

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 Fragments of an Epitome of Livy Discovered at Oxyrhynchus

J. S. Reid

The Classical Review / Volume 18 / Issue 06 / July 1904, pp 290 - 300
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00990346, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00990346

How to cite this article:

J. S. Reid (1904). On the Fragments of an Epitome of Livy Discovered at Oxyrhynchus. The Classical Review, 18, pp 290-300 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00990346

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

405 *convectant calle angusto ; pars grandia
trudunt—*

431 *non iam coniugium antiquum, quod
prodidit, oro—*

538 *iussa sequar? quiane auxilio iuvat ante
levatos—*

633 *namque suam patria antiqua cinis ater
habebat—*

In Book V :

170 *radit iter laevum interior, subitoque
priorem—*

250 *victori chlamydem auratam, quam plu-
rima circum—*

316 *corripiunt spatia audito limenque relin-
quunt—*

468 *ast illum fidi aequales genua aegra
trahentem—*

608 *multa movens, necdum antiquum satu-
rata dolorem.*

In most of these it will easily be perceived that the exception is rule-proving ; either in the weight of the word, or in the general sense and rhetoric there is something which justifies to the ear the unusual rhythm. If any may be regarded as a mere license, it is II. 300, not one of the poet's strongest or happiest lines. Those verses, which obey the rule and show tmesis, are everywhere the vast majority.

It is worth notice, though not strictly within the limits of our subject, that almost every one of the exceptions here quoted exhibits an elision before the exceptional word, and has thus an 'apparent caesura' (in Mr. Winbolt's terminology) at the penthemimeral place. And this is usual, though not absolutely universal ; see *Georg.* 2. 5, an interesting case.

Many other applications of the principle may be observed. Thus, although Virgil's

*per conubia nostra, per in-ceptos hyme-
naeos*

is partly shaped by recollection of Catullus, it exhibits a Virgilian nicety in the tmesis which marks the place of the hephthemimeral

caesura, and thus brings the verse almost within the ordinary Virgilian rules. Catullus, in his similar verse, has the indivisible *optatos* at that place.

Again, a common combination of caesurae in Virgil is this

infandum, | regina, | iubes | renovare dolorem

occurring, Mr. Winbolt says,¹ about once in 11 verses. Much more rare, 'about 1 in 400,' is the type having only the two latter of these three caesurae

*cornua detorquentque ; | ferunt | sua flamina
classsem.*

Now in these circumstances we cannot treat as indifferent the fact that in the much more rare type the missing caesura is represented by a tmesis. Every one of Mr. Winbolt's four examples shows this phenomenon, which is scarcely less important for Virgilian metre than the caesurae themselves : add to the above

*omnia cor-ripuisse : | metum | iam ad limina
ferri—*

*impulit ef-funditque | solo, | Turnusque secu-
tus—*

*moenia, sub-limemque | feres | ad sidera
caeli.*

Whether this rule is universal I have not ascertained, and probably exceptions may be found. But it is manifest that Virgil felt the tmesis, and calculated on its rhythmical effect.

To treat the topic fully is not the purpose of this note, still less to make any complaint against Mr. Winbolt. It is the very fulness of his treatise which leads me to suppose that a topic, for which he does not find adequate place, requires some further notice. And indeed I have never seen any treatment answering quite sufficiently to the facts.

A. W. VERRALL.

¹ P. 83.

ON THE FRAGMENTS OF AN EPITOME OF LIVY DISCOVERED AT OXYRHYNCHUS.

By the kindness of Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt, and Mr. Warde Fowler, I have had the advantage of studying in proof the

portion of the new Oxyrhynchus volume which contains these fragments. A good many of the suggestions made by me

privately have been used in the publication ; but much matter more or less debateable the editors were of course unable to use. In the present article I propose to confine myself to the most necessary task, the constitution of the text, dealing with subject-matter only in close connexion with the text, and leaving over many aspects of the new discovery for discussion in a future article. In studying the fragments (which, or their compiler, I denote by O, indicating where necessary the original by O¹ and the corruptions by O²) one is struck by their close correspondence with the actual words of Livy when those have been preserved. Much of Livy's wording has filtered down into the works of late compilers, and the safest guide to the restoration of the epitome, where Livy is lost, is the extant literature. I have endeavoured to avoid repeating matter contained in the publication by Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt, along with which this article is intended to be read. The references to lines are to those of the published text. I use Epit. (with GH) for the old Epitome of Livy.

BOOK 37.

Lines 1-6: the compiler has an eye for the Spanish peninsula throughout. The excerpts from Livy 37 only begin with c. 46 § 7, but they include two references to Spanish affairs. The names of the consuls for 189 B.C. are taken from c. 48 and the story of the pontifex maximus and the flamen from c. 51. It is natural therefore to refer l. 3 [*Aetoli*]*s pax iterum data est* to c. 49. But, curiously, that passage displays the hostility of the Romans to the Aetolians as extreme. Has O been misled by the mention earlier in the book of *indultae* twice accorded to the Aetolians? (c. 1 § 1 and c. 7 § 6.) Or has O anticipated the mention of the peace in 38 cc. 11-12? Against this is the fact that he adheres almost slavishly to Livy's order. It is curious indeed that in his extracts from 38 he does not mention the final peace. It is more likely that the text here is wrong, and that *non* has dropt out before *data*, or rather that *data* is an error for *negata*, for which cf. l. 202 *praemium negatum* and Liv. 37 § 1 *negari pacem*. The *iterum* refers back to c. 1. In ll. 5, 6 *pro-ficisci in Sardiniam* [. . .] *ant*, the letters *ant* represent a corruption of a perfect ending in *vit*, the word being perhaps *impedivit* or even *denegavit* rather than *retinuit* or *tenuit*, which are less suited to the infinitive. In l. 5 perhaps the sight of *Quirinalem* in Livy's text caused the use of the wrong case.

l. 7: [*vastati*]. Livy here has *fusi fugatique*; cf. ll. 13; 83. As to *Rhodia desoli deducta*, the original compiler may have mentioned (like Epit.) both the Rhodian embassy about Soli (c. 56) and the foundation of Bononia. Perhaps our scribe ought to have written either *Bononia de seto deducta* (Liv. 37, 57 § 7) or *B. de Boiis d.* (*ib.* § 8 *de Gallis Boiis*).

ll. 8-10: the verbal errors in the account of Glabrio's candidature are not easy to explain. For *minantes* [*accusa*]*tionem compellitoribus* perhaps *minanti a. competitori* (Cato) should be adopted. For *composito* GH give *proposito*, but the word may be right ('by arrangement'); it would describe fairly the withdrawal of the candidature by Glabrio, along with the dropping of the fine by the tribunes.

BOOK 38.

l. 12: this first sentence like the first in Epit. covers cc. 1-12.

l. 13: no battle was fought with the Gallograeci in Pamphylia, but O has been deceived by the mention of that district in c. 13 § 11 and c. 15 § 7.

l. 14: [*tota Asi*]*a liberata* must be right, in view of c. 16 § 12 and c. 48 §§ 1, 5.

ib.: O has taken *captiva* from one sentence of Liv. (c. 24 § 2) and *Orgiagontis* from the next, while *nobilis* (unless deduced by O from the story) represents *eximia forma*. Both Epit. and O go beyond the text in saying that the lady slew her oppressor.

ll. 15, 16: *aurum admit* [*t*] *poscentem occidit*. A crabbed passage. It is natural to suppose with GH that O¹ had *pensantem*, which is in Livy; but how to complete the reading with this is hard to see. Maybe *poscentem* is a mistake for *portantes*, referring to the *duo ne plus necessarii* who were allowed to bring the ransom. In that case read *admittentem*, which would partly account for the change of *portantes* to *poscentem*; for assimilation is a besetting sin of O; cf. ll. 33, 37, 95, 100, 115. This solution I now prefer to my earlier conjecture *admissos suos poscentem*.

l. 18: from cc. 26-34, but a misdescription. There was much killing, but no *proelia* between Achaeans and Lacedaemonians.

ll. 20, 21: read [*immensa p*] *raeda per Thra[eces] rapta*.

l. 26: in the account of the trial of P. Scipio, *ne revocaretur* represents Livy's *ne causam dicat*.

ll. 27, 8: *L. Cornelius Scipio dam[natus]*

...]. *eni*. Comparing Liv. c. 55 § 9 we may with probability write *L. C. S. d. XL pecunias*.

BOOK 39.

l. 30: *Ligures perdomiti*. A stronger statement than Livy's.

l. 31: $v[iae\ Flamini\ e]t\ Aemiliana\ munita[e]$. So GH. But this gives only a loose correspondence with Livy's words *viamque a Placentia usque Ariminum perduxit* (sc. *M. Aemilius*), which appear in Euit. as *M. Aemilius . . . viam Placentia usque Ariminum perductam Flaminiae iunxit*. One would at least expect in O *iunctae* (or possibly *unitae*) if the rest of the reading given by GH be kept.

l. 32: *Latinorum [multitudo hom]inum coacta ab Roma redire* would accord with Liv., who has *redire* and *multitudine onerante* in § 6 and *multitudinem* above. Another possible restoration, looking to Liv., is *Latinorum [civium per Terent]i{n}um*, but this is less likely.

l. 33: (triumph of Manlius). Liv. suggests *Cn. Manlius de Gallograecis in triumpho tulit aurum*. The *m* before *de* is a remnant of *Manlium* written for *Manlius* (cf. n. on ll. 15, 16) and the termination of *aurum* was written *am*. The words that follow, viz. [*.pe*]cunia quae trans[lata erat]tis p[e]r[s]oluta must be further emended from Livy's text: *senatus consultum factum est ut ex pecunia quae in triumpho translata esset, stipendium collatum a populo in publicum, quod eius solutum antea non esset, solveretur. Vicenos quinos et semisses in milia aeris quaestores urbani . . . solverunt*. Hence read *e pecunia quae translata erat XXVS aeris persolutum* (probably this word in O² has been assimilated to *pecunia*).

l. 38: *Rutilius* for *Rutilus*, as in l. 50 *Licinio* for *Licino*.

l. 40: the Bacchanalian conspiracy. Probably O¹ had *indicium deferentibus* not *referentibus* (cf. Liv. c. 14 § 2 *delata*). In this connexion *deferre* was so familiar all through the Imperial time that it is not likely to have been changed. The gap after *Bacchanalia sublata* may be filled up by *per senatum* or *s-consulto* (less likely). Some mention of the senate is highly probable.

ll. 40, 41: it is curious that *Hispani subacti* is taken from a hypothetical statement in Liv. c. 22 § 10 *H. subacti forent* etc.

ll. 45 sq.: here Livy's order is not followed. The words *Gallis in Italiam transgressis* come from c. 22 § 6 *Galli Transalpini transgressi in Venetiam*. But in c. 45 § 7 these Gauls are still in the valley

of the Po, and a praetor receives orders to attend to them. Marcellus is not named before c. 54. He requires L. Porcius the proconsul to call on the Gauls to surrender, and they comply. The word *persuasit* is odd, as the barbarians were driven out (c. 55 § 4 *Gallis . . . exactis*). I should write [*p*]ersuasit [*ut Italia excedere*]nt rather than *trans Alpes redirent* (GH); relying on Liv. c. 54 § 13 *Galli . . . Italia excesserunt*.

l. 49: *Ligures fu[gati] llis accepta*. Nothing in Liv. explains *accepta*, which must be corrupt. Some words in c. 32 § 2 *Sempronius . . . Ligures vastando urendoque vicos et castella*, seem to lead on to *Ligures fusi, vicis castellis accensis*; or *L. fusi, vici et castella accensa*. At first I thought . . . *llis accepta* might be a relic of *repulsis acceptis* in reference to the consular elections narrated in Liv. c. 32, where (in most texts) *repulsis* twice occurs. But syntax renders the solution difficult.

l. 51: *homini ced* ∞ [.] *efici damnati*. This should probably run *hominum ad* ∞ ∞ *Naevio pr. veneficiv d.*; cf. Liv. c. 41 § 6 (*Naevius*) *ad duo milia hominum damnavit*.

l. 52: write *L. Quintius Fla[mininus cos. in] Gallia* and compare c. 42 § 5 *consularem*; § 8 *in Galliam provinciam*; Cic. *Cato m. 42 cum esset L. Flamininus consul in Gallia*.

l. 56: perhaps a *Catone cen[s. senatorio loco motus]*, in accordance with c. 42 § 6 *senatorio loco movit*.

l. 60: *per triduum* should fill the gap; see c. 46 § 2 *P. Licinii funeris causa . . . ludi funebres per triduum facti*. A little later I should prefer *defunctum quod* to *evenit id quod* (GH) because of Livy's *defunctosque volgo ferebant quod inter fatalia vates cecinissent*, a passage which also indicates *vates cecinerat fato* (or *fatale*) *tabernacula in foro futura* for the remainder of the sentence in O.

l. 63-5: the cure of these lacunose lines is not easy. The first portion is related beyond question to Liv. c. 50 § 11 *memoriae mandatum est tres claros imperatores eo anno decessisse, Philopoemenem Hannibalem P. Scipionem*, and probably the remainder concerns Hannibal's death in c. 51. The original may have run nearly thus: *interisse tradunt* (or *traditum*) *Philopoemenem Hannibalem P. Scipionem. Flamininus Hannibalem obire* (or *mori*) *coegit*.

BOOK 40.

l. 68: something like *Ligurum bellum decretum a senatu*, from c. 1.

l. 69: only the mysterious *ellitesin* is preserved in this l., which was probably drawn from c. 1 in *Hispaniam utramque quae ducerentur quattuor milia peditum civium Romanorum et ducenti equites etc.* Hence the l. may be completed thus: *equites pedites in Hispaniam utramque scripti.*

l. 70: the tale of Theoxena is from c. 4. The following will give the gist, at least, of the original: *Theoxen[a enecatis liberis] in mare[m] fugiens se iccit.*

l. 72: (the strife of Demetrius and Perseus). For the queer *grimonibus* the most likely correction is *criminibus* as in c. 12 § 6 *conficti . . . criminis*, also c. 13 § 1, and c. 23 § 8 *Persei criminibus*. But *factis querimoniis*, a phrase found in literature, is also possible. The story in O was fashioned somewhat thus: *D. factis criminibus [accusatus a fratre] per patrem coactus causam perorare, or peroravit if coactus is an error for vocatus (cf. c. 8 § 4 vocari . . . iussit).*

l. 74: the error in *Lentulo* is due to Liv. in whose text O perhaps also found *quod* for *quot*.

l. 75: perhaps O abbreviated *libri* to *li*, and l. 82 possibly ended with *his fuit*.

BOOK 48.

l. 83: *adversus Cha[r]taginienses* may have been preceded by a reference to the mighty battle between the forces of Masinissa and Carthage which Scipio witnessed from an eminence, even as Zeus looked on at the Homeric battles. (The comparison is Scipio's own.) Kornemann's suggestion that in Epit. 48 *Servius Sulpicius Galba male adversus Lusitanos pugnavit*, the expression *male* means 'perfidiously' not 'unsuccessfully' seems to me improbable. The good fortune of Galba is represented by Appian. *Ib.* 58 as trivial; his defeat as crushing. Orosius omits mention of his luck and says that only he and a handful of his men escaped destruction. Epit. takes the same line as Orosius, but O has (perversely) laid stress on the unimportant successes, unless we suppose that *Lusitani vastati* is a blundering version of *Lucretius consul, cum Claudius Marcellus cui successerat pacasse omnes Celtiberiae populus videretur* (Epit.). Or again, O may have had before him in Livy something coinciding with Appian's account of Galba's operations when he began to recover from disaster: *Ib.* 59 [Λούκουλος] τὴν Λυσιτανίαν ἐπὶ μέρους ἐπόρθει. ἐπόρθει δὲ καὶ ὁ Γάλβας ἐπὶ θάτερα.

l. 84: that O mentioned a Cethegus charged with *stuprum* is certain. It is just

possible that this may be C. Cornelius Cethegus who attacked Galba (Epit. 49). In that case we are reminded of a charge of indecency which was hurled by Galba at another antagonist, L. Scribonius Libo (Cic. *De Or.* 2, 263). The *P. Decim* of O recalls indeed Liv. 39, c. 39 § 1 where a C. Decimius and a P. Cornelius are brought together, but it is a coincidence merely. If *Decim* be supposed a fragment of the name *Decimius*, two of the name played a part in the politics of the period, a C. *Decimius* several times mentioned in Liv. 42-5, while L. *Decimius* appears in 42. If however *su* is part of a cognomen, we may read *P. Decii Subulonis*; this name occurs several times in Liv. 43-5. On the whole this seems more likely. Kornemann's conjecture that Cornelius is a centurion who was '*mori coactus*' in prison because of *stuprum* in the case of an *adulescens ingenuus* (Val. Max. 6, 1, 10), occurred to me also, but I rejected it because it is hard to reconcile *damnatus* in l. 86 with *mori coactus*. To all appearance in O there is allusion to a trial for *stuprum per vim illatum* and to a pecuniary penalty imposed. The letters *dcu* (or *i*) in l. 85 point to a sum of money, perhaps *DC aeris*. I still think *ancillam* the most probable correction for *a.ictam*.

BOOK 49.

ll. 88, 9: Oros. 4, 22 § 1 and Epit. 49 shew that Liv. is closely followed.

ll. 89, 90: *Uticenses [b]enigne locant auxiliare*. The corruption is deep; perhaps underlying it is the Livian phrase *benigne locuti auditique* (43, c. 17 § 4). If *auxiliati* (*sc. sunt*) is the true lection (GH), *locant* may have sprung from *legati*; cf. *Uticenses legati* in Epit. 49. What one would have expected is some mention of the *deditio* as in Polyb. 36, 1, 1; App. *Lib.* 75 and Epit. 49. But there is no room for it, and the word *deditio* would not occur twice in two lines.

l. 90: in spite of appearances and Epit. I think one embassy is indicated here, not two; viz. that which met the consuls and surrendered the armaments of Carthage (Polyb. 36, 4, 6 and Epit.). Orosius 4, 22 §§ 2, 3 in the same way passes over the mission to Rome, and describes the surrender of weapons, the new demands, and the outbreak of war, all in one sentence.

l. 92: read *mo[ta ira ad arma] redierunt*, on account of Flor. 2, 15, 8 *quod . . . movit iras ut extrema mallent*. *Comploratum igitur*

publice statim et pari voce clamatum est 'ad arma.'

l. 93: probably Roman[os equite]s Carthaginenses pepulerunt, alluding to losses inflicted by Himilco (Phamea) the cavalry leader. See App. *Lib.* cc. 97, 100, 104 and Zonar. 9, 27 Μανίλιος κακούμενος ὑπὸ Ἱμίλκωνος τοῦ τῶν Καρχηδονίων ἡπάρχου. The word Scipio which follows pepulerunt in O may be part of a statement that Scipio was the only man whom Phamea feared. The twenty-one missing letters may give Scipio[nis] pugnam vitavit Phamea; cf. Polyb. 36, 6, 1 ὁ Φαμέας . . . ἐξέλιπε τὰς πρὸς Σκιπίωνα συμπλοκὰς and App. *Lib.* 100.

ll. 95 sq.: the broken tale *Aemiliani fidem* p I would complete by aid of Diod. 32, 7, who says that Scipio alone of the Romans τὰς δοθείσας πίστεϊς ἐήρπει; so no besieged Carthaginian would surrender unless he were a party to the terms. The reputation of Scipio in Spain is similarly described by Appian *Ib.* 54; and we have like accounts of Tiberius Gracchus, father and son. We may therefore write *Aemilianus fidem* p[raestitit hostibus] with some confidence that the drift of the original is rendered. For the assimilation of *Aemilianus* to *Aemiliani* which immediately follows cf. n. on ll. 15, 16. Next comes the rescue of a besieged Roman force by Scipio, which looks not so much like the exploit at Nepheris (GH) as the repulse of the Carthaginians at an earlier date from the Roman camp. With *liberatus* cf. Epit. *liberatum* and *castrorum liberatorum* and App. 102; Dio *fragm.* 69; Plin. *n.h.* 22, 13. This won for Scipio the *corona obsidionalis* (*Vir. ill.* 59), and is the kind of personal achievement to which O inclines. Next comes a gap of sixteen letters followed

(mysteriously) by *per Caridemum* poe [. . . .] after which we have the attack on Galba for his misdeeds in Lusitania. We may choose between two remedies. We may imagine O to have recorded the famous quotation of Cato about Scipio, οἷος πέτρωναι κ.τ.λ. of which many writers speak. It is mentioned in Epit. just before the case of Galba. This alternative inclines to something like *a Catone laudatus per Homerum poemate*. The other assumption is that the excerpt about Galba began immediately after *liberatus*, and if that be so the substance of it may be contained in *vir perfidissimus* (or *summæ perfidiae*, Val. Max. 9, 6, 2) *per Scribonium* (i.e. *Libonem*) *pro rostris* (Val. Max. 8, 1, 2). O often corrupted names deeply. The first alternative is preferable.

l. 98: the narrative about Galba must

have been somewhat of this fashion: *Ser. Galba a Lusitanis reus product[us] II filios duxit et Galli fili[um] > quos flens com[m]endavit*. I prefer *commendavit* to *complectus* (Epit. and GH) because of Cic. *Brut.* 89 *Galba . . . cum suos filios tum C. Galli etiam filium flens commendabat*; also *De Or.* 1, 228 *commendasset*; Val. Max. 8, 1, 2 *liberos suos et . . . Galli filium flens commendare coepit* (where *populo*, inserted by some MSS. and edd., is needless). It is clear on a comparison of Epit. 49 with Val. Max. 8, 7, 1, where Cato is represented as defending the Hispani against an *accusatio* by Galba, that Val. Max. knew Galba's case from Livy. But Livy appears to have copied Cicero; cf. *interposita fide* in *Brut. l.c.* with the same phrase in Val. Max. 8, 1, 2.

l. 100: Zonaras 9, 28 closely resembles Epit. and supports my conjecture (in GH) *Persei se Philippum*; cf. too Vell. 1, 11 *Pseudophilippus . . . qui se Philippum . . . ferebat*, followed by *armis occupata Macedonia*. For *Philippi* by assimilation, see n. on ll. 15, 16. O can hardly have fallen into the mistake made by Ampel. 16 *cum ex similitudine formae Philippi filium se esse persuasisset*.

l. 102: the twenty vanished letters may have alluded to the embassy of P. Scipio Nasica (Zonar. 9, 28) or (less probable) to some facts of the early history of Andrisceus (as Epit.).

BOOK 50.

l. 107: for want of information elsewhere this line cannot be filled out with any certainty. Perhaps *in ultimum Graeciae finem repulsus latitabat*.

ll. 109 sq.: this passage certainly touched on the murder of Prusias, King of Bithynia, by his son, Nicomedes II. The authorities suggest here [*per Nicomedem filium Prusias rex Bithy[ni]us occisus est*]. There is no escape from the conclusion that *positus* is a blunder for *occisus* or some word of equivalent sense. Next probably came *ad Attalum regem et Prusiam* (in is a distortion of the m) *Pergamum missi sunt legati*. It may be noted that Epit. mentions the murder of Prusias before the embassy. Its first destination must have been Pergamum not Bithynia as Plutarch *Cat. m.* 9 says. Polyb. 37, 1 shews that the murder was expected when the envoys left.

ll. 111-5: *Marco* [.] *gricus* corresponds with Μάρκος Λικίνιος ἄνθρωπος ποδαγκὸς in Polyb. In O *Licinius* was probably shortened to *Lic*. Then comes A. *Hostilius Mancinus capite* [.] a *quondam*, possibly for *commutato* or *deminuto* or *comminatus*

or *deminutus qu.* The word *quondam* has a parallel in ποτὲ of App. *Mithr.* 6 τὴν κεφαλὴν ποτὲ λίθῳ πλῆγείς, describing this man. In l. 114 read *qui cum ob legationem dicerent* (i.e. in the senate). Cato was obviously addressed by them (προσαγορευόμενον in Polyb.). For the proverb *nec caput nec pedes* see Otto, Sprichwörter d. Römer p. 74; the addition of *nec cor* is Cato's own. As to the envoys, the only known M. Licinius who is possible is the praetor peregrinus of 186 B.C. If the *praenomen* be wrong, he may be one of the three Licinii Nervae who figure in the last decade of Livy. Regarding L. Man(i)lius Vulso I can make no guess. A certain A. Hostilius Mancinus is the hero of a dateless story in Gell. 4, 14; he certainly in peculiar circumstances received from a stone a wound in his head conspicuous enough to be exhibited publicly when he tried to prosecute the offender (a woman). If this is the man, the anecdote may have formed a piquant portion of Cato's speech. But Gell. got it from the 'Coniectanea' of the great lawyer C. Ateius Capito. The ultimate source of information about this embassy for all later writers was doubtless Polyb.

l. 115: Mr. Warde Fowler's suggestion that we have here the passing of the *lex Scantinia* deserves consideration. On the other hand *Scatius* (O) is a possible name, and *Scantius* (a known name) an easier correction, and (2) a trial fits the passage more readily than legislation. Perhaps *M. Scantius X̄ aeris multam tulit in stupro deprehensus*. Cf. Cic. *Deiot.* 36 *multam sustulerat*; of course *poenam ferre* 'to come off with punishment' is common. For the *X̄ aeris* cf. Quint. 4, 2, 69 *decem milia quae poena stupratori constituta est*; also 7, 4, 42. It is not likely that O had *de in stupro deprehensis*. The case of *deprehensi* was assimilated to that of *aeris*.

ll. 118-120: there does not seem to be much probability that the compiler of O wrote *Masinissa liberos IIII reliquit decedens, cuius regnavit natu maximis filiis per Aemilianum distributum* (GH). The original figure was more likely LIV; cf. Val. Max. 5, 2, 4 *quattuor et quinquaginta filiorum numero relinquens* (doubtless from Livy); Eutrop. 4, 11 *mortuo XLIV filiis relictis*. For other curious statements about Masinissa's children see App. *Lib.* 106; Diod. 32, 10; Zonar. 9, 27. The passage of Appian concerns us here because it intimates that Scipio distinguished not between older and younger sons, but between legiti-

mate and illegitimate. We should therefore read *III legiti[mis] filiis for natu max[imis] f.* The missing word before *reliquit* in l. 119 can scarcely be anything but [*superstite*]s. In l. 120 *regnum . . . distributum* is a more correct expression than *regni dividendi* in Val. Max., and *divisit* in Oros. 4, 22, 8; for the kingdom was not split into three. Polyb. 37, 3, 5 and others after him mention a son four years old when the father died. Polyb. says there were *four* others, but have the words καὶ πενήκοντα dropped out after τέσσαρας? As the child was adopted by one of the legitimate sons (Micipsa) it is not likely that he was reckoned among the legitimate (GH).

BOOK 51.

ll. 122, 3: (the murder of Hasdrubal in the Curia at Carthage). In Epit. suspicion falls on him because he is *propincus Gubussae* (i.e. sister's son, as is seen from App.). Livy cannot have used *adfinis Masinissae* (l. 122) to convey this relationship. For the beginning of l. 123 I conjecture [*is per fragmen]ta subselli <orum> occisus est; socius for occisus* has arisen from the transference of the first *s* in *occisus*. Cf. Oros. 4, 22, 8 *subselliorum fragmentis*; he also has *occisus*, while Appian gives ὑποβάθρου = *subsellis*. O, like his brother stylist Obsequens, is fond of *per*; see ll. 20, 22, 30, 73, 98, 102, 107, 120, 135, 138. For *subsellia* broken into weapons cf. Vell. Pat. 2, 3, 2 *fragmine subselli ictus* (Tib. Gracchus) and Val. Max. 2, 4, 2; also Suet. *Ner.* 26 *cum . . . subselliorum fragmentis discerneretur*; and Cic. *Sest.* 79 where a tribune is attacked *fragmentis saeptorum*.

l. 125: the successes of Manilius are not traceable elsewhere, except in Epit. I cannot remember to have seen *dimicari* as deponent; it seems to be a piece of barbarity.

l. 127: I prefer [*Andriscus a*] *Metello captus* to *Philippus* (GH) for *Pseudophilippus*. Epit. 52 calls him *Andriscus* in speaking of the triumph.

ll. 127, 8: possibly O did not mention the sacred laurel of which Obsequens speaks. In that case we should restore *sacrarium [una cum omnib]us sacris (for soci) maximo incendio [inviolatum]*. Or, if the laurel was mentioned, *sacrarium [Iovis et laur]us sacra*. So when the *sacrarium Saliorum* was burned the *lituus Iovis* was untouched; see Val. Max. 1, 8, 11, who records two other miracles of this sort. For the *sacrarium* of the Regia cf. Gell. 4, 6, 2.

ll. 132 sq. : possibly something such as this was in O: [captos] *Carthaginiensis Hasdrubal crudelissime interemit. Lon<g>e obsidentes Romani non [cepere Carthaginem] crebris proeliis*. The corruption of Hasdrubal's name is portentous; but the only reference possible is to his savagery as recorded by App. *Lib.* 118, where not only the cruel torture and execution of prisoners is reported, but also the murder of Carthaginian senators, which might suggest in l. 132 *patres Carthaginenses*. The order of words is thus better, but *crudelissime* is less appropriate. Of course *longe* for *diu* unaccompanied by any other indication of time did not occur in the text of Livy. In l. 133 *Romanos* in O for *Romani* is paralleled by l. 135 *Romano*; l. 5 *Quirinalem*; l. 8 *minantes*; l. 111 *Marco*; l. 201 *interfectores*. In some or all of these instances the compiler took the wrong case from Livy's text and did not trouble to adapt it.

l. 136: the reading *subacti* for *subalti* (GH) is difficult. One can scarce imagine that the compiler carried away from the story of Vetilius and Plautius (App. *Ib.* 61 sq.) the idea that the Lusitani were *conquered*, particularly as he relates fresh disasters a few lines further on. A mere raid is indicated in ll. 83, 210 by *vastati*, which is preferable here, and the corruption may be partly caused by transference of letters, for which cf. n. on ll. 122-3. The case in l. 77, where *subacti* occurs, is far different; brilliant successes are summarised (Liv. 40, cc. 39-41).

ll. 139 sq.: (the death of Hasdrubal's wife.) Polyb. in book 39, of which we have but fragments, was the ultimate authority (probably an eye-witness) for this episode as told by App. 130; Liv. Epit.; Zonar. 9, 30; Flor. 2, 17, 15; Oros. 4, 23, 4; Val. Max. 2, 2, 8. The narrative of course gathered embellishments as time went on. The following restoration of O will represent the general sense: *qu[um] duci exprobra[visset] uxo[r] impietatem*] (or *perfidiam* or *prodicionem*) *duobus fil<i>is secum incensis se*] *potestate [liberavit Scip<ionis> Aemilia<ni> qu[o] modo] Dido regina*. This outline is drawn from the authorities; cf. especially Val. Max. *exprobrata impietate*; *προδοτήν γενόμενον* in the wife's speech in App.; *ἐξοβειδίσασα* in Zonar. Also Flor. *l.c. imitata reginam quae Carthaginem condidit*; Oros. *l.c. eundem nunc exitum faciens novissima regina Carthaginis quem quondam prima fecisset*. These two passages make it highly probable that there was in Liv. and O a glance at Dido; the shape taken by the

later tale must have owed something to the legend.

Book 52.

l. 146: I do not feel sure that Kornemann is right in referring this passage to the death of Diaeus, the Achaean general, who poisoned himself after killing his wife. In Epit. 52 this incident precedes *Corinthon* . . . *diruit*, while immediately after come the three triumphs and then Viriathus. It is not unlikely, I think, that O touched on some event in the unhappy married life of Viriathus (Diod. 33, 7, Dio. *fragm.* 75). O had little interest in the Eastern Mediterranean. He kept an eye on sensational scenes in which ladies were involved, but as between an Eastern scene and a Western, he would choose the latter.

l. 147: the *clades* seems to be that spoken of by Oros. 5, 4, 1, who says that during 146 *Viriathus maximo terrori Romanis fuit*, words closely resembling Epit. 52. Perhaps the *clades* is the disaster of Vetilius.

ll. 149-151: I am not convinced that there was here anything about the dispatch of a consular army against Viriathus (GH). The records of this period of the Spanish war are curious. Only in Cicero (*De Off.* 2, 40, *Brut.* 84) do we hear that Laelius broke the neck of the war and made it easy for his successors; only in App. 67 of Fannius. Oros. 5, 4 has nothing to say of the commission given to the consul Fabius; after mentioning Vetilius and Plautius he goes on: *post etiam Claudius Unimannus* (or *Unimanus*) *cum magno instructu belli contra Viriathum missus quasi pro abolenda superiore macula, turpiorem ipse auxit infamiam* etc. Florus 2, 17, 16 mentions both Claudius and Fabius, while *Vir. ill.* 71 adds Nigidius, who appears nowhere else. Appian, like Epit., omits Claudius. In l. 150 *M. Petroni* can hardly be right, unless some obscure man's exploit was narrated, like those of Occius later, or like those of the Spanish *Olyndicus*, recorded only by Flor. 2, 17, 14. [Can he be the same as the Πούνικος of Appian?] It is, however, far more probable that the name is a corruption of that of Plautius, the praetor who (most likely) succeeded Vetilius. Comparing *contra Viriathum missus* in Oros. *l.c.* with *adversu[s]* in l. 151, I suppose O ran somewhat thus: *C. Plaut[io] fugato* (cf. *fugavit* in Oros.) *Claudius Unimannus adversu[s] Viriathum missus*. It is just possible, but less likely, that the condemnation of C. Plautius was the theme (*re*

male gesta adversus Viriathum), for which cf. Diod. 33, 3.

ll. 152-6: Kornemann is certainly right in changing *L. Metellus* to *Q.* (i.e. Macedonicus). *O* here recorded his success at the election held in the summer of 144 for the consulship of 143 B.C. His two *repulsae* must have occurred in 146 (after the triumph) and 145. The reference to *Vir. ill.* 61 for *qui invis[us] plebi* is excellent, but what can *petitur v[]* in l. 156 indicate? It seems to introduce some prosecution for a fine, perhaps involving some such words as *multa petita* followed by a sum of which *V* is part. In that case the *invisus* or *invisi* may have been the culprit or culprits, possibly competitors with Metellus for office. The question whether Macedonicus was entrusted with both provinces at once, depending mainly on the reading *utramque Hispaniam* in Val. Max. 9, 3, 7 (see GH p. 110) is also affected by another passage, Val. Max. 7, 5, 4. After a mention of the triumph it is there said that the *populus* denied the consulship to Metellus, *cui mox duas clarissimas provincias aut daturus erat aut debiturus, Achaïam et Macedoniam*. If *mox* is sound, *Achaïam et Macedoniam* must be excised as a gloss, and *aut daturus erat aut debiturus* is nonsensical. An original reading *daturus* was glossed by *aut debiturus*, which got into the text, the first *aut* being then added. Thus corrected, the passage refers again to the two Spanish provinces.

l. 157: *Syria vastata*. This bears on the wars between Demetrius and Alexander Balas, but is a little out of chronological order, through Livy's fault, most likely. Rome had recognised the pretender. L. 158 begins with *content[io]*, continuing, probably, the excerpt about Eastern affairs.

Book 53.

ll. 161-3: may be restored with some confidence from Val. Max. 5, 1, 5 somewhat thus: *Rhoetog[ene invito Q. Metellus ne] liberos [eius caedi pateretur] proposito a[bstulit]*. Rhoetogenes was ready to sacrifice his own children, that Metellus might capture the town, which Val. Max. calls *Centobriga*; it is in all probability the same as *Nertobriga* in Flor. 2, 17, 9 *cum (Metellus) Contrebiam memorabili cepisset exemplo et Nertobrigae maiore gloria pepercisset*. In App. *Ib.* 49-50 appears *Ἐργόβριγα*, a town of the Arvaci, with whom Metellus fought, and in Diod. 33, 24 *Κόνροβρις* is supposed to be *Contrebia*. Perhaps Val. Max. partially confused the two names *Contrebia* and

Nertobriga; there were also other names in *-briga* rather similar. In Val. Max. Rhoetogenes appears as a voluntary prisoner in Roman hands, but he joined the Numantines (App. *Ib.* 94) and perished with them (Flor. 12, 8, 15).

ll. 163-5: there is comparatively little difficulty about the restitution of these lines. An objection to *sagulo remisso* is that it is not readily referred to the Spaniard, as Occius is subject through the sentence. Probably *sagulum* is right with *remissum*; also *inunxit* rather than *dedit*. The peculiarly Spanish *sagulum* is described by Appian, Strabo, Val. Max., and others.

l. 167: I hesitate to accept the statement of *O*, [*M*]etellus *cos. a Lusitanis vexatus*, as expressing fact. We have already seen, of course, that important events of these Spanish wars have only come down to us by casual mention in unexpected places. But here *cos.* may easily be an error for *procos.*, and the occurrence may be an incident in the siege of Contrebia during the proconsulate (Val. Max. 7, 4, 5).

ll. 168-9: the information about the distribution by Mummius of works of art brought from Corinth is interesting. I would complete l. 169 thus: *distribuit circa oppida et Rom[am] replevit*, relying on Plin. *n. h.* 33 § 36 *Mummius Achaïa devicta replevit urbem*, and *Vir. ill.* 60, 3 *cum totam repletset Italiam*, which illustrates *oppida* here. In l. 168 the true reading may be *Corinth[ium] aes M[ummius]*; cf. Plin. *n. h.* 34 § 12 *Mummi victoria Corinthum quidem diruit; sed e compluribus Achaïae oppidis simul aera dispersit*. Also Frontin. *Strat.* 4, 3, 15, *L. Mummius... non Italiam solum sed etiam provincias tabulis statuisque exornavit*. Could Mummius give away treasures not belonging to his *manubiae*? The rest would naturally be sold for the benefit of the treasury (cf. Plin. 33 § 148); and as to an auction in Greece see an amusing story in Plin. 35 § 24. Dio *fragm.* 76 speaks of Mummius as having many treasures at his disposal. Some of inferior class he gave to a Pergamene general; see Pausan. 7, 16, 8, who says *M.* was the first Roman to make dedications in a Greek temple. Not easily reconcileable with the anecdotes about his contempt for art, which probably have little foundation.

Book 54.

l. 175: not quite the earliest recorded contact between the Romans and the powerful Celtic Scordisci, who crushed a consul 27 years later. See Obseq. 75 (156 B.C.).

1. 177: *Appius Claudius evicit ne duos* [*delectus*] *annus haberet* (so Greenidge, ap. GH). But whether the ordinance is conceived as permanent or as applying to the one year only, I doubt the correctness of the reading. The military grievances of which we hear as rife at this time are, first, the corrupt and capricious selection of persons for service, which was remedied by resort to the ballot (App. *Ib.* 49), and the extension of service beyond 16 years (*ib.* cc. 65, 78). A dispute was carried on in this period about the presence of a new governor in a province before his predecessor had departed. One of Cato's speeches was entitled *ne imperium sit veteri ubi novus venerit* (Gell. 20, 2). Conceivably O had *duos praetores* or *imperatores*; some reference, however, to provinces would be expected. But I am inclined to think that O recorded the result of a struggle between the two foes, Claudius and Aemilianus, and that *annus* is a remnant of the latter name; cf. *miliaannum* in l. 120. Possibly the famous embassy of Scipio to the Eastern kings caused a contest in the senate. According to most of the authorities the envoys were three; see Diod. 33, 28a, 1; Plut. *apophth.* *Sc. min.* 13 f.; Justin. 38, 8, 8. But *Vir. ill.* 58, 7 ignores this version, saying that only two slaves and Laelius accompanied Scipio, and Cic. *Acad.* 2, 5 contradicts it. There was, most likely, a second version, that he went unaccompanied. If Livy and O referred to this, the *duos* may be the two whom he was not allowed to take (? *ne duo s[ecum Aemili] a[nn]us haberet*). But, if we believe the accounts of the great powers bestowed on the embassy, we may suppose that Scipio wished to confer pomp on the mission by increasing its number beyond the usual three, and O² may have omitted *plus* before *duos*. Justin alone gives the names of the two envoys, Sp. Mummius, whose presence might be inferred from Cic. *Rep.* 3, 47, though it is only there said that he and Scipio were together at Rhodes, *nuper* (i.e. in relation to 129 B.C.); and L. Metellus, consul of 142, about whose name there is difficulty. If the date now usually accepted for the embassy, viz. the time immediately following the censorship, which ended in the middle of 140, be correct, we must either suppose that L. Metellus was not an envoy, or that he was not proconsul for two years in Gaul, as has been believed on the strength of inscriptions (Münzer in Pauly-Wissowa). Is the story, of which we have seen traces, that Scipio went Eastward alone, the true one after all? In any case, it is strange if he took with him a

brother of a strong opponent, Metellus Macedonicus.

1. 183: the words *interpellantem professionem suam* are unsuited to the exercise of the tribunician veto (GH), and point rather to some personal insult, such as the pronunciation of the *dirae* by the tribune against the consul (as in the case of Crassus departing for Syria), or the *consecratio bonorum* (Cic. *dom.* 123). The use of force to repel the veto is hardly intelligible.

1. 186: *pacem fecit*: this corresponds with Epit. and with App. *Ib.* 69. But Dio *fragm.* 75 speaks of abortive negotiations with Popilius, which appear from Oros. 4, 5, 12 to have been actually carried on with Fabius. Diod. 33, 21 seems to correspond with Dio *l.c.* Flor. 2, 17, 17 on another occasion substitutes Popilius for Servilius Caepio. There may have been two conferences with Fabius, or (less probable) the peace may have been really concluded with Popilius.

1. 187: possibly [*exceptus i*] *insidiis*.

1. 188: that some sanctity attached to the Anio appears from an obscure fragment of Cato's speech against L. Veturius *de sacrilegio commisso* ap. Priscian. vi. p. 684 P: *aquam Anienem in sacrarium inferre oportebat. Non (! nam) minus XV millia Anien abest.* This may account for the preference given to it in the interpretation of the oracle. Perhaps the line should begin with [*depugnavit*] and *inaedevota* is possibly a corruption of *inaedificata*, referring to the repair of the Anio Vetus. Frontin. *Aq.* 1, 7 (whose authority was Fenestella) might suggest *vindicata*. The cutting off of the water from the Capitol when Saturninus was killed is recorded by Plut. Oros. Flor. App. Auct. *Vir. ill.*

1. 193: *verna* is strange but apparently sound; perhaps *verna* [*natus*].

1. 194: possibly [*procos.Q.*] *Servilius*.

1. 196: a comparison with Dio *fragm.* 78 raises the question whether *clava* could mean a billet of wood suitable for burning. The soldiers piled logs round Caepio's *praetorium*, meaning to set it on fire, and he had to flee. If this were possible we might read *lavi[s cinctus paene ustus est]*.

1. 197: may be completed by [*consilio Caepionis*] from Epit. Cf. also Vell. 2, 1, 3 *fraude . . . Servili Caepionis*, in the same connexion.

BOOK 55.

1. 201: *interfectores* in Eutrop. 4, 16. Appian. *Ib.* 71 says that after the murder Caepio allowed the assassins ἀδείως ἔχειν ὄρα ἔχουσι (*impunitate promissa*, Val. Max. 9, 6, 4)

but as to the reward which, according to App., he had promised, he referred them to Rome. The recompense was refused by the 'Romans' (Oros. 5, 4, 13). According to *Vir. ill.* 71, 4 the 'victory' was not approved *a senatu*; hence *a senatu* might be inserted here after *praemium negatum*. Dio *fragm.* 80 and Eutrop. 4, 16 testify to a tradition which held Caepio blameless and placed in his mouth a high-minded utterance.

1. 202: Val. Max. 3, 7, 3 shews that Curiatius and Scipio Nasica were at variance about another matter, the supply of corn in a time of scarcity. The tribune Licinius may be the man named in a passage of Valerius Antias given by Gell. 6, 9, 9: '*peposci*' quoque non '*poposci*' V. A. libro *annalium XLV scriptum reliquit*: '*denique Licinius tribunus plebi propter perduellionem et diem dixit et comitiis diem a M. Marcio praetore peposcit*.' An objection is that Gell. 6, 9, 12 quotes book xxii of Val. Ant. for an event of 136 B.C. But the figure may be wrong, or Val. Ant. may have quoted the case of Licinius to illustrate a much later prosecution. Unfortunately the praetor cannot be identified. Licinius might well have treated the refusal to exempt men from punishment as *perduellio*. There are, of course, passages scattered about where *multa* = *poena*; but *multa remissa* seems to point to something unconnected with *perduellio*; possibly touching *consecratio bonorum*.

11. 205-7: an important and difficult passage. One is surprised that the people should have interceded for an unpopular man like Nasica (cf. Cic. *Planc.* 51; *De Off.* 1, 109; Val. Max. 7, 5, 2). My first idea was that O had *mult[um] remissa ex decreto trib. pl.* But against this is the passage in Pliny *n. h.* 21 § 10, obviously important in this connexion: *florum quidem populus Romanus honorem Scipioni tantum habuit. Serapio cognominabatur propter similitudinem suarii cuiusdam negotiatoris. Obierat in tribunatu plebei admodum gratus dignusque Africanorum familia, nec erat in bonis funeris impensa. Asses ergo contulit populus ac funus elocavit.* The annals of the Nasica family are notoriously obscure; ancient writers confuse them, and Cicero tells us of a Nasica in his time who was at sea about the family history. Here Pliny contradicts Epit. and Val. Max. 9, 14, 3, who say that the name *Serapio* was imposed on the consul of 138 B.C. (*ab irridente Curiatio*, Epit.; *vulgi sermone*, Val. Max.). The idea of Pliny that the *funus stipe collata* necessarily implied poverty in the person so honoured can be shewn to be an error.

Such an honour was usually reserved for persons of very great eminence; but that it was not impossible in the case of a tribune is proved by a legend, related with absurd seriousness by Plin. *n. h.* 18 § 15 and 34 § 21. We may also compare the *stipis collatio* for raising statues to M. Marius Gratidianus, as recorded by Plin. 34 § 27, and similar tales in 34 §§ 25, 32. The passage in Plin. 21 § 10 has most often been interpreted as referring to Nasica Corculum, the father of the consul of 138. But how could Pliny or his authority (probably Fenestella) suppose that he died as tribune, or how could Pliny accept such a statement at second-hand without question? To suppose, with Mr. Warde Fowler, that an unknown Nasica was the tribune in question leaves large difficulties untouched. For a solution I would look in another direction. On comparing O with Epit. it clearly appears that the death of the popular person is closely connected with the strife between Nasica the consul and the tribunes; it is interposed in fact in the middle of the story. If the death be that of Corculum, who was honoured by a popular funeral, it becomes easy to understand why the populace at such a moment induced the tribunes to abandon their prosecution. But about the tribunate? Comparing Plin. 7 § 54 [*qualis causa imposuit cognomen*]. *Scipioni Serapionis; is erat suarii negotiatoris vile mancipium* with 21 § 10, it looks as if the latter passage were incomplete and had lost words corresponding to *vile mancipium*. If so, another word *multa* may have dropped out before *obierat*, 'he had done much service.' The imperfection of the records makes it quite possible that Corculum had been tribune before his aedileship (168), in 170 or 169. Popular agitations were certainly going on at the time, and there is nothing remarkable either in Corculum having taken the popular line, or in the people remembering it thirty or more years later. Turning to O the gaps may be filled, in accordance with this suggestion, as follows: *precibus populi multa remissa [patris causa]. Trib[unus] pl[ebis] pro commodis pop[uli] multa obiit (or obierat)*. At the end of l. 204 some epithet in agreement with *precibus* seems to have vanished, or possibly *totius* or *universi (populi)*.

1. 207: perhaps write *communi delectu*. Of course *desertores* is applicable to those *qui nomina non detulissent*. Curiously Epit. only mentions one, though O shews the number was great. For the tribunician protest cf. the case in Val. Max. 2, 7, 15. A curious fragment of Cato *ap. Fest.* 234 M

relates to the sale as slaves of Romans who shirked service.

l. 210: this passage opens up the inquiry whether Scipio Aemilianus did not prosecute his enemy L. Aurelius Cotta (the *trico nummarius* of Lucilius) more than once. It is not easy to get over the repeated statement of Cicero that a trial took place after Scipio had been censor and twice consul (*Mur.* 58; *Div. in Caec.* 69); particularly as he knew speeches made in the case (*Brut.* 81-2). The language of Cic. in these passages (and in *Font.* 38) taken with App. *B.C.* 1, 22 proves the case to have been one of *repetundae*. But observe that Val. Max. 8, 1, 11, speaks of a trial before the *populus*; his language closely resembles that of O here.

l. 211: if *magnitudinem* is right, *per* was

in the preceding line; but perhaps read *magnitudine*. The whole phrase may have been [*fugit per*] *magnitudinem nom[inis eius]* or [*solutus*] *magnitudine*{*m*} *n.e.*

l. 211: probably *cae[de ingenti] Lusitani vastati*.

l. 217: the crossing of the river Oblivio (*Limia*, *Limaea*, or *Limius*, mod. *Lima*) was evidently regarded as important. The native name may have resembled *Oblivio* and this may have accounted for soldiers' superstitions. Though the name *Oblivio* (*Ἀθήνη* in Greek writers) often occurs, it is not given in recent maps of Ancient Spain. In spite of improvements, maps are still often unsatisfactory accompaniments to the study of ancient historical literature.

J. S. RED.

SOME EMENDATIONS IN STATIUS' *THEBAID*.

i. 172:

miseraque oculos in matre reliqui.

Perhaps *miserosque* 'that sinned in the matter of my mother'; *miseraque* arose by attraction to *matre*: similar cases of attraction are frequent in P: e.g. i. 223, i. 301, iv. 378. [In a fourteenth century MS. in the Phillips Library I find *maligni* as a variant (*sec. man.*) for *reliqui*.]

ii. 638:

etiamnum in luce codd. plerique.
et adhuc in nube Codex P. Vlamingii.

Read *leti iam in nube.*

iii. 231: *cuncta perosi.* Read *tuta*: 'let them, hating peace, love thee.'

iii. 378-379:

licet optima conjux
auditusque iterum revocet socer.

Perhaps

licet optima conjux
suadeat usque torum, revocet socer.

(In iii. 343: *saudet* for *suadet* P. v. 169. *audet* for *audit* P.)

iii. 522:

Sed similes non ante metus, aut† astra
notavi
prodigiosa magis.

What have *astra* to do with augury? I would suggest *tesca*. For the meaning of *tesca* in augury cf. Varro *L. L.* vii. 6. 'templum tescumque finito in sinistrum' (*sub. arbor*).

iv. 757-758:

tu nunc ventis pluvioque rogaris
pro Jove, tu refugas vires . . (reple 759)

Perhaps

tu nunc undis—pluvioque rogaris
pro Jove—tu refugas etc.

vi. 551:

aluitque vultus } P.
latuitque in corpore virtus }
patuitque in corpore virtus. cett.

Read *latuitque in corpore vultus*. 'The beauty of his body eclipsed that of his face.'

In x. 374 I believe a similar corruption to have arisen: the MSS. have

absiliunt nubes, et fulgure claro
astra patent.

The sense imperatively demands *latent*, which I would restore. Such was the brightness of the lightning that it put out the stars.

Gronovius at vi. 551 quotes from Sidonius Apollinaris:

collata rubori
pallida blatta latet, depressaque lumine
voltus
nigrescunt vincto Baccharum volnera collo.

Sidonius is probably directly imitating Statius vi. 551: but despite the exact parallel editors still read *patuit . . virtus*.

xi. 683: *anguste tantos.*

The Codex P. Vlamingii has a tempting variant *anguste latos*.