ταυτηνὴ παροιμίαν τοῖς δυστυχέσιν ὁμιληταῖς ἐκβοῶν, ὡς 'τὸ λαλεῖν ἐκ τοῦ λαλεῖν,' and (in the second passage) ἀνδρὶ τὸ λαλεῖν ἐκ τοῦ λαλεῖν ἐπιτηδεύοντι. The context shows that the proverb was quoted by an unknown rhetorician of the time of Evagoras, that is, between the times of Hermogenes and

Syrianus. Erasmus, misled by a slight ambiguity in the Aldine text, made the mistake of supposing that the proverb expressed the opinion of Evagoras: it really expressed the opinion of his unnamed opponent.

J. E. SANDYS.

Das römische Strassennetz in Norddeutschland, by E. Dünzelmann (Teubner) 8, 1893. Reprinted from Fleckeisen's *Jahrbücher*.

THE Roman occupation of the lands between the Rhine and the Elbe lasted only a few years and left very few traces behind it, but the narrative of Tacitus and the probabilities of the case alike suggest that some roads and some fortifications had been constructed before the defeat of Varus and the needs of the exchequer compelled the abandonment of the country. In the pamphlet before me, an attempt is made to fix the courses of these roads and the sites of the forts, and thence to deduce detailed conclusions as to the campaigns of Varus and Germanicus. The great plains and marshes of Oldenburg are crossed by a number of roads of uncertain but undoubtedly ancient date, 'Sandwege,' 'Bohlwege,' 'Postwege,' as they are locally styled; Mr. Dünzelmann considers some of these to be Roman and infers, from their directions, the courses of the marches made by the Roman armies. This method of investigation is undoubtedly an admirable one, and will often lead to good results: the correspondence, for instance, between the roads and the history of Roman Britain is in many details very striking and suggestive. In North Germany, however, the inquirer is met by serious difficulties. In the first place, the origin of the old roads alluded to is by no means proven. It is something in their favour that three of them begin on the Rhine near Xanten (*Vetere*), but the majority lie east of the Ems and have no connexion with any Roman site. The alleged Roman forts which Mr. Dünzelmann mentions are equally uncertain: oddly enough, they mostly stand aside from the roads which he calls German. The truth is that neither forts nor roads have been properly excavated or surveyed, and till this is done, criticism will remain unprofitable. One is glad to learn, however, that something is being done, and Mr. Dünzelmann's article certainly comes in opportunely to suggest points for examination. A second difficulty, however, remains. Tacitus is neither a military nor a geographical writer, and his accounts of the North German campaigns cannot be pressed. When Mr. Dünzelmann argues that the *Luppia* cannot be the Lippe, because the course of the latter river conflicts with Tacitus' description of a certain march, he is probably attaching far too much weight to Tacitus' words. On the whole, therefore, I am inclined to think that the theories of this pamphlet, while likely to be most valuable in suggesting further inquiries, are hardly capable of proof and cannot be accepted, as they stand, by outside scholars. Oldenburg antiquaries would do well to study and criticize the article carefully: English readers may, perhaps, wait for their conclusions.

F. H.

Handbuch der Griechischen Staatsalterthümer, von G. GILBERT. Erster Band: Der Staat der Lakedaemonier und der Athenen. Zweite Auflage. Teubner, 1893. 8 Mk.

BUT few words are necessary to introduce the second edition of this well-known and valuable work, especially in view of the forthcoming translation by Messrs. Brooks and Nicklin of St. John's College, Cambridge, which one is glad to observe is already announced by Messrs. Sonnenschein and Co.

Of course the discovery of the *Atheniensium Respublica*, with all its fresh light on things Attic, made a recast of all our conceptions of the Athenian states absolutely necessary. The immense importance of that MS. is well instanced by the second edition of Gilbert's *Handbook*. While his account of Sparta is longer by four pages than in the first edition, Athens claims about 100 more. Here one may express a regret that the author did not see fit to give us some clue to the paging of the former edition, an omission which renders all references in the new *Dictionary of Antiquities* useless. The translators, it is to be hoped, will rectify this.

In his introduction the author gives a clear account of his views of the *Respublica*. He believes it to be Aristotelian, and written either by Aristotle himself or under his direction. He adds an interesting review of the authorities probably used in the compilation.

It is not indeed necessary to condescend to particulars as regards the general contents of a work so well known and so highly valued. Still, as a good instance of additional details bringing the book up to date, one may mention the reference on pp. 257-8 to M. Paul Foucart's article in the *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique*. xii. 434, where an inscription of 352 is published and discussed, showing that the title ὁ στρατηγὸς ὁ ἐπὶ τὴν φυλακὴν τῆς χώρας occurs as early as 352, the date of the inscription. Hitherto it has been supposed that 334-3 was the earliest date for this distribution of the duties of the *στρατηγοί*, as in that year they acted together. In the new edition by Thumser of K. F. Hermann's *Staatsalterthümer* this inscription does not appear to be quoted.

One is glad to see too that Dr. Gilbert is not quite so sure as he was of the true Achaean origin of the Agiadai, though he still holds to the Aigeidai. We shall probably have to postpone the settlement of these and many other questions till the discovery of the *Lakedaemoniorum Respublica*, a work which some, it must be confessed, would have preferred to that discovered.

T. R. GLOVER.