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](#)

Varia

F. K. Ball

The Classical Review / Volume 8 / Issue 05 / May 1894, pp 197 - 198

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00188079, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00188079

How to cite this article:

F. K. Ball (1894). Varia. The Classical Review, 8, pp 197-198 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00188079

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

Prof. Tyrrell (*Bacchae*, ed. 1892, p. 126), 'that he [Stephens] was in the habit of recommending his own conjectures by the authority of pretended MSS. (vid. Kirch. Praef.)' and in the preface, p. xix., he says 'Kirchhoff has shown that they [the vett. codd.] were feigned to give authority to his own conjectures.' Dr. Sandys, again (*Bacchae*,³ p. 213), talks of H. Stephens' 'fraudulent statement' about his 'pretended Italian MSS.'

Supposing it should turn out that neither in any 'preface' nor anywhere else had Kirchhoff touched the subject of Stephens's Italian MSS., and some indignant defender of the memory of the author of the *Thesaurus* were to call Prof. Tyrrell—but it is too horrible to contemplate. I, at all events, can find no reference to the question in any of Kirchhoff's writings. Brunck (on *Bacchae*, v. 235) speaks of H. Stephens's *sublesta fides* as the only support for a reading, asking why he had not said *where* he saw the MSS. Elmsley, in the preface to his *Bacchae*, comments somewhat significantly on the fact that no one else had seen these MSS., and Hermann (pref. to Eur. *Helena*, p. v.) says that people who believe in Stephens's two old Italian MSS. are *nimis creduli*. At the most, he says, the readings were marginal notes, perhaps Stephens's own.

Is it not a reason for being 'credulus' when we find that in twenty-three passages in the *Troades* Stephens quotes from his '*vetustissima exemplaria*' variants which turn out to be the readings of the better class of

MSS. of which *Vat.* 909 (Prinz's *B*, Kirchhoff's *B*) is the best representative? The published editions of the *Troades* in Stephens's time, and for about 200 years afterwards, were based on *Pal.* 287 (Prinz's *P*, Kirchhoff's *B*). In two passages in the *Troades* (vv. 193-196, and vv. 232-234) *P* and Ald. omit half lines to the extent of thirteen words, which words occur in *Vat.* 909, and are recorded almost exactly by Stephens as noted by him in his old MSS. If he did *not* find these words there, where did he find them?¹

Isaac Voss (of whom Charles II. said that he was a sort of *savant* who would believe anything provided it was not in the Bible) said he had found certain readings in a Florentine MS. of Euripides. Nobody has seen or identified the MS. but nobody doubts the genuineness of the readings. And yet one of the most learned Greek scholars and one of the greatest benefactors of classical scholarship that ever lived, is in the nineteenth century called *mendacissimus* (Prof. Tyrrell, *Bacchae* ed. 1871, p. 60) for having made a similar statement. Surely this question ought not to be regarded as settled without a much more searching discussion than it has yet received.

E. B. ENGLAND.

¹ In nearly but not quite all these twenty-three cases P. Vettori, in his marginal notes to the Aldine ed. preserved in the Munich Library, gives the same reading as H. S. Stephens made Vettori's acquaintance on his Italian journey: perhaps some one will say that he got his readings from Vettori, but I hardly think it is likely.

VARIA.

ON SOPHOCLES, *Tr.* 1260, 1261.

χάλυβος
λιθοκόλλητον στόμιον παρέχουσ'.

That λιθοκόλλητος is a perfectly good word, and means 'set with stones' is attested by plenty of passages (e.g. Chares *ap.* Athen. 514 F, Aristobulus *ap.* Strabo 730, Menander *ap.* Poll. 10, 187, &c.). From Lucian (i. p. 29: καὶ ὁ χαλινὸς ἦν λιθοκόλλητος, Δαρείου τινὸς ἢ Καμβύσου ἢ Κύρον αὐτοῦ κειμήλιον) it is plain that stones were used at least in the ornamentation of the bridle very early. Professor Jebb in the appendix to his edition of the *Trachiniae*

(on v. 1261) says that a curb of steel, set with pieces of stone, has not been supported by any proof that a steel curb was ever furnished with teeth of stone; and further, that the epithet, if referring to ornamentation of the bridle, would be wholly out of place here. This latter we grant: but there is evidence from ancient writers that the bit was set with stones. One of the scholiasts on Sophocles, who probably wrote before 30 B.C., recognizes the word and explains it by λίθινον καὶ σκληρὸν χαλινόν. More conclusive evidence is to be found about 400 years later in the poet Claudian (70, 7):

sanguineo virides morsu vexare smaragdos;

Cf. *id.* 8, 549, 550:

turbantur phaleræ: spumosis morsibus aurum
fumat: anhelantes exundant sanguine gemmae;

and, again, 73, 7, 8:

accipe regales cultus, et crine superbus
erecto virides spumis perfunde smaragdos.

These jewels were set doubtless near the ends of the bit, and were ornamental as well as severe. Cf. *Isid. Orig.* 4, 8: frenusculi ulcera circa rictum oris: similia his quae fiunt iumentis asperitate frenorum. But at the outset probably nothing but sharp or jagged pieces of stone were used, which would make a very cruel bit. It is likely therefore that this sort of a bit is meant in the *Trachiniae*. (The passage from Nonnus quoted by Prof. Jebb, p. 206, I cannot find, but εἰλαίγγας occurs in Nonnus 11, 122, and 32, 242, ed. Koechly, 1857. Compare Claud. 70, 3: gemmis dum frena renident, &c.)

ON TIBULL. I. 1, 2.

et teneat culti iugera magna soli.

Shall we read magna or multa? Magna is supported by G (Baehrens) and by the Paris and Freising excerpts, and has therefore the weight of authority. Multa is found in A V g (Baehrens). Editors agree, I think, in reading multa, and for the same reason perhaps that Prof. Ramsay urges, that the iugerum is a fixed amount! To say that a similar mistake occurs in Ovid, *Amor.* 3, 15, 12, is begging the question. In this passage, Palatinus primus with two other MSS. reads iugera parva. Most editors (if not all except Müller in his *Carm. Amat.* 1861) accept pauca.

Light is thrown on both these passages by Statius (*Th.* 5, 550):

collectus gyro spatiosaque iugera complet.

Our acres, too, are all of the same size, but we say, rhetorically, 'broad acres.' Why should not the Romans do likewise? Magna (and parva too) is the lectio difficilior, and therefore the more probable reading.

F. K. BALL.

Cambridge, Massachusetts.

THE WORD ANΑΣAKET.

THE inscription on a bronze helmet (no. 247 in Zvetaieff's *Inscript. Italiae Inferioris Dialecticae*, Rhein. Mus. xxxix. p. 558, *Mém. de la Soc. de Ling. de Paris* vi. p. 51) has caused great difficulty to scholars. BÜCHELER reads Σαῖπινς ἀνα ἀκετ Σπεδῖς Μαρμερεκῖες, and translates 'Saepina praeda; egit Spedius Mamercius' 'Saepine spoil—Spedius Mamercius won it.' He denies that the Σ after ἀνα is a letter. BRÉAL reads Σπεδῖς Μαρμερεκῖες Σαῖπινς ἀνασάκετ, and translates 'Spedius Mamercius Saepinas consecravit' 'Spedius Mamercius of Saepinum made this offering.' W. DEECKE in his appendix to Zvetaieff says: 'Die Inschrift im Rhein. Mus. xxxix. 558 ist zu lesen—spedis: mamerekies: | saipins: ana aket, d.i. Spedius Mamercius Saepinus dedicavit. ana is Preposition, akēt Perfect from akum = agēre.'

Prof. Conway (*Trans. of the Camb. Phil. Soc.* vol. iii. part iv. p. 222 sqq.), in discussing 'Veseris and the letter F,' mentions a set of Oscan coins with the legend ζεσρεp and and fensernum which Dr. Imhoof-Blumer (*Numismat. Zeits.* 886, p. 206 ff.)

assigns to the town Vesis. The object of his paper is to discuss the 'altogether exceptional representation of the same sound by v in Latin and f in Oscan.' Dr. Blumer had been unable to give parallel uses of the sign ζ. But Prof. Conway quotes our inscription and also the one immediately preceding it in Zvetaieff as containing the same letter reversed,¹ adding that in these two inscriptions σ is the ordinary Ionic ζ. The latter inscription is Τρεβῖς Σ. Σεσρες δεδετ (sic Zvetaieff) where Conway explains it festes = Festus. In the former he explains ΤΕΥΛΑΣΑΝΑ, as -faket in composition = Osc. *fefaced (fefacust) Umbr. *faced (facust). He compares Umbr. K l a v i a f a a n f e t a f Tab. Ig. ii. a. 33, which he says may possibly mean 'the dedicated chine.' Apparently therefore, though he does not translate the inscription, he wishes to get the same meaning as I do.

Σεσρες in the inscription above quoted

¹ A view to which he still adheres in *Class. Rev.* vol. vii. pp. 468, 469.