REVIEW–DISCUSSION

THE FRAGMENTS AND *PERIOCHAE* OF LIVY

D. S. Levene, *Livy. The Fragments and Periochae. Volume I Fragments, Citations, Testimonia.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2023. Pp. xliv + 352. Hardback, £160.00. ISBN 978-0-192-87122-0. *Volume II The Fragments and* Periochae. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2023. Pp. lxxxiv + 723. Hardback, £190.00. ISBN 978-0-192-87123-7. Both volumes: £275.00. ISBN 978-0-198-88853-6.

These volumes, the first two in a projected series of four, are an outstanding contribution to the study of Livy. In the first D. S. Levene (henceforth L.) has re-edited the fragments of Livy and, for the first time, collected citations of Livy made before the early Middle Ages and testimonia to his life and writing; he has also provided an introduction, text, translation, and commentary on not only the fragments but also the citations and testimonia. The second volume, titanic in scale, deals with *Periochae* 1–45; it contains a long introduction, the text, a critical apparatus to the text, a translation into English, and a massive commentary. L. does not fully disclose his plans for commenting on the later *Periochae* in the remaining volumes but does state (vol. II, p. xi) that the so-called Oxyrhynchus Epitome will be discussed in Volume III, and the *Liber prodigiorum* of Julius Obsequens in Volume IV. Both printed and online versions of the two volumes have been well produced by Oxford University Press and are extremely well indexed.[1]

---

[1] In case correction of misprints becomes easier in our digital age, I list the typographical errors that I have noticed. Vol. I: read (p. 48, F 65) *ornatu. nam* for *ornatunam*; (p. 152) 'also have had' for 'have also have had'; (p. 224) 'BC.' for 'BC'; (p. 240, three lines from end of second paragraph) 'Ganymedes' for 'Ganymede'; (p. 326) 'Develin' for 'Develin.'. In the apparatus to C 70 the juxtaposition of *XXXVIII* with *XXXUII* and *XXXUI* is odd, since L. does not normally use 'u' for 'v'. Vol. II: read (p. 30, apparatus) 'Sophus *Levene*' (thus the text) for 'Stofus *Levene*'; (p. 34, apparatus on 21.1) '*Lat.*' for '*Lat*'; (p. 95, line 7) 'simply' for 'a simply'; (p. 117, note on 3.5) '*a* [or *A*] is omitted' for 'A is omitted'; (p. 146) 'gods' intervention with'[*uel sim.*] for 'gods' intervention'; (p. 148) 'the Veliterni' for 'the Velitrae'; (p. 176) '*Rep.*' for 'Rep.' (at the second appearance of the abbreviation); (p. 241, second paragraph) 'offering the' for 'the offering the'; (p. 265, last line of penultimate paragraph) 'than' for 'that'; (p. 269 n. 99) a Greek semi-colon for a Greek question mark; (p. 484, on 23.7) 'in any part' for 'in in any part'; (p. 486) a full stop at the end of the first paragraph; (p. 527) '28.9.10' for '22.9.10'.

                   7 July 2025

L. had already published two books on Livy: *Religion in Livy*, which covers all the extant books, and *Livy on the Hannibalic War*.[2] Because it was the first full literary study of Livy's finest books for over half a century and the first ever to be written in English, the latter is likely to remain L.'s most read and hence most influential publication on Livy; but the volumes reviewed here draw on a wider range and depth of classical scholarship that few alive today could match. L. has collated MSS afresh; he has edited his texts with discrimination and produced numerous textual notes and conjectures of his own; he has provided the *Periochae* with a more rational subdivision into sections;[3] he deals adroitly with its language and style; he is fully at home with the numerous historical problems posed by his texts; and the massive bibliographies attest to his wide learning. Whether the *Periochae*, a text that L. himself says (lxxiv) 'is curt, uninvolving, undramatic, and rarely if ever shows even the slightest elements of profundity', deserves such lavish treatment is a question that I shall not attempt to answer. In what follows, in addition to describing and commending the content of these two volumes, I shall make such adverse criticisms of them as I can manage, but the obvious triviality of many of these should serve as another pointer to L.'s excellence.

Volume I

L.'s edition and enumeration of the fragments should become standard and replace the editions of P. Jal (1979) and W. Weissenborn as revised by H. J. Müller (1881).[4] By including in his volume not only ninety-three fragments of Livy but also eighty-three citations and sixty-five testimonia L. innovates against previous editions of the fragments. He states (xvii n. 1) that he would be glad to be told of any references to Livy made before AD 650; so far, I have found only one (to *praef.* § 4): Porph. ad Hor. *Epod.* 16.2 *svis et ipsa roma viribvs rvit*] *Hoc est, quod Titus Libius ait: ut magnitudine laboret sua* (cf. Ps.-Acro *ad loc.*: *svis et ipsa Roma v. r.*] *magnitudine sua laborat*).[5] Both citations and testimonia will be

---

[2] Levene (1993) and (2010).

[3] I use L.'s subdivisions in citing from *Per.* 1–45. L. uses a 'v' as a grapheme for consonantal 'u', but my own practice is to use a 'u'. To avoid a confusing mix of practices in this review, I have used a 'u' throughout except for passages quoted directly from L.'s books.

[4] Jal (1979) and Weissenborn and Müller (1881).

[5] The MS tradition of Ps.-Acro is notoriously difficult and it is well known that the edition of Keller (Keller 1902–4) is inadequate. Various sources make up the scholia that go under this name: one was an earlier version of the commentary of Porphyrio that was more complete than the version which we have today and of which V of Porphyrio (= Vat. lat. 3314, s. ix) is the archetype; another was the tradition deriving from V. That the citation in Ps.-Acro here derives ultimately from Porphyrio is clear; whether it derives from the fuller Porphyrio or the abbreviated version represented by V is less clear. I have found the

of use to anyone interested in the reception of Livy in antiquity and its immediate aftermath, although, as L. is well aware (xvii), they can tell only part of a story that begins in Augustan times. What should count as a fragment and what as a testimonium may be debated, and L. explains his sensible practice at vol. I, pp. xviii–xxii. For example, the comment *unde secundum Liuium legati pacis caduceatores dicuntur* (Serv. *Aen.* 4.242; Isid. *Orig.* 8.11.48) is fr. 72 W-M but very reasonably regarded by L. as a testimonium (T 65). Other testimonia of L.'s that were printed as fragments by earlier editors are TT 7, 53, 58, 59, 61, 62, 63; in each case, L.'s judgement is plausible.

The introduction to the first volume (xvii–xxxi) is relatively brief. After discussion of what should be regarded as a fragment, a citation, and a testimonium, it is concerned with the circulation of Livy in the Principate and in later Antiquity and the evidence for the transfer of books of Livy from papyrus roll to codex. L. notes the paradox that Livy, although generally regarded as a major author, is cited relatively seldom. He provides a good discussion of the authors who cite Livy most often, their interest in Livy, and their reliability; these authors are Priscian, followed by Servius (who may not always have cited Livy from first-hand knowledge), Plutarch (about whom the same could perhaps be said), and the scholia to Lucan. L.'s conclusion that Books 1–30 of Livy were cited far more often than any of the later books, and Book 1 more than any others, seems irrefutable. Among the later books, those dealing with the civil wars of the first century BC are cited more than others, and L. presents the evidence that Books 109–16, which describe these wars, had a separate numbering; he reasonably suggests that this reflects later interest, particularly in the exemplary tradition, in the figures active in this period. On pp. xxi–xxii L. makes the important observation that in later antiquity it seems to have been assumed that 'all traditions of Republican history derived from Livy', which he uses to explain why some details that are not found in Livy himself but are found in other later imperial writers could find their way into the *Periochae* and why Florus, Eutropius, and the *De uiris illustribus* could be regarded as epitomes of Livy.

L. states (xxxi) that he has drawn his text of the fragments and citations and testimonia entirely from standard editions, except that he has checked the MS sources of FF 13 and 23. This is entirely reasonable. It follows, however, that his list of sigla on pp. xxxiii–xliii is drawn from these standard editions,

---

scholion in, e.g., Paris lat. 7988, Vatican, Urb. lat. 359, and Vat. lat. 3257. I have retained V's spelling of *Livius* with a /b/. L., taking his text from Holder's edn. (Holder (1894)), in which the /b/ is found, does the same when he cites Porphyrio, even though at F 65 this leads to the spelling *Libius* in the text taken over from V but *Livius* in the parallel text of Ps.-Acro; the spelling used by Porphyrio himself, the ultimate source of both, is uncertain but was presumably *Liuius*. The phrasing of Sen. *Dial.* 7.13.5 *non est bonum, quod magnitudine laborat sua* was perhaps suggested, consciously or unconsciously, by this passage of Livy.

and this is in part responsible for a few errors and some confusion in these pages. The etiolated references to some important libraries (e.g., 'Paris' for 'Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France') and the omission of 'lat.' and 'gr.' in shelf-marks (e.g., Vatican 355 for Vat. lat. 355) are readily intelligible, but on p. xxxvi 'Wrocław' should replace 'Breslau', and we could usefully be told in which library of Valencia MS V of Jordanes is to be found; on p. xxxvii Rehdigeranus 107 of Orosius is in Wrocław, not Berlin; on p. xxxviii there are superfluous (given L.'s normal practice) references to 'Pollinganus' in a Munich MS and to 'Sangermanensis' in two Paris MSS; on p. xxxix 'Leiden, Vossianus 12.8' is the same MS that is a little more helpfully described as 'Leiden, Vossianus O.12' lower on the page, and 'Bamberg class. 43' appears to be Bamberg Msc. Class. 32; on p. xl 'Leiden, Vossianus XIX f. 63' is Vossianus, lat. F 63, and 'Baltimore 114' is presumably Baltimore, Walters Art Museum 114; on p. xli MS A of Serenus is called 'Turin C 78' when it is Zurich, Zentralbibliothek Hs. W 78 (L. was probably misled by 'Turicensis', the Latin adjective of Zurich); on p. xlii 'Guelph 2091' invents a library (the MS is Wolfenbüttel [turned into Latin as 'Guelpherbytum' or 'Guelferbytum'], Herzog August Bibliothek, cod. 7.10 Aug. 2° and is '2091' in Heinemann's catalogue, from which it is not normally cited). Throughout these lists L. and his copy-editor failed to find a consistent way to cite the plutei of Florence's Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana. Few will read or consult these pages, and even fewer will be troubled by these errors, but they offer a rare glimpse of L. operating at a much lower level than elsewhere in these volumes.

The ordering of the fragments broadly follows that of Weissenborn-Müller and Jal, but, in addition to the exporting of some fragments to the testimonia, the discovery of parchment containing two fragments from Book 11 and the decision, doubtless correct, to include FF 64, 68, 70, 79 (L.'s view that this fragment comes from a speech is attractive), and 80 necessitated renumbering. And L. has made other adjustments elsewhere: F 40 (= fr. 57 W-M and J) is placed in Book 109 rather than Book 116; the references to Crastinus in the context of Livy at Σ Luc. 7.471 and Comm. Bern. 470 (frr. 41–2 W-M, 42–3 J) are rightly subsumed under F 46, and, most prominently, fr. 1 W-M and J is now F 69.

As one would expect, commentary is provided on all the fragments. The further provision of a commentary on the citations and testimonia where explication is needed or where L. has something interesting to say is a useful innovation that gives readers guidance on how to make use of both. Regular in the commentary on the citations is a comparison with the text given by the direct MS tradition of Livy (see, e.g., on CC 2, 12, 21, 24, 42, 54, 55, 62, 63, 65, 66, 68, 72, 77, 79, 80, 81); the discussions of citations in Plutarch throw light on Plutarch's working methods.

I shall make some general remarks on L.'s virtues as a commentator below in discussion of volume II; here are some additions to, observations on, and

(very occasionally) corrections of the commentary in this volume. **FF 1–2.** L. briefly explains how the fragments were identified as coming from Livy Book 11: '[t]he fragments … contain some distinctively Livian phrasing, and are largely congruous with his manner and with what other evidence we have for his treatment of these events' (perhaps 'largely' would have been better omitted). L. offers some pointers to what is 'distinctively Livian' in the phrasing, but has nothing on F 2's *dicto parere*, which is one of the more interesting expressions. A full study is available in the original publication of Bravo and Griffin,[6] but since this phrasing is the decisive pointer to Livy's identification as author and since L.'s commentary is bound to become the standard work on Livy's fragments, it is a pity that he did not repeat these details, which would have cost little space. See also my remarks on F 23. **F 13 P. Cloelius:** whether this fragment belongs to Book 11 or Book 20 (see L.'s good discussion), it is perhaps worth noting that, after the man mentioned by Livy 6.31.2, later patrician Cloelii are attested only here, at 40.42.11, and Val. Max. 1.1.4 (the last two references conceivably to the same man, who, as Mommsen noted in the original publication of the fragment,[7] may have been a descendant of the man mentioned in this fragment). For the corruption of *Cloelius* to *Caelius* see also Briscoe's note on 40.42.11. **F 15** 'Livy … cites Piso, Gellius, and Hemina at other times'. Gellius and Hemina are not cited in the extant writings of Livy. **F 19** Sulla did not have a 'dictatorship in 82–79', but ceased to be dictator on becoming consul in 80. **F 23** is the undertext of Vatican, Pal. lat. 24, visible to varying extents on fos. 73–8. In the *editio princeps* Giovanezzi and Bruns reported 'Titi Livi Lib. XCI' above the text;[8] whether they were right to do so the Vatican's digital images, made two centuries after chemical reagents had been applied to the MS, do not allow us to determine, but numerous instances of Livian phrasing leave no doubt about the fragment's author. Many of these were noted by Ogilvie in his article on the fragment.[9] As with Bravo and Griffin's article on FF 1 and 2, I regret that L. did not take over more of this evidence, although I agree with him that Ogilvie's criticism of the style of the fragment is overstated. For an instance of

---

[6] Bravo and Griffin (1988). The late Miriam Griffin was the first to see that the fragments relate to the consulship of Postumius Megellus. Impressed that someone who was not a specialist in earlier Roman history had been able to recognise this obscure episode, I asked her how she had managed to make the identification; she told me that it was because Tutors in Roman history in Oxford needed to be authorities on *maius imperium*, a standard topic for essays in Greats.

[7] Mommsen, in Krüger and Mommsen (1870) 373–4.

[8] See Giovenazzi and Bruns (1773) v, xvii–xx, xxxviii–xxxix.

[9] Ogilvie (1984).

this formulaic phrasing see my next observation.[10] **F 23.10 a castris …
pabulandi aut frumentandi causa progressi essent:** in his apparatus
L. notes that the text offered by the underscript of Vatican, Pal. lat. 24 is
virtually unreadable hereabouts. He follows Ogilvie in reading *progressi*,[11] but
his use of 'alii alia' for the proposals of others leaves it unclear whether he was
aware of Carey's note.[12] Carey proposed *digressi*, but, whereas *a castris progredi*
is, as Ogilvie showed, a Livian expression (25.17.1, 25.17.3, 25.34.4 *procul a castris
lignatum pabulatumque progressos*, 27.27.3, 37.39.6), *a castris digredi* is not. **F 37
cuius licet magnitudinem olim nemo, ut refert Liuius,
circumuectus est, multis tamen data est uaria opinio de ea
loquendi. quam diu siquidem armis** <u>**inaccensam**</u> **Romanis Iulius
Caesar proeliis ad gloriam tantum quaesitis aperuit. peruia
deinceps mercimoniis aliasque ob causas multis facta
mortalibus, non indiligenti quae secuta est aetati certius sui
prodidit situm**: thus L.'s text; in his apparatus he records 'inaccensam *HV* :
inaccensa *P* : inaccessam *LABX*'. *Inaccensam* is self-evidently the *lectio difficilior*
(L. translates 'after it had not been set alight for a long time by Roman arms'),
but this seems to be one of those places where the *lectio difficilior* is not *potior* but
simply wrong: the metaphor from burning is awkward and inappropriate; by
contrast, *inaccessam* is supported by *circumuectus*, *aperuit*, and *peruia*. Inspection of
the edition of Grillone, which L. cites on p. xxxvi as the standard edition of
the *Getica*, shows that he printed *inaccessam*.[13] **F 40 Regina ciuitas**: L.
translates 'the town of Regina' and writes in his note '[f]or the version of the
name used here see *AE* [i.e. *L'année épigraphique*] 60', where one duly finds
C]IVITATIS REGINAE; but *Reginus* is simply an adjective formed from *Regium*;
cf., e.g., Cic. *Verr.* 2.2.114 *Mamertina ciuitas* (and often elsewhere), 3.110 *Leontina
ciuitas*, 3.114 *Centuripina ciuitas* (also 5.83), 3.170 *ciuitas Halaesina*, 4.17 *quid te a
Centuripina ciuitate, a Catinensi, ab Halaesina, a Tyndaritana, Hennensi, Agyrinensi
ceterisque Siciliae ciuitatibus circumueniri atque opprimi dicis?*; Val. Max. 2.2.5 *Tarentina
ciuitas*, 4.8. ext. 2 *Acragantina ciuitas*. Formations of this kind, however, are not
found in the extant books of Livy (F40 is a paraphrase from Servius). For a

---

[10] Livy's formulaic phrasing was an interest of Ogilvie's in the years before his death. In
response to my request for advice on a topic in Livy for study towards a Ph.D., he wrote a
letter (undated) to me early in 1980 that includes these words: 'There is masses to be done
because the resources of Packard's <u>Commentary</u> [he meant <u>Concordance</u>] have only just
been tapped. I am thinking particularly of such things as (I <u>think</u> you were at my paper in
Nov. in Cambridge or perhaps not) [I was] 1. Subconscious repetition—the recurrence of
words and phrases in close proximity. 2. What, discussing Livy Book 91 (<u>sic</u>) I called his
mechanical or formulaic style when dealing with non-exciting material'.

[11] Ogilvie (1984) 124.

[12] Carey (1985).

[13] Grillone (2017) 11.

similar misunderstanding see below on *Per.* 39.5. **F 48 bono animo esse:** L. discusses the inaccuracy of the *Commenta Bernensia*'s saying that Cicero received a letter of reassurance from Caesar while he was in Sicily; he might have noted that the *Commenta*'s phrasing is paralleled at Cic. *Deiot.* 38 *Iubes enim eum* [Deiotarus] *bene sperare et bono esse animo, quod scio te* [Caesar] *non frustra scribere solere. Memini enim isdem fere uerbis ad me te scribere meque tuis litteris bene sperare non frustra esse iussum.* **F 49.** For a wife said to be a bringer of ill fortune, cf. Cic. *Phil.* 2.11. **FF 61–2.** For many years the fullest treatment of the language of these fragments was by Tränkle.[14] L. does not cite Tränkle, probably because of the more recent analysis of Livy's language in these passages by Woodman.[15] Tränkle is worth reading, however, on *taedium … cepit* (for Livy's predilection for an abstract noun as subject of *capio*), on *stolidae*, on *attollentes* (all F 61), and on the periodicity of F 61. **F 61.** In the sentence *uix attollentes <prae> lacrimis oculos homines intueri trucidata membra ciuis poterant* L. adopts Haase's *trucidati* and Woodman's *Ciceronis* respectively for *trucidata* and *ciuis* (the latter certainly corrupt) in the MSS of Seneca; but there is perhaps no need to emend *trucidata*, and Watt's *eius* is palaeographically much easier than *Ciceronis*, which I find too emphatic. **F 62.** The coupling *magnus ac memorabilis* is well discussed by L., but he does not note that Livy uses *uir* + adjective in obituaries also at 6.20.14 (*memorabilis*), 7.1.9, 30.26.8, and 38.53.9 (*memorabilis*). **F 63a.** A comma is needed after *hique* since the following relative clause is not restrictive. **F 67. —is enim terminus saeculi—:** L. might have commented on Livy's love of parenthesis: *is enim* is found introducing a parenthesis at 3.2.1, 5.24.11, 27.42.16, 32.7.3, 32.35.2, 37.14.5; other or cognate forms of *is* do this at 7.21.9, 8.26.6, 23.17.10, 43.17.9.

T 37. Under (e) L. cites the subscription *emendaui Nicomachus Flauianus u.c. ter praef. urbis Hennam* in his text as found in MSS M and H for Book 7 and M alone for Book 8. In fact, as he notes in his apparatus, instead of *Hennam*, M has *term̄* for Book 8; I take more seriously than L. does Cameron's hypothesis that for the correction of Book 8 Flavian had moved from Henna to Thermae Selinuntiae.[16]

Volume II

Introduction, Text, and Editing

The introduction to Volume II is much more massive than that to Volume I and is in effect a monograph on the *Periochae*. It is divided into nine sections.

---

[14] Tränkle (1968) 142–51.

[15] Woodman (2015) 75–86.

[16] Cameron (2011) 522–3.

The opening sections (i. 'Introduction' [pp. xi–xiv]; ii 'The *Periochae* and Orosius' [xiv–xxii]; iii 'The *Periochae* and Livy' [xxii–xxviii]; and iv 'The *Periochae* and Orosius Revisited (also Augustine, Eutropius …)' [xxviii–xxxii]) deal mostly with two topics: the modes of summarising the text of Livy and the question of whether the *Periochae* and other texts (e.g., Florus and Orosius) derive from an early summary of Livy. After introducing us to the surviving ancient epitomes of Livy (the *Periochae*; the so-called Oxyrhynchus epitome; the opening of *Periocha* I known as 'A' and plainly a text different from the rest of the *Periochae*; and Julius Obsequens), L. gives two reasons for sharing the view that already in the first century AD Livy had been epitomised. The first is that *Per.* 23.10 and Plut. *Marc.* 11.8 (C 53) concur in a very similar sentiment that does not reflect the episode of Livy to which they relate;[17] L. argues that since the author of the *Periochae* (henceforth 'P.', the abbreviation used by L.) is most unlikely to have drawn on Plutarch both must have drawn on a common source that was not Livy. I shall discuss this argument below. The second is that the 'most natural' interpretation of the much-discussed Martial 14.190 (T 23) is that it refers to an epitome of Livy. L. then notes that the argument that the *Periochae* and other texts in the 'Livian' tradition drew on a lost epitome rests on their use of similar language and their sharing versions of some stories that differ from those in Livy. L. (xiv) doubts the efficacy of the second argument, holding that P. did not need to use an intermediate source to be persuaded to substitute a non-Livian version of events popular in later antiquity for a Livian version; and, if one writer could introduce such a version, then so could another, and there is no need to postulate that both drew it from an epitome. L. starts his section ii by listing forty-seven passages where P. and Orosius share overlapping phrasing and explains why this sharing has made the hypothesis of a shared source attractive: it cannot be the result of both authors independently rephrasing Livy, since the shared expressions are not found in Livy; and since each retains aspects of Livy's account that are not found in the other, neither would appear to derive from the other. L. himself doubts that these arguments are cogent: he points out that the overlapping phrases cover only a very small proportion of the text of the *Periochae* and an even smaller proportion of the text of Orosius; he follows those who believe that Orosius often consulted Livy directly as well as using other sources; and he says that he will demonstrate that in similar fashion P. used both Livy and an epitome. That would leave only the shared language to be explained, and in section iv he will go on to argue that the shared phrasing could come from one author (in his view, Orosius) having used the other.

In section iii L. considers P.'s mode of working and at once tackles the question of direct use of Livy. He notes the difficulty caused by the epitome

---

[17] I give the section number of the standard Teubner text of Plutarch; L., following the Loeb, prefers 11.4.

that he and others postulate: much that could point to direct us of Livy could equally well be held to come via the epitome; but L. nevertheless gives his reasons for believing that Livy was consulted directly, one among which is the pointlessness of producing another epitome, another the manner of the *Periochae*'s engagement with Livy. L. notes how the *Periochae*'s Livian language is not always drawn from the portion of Livy being summarised but from elsewhere, 'elsewhere' sometimes being a later passage of Livy that refers back to the portion in question. He notes also that the *Periochae* sometimes adopt a version of a tale that Livy himself viewed with less favour.[18] Another indication that the *Periochae* do not simply reproduce an epitome of Livy is the fact that occasionally they are demonstrably using another source, sometimes Cicero, even more often Valerius Maximus;[19] the sheer number of these makes it unlikely that they derive via an epitome. L. concludes (xxvii):

> At least on the evidence of his summary of the surviving Livian books, he [i.e. P.] based himself on Livy's own text, but, when constructing the abridgement, he at different times had recourse to other texts, either the earlier epitome which had itself summarized Livy, but also apparently extraneous sources like Cicero and Valerius Maximus, both widely read in later antiquity.

On L.'s view, the recourse to the epitome was to help him steer his way through the vast *Ab urbe condita*. The recourse to Cicero and Valerius is 'explicable when one recalls the blurring in later antiquity between Livy's actual text and the general traditions of Republican history' (xxviii).

The arguments in L.'s introduction draw on the evidence assembled in his commentary, where the way in which the stories of the Early and Middle Republic were reported in later antiquity is meticulously examined. Often L. is able to show that P. follows the standard practice either of the exemplary tradition or of late antiquity in choosing what to report and how to report it.[20] Anyone interested in exploring this use of Cicero and Valerius should start

---

[18] For examples, see the index entry on p. 718 'substitutes Livy's alternative version' under the rubric *Periochae*.

[19] L. suggests that at 37.3 *filius Africani captus ab Antiocho patri remissus est* the *Periocha* draws on Julius Paris' epitome of Val. Max. 2.10.2 (*filium Africani Scipionis a militibus eius interceptum ultro patri remisit*) rather than Valerius himself (*filium eius a militibus suis interceptum honoratissime excepit, regiisque muneribus donatum ultro et celeriter patri remisit*). That the author of the *Periochae* was consulting Paris as well as Valerius seems bizarre (but perhaps not absolutely incredible given some of his other habits); it is easy enough to believe that both the *Periocha* and Paris were independently abbreviating Valerius.

[20] For examples, see the index entry on p. 717 'adapts Livy to fit tradition' under the rubric *Periochae*.

with his index entries on p. 718[21] and his note on 1.B.6,[22] which gives further references.[23] I hope that it will be obvious from my summary that L.'s work makes a very important contribution to our understanding of the sources and methods used by the historians and other authors of later antiquity who wrote about the Republic.

In iv. L. returns to the question of the relationship of the *Periochae* to Orosius and argues that the similarities between the two are to be explained by Orosius' use of the *Periochae*. Although most of the forty-seven passages allow no conclusion about priority to be drawn, he gives good reasons for thinking that Orosius 2.13.2, 3.22.6–7, 4.8.1–2, and 4.16.15–17 derive, respectively, from *Per.* 3.6, 11.1, 17.4, and 25.5–8. L. then presents evidence that Eutropius, Augustine, and the *De uiris illustribus* drew on the *Periochae*.

L.'s argument in these pages that the *Periochae* drew on both Livy himself and an earlier epitome is in theory perfectly plausible but involves a paradox: once he has demonstrated that Orosius (especially), Eutropius, and others made use of the *Periochae*, much of the evidence for the use of (and, indeed, the existence of) an earlier epitome disappears. L.'s prime pieces of evidence are the following passages dealing with Marcellus' victory at Nola:

Livy 23.16.15–16: *uix equidem ausim adfirmare, quod quidam auctores sunt, duo milia et octingentos hostium caesos non plus quingentis Romanorum amissis: (16) sed siue tanta siue minor uictoria fuit, ingens eo die res ac nescio an maxima illo bello gesta sit: non uinci enim ab Hannibale †uincentibus† tunc difficilius fuit quam postea uincere.*

Plut. *Marc.* 11.8: ὁ δὲ Λίβιος οὕτω μὲν οὐ διαβεβαιοῦται γενέσθαι μεγάλην <τὴν> ἧτταν, οὐδὲ πεσεῖν νεκροὺς τοσούτους τῶν πολεμίων, κλέος δὲ μέγα Μαρκέλλῳ καὶ Ῥωμαίοις ἐκ κακῶν θάρσος ἀπὸ τῆς μάχης ἐκείνης ὑπάρξαι θαυμαστόν, οὐχ ὡς πρὸς ἄμαχον οὐδ' ἀήττητον, ἀλλά τι καὶ παθεῖν δυνάμενον διαγωνιζομένοις πολέμιον.

Per. 23.10: *Claudius Marcellus praetor Hannibalis exercitum ad Nolam proelio fudit et uicit, primusque tot cladibus fessis Romanis meliorem spem belli dedit.*

Orosius 4.16.12: *Claudius Marcellus ex praetore proconsule designatus Hannibalis exercitum proelio fudit, primusque post tantas rei publicae ruinas spem fecit Hannibalem posse superari.*

---

[21] There a reference to p. 522 should have been added.

[22] L. there writes 'P.s phrasing … follows Val. Max. 7.3.2', but he may have kept an eye on Livy too: *quis eorum* is closer to Livy 1.56.10 *quem eorum* than Valerius' *quisnam ex ipsis.*

[23] I make suggestions below on pp. XIX and XXVIII.

L. argues (xiii) that Plutarch's Ῥωμαίοις ἐκ κακῶν θάρσος ἀπὸ τῆς μάχης ἐκείνης ὑπάρξαι θαυμαστόν and the *Periocha*'s *primusque tot cladibus fessis Romanis meliorem spem belli dedit*, which latter contains a sentiment not found Livy, both derive from the same source, which must therefore have predated Plutarch and have been an epitome of Livy. The presence of *spem* in Orosius may be explained by his having drawn on the *Periochae*. L. could be correct (that the datives Ῥωμαίοις and *Romanis* and the words θάρσος and *spem* are similar is obvious), but there are some difficulties: (i) ὁ δὲ Λίβιος οὕτω μὲν οὐ διαβεβαιοῦται γενέσθαι μεγάλην ἧτταν οὐδὲ πεσεῖν νεκροὺς τοσούτους τῶν πολεμίων is a very clear reference to Livy 23.16.15, and it would be surprising to find this kind of Livian comment on his sources carried over into an epitome; (ii) Livy's *ingens … gesta sit* could have suggested κλέος δὲ μέγα Μαρκέλλῳ (note especially *ingens* and μέγα); (iii) Livy's *uinci* and *uincere* could have suggested the ideas of victory and defeat implicit in both οὐχ ὡς πρὸς ἄμαχον οὐδὲ ἀήττητον and the *Periocha*'s *primusque tot cladibus fessis Romanis meliorem spem belli dedit*; (iv) Livy's *postea* could perhaps have suggested the notion of time implicit in the *Periocha*'s *primus*.[24] I noticed very little other cogent evidence that L. cites for the existence of an earlier epitome.[25] L. may be right in holding that P. made use of an existing epitome, but if he had followed other scholars in rejecting this notion,[26] he would have given himself an easier task in proving that P. made direct use of Livy.

For those interested in the *Periochae* as literature, 'v. The Narrative of the *Periochae*' (xxxii–lv) will be the most important section of the introduction. L. explains why the theory of Klotz, that the text does not have a single author but grew by accretion, is unlikely to be right. Despite the seemingly atomised state of many sentences in the *Periochae*, L. shows that P. has worked to give them some shape and narrative continuity. He explains how some stories (e.g.,

[24] Another possible inspiration for that word is *primus* at Val. Max. 4.1.7 *M. Marcellus, qui primus et Hannibalem uinci et Syracusas capi posse docuit*; note also *primum* at Val. Max. 1.6.9.

[25] On 39.5 L. states that Plutarch, *Flam.* 18.5 (§9 in the Teubner text) summarises Livy's version of the story behind L. Flamininus' expulsion from the senate in much the same way as the *Periocha* and suggests tentatively that this may be evidence for the dependence of both on an epitome; but both Plutarch and the author of the epitome could have noticed the striking references to a speech of Cato at Livy 39.42.6 and 43.1 and referred independently to it. On 36.4 *prospera* L. writes: '*prospere* is one of P.'s favourite words, but he employs the adjectival form far less commonly: apart from here, he uses it only at 94.1 and 117.1, and only the first of these is in the context of a battle. It may not be coincidental that Book 94 is a book whose summary, like that of Book 36, is extremely skimpy: in both cases P. may be reflecting the language of a pre-existing epitome'. On 13.2 L. (quoted below, n. 29) ponders the possibility that language shared by the *Periochae* and Eutropius may point to an intermediate source, but he notes also that it could come from independent summarising of Livy. All this amounts to weak evidence for a pre-existing epitome.

[26] See, e.g., Begbie (1967).

that of Philip V) are phrased so that there are links between the different *Periochae*, how a death brings 'closural force' to seventeen 'books', how Livy's narrative order is changed (there is a clear example of material being moved from one book to another), how the formula *res praeterea continet* or its equivalent alerts the reader to a disruption of temporal order. P. is shown to have particular interests: in the census and recording of Rome's population, in colonisation, the first occurrence of something in Roman history, in speeches and their effect. He focuses on individuals, especially Scipio Africanus, Scipio Aemilianus, Caesar, and Pompey. Conversely, he displays little interest in religion or in the moral complexity of behaviour about which Livy wrote.

That numerous 'Livian' expressions reappear in the *Periochae* is no surprise, but L. provides an interesting discussion of two phenomena on which he often remarks in the commentary: sometimes the *Periochae* use language in recounting an episode that comes not from Livy's main account of the episode itself but from a later passage in which he refers back to it; sometimes the language is Livian but attested only elsewhere in Livy. The conclusion that P. knew Livy's language extremely well is inescapable. L. also illustrates the presence of words attested only in late antiquity and of some Christian vocabulary, which, combined with P.'s lack of interest in Roman religion, suggests that he may have been a Christian. Good though L.'s remarks on the style of the *Periochae* are, I should have been glad of an even longer discussion. It is worth noting, for example, that, in contrast to much late antique Latin prose, the ends of sentences do not regularly exhibit *clausulae* that conform to either metrical rules or the *cursus*.

In 'vi. Authorship and Composition' (lv–lix) L. employs two arguments to date the *Periochae* to the late fourth century AD: the Christian language that he has detected and an echo in Eutropius, who wrote c. 370. More tentatively he suggests, largely on the basis of the geographical knowledge displayed by the *Periochae*, that the text was written near Milan. L. suggests that the brevity of the *Periochae* for Books 36, 53, 81, 87, and 91 may be explained by P.'s having access only to an imperfect text of Livy.

'vii. Reading the *Periochae*' (lx–lxxiv) is concerned mostly with allusion, which interests L. greatly.[27] In Levene (2010) he argued that as well as using Polybius as a source Livy alluded to him. In Levene (2011) he developed his

[27] For an interesting discussion of a possible nexus of allusion, see L.'s note on 13.1 *omnia uersa in hostem*. Occasionally, I thought that his enthusiasm for allusion goes too far. In his note on 40.2 *certamina inter filios Philippi, Macedoniae regis, Persen et Demetrium, referuntur* L. says that the closest parallel to P.'s phrasing is Trog. *Prol.* 16 *ortisque inter filios eius certaminibus* (of sons of Cassander) and comments '[t]his may merely be coincidence, but it is at least possible that the prologue of Trogus reflects the phrasing of the original, and that P. is alluding to it here, showing how elements from Macedonian history are being partially replayed under Philip'. I doubt that the author of the *Periochae* was capable of such sophistication; besides, *certamen + inter* and the accusative is an extremely common collocation.

ideas in a 'working paper', and this long section is largely devoted to explaining the relationship of the *Periochae* to Livy in terms of allusion. Much of the ground traversed in it is similar to that in his 2011 paper, but L. has refined his ideas somewhat and takes less interest here in allusion that leads to the reading of one episode in history or historiography in the light of another (for example, Livy's Hannibal in the light of Sallust's Catiline, to take a well-known Livian example), something that is of little relevance to the *Periochae*.[28] Rather, *inter alia* L. returns to and reinforces his earlier published arguments about the relationship of historians to their sources. He argues again that when an historian is using another historian as his source, he is alluding to that historian. Although L. accepts that in many cases the existence of an allusion can be appreciated only by those who know the text of the source, he does not think that this matters. He argues that it is a mistake to regard the audience of historians as unitary: even if many readers could not appreciate an allusion, some people could; he is prepared even to suggest that the only person who may have appreciated an allusion was the later historian himself, sometimes enjoying a private joke. Because historians were recounting reality (or what was imagined to have been reality), there were limits to the extent to which their allusive activity could be creative. L. considers the difference, therefore, between a later historian's changing substantially the narrative of an earlier historian and hardly changing it at all (he points to those passages of Livy that are hardly changed from Polybius). In the former case, the later historian is in L.'s view producing a narrative that avoids misrepresentations of reality in the earlier. In the latter case, he argues, the later historian produces 'an allusion with a distinct ontological status: it not only refers to the earlier account but accepts its truth'. But how, L. asks, can this be an allusion, or a meaningful allusion, if the later historian has, in effect, contributed little or nothing to the crafting of his own narrative? Before answering this question L. shows the difficulty of historicising readings that ignore collective memory and attempt to make the time of the later historian's writing the decisive factor in inter-pretation. In the case of the passages of Livy whose content was taken over more or less unchanged from Polybius and which accordingly received their fundamental shape and point in the second century BC, this means Livy's Augustan time of writing. L. thinks that the tendency of classical scholars to take more interest in those places where a later writer has changed his source than in those where the material from the earlier writer is reproduced largely unchanged is a mistake. In the penultimate paragraph of the section he writes (lxxiii):

[28] L. tells his readers (p. lx n. 49) that 'all future references to this material should be made to the version in this volume', but some material in the 2011 paper is not reproduced.

> [C]ontemporary interpreters of ancient historiography (as of other literary texts) have tended to work from broadly historical assumptions, whereby we abstract the contribution of each particular writer and seek to interpret it as a product of its time. But once we understand that allusion in ancient historiography can often be generated less by a decision to allude, but rather more by a prior commitment to represent the work of an earlier author (often founded in a presumption of that work's historicity), it makes more sense to adopt a broader, trans-historical approach side by side with that of historicism, and to see the episodes not as product of a single writer, but as part of the developing traditions of Roman historical culture and Roman historical memory.

L. prefers to term such allusion 'collaboration'.

   All this has relevance to the *Periochae* in various ways. Since the shadow of Livy is omnipresent (even if he was not always the source for all that is said, the fact remains that the *Periochae* claim to be, and mostly are, summaries of his work), there must, on L.'s view, be constant allusion to Livy; but, since allusion of this kind is so incessant and insistent, it ceases to be meaningful: hence the need for the term 'collaboration'. Since P. is most unlikely to have read Polybius, we should view passages in which the *Periochae* present material that Livy derived from Polybius as 'a collaboration across time by authors who may be assumed to be unacquainted with one another' (lxx). However, the *Periochae* do not always follow Livy's version of events: L. regards these as sly allusions, to be picked up only by those who know their Livy very well. Sometimes the telling of an episode in the *Periochae* differs from that found in Livy because P. is influenced by the standard way of referring to the episode in the later Empire. Here, in L.'s view, an historicising interpretation does work, because the historical circumstances of composition explain the difference from Livy.

   L. reached his view on collaboration via his argument that historians allude to their sources. It could perhaps have been reached by other routes, but it strikes me as a very helpful formulation. He is right to say that when comparing an ancient historian to his source students of the former (amongst whom I include myself) have tended to concentrate too much on what is changed and not enough on what is left unchanged. They know that anything changed by the later author provides evidence for what is original and distinctive about his literary techniques but forget that taking over material largely unchanged is as much a part of the later historian's technique. L.'s remarks on the danger of 'historicising' interpretations of such changes are well put: we are all familiar with the sometimes fanciful attempts to read Latin texts of the early Principate with too exclusive reference to the man who was *princeps* at the time or imagined time of the author. It is difficult to disagree with L.'s view that historians allude to their sources, since a later historian must

have had the earlier writer in view and for the most part been self-conscious about any changes that he made (or did not make) to the earlier writer's narrative, but how far does pointing out that historians allude to their sources add to what has been learnt about their techniques from patient, old-fashioned observation of how they used their sources?[29] Perhaps we should stress more that the later writer expected the changes that he had made (or not made) to the earlier writer to be observed and pondered. That would work well for passages that contain explicit remarks on the content of a source (e.g., Livy 7.10.4); but since readers of the later historian could not be expected often to recognise these changes, L. is forced to stress the possibility that the later historian may be alluding for his own benefit alone. In my view, this greatly reduces the interest and utility of L.'s formulation.

In 'viii. The *Periochae* and the articulation of Livy's text' (lxxiv–lxxix), L. discusses what the *Periochae* can tell us about the way in which Livy designed his history. His comments 'it may well be the case that Livy did not have a single structuring device for his entire work' (lxxviii) and '[t]he most likely explanation for the *Periochae* recording 142 books, therefore, is that Livy wrote 142 books' (lxxix) are both wise.

Textual matters are discussed in 'ix. Note on the Text' (lxxix–lxxxii). In constituting his text L. has availed himself of work on the MS tradition by Reeve and Reid,[30] which he summarises succinctly. He uses seven MSS. Six of these are derived from the same source: N = Heidelberg, Pal. Lat. 894 (s. ix); the pair G = Paris, NAL 1767 (s. x) and U = Bern, Burgerbibliothek 249 (s. xi) (these represent a family that has only *Per.* 1–7); P = Paris Lat. 7701 (s. xii) and the pair E = Florence, Laur. Edili 186 (s. xiv) and F = Florence, Laur. 89 inf. 25 (s. xv) (these two last representing the large family of Italian MSS; this shares a lost intermediate ancestor with P). Like Reeve,[31] L. leaves open the question of whether a seventh MS (B = Bern, Burgerbibliothek A 92.10, s. ix) that now survives as a single leaf containing only 6.2–8.1 was once the ancestor

---

[29] To take an example from L.'s own commentary, on 13.2 he writes: '**redimendis captivis:** *captivos redimere* is found a number of times in Livy, including a reference to the mission to Pyrrhus (22.59.7; also 22.57.12, 22.61.3, 22.61.7, 38.47.12, 44.24.7). P.'s language here may accordingly reflect Livy's original; but it is worth noting the close similarity of this whole passage with Eutr. 2.12.2: *legati ad Pyrrum de redimendis captivis missi ab eo honorifice suscepti sunt. captivos sine pretio Romam misit.* This may result from both P. and Eutropius drawing on Livy or some other intermediate source, but the clustering of similar phrases despite each text containing material not present in the other makes it more plausible that one is partially drawing on and alluding to the other, albeit perhaps also with an awareness of Livy's text in the background'. What is gained by the inclusion of 'alluding'? It is hard to imagine that either Eutropius or the author of the *Periochae* wanted his readers to ponder the relationship of his exiguous narrative to the exiguous narrative of the other writer.

[30] See Reeve (1988) and (1991) and Reid (1990).

[31] Reeve (1988) 487.

of all extant MSS; certainly none of its readings precludes this. L. has collated all these MSS himself and reports all readings of B and N (orthographical trivia apart) but does not report the individual errors of G, U, P, E, and F. The resulting apparatus, which mixes 'positive' and 'negative' formats, is easy to use and presents a striking contrast to that of Jal, who packed his own previously standard edition (Paris, 1984) with the fruits of his collation of numerous other MSS, the presence of whose readings adds no useful evidence for establishing the paradosis.[32]

L. notes (lxxxii) that Rossbach in his edition had given 'a surprising prominence to the *editio princeps*' (r). He himself rightly doubts that it has any independent value and ignores it 'except as a repository of conjectures'. Because incunables were produced by the hundred, they were readily accessible to early modern scholars in the way that MSS, dispersed among the libraries of Europe, generally were not; hence their readings lurk in too many editions of classical texts. These readings very often differ hardly at all from those of MSS earlier than the incunables, and hence conjectures reported from incunables are often found also in earlier MSS. More systematic investigation of MS traditions often allows the ejection of incunables from critical apparatuses and their replacement by MSS. In the case of the *Periochae* it is well known that Vat. Lat. 6803, written in part by Giovan Andrea Bussi, the editor of the *editio princeps*, was the MS from which the *editio princeps* was set up; hence the *editio princeps* should be banished entirely from the apparatus in favour of Vat. Lat. 6803, even though the banishment takes us further back in s. xv by perhaps only a few months.[33]

---

[32] I checked BNGPF for 3.1–8.1. I found L. to be an accurate collator (I confess that he notes several readings that at first I had missed), but would record MS readings differently in the following places: 4.2 *aliquot*] *aliquit* G: *aliquid* G², 4.10 *tribunus* N²P²G² : *tribus* NPGF, 5.4 *tribunus*] *tribus* PN (perhaps corrected by N²) G, 5.7 *contulerat* NP (not *contulerunt*), 7.3 *esset a M.*] *esse tam* B : *essetam* N : *esset am* B² : *esse a* N², 7.6 *Pomptina*] *Pomp tinia* B : *Pomp linia* B² (the 't' is deleted), 7.11 *tribuni*] *tribus* BN(corr. N²)P, 7.11 *occasionem*] *occansionem* BNP² : *occausionem* P : *occausionem* P^cmg. Complete accuracy in collation is a gift given to only a very select few who edit texts or investigate MS traditions.

[33] On Vat. Lat. 6803 and r, see, e.g., Billanovich, in Menegazzo and Billanovich (1982) 342–3, Reeve (1988) 484, and Orestano (2020). In the places listed below in which L. cites a reading of r, I inspected Vat. Lat. 6803 and found that in all it has the same reading († indicates that Jal, whose apparatus does not always allow the reading of the primary MSS to be discerned, reports the reading from Vat. Lat. 6803, * indicates that he reports it from other MSS). A1 *[Italiae]* (but replaced by *& siluii ęneae*), †*2.4 *Coclitis*, 4.2 *a tri. pl.*, 4.4 *index* (as a correction), 5.4 *idem*, †*7.7 *ab ipso lata* (as a correction), 13.1 *processit*, 13.3 *petiit*, *15.4 *Beneuentum* (but followed by *in Samnio*. This supplement is printed by Jal, who reports it from Vatican, Urb. Lat. 392, a MS that was copied from r), 17.4 *Calatinus*, *19.6 *iterumque*, 22.4 *aduersis proeliis militem*, *22.4 *pugnae* (as a correction; *pugnare* before correction), 23.2 *barchina* (as a correction; before correction it had *barcina*, the reading printed by L. and ascribed by him to a conjecture by Drakenborch), 29.8 *P. Pleminii* (as a correction; *p. pelminii* before

The critical apparatus contains a few eccentricities. Although the rest of the editorial comment is in Latin, the names of the cities in which MSS are now housed (but not the shelf-marks assigned to them by their libraries) are generally in English. To take p. 12 as an example one finds '*Vatican Ottob. Lat. 2852*', '*London Burneianus 204*', '*Leiden Bibl. Pub. Lat. 19 et cett.*'; but there is some inconsistency, since on the same page we find '*Guelferbytanus 175*' and '*Leidensis Bibl. Pub. 19*'. At 13.8 L. prints *[et]* in his text and has '[et] INPEF delevi' in his apparatus; the square brackets in the apparatus are unwanted.

The normal Latin adjectives to refer to Besançon are *Vesontinus* or *Vesontinensis* or *Vesontiensis*; L.'s *Vesoniensis* (apparatus to 14.3) is aberrant. At 20.12 L.'s text is *coloniae deductae sunt in agro de Gallis capto Placentia et Cremona [in Italia]*. In his apparatus he has '[in Italia (Yt- *E*)] *in NPEF initio libri XXI scriptum est;* initia *Sigonius; huc transposuit Gronovius; seclusit Rossbach*'. With the decision to accept Rossbach's deletion I have no quarrel, but it is surprising not to have this entry at the beginning of Book 21.

L. is a resourceful editor and not afraid to propose conjectures of his own; I was surprised that at this late stage in the editing of Latin texts he has been able to make so many. These include suggestions in the following passages: **2.5** (postulation of a lacuna after *CCC esse*; but conjectural supplements here go back at least to s. xv), **4.2** (that the text is lacunose here has long been recognised; in his apparatus L. suggests *tribuni militum consulari potestate promisce creati sunt ex patribus et plebe* exempli gratia for *tribuni plebis*), **4.11** (*Labicanos* for *labscos* or the like in the MSS), **5.11** (*Ioui* for *Ioui Capitolino*), **11.2** (*<et> in quo ipsum numen*), **20.6** *qui subacti* for *subactique* (a neat conjecture), **22.4** (*aduersis proeliis territos milites* for *aduersus proeliis milites*, a minor variation on a proposal of Madvig's), **27.1** *Herdoniam* for *hieroniam* (but Sigonius had already proposed *Herdoneam*). On **25.9** L. makes the attractive suggestion that in the text of Livy at 25.31.9, which Briscoe prints as *in tanto tumultu, quantum †captae urbis† in discursu diripientium militum ciere poterat*, the obelised words should be placed after *tumultu* and, as others had already suggested, a word such as *furor* or *pauor* be inserted after *quantum*. At **35.3** L. prints *<cum> Nabis, Lacedaemoniorum tyrannus, incitatus ab Aetolis, qui et Philippum et Antiochus ad inferendum bellum populo Romano sollicitabant, a populo Romano desciuisset … bello … interfectus est* and observes in his commentary that his placing of *cum* in initial position rather than before *a populo* (thus Jahn) 'is less stylish but more typical of P.'. Jahn's more stylish position is supported by, e.g., 2.5 *Porsenna, Clusinorum rex, bello cum Tarquiniis suscepto, cum ad Ianiculum uenisset …*, 2.8 (two instances), 2.10, 2.15, 5.6, 6.3, 7.10, 14.3, 17.4, 39.4 etc.; it has the advantage of allowing a new topic be introduced by the initial proper name, which serves as a heading. At **18.4** L.'s conjecture

correction), 30.3 *isque*, †34.5 *ut id fieret* (as a correction; *ute* (?) before correction), 35.5 *chalcidem* as a correction; *calchidem* before correction), †41.3 *erexit*.

Valerius Maximus Sempronius Sophus censores for *M. Sempronius Maximus C. Sempronius Stofus censores* in three of his four primary MSS postulates an unlikely interpolation of *praenomina*. Read either *M'. Valerius Maximus P. Sempronius Sophus censores* (restoring the correct names from the *Fasti Capitolini*) or *M'. Valerius Maximus C. Sempronius Sophus censores* (assuming that the original text of the *Periochae* had a mistake). L. refers to his note at 4.4 for the omission of *praenomina* in the *Periochae* but there he admits that such omissions are not invariable and with this passage we may compare 34.5 *Sextus Aelius Paetus et C. Cornelius Cethegus censores*, 59 *Q. Pompeius Q. Metellus, tunc primum uterque ex plebe facti censores*, 62 *L. Caecilius Metellus Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus censores*, 98 *Cn. Lentulus et L. Gellius censores*.

I offer here a few other observations on L.'s text. On **2.4** L. provides a good defence of the MS reading *L. Valerius* against Sigonius' *P. Valerius*: although Livy refers to P. Valerius Publicola, the *praenomen* Lucius is found in other late antique texts. At **28.7** the comma placed in the text after *motam* should be deleted. At **38.4** L. prints *exemplum quoque uirtutis et pudicitiae in femina traditur. quae cum regis Gallograecorum uxor fuisset capta, centurionem, qui ei uim intulerat, occidit.* I should prefer to punctuate with the comma after *capta* placed instead after *fuisset*; for the nominative perfect passive participle after the *cum* clause cf. 56 *ad exsoluendum foederis Numantini religione populum Mancinus, cum huius rei auctor fuisset, deditus Numantinis non est receptus.* P. rarely uses the root *fu-* in making passive forms with the perfect passive (only at 20.11, 25.3, 29.14) and rarely inverts participle and auxiliary. **38.9 Scipio Africanus … in uoluntarium exilium Liternum concessit:** L., like Jal before him, cites *exilium Liternum concessit* only from Vat. lat. 6803 (on which see above); his four primary MSS have merely *exilium concessit*. Since the paradosis is intelligible and since the *De uiris illustribus*, which L. himself believes to derive from the *Periochae* hereabouts, has (49.18) *inde in uoluntarium exilium concessit*, there is no need to emend.

Commentary

L. in general gives more space to commenting on the *Periochae* of Books 11–20 of Livy, which have not survived, than on those of books of Livy that have survived. His commentary on Books 1–10 (pp. 73–197) comprises 124 pages, that on Books 11–20 (198–451) 254 pages; that on Books 21–30 (452–558) 107 pages; that on Books 31–40 (559–630) 72 pages; that on Books 41–5 (631–72) only 42 pages. The variations in length partly reflect the varying length of the *Periochae*. In commenting on the *Periochae* of those books of Livy on which extensive modern commentaries have been written (viz. 1–10, 21, 22, 26, 27, and 31–45), L. does not content himself with referring to these commentaries but considers problems afresh, sometimes correcting views put forward in

these commentaries.[34] He has carefully re-read all the ancient sources for the episodes of Roman history covered by the *Periochae* and the fragments and has read very extensively in the modern bibliography on the numerous problems and controversies provoked by these sources. Any good commentator on a Greek or Roman historian needs to be able to distinguish philological and historical problems and to adopt the appropriate mode of exposition for dealing with each. L. passes this test with flying colours; among the many notes that prove this, that on **27.5** *CXXXVII milia CVIII* at vol. II, pp. 519–20 may serve as a typical example. Where the full text of Livy is extant, L. carefully shows how the *Periochae* adapt it. I have already observed that L. always compares the adaptation with accounts found in other post-Livian sources and thereby places it in the context of the so-called 'Livian' tradition.

There are some long notes, which any historian interested in the problems with which they deal would be unwise to neglect, for example at **11.1** (on the command of Fabius Gurges), **11.6** (the third secession of the plebs), **12.1** (fighting against Gauls), **12.2** (the war with Tarentum), **12.5** (the Campanians at Rhegium), **13.1** (the battle of Heraclea), **13.2–3** (negotiations after Heraclea), **13.5** (the battle of Ausculum), **13.6** (Carthaginian treaty), **13.7** (Fabricius and the traitor), **15.7** (expansion of the quaestorship), **16.2** (the beginning of the First Punic War), **18.1–2** (Regulus' campaigns in Africa), **18.5** (death of Regulus), **19.6** (the prosecution of Claudia), **19.9** (the Roman victory at the Aegates islands and subsequent treaty), **20.1** (the revolt of Falerii), **20.4** (Roman fighting in Sardinia and Corsica), **20.6** (the First Illyrian War), **20.8** (the Gallic War and Telamon), **20.10** (the Istrian War), **31.1–3** (the opening of the Second Macedonian War), **38.8–10** (the trials of the Scipios), **41.5** (the lex Voconia). That many of these long discussions are to be found in the notes on *Periochae* 11–20 reflects the difficulties caused for the period 292–219 by the absence of the full text of Livy.

Although L. writes many good shorter notes too, he is perhaps a little less interested in some minor details. For example, prosopographical notes are not provided on some characters when they first appear, e.g., at **32.7** (Cornelius Cethegus), **32.8** (Nabis), **34.5** (Sex. Aelius Paetus). At **37.4** there is no note on *Taurum montem.* At **2.4** The absence of any (brief) explanation of what *prouocatio* was and the problems caused by the ancients' view that it was introduced in this year is surprising; at **30.6** L. does not explain why Q. Terentius Culleo was *pilleatus*; at **37.5** there is no comment on the form *Asiaticus* (rather than *Asiagenes*).

I offer now some miscellaneous additions or corrections, mostly on the commentary but occasionally on the translation. ***Per.* 3.6 petitis per legatos et adlatis Atticis legibus ad constituendas eas**

---

[34] I accept, e.g., L.'s criticism (on 9.4) of my note on 10.23.12 (Oakley (1997–2005) IV.266), where, as L. shows, *semitam* is likely to mean a side-path.

proponendasque X uiri pro consulibus sine ullis aliis magistratibus creati: L. sees that the natural way in which to understand *eas* is to translate it as 'them' and have it refer to *Atticis legibus*; he worries, however, that Livy does not describe the laws as 'Attic' but merely records that the decemviri proposed laws partly modelled on Attic ones; he therefore understands *eas* as being equivalent to *tales* and translates 'ones like them'. Since L. tells us that Orosius (2.13.2) has *constituendarum legum Atticarum gratia* and plausibly thinks that Orosius here derives from this *Periocha* and since the *De uiris illustribus* (21.1) refers to a translation of Solonic laws, it seems better to give *eas* its natural meaning and assume that the *Periocha* follows a divergent late antique tradition. **4.4 Sp. Maelius … <u>regnum affectans … occisus est:</u>** L. does not cite Val. Max. 5.3.2g *Atque horum quidem secessus uoluntari: Ahala uero, cum magister equitum Sp. Maelium <u>regnum adfectantem</u> occidisset.* This may be further evidence for P.'s use of Valerius Maximus, but since *regnum affectare* is a Livian expression (1.35.3, 1.46.2, 2.7.6, 24.25.4, 42.50.10) its presence here could also be explained as an example of P.'s general familiarity with Livian phrasing. **4.4 boue aurata:** L. thinks it possible that P. took the faulty *aurata* from a corrupt MS of Livy; I prefer to believe that, knowing the gender of *bos*, he wrote *aurato* and therefore that our MSS are corrupt. **9.1 deforme foedus:** L. notes that the expression is unparalleled and suggests tentatively that it could have been taken from Val. Max. 2.7.1 *deformi … foederis ictu* (on the similar treaty of Mancinus); an alternative is that it was suggested by Livy 9.5.14 *deformatione* and 9.6.3 *deforme*. **11.1 C. Pontium, imperatorem Samnitium, ductum in triumpho:** L.'s note strikes me as being unduly pedantic and fussy. He argues against those who both identify Pontius with the Pontius of Caudine Forks fame and reject the historicity of this notice. Although it is possible that the two Pontii are different and that the notice is sound, it would be entirely characteristic of the annalistic tradition to have invented a capture that gave final revenge for the humiliation in the Caudine Forks. **11.7** L. writes 'book-divisions in Livy rarely coincide with the beginnings and ends of years'. In fact, such coincidence occurs in Books 2–10, 26, 30, 32, 36, 37, 40, and 42, that is sixteen out of the thirty-five extant Books, and it almost certainly occurred in the lost Book 11. **13.7 is:** in discussing the story of Fabricius' handing over the fugitive who offered to poison Pyrrhus, L. refers to 'later sources dependent (directly or indirectly) on Quadrigarius'; when so much of the annalistic tradition is lost (including Piso and Cn. Gellius), this remark seems incautious. **16.1** Since L. here discusses ethnographic digressions in historiography, it is slightly surprising that he does not mention others in Livy (5.33.2–35.3; *Per.* 104.1). **18.1 erat:** read 'primary MSS' for 'MSS' in '[o]mitted in the MSS'. **21.5 duce hostium Magone capto**: L. translates 'capturing the enemy general Hanno'; in his note he explains that Livy, Polybius, and Zonaras refer here to Hanno, and the faulty translation

perhaps derives from an earlier state of his text that read *Hannone.* **29.3** L. rightly places *aliquot* in his text but writes '**aliquod proeliis:** Cf. 12.3 n. *aliquod = aliquot*'. **29.10 amicitiam … renuntiauit** provides a good illustration of the *Periochae* using a Livian expression not found in the episode being summarised (five out of the eight instances of the expression that are attested before the Church Fathers come from Livy). **39.5 meretrice Placentina** is translated 'Placentina, a whore', but *Placentina* is an adjective, as is shown by Livy's original (39.43.2) *Placentiae famosam mulierem, cuius amore deperiret* [sc. L. Flamininus], *in conuiuium accersitam scribit* [sc. Valerius Antias]'; for the feminine form cf., e.g., Livy 41.1.6, 44.40.6. **39.7** L. well illustrates the metaphorical use of *origo* as subject of *fluo.* More generally, metaphors of flowing are common in Latin; cf. Cic. *Cael.* 19 and Cypr. *Eccl. un.* 5 (with *riui … defluunt … origine*).

It remains to express the hope that L. will soon be able to give us the third and fourth volumes of this magisterial series.

S. P. OAKLEY

Emmanuel College, Cambridge   sp023@cam.ac.uk

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Begbie, C. M. (1967) 'The Epitome of Livy', *CQ* 17: 332–8.

Bravo, B. and M. Griffin (1988) 'Un frammento del libro XI di Tito Livio?', *Athenaeum* 66: 447–521.

Briscoe, J. (2008) *A Commentary on Livy Books 38–40* (Oxford).

Cameron, A. (2011) *The Last Pagans of Rome* (New York and Oxford).

Carey, C. (1985) 'Livy: LIB. XCI. FR.VAT. 45–7', *LCM* 10.4: 64.

Giovanezzi, V. M. and P. J. Bruns, edd. (1773) *Titi Livi historiarum libri XCI. fragmentum* ανεκδοτον, *descriptum et recognitum a cc. vv. Vito M. Giovenazzio Paullo Iacobo Bruns ex schedis vetustissimis Bibliothecae Vaticanae. Eiusdem Giovenazzii in idem Fragmentum scholia* (Rome).

Grillone, A., ed. (2017) *Iordanes. Getica* (Paris).

Holder, A., ed. (1894) *Pomponi Porfyrionis Commentum in Horatium Flaccum* (Innsbruck).

Jal, P., ed. (1979) *Periochae: Abrégés des livres de l'histoire romaine de Tite-Live. Tome XXXIV, 1re Partie: 'Periochae' transmises par les manuscrits (Periochae 1–69)* (Paris).

Keller, O., ed. (1902–4) *Pseudacronis scholia in Horatium vetustiora*, 2 vols (Leipzig).

Krüger, P. and T. Mommsen (1870) 'Anecdoton Livianum', *Hermes* 4: 371–6.

Levene, D. S. (1993) *Religion in Livy* (Leiden, New York, and Cologne).

—— (2010) *Livy and the Hannibalic War* (Oxford).

—— (2011) 'Historical allusion and the nature of the historical text' *Histos Working Papers* 2011.01. https://histos.org/index.php/histos/libraryFiles/downloadPublic/3.

Menegazzo, E. and G. Billanovich (1982) 'Tito Livio nell'umanesimo veneto', *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 25: 313–44.

Oakley, S. P. (1997–2005) *A Commentary on Livy Books VI–X*, 4 vols (Oxford).

Ogilvie, R. M. (1984) 'Titi Livi Lib. XCI', *PCPS* 30: 116–25.

Orestano, G. (2020) 'Un caso di *printer's copy*: Il codice Vat. lat. 6803 e l'*editio princeps* delle *Periochae* liviane', *Bibliofilia* 122: 7–22.

Reeve, M. D. (1988) 'The Transmission of Florus' *Epitoma de Tito Livio* and the *Periochae*', *CQ* 38: 477–91.

—— (1991) 'The Transmission of Florus and the *Periochae* Again', *CQ* 41: 453–83.

Reid, R. A. (1990) 'The α class of the Manuscripts of the *Periochae* of Livy', in E. M. Craik, ed., *'Owls to Athens'. Essays on Classical Subjects Presented to Sir Kenneth Dover* (Oxford) 367–79.

Tränkle, H. (1968) 'Beobachtungen und Erwägungen zum Wandel der livianischen Sprache', *WS* nf 2: 103–52.

Weissenborn, W. and H. J. Müller, edd. (1881) *Titi Livi Ab Vrbe Condita libri bearbeitet von W. Weissenborn und H. J. Müller. Zehnter Band. Buch XLV und Fragmente*² (Berlin).

Woodman, A. J. (2015) *Lost Histories: Selected Fragments of Roman Historical Writers, Histos* Supplement 2.