

something is beautiful (ἐστὶ...καλόν, 100c4) or tall (100e5–6), or when a body will be sick (νοσήσει, 105c3) or alive (ζῶν ἔσται, 105c9–10). Explanation is called for, Socrates thinks, when an object has a property its title to which is insecure, in the sense (to judge from 102b8–c8) that the object's having the property is not guaranteed by its being what it is. Thus Socrates wants an explanation, for example, of a person's being tall (102c1–9) or – the case of especial interest in the *Phaedo* – of a body's being alive.

On Socrates' theory, the explanation for an object's having a property, when it has it only insecurely, is provided by something *in* the object whose title to the property *is* secure. A person's being tall, for example, is explained by reference to the tall *in* the person, which will not admit shortness (102d6–8), and a body's being alive is explained by the presence *in* it of soul, which will not admit death, life's opposite (105c9–d11). In these cases, what begins as a property of an object – a person's tallness, or a body's life – emerges, on Socrates' analysis, as really the property of something *in* that object – the tall, or soul.

Phaedo 77d–e anticipates this pattern of explanation on the level of imagery. There, Socrates pokes fun at Simmias and Cebes for rejecting his earlier arguments for the immortality of the soul, saying they 'have the children's fear (δεδιέναι τὸ τῶν παίδων) that, when the soul leaves the body, the wind will disperse and scatter it, particularly if one happens to die not in calm weather but in a high wind' (77d7–e2). Cebes laughs at this, and says in answer, 'Assume that we are afraid, Socrates, and try to change our view. Or rather, don't assume that *we* are afraid; perhaps, though, there is a child in us who fears such things. Try to persuade him not to fear death as if it were a hobgoblin' (77e3–7). Uncertain as to whether he and Simmias really have the fear, then, Cebes refers the fear, not to himself and Simmias, but to something *in* them. And, since the fear in question is a children's fear, that something must be a child.

The Claremont Graduate School

CHARLES M. YOUNG

DILUTION OF OARCREWS WITH PRISONERS OF WAR

At 10.17.6–16 Polybius relates how Scipio seized the opportunity offered by his capture of New Carthage in 209 B.C. to increase his fleet of quinqueremes by half as much again. There is a briefer passage on the same subject in Livy 26.47.1–3.

Polybius says that the total number of prisoners taken was nearly ten thousand, from whom Scipio separated two groups: first citizens, men and women with their young children, and secondly craftsmen. He freed the former, and made the latter, numbering about 2000, public slaves of Rome. In Livy's account women and children are not mentioned; the prisoners are said to be ten thousand free men. As in Polybius, the citizens are said to have been set at liberty and the two thousand craftsmen made public slaves. In Polybius Scipio is said to have selected from all those not in the first two groups 'the strongest, the fittest looking and the youngest and mixed them up with his own crews. And making the whole body of oarsmen (ναῦται) half as many again as before he succeeded in manning the captured ships as well as his own ὥστε τοὺς ἄνδρας ἐκάστω σκάφει βραχύ τι λείπειν τοῦ διπλασίου εἶναι τοὺς ὑπάρχοντας τῶν προγενομένων, for the captured ships were eighteen in number and the original ships thirty-five'. The corresponding passage in Livy is as follows: 'the remaining multitude [*multitudinem*, a word suggesting a larger number than the two former groups together] of young inhabitants¹ and of strong slaves he handed over to the fleet

¹ *incolae*, presumably neither citizens nor slaves.

to increase the number of oarsmen (*remigum*). And [an increase was needed because] he had added eight captured ships to the fleet'. Editors suggest, and it seems likely, that 'eight' here replaces 'eighteen', as in Polybius, through faulty manuscript tradition. The passage in Polybius concludes with the incomplete sentence: 'By his forethought Scipio seized the opportunity of increasing the fleet by half as much again, and he...'

From these two accounts which, though containing differences, nevertheless throw light on each other, a clear picture emerges of what Scipio needed to do and of what he did. He needed oarcrews for the ships he had captured. His *socii navales* could supply *huperesiai* (petty officers, deckhands etc.) and the legions could provide the decksoldiers, as they normally did.² But for oarcrews he needed $18 \times 300 = 5400$ fit men, and saw that they were to be found among the young adult free men and the strong slaves he had captured. However, to use solely the new recruits to pull the captured vessels might have resulted in ships of doubtful loyalty or performance. What he did therefore was to form crews in which his own men were diluted 2:1 with the new recruits.

The clause cited above in Greek in the Polybius passage is given in the traditional text,³ and is translated by W. R. Paton⁴ as follows: 'And he made the complement of each ship nearly double what it had been.' This is a reasonable rendering of the text as it stands, except that the emphasis on youth and strength in Polybius and a plain statement in Livy makes it plain that Scipio was looking for oarsmen and oarsmen only. The same criticism applies to Walbank's note:⁵ 'in addition to increasing his sailors by half, Scipio chose enough men from among the slaves at New Carthage to enable the total complement of each ship, including both sailors and troops, to be increased to nearly twofold its former size.' The main difficulty however lies in the concept of doubling the complement of each ship.⁶ In the rest of the passage of Polybius this is not represented as Scipio's purpose or achievement. And it is absent in Livy. Yet in the untranslated clause in Polybius it appears as the result (*ὥστε*) of the operation. Furthermore, Scipio's own ships would before have had their normal oarcrew and *huperesia* and probably also most, if not all, of the normal complement of troops. To *double* these would be a physical impossibility. The eighteen captured ships before Scipio's action were empty.

The root of the trouble is *προγενομένων* which Reiske emended long ago to *προσγεγενημένων*.⁷ His suggestion appears in the apparatus criticus of Hultsch's edition⁸ with the note: 'voluisse videtur προσγεγενημένων'. *Προσγεγενημένων* must be right, since it provides the proper antithesis to *ὑπάρχοντας*, the additional as opposed to the original crewmembers. So emended the clause fits, as unemended it did not, into the logical sequence of the passage, giving the effect of the dilution process *on each ship*. 'Making the whole body of oarsmen half as many again as before, Scipio succeeded in manning the captured ships as well as his own, with the result that in each ship the original crewmembers should be nearly twice as many as the additional

² For *ὑπηρεσία* see my article *JHS* 104 (1984), 48ff. For the use of legionaries as *ἐπιβάται* see, e.g., Polybius 3.95.5.

³ Büttner Wobst (Berlin, 1893).

⁴ Loeb edition (London and Cambridge, MA., 1968), iv.140–5.

⁵ *Commentary on Polybius* ii (Oxford, 1979), p. 218.

⁶ The complement of the Roman quinqueremes at Ecnomus in 256 B.C. was 300 oarsmen and 120 troops etc. (Polybius 1.26.7).

⁷ J. J. Reiske: *Animadversionum ad Graecos auctores volumen quartum quo Polybii reliquiae pertractantur* (Lipsiae, 1763), p. 518.

⁸ Berlin, 1870.

men – nearly, because the captured ships were eighteen in number and the original ships thirty-five’ (i.e. the former were rather more than half the latter).

Fifty-three ships would require an ideal complement of 15,900 oarsmen. The ratio of original ships to captured ones (35:18) suggests a division of 10,500 original oarsmen and 5400 new ones – in a ratio, therefore, of about 2:1 in each ship.⁹

Cambridge

J. S. MORRISON

⁹ The precise arithmetic works out as follows: $47 \times (198 + 102)$; $6 \times (199 + 101)$.

THE EPITAPH OF PUBLIUS SCIPIO RECONSIDERED

Quei apice insigne Dial(is) flaminis gesistei | mors perfec(it)
tua ut essent omnia | brevia, honos, fama, virtusque | gloria
atque ingenium. Quibus sei | in longa licuisset tibi uter
vita, | facile facteis superases gloriam | maiorum. Qua re
lubens te in gremiu, | Scipio, recipit terra, Publi, | prognatum
Publio, Corneli.

(ILLRP 311)

In her recent discussion of *ILLRP* 311 Kirsteen Moir draws attention to the discrepancy between the epitaph’s apparent claim that young Publius had before him a brilliant career, had he but survived, and the description which Cicero provides of Africanus’ son, Publius, who is usually identified, with varying degrees of conviction, as the subject of this inscription.¹ As Moir points out, the son of Africanus, though remarkably erudite, was incapacitated by poor health from achieving the military and political distinction predicted by the necrology. Within the actual text of this inscription, one might add, there is another discrepancy: the Publius here commemorated was flamen Dialis, and the taboos which restricted the daily life of the priest of Jupiter effectively barred him, regardless of his powers or inclination, from fulfilling the promise voiced by his memorial. Moir proposes a solution which will solve both problems. She suggests that the *gloria* to which Publius could look forward was literary celebrity. The son of Africanus, after all, composed works known and read by Cicero a century later, works which documented his literary capabilities.² Such attainment was well within the grasp of the flamen Dialis. And this interpretation of the inscription, if correct, would solve both discrepancies.

The principal difficulty with Moir’s proposal is its subtlety: for the inscription to be understood as she takes it close and careful scrutiny is demanded. The other surviving elogia of the Scipios are otherwise; each is entirely straightforward in its claims. The gravestones of accomplished men record their specific achievements, while that of L. Cornelius Scipio (*ILLRP* 312), who, like Publius, died young, expresses general, commonplace sentiments.³ Moir, however, adduces two arguments for rejecting the view that Publius’ epitaph could be ‘mere commonplace’: first, the Scipios would not have suggested that anyone could expect to surpass the

¹ K. M. Moir, ‘The Epitaph of Publius Scipio’, *CQ* 36 (1986), 264–6. The only serious challenge to the traditional identification is that of G. V. Sumner, *The Orators in Cicero’s Brutus* (Toronto, 1973), pp. 36–7, whose arguments, based primarily upon chronological considerations, are countered by Moir. This is not to say that Sumner is necessarily wrong; rather, as Moir demonstrates, chronology is not the means to settling the issue. Cicero on Publius Africanus f.: *Sen.* 35; *Off.* 1.121; *Brutus* 77.

² Velleius (1.10.3) also mentions Publius’ *vigor eloquentiae*. Publius was an historian (Schanz–Hosius 1.176), which renders Cicero’s positive judgement of his style all the more remarkable (cf. *De orat.* 2.51ff.; *Leg.* 1.6–7).

³ *ILLRP* 314, the epitaph of Cornelius Scipio Asiagenus, who died at sixteen, is succinct.