

And while one cannot be absolutely sure that the *poeta* apostrophized by Propertius at 3.9.44 is in fact Philitas, since the manuscripts identify him only with an impossible *dure*, most editors think that it is and emend that *dure* to *Coe* (Beroaldus):

inter Callimachi sat erit placuisse libellos
et cecinisse modis, Coe poeta, tuis.

In 3.1.1, therefore, we might expect Propertius to have written:

Callimachi Manes et Coi sacra *poetae*

The manuscripts' *Philetæ* would then be an early gloss on *poetae* which had found its way into the text.

Against *poetae*, it might be objected that *Philetæ* better balances *Callimachi* at the beginning of the line. Yet it may be worth considering that Propertius could have inherited—from Callimachus surely, if from anybody—the established antonomasia which we find in Ovid's references to the 'Coan' and the 'Coan poet'; Callimachean allusiveness will then have been more desirable than a nice balance of personal names. There is no reference to the 'Coan' in Callimachus' surviving works, although Wimmel and others have supplied *Κῶιος* in line 9 of the lacunose *Aetia* prologue (I fr. 1 Pf.).³ But Callimachus almost certainly refers to the poetry of Philitas by a sort of antonomasia in his tantalizing mention of 'Coan writing' (fr. 532 Pf., τῶι ἱκελον τὸ γράμμα τὸ Κωϊόν),⁴ and it is not hard to imagine that he may have referred elsewhere to Philitas himself simply as the 'Coan'.

Penn State University

ARCHIBALD ALLEN

³ W. Wimmel, 'Philitas im Aitienprolog des Kallimachos', *Hermes* 86 (1958), 346–54, at 352. W. M. Edwards, *CQ* 23 (1930), 110, first thought of it.

⁴ See Pfeiffer's notes ad loc., including his observation that 'Ovidius semper *Coum poetam* sine nomine proprio significat'. And on the likelihood that Prop. 2.1.5–6 ('sive illam Cois fulgentem incedere... / totum de Coa veste volumen erit') is indebted to this Callimachean comparison, see S. J. Heyworth, *CQ* 36 (1986), 209.

RESTORATIONS IN LIVY 9.40: A REASSESSMENT*

In 1918 Conway and Walters published a restoration of Livy 9.40.3.¹ The passage in question describes how the Samnite army of 310 was composed of two differently equipped corps. Conway and Walters' restored text runs as follows:

(2) Duo exercitus erant; scuta alterius auro, alterius argento caelaverunt; forma erat scuti: summum latius, qua pectus atque umeri teguntur, fastigio aequali; ad imum cuneatior mobilitatis causa. (3) Spongia pectori tegumentum et sinistrum crus ocrea tectum. Galeae cristatae, quae speciem magnitudini corporum adderent. Tunicae auratis militibus versicolores, argentatis lintae candidae. <<(His vaginae argenteae, baltea argentea)>> <auratae vaginae, aurata baltea illis erant, et equorum inaurata tapeta>. His dextrum cornu datum; illi in sinistro consistunt.

There were two armies; the shields of one were inlaid with gold, of the other with silver, and the shape of the shields was this: the upper part was quite broad where it protected the breast and shoulders and had a smooth rim, while the base was rather tapering, for easy handling. A corslet made of sponge covered the breast, and the left leg was protected by a greave. Helmets were

* I should like to thank Dr J. Briscoe for his generous assistance during the preparation of this piece, and Dr S. P. Oakley for his criticism of an earlier draft. I should also thank Dr N. V. Sekunda for first drawing my attention to this passage.

¹ 'Restorations and Emendations in Livy VI–X', *CQ* 12 (1918), 98–105; for Livy 9.40 see 103–4.

plumed, to give an impression of greater stature. The tunics of the gilded soldiers were multi-coloured, and of the silver-plated of dazzling white linen. [The latter had silver scabbards and silver baldrics, the former had golden scabbards and baldrics, and their horses gold-embroidered saddle cloths.] These were assigned the right wing; the others were stationed on the left. (trans. B. Radice).

This restoration appears in the apparatus of Conway and Walters' Oxford text of Livy VI-X, is included in the main text of the Loeb and also appears in B. Radice's Penguin translation.

Conway and Walters' restoration is achieved by the insertion of two fragments of Livy: (1) 'auratae vaginae, aurata baltea illis erant', quoted explicitly from Livy Book 9 by Nonius (286.4 = 194.20M); (2) 'erant et equorum inaurata tapeta', quoted by Probus in *Instituta Artium* (GL IV 129-30), and by the anonymous author of the *Explanationes in Donatum* (GL IV 542). The sentence is completed with Conway and Walters' own introductory phrase: 'his vaginae argenteae, baltea argentea'.

We should have no quarrel with the possibility of restoring the quotation found in Nonius. Assuming that the book number is accurate, there is no better location within Book 9 (or indeed anywhere else in Livy) than at 9.40.3.² Nor is there a fundamental problem with the requirement for a supplement, since it is highly unlikely that the quotation in Nonius would correspond exactly to a lacuna in Livy.

There is, however, a problem of translation. Most translations place the gold corps on the right and the silver corps on the left. Conway and Walters approved of this and indeed thought it to be necessary: 'This restoration has the advantage of putting the "golden" army on the right, which seems a priori their proper place.' They seem to have overlooked the subsequent battle narrative in which it is the silver army that appears on the right wing: 'prior forte Iunius commovit hostem, laevo dextrum cornu, sacratos more Samnitium milites eoque candida veste et paribus candore armis insignes' (9.40.9). And if we read the transmitted text of Livy 9.40.2-3 without Conway and Walters' restoration, the Samnite silver army is accordingly placed on the right. This could be used as an argument against restoration of the text if Conway and Walters had been correct that the restored text places the gold army on the right. But in fact even the restored text can be read so that the silver army appears on the right. Conway and Walters' interpretation employs the standard consecutive treatment of 'hic' and 'ille', where 'hic' takes the nearest antecedent. But the normal meaning is sometimes inverted,³ and Livy may well have chosen to invert it here

² Conway and Walters were not the first to consider restoring this fragment to Livy 9.40. M. Hertz (1862) suggested adding a supplement after the fragment and placing the whole after 'adderent': 'galeae cristatae, quae speciem magnitudini corporum adderent. <auratae vaginae, aurata baltea illis erant> <<argentatae vaginae, argentata baltea his.>> tunicae auratis militibus versicolores, argentatis lineae candidae'. The lack of clear antecedents for 'his' and 'illis' (and perhaps also the position of 'his') render this unsatisfactory. K. E. Georges (1884) placed the fragment after 'duo exercitus erant': 'duo exercitus erant: <auratae vaginae, aurata baltea illis erant>; scuta alterius auro, alterius argento caelaverunt'. Here we should expect 'iis' for 'illis', and the prominence given to baldrics and scabbards is unlikely. L. Müller (1885) joined the fragment quoted in Nonius with 'erant et equorum inaurata tapeta' and prefacing this with a conjectural supplement placed the whole after 'adderent': 'galeae cristatae, quae speciem magnitudini corporum adderent. <<sed maxime equitum facies oculos in se convertit:>> <auratae vaginae, aurata baltea illis erant et equorum [in]aurata tapeta>; tunicae auratis militibus versicolores, argentatis lineae candidae'. However, the free composition is highly conjectural, and again we find 'illis' when we should expect 'iis'. Objections to the addition of 'erant et equorum inaurata tapeta' are presented below. For discussion and references see H. J. Müller, 'Zu den Fragmenten des Livius', *NJPhP* 34 (1888), 485-8.

³ TLL 6.3.2715.40ff.; J. B. Hofmann and A. Szantyr, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik* (Munich, 1965), p. 182. I owe these references to Dr J. Briscoe: see his note on Livy 37.51.2-3.

precisely because of the possibility of confusion, having initially referred to the silver army as 'his' and the golden army as 'illis'. Thus 'his vaginae argenteae, baltea argentea; auratae vaginae, aurea baltea illis erant' and 'his dextrum cornu datum; illi in sinistro' should be considered as parallel phrases where 'hic' always refers to the silver corps (picking up 'argentatis') and 'ille' to the gold (picking up 'auratis militibus'). In this case the silver army appears on the right wing, and the gold on the left. Given 9.40.9 this interpretation is much to be preferred.

Having accepted Conway and Walters' restoration of the quotation of Livy found in Nonius, we turn to 'erant et equorum inaurata tapeta', which is much less secure. In Probus this quotation is ascribed to Lucilius in R (Lindemann's apograph of a lost Vatican MS: cf. Keil, *GL* IV xi-xii) but to Virgil in B (Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek 17),⁴ while the commentator on Donatus quotes from Livy (though Keil emends to 'apud Lucilium' in order to make the passage agree with Probus). Such a phrase appears nowhere in Virgil, and an origin in Lucilius would require 'aurata' for 'inaurata' to maintain the hexameter. Thus Conway and Walters are probably right to think that the commentator on Donatus gave the correct source i.e. Livy. But they are wrong to assume that it belongs in 9.40. Unlike the quotation in Nonius, it is not ascribed to a particular book but is found merely 'apud Livium'. There is therefore a very strong possibility that this quotation comes from a lost portion of Livy. But probability is not the only argument against its restoration here. That it cannot be placed at 9.40 should be clear from the context of the passage. Livy is discussing two corps of Samnite infantry and nowhere mentions cavalry, so an insertion mentioning horse furniture, whatever its colour or manufacture, is singularly inappropriate.

In conclusion, we can accept the possibility that 'auratae vaginae, aurata baltea illis erant' should be restored to Livy 9.40.3, with the qualification that the restored text should be understood to mean that the Samnite silver army appears on the right wing and the gold army on the left. 'erant et equorum inaurata tapeta', however, should no longer be considered an acceptable restoration on grounds of both probability and context.

University of Manchester

S. J. NORTHWOOD

⁴ 'ablatiuo...codex *Lavantinus*' (i.e. St Paul in Carinthia Stiftsbibliothek 2.1) in Keil's apparatus is, of course, merely a reference to the commentator on Donatus.

PS-SENECA, *OCTAVIA* 889 AND VERGIL, *AENEID* 12.539FF.*

At 876ff. Octavia's partisans lament the ruinous intervention of the Roman mob in support of the heroine's legitimate claims against Poppaea. A series of paradigmatic figures illustrates the sentence 'o funestus multis populi dirusque fauor': the two Gracchi, first, then Livius Drusus, the *tribunus plebis* of 91 B.C., stabbed to death in his house in the year of his tribunate. The gallery of historical characters suits the Roman atmosphere of the play, the fallen heroes of Republican times are presented as noble and disinterested figures, struck by disaster and evil fortune. This is the description of Livius' fate (887-90; text and colometry given as in Zwierlein's OCT):

te quoque, Liui, simili leto
Fortuna dedit,
quem neque fasces texere, suae
nec tecta domus

* I am grateful to the Editor and to the anonymous referee of *CQ* for some suggestions and improvements. E. Fantham also made useful comments.