

had the battle been fought where Livy puts it there could have been little or no fighting in this defile. Further inquiries as to the district within which skulls have been found might lead to positive conviction as to the site of the battle.

It is generally supposed that Livy's account is exceedingly clear; indeed quite recently I saw it referred to as one of the few exceptions to the vagueness with which ancient historians describe battles. But the account, though as usual with Livy's

work it presents a smooth surface, does not bear close inspection. The discrepancies in it have been well pointed out by Voigt (*Philologische Wochenschrift*, p. 1883, iii. 1580 ff.). I will only call attention here to the following phrases—*ab tergo ac super caput †haud dispectae† insidiae; in pontem lateraque pugnari coeptum est; ab lateribus montes ac lacus, a ponte et ab tergo hostium acies clauderat*—and ask how they can be reconciled with one another.

A. TILLEY.

SOME PASSAGES IN THE *THEBAID* OF STATIUS.

I. 224.

nunc geminas punire domos, quis sanguinis auctor
ipse ego, descendo. Perseos alter in Argos
scinditur, Aonias fluit hic ab origine Thebas.

227 mens cunctis † imposita manet: quis funera Cadmi
nesciat et totiens excitam a sedibus imis
Eumenidum bellasse aciem, etc....
.....uix lucis spatio, uix noctis abactae
enumerare queam mores gentemque profanam.

The word always selected for emendation in l. 227 is *imposita* (*infesta*, *inmota*, *infesta* and many other suggestions have been made). I believe that *imposita* is sound and *cunctis* corrupt. Read:

mens *cunis* imposita manet.

'The temper implanted in their cradle is unchanged'; they are still a wicked generation. *Cunis imposita*, meaning *illis imposita in cunis*, requires no illustration.

I. 517.

uario strepit icta tumultu
regia: pars ostro † tenues auroque sonantes
emunire toros alteque inferre tapetas.

Müller *ostro tinctos* (badly; *ostro stratos* would be better). Read:

pars ostro *ardentes* auroque sonantes,

the participles balancing each other. *ardentes* is just the word required to balance *sonantes*;

cp. Valerius Flaccus iii. 340, *ardentes murice uestes* imitated from Virgil's *ardebat murice laena*.

II. 637.

exit et in fratrem cognataque pectora telo
conserit; ille oculos et adhuc in luce
natantes
sistit et aspecta germani morte resolvit.

So the Puteaneus. The other MSS. have *etiamnum* for *et adhuc*. It seems to be generally thought that both traditions are corrupt; Kohlmann asterizes the passage. With either reading the sense is of course the same and seems to me excellent. *in luce natantes* is opposed to *in tenebris mersos*. It is impossible, it may be observed, to retain in the figure the mode of expression which is usually employed in speaking of literal swimming. On the analogy of the opposition between *in aqua* (not *in aere*) *natare* and *in aqua mergi*, we might expect *in tenebris natare*; but as a limit between light and darkness is not familiar like limits between air and water, such an expression would suggest a totally different meaning. I dwell on this because I think that the suspicion thrown on the passage is due to a misapprehension of the metaphor, which must not be confounded with our expression 'his eyes swam.' Everything expressed in Markland's *extrema* or Bährens' *casura in*, is suggested fully by *et adhuc* or *etiamnum*.

As between these two readings, the presumption is of course strongly in favour of the Puteaneus, whose superiority to its fellows is abundantly proved on every page. I should also prefer *et adhuc* in point of sound. As *etiamnum* was a favourite word of Statius (see e.g. iii. 227, vii. 515, xii. 21,

424, 595, 725; and v. 326, where all the MSS. have *etiamnum* except P and G which preserve the true reading *etiumnunc*), it might easily have been introduced by a copyist.

II. 670.

iam sublata manus cassos defertur in ictus
tardatique gradus, clipeum nec sustinet
umbo
mutatum spoliis, gelidus cadit imber anhelo
pectore, etc.

In correcting *mutatum*, we must observe that no intelligible sense can be made on the hypothesis that *umbo* is the subject of *sustinet*. Thus Lachmann's *nutantem* will not do, though there can be little doubt that some part of *nutare* is concealed in *mutatum*. Bährens advanced a step with his

clipeum nec sustinet, umbo
nutat cui spoliis,

but this is too far from the MSS., and the construction is not quite like Statius. I propose to read

clipeum nec sustinet, umbo
nutat dum spoliis, gelidus cadit imber anhelo
pectore.

It is quite a trick of Statius to use *umbo* immediately after *clipeus*, as a synonym; cp. viii. 704 multa rigent *clipeco*. densis iam consitus hastis ferratum quatit *umbo* nemus, and again xii. 665.

III. 378.

ibo libens certusque mori, licet optima
coniunx
tauditusque iterum revocet socer.

Polynices is speaking. Köstlin proposed *Argivusque*, Bährens *cunctatusque*. Read, with far less change,

augustusque iterum revocet socer.
augustus balances *optima*.

X. 306.

huic languida ceruix
in laeuum cogente deo mediaque iacebant
colla † *relicta* † *lyra*.

(*reiecta*, Bährens, Kohlmann.) Read

colla *recepta* *lyra*.

Compare iii. 397 ingentique *exceptus* terga
columna, iv. 433 effusam pharetra cervicem
excepte quiescit.

X. 537.

qualiter aut Malean aut alta Ceraunia
supra
cessantes in nube sedent nigrisque *teguntur*
collibus et subitae saliant in uela procellae.

So edd. from one of the Behottian MSS. *teguntur* might be acceptable if we had only to reckon with the reading of B (Bambergensis) and some other MSS., *leguntur*. But the Puteaneus has *locuntur*, and S (Parisinus) has *legantur*. These variants, I contend, point distinctly to reading

nigrisque *locantur*
collibus,

'lodge themselves on the black hills.' For this verb in Statius see iii. 497 *membra locat scopulo*.

J. B. BURY.

EPICURUS AND EROTION.

WE know from Diogenes Laertius x. 7 that Erotion was one of Epicurus's disciples. The words of Diogenes are *συνείναι τ' αὐτῷ* (sc. Τιμοκράτης φησὶν) *τε καὶ Μητροδώρῳ ἐταίρας καὶ ἄλλας, Μαρμάριον καὶ Ἡδείαν καὶ Ἐρώτιον καὶ Νικίδιον*.

It appears to me very probable that the lady in question appeared in an admittedly corrupt passage of the *De Finibus*. In book i. § 25 Cicero is arguing against the idea that an orthodox Epicurean could hold that anything is pleasant in itself, apart from its reference to the body. 'Do not tell me,' he

says to Torquatus, 'that your literary studies are pleasant to you *in themselves* (ipsa), and that in like manner your ancestors' famous deeds were pleasant *in themselves* to them. Nunquam hoc ita defendit Epicurus, *neque vero tu* aut quisquam eorum, qui aut saperet aliquid aut ista didicisset. The whole theory of Epicurus', Cicero goes on to say, 'is overthrown, if you allow that there is any pleasure but what is referable to the body. No orthodox Epicurean can possibly maintain such a proposition.'

The words *neque vero tu*—the reading,