The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

The Battles of the Trebia and Lake Trasimene.—A Reply to Mr. Grundy

W. W. How and H. D. Leigh

The Classical Review / Volume 10 / Issue 08 / November 1896, pp 399 - 400

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00204939, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00204939

How to cite this article:

W. W. How and H. D. Leigh (1896). The Battles of the Trebia and Lake Trasimene.—A Reply to Mr. Grundy. The Classical Review, 10, pp 399-400 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00204939

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

RIBBECK'S *VIRGIL*.

P. Vergili Maronis opera apparatu critico in artius contracto iterum recensuit OTTO RIBBECK. (Teubner.) 1894—1895. 8vo. Pp. 941. M. 22 40.

THE first edition of Ribbeck's *Virgil* was published between the years 1854 and 1860, at a momentous period in the history of Latin scholarship. Ritschl's *Plautus* and Lachmann's *Lucretius* preceded it by a little, Mommsen's *History of Rome* was its contemporary, Madvig's *Livy* followed soon after, his *De Finibus* had appeared a little before it. It was an age of new things in learning as in politics and the revolutions of February and March were not more sweeping than the changes wrought by these scholars. To Ribbeck, in particular, we owe an entirely new, an infinitely more accurate presentation of Virgil's poems. There were *fortes ante Agamemnona*, Heinsius, Heyne, Wagner, and others, but the text of Virgil before 1854 was in a condition which now perhaps is hardly appreciated. Traces of it may be detected in the first volume of Conington's commentary, issued in 1858 and compiled to some extent under the influence of the older views—e.g. that MSS. should be counted, not classified—but most of our modern editions are based upon Ribbeck's work and seldom even allude to the unliterary and sometimes even illiterate copies of Virgil which passed muster before 1850. Ribbeck unfortunately was not content with his own work. When he had laid the foundations for the textual criticism of Virgil and had made it possible for the world to read and enjoy something

like the real Virgil, he went on to spoil the result by theories and conjectures which seriously detracted from the worth of his text, and at the present day his name is connected by most people with a number of bad emendations rather than with a gigantic improvement in the text of Virgil. Such then was Ribbeck's first great edition: now it has done a large part of its work and has indeed been long out of print. The new edition is suited to the new state of things. The first edition, with its copious critical commentary and its elaborate Prolegomena, was suited to inaugurate the new era: the book before me has no Prolegomena nor even a list of manuscripts, and its critical commentary has been pruned of everything not absolutely necessary to fix the text of the poet. What is given, is of course brought up to date. The Medicean codex is quoted from the collation of Hoffmann: such new readings or 'testimonia' as have been discovered since 1860 and are worth quoting are quoted, and many similar improvements have been made. The text is also altered, I think, for the better. Many doubtful conjectures have disappeared, though there still remain many to which a conservative and cautious critic must object. The doctrines of strophes in the Eclogues and of transpositions in the poems generally are also still adhered to, but the latter is applied more sparingly. The total result is a very valuable book, a text which is certainly improved, and a critical commentary which is full, concise, and accurate, and which is also improved.

F. HAVERFIELD.

THE BATTLES OF THE TREBIA AND LAKE TRASIMENE.—A REPLY TO MR. GRUNDY.

MR. GRUNDY, whose careful study of several of the principal Greek and Roman battle-fields lends weight to his criticism, has attacked the view we have taken of these two battles, and especially of the battle on the Trebia. It is not our intention to offer a detailed defence. The question has been too often thrashed out already. But Mr. Grundy has charged us with displaying a fine independence and assuming a disrespectful attitude to the

ancient authorities. We are accused of an unjustifiable assault on two respectable historians, and the sin apparently is not only flagrant, but original. Yet if we sin we sin in good company.

With regard to the Trebia, Professor Mommsen in his latest and definitive edition (*English Trans.* vol. ii. p. 272 note) considers the view assailed by Mr. Grundy, 'indisputable' and declares that 'the erroneousness of the view of Livy,' which Mr. Grundy

follows, 'has lately been repeatedly pointed out.' Dr. Neumann in his full and competent history of the Punic wars, deliberately rejects the view supported by Mr. Grundy though in some respects modifying the account given by Mommsen. Mr. W. T. Arnold, who would naturally maintain his grandfather's version, can only quote Ihne in support, and admits that Mommsen's is the 'current view.' He shows that there are difficulties in either theory, and that phrases like Mommsen's 'indisputable' (or Mr. Grundy's 'quite clear') are out of place. As he justly says, 'Polybius omits the essential point' and 'we are left to study the map and to weigh all the circumstances before we can come to a *probable* conclusion.' What need to pile up more names?

The reader of Mr. Grundy's article would scarcely believe that we have nowhere expressed a *decided opinion*. No doubt there can be found an implied preference for the current view, as agreeing better with our conception of the strategy of the whole campaign, but after a careful study at first hand both of the ancient authorities and of the best modern criticisms, we determined to record the two versions without concealing the difficulties of either alternative (cf. p. 185).

We still hold that, in view of the careless topography of the ancients, and of the inevitable inaccuracy of all, even the most recent, military history, such problems must remain insoluble. But we are obliged to Mr. Grundy for a useful correction. He has pointed out an error in the description of Scipio's second position due to the loose use of a military term.

With regard to the Trasimene we are too

much in agreement to dispute about details: in the one point at issue we again follow excellent authority, nor are we at all sure that Mr. Grundy's innovation is made convincing by his arguments. The questions raised by our critic can of course be adequately dealt with only by a trained scholar who is also an experienced soldier. Mr. Grundy by his local investigations has done good service to Roman history. His valuable study on the topography of the Trebia (*Journal of Philology*, vol. 24) may possibly turn the balance of probability, in a case where certainty is not attainable. Of his criticism we have only this complaint to make: he has, we think, exaggerated the extent of our departure from the ancient authorities, whose unanimity he has unduly emphasised, and apparently he has not fully considered those contradictions and deficiencies in the sources of ancient history which have led modern critics to reconstructions compared with which Mommsen's treatment of the Trebia is conservative. Thus he makes our agreement about this battle with the ablest modern historians a ground for charging us substantially with an attitude of wilful innovation, and an unsound critical method. For this the only proof given is our treatment of two minor points of military detail, disputable in themselves, and still a matter of controversy between experts.

In conclusion we have to thank Mr. Grundy heartily for his generous praise of our work as a whole, and our treatment of the remainder of the Hannibalic war in particular.

W. W. HOW.

H. D. LEIGH.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

DITTENBERGER AND PURGOLD'S OLYMPIA.

Olympia. Die Ergebnisse der von dem deutschen Reich veranstalteten Ausgrabung. Textband V.: Die Inschriften, bearbeitet von W. DITTENBERGER and K. PURGOLD. Berlin 1896. 50 M.

THE monumental record of the excavations undertaken by the German Government at Olympia is gradually approaching completion. The present year has also seen the

publication of the second volume, containing an account of the architectural remains; and now all that remains to be published is vol. i., containing a general history of Olympia and the fate of the monuments, and a detailed account of the excavations, and vol. iii., part 2, completing the description of the sculpture and terra-cottas.

A work of this kind seems to be almost beyond criticism, in view of the fact that no expense is spared in its production and that the services of the most eminent scholars in each branch of the subject have been en-