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](#)

Emendations of Philo *De Sacrificantibus*

Fred. C. Conybeare

The Classical Review / Volume 10 / Issue 06 / July 1896, pp 281 - 284

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00204265, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00204265

How to cite this article:

Fred. C. Conybeare (1896). Emendations of Philo *De Sacrificantibus*. The Classical Review, 10, pp 281-284 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00204265

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

EMENDATIONS OF PHILO *DE SACRIFICANTIBUS*.

THE tradition of this treatise in the Greek MSS. is very imperfect and in spite of Thomas Mangey's many brilliant conjectures (which I add in brackets) the text remains full of faults and lacunae. The following emendations are based upon the old Armenian version, printed at Venice in 1892. In this version the treatise begins only with § 5 (= Mangey's ed. vol. 2, p. 254, 45) of the Greek treatise, giving in place of the words τὰ ἄλλα τὰ περὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον the fresh title Φύλωνος τὰ κ.τ.λ.

Mang. 255, 9....ἐπισκεπτέον πρὸς ἀλήθειαν. Τοῦ θεοῦ θυσιαστήριον ἐστὶν ἡ εὐχάριστος τοῦ σοφοῦ ψυχὴ παγείσα ἐκ τελείων ἀριθμῶν ἀτμήτων καὶ ἀδιαιρέτων.

In the above Arm. places the full stop after ἐπισκεπτέον and reads ἀρετῶν for ἀριθμῶν.

[Mang. : quidni ἀρετῶν, ob sequentia ?]

255, 15. ὅπερ γὰρ αἰσθητὸν φῶς εἰς ὀφθαλμούς, τοῦτ' ἐπιστήμη λογισμῶ πρὸς θεωρίαν τῶν ἀσωμάτων.

After ὀφθαλμούς Arm. adds: 'ad apprehensionem corporum,' perhaps = πρὸς κατάληψιν σωμάτων; and such an addition is required to balance πρὸς θεωρ. τ. ἀσ.

255, 27, § 6. καίτοι τῶν κρεῶν ἀναλίσκομένων ὑπὸ πυρὸς, ὡς εἶναι σαφεστάτην πίστιν, ὅτι οὐ τὰ ἱερῆα θυσίαν, ἀλλὰ τὴν διάνοιαν καὶ προθυμίαν ὑπολαμβάνει τοῦ καταθύντος, ἵνα ᾗ μόνιμον καὶ βέβαιον ἐξ ἀρετῆς.

What underlies is of course the thought that the true sacrifice is a broken and a contrite heart; but why ἵνα ᾗ κ.τ.λ.? Read with Arm. καταθύντος εἶναι, ἐν ᾗ τὸ μόν. κ.τ.λ.

255, 33. μηδέτερον ἀξίων διαφέρειν ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον.

'Melius προσφέρειν' wrote Mangey and the Arm. confirms his conjecture.

256, 12. Εἰ δὲ ὁ τῶν ὄλων Κτίστης...μεταδίδωσί σοι τῆς ἰλεω δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ τὰς ἐνδείας ἀναπληρῶν αἷς κέχωσαι.

Here αἷς κέχωσαι is impossible. The Arm. renders 'quibus oportet te uti.' Therefore read αἷς κέχρησαι, 'the wants, in which you are needy.'

256, 20. ἰσότηρός τε καὶ φιланθρωπίας καὶ τῆς ἀρετῆς ἐπιμελείσθαι, ἀποβαλλόμενον τὴν ἀνισον...κακίαν.

Here Arm. adds ἄλλης before ἀρετῆς [Mang. : Forsan deest ἄλλης uel ἀπάσης] and implies προβαλλόμενον which is more in accordance with Philonean usage.

256, 31. Ἐτέρου δὲ τοῦ καὶ νύκτωρ ἀδελφόν τι καὶ συγγενὲς ταῖς μεθήμεριναῖς θυσίαις

ἐπιτελείσθαι πρὸς ἀρεσκίαν θεοῦ, καὶ μηδένα χρόνον ἢ καιρὸν εὐχαριστίας παραλείπειν ἐπιτηδεύοντων καὶ προσφύεσθαι τῇ νυκτί. θυσίαν γὰρ αὐτὴν καλεῖν τὴν τοῦ ἱερωτάτου φέγγους ἐν τοῖς ἀδύτοις αὐγῇ.

Philo is stating his second reason for a lamp being kept burning in the sanctuary from evening till dawn. But τῇ νυκτί is awkward for it is not the χρόνος ἢ καιρός which naturally suits the night, but the burning of a lamp which does so. The Arm. has a full stop after ἐπιτηδεύοντων and then continues in this sense: Et natura aptum in nocte sacrificium huius oblationis. Sacrificium enim id oportet uocare, etc. Therefore begin fresh clause and add ἡ θυσία or similar after τῇ νυκτί.

257, 23. Ἐπὶ μὲν οὖν τῶν αὐτῶν ὄρων ἕκαστον ἴδονται εὐθύς, ἐφ' οἷς ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐποίησεν ὅτε ἐτάχθη.

What Philo meant to say here is well expressed in Mangey's Latin rendering: Manent igitur horum singula intra praestitutos sibi ab initio, quando composita sunt, fines. But this the Greek does not say.

The Arm. has the following sense:...fixum est quibus super statim ab initio quo tempore fiebat, quodcunque dispositum est. Probably εὐθύς and ὅτε came to be misplaced, and the latter to stand both before and after ἐποίησεν, in the latter position being changed into ὅτι. Therefore reconstruct thus: ἴδονται, ἐφ' οἷς εὐθύς ἐξ ἀρχῆς, ὅτε ἐποίησεν, ἐτάχθη.

257, 38. σύμπας ὁ κόσμος, ὃ τε ὁρατὸς καὶ ἀόρατος καὶ ἀσώματος, τὸ παράδειγμα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.

Read with the Arm. ὃ τε ὁρατὸς καὶ ὁ ἀσώματος, τὸ π. τοῦ ὁρατοῦ. [Mangey notes: οὐρανοῦ. Melius, ut uidetur, ὁρατοῦ.]

258, 4. σκιρτῶντες αὐθαδῶς καὶ ἀποσχονίσεις. 'Melius ἀπαυχενίζοντες' wrote Mangey and the Arm. supports his conjecture.

258, 28, § 10. τὸ ταπεινὸν τῶν λεχθέντων ἀξιόπρῳνομίας. The Arm. has προνομίας προνοίας. [Mang. : scribe προνοίας.]

258, 33. Ἰκέται δὲ καὶ θεραπευταὶ τοῦ ὄντως ὄντος ἀξίως ὄντες. Arm. omits ἀξίως. [Mang. : Forsan redundat ἀξίως, uel scribendum ἀληθῶς.]

258, 46. λογισάμενος ὅτι πρῶτον μὲν ἀμέτοχα ταῦτ' ἐστι τ' ἀγαθοῦ φύσεως· ἔπειτα δὲ, ὅτι καὶ ὀξείαν ἔχει τὴν μεταβολὴν, μαραινόμενα τρόπον τινα πρὶν ἀνθῆσαι βεβαίως· καὶ τῆς ἱκεσίας αὐτοῦ περιεχόμεθα.

Here the transition to καὶ τῆς ἱκεσίας is

very abrupt and the Arm. reveals a lacuna in the Greek text, for after *βεβαίως* it proceeds thus: *sed quod firmum est et immutabile et immotum bonum illud sequamur, et supplicationes eius et ministrations amplectamur.*

259, 21. *παιδευόμενοι τὰ κάλλιστα ἀνδράσι.*

Mang. renders: *doctrina imbuti quae viros maxime deceat*, but Arm. = *imbuti quae optima apud divinos homines et deo deditos*. The reference is of course to the teaching of Israel by Moses and the prophets, and the corresponding words have dropped out of the Greek MSS.

259, 44. *Αἱ δὲ ἐκ προγόνων ἀφ' αἵματος αὐταὶ λεγόμεναι συγγένειαι.*

For *αὐταὶ* the Arm. implies *αἱ*, which we must either read or correct to *τ'* *αὐ αἱ*.

260, 3. *φῆσὶ γὰρ 'Υἱοὶ ἐστε κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν (? ὑμῶν)' δηλονότι προνοίας καὶ κηδεμονίας αἰσθησόμενοι τῆς ὥς ἐκ πατρός. Ἡ δὲ ἐπιμέλεια τοσοῦτον ἰδίους τοῖς ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων, ὅσον περ οἶμαι καὶ ὁ ἐπιβουλευόμενος, διαφέρει.*

The Arm. renders the last clause thus: *sed cura horum tanta abundantia excelleat eam quae ex hominibus quantâ censeo et is qui curans est excelleat.*

[This virtually confirms Mangey's conjecture: '*Forsan scribendum ἰδίας τῆς scil. ἐπιμελείας. Mox etiam pro ἐπιβουλευόμενος, repono ἐπιμελόμενος.*']

260, 10, § 12. *οὐκ ἀξιῶν τοὺς ἐν τοιαύτῃ πολιτείᾳ τραφέντας ἐργάζεσθαι καὶ μυστικῶν πραγμάτων ἐκκρεμαμένους ὀλιγωρεῖν ἀληθείας.*

Philo refers to Moses' prohibition to Jews to initiate themselves in heathen mysteries. The Arm. implies: *...πολιτεία ἐγγραφέντας ὀργιάζεσθαι καὶ μυθικῶν πλασμάτων ἐκκ. [Mang.: Omnino ὀργιάζεσθαι quod etiam uisum Doctiss. Cotelier. Monum. Eccl. Graec. ... Quidni uero μυθικῶν πλασμάτων?]. ἐγγραφέντας alone Mangey failed to conjecture; and it is less essential to the passage, though undoubtedly the correct reading.*

260, 18. *Τί γὰρ εἰ καλὰ ταῦτ' ἐστίν, ὧ μῦστα, καὶ συμφέροντα, συγκλεισάμενοι ἑαυτοὺς ἐν σκότῃ βαθεῖ, τρεῖς ἡ ἑτταρὰς μόνους ὠφελεῖτε.*

For *ἑαυτούς* the Arm. renders in the sense 'during two years,' *biennales*. Therefore add *δύ' ἐνιαυτούς* in the Greek text, the reference being to the length of the period of initiation. The novice was granted the *ἐποπτεία* in the second year only of his admission. In the Greek text the words were lost through homoioteleuton.

260, 4, 2. *καρπῶν ἀμυθῆτων ἰδέας.*

Arm. implies *ἀμυθῆτους* [Mang. *melius ἀμυθῆτους*].

261, 1. *τοῖς ἀξίοις ἐπ' ὠφελείᾳ.*

Arm. involves *ἐπωφελείας* [Mang. *melius ἐπωφελείας*].

261, 19. *τῶν νοσοῦντων τὴν ἀληθῆ νόσον, ἀνδρογύνων.*

For *ἀληθῆ* Arm. has *θῆλειαν* [Mang.: *Repone θῆλειαν*].

261, 25. *'Ελαύνει δ' οὐ μόνον πόρνas, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ἐκ τῆς πόρνῆς ἐπιφερομένους μητρῶν αἰσχος, διὰ τὸ τὴν πρώτην σποράν καὶ γένεσιν αὐτοῖς κεκιβδηλεύσθαι. τόπος γὰρ οὗτος, εἰ καὶ τις ἄλλος ἐπιδέχεται ἀλληγορίαν, φιλοσόφου θεωρίας ὦν ἀνάπλεως. τῶν γὰρ ἀσεβῶν καὶ ἀνοσίων οὐχ εἰς τρόπος, ἀλλὰ πολλοὶ καὶ διαφέροντες.*

The context here and also the subsequent course of the argument (e.g. 262, 16 *καθὰ γὰρ ὦν μητέρες πόρναι, τὸν μὲν ἀληθῆ πατέρα οὐκ ἴσασιν κ.τ.λ.*) involves some reference after *κεκιβδηλεύσθαι* to the fact that a prostitute's children have no one father and that none of them know their father. Even so, he says, idolaters ignore the one true god (*ἀγνοοῦντες τὸν ἕνα καὶ ἀληθινὸν θεόν* 262, 20). The Arm. must therefore be held to have preserved the true text, for after *κεκιβδηλεύσθαι* it indicates a lacuna in the Greek which it thus fills up: *et inter se confusio est propter multitudinem eorum qui cognoverunt matres, adeo ut nequeant uerum patrem certo agnoscere et dignoscere*. In the Greek then there stood something like this: *τό τε συγκέχυσθαι διὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν μητράσιν ὁμιληκότων, ὥς καὶ τὸν ἀληθῆ πατέρα μὴ γινώσκειν.*

261, 34. *τὴν ἀναγκαιοτάτην οὐσίαν ἐκ τῶν ὄντων ἀναιροῦντες, ἥτις ἐστὶν ἀρχέτυπον παράδειγμα πάντων, ὅσα ποιότητες οὐσίας καθ' ἣν ἕκαστον εἰδοποιεῖται καὶ διαμετρεῖται.*

For the last word Mangey writes: *Melius, ut uidetur, περατοῦται*, for *ποιότης* limits, but does not *measure* matter. The Arm. restores the text thus: *ὅσα ποιότητες ἢ ποιοτήτες, καθ' ἣν κ.τ.λ.* Thus *οὐσίας* is corrupt.

261, 40. *οὕτως ἡ ἀναιρούσα δόξα ἰδέας, πάντα συγχεῖ καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἀνωτέραν τῶν στοιχείων οὐσίας τὴν ἀμορφίαν, ἀπὸ σκηνῶν ἄγει.*

Mangey corrects *οὐσίας* to *οὐσίαν* and writes of *ἀπὸ σκ. ᾧ*: '*omnino mendose scribitur. Forsan haud ingenti literarum et soni discrepantia καὶ σύγχυσιν εἰσηγέται.*' The Arm. however restores the true text and involves the following... *τῶν στοιχείων οὐσίαν τὴν ἀμορφίαν καὶ ἀποιότητα ἐκεῖνα ἄγει.*

Perhaps, as Philo uses *ἄποιος* elsewhere and not *ἀποιότης*, and also avoids hiatus, we should rather read *καὶ τὸ ἄποιον ἐκεῖν' ἄγει* (or *ἀνάγει*).

261, 45. *οὐ γὰρ ἦν θέμις ἀπείρου καὶ πεφυρμένης ὕλης ψαύειν τὸν ἵδμονα καὶ μακάριον.*

The Arm. has *φερομένης* or *φορομένης* for *πεφυρμένης*, either of which agrees with

Philo's diction elsewhere, and for ἰδμονα it has εὐδαίμονα [Mang. melius εὐδαίμονα].

262, 2. Ἕτεροι δὲ...προσυνπερβάλλουσιν, ἅμα ταῖς ιδέαις καὶ πρὸς ὑπαρξίν θεοῦ ἐπικαλυπτόμενοι ὡς οὐκ ὄντος, λεγομένου δὲ εἶναι χάριν τοῦ συμφέροντος ἀνθρώποις. Οἱ δὲ δι' εὐλάβειαν τοῦ δοκοῦντος πάντῃ παρῆναι καὶ πάντα καθορᾶν, ἄγονοι μὲν σοφίας, ἐπιτηδεύοντες δὲ τὴν μεγίστην κακιῶν ἀθεότητα, τρίτοι δὲ εἰσιν, οἱ τὴν ἐναντίαν ἔτεμον· εἰσηγησάμενοι πλῆθος ἀρρένων τε καὶ θηλειῶν...πολυαρχίας λόγων τὸν κόσμον ἀναπλήσαντες.

That the above is somehow wrong Mangey felt, when he proposed to place a full stop ἀθεότητα and then to proceed τρίτοι δὲ. Philo is distinguishing in the context several degrees of impiety. There are first those who declare the bodiless ideas to be a mere name devoid of reality. These he has characterized in the passage 261, 32 beginning οἱ μὲν γὰρ τὰς ἀσωμάτων ιδέας. The second set are those who for police reasons pretend that there is a god. These he characterizes in the passage beginning 262, 2 ἕτεροι δέ. Now these would, according to Mangey's suggested emendation, be the same as the third set (τρίτοι δὲ). But this third set are pure polytheists and not atheistical simulators of a belief in a single god.

The Arm. accordingly reveals a lacuna in the Greek MSS. after καθορᾶν, which it fills up somewhat as follows, omitting δι' before εὐλάβειαν:—Οἱ δὲ εὐλάβειαν τοῦ δοκοῦντος πάντῃ παρῆναι καὶ πάντα καθορᾶν [ἀκοιμήτοις ὄμμασιν κατεσκεύασαν, τοῦ arcere ἑαυτοὺς ἀπ' ἀδικίας. Τούτους ὁ νόμος κατὰ πρόσωπον ἀποκεκομμένους καλεῖ, πᾶσας τὰς γεννητικὰς τὰς περὶ αὐτοῦ ἀποκόψαντας ἐξ ἑαυτῶν ὑπολήψεις], ἄγονοι μὲν σοφίας κ.τ.λ.

What word stood for *arcere* in the Greek I cannot conjecture, for κωλύειν ἑαυτὸν ἀδικίας = 'to screen oneself from injustice' is hardly Philonian. Anyhow, thus restored, the passage makes good sense.

The Arm. also omits πρὸς before ὑπαρξίν, which is better. It was either carried over from προσυνπερβάλλοντες or belongs to ἐπικαλυπτόμενοι. After πλῆθος it also adds θεῶν, which has dropt out of the Greek MSS.; and has λόγῳ for λόγων, both to the great improvement of the sense.

262, 22. περὶ τὸ ἀναγκαῖον τῶν ὄντων.

The Arm. implies ἀναγκαιότατον [Mang. melius, ut uidetur, ἀναγκαιότατον].

262, 23. ὅπερ ἡ τέλος μόνον ἢ πρόωiston.

Arm. omits τέλος [Mang.: dele τέλος cum desit in MSS. et omnino redundet].

262, 26. τετάρτους δὲ καὶ πέμπτους ἐλαύνει.

Arm. adds τούτους after δέ, which the Greek seems to need.

262, 35. τὴν ἡγεμονίαν καὶ βασιλείαν τῶν ἀνθρωπείων πραγμάτων ἀνάγουσιν αὐτῷ.

The Arm. involves ἀνάπτουσιν [Mang.: Forsan ἀνάπτουσιν].

262, 39. καὶ τὰ μέλλοντα εἰκότι στοχασμῷ ἀνοσιοῦσθαι.

Instead of ἀνοσιοῦσθαι the Arm. has: prae-imaginari et in animo uoluer. Some codd. have ἀφοσιοῦσθαι. Therefore correct to φαντασιοῦσθαι. [Mang.: quidni uero ἀφεικ-άσασθαι?]

262, 42. οὗτος ὁ τὸν οὐρανὸν κατασκευάσας, καὶ τὴν χέρσου φύσιν παντὸς λόγῳ ἐπινοίας κρείττοσι πλωτῶν ἐργασάμενος.

For οὐρανὸν Arm. has ναῦν simply [Mang.: quidni enim a Philone scriptum ναῦν οὐριόδρμον?].

After ἐργάσαμενος the Arm. also reveals a lacuna in the Greek MSS. which it fills up as follows: 'hominem. et uias per mare πολυσχιδεῖς et πολύχινους usque ad portum. Qui ex urbe in urbem et cursuum (ἰοῦν δρόμῳ) ὁδὸν ἔτεμε λεωφόρον, et cognita fecit ἡπερώταις τὰ νησιῶν; nusquam conuenissent nisi nauigium susceptum fuisset. Hocce erat operariorum et clarissimorum artificum inuentio supradictorum.'

262, 45. παιδείαν ἐπενόησε καὶ πρὸς τὸ τέλος ἡγαγεν.

After ἐπενόησε Arm. adds καὶ ἠύξησε or καὶ συνῆξησε.

263, 7, § 15. οἱ δὲ τῶν αἰσθήσεων προστάται τὸν ἔπαινον αὐτῶν εὖ μάλα στενοποιοῦσι.

Arm. has σεμνοποιοῦσι [Mang.: omnino reponere σεμνοποιοῦσι].

263, 12. αἱ τῶν σιτίων τροφαί.

After σιτίων Arm. adds καὶ ποτῶν.

263, 30. εἰς τε τὴν οἰκείαν καὶ ἀλλοτρίαν καὶ φίλων διάκρισιν καὶ βλαβερῶν μὲν φνγγῆν, αἴρεσιν δὲ ἐπωφελῶν.

After φίλων Arm. adds: et inimicorum = καὶ ἐχθρῶν, which has certainly dropt out of the Greek MSS., being needed to complete the symmetry of the Greek sentence.

263, 40. οἱ μῆτε χερσὶ μῆτε ποσὶ δύνανται κατὰ τὸ βέλτιον, τὴν πρόσρησιν ἐπαληθεύειν, ἦν...θέσθαι φασὶ τὸς προτέρους, ἀδυνάτους ὀνομάσαντες θαυμασιώτατα. 'Ἡ ἀκοή δὲ χρῆμα δι' ἧς μέλη καὶ ῥυθμοὶ καὶ πάνθ' ὅσα κατὰ τὴν μουσικὴν ἐπικρίνεται. Ὡδὴ γὰρ καὶ λόγος ὑγιεινὰ καὶ σωτήρια φάρμακα, κ.τ.λ.

In the above the Arm. enables us to correct ἐπαληθεύειν, which hung in the air, to ἐπαληθεύοντες; then ὀνομάσαντες to ὀνομασάντας—a correction which Mangey had foreseen.

Next the Arm. reveals several lacunae in the Greek text for it proceeds thus:.... ὀνομάσαντας [simul enim cum oculorum destructione (i.e. πηρώσει) etiam corporis uirtutes non modo laqueo captae labuntur,

sed etiam destruuntur.] *θανασιωτάτη δὲ ἡ ἀκοή δι' ἧς μέλη καὶ ῥυθμοὶ* [et compages, transitiones, harmoniae et concordiae uocum et generum et coetuum gregum] *καὶ πάνθ' ὅσα κατὰ τὴν μουσικὴν ἐπικρίνεται* [ἡ λόγων προφορικῶν παμπλήθη εἶδη, δικανικῶν, βουλευτικῶν, ἐγκωμιαστικῶν; etiam eorum qui ex antiqua historia sunt, et in concionibus publicis; uel in necessariis de iis quae ad uitam spectant, de iis quae τὸν αἰῶνα (?) tangunt. Nam cum uniuerse uox nostra duplicem habeat uirtutem loquendi et canendi, duo illa aures seligunt definiunt pro commodo animae] *Ὡδὴ γάρ κ.τ.λ.*

The Greek text has here been considerably mutilated.

264, 3. *ἀφροσύναις καὶ ἀηδίαῖς.*

Arm. has *ἀφρ. κ. ἀδικίαῖς.* [Mang.: melius, forsan, *ἀδικίαῖς.*]

264, 6, § 16. *οἱ τε τοῦ νοῦ θιασῶται καὶ τῶν αἰσθήσεων, οἱ μὲν ἐκείνον, οἱ δὲ ταύτην θεοπλαστοῦσιν.*

Arm. has *ταύτας* for *ταύτην* [Mang.: omnino scribe *ταύτας*].

264, 25. *Ὅντως γὰρ οἱ μὲν ἄθλιοι τὰς ψυχὰς τεθνῶσιν.*

Arm. has *ἄθελαι* for *ἄθλιοι*, [Mang.: Ex contextu reponendum uidetur *ἄθελαι*.]

In the above notes I have only noticed such variants on the part of the version as are essential to the Greek text. Neutral variants I have passed over. They abundantly confirm the opinion formed by Dr. P. Wendland of Thomas Mangey's great critical skill. Philo is an unjustly neglected writer. For example, there is left us from antiquity no finer or more pertinent and instructive criticism of the mysteries than that which this treatise contains, yet who of the many modern writers, who deal with this subject, has noticed it? For this reason, and because the Greek tradition of it is singularly imperfect, I have chosen the *de Sacrificantiis* as an example of the critical utility of an old Armenian version.

FRED. C. CONYBEARE.

THE TREBBIA AND LAKE TRASIMENE IN MESSRS. HOW & LEIGH'S ROMAN HISTORY.

THE *Roman History* recently issued by Messrs. How and Leigh seems so good that it is likely to be largely used. This very fact, however, must serve as a provocation to any one who feels that the views expressed in the book are open to criticism, more especially if those views are expressed in a portion of the work which is likely to be of peculiar interest to those for whom it is intended. The special point to which I refer is the account of Hannibal's operations in Italy from the time of the passage of the Alps to the battle of Lake Trasimene. The subject would be of much less importance did it not necessarily affect the view which must be taken of Polybius and Livy as military historians. Messrs. Leigh and How follow Polybius' account of the operations up to the time of the retreat of Scipio from the Ticinus to Placentia. After this, in dealing with the campaign in North Italy they diverge from both Polybius and Livy, and this apparently without adequate reason.

Briefly put, their view seems to be:—

(1) That Scipio's first camp after his retreat from the Ticinus was on the left or west bank of the Trebbia, i.e. on the opposite bank to Placentia (p. 185).

(2) That connection with the right or east bank was maintained by a bridge, possibly of boats (p. 185).

(3) That the river Trebbia flows in winter with a strong and turbulent flood (p. 185).

(4) That the second camp occupied by Scipio was on the right or east bank of the river on a spur of the Apennines (p. 183). (Quite a different view is stated, not apparently as an alternative, on p. 185.)

(5) That, consequently, the actual battle took place on the left or west bank.

These statements are so inter-dependent that it is impossible to discuss them quite separately.

If the remark about the Trebbia is intended to convey the meaning that it is during the winter season in a continuous state of strong and turbulent flood, it is incorrect. The water is frequently low during the winter. The rise and fall of so quick a stream is, of course, rapid and liable to frequent variation. Furthermore it may reasonably be concluded that before the day of the battle the stream was low and easily passable, for on that day the Romans crossed it, although swollen by a rain storm which had occurred during the previous night (Polyb. iii. 72, 4). The