

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editors of the CLASSICAL REVIEW.

SIRS,

Mr. A. R. Bonus (*C.R.*, XLVI, 189) evidently thinks an attack is the best defence. Instead of attempting to meet my objections to his theory, he calls on me to answer his objections to mine. My argument, he says, is 'based on a series of assumptions having no sure foundation in scripture.' First, he says, I am 'compelled to assume that in Polybius' time the Aygues was called the Isara.' I assumed nothing of the kind. One advantage of my theory is precisely that it is consistent with any reading or emendation of Livy and Polybius, since the pre-Roman name of the Aygues is unknown, whereas the Sorgues is impossible because its ancient name is known, and no one would follow Professor Conway in his desperate attempt to bring Livy, Polybius, and Strabo into harmony by emending all three. I may add that to substitute the Aygues for the Sorgues does not necessarily 'damage the Col du Clapier theory.' On the contrary it strengthens it by reconciling the number of marches with the actual distances.¹

Next he says I 'make the further assumption that Polybius' distances were merely inferences from the number of days of Hannibal's march or his own journey.' It is not an assumption but a logical inference. No one supposes that either Hannibal or Polybius had the route measured by surveyors, and there were no Roman milestones, yet Polybius gives distances. The only reasonable conclusion is that they were inferred from the number of days of a march or journey. As I did not wish to make assumptions, I left it an open question whether it was Hannibal's march or Polybius' own journey. But I have no doubt whatever that the number of days was derived from Silenus' narrative. Very probably Silenus followed Xenophon's example in the *Anabasis* and gave, not only the number of days, but also the number of stades. But let us see how Mr. Bonus proceeds in this matter. On p. 3 of his book he quotes with approval the statement that 'in Polybius' day there were no Roman roads in Languedoc.' He believes, therefore, as most people do, that Polybius published the third book of his history before Gallia Narbonensis became a Roman province and before the Via Domitia was made, *i.e.*, before 121 B.C. Yet on p. 18 he writes 'Now, when Polybius followed the route taken by Hannibal, if indeed he did so in this section, it would appear that this length of the road from Tarascon, through Avignon, Orange, Montélimar, and Valence had been measured, and milestones set up.' Here he assumes that there were Roman mile-

stones as far as the Isère at a time when the country had not even been conquered. Then he goes on 'When he turned up the Isère valley towards Grenoble, he got on to a road not yet measured, on which there were no milestones. He had consequently to record the distance by time.' What is this but the very 'assumption' that I make? The only difference between us is that I hold that there were no milestones anywhere in Gaul when Polybius wrote, whereas Mr. Bonus thinks there were milestones in the Rhone valley, though not between it and Spain, and that he thinks Hannibal's army of 46,000 men marched 22 miles a day, whereas I suppose its normal day's march was about 10 Roman miles; for that estimate I have the authority of Polybius, to say nothing of modern soldiers.

My third assumption is 'that Polybius followed Hannibal's route through the Alps, which Polybius himself does not claim to have done.' What Polybius says is *ἡμεῖς δὲ περὶ τούτων εὐθαρσῶς ἀποφαινόμεθα διὰ τὸ περὶ τῶν πράξεων παρ' αὐτῶν ἰστορηκέναι τῶν παρατετευχέντων τοῖς καιροῖς, τοὺς δὲ τόπους καταπτευνκέναι καὶ τῇ διὰ τῶν Ἀλπεων αὐτοὶ κεχρησθῆαι πορεία γνώσεως ἕνεκα καὶ θέας* (3. 48 §12). It is plain that in this context *τοὺς τόπους* means the country Hannibal passed through and *τῇ . . . πορεία* the route which Hannibal took over the Alps, for no other route would be relevant. Moreover my argument does not depend in any way on this 'assumption.' I believe that all the statements about Hannibal's march that are of any value are derived from Silenus and that Polybius added nothing of importance from his own observations.

My fourth assumption is 'that "the river itself" (unnamed) of Polybius III. 39 was the Rhone and not the Durance.' Polybius' words are *ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς διαβάσεως τοῦ Ῥοδανοῦ πορευομένοις παρ' αὐτὸν τὸν ποταμὸν ὡς ἐπὶ τὰς πηγὰς εὐς πρὸς τὴν ἀναβολὴν τῶν Ἀλπεων τὴν εἰς Ἰταλίαν χίλιοι τετρακόσιοι*. Mr. Bonus holds (p. 7) that this sentence refers, not to the route taken by Hannibal, but to 'the direct route . . . up the valley of the Durance,' which he did not take. But *ἤμελλον ἕξειν* in the next section shows that Polybius is speaking of Hannibal's route, and apart from that nobody who knew Greek would seriously maintain that *παρ' αὐτὸν τὸν ποταμὸν*, following immediately on *τοῦ Ῥοδανοῦ*, could mean anything but the Rhone. Also 1,400 stades are 175 Roman miles,² whereas accord-

² Professor Spenser Wilkinson (*Nineteenth Century*, CXI, 99) thinks I 'adopt a now discarded length for the stadium.' I followed the data given in Sandys' *Companion to Greek Studies*, p. 439, only correcting the length of the English foot to 304.8 mm. I took Polybius' stadium to be 600 Attic feet. With these data 100 stades = 11 English miles, as Professor Spenser Wilkinson says, and 8 stades = 4,795 Roman feet, which is 205 Roman feet short of a Roman mile. Thus 8 stades are roughly equivalent to a Roman mile. As Polybius'

¹ Professor Spenser Wilkinson, when abandoning the Sorgues, was ill-advised to substitute the Durance, for, as he himself admits, Hannibal would reach that river in two marches from Fourques (*Nineteenth Century*, CXI, 99).

ing to Strabo, p. 179, it was only 63 Roman miles from Tarascon to the beginning of the ascent of the Alps on the Durance route.

My fifth assumption is that in Polybius, 3. 42 § 1, the "four days' march from the sea" is to be reckoned from the nearest point of the coast, and not from the point where Hannibal himself turned inland. I neither said nor assumed that it was to be reckoned from the nearest point of the coast. I followed Professor Spenser Wilkinson in supposing that Polybius reckoned the distance by the marches of Scipio's army. I have motored from Nîmes to Aiguemortes, Les Saintes-Maries, and St.-Gilles, and I have gone by train to Narbonne. Hence I do not believe that Hannibal followed the coast to Aiguemortes, as Mr. Cecil Torr supposes. I agree with Mr. Bonus (p. 26) that he would turn inland at Agde to avoid the lagoons and salt-marshes. Now Agde, as Mr. Bonus says, is about 80 miles from Tarascon. Since Tarascon is only about 35 miles from the sea, I cannot believe that Polybius would have said in effect that it was 80. And anyhow it does not affect the main argument, for Mr. Bonus thinks, as I do, that Hannibal crossed at Tarascon.

Finally, Mr. Bonus complains that I do not specify any of the points in which he is contradicted by Livy and Polybius. Surely he understands that, when the foundation of his theory is demolished, it would be a waste of time to criticize the details. I have already said that he begins by declaring Polybius, 3. 39, to be spurious. Till he can induce any competent scholar to accept that opinion, it is unnecessary to discuss the fabric which he builds on it; *ἵνα μὴ φάσκει δ' ἀπορεῖν με*, I will give one instance. On p. 18 he says 'the 800 stades represent the distance from Tarascon to the Rhone-Isère confluence [Mr. Bonus thinks the Island lay to the north of the Isère]. It is the same piece of road to which Livy alludes (21. 31) when he says that after four days' march from the Durance, Hannibal reached the "Island." Livy's words are *quartis castris ad Insulam peruenit* (21. 31 § 4). He says not a word about the Durance, and the context shows

distances are merely inferences from the number of days, it is unnecessary to be more exact. But why, after reckoning 600 stades as about 66 English miles, I made 800 stades nearly 92, I cannot say. I should have said 88.

clearly that the four days' march is measured from the Rhone crossing. The Durance is not mentioned till § 9. Polybius says in 3. 49 § 5 'Ἀννίβας δὲ ποιησάμενος ἐξῆς ἐπὶ τέτταρας ἡμέρας τὴν πορὲν ἀπὸ τῆς διαβάσεως ἦκε πρὸς τὴν καλουμένην Νῆσον, and in 3. 50 § 1 'Ἀννίβας δ' ἐν ἡμέραις δέκα πορευθεὶς παρὰ τὸν ποταμὸν εἰς ὀκτακοσίου σταδίου ἤρξατο τῆς πρὸς τὰς Ἄλπεις ἀναβολῆς. It is plain that Polybius' 49 § 5 corresponds to Livy's 31 § 4 and Polybius' four days' march from the crossing to Livy's *quartis castris*. And it is equally plain that the march of 800 stades in ten days to the ascent of the Alps is not the march of four days to the Island. Therefore Mr. Bonus' statements are clearly at variance with both Livy and Polybius.

Yours truly,
R. L. DUNBABIN.

University of Tasmania.

To the Editors of the CLASSICAL REVIEW.

DEAR SIRS,

May I ask that you give space in the *Classical Review* to this request?

I am preparing for publication a complete collation of the MSS. of Petronius. A MS., once at Messina but now lost, is known only through a collation made by Otto Jahn in 1839 (Bücheler, ed. mai., p. xx). Bücheler used this collation, and Beck secured a copy of it for his work on the Petronius MSS.

Three copies of the Bipontine edition of 1790, with notes and collations by Jahn, are listed in the sale catalogue of his library, issued by Joseph Baer, Max Cohn and Sons and M. Lempertz in 1870 (Nos. 6490, 6491, 6492 in Part I). Some of his books went to the late Professor J. E. B. Mayor, part of whose library was purchased by Messrs. Bowes and Bowes of Cambridge, then dispersed.

It would greatly further my work if the copy of Jahn's Bipontine edition with his collation of the Messina MS. could be found. Anyone who has in his possession any one of the copies mentioned will confer a great favor upon me by communicating with me.

Yours truly,
EVAN T. SAGE,
Professor of Latin.

University of Pittsburgh.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY.

VOL. XXVI. NOS. 1-7 (OCTOBER-NOVEMBER, 1932).

J. Stinchcomb, *Literary Interests of a Roman Magnate (Q. Tullius Cicero)*. Documented sketch of his life, character, and literary activities. L. R. Shero, *Xenophon's Portrait of a Young Wife*. Discusses how far X., who is the rather priggish husband Isocho

machus, is presenting the normal views of his generation, and how far notions of his own. A. D. Fraser, *The Sutors' Competition in Archery (Odyssey XXI. 419-23)*. Iron axeheads (of the Syrian spectacles type), with holes all ready for the test, are known as early. *πρώτη στείλει* cannot be 'the foremost point of the haft' or 'the top of the handle.' Translate 'the arrow did not miss the entrance of the hole (or the actual hole) in every one of the axes, but went right