

WILEY



Review: The Roman Empire

Author(s): D. G. H.

Review by: D. G. H.

Source: *The Geographical Journal*, Vol. 21, No. 3 (Mar., 1903), p. 314

Published by: geographicalj

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1775816>

Accessed: 26-06-2016 20:21 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://about.jstor.org/terms>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Wiley, The Royal Geographical Society (with the Institute of British Geographers) are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Geographical Journal*

HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY.

THE ROMAN EMPIRE.

'Murray's Handy Classical Maps.' Edited by G. B. Grundy. 'The Roman Empire.' London: Murray. 1s. *net*.

The plan of these maps, with their clear printing and distinction of epochs, seems to be excellent. One map, with features of relief distinguished by tints, is placed side by side with another untinted, except along the frontier lines of the Empire. On so small a scale equal clearness probably could not have been attained otherwise. To have printed one map on tissue paper, and to have allowed it to fall precisely upon the other, would have been even better, had durability not had to be considered. A complete index is added. One cannot help noticing, however, considerable unevenness in the accurate delineation of detail in the upper map. On so small a projection this might be disregarded, were it not that a minute accuracy is evidently aimed at in certain parts. One must therefore ask why, if the three high points of Crete are all specially shaded, the great Mesaorea plain of Cyprus is tinted as uniformly over 600 feet? Why a broad belt of green runs all round the north and west of Asia Minor, often as in reality the coast is fringed by high ranges? Why, among mountains rising over 3000 feet, there is no indication of Taygetus, or the Eubœan range, or the higher points of the lesser islands (which, indeed, all appear as under 600 feet)? Why, among points over 9000 feet, Olympus, the Rila Dagb, Liubotrn, the Van volcanoes, and Sahend do not appear? And why, on the other hand, Hermon and the inner range of Midian do appear in the highest category? In regard to the lower map, there is nothing to criticize of any importance. Oxyrhynchus is on the wrong side of the Bahr Yusuf, as in the upper map also. We suppose that the editor's plan is not to take account of additions to the Empire after 100 A.D., and that for this reason Dacia and the trans-Euphratean conquests of Trajan are not included within the tinted frontiers.

D. G. H.

HISTORICAL ATLAS.

'A New Students' Atlas of English History.' By Emil Reich. Macmillan & Co., London and New York. 1903. 10s.

This is a series of what Dr. Reich calls "plastic maps," with notes and index, for the use of students of all ages. The main idea is to suggest the movement of events and their dynamic nature by coloured lines and arrows—in itself an admirable idea, and worked out here as fully as is consistent with clearness on such a small scale. But as these maps contain no hill-work or suggestion of contours, they are hardly sufficient by themselves to express history in terms of geography. Dr. Reich's idea, in fact, ought to be further applied to maps on a larger scale, and, if possible, to relief models. For the present instalment, however, we are duly thankful. The maps in the great majority of cases show military movements—that majority is rather large for a series based avowedly on J. R. Green's 'History'—but there are also others showing the progress of enclosure and discovery, the distribution of fiefs and abbeys. We might have expected one at least showing the growth of towns, and would have exchanged for it the three illustrative of British genius. For one may fairly question the standard adopted to determine that rare quality. Dr. Reich relies on the 'Dictionary of National Biography,' *i.e.* on Sir Leslie Stephen and Mr. Sidney Lee, very good authorities indeed, but not conclusive.

D. G. H.