

A. GRAF: *Uebersicht der antiken Geographie von Pannonien*. (Dissertationes Pannonicae ex Instituto . . . Universitatis . . . Budapestinensis, ser. I fasc. 5.) Pp. 156: folding map at end. Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 1936. Sewn, Pengö 15.

ITS title might suggest that this book is a critical discussion of the early sources for the geography of Pannonia—something like the third book of John Horsley's *Britannia Romana*, with the text of each ancient writer forming the basis of a separate chapter. Such an arrangement makes easy reading, and that is not a disadvantage in a work of reference. Mr Graf has chosen a different method, and produced a gazetteer of the province, fully documented with references not merely to ancient writers but to modern research—so fully, and so objectively, that the general view which its title promises is at times hard to obtain. That is not altogether Mr Graf's fault. Few provinces of the Roman Empire can have received such intensive and well-directed attention as Pannonia has obtained in recent years, largely as a result of the stimulus given by Professor Alföldi and the university which sponsors the present publication; and the general view has a host of articles, written in half-a-dozen languages (not all familiar to most English readers), to take into account. Adequate indexes, and a map of welcome simplicity, combine to make the book invaluable as a quarry, for all its lack of form. Those who wish to know how much has been discovered about a particular site, or to place an inscription recorded in *L'Année Epigraphique* under an obscure modern name, may rest assured that it will save them an extended search; and it can be made to supply welcome information on wider questions, such as the tempo of the Roman advance to the Danube frontier, and the romanization of its hinterland.

Sometimes the symbols used on the map to distinguish sites of different types appear to be mischosen, and the placing of tribes and spelling of place-names do not always command confidence; one could wish, too, that the boundaries between Pannonia and neighbour-

ing provinces had been defined with as much care as that between Upper and Lower Pannonia; but these are minor points which do not really detract from the value of a first-rate work of reference. ERIC BIRLEY.

Hatfield College, Durham.

Betty HEIMANN, Ph.D.: *Indian and Western Philosophy, a Study in Contrasts*. Pp. 156. London: Allen and Unwin, 1937. Cloth, 5s. net.

MISS HEIMANN, who is a Lecturer in Sanskrit at the London School of Oriental Studies, deals in sweeping generalizations. Indian philosophy is 'cosmic', Western philosophy is 'anthropological'. The *homo mensura* doctrine is the basis of all Western philosophy (except that of the Pre-Sophistics and that of Plato, 'the last great cosmic thinker of the West'), while Indian philosophy refuses to allow to man any pre-eminence over other things in the world. Plato retained a 'cosmic' outlook by applying to his principles the term *θεωρία*, while 'conversely' Aristotle, the 'first great Western philosopher', 'invented' the term *σύστημα*, and so guided Western speculation along the 'anthropological' path. These assertions are bold, and I find the last one obscure, but the inference seems to be that Western philosophy has spurned Plato and followed in the steps of Protagoras and Aristotle. If this inference be accepted, then we must disregard, as what biologists call a 'mutant', any Western philosophic doctrine which diverges from 'Western philosophy' so defined. And this may help us, perhaps, to understand such twin assertions as that (a) Aristotle's work is Western, and (b) 'in India purpose is looked upon as inherent in any cosmic function, while to us it is a mere accidental, coming to objects from without'. It is fair to say that the bulk of Miss Heimann's short book deals with the salient features of Indian philosophy, and I am not competent to criticize what she says on that subject.

T. M. KNOX.

University of St. Andrews.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE LOEB *DE PARTIBUS ANIMALIUM*.

To the Editors of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

DEAR SIRS,

Perhaps you can allow me room to supplement Professor Sir D'Arcy Thompson's review of Dr. Peck's edition of Aristotle's *De Partibus*, by drawing attention to the full Introduction, and also to the Foreword contributed by Dr. F. H. A. Marshall, neither of which he has found space to mention.

We non-scientific scholars are grateful to Dr. Marshall for pointing out the importance of this treatise as the earliest text-book of animal

physiology, for indicating the departments of the subject in which Aristotle attained accurate knowledge, and for discussing the teleological aspect of Aristotle's work in this field.

Dr. Peck's introduction is full of useful information clearly set out; some points are original, while on others he acknowledges his debt to Sir D'Arcy Thompson and other authorities. Valuable items are a table of Aristotle's biological and zoological works classified by subject, showing the place of *De Partibus* in the whole scheme; a synopsis of its contents; and a study of a series of technical terms, *μόριον*, *αἰτία*, *λόγος*, *γένεσις*, *δύναμις*, and so on—this will be most useful to beginners, and is not to be ignored by accomplished Aristotelians.

An account is given of the Syrian, Arabic, and Latin versions of Aristotle's zoology, the most detailed short study known to me of the transmission of the Master's work. It is a fascinating story. Among the figures that flit across the screen are Haroun-al-Rashid's son, court physician to the Caliph, Michael Scot, official astrologer to the King of Sicily at Palermo, Grosseteste, a Suffolk man, Bishop of Lincoln, William of Moerbeke in Flanders, translator for Saint Thomas Aquinas, and the humanist Popes Nicholas V and Sixtus IV. Then we come to Aristotle's influence on the biologists of the Renaissance, especially William

Harvey, and the rediscovery of him later on by Cuvier and St. Hilaire.

In conclusion Dr. Peck makes a noteworthy contribution to textual criticism. Several corrupt passages are restored with the aid of the Arabic and Latin versions—in regard to the British Museum copy of the former Dr. Reuben Levy has lent his aid. In many places Dr. Peck has studied the six MSS of Michael Scot's version that are in England, and the three Oxford copies of William of Moerbeke.

H. RACKHAM.

Christ's College, Cambridge.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

(A reference to *C.R.* denotes a review or mention in the *Classical Review*.)

GNOMON.

XIV. 1. JANUARY, 1938.

Pagasai und Demetrias. By F. Stählin, E. Meyer, and A. Heidner [Berlin: de Gruyter, 1934. Pp. xi+273, 35 illustrations, 24 plates, 3 maps, 4°] (Fabricius). Heidner's maps and Stählin's descriptions are good; Meyer's historical survey excellent. G. Daux: *Delphes au Ile et au Ier siècle*. . . [C.R. LI. 191] (Klaffenbach). A book of wide learning. K. regrets the absence of adequate indices. A. W. van Buren: *Ancient Rome as revealed by recent discoveries* [C.R. L. 190] (Boëthius). Instructive and suggestive. E. Benevise: *Origines de la formation des noms en Indo-Européen*, vol. 1 [Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1935. Pp. 224] (Specht). Sp. is impressed by B.'s method, though he argues against many of his opinions. E. Löfstedt: (1) *Philologischer Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aetheriae* [C.R. LI. 1]; (2) *Vermischte Studien zur lateinischen Sprachkunde und Syntax* [C.R. LI. 140] (Hofmann). (1) The reprint of this remarkable book is very welcome. (2) It is a pleasure to use a book showing such a mastery of so wide a range of problems. R. Nierhaus: *Strophe und Inhalt im pindarischen Epinikion* [Berlin: Junker und Dünhaupt, 1936. Pp. 122] (Bischoff). May sometimes be useful, but the argument is uneven and the matter not well arranged. I. Barkan: *Capital punishment in ancient Athens* [C.R. LI. 190] (Volkman). V. argues against B.'s theory that Athens was humane in her method of exacting death penalties. E. G. E. Lorenz: *Alexander der Grosse* [Berlin: Hobbing, 1935. Pp. 236, 4 plates] (Berve). Does not claim to be a work of scholarship. H. Ziegler: *Titus Pomponius Atticus als Politiker* [Diss. Munich: New York, 1936. Pp. x+125] (Strasburger). Z.'s thorough and independent examination is valuable for the understanding of Cicero's letters to Atticus. T. Wikström: *In Firmicum Maternum Studia critica* [C.R. L. 89] (Bickel). W. is not an outstanding textual critic, but he makes some interesting observations. G. Wagner: *Hölderlin und die Vorsokratiker* [Würzburg: Triltsch, 1937. Pp. 191] (Venske). This book,

though daring in method, may be counted among the forerunners of a future interpretation of Hölderlin.—Forthcoming books from German publishers.—Obituary notice of Johannes Sykurtris by A. Körte.

XIV. 2. FEBRUARY, 1938.

H. Payne and G. M. Young: *Archaic Marble Sculpture from the Acropolis* [London: The Cresset Press, 1936. Pp. xiv+75, 140 plates, Fol.] (Lullies). Y.'s photographs and P.'s introduction are of the greatest value. The book marks a new stage in the study of early Attic sculpture. Ch. Hofkes-Brukker: *Frühgriechische Gruppenbildung* [Diss. Würzburg: Triltsch, 1935. Pp. xii+80, 12 plates] (Matz). Lacks system and solidity, but calls attention to some aspects which may prove to be important. R. Naumann: *Der Quellbezirk von Nîmes* [Berlin: de Gruyter, 1937. Pp. vi+60, 50 illustrations, 43 plates] (v. Gerkan). A trustworthy piece of work which opens the way for further study. G. Juhász: *Die Sigillaten von Brigetio* [Budapest: Inst. f. Münzkunde u. Archäol. d. Univ., 1936. Pp. 201 and a volume of 59 plates, 4°] (Dragendorff). Throws some light on ancient culture. A German summary follows the Hungarian text. G. Calogero: *Studi sull' Eleatismo* [Rome: Tip. del Senato, 1932. Pp. 264] (v. Fritz). In a long review v. F. finds much cause for disagreement, but considers that the book deserves study. C. Opheim: *The Aristaeus Episode of Vergil's Fourth Georgic* [C.R. LI. 231] (Seel). Does not advance our knowledge. O. Foerster: *Handschriftliche Untersuchungen zu Senekas Epistulae Morales und Naturales Quaestiones* [Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1936. Pp. 56, 2 illustrations] (Castiglioni). Careful work, which is fruitful in connexion with the *Ep. M.* but without importance for the textual criticism of the *N.Q.*—Bibliographical Supplement 1938 Nr 1 (down to January 31).

XIV. 3. MARCH, 1938.

Fr. W. König: *Die Stele von Xanthos. Part 1: Metrik und Inhalt* [Vienna: Gerold,