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](#)

Henri Kiepert. *Manuel de Geographie Ancienne*, traduit par Emile Ernault. 6 frcs.

M. Longnon

The Classical Review / Volume 2 / Issue 03 / March 1888, pp 83 - 83

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00192273, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00192273

How to cite this article:

M. Longnon (1888). The Classical Review, 2, pp 83-83 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00192273

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

ground. The account of each province is prefaced by a general sketch of its characteristics, and a notice of its inhabitants, after which the country itself is described in minute detail. It will readily be understood that such a work is useful for reference, and for consultation on special points, but is hardly suitable for continuous reading. Dr. Lolling is sternly self-denying in excluding all such elements as might infuse brightness into his subject, or contribute to make it interesting. Places which are important in history, or distinguished by beauty or grandeur, receive no more attention than those that are less conspicuous. Delphi is dismissed in four sentences, the waterfall of the Styx in one. The discovery and clearing out of the tunnel of Eupalinus at Samos, described by Herodotus, though it is one of the most remarkable pieces of archaeological exploration in modern times, is not even mentioned; but a reference is given to an article by Fabricius in the *Mittheilungen des deutschen archäologischen Institutes in Athen*, which gives full details respecting it. An exception, however, is made in favour of Athens, to the topography of which a separate monograph is devoted. The extreme compression of statement in some cases is liable to produce confusion in the reader's mind. Thus, in the account of Arcadia we are told that the modern name of the Alpheius is Ruphias, and, in the next sentence, that that of the Ladon is Ruphia. A few words of explanation would have made it clear, that the name Ruphia is applied to the Ladon until it joins the Alpheius, and afterwards to the combined waters of the two rivers. To say the truth, though we are unwilling to appear ungrateful for so sound a piece of work, yet we are doubtful whether such a delineation was needed, since the same subject had already been worked out in Bursian's *Geographie von Griechenland*, in which work, also, references to ancient authors are given, while they are altogether excluded from the present treatise. What we especially miss in Dr. Lolling's work is any attempt to give a *résumé* of general points connected with Greek geography. Of the eleven pages to which his introductory remarks are confined, all but three are devoted to the sources of our information on the

subject. Though the products of various districts are sometimes mentioned, there is no general account of the vegetation; and the climate and winds, notwithstanding their intimate connection with geography, are hardly noticed. Yet these questions have been fully discussed in Neumann and Partsch's *Physikalische Geographie von Griechenland*. The origin and meaning of names of places, too—a subject which has been worked out by E. Curtius for the promontories of Greece in his *Beiträge zur Geographischen Onomatologie der griechischen Sprache*, and by Angermann in his *Geographische Namen Altgriechenlande*—is almost entirely ignored. There is one part of Dr. Lolling's work, however, which deserves the highest praise. This is the bibliographical notices, which are appended to each section, and include numerous monographs and contributions to magazines, which might otherwise escape notice, and also a selection of those of the earlier works on the subject which still retain their value. In compiling summaries of this sort it is impossible to arrive at perfection; and we are surprised under the head of 'Macedonia' to find no mention of such important works as Von Hahn's *Reise von Belgrad nach Salonik und Reise durch die Gebiete des Drin und Wardar*, and Barth's *Reise durch das Innere der Europäischen Türkei*. But omissions like this are rare, and the wonder is that they are so few. We cannot help remarking, in conclusion, that the author makes much too light of Sir E. H. Bunbury's *History of Ancient Geography*, when he speaks of it as a mere compilation from earlier works. To us it seems the greatest contribution to the subject that has appeared in modern times.

H. F. T.

Henri Kiepert. Manuel de Géographie Ancienne, traduit par ÉMILE ERNAULT. 6 frs.

This is a pleasantly written and printed translation of Kiepert's smaller geography, of which an English version already exists. The only special feature of it is that the section referring to France has been taken from Kiepert's larger work, and a few patriotic corrections made by M. Longnon.

NOTES.

NOTES ON AP. RHOD. with reference to Liddell and Scott:—AP. RH. I. 378, 379.

ὕψι δ' ἔρ' ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα μεταστρέψαντες ἑρετμὰ πῆχυνον προῦχοντα περὶ σκαλμοῖσιν ἔδησαν.

These lines have been made rather difficult by an interpretation of Et. Magn. adopted by L. and S. *sub verb.* πῆχυος, as follows: 'II. as Subst. = τροπῶτήρ Ap. Rh. i. 379, cf. E. M. 671, 8.' Turning to E. M. we find πῆχυον προῦχοντα, Ἀπολλώνιος. οἱ μὲν, μικρὸν ἰμαντίδιον τὸ συνέχον τὴν κώπην τρὺς τὸν σκαλμὸν ὅπερ Ἀττικοὶ πηχυαλὰ καλοῦσι. οἱ δὲ, τὸ ὅπισθεν μέρος τῆς κώπης ὅπερ κατέχων ὁ ναύτης κοπηλατεῖ. Of whatever value the first explanation may be in itself it is pretty certain that πῆχυον has not the meaning of τροπῶτήρ here, and I can only account for the statement by supposing that l. 379 having been taken from the context, it became necessary to assign some new meaning to πῆχυον. It is however translated by Beck 'lorum prominens scalmis alligantur,' and also by Shaw, though his opinion is not of much weight. But in 392 we read σκαλμοῖς δ' ἀμφὶς

ἑρετμὰ καθήρτων and this has led Matthiae to reject 378, 379 as spurious. But there is really no difficulty in these lines as Wellauer observes ad. loc., and the second explanation of E. M. helps us to the meaning of μεταστρ. ἔρ. in 378. The launch of Argo is being described. After she has been placed upon the rollers it is necessary of course to move her into the water. With this object the oars are placed on each side with their handles projecting a cubit's length beyond the rowlock (μεταστ. ἔ. π. πρ.) and are there temporarily fastened to the thole-pins. In this way the Argonauts have each a cubit's length of oar handle to push at and they stand in order on each side and push accordingly, as is described 380 foll. Then when Argo has reached the water, the oars are released from their peculiar position and affixed to the thole-pins in the usual manner. The second explanation given by E. M. then really points to the words μεταστρέψαντες ἑρετμὰ and not to πῆχυον while the first explanation seems, as Merkel remarks, to be made for the occasion. πῆχυον occurs three times in Ap. Rh. in its usual meaning of πηχυαῖον viz. iii. 854,