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](#)

Anderson's *Asia Minor* *Asia Minor*. By J. G. C. Anderson. (Murray's Handy Classical Maps, General Editor, G. B. Grundy.) Murray, 1903. 2s. cloth, 1s. net, paper.

Ronald M. Burrows

The Classical Review / Volume 18 / Issue 02 / March 1904, pp 122 - 125
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00209463, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00209463

How to cite this article:

Ronald M. Burrows (1904). The Classical Review, 18, pp 122-125 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00209463

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

of Plato's thought the curious reader will find in Shorey's pages. He is specially happy when dealing with the portentous 'discoveries' of M. Lutoslawski. *E.g.*, (à propos of *Euthyd.* 301 A) 'Lutoslawski (p. 212) affirms that Plato "would have said later *πάρεστι τὸ κάλλος (αὐτὸ καθ' αὐτό)*." He never did say nor could he have said anything of the kind' (p. 31 n.).

In the last section Prof. Shorey discusses the reputed Pythagoreanism of Plato's old age, and the 'ideal numbers.' 'Ideal numbers,' he contends, are simply the ideas of numbers, or in other words, the abstract, 'mathematical' numbers, as *νοητά* and contrasted with the 'concrete numbered things' which are 'the numbers of the vulgar.' The apparent multiplicity of the idea of 'One' is due to the inevitable *ἀλλήλων κοινωνία* of the ideas—that inherent paradox of the theory, which is specially glaring in the case of numbers. In spite of the doubts of Dr. Adam (on *Rep.* 525 D), Prof. Shorey assures us that 'that is all there is of it,' and that we must not hold Plato responsible for all the 'pitiful scholasticism' of the Academic quibblers concerning the numerical 'before and after,' and the 'indefinite Dyad,' and so forth. And herein, surely,

all loyal *τῶν εἰδῶν φίλοι* will hope, at least, that he is wholly right.

I have dealt more particularly with Prof. Shorey's views on Plato's metaphysics, but he has much that is equally valuable to say on vexed questions of Platonic Ethics and psychology. In all he aims at the same goal—to minimise discrepancies, to explain away apparent variations and inconsistencies, to trace the lines of connexion and unfold the 'unity' underlying the multiplicity 'of Plato's thought.' In all he endeavours to substitute a 'simple, sane, and natural interpretation of Plato's writings' in place of the erroneous and distorted constructions forced upon them by the misguided industry of perversely ingenious scholars. It is a timely protest against the prevailing fashion in Platonic criticism, a protest which deserves to be well weighed by all serious students; and if it effects nothing more, it will at least serve, I trust, most effectually to explode the pseudo-Platonism of M. Lutoslawski *et hoc genus omne*. I, for one, most cordially welcome 'The Unity of Plato's Thought' as an admirable study in what Maguire himself (*ὁ μακάριος*) would recognise as genuine Platonism. R. G. BURY.

ANDERSON'S ASIA MINOR.

Asia Minor. By J. G. C. ANDERSON. (Murray's Handy Classical Maps, General Editor, G. B. GRUNDY.) Murray, 1903. 2s. cloth, 1s. net, paper.

THERE is no part of the Ancient World where so much has been done for Geography within the last decade as Asia Minor. A new map was urgently needed, and no fitter man could have been found to execute it than Mr. J. G. C. Anderson, one of the group of scholars who have followed in Professor Ramsay's steps, and made this branch of exploration predominantly a British one. As might be expected, this map is in advance of any hitherto accessible. There is in the first place a great increase in the number of places identified. The Index records about 2000 names, and the far smaller number that we find in our Kiepert's is, in the main, due, not to rejection consciously made for purposes of simplification, but to limitation of knowledge. A feature only less important than the record

of new identifications is the exact contouring of altitudes. The system of shading mountain chains, which it replaces, has been, in the case of Asia Minor, even more rough and ready than in that of most countries. Indeed the evidence on which such contouring could be based has only now been gathered together from a mass of scattered monographs, for the purposes of the present map. Several interesting points also suggest themselves in regard to the exact boundaries of the Roman Provinces. Antiocheia Pisidiæ is, for instance, placed in the Province of Asia both in Kiepert's *Atlas Antiquus* and in his special maps attached to Mommsen's *Provinces of the Roman Empire*. It is not so here. During the period chosen by Mr. Anderson, A.D. 63 to 72, it was contained in what will probably strike everyone who has been accustomed to other maps, as the surprisingly large Province of Galatia. The comparative smallness of the Province of Bithynia and Pontus is equally interesting. The difficulty

of choosing a single period at which to give the boundaries of all the Asiatic Provinces must have been considerable. Throughout the first century those of the North Eastern Provinces in particular were constantly changing. We must trust Mr. Anderson for having wisely balanced the alternatives, and can only regret that he found it undesirable to choose a time when Trapezus belonged to Cappadocia, and the supreme importance of that great frontier province could be made especially obvious.¹

It is needless further to labour the proof that Mr. Anderson's Map is essential for every classroom and every scholar's study. None the less, one or two criticisms are necessary. In the first place it is unfortunate that red lines have been used to denote the boundaries of Roman Provinces. The usual plan was to use for this purpose different coloured shadings. It may be presumed that the reason this has been abandoned is that it was thought likely to interfere with the colours used for contouring. The objection need not have been fatal, if the shadings had been judiciously chosen. But granting that lines were inevitable, need the lines all have been of the same colour? The importance of the point is this, that the uniform red lines, passing through the map in all directions, look exactly like roads. The correct explanation is of course given at the foot of the map, but none the less the first and natural impression is a serious consideration. Further, the roads themselves should have been marked by some uniform bright colour line. The road system of Asia Minor, as Mr. Anderson and his fellow-workers in the East have been themselves the foremost to point out, is of vital importance for the understanding of its political and military history. In the maps attached to Mr. Anderson's article on the Road System of Eastern Asia Minor, (*J.H.S.* xvii, p. 22) and to Mr. J. A. R. Munro's on Roads in Pontus Royal and Roman, (*J.H.S.* xxi, p. 52) a red line is in fact thus used. The practice is also found in contour maps. Dr. Alfred Philippson has, for instance, used different red lines for railways and roads in his excellent contour map of the Peloponnesus. Now the mischief is this, that in the present map the roads are positively more obscure than in its predecessors.

Kiepert's *Atlas Antiquus* and the maps attached to Mommsen's *Roman Provinces* marked them by thin black lines. This might have been improved on. But we must allow that on the white ground they attract a certain amount of attention. On the brown ground colour formed by Mr. Anderson's contouring (in this hilly country often a very dark brown), the black roads are a negligible quantity, even those of them that as 'Romanae (nota regione)' are marked with two parallel lines.

Indeed a distinction, useful enough in itself, that marks 'Romanae (incerta regione)' with merely two parallel dotted lines, renders the obscurity of some of the more important roads even more profound. Let us take two instances. In his paper on Roads in Pontus mentioned above, Mr. Munro lays stress on the primary importance of 'the grand trunk road' through the heart of Pontus, from the head waters of the Lycus to those of the Amnias. Along it and the road from Amisus to Zela 'moves,' to use his words, 'the main history of the country and most other roads may be regarded as mere loops to them' (p. 54). In the map attached to his paper Mr. Munro marks the road throughout its length. So do Kiepert's *Atlas Antiquus* and the map in Mommsen's *Roman Provinces*. Yet in Mr. Anderson's present map a considerable portion of it, almost the whole way along the valley of the Lycus from Nicopolis to Neo-Caesarea (Niksar), has merely these insignificant dotted lines. Why is this distinction made? Mr. Munro, who explored this portion of it with Mr. Hogarth in 1891, and the remainder, from Neo-Caesarea to the west, with Mr. Anderson himself in 1899, states of the whole road that, 'apart from the milestones there are few material traces' of it. He proceeds 'Only in the most desolate part of the Lycus valley, between Enderes and Niksar, is its dyke once or twice visible near a solitary fragment of a Roman bridge.' (p. 65) Now this point, which in Mr. Munro's original account of his journey², we can identify more closely as near Kundu, about 20 miles west of Koilu-Hissar, is precisely where the map before us subsides into a dotted line. Why is it, for the purposes of this map, on a different footing from the rest of the road, all trace of which is, as Mr. Anderson elsewhere tells us, lost at one point, west of Magnopolis, for thirty miles?³

¹ Mommsen indeed (*Rom. Prov. Eng. Tr.* i. pp. 332 and 324) says that this was the case in A.D. 63, but Mr. Anderson has elsewhere (*Studia Pontica*, vol. i. 1903, p. 87, note 1) expressed his doubts on the point.

² *Supplementary Papers of the Royal Geographical Society*, vol. iii. (1893), pp. 728, etc.

³ *Studia Pontica*, vol. i. (1903), pp. 78, 79; cp. p. 53.

Granting that, at various points in the Lycus valley, there is some doubt as to the exact course of the road, none the less the valley is narrow, and there is no doubt that the road ran through it or along its slopes.¹ Is it worth while to obscure an important and certain historical fact when the possibility of topographical error is so slight? Take again the road from Caesarea by Herpa and Gurun to Melitene and the East. 'It was,' says Mr. Anderson, in his paper mentioned above (p. 22) 'at all times the great route to the East. It was the Persian Royal road: it existed in Roman times: and it is the road to the East throughout the Byzantine period.' Such a great road should be marked clearly. Yet when we look for it on the present map we can hardly find it, and when we have found it, we can scarcely believe that it was an important direct route to Melitene. In a course of not 200 miles it has four different markings. For its first section, from Caesarea to Arasaxa, where it coincides with the Roman military road by Cocusus and Arabissos, it has a continuous double line. From Arasaxa to Tzamandos, in virtue of its being 'Romana (incerta regione),' it has the double dots: from Tzamandos to within about 15 miles from Melitene, it has a single line as not being Roman at all. Then it again becomes 'Romana (nota regione),' and has the double lines. These distinctions are doubtless important in themselves, and would be valuable here if the colour which was to be treated in subtle ways were in itself conspicuous. As it is, the result is scarcely intelligible.

In the new edition which the advance of exploration will doubtless before long make necessary, it is to be hoped that Mr. Anderson and his General Editor will make one or two further alterations. The principle of contouring colours is that the transitions should be gradual, but distinct. The two greens that mark sea level to 600 ft., and 600 ft. to 1000, are not distinct enough from each other: in some places indeed, especially in the table of reference, one would almost imagine that the colour printing is faulty. On the other hand, both of them are too bright for the transition to the light brown of the next contour. Dr. Philippson in his contour map of the Peloponnesus secured a paler and yellower green to lead up to his lightest brown. In regard to the browns themselves Mr. Anderson has been bold in

giving us nine different shades from 1000 to 10000 ft. It cannot be said, that in every case the difference is distinct. But it is ungracious to criticise. The general effect is admirable. One has never realised so fully before the massive mountain chains and tablelands of Asia Minor.

Lastly, a few explanatory notes are needed as to the practice observed in printing place-names of different epochs. Kiepert in his *Atlas Antiquus* uses letters sloping back for oriental names not found in Greek and Roman writers, and thin type for names first given in Roman or, in some of his maps, Macedonian, times. In his maps attached to Mommsen's *Roman Provinces* he uses square brackets for 'ancient oriental names' and letters sloping backwards for modern names. In each case the practice followed is clearly stated. Mr. Anderson, however, gives no explanation at all of the round brackets, square brackets, thin type, and queries plentifully scattered over his map. Alternative names occurring in Classical Authors of any period are apparently printed one above the other without distinction of type or brackets, modern names in round brackets and thin sloping type, oriental names in square brackets: thus we find

Cabeira	Europus
Diospolis	[Carchemish]
Neo-caesareia (<i>Niksar</i>)	(<i>Jerabis</i>)

But is not Lacotena? Sozopetra obscure (*Viransheher*)

without explanation?

And do the two entries Cholle? and [Cholle?] (*Suchne*), occurring north and south of Oriza on the Palmyra-Resapha road, carry their own meaning on them? There are indeed two Cholles in the Index, which might help the inquirer out, but there is only one Herpa, and yet we find Herpa? between Arasaxa and Tzamandos, Ariarathia?

(*Yeregetchen*)

and [Herpa??] a little east of Ara-

Lycandros—Lapara.

Ablastha (*Albistan*).

bissos.

If our interpretation, too, of Mr. Anderson's use of square brackets is the correct one, why do we find [Praetorium?]? (*Hakinkhan*)

If ever the Latinity of a name is self-evident it is surely here.

These criticisms, however, it must be repeated, do not detract from the solid value of Mr. Anderson's Map as a contribution to knowledge. As is stated in

³ *Supp. Pap. R. G. S.* vol. iii. pp. 728 and 730. The valley is for most of the way only half a mile broad.

a prefatory note, the preparation of the map must have been a work of great labour and expense, and much of the matter contained in it is altogether new. In the case of new maps of well explored countries adverse criticism of the precise method of presentation would be damaging, for it could only be on the grounds of excellence of that kind that the maker of the map

could justify its existence. In this case Mr. Anderson has laid scholars under such a debt of gratitude by the new ground he has broken, that we can afford to wait for perfection till he gives it us in the second edition.

RONALD M. BURROWS.

CARDIFF.

OWEN'S *PERSIUS AND JUVENAL*.—A REJOINDER.

PRESSURE of various business has prevented me from noticing earlier Mr. Housman's strictures on my text of Persius and Juvenal, the injustice and flippancy of which seem to call for some remark, if for no other reason, at any rate by way of protest against the style of writing (now fortunately obsolete) which Mr. Housman has thought fit to adopt. It is possible to speak with fairness and courtesy in literary questions of those with whose conclusions one does not agree. But Mr. Housman seems to be of Dr. Johnson's opinion that 'treating your adversary with respect is giving him an advantage to which he is not entitled'; and he has condescended to employ abusive jargon, adorned by rhetorical embellishments such as 'lazy' and 'limpet,' which recall the period when the Battle of the Books was waged, or when Gilbert Wakefield railed against Lambinus. I will say no more on this head except that Mr. Housman, whose bludgeon has recently gone forth against all lands, cannot be surprised if I deprecate language which insults without convincing.

Mr. Housman's review is so lengthy that to reply in detail to all that he alleges would require more space than I can claim or care to give. In some matters, such as the insertion or omission of conjectures, his judgement differs from mine. It is easy to differ with regard to such minutiae. My guiding principle was to insert only such conjectures as seemed to be either inherently possible, or, if not true themselves, to raise critical doubts, which might bear important fruit. The latter consideration caused me to mention several recent conjectures. Few will agree with Mr. Housman that I should have done right to suppress Heinrich's *uetulum* (Pers. iii. 29); as is proved by the coincidence of its rediscovery by no less than four scholars, none of whom knew that

Heinrich had already hit upon it (*C.R.* ii. 85, xvi. 283). I am taken to task for ignoring 'the only certain emendation ever made in the text of Persius, Madvig's *articulis* for *auriculis* at i. 23.' This conjecture of Madvig (*Adu.* ii. 128), based on a false reading printed in the text of Priscian (iii. p. 107 Keil) by Putsche (1605), but unknown to Keil, is not a certain conjecture, and has consequently not been generally admitted, though the curious may find it in Némethy's recent edition. I consider the conjecture wrong firstly because the traditional text yields a satisfactory meaning, as explained by Nettlehip in his edition of Conington, from Sen. *Ep.* 122. 4; and secondly because the repetition of *auriculis* (*tun, uetule, auriculis alienis colligis escas, auriculis quibus etc.*), is a repetition characteristic of Persius, a consideration which ought to weigh with an editor. As this has not, I think, been noticed, I adduce instances: i. 45, 46, *si forte quid aptius exit*, | . . . . . *si quid tamen aptius exit*; i. 53 *calidum scis ponere sumen*, | *scis comitem etc.*; ii. 22, 23 *Iuppiter...Iuppiter...Iuppiter*; ii. 49 *iam crescit ager, iam crescit ouile*, | *iam dabitur, iam, iam*; ii. 68 *peccat...peccat*; iii. 12, 14 *querimur...querimur*; iii. 15 *miser...miser*; iii. 41, 42 *imus...imus*; iii. 85 *hoc est...hoc est*; iii. 88, 89 *inspice...inspice*; iv. 23 *nemo...nemo*; v. 8 *si quibus...si quibus*; v. 79–81 *Marcus...Marco...Marco...Marcus...Marce*; v. 143 *quo...quo*; v. 172, 174 *nec nunc...nec nunc*; *hic hic...hic*; vi. 12, 13 *securus...securus*; vi. 22 *utar...utar*; vi. 58, 59 *unum...unum*; vi. 68 *reliquum...reliquum*.

As regards the change in the punctuation which I have introduced in Pers. i. 92 ff. Mr. Housman approves of my assigning 92–97 to Persius' antagonist; but he does not agree with me in giving 99–102 to the same disputant. Let me