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](#)

***Akarnanien, Ambrakia, Amphilochien, Leukas, im Alterthum*, von Dr Eugen Oberhummer, München, 1887. 10 Mk.**

M. G. Glazebrook

The Classical Review / Volume 1 / Issue 09 / November 1887, pp 279 - 279
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00182228, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00182228

How to cite this article:

M. G. Glazebrook (1887). The Classical Review, 1, pp 279-279 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00182228

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

authority; and parts of the other three treatises can be also referred to it, though the question here becomes more intricate.

The original work in question cannot have come either from Palaemon or Scaurus or Cominianus. But where its author and Cominianus agree, their agreement is to be accounted for by their use of the same authorities.

Dr. Boelte's general conclusion seems to me to be fairly made out both on its positive and on its negative side. That the passages in which these five treatises are virtually identical are derived from one source is quite clear: that no known writer, not Scaurus, or Palaemon, or Cominianus, is the author of this treatise seems equally clear. Certainly not Cominianus, for according to Charisius' repeated statements, he was a brief writer: certainly briefer than we must suppose the author of our (now) anonymous grammar to have been. And about the *Artes* of Palaemon and Scaurus we know too little to say with certainty to what exact extent they served as the bases of later manuals.

As is natural in such a case, I feel inclined to differ from Dr. Boelte on some points of detail. But students of this obscure corner of Latin literature will undoubtedly derive much assistance from his essay. It is to be hoped that he may pursue his investigations further with equal industry and success.—H. NETTLESHIP.

General Karte des Königreiches Griechenland, bearbeitet und herausgegeben vom K. K. Militär-geographischen Institute in Wien.

THE map published in 1852 by the French military survey has hitherto been the chief authority for the topography of Greece. The Vienna map, though on a smaller scale (1: 300,000) is so much superior in clearness and in the amount of information given, that it must take the first place. It is an admirable specimen of the best German workmanship. The mountains are marked in great detail with brown hatchings; the principal heights are marked in metres; the outlines are at once elaborate and distinct. The survey of Macedonia and northern Epirus is unfortunately only partial. The map gives the towns, rivers, and roads, but no mountains. But even thus it adds to our information. Not only is it one of the few maps which give the course of the Haliaemon correctly: it gives quite a new view of the rivers and lakes of north-western Macedonia (Malik See, Presba See, &c.), and assigns a very different outline and proportions to the lake of Joannina (Dodona). The mountains of Aetolia and Arcadia have also gained much by revision. All modern roads, bridlepaths, and footpaths, are carefully marked, so that the map is invaluable to travellers. But will it be of much use to scholars? The answer is both yes and no. Those who have plenty of time and an eye for maps can extract from it a great deal of information. But to a casual observer it gives no distinct impression at all. There is so little level ground in Greece that the practice of marking every hill makes it impossible to distinguish relative heights. Until you look at the number of metres marked upon a given hill it is almost impossible to guess whether its height is 500 feet or 5,000. Consequently the map gives no idea that Pindus, for instance, is a great barrier. It looks no more formidable than Oneium.

The praiseworthy desire to give information about roads has also interfered with clearness. Rivers and bridlepaths are only distinguishable by the superior straightness of the latter. Footpaths and the two kinds of boundaries also interfere with each other.

And rivers, roads, and boundaries, are continually broken by gaps for names to come across them. The river Inachos is thus broken ten times in as many miles, and never gets to the sea at all. This is specially unfortunate in a country where so many rivers go underground. The reader is continually suspecting *barathra*, only to find that his river has been engulfed in the name of a village.

The map is entirely modern. The lakes of Peneus and Stymphalus, for instance, have their full modern extent, and the Peneius (Elis) its modern course. But in a large number of cases the ancient names of mountains and rivers are given in a different type. There are so many that one wonders why Maenalus and Thaumasion do not appear. And it is difficult to see why a courtesy extended to ancient mountains and rivers should be almost entirely denied to ancient towns.—M. G. GLAZEBROOK.

Akarnanien, Ambrakia, Amphilochien, Leukas, im Alterthum, von Dr. EUGEN OBERHUMMER, München, 1887. 10 Mk.

THE bulk of this book is historical. Dr. Oberhummer has, with immense industry, collected not only all references to Acarnania in the classics, but a great deal of information derived from coins and inscriptions. The result is a fairly consecutive account of the relations of Acarnania to other countries. It is likely to be very useful as a book of reference, but has only that kind of interest which attaches to the attempts to write the lives of Shakespeare's minor characters. Our author has patiently sought out all traits that could give individuality to the little country which he has taken under his protection. We find accounts of hunting, trade, arts and science, which read much like the chapter on snakes in Iceland. Under the heading of philosophy, for instance, we find that Acarnania claims that Cleombrotus, who after reading the Phædo threw himself into the sea, in order to settle in his own mind the question of immortality. More solid are the geographical introduction and appendix. They supply a useful catalogue of places which have been identified, and of the references to them in classical writers. The author has visited Acarnania, and is able to make some small corrections in the existing maps. The only change of importance which he proposes is that already suggested by Henzey, to transfer Solium to a point a few miles inland to the west of the bay of Tavarda. The evidence which he offers for this seems very insufficient; but so is the evidence for placing it on the east of the same bay.—M. G. GLAZEBROOK.

Passages for Translation into Latin Prose. With an introduction by H. NETTLESHIP, M.A., Corpus Professor of Latin in the University of Oxford. Bell & Sons. 1887. 3s.

PROFESSOR NETTLESHIP'S book consists of sixty-three pieces for translation into Latin Prose, selected from various authors from Bacon to the late Rector of Lincoln. To this is prefixed an introduction in four parts, dealing with (1) the Latin representatives of some common English words expressing political and social ideas; (2) the range of metaphorical expression in Latin; (3) the development of classical style in Latin Prose; (4) cautions as to orthography. The first two parts necessarily cover only a small portion of the ground, and it is to be wished that Professor Nettleship could be prevailed upon to treat the subjects at greater length in a larger work. Some book is much wanted which would do for English what Nägelsbach's *Stilistik* does for German. The third part gives in a handy form lengthy quotations from