

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](#)



Rushforth's *Latin Historical Inscriptions* Latin *Historical Inscriptions*, by G. Mc N. Rushforth, M.A. Clarendon Press. 10s.

E. G. Hardy

The Classical Review / Volume 8 / Issue 1-2 / February 1894, pp 50 - 54
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00187347, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00187347

How to cite this article:

E. G. Hardy (1894). The Classical Review, 8, pp 50-54 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00187347

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

Thus the first line of *Ol.* i. 1 is read:
 ∪ ∶ ∟ | ∪ ∪ | ∪ ∪ || ∟ | ∪ ∪ | ∪ ∪ | ∪ ∪ >
 and the second ∪ ∪ ∪ | ∪ ∪ || ∟ | ∪ ∪ | ∪ ∪ |
 ∪ ∪ || ∪ ∪ >]. Mr. Fennell here speaks of
 'the inevitable symmetry which results
 from J. H. H. Schmidt's method as well as
 from mine': the symmetry found by the
 latter may be trustworthy—that is another
 enquiry—but his own period 3, 4, 2, 4, 1
 does not on the face of it look 'inevitable.'

I append a few notes on particular passages.

Ol. ii. 78, Πηλεύς τε καὶ Κάδμος ἐν τοῖσιν ἀλέγονται. 'ἀλέγονται,' 'are numbered among them,' requires illustration. The best parallel is to be found in the *παρθένιον* of Aleman, οἶον οὐ Δύκαισον ἐν καμοῦσιν ἀλέγω, 'I count him not among the dead.'

Ol. v. 10, ἀεῖδει μὲν ἄλσος ἀγρόν is not so obviously intelligible as to require no note. Is it 'fills with song,' as we have in the passive αἰλεῖται δὲ πᾶν | μέλαθρον, or is it like ὄν πατέρ' Ἀκρων' ἐκ ἄρ υ ξ ε καὶ τᾶν νέοικον ἔδραν, makes the theme of heralds or of singers, heralds or sings 'by an agent' as Mark Twain would say?

Ol. vii. 49, 'note that P.'s point is to show—.' This is the evil example of Gildersleeve! The cost of printing 'Pindar' in full is not so enormous as to justify an editor in causing irritation to a large class of sensitive readers.

Pyth. i. 76, ἀρέομαι | παρ μὲν Σαλαμῖνος Ἀθηναίων χάριν | μισθόν κ.τ.λ. 'I shall win from Salamis the gratitude of the Athenians as my reward.' Has it never been suggested that this is a simple case of *Χιασμός*? παρὰ μὲν Ἀθηναίων ἀρέομαι μισθὸν Σαλαμῖνος χάριν, ἐν Σπάρτᾳ δὲ κ.τ.λ. Is it more puzzling than Aristophanes' words in the *Peace*

ὁ Ζεὺς μὲν ὄν οἶδ' ὡς τὰ τούτων μῶρ' ἔμ' εἰ
 πύθοιτ' ἂν ἐπιτρέψει

or than a passage where Mr. Fennell himself recognizes 'interlacing' of words, *Pyth.* iv. 24, ἀνικ' ἀγκυραν ποτὶ χαλκόγενυν ναὶ κρημνάντων ἐπέτοσε (ἄγκ. χαλκ. ποτὶ ναὶ κρ.)? Another passage where 'interlacing' should be recognized is *Ol.* ii. 63, ὅτι θανόντων μὲν ἐνθάδ' αὐτίκ' ἀπάλαμνοι φρένες κ.τ.λ. Mr. Fennell rejects Rauchenstein's explanation on the ground of the position of 'ἐνθάδε'!¹

Pyth. iii. 34, ἐπεὶ παρὰ Βοιβιάδος κρημοῖσιν ὄκει παρθένος. An unpleasing and unnecessary note of Mr. Fennell's occupies space which would have been better filled by quoting the graceful opening of one of the *Ἅοῖαι*

ἡ οἷη Διδύμους ἱερὸς ναίουσα κολωνὸς
 Δωτῶ ἐν πεδίῳ πολυβότρυος ἄντ' Ἀμύριοι
 νίματο Βοιβιάδος λίμνης πόδα παρθένος ἀδμῆς.
 (fr. 142, Kinkel.)

Very likely Pindar had this passage in mind.

Pyth. iv. 57. Mr. Fennell does not venture upon a theory about ἡ ρα. But surely it is a thing about which an editor must say *something*. Is it the Homeric 'spoke,' with the *schema Pindaricum*?

Ib. 105, οὐτ' ἔπος εὐτράπελον. He suggests οὐτε φέπος τραπελόν, 'shifty.' But is not *εὐτράπελον* the happiest possible expression—'frivolous,' a euphemism for 'disrespectful' or 'insulting'?

Ib. 189, ἐπαινῆσαις 'gave praise to each.' Mr. Myers' 'thanked them' is more exact.

W. R. HARDIE.

¹ Demos. *Ol.* ii. 30 is a prose passage where Chiasmus has sometimes been ignored, εἰ δὲ τοῖς μὲν ὤσπερ ἐκ τυραννίδος ἡμῶν ἐπιτάττειν ἀποδώσετε κ.τ.λ. The construction is τοῖς μὲν ἡμῶν, not τυραννίδος ἡμῶν.

RUSHFORTH'S LATIN HISTORICAL INSCRIPTIONS.

Latin Historical Inscriptions, by G. Mc N. RUSHFORTH, M.A. Clarendon Press. 10s.

THIS book is very significant of the change which has come over the teaching of ancient—and especially perhaps of Roman—history in Oxford in the course of the last fifteen or twenty years. Those who can recollect the ordinary history lectures in—say the early seventies—will remember that they consisted

very much of summaries, not so much of facts as of tendencies, and of generalisations, more or less wide, based on these as to the social or political characteristics of a particular period. The lectures were often highly suggestive, but they were suggestive of the ultimate results of historical investigation, not of the process of constructing history. The student learnt from them the faculty of writing extremely good essays on his-

torical results, but he was comparatively seldom allowed any insight into the processes by which the lecturers, or their German authorities, arrived at these results from the original data on which of course he had some vague idea that they depended. There was a tendency in those days rather to look down upon the man who had the reputation of 'knowing his books,' and a 'First' gained by such knowledge, as it was reported to be sometimes, was somewhat of a 'lusus naturae' and argued a certain amount of eccentricity on the part of examiners. A few years later one used to hear at a distance from Oxford that cases of this kind were becoming commoner, and without knowing exactly what the change really meant, one had perhaps an uneasy—perhaps a complacent—idea that a First in Greats was not what it had been. As a matter of fact the change was a wholly good one, at least as far as history was concerned, and it was due very largely to Prof. Pelham's teaching and influence. Even in the days I have alluded to, his lectures were beginning to be an exception to the general rule, and his hearers had many more references and citations given them than they perhaps quite knew what to do with. But Prof. Pelham was then only one among many; now he stands in a position by himself, and those who come nearest to him are his own pupils who carry out the method which they have learnt from him. And that method consists in going back to the sources of history, accepting no generalisation which is not based on and cannot be traced back to—evidence, the evidence of classical writers critically weighed, the evidence of inscriptions and coins, the evidence in fact of archaeological data of any sort. Treated in this way the teaching of history is a training in scientific method, a distinct preparation for original work. It is of course possible to carry this tendency too far. The collection of evidence, the multiplication of citations, the consideration of 'fontes' are in truth only means to an end—the historical reconstruction of the past, and possibly Oxford lectures sometimes a little lose sight of this, and tend to become a little scrappy, a little too crowded with evidence, brought together with a view more of showing how much evidence we have, than of developing the conclusions to be drawn from it. If the book before us in any way suggests this last remark, it is more because there is a certain want of proportion and perspective in Mr. Rushforth's work than from any failure to recog-

nise the proper relation between evidence and conclusions. It is perhaps a little surprising that Mr. Hicks's volume of Historical Greek Inscriptions has not been followed before this by a corresponding book on Latin Inscriptions. As Mr. Rushforth says, 'the ordinary student is almost helpless in presence not merely of the Corpus but even of selections like those of Wilmanns' which do not supply or supply only imperfectly "the historical setting" on which the value of the inscriptions depends. Mr. Rushforth has to a certain extent filled this gap: if he has not filled it quite sufficiently, as sufficiently as his careful and accurate work and his familiarity with the literature of the subject would have enabled him to do, it is, in addition to some faults of arrangement, because he has been too anxious to make his book a small one, to limit the number of his inscriptions to one hundred, and above all to confine himself rigidly within the limits of the period usually taken up for the Oxford examination. The result is a piece of work which, as far as considerable portions of it are concerned, can only be described as sketchy, a characteristic which is certainly not due to any lack of qualifications on Mr. Rushforth's part to have made it complete, and probably not to any undue precipitancy in publishing work that is imperfect, but seems to be an instance, an unfortunate one in this case, of the self-repression which makes the work of some scholars so much less full than their readers would like to have it.

To a certain extent indeed Mr. Rushforth seems to have wavered between two methods of illustrating the historical value of inscriptions. One method would be to select a number of headings such as the Constitution of the Principate, the Administration or the Frontier policy of the Empire, or of particular provinces in it, the Organisation of the army or the fleet or the Imperial worship, and to show under each heading to what an extent epigraphical evidence contributes to our knowledge of it. A work of this kind would be more or less systematic; its value would depend on its completeness, and on the cumulative nature of the epigraphical evidence. Another method would be to show from a series of individual inscriptions the kind of information that we derive from this sort of evidence, and how inscriptions may supplement or correct our historical texts. In this case the value of the work will depend on the importance of the inscriptions selected: there will be less room for systematic arrangement, and

diversity of illustration will be aimed at rather than completeness of treatment. A third method, that of chronological arrangement, followed by Mr. Hicks, is precluded in this case by the smallness of the period touched upon. Now it seems to me that ostensibly, and as far as outward form goes, Mr. Rushforth has chosen the second method, while his real object has been the exposition of certain branches of organisation and administration. The result of this fusion of methods has been in some ways unfortunate. Anything like a sufficient treatment of the various headings would require the citation of a number of inscriptions to illustrate each; but the plan of Mr. Rushforth's book with its hundred inscriptions limits him to one or two or at most three (I shall mention one or two exceptions below) for any particular section, while his too scrupulous care not to admit inscriptions of a date later than 70 A.D. has been a still further limitation, and usually a quite unnecessary one, to his treatment. Except in connexion with matters in which a change is known to have taken place after Nero, inscriptions belonging to Vespasian's reign or Domitian's or even Trajan's would have been quite as admissible for Mr. Rushforth's purpose as those of the earlier princes. He gives one example of this himself when he takes two comparatively late inscriptions indicating the boundary between the two Germanies as the pegs on which to hang the few remarks he has to make on those provinces. Again Mr. Rushforth has often apparently found it impossible within the limits he has placed on himself to put really important and light-giving inscriptions at the head of his sections; and, as his plan precludes him from substituting for one or two important ones the cumulative evidence of numbers, and he has in his exposition somewhat strictly limited himself to the evidence of the inscriptions he has chosen—in these cases, and they are not infrequent, we really get the advantages of neither method, we neither have striking examples of epigraphical evidence, nor a sufficient exposition of the heading under which the inscription is placed. Thus under the heading of the organisation of Spain we have two milestones and an inscription relating to the pacification of Baetica. Mr. Rushforth's commentary consists of a very brief reference to roads in Spain, and to the number of legions placed in *Tarracensis*. Under the heading—organisation of *Pannonia*, we have the funeral inscrip-

tion of a centurion of *legio viii. Aug.* found near *Poetovio*, and the commentary confines itself to the question whether the military boundary of the province extended or did not extend to the Danube at the time. The commentary on the organisation of *Syria*, based on an inscription interesting mainly as an example of an equestrian *cursus honorum*, does nothing more than fix the date of the governorship of *Quirinius*, and inform us that the provincial census was usually taken by an official of equestrian rank. The section on the colonies of *Augustus* in *Pisidia*, based on a milestone found at *Comana*, touches the fringes only of the Augustan organisation of the southern portion of *Asia Minor*. That on the military frontier of *Africa* does no more than fix on *Theveste* as the legionary camp before *Hadrian*. The section in *Moesia* is perhaps especially disappointing. Mr. Rushforth chooses the well-known inscription which mentions a *praefectus civitatum Moesiae et Treballiae*, and another mentioning the two *Moesian* legions in 33 A.D. With regard to the latter we are merely told that their head-quarters are unknown; from the former it is inferred that the organisation of the province was still under *Tiberius* in a rudimentary stage, and that it was necessary for a special reason to place these native communities within the province under a *praefectus*. But does the former statement follow from the latter? Mr. Rushforth says that the first mention of a *legatus* is in 6 A.D.: he omits to mention *Mommsen's* almost certain supposition that the *Calpurnius Piso* described by *Dio Cassius* (54, 34) as governor of *Pamphylia* in 11 B.C. was really *legatus* of *Moesia*, in which case the province would have been organised for twenty-five years at the beginning of *Tiberius's* reign. But surely the existence of a *praefectus* for some outlying parts of the province no more proves *Moesia* to have been in a rudimentary state of organisation than the existence of a '*praefectus orae maritimae conventus Tarraconensis*' proves the Spanish province to have been, or than the existence of a *praefectus orae Ponticae* proves *Pontus* to have been under *Trajan*. But Mr. Rushforth has missed a good opportunity in *Moesia* of showing how epigraphical evidence may throw light on the organisation of a province. The relations between *Poppaeus Sabinus*, who was apparently *legatus* of *Moesia* all through the reign of *Tiberius*, and other people who are also spoken of as its *legates* during the same period are not cleared up

by the account of Tacitus, but Domaszewski has shown by means of an inscription (*C.I.L.* xi. 1835 = *Wilm.* 1138) which falls within Mr. Rushforth's rather narrow limits that, owing to the temporary incorporation of Macedonia and Achaia with Moesia, the consular legate of Moesia had the general administration of all these provinces while a praetorian legate also described as *pro praetore Moesiae* had a special command of the two Moesian legions and the Moesian frontier (*Rhein. Mus.* vol. xiv. pp. 1—5).

But if these are instances of somewhat incomplete treatment, in other cases Mr. Rushforth's work has been much more thorough. His account of the organisation of the *Tres Galliae* and *Gallia Narbonensis* is extremely clear and good; but then under these two headings he has used no fewer than eight out of his hundred inscriptions. Would not a similar method in other cases have produced a similar result? Again his account of the Imperial worship in the Provinces and Italy, on which he has expended fourteen of his inscriptions, is altogether admirable and could hardly have been made more clear and intelligible; and, generally speaking, his treatment of Rome and Italy is fuller and better done than his account of provincial matters. To a certain extent no doubt this is due to the existence of such a book as Hirschfeld's *Verwaltungsgeschichte*, but still a better use has been made of the epigraphical material, and above all the arrangement is better. It is really the arrangement which is the weakest point in the book. In the first place its division into two parts, one relating to Augustus and the other to the succeeding emperors, is awkward and, as it is worked out, quite unnecessary. If the first part had contained the original Augustan arrangements, and the second developments from them, the division might have been made instructive; but this is not the case or in very few instances, and the results are rather such awkward separations as that of the two accounts of Armenia on pp. 21—22 and p. 126; that of Pannonia which comes in Part I. from the other Danube provinces which all come in Part II.: that of the annexation of Egypt in Part I., from its army in Part II., and the double treatment of the water supply on p. 29 and 87—89. Again under the heading—Organisation of the Provinces—we find very little indeed that justifies the title. There is nothing about the organisation of the Spanish provinces, nothing about the organisation of Syria. What is said about the

Eastern policy of Augustus does not properly belong to this head, while of Pannonia only the frontier line is discussed. In Part II. everything provincial is included under the wide heading Frontiers and Provinces, and accordingly we find such heterogeneous subsections as Roads in Dalmatia, the Cities of Asia, the occupation of Frisia, and the development of the *Canabae*. Similarly another heading—the emperors and persons connected with them—has very miscellaneous contents, personal matters such as the position of Julia Augusta or of Sejanus or the epitaphs of Agrippina and her son Nero, all of which with the exception of Sejanus would surely have come more appropriately under the Imperial family. Then we have isolated references to the invasion of Italy in 69, to Civilis and the *Imperium Galliarum* and to the attempted revolution in Africa by Clodius Macer, and finally an inscription of primary importance, the *lex de imperio Vespasiani*, comes in under this personal section; though it would much more naturally have been taken in connexion with the constitution of the Principate for which by the by Mr. Rushforth can apparently find no inscriptions more appropriate than entries from the *Fasti Praenestini* and the *Fasti Feriarum Latinarum*. Mr. Rushforth's book would, it seems to me, be much improved by a radical rearrangement of his material, by abolishing the distinction, not worked out in a way to make it a real one, between Augustus and the succeeding principes, by collecting the materials for the provinces under two heads Organisation and Frontier Policy, by adding sections on the army (many of the inscriptions would come more appropriately under this head than any other), the system of roads, and the *cursus honorum* both senatorial and equestrian. A rearrangement of this kind with the addition of another fifty inscriptions, as the material for a somewhat fuller exposition in certain parts of the book, would, I cannot help thinking, make the work far more useful than it is to the young students for whom it is intended. On the other hand, taking the book as it is, it deserves a very cordial reception, as a piece of exceptionally accurate work. When Mr. Rushforth really gets hold of an important inscription, such as the edict of Claudius on the *civitas* of the *Anauni* or the epitaph of Plautius Silvanus, his treatment of it is admirable. It has already been noted how thoroughly he has illustrated the Imperial worship, and his sections on the *Canabae*, the Praetorian

Guards and the Augustan administration of Rome are all as excellent as they could be. There can be no doubt that the book will in a great measure answer all the purposes for which it was intended: it will serve better than any other book as an elementary hand-

book to Epigraphy: it will supply a good deal of historical information and, perhaps better still, it will throw a good deal of light on the data from which much of the Imperial history has to be constructed.

E. G. HARDY.

THUMSER'S POLITICAL ANTIQUITIES OF ATHENS.

K. F. HERMANN'S *Lehrbuch der griechischen Antiquitäten*. I. Band, *Staatsaltertümer*, 6te Auflage herausgegeben von Viktor Thumser. 2te Abteilung: *Der athenische Staat und seine Geschichte*. Freiburg-i.-B. 1892. 8vo. pp. vii. + 529 [273-801]. Mk. 12.

It was in 1875 that the fifth edition of this well-known handbook was issued. The interval of seventeen years between that date and the date of Thumser's revision has been one of extraordinary activity in the field of political and legal antiquities, as in other fields of scientific study. Inscriptions from all quarters of the Greek world have supplemented the previously available sources of information, the recovery of Aristotle's *'Αθηναίων πολιτεία* has set in motion a train of readjustments of ideas that is still in full course, and this great and still growing fund of fresh material has attracted an increasing number of zealous investigators. As was to be expected, therefore, many changes were called for, and have been made by Thumser, in the earlier edition by Bähr and Stark.

The increase in size is considerable. The account of the Athenian state in the fifth edition contained 372 pages; this corresponding *Abteilung* of the sixth edition contains 506 of materially larger size. The reviser's preface calls attention to the small number of sections that appear in the sixth edition unaltered or but slightly altered. Examination shows that the book has in fact been so worked over as nearly to constitute, as regards contents, a new work; and this in spite of the fact that Hermann's general plan, and for the most part the details of the old arrangement, have been preserved. Most of the headings of sections are retained, sometimes with a slight variation in wording; they mostly follow the same order, a few new headings being inserted. Transpositions in the other *Abteilungen* have caused a complete renumbering of the

sections; under these circumstances one does not see the necessity or the advantage of marking the divided or newly inserted sections with *a* and *b*. It would have been simpler and equally convenient to number consecutively, especially as the old number is placed in brackets beside the new. *E.g.* 57 *a* *Der theseische Synoikismos* is a new heading; this section and 57 *b* *Der attische Gesamtstaat und seine Gliederung* together correspond to section 97 in the earlier edition. To subdivide by letters in this way preserves the difference of precisely forty between the old and the new numbering, it is true; but the comparison of the two editions is but very slightly facilitated thereby, while as a matter of book-making the disturbance of sequence in the numbering is annoying. Still of course this is but a trifle. And on the other hand it is a great improvement in form that the notes, as in the recent editions of other portions of the *Lehrbuch*, are placed at the foot of the page instead of being grouped at the end of the respective sections.

Along with Hermann's general plan and arrangement of matter the general method of treatment has remained essentially the same. The political and legal antiquities of Athens are described from the historical point of view; the leading aims appear to be the utmost completeness, the utmost brevity, the utmost precision of statement. Completeness involves no little polemic; this combination tends to obscure the larger outlines; and when the constant endeavour after brevity is added, elegance of style is put out of the question and occasional obscurity is inevitable. Gilbert's *Handbuch der griechischen Staatsaltertümer*, the first volume of which has also recently appeared in a new edition, is far more readable, because it neither aims at the same completeness in details nor turns aside so often to notice discrepant views. Gilbert's is therefore the better work for the beginner; though on many controverted points Gilbert