger volumes, have added the greatest and most outstanding prestige to their writings. I would wish also that the subject permitted this in our endeavours, so that in these teachings also prestige might be accentuated by enlargement; but that is not, as is thought, convenient. For one does not write about architecture as one writes history or poetry. Histories grip the reader by themselves: for they possess the expectation of variegated new deeds … But that cannot be the case in compositions about architecture … Nonetheless, since I noticed that the state was stuffed full by public affairs and private business, I judged it necessary to write briefly, so that readers might understand these matters in the narrow span of their leisure.

We find this same idea echoed more than a half century later by Seneca (*Ep.* 93.11) who juxtaposes the slim and elegant book (like his own) with a bulky work of history:

> et paucorum versuum liber est et quidem laudandus atque utilis: Annales Tanusii scis quam ponderosi sint et quid vocentur.

> And the *liber* of few *versus* is indeed both praiseworthy and useful. You know how bulky the *Annales* of Tanusius are, and what they are called.

Tanusius Geminus was a contemporary of Sallust, which licenses us to wonder whether the *libri* of the latter were as *ponderosi* as those of the former.[36]

This solution neatly resolves a number of problems. First, it explains the anomaly of Velleius' very long books: an *hommage* to the master. Second, it offers a plausible explanation of why Hegesippus crammed so much into his first and fifth books: the apparent imbalance of the work was not a bug caused by the author's Sallustian structure, but a feature of it. Third, it makes Sallust's books much closer in length to historical and contemporary Greek practice. The works of Thucydides, Polybius, and Diodorus Siculus, to name only a few, are made up of books that average roughly 25,000 words, or 150,000 characters, each. The powerful influence of Thucydides on the ideas and style of Sallust was acknowledged in antiquity and has been extensively studied: it seems likely that it extended to the structure and arrangement.[37] Fourth, it fits well with the surviving fragments, which are extraordinary in their number and variety. Some 140 fragments have been identified from the first book of the *Histories* alone and these come to a total of more than 3,000 words (including two speeches, of Lepidus and Philippus). Yet these are not remotely sufficient to even sketch out the lineaments of a coherent book which, though it started in 78 BC, probably also had a good deal to say about the 80s.[38] The extant fragments would wildly distort a book of 8,000–12,000 words, which would have had to cram its actual narration of events into a very narrow frame. If, however, the first book of Sallust's *Histories* had an original length between 20,000 and 25,000 words, then the extant fragments could be comfortably accommodated in that rather roomier architecture.

The idea of long Sallustian books would also neatly explain the one explicit ancient *testimonium* to tell us directly what the *Histories* were like, a passage that has not received all that much attention. Granius Licinianus, of uncertain date, but generally assigned to the middle of the second century AD, was undoubtedly no *Sallustianus* himself.[39] Nonetheless, he acknowledges that he is stepping

---

[36] On Tanusius, see *FRHist* 44 (Drummond), a sure pilot in deep waters.

[37] Ancient commentators: Vell. Pat. 2.36.2 (*aemulumque Thucydidis Sallustium*); Sen. *Suas.* 6.21; Quint. 10.1.101 and 2.17. Modern scholars: Perrochat (1949) 1–39, Scanlon (1980) (in particular), and Avenarius (1957) 49–56, who also covers (64–6) the influence of Polybius; cf. also the focused study of Meyer (2010) on two letters in Thucydides and Sallust. We take no view here on the chronological arrangement of events in Sallust and whether that was influenced by Thucydides, on which see Rich (2015).

[38] Rawson (1987); Konrad (1997). As Maurenbrecher (1891–3) II.xiv–xxi showed long ago, the extended narrative of various atrocities of the 80s in Firmicus Maternus, *Mathesis* 1.7.25–38 probably goes back to Sallust's *Histories* and gives some sense of their coverage of events. On Firmicus Maternus, see Woudhuysen (2018).

[39] See Criniti (1993), esp. 151–3 on the date.

into dangerous territory when his historical narrative comes to 78 BC, the year Sallust's work commenced (36.30–2):

> Sallusti opus nobis occurrit, sed nos, ut instituimus, moras et non urgentia omittemus. nam Sallustium non ut historic<um ai>unt, sed ut <o>ratorem legendum. nam et temp<ora> reprehendit sua e<t de>licta carpit et cont<iones> in<s>erit et dat in<vicem> loca, montes, flum<ina> et hoc genus a<lia>, et cul<p>a<t> et conpa<rat> disserendo.[40]

> Sallust's work confronts us, but, as we have decided, we will omit anything which slows us down and is not pressing. For it is said that Sallust should be read not as an historian, but as an orator. He critiques his own times and carps at their failings; he inserts speeches and includes throughout descriptions of places, mountains, rivers, and other such things; he passes judgements and makes extended comparisons.

Sallust may have been famous for his *brevitas—illa Sallustiana brevitas* in Quintilian's words (10.1.32)—but it was brevity of style and not of content.[41] This characterisation, we might note, is also very appropriate to our surviving manuscript fragments from Books 2 and 3 of the *Histories*, which are relatively substantial in length and leisurely in pacing.[42]

Finally, the very substantial nature of the work might provide a plausible explanation for why it failed to survive. The *Histories* as we reconstruct them were indeed a monumental work. When the Fleury manuscript was whole, it would have consisted of as many as 400 folios, which is to say that it would have been about the same length as the Puteaneus of Livy's third decade (Paris lat. 5730).[43] It is not so much of a surprise then that Sallust's work suffered the

---

[40] As the number of angle-brackets should make clear, Licinianus' work is preserved only in a badly damaged palimpsest (Reynolds (1983a)). The text comes from Criniti (1981).

[41] Compare Avienius, *Ora Maritima* 33 ff. who seems to have regarded Sallust as important primarily for his lengthy geographical digressions.

[42] On the fragments and their arrangement, see the literature cited above, n. 30. Rich (2015) 25–7 also offers a very helpful overview. We leave to one side here the controversial question of the precise arrangement of fragments, noting only that any reconstruction makes sense only in a narrative that devoted very substantial space to a handful of events. Very long books would, for example, provide a neat explanation for the oddity pointed out by Frassinetti (1975) 397 that the events just of the year 75 BC seem to have taken up some 2,352 manuscript lines, or *c*. 47,000 characters.

[43] Of the first half of the fifth century: *CLA* V.562. Puteaneus, not Puteanus: see Briscoe (2016) viii and n. 10.

same fate as most of Livy's work.[44] None of our long Latin histories before Hegesippus survive entire. Most of them that are extant in some substantial part—some decades of Livy, Tacitus, Ammianus Marcellinus, the *Historia Augusta*, and even Suetonius—came down to the Carolingian period by the slenderest of threads, in single, often damaged witnesses.[45] This is undoubtedly because, even in late antiquity, complete copies of such authors were expensive and rare. For Sallust, there is the additional confounding factor of his *opera minora*, that is, the monographs—much shorter and probably more widely available—which perhaps diminished the appeal of going to the effort and expense of the *opus maius*.[46] There is reason to think as well that a defloration of the speeches from the *Catiline*, *Jugurtha*, and *Histories* (which survives) was already in existence in antiquity.[47]

If there is one broader lesson to emerge from this brief analysis of Hegesippus and Sallust, it is that study of a canonical text and its ancient reception can significantly enrich our knowledge of both. In reconstructing the *Histories*, attention has rightly been lavished on the grammarians who transmit most of our fragments and on those later authors (Plutarch, e.g.) from whom we might recover some sense of what Sallust said about particular individuals and episodes. Much less effort has been expended on those who set out to write about different periods and events in the style that Sallust had made so famous, and with some of his preconceptions. Yet, Hegesippus shows quite how richly informative they might be. Take, for example, his description of Caesar (1.44): *Iulius Caesar triennio et septem mensibus potestate functus perpetua, quia privati* **habitum supergressus** *fuerat, in senatu graves poenas dedit Cassio Brutoque auctoribus.*[48] Compare that with Aurelius Victor's description of Diocletian in comparison with Marius (*Caes.* 39.6): *hinc*

---

[44] On the transmission of Sallust, see Stover and Woudhuysen (2015 [2020]) and Pollard (2018) 23–7.

[45] On all of these, see the entries in Reynolds (1983b). On Ammianus in particular, see Kelly and Stover (2016); on the *Historia Augusta*, see Stover (2020) and Dorfbauer (2020).

[46] Funari (2016) lists three ancient fragments (papyrus and parchment) of the *Histories* against four of the *Jugurtha* and two of the *Catiline*. One should keep in mind, of course, that fragments of a lost work are much more difficult to identify.

[47] This is preserved in Vat. lat. 3864 (s. IX, middle of third quarter, from Corbie: Bischoff, *Katalog* III.6890–2, cf. Reynolds (1991) xiv, xvii–xviii). The antiquity of the collection (in any case, a much more characteristically ancient than medieval activity) is indicated by the independence of its text of the speeches in the *Catiline* and *Jugurtha* from the medieval manuscripts of those works (see Funari (2016) 157–8).

[48] 'Julius Caesar, after he had exercised perpetual power for three years and seven months, since he had exceeded the dress appropriate for a private individual, paid a heavy penalty in the senate at the hands of Brutus and Cassius.'

Marius patrum memoria, hinc iste nostra communem **habitum supergressi**.[49] This coincidence of a rare collocation of words suggests a common model, and the fact that the two authors are Victor and Hegesippus suggests further that that model ought to be Sallust. We have, in fact, a stray quotation in Priscian (14; *GLK* III.39): *Sallustius: 'commune* **habitum** trans**gressus**', *pro 'supergressus'*, which confirms that both authors were using Sallust and suggests the validity of this method even when we do not have the chance survival of the Sallustian original.[50] In 2010, for example, Dorothea Weber published new evidence for a lost fragment from the *Histories*: comparing parallel passages in Prosper of Aquitaine and Hegesippus, she convincingly argued that a Sallustian passage ought to lie behind both of them.[51] Such methods might be taken further. Both Hegesippus (1.8) and Victor (*Caes.* 42.6) use the phrase *materna stirpe*. These are the only surviving instances of the collocation from antiquity, but the fact that they come from two devoted Sallustians makes it very likely that Sallust himself had used the phrase in some lost part of his work.[52]

A more extended example can perhaps give a sense of how fruitful this approach might be.

Hegesippus, *Hist.* 1.36.2:	Aurelius Victor, *Caes.* 23.3:
rursus exagitabat eum **cumulatior in dies** erga **adulescentem amor** universorum et regni periculum.	haec cum augerentur **in dies** ac magis magisque Alexandri, quem comperta Opilii nece Caesarem nobilitas nuncupaverat, **amor cumularetur**, in castris praetoriis tricesimo regni mense oppressus est. (cf. 24.2: Qui quamquam **adolescens** …)
The love of everyone **towards the young man**, **piled up more each day**, and the danger to his kingdom roused him up.	As these things increased **every day**, and **love** of Alexander, whom the quality had proclaimed Caesar when they learnt of the murder of Opilius, **was piled up higher and higher**, he was overthrown in the praetorian camps in the thirtieth month of his reign. (cf. 24.2: Who although **a young man** …)

[49] 'For this reason, Marius in the recollection of our ancestors and this man in our own exceeded the common style of dress.'

[50] 'Sallust: "he went beyond the common style of dress", for "he exceeded".' See Stover and Woudhuysen (2015 [2020]) for an extended discussion of this fragment and where it belongs in the Sallustian corpus. Besides these three, no other authors in antiquity ever uses *habitum trans/supergredi.*

[51] Weber (2010). Cf. Pratje (1874) 40–65, who used Dictys of Crete and Sulpicius Severus to illuminate various difficult passages in Sallust.

[52] In this case, at least, is also possible that Hegesippus was drawing on Victor directly.

No other two passages in surviving Latin literature show this same remarkable parallelism of words and ideas, and indeed few texts have the evocative idea of *amor* piling up.[53] Both also have a notable parallelism of content. Hegesippus is describing the growing popularity of a young man, Aristobulus III (the brother-in-law of Herod the Great), Victor that of Alexander Severus, the cousin of Elagabalus. That both are imitating Sallust is suggested by the fact that Victor's *in dies ac magis magisque* is definitely Sallustian (cf. *Cat.* 5.6 and *Jug.* 7.6). Sallust's *Histories* then ought to have contained a description of how the *amor* for an *adulescens* continued to 'pile up' (*cumulare*) every day (*in dies*). Might this have been a reference to Pompey (cf. fr. 3.15.23 (3.48M.23) [*oratio Macri*]: *Pompeium tantae gloriae adulescentem*)?[54] In any case, the *Sallustiani* deserve serious study not only as a meaningful tradition in Latin historiography, but also for what they might tell us about one of its lost landmarks. At the same time, close study of Sallust's works clearly has much to teach us about the works of the later Roman historians. The *rerum Romanarum florentissimus auctor* (Tac. *Ann.* 3.30.2) was not merely a quarry for well-turned epigrams and archaic vocabulary, nor even just a model for the *brevitas* that made him so famous. He was a source of intellectual inspiration, the guide to how to structure a prologue, or even an entire work.[55]

Sallust's *Histories* are one of the sadder losses of ancient literature, a sadness made even more acute in the late nineteenth century, when fragments of the ancient manuscript began turning up—mournful reminders that the work almost made it.[56] It is certainly not impossible that future

---

[53] cf., e.g., *Laudes domini* 11 (*lex divina tamen meritum cumulabat amoris*); Paulinus of Nola, *Ep.* 17 (*cumulato nunc amore*).

[54] 'Pompey, that young man of such great glory'.

[55] Indeed, on the basis of the collection of *orationes* discussed above (n. 47), it is even possible that ancient readers divided Sallust's *oeuvre* into two parts: a five-book *Historia* and a two-book set of *Bella*. This might explain why Velleius and Sulpicius wrote their works in two books. Elsewhere, we argue that Victor's *Historia* was originally divided into five parts (as against the six-fold division of Dufraigne (1975) xli–xlv).

[56] It seems to be generally assumed (if not always articulated) that the manuscript that arrived at Fleury was a complete text of Sallust, lamentably destroyed there (e.g., Mostert (1989) 48). That is possible, but it is perhaps more likely that what the monks possessed was some disbound leaves from a manuscript of Sallust, which they recycled. In favour of this interpretation is the fact that manuscripts copied at or in the possession of Fleury, including many remarkably early ones, have survived in quite large numbers (amply catalogued by Mostert (1989)). If a Sallust manuscript of several hundred folios had been recycled, we might expect many more fragments to have appeared: compare, for example, the quantity of palimpsested Fronto that survives. The diverse provenances of the surviving fragments (above, n. 30) perhaps strengthen this argument. It is intriguing, in this connection, to note

discoveries might allow even more substantial recoveries of the text. Until then, however, perhaps reading the five books of Hegesippus can give us some impression of what it might have been like to read the five books of Sallust.

JUSTIN A. STOVER

University of Edinburgh   Justin.Stover@ed.ac.uk

GEORGE WOUDHUYSEN

University of Nottingham   George.Woudhuysen@nottingham.ac.uk

Postscript: While this article was in press, a study of the Fleury manuscript of the *Histories* by G. Garbugino was published: 'Osservazioni sulla struttura dei libri II e III delle *Historiae* di Sallustio', *Euphrosyne: Journal for Classical Philology*, 48 (2021) 27–43. Garbugino argues that two surviving bifolia both come from Book 2 of Sallust's work. It is not possible for us to go through his argument in detail here, but suffice it to note that, first, if there is no book division in the Fleury manuscript, then it cannot (*contra* Perl) allow us to calculate the length of the Books in the original, and second, that if all the events mentioned are indeed from Book 2, then it must have been very expansive in its coverage.

that Fleury was the origin of one of the early manuscripts of the *Jugurtha* to have the lacunose passage supplied at the end (Paris lat. 6085); Mostert (1989) 209.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Avenarius, W. (1957) 'Die griechischen Vorbilder des Sallust', *SO* 33: 48–86.

Bammel, E. (1993) 'Von Josephus zu Hegesipp', in *Cristianesimo Latino e cultura Greca sino al sec. IV* (Rome) 37–49.

Barré, H. (1962) *Les Homéliaires Carolingiens de l'École d'Auxerre* (Vatican City).

Bauhofer, K. (1935) *Die Komposition der Historien Sallusts* (Munich).

Bay, C. M. (2018) *The Bible, the Classics, and the Jews in Pseudo-Hegesippus: A Literary Analysis of the Fourth-Century* De Excidio Hierosolymitano *5.2* (diss., Florida State University).

—— (2019) 'Pseudo-Hegesippus at Antioch? Testing a Hypothesis for the Provenance of the *De Excidio Hierosolymitano*', *Bulletin de l'Académie Belge pour l'Étude des Langues Anciennes et Orientales* 8: 97–128.

—— (2020) 'Jewish National Decline and Biblical Figures as Classical *Exempla*: Moses, Aaron, Joshua, David, and Elisha in *De Excidio* 5.2.1', *Journal of the Bible and its Reception* 7: 167–204.

—— (2021a) 'Writing the Jews out of History: Pseudo-Hegesippus, Classical Historiography, and the Codification of Christian Anti-Judaism in Late Antiquity', *Church History* 90: 265–85.

—— (2021b) 'Disease and the Christian Discourse of Jewish Death in *De Excidio Hierosolymitano* 5, 2', *Vox Patrum* 78: 157–82.

—— (2021c) 'On the Multivocality of the Latin Josephus Tradition: A Comparison between the Latin *War*, Latin *Antiquities*, Pseudo-Hegesippus, and Rufinus Based on the Egyptian Pseudo-Prophet Episode (*War* 2.261–263, *Antiquities* 20.169–172a)', in R. F. Glei and M. Goth, edd., *Medievalia et Humanistica* n.s. 46: 1–36.

—— (2021d) 'Exemplarity, Exegesis, and Ethnography: Abraham in Pseudo-Hegesippus as a Test Case for Biblical Reception in Christian Late Antiquity', *Journal of the Bible and its Reception* 8: 35–59.

—— (2021e) 'A New King David for Late Antiquity: Classical Exemplarity and Biblical Personality in Pseudo-Hegesippus', *Journal of Early Christian History* 11: doi: 10.1080/2222582X.2021.1880953.

—— (2021f) 'Pseudo-Hegesippus and the Beginnings of Christian Historiography in Late Antiquity', *Studia Patristica* 126: 255–66.

Bell, A. A. Jr. (1977) *An Historiographical Analysis of the De excidio Hierosolymitano of pseudo-Hegesippus* (diss., University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill).

—— (1980) 'Classical and Christian Traditions in the Work of Pseudo-Hegesippus', *Indiana Social Studies Quarterly* 33: 60–4.

—— (1987) 'Josephus and Pseudo-Hegesippus', in L. H. Feldman and G. Hata, edd., *Josephus, Judaism, and Christianity* (Detroit, Mich.) 349–61.

Birt, T. (1882) *Das antike Buchwesen in seinem Verhältniss zur Litteratur* (Berlin).

Bloch, H. (1961) 'The Structure of Sallust's *Historiae*: The Evidence of the Fleury Manuscript', in S. Prete, ed., *Didascaliae: Studies in Honor of Anselm M. Albareda* (New York) 59–76.

Bolaffi, E. (1949) *Sallustio e la sua fortuna nei secoli* (Rome).

Brakman, C. (1932) 'Ad Hegesippum quem edidit Vincentius Ussani', *Mnemosyne* n.s. 60: 321–35.

Briscoe, J. (1998) *Valeri Maximi facta et dicta memorabilia*, 2 vols (Stuttgart and Leipzig).

—— (2016) *Titi Livi: Ab urbe condita III: libri XXI–XXV* (Oxford).

Brünnert, W. (1883) *Sallust und Dictys Cretensis* (Erfurt).

Büchner, K. (1982) *Sallust*² (Heidelberg).

Callu, J.-P. (1987) 'Le *De Bello Iudaico* de Pseudo-Hégésippe: essai de datation', *Bonner Historia Augusta-Colloquium 1984/1985* (Bonn) 117–42.

Criniti, N. (1981) *Grani Liciniani Reliquiae* (Leipzig).

—— (1993) 'Granio Liciniano', *ANRW* II.34.1: 119–205.

Dorfbauer, L. J. (2020) 'Das Nürnberger Fragment und die karolingische Überlieferung der "Historia Augusta"', *Hermes* 148: 345–77.

Dufraigne, P. (1975) *Aurelius Victor, Livre des Césars* (Paris).

Earl, D. C. (1961) *The Political Thought of Sallust* (Cambridge).

Estève, D. (1987) *L'œuvre historique du pseudo-Hégésippe De bello iudaico: Livre I à IV*, (diss., Paris X-Nanterre).

Everett, N. (2003) *Literacy in Lombard Italy, c. 568–774* (Cambridge).

Fontaine, J. (1975) 'L'affaire Priscillien ou l'ère des nouveaux Catilina: Observations sur le "Sallustianisme" de Sulpice Sévère', in P. T. Brannan, ed., *Classica et Iberica: A Festschrift for the Reverend Joseph M.-F. Marique, S.J.* (Worcester, Mass.) 355–92.

Foraboschi, D. (1967–71) *Onomasticon alterum papyrologicum: supplemento al Namenbuch di F. Preisigke* (Milan).

Fornara, C. W. (1992) 'Studies in Ammianus Marcellinus II: Ammianus' Knowledge and Use of Greek and Latin Literature', *Historia* 41: 420–38.

Frassinetti, P. (1975) 'I fatti di Spagna nel libro II delle "Historiae" di Sallustio', *StudUrb* 49: 381–98.

Funaioli, G. (1920) 'C. Sallustius (10) Crispus', *RE* I.A.2: 1913–55.

Funari, R. (1996) *C. Sallusti Crispi* Historiarum fragmenta, 2 vols (Amsterdam).

—— (2016) 'Outlines for a Protohistory of Sallust's Text', in J. Velaza, ed., *From the Protohistory to the History of the Text* (Frankfurt am Main) 141–64.

Gerrish, J. (2019) *Sallust's* Histories *and Triumviral Historiography: Confronting the End of History* (London and New York).

Gitner, A. (forthcoming) 'Hegesippus', in J. A. Stover, ed., *The Oxford Guide to the Transmission of the Latin Classics*.

Gorman, M. (2006) 'Adomnán's *De locis sanctis*: The Diagrams and the Sources', *Revue Bénédictine* 116: 5–41.

Hauler, E. (1887) 'Die Orléaner Palimpsestfragmente zu Sallusts Historien', *WS* 9: 25–50.

Higbie, C. (2010) 'Divide and Edit: A Brief History of Book Divisions', *HSCPh* 105: 1–31.

Hoyos, B. D. (1989) 'A Forgotten Roman Historian: L. Arruntius and the "True" Causes of the First Punic War', *Antichthon* 23: 51–66.

Kelly, G. (2008) *Ammianus Marcellinus: The Allusive Historian* (Cambridge).

—— and J. A. Stover (2016) 'The Hersfeldensis and the Fuldensis of Ammianus: A Reconsideration', *CCJ* 62: 108–29.

Klebs, E. (1890) 'Entlehnungen aus Velleius', *Philologus* 49: 285–312.

—— (1895) 'Das lateinische Geschichtswerk über den jüdischen Krieg', in *Festschrift zum fünfzigjährigen Doctorjubiläum Ludwig Friedlaender dargebracht von seinen Schülern* (Leipzig) 210–41.

Klostermann, E. (1904) *Das Onomastikon der Biblischen Ortsnamen* (Eusebius Werke III.1; Leipzig).

Konrad, C. F. (1995) 'A New Chronology of the Sertorian War', *Athenaeum* 83: 157–87.

—— (1997) 'Marius at Eryx (Sallust, P. Rylands 473.1)', *Historia* 46: 28–63.

Kraus, C. S. and A. J. Woodman (1997) *Latin Historians* (*G&R New Surveys in the Classics* 27; Oxford).

Kurfess, A. (1972) *C. Sallustius Crispus: Catilina, Iugurtha Fragmenta Ampliora*³ (Leipzig).

La Penna, A. (1963) 'Per la ricostruzione delle "Historiae" di Sallustio', *SIFC* n.s. 35: 5–68.

—— and R. Funari (2015) *C. Sallusti Crispi Historiae I: Fragmenta 1.1–146* (Berlin and Boston).

Leeman, A. D. (1965) *A Systematical Bibliography of Sallust (1879–1964)* (Leiden).

Leoni, T. (2007) 'Translations and Adaptations of Josephus's Writings in Antiquity and the Middle Ages', *Ostraka: Rivista di antichità* 16.2: 481–92.

—— (2009) 'The Text of Josephus' Works: An Overview', *JSJ* 40: 149–84.

Lowe, E. A. (1928) 'More Facts About Our Oldest Latin Manuscripts', *CQ* 22: 43–62.

MacRae, D. (2021) '*Ludibrium Paulinae*: Historiography, Anti-Pagan Polemic, and Aristocratic Marriage in *De excidio Hierosolymitano* 2.4', *Journal of Late Antiquity* 14: 229–56.

Marshall, P. K. (1983): 'Florus', in Reynolds (1983b) 164–6.

Mason, S. (2016) 'Josephus's *Judean War*', in H. H. Chapman and S. Rodgers, edd., *A Companion to Josephus* (Chichester) 13–35.

Maurenbrecher, B. (1891–3) *C. Sallusti Crispi Historiarum reliquiae*, 2 vols (Leipzig).

McGushin, P. (1992–4) *Sallust:* The Histories, 2 vols (Oxford).

Meyer, E. A. (2010) 'Allusion and Contrast in the Letters of Nicias (Thuc. 7.11–15) and Pompey (Sall. Hist. 2.98M)', in C. S. Kraus, J. Marincola, and C.

Pelling, edd., *Ancient Historiography and its Contexts: Studies in Honour of A. J. Woodman* (Oxford) 97–117.

Molinier-Arbo, A. (2020) 'Une lecture romaine et chrétienne de la chute de Jérusalem: l'adaptation latine de la *Guerre des Juifs* attribuée à Hégésippe', in F. Chapot, ed., *Les récits de la destruction de Jérusalem (70 ap. J.-C.): contexts, representations et enjeux, entre Antiquité et Moyen Âge* (Turnhout) 233–57.

Mostert, M. (1989) *The Library of Fleury: A Provisional List of Manuscripts* (Hilversum).

Mras, K. (1960): *see* Ussani and Mras (1960).

Nicholson, O. P. (2017) 'The Christian Sallust: Lactantius on God, Man and History', in id. and M. Vinzent, edd., *The Classical or Christian Lactantius* (*Studia Patristica* 80; Leuven) 119–37.

Oakley, S. P. (2020) 'Point and Periodicity: The Style of Velleius Paterculus and Other Latin Historians Writing in the Early Principate', in M. C. Scappaticcio, ed., *Seneca the Elder and his Rediscovered* Historiae ab initio bellorum civilium*: New Perspectives on Early-Imperial Roman Historiography*, (Berlin and Boston, Mass.) 199–234.

O'Gorman, E. (2007) 'The Politics of Sallustian Style', in J. Marincola, ed., *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, 2 vols (Oxford) II.379–84.

O'Loughlin, T. (1995) 'Dating the *De Situ Hierusolimae*: The Insular Evidence', *Revue Bénédictine* 105: 9–19.

—— (2007) *Adomnán and the Holy Places: The Perceptions of an Insular Monk on the Locations of the Biblical Drama* (London and New York).

Owens, E. L. (1958) *Phraseological Parallels and Borrowings in Ammianus Marcellinus from Earlier Latin Authors* (diss., Birkbeck College, University of London).

Perl, G. (1967–8) 'Der alte Codex der "Historiae" Sallusts', *Bulletin d'information de l'Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes* 15: 29–38.

Perrochat, P. (1949) *Les modèles grecs de Salluste* (Paris).

Pertz, G. H. (1874) *Monumenta Germaniae Historica: Scriptores* XXIII (Hannover).

Pollard, R. M. (2015) 'The *De excidio* of "Hegesippus" and the Reception of Josephus in the Early Middle Ages', *Viator* 46: 65–100.

—— (2018) 'Flavius Josephus: The Most Influential Classical Historian of the Early Middle Ages', in E. Screen and C. West, edd., *Writing the Early Medieval West: Studies in Honour of Rosamond McKitterick* (Cambridge) 15–32.

Pratje, H. (1874) *Quaestiones Sallustianae ad Lucium Septimium et Sulpicium Severum Gai Sallusti Crispi imitatores spectantes* (Göttingen).

Raimondi, M. (2011) 'Ambrogio ed Egesippo nella Roma del IV secolo: una nuova prospettive per un vecchio problema', *Rivista di Storia della Chiesa in Italia* 65: 135–47.

Ramsey, J. T. (2013) *Sallust: The War with Catiline. The War with Jugurtha*, rev. edn. of J. C. Rolfe, 1921 (Cambridge, Mass. and London).

—— (2015) *Sallust: Fragments of the Histories, Letters to Caesar* (Cambridge, Mass. and London).

Rawson, E. (1987) 'Sallust on the Eighties?', *CQ* 37: 163–80; repr. in ead., *Roman Society and Culture* (Oxford, 1991) 546–69.

Reeve, M. D. (1988) 'The Transmission of Florus' *Epitoma de Tito Livio* and the *Periochae*', *CQ* 38: 477–91.

Reynolds, L. D. (1983a) 'Granius Licinianus', in id. (1983b) 180.

——, ed. (1983b) *Texts and Transmission: A Survey of the Latin Classics* (Oxford).

—— (1991) *C. Sallusti Crispi: Catilina, Iugurtha; Historiarum fragmenta selecta; Appendix Sallustiana* (Oxford).

Rich, J. (2011) 'Velleius' History: Genre and Purpose', in E. Cowan, ed., *Velleius Paterculus: Making History* (Swansea and London) 73–92.

—— (2015) 'Structuring Roman History: The Consular Year and the Roman Historical Tradition', *Histos* 5: 1–43.

Ross, A. (2016) *Ammianus' Julian: Narrative and Genre in the* Res Gestae (Oxford).

Scanlon, T. F. (1980) *The Influence of Thucydides on Sallust* (Heidelberg).

Schreckenberg, H. (1972) *Die Flavius-Josephus-Tradition in Antike und Mittelalter* (Leiden).

Schur, W. (1934) *Sallust als Historiker* (Stuttgart).

de Senneville-Grave, G. (1999) *Sulpice Sévère: Chroniques* (Paris).

Skutsch, O. (1975) 'The Second Book of Propertius', *HSCPh* 79: 229–33.

Somenzi, C. (2009) *Egesippo–Ambrogio: formazione scolastica e cristiana a Roma alla metà del IV secolo* (Milan).

Stover, J. A. (2020) 'New Light on the *Historia Augusta*', *JRS* 110: 167–98.

—— (2021) 'The Ciceronian Book and its Influence: A Statistical Approach', *Ciceroniana On Line* 5.2: 263–84.

—— (forthcoming) 'The Book in the Roman and Post-Roman World', in G. Kelly and A. Pelttari, edd., *The Cambridge History of Later Latin Literature*.

Stover, J. A. and M. Kestemont (2016) 'The Authorship of the *Historia Augusta*: Two New Computational Studies', *BICS* 59: 140–57.

—— (2017) 'Reassessing the Apuleian Corpus: A Computational Approach to Authenticity', *CQ* 66: 645–72.

Stover, J. A. and G. Woudhuysen (2017) 'Giovanni de Matociis and the *Codex Oratorianus* of the *De viris illustribus urbis Romae*', *Exemplaria Classica* 21: 125–48.

—— (2015 [2020]) 'Aurelius Victor and the Ending of Sallust's *Jugurtha*', *Hermathena* 199: 93–134.

—— (2021) 'Jordanes and the Date of the *Epitome de Caesaribus*', *Histos* 15: 150–88.

Syme, R. (1964) *Sallust* (Berkeley and Los Angeles).

Tiffou, E. (1974) *Essai sur la pensée morale de Salluste à la lumière de ses prologues* (Paris).

Trovato, S. (2010) 'Sallust's *Historiae* in Eumenius' *Pro instaurandis scholis:* A New Source for Fragment I.11 Maurenbrecher', *Revue d'histoire des textes*, n.s. 5: 281–90.

Ussani, V. (1932) *Hegesippi qui dicitur Historiae libri V*, vol. 1 (Vienna).

—— and K. Mras (1960) *Hegesippi qui dicitur Historiae libri V*, vol. 2 (Vienna).

van Andel, G. K (1976) *The Christian Concept of History in the Chronicle of Sulpicius Severus* (Amsterdam).

Van Hoof, L. and P. Van Nuffelen (2020) *The Fragmentary Latin Histories of Late Antiquity (AD 300-620): Edition, Translation and Commentary* (Cambridge).

Vogel, F. (1878) 'Ὁμοιότητες Sallustianae', in I. Müller and E. Wölfflin, edd., *Acta seminarii philologici Erlangensis* (Erlangen) I.313–65.

Weber, D. (2010) 'Eine spätantike Sallust-Reminiszenz? Zu Prosper, *De vocatione omnium gentium* 1.4.7', *Act. Ant. Hung.* 50: 89–96.

Woodman, A. J. (1969) 'Sallustian Influence on Velleius Paterculus', in J. Bibauw, ed., *Hommages à Marcel Renard* (Brussels) I.785–99.

—— (1977) *Velleius Paterculus: The Tiberian Narrative, 2.94–131* (Cambridge).

Woudhuysen, G. (2018) 'Uncovering Constans' Image', in D. W. P. Burgersdijk and A. J. Ross, edd., *Imagining Emperors in the Later Roman Empire (Cultural Interactions in the Mediterranean* 1; Leiden) 158–82.

Zorzetti, N. (1982) *Iulii Exuperantii Opusculum* (Leipzig).