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](#)

Wörterbuch zu den homerischen Gedichten. Fürschüler
bearbeitet von Dr. Georg Autenrieth. Mit vielen
Holzschnitten and zwei Karten. Sechste verbesserte
Auflage. Leipzig: 1890. 3 Mk.

T. D. Seymour

The Classical Review / Volume 5 / Issue 07 / July 1891, pp 328 - 328

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00179193, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00179193

How to cite this article:

T. D. Seymour (1891). The Classical Review, 5, pp 328-328 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00179193

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

To hear its tones, on whom you rained
 Delicious kisses unrestrained
 Full many a time; nay, thought not wrong
 To interrupt my half-heard song,
 Seeking once more to kiss in play
 My lips, as o'er the reeds they stray.
 Ah grief! and could you in the end
 To love of Mopsus condescend!
 His feeble Muse, his rough-toned speech,
 His scrannel straw's ill-grating screech!
 Whom follow you, whom, Phyllis, fly?
 Far goodlier man, they say, am I,
 Than e'er was he; that this is so,
 Your own lips told me long ago.

Like most poets, Calpurnius is least good when he is most courtier-like: correspondingly, Mr Scott is at his best in rendering 'the happy country tone', while his verse falls flat in compliments to Caesar. It may be well to call his attention to a curious slip on p. 7, whereby the river Ladon appears instead of the shepherd Lygdon.

E. D. A. MORSHEAD.

Wörterbuch zu den homerischen Gedichten.

Fürschüler bearbeitet von Dr. GEORG AUTENRIETH.
 Mit vielen Holzschnitten und zwei Karten. Sechste verbesserte Auflage. Leipzig: 1890. 3 Mk.

AUTENRIETH'S *Homeric Dictionary* has been an eminently useful book, as is shown by the six large editions of the original, published in seventeen years, and by the translations into several languages. The book is known too well to need either praise or blame for its general plan. The later editions have thrown off several of the fads of the original work, such as the unpractical arrangement of the words, according to the forms which happened to be in Homeric use, a somewhat excessive indulgence in oriental illustrations applied to the Homeric age, and the Latin translation of most words. A considerable number of woodcuts and some 'family-trees' have been added.

The author endeavours to give the results of recent research, and does so in the main. The broom could be used more freely on some rubbish,—to clear away such etymologies as those for "Ἡρη and κέ. Whether true or not, such derivations have no place in an elementary book. In some very minor matters the book shows the absence of a minute revision. For instance, in the first edition, the author began marking the quantities by adding a parenthetical note, as ἄλλοτε []], ἄλλοτε []], even though, as in these cases, the quantity of each syllable was distinct. But presently the simple device of marking the quantity of the doubtful vowels only commended itself and was adopted. In the five new editions of the work, however, the []] etc. stand just as they did in the first. So, too, some false accents, as ἀγορήτης, have been handed down. The woodcuts are not conveniently arranged for reference. For instance, under πεμπάβολα we have a scene in which no πεμπάβολον is visible, but in which two youths are roasting meat. This cut should stand under ὀβελῶνι, where a reference is given to πεμπάβολα [sic.]. From the first edition is inherited 'πᾶρά, ᾧ κ 242,' where the note παρὰ is παρὰ in κ 242 is based on old editions. Bekker in 1848, and almost all editors since, read παρ ρ'. The statement that ἀργυρόπτε(α) is found only in the *Iliad* overlooks ω 92. To see γλαυκάπις Ἀθήνη explained as owl-eyed, is almost amusing; especially since this is not an unconscious survival from an earlier edition. In the fourth edition, 'owl-eyed' is said to be due to a misunderstanding of ancient commentators.

But this is not the place for a list of errata; and

while the book before us is not perfect, nor of such convenient form as Dr. Keep's translation of an early edition, it has been greatly improved and is well adapted to its use.

T. D. SEYMOUR.

Georgii Cyprii Descriptio Orbis Romani, accedit Leonis Imperatoris Diatyposis genuina adhuc inedita. Edidit praefatus est commentario instruxit H. GELZER (Lipsiae: Teubner). pp. lxxii + 247. 3 Mk.

THE 'Description of the Roman World, by George of Cyprus' is the topographical list better known as the first of the 'Notitiae Episcopatum' published by Parthey and often quoted by writers on Byzantine geography. The present edition is something more than a revised and accessible text edited by a competent and experienced scholar, though it possesses these very considerable merits. Its chief feature is its editor's treatment of the second part of the list. In an elaborate preface he points out that the list really falls into two parts, each containing about 500 names. The first part is really a list of bishoprics for the diocese of Constantinople and gives, in the usual fashion of an Episcopal notitia, the provinces and sees of the metropolitans, autocephali, and bishops within the area indicated. The second part does nothing of the sort. It includes some of the East and the relics of Byzantine power in Italy, Africa, and Spain at the time of its composition, and it deals with them as civil not ecclesiastical districts. It mentions towns not bishoprics, civil rather than ecclesiastical dignitaries, fortresses rather than holy cities, *βεγέωνες* and *σάλτοι*, not Episcopal dioceses. Hence Dr Gelzer concludes that the second half of the Notitia is really a secular document, with one or two ecclesiastical notes introduced by a later hand. The conclusion seems very probable. It is true, as Prof Ramsay points out in his new book (*Historical Geography of Asia Minor*, p. 93), that as a rule Zeno's principle was carried out and each city had a bishopric, and that the ecclesiastical and civil topography was often identical. It is possible also that Dr. Gelzer has, in his arguments, not made quite enough allowance for this resemblance. Still, the differences which he points out are so marked that his theory seems tolerably certain. Dr. Gelzer then goes on to settle the authorship and date of the work. A note in the two principal MSS. states that the whole Notitia was compiled by one Basileios, while the Cyprian section is said to be by one Γεώργιος ὁ Κύπριος and, as the Cyprian section belongs to the second part of the work, that writer may be assumed to have written the second part. The date of Basileios or at least of the first part is fixed by internal evidence to the early part of the ninth century and the date hitherto usually assigned, A.D. 883, on the authority of a note in one MS., is set aside as intrinsically improbable and devoid of good authority. The date of the second part is, of course, not necessarily the same as that of Basileios; indeed it seems to be a good deal earlier, somewhere about A.D. 600. If this be so, the second part will have to be considered far earlier than the ordinary *Notitiae Episcopatum*. There are one or two difficulties in the way of this, notably the difficulty that the Byzantine empire was not the same from A.D. 600 till A.D. 830, and it is strange that Basileios should not have taken this into account. However, Byzantine writers did sometimes do such things, and Dr. Gelzer's theory appears to have most weight on its side. It is not the only contribution he has made to our knowledge of the treatise, for he has added copious topographical notes on the second part, and has also edited, in better shape than had been pre-