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](#)

De Artium Scriptoribus Latinis. Scripsit Felix Boelte. Bonn. University Press. 1886. 1 Mk.

H. Nettleship

The Classical Review / Volume 1 / Issue 09 / November 1887, pp 278 - 279

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00182204, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00182204

How to cite this article:

H. Nettleship (1887). The Classical Review, 1, pp 278-279 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00182204

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

Roman camp was formed on the rising ground opposite the village of Erder, facing eastward, and that the Germans had collected further east on the height of Arensburg, in the first part of which word he thinks a name of the German war god (the 'Hercules,' cf. 2, 12, 1) may be traceable. The plain into which they descended to battle he places at Eisbergen (in the first syllable of which name he would trace the two first syllables of 'Idistaviso'), opposite Rinteln. He supposes that the defeated army was pursued eastwards along the river, perhaps as far as Oldendorf, and that the trophy (2, 18, 2) may have been erected on the height of Papenbrink, overlooking the battlefield and whole surrounding district.

On the subsequent line of march, and the site of the second great battle of this campaign, Tacitus (2, 19-21) is again altogether vague. Dr. Knoke concludes, on general geographical and strategical considerations, that this battle took place also on the Weser, at a lower point, probably at Leese (about thirty miles below Minden), where some remains, which he thinks may be those of the boundary fence of the Angrivarii (2, 19, 4), have been discovered.

The above is necessarily a most meagre outline of the principal contents of the book, and does no justice to what appears to be a most careful study of the geographical and other questions involved, and a full exposition and discussion of all views differing from those adopted.

No Englishman can well be in a position to offer criticism of a treatise involving so much minute local knowledge of German geography. Students of Tacitus may be on the whole inclined to doubt whether Dr. Knoke, though at times dismissing statements as merely rhetorical, is not on the whole disposed to follow that author too closely into detail.

Without going so far as to pronounce him, with Mommsen, 'the most unmilitary of writers,' we must own that, besides the disadvantages under which all ancient historians labour in their attempt to represent, without maps before them, the geography of distant countries, Tacitus is peculiarly apt to conceive campaigns and battles rhetorically, to describe isolated events rather than connected movements, and to speak generally of local features, without such marks as might serve to identify them.

Hence it is that neither can German research reach certainty as to the sites of the Teutoburgensis Saltus or Idistaviso; nor will Englishmen ever satisfy themselves as to the locality of the last heroic struggles of Caractacus or Boudicca. Algerian students, if such there ever should be, will find themselves perhaps still more bewildered in the attempt to represent geographically the advances and retreats of Tacfarinas.

H. FURNEAUX.

De Artium Scriptoribus Latinis. Scripsit FELIX BOELTE. Bonn. University Press. 1886. 1 Mk.

It is generally recognised by all scholars who have given any attention to the subject that a large amount of the grammatical treatises comprised in the *Corpus Grammaticorum Latinorum*, and now printed in Keil's edition, is a mere repetition of identical matter, which must in the long run be referred back to a few, probably a very few, common sources. The questions for criticism to settle are: (1) what these authorities were; (2) how far was their form modified in the process of redaction and repetition.

For that some considerable modifications took place is clear. It is not uncommon to find, in the various *Artes*, short passages of identical sense repeated with some slight variation of form; and long passages

treating twice, or oftener, of the same subject in successive paragraphs. Charisius indeed tells us in his preface that his studies have been *ex variis artibus inrigata*, and lets us generally see pretty plainly, in the course of his work, how it was composed. But even in Diomedes and Priscian, whose arrangement is far more lucid and logical than that of Charisius, the same phenomenon is visible. I would suggest that it is partly due to the fact that these *Artes* were originally composed as lectures, for the purpose of oral instruction. The quantity of such manuals doubtless increased as time went on, until by the fourth and fifth century A.D. they were tolerably numerous. Each *magister* would probably take some one manual as his basis, and add illustrations, fresh information, and statements of differing views, from other manuals or works of reference. Thus the lectures, in this imperfect form, would be put together and published as a book. Diomedes seems to imply something of the sort when he says to his friend Athanasius in his preface that his *ars merae Latinitatis* is *trino digesta libello . . . quia ipsos aurium meatus audita scientia complere absentia denegatum est*. The fragment of Donatianus, printed in Keil, vol. vi. p. 275, begins, *Ars grammatica accepta ex auditorio Donatiani*. And the commentaries on Donatus by Pompeius, Servius, and Sergius leave the same impression still more clearly, when, as they not unfrequently do, they add to the text of Donatus remarks from the older writers such as Pliny and Scaurus.

It is doubtful whether any really original *Ars Grammatica* was composed in Latin after that of Terentius Scaurus in the reign of Hadrian; and to assume that this was to any great extent original may be going too far. Scaurus had been preceded by Remmius Palaemon in the reign of Claudius and Nero. There was a great deal, indeed, of critical and lexicographical work done in the first and early second centuries, such as the collections of Valerius Probus, Pliny's book *Dubii Sermonis*, the commentaries of Caper, Asper, and the *Stromateus* of Caesellius Vindex. Scaurus may well have used much of the materials collected in these works. That his was the last really important *Ars Grammatica*, and that those which follow are mere variations and abridgments, seems to be shown by the fact that very few quotations indeed occur in the Latin grammarians later than Juvenal and Suetonius.

Dr. Boelte's essay examines in a very thorough way five treatises—those of Charisius, Diomedes, Donatus, Dositheus, and the *Excerpta Charisii* (or *Anonymus Bobiensis*). Starting from the undeniable fact that large parts of these treatises really represent one and the same work, Dr. Boelte sets himself to find out what this work was, and in what form it was known to the writers whom he is considering. After a careful and conscientious examination, a large part of which I have tested by verifying his references, he comes to the conclusion that the common source was a manual whose author's name has been lost. The author probably lived some two generations before Aelius Donatus; that is, at the end of the third century A.D., or thereabouts.

In the section on the Noun, however, there is a marked resemblance on the one hand between Charisius, the *Anonymus Bobiensis*, and Dositheus, and on the other between Diomedes and Donatus. The inference is that there were two recensions of the original manual, one of which was used by the first three writers just named, and the other by the two last.

In all the other sections, where Diomedes and Donatus agree, the same work is their common

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. Oberhammer 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