SIX NOTES ON LIVY 36–40

The most recent edition of these books is the OCT edited by P. G. Walsh (Oxford, 1999), which I denote by 'OCT'; by 'Walsh' I denote his separate editions of the five books (Warminster, 1990–6). 'Briscoe' = J. Briscoe, *A Commentary on Livy Books xxxiv–xxxvii* (Oxford, 1981). 'W–M' = the edition of Weissenborn and Müller (Berlin 1906–9).

in eo *modo* diuersae sententiae erant, quod alii extemplo agendum, alii ex hieme . . . differendum in ueris principium . . . censebant. (36.6.9)

Here are some translations of the main clause: Sage (Loeb edition), 'In the matter of procedure there were different opinions'; Manuelian (Budé edition), 'Sur la manière, les avis étaient partagés'; Walsh, 'Opinions differed to the extent that'. The Latin means 'Only on this point [*eo* looks forward to the *quod* clause] were there different views'.

in eam legationem Mnasilochus et qui eius factionis erant de industria *coniecti* . . . terebant tempus. (36.12.4)

The manuscript evidence is divided between *coniecti* and (what is almost the same thing in script) *collecti*. Editors naturally prefer the former, but have been unable to make it plausible by producing a parallel (see Briscoe's note). I have no doubt that we should read *electi*; an initial *e* has been mistaken for the *con*-symbol (a reversed *c*). The two are quite often confused, as at Sen. *Nat.* 4a.pr.15 (*concutere*/*euertere*); Val. Max. 5.10.3 (*conuocaret*/*euocaret*), 6.5.7 (*constaret*/*exstaret*); Curt. 5.3.21 (*coniecti*/*eiecti*), 6.9.31 (*corripuit*/*eripuit*).

inde ex propinquo explorans quid hostes agerent, primo in magna spe fuit [sc. Polyxenidas], quem ad modum Rhodiam classem ad Samum circumsessis ad exitum faucibus portus expugnasset, sic et Romanam expugnaturum. (nec est dissimilis natura loci: promunturiis coeuntibus inter se ita clauditur portus ut uix duae simul *inde* naues possint exire.) *inde* nocte occupare fauces Polyxenidas in animo habebat. (37.28.6ff.)

It is usual to delete *inde* at the beginning of the last sentence as an erroneous repetition of the two previous occurrences of the word. It is indeed very probable that these have exercised an influence, but I think that the influence has been to turn another word into *inde* rather than to cause a gratuitous interpolation. That other word could have been *itaque*, linking this sentence not to that which immediately precedes but to the one before that; I have punctuated accordingly.

Romani, ex iis quae in deum immortalium potestate erant, ea habemus quae di dederunt. animos, qui nostrae *mentis* sunt. eosdem in omni fortuna gessimus gerimusque, neque eos secundae res extulerunt nec aduersae minuerunt.
(37.45.11–12, Scipio Africanus speaking in the senate)

'The *mens* is the reasoning part of the soul, the *animus* the part that conceives ambitions for further conquests etc.', says Briscoe; what then, I ask, are the *animi* of the *mens*? 'Attitudes proper to our mentality', says Walsh; this is at least intelligible, but it ignores the context, which demands a contrast between things that are in the power of the gods (presumably victory in war, as W–M say) and things that are under our own control. *Nostrae potestatis* (with rhetorical variation from the preceding *in deum potestate*) would give the required sense, but the only word with that meaning which could (through abbreviation) have been corrupted to *mentis* is *moderationis*, a good Livian word.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.1.301 Published online by Cambridge University Press

si gladium in Asia non strinxissem, si hostem non uidissem, tamen †per† triumphum in Thracia duobus proeliis merueram. (38.49.12)

Speaking in the senate in 187 B.C., Manlius Volso claims a triumph on the strength of (i) his Galatian campaign in the summer of 189 B.C., and (ii) his battles with the Thracians on his return journey in 188 B.C..

It is tempting to restore sense by deleting *per*, but it is difficult to account for its presence in the text; hence it has usually been replaced by another word or words. The traditional correction is *proconsul*; recent editors prefer Nitsche's *patres conscripti*, which has little palaeographical probability and can probably be ruled out by the occurrence of *patres conscripti* at the end of the next sentence. (To delete it there, as OCT does, is quite gratuitous; there is no objection to its ending a sentence.) I suggest <nu>per, the omission being due to haplography after *tamen. Nuper* would refer to the previous year; the word can have a wide range of reference.

Romani sociique paulo plus sescenti et prouincialium auxiliorum centum quinquaginta ferme ceciderunt. tribuni militum quinque amissi et *pauci* equites Romani cruentae maxime uictoriae speciem fecerunt. (39.31.15–16)

'Since there were only six military tribunes to a legion . . . this represented a severe loss to the officer-establishment. The odd suggestion that the loss of a few cavalry gave the impression of a bloody battle may indicate that these were prominent Roman figures (so W–M), but more probably Livy groups the loss of the tribunes and the cavalry together as indicating severe fighting', says Walsh. The 'odd suggestion' in question is, I think, due not to Livy but to his copyists: I would read <*non*> or <*haud*> *pauci.* The part played by the cavalry has been described in §11: they had penetrated the enemy's camp but had got into difficulties and been forced to dismount; nevertheless they had borne the brunt of the battle, as their commander acknowledges in §17 (*eorum maxime opera hostes fusos, castra capta et expugnata esse*). Editors similarly insert a negative at 39.55.5 (before *placuit*) and at 40.22.4 (before *rarum*).

Aberdeen W. S. WATT

CRETE IN THE *AENEID*: TWO INTERTEXTUAL FOOTNOTES

I

In her perceptive paper on 'Crete in the *Aeneid*' Rebecca Armstrong[1] adverts to the relatively small extent to which Book 3 appears indebted to Homer: 'In a book so recognizably, ostentatiously Odyssean, it is remarkable that comparatively little of the material contained actually finds its source, even indirectly, in Homer.'[2] I believe that Homeric influence is more significant than she allows, in particular, that the effect of Odysseus' cover-stories deserves more attention than she allots it.[3]

The *Odyssey* gives Crete some prominence as an element in an alternative narrative, of which we are immediately reminded by the line with which Anchises directs our attention towards the island (3.104): *Creta Iouis magni medio iacet insula ponto*;

[1] R. Armstrong, 'Crete in the *Aeneid*: recurring trauma and alternative fate', *CQ* 52 (2002), 321–40.

[2] Ibid., 329. [3] Ibid., 338, n. 83.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/53.1.301 Published online by Cambridge University Press