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](#)

Jurenka's *Bacchylides Die neugefundenen Lieder des Rakchylides*. Text, Uebersetzung und Commentar von Hugo Jurenka. Wien. Alfred Hölder. 1898. Pp. xx., 162. Marks 7.

J. A. Nairn

The Classical Review / Volume 13 / Issue 03 / April 1899, pp 167 - 168

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00042785, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00042785

How to cite this article:

J. A. Nairn (1899). The Classical Review, 13, pp 167-168 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00042785

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

spelling might very well be the *result* of the difference, the force of the preposition being more marked when the word meant 'attend upon.' It is clear that, certain words excepted, *adp-* is the almost uniform spelling of our earliest MSS., and it is doubtless for this reason that it is adopted in one of our most recent school editions.

Yet there are reasons why one may hesitate before accepting such a change without reservation. Is the spelling *adporto* etc. also that of republican times and of the first century A.D., in other words is its history like that of *adfero*? Unfortunately I have not always been on the watch for such words in my reading of the inscriptions; but for many of them there is, as far as I know, no actual occurrence of the assimilated form to contradict the supposition mentioned, and one might cite in its support the *adporto* x. 4842 (Augustan period) and *adprobo* beside *appello* on the inscription of Claudius at Lyons (Dessau no. 212), not to mention examples on later inscriptions. But there is on the other hand the possibility that *adporto* etc. rests merely on recomposition in the spelling (as *adcurro* beside *accurro*), replacing an earlier *apporto*, the lack of evidence of which would be merely accidental, due to the fact that the words do not happen to occur on republican inscriptions. In this case, we could not be certain whether the new spelling had become fully established in the first century A.D. or not. The *adporto* might be an isolated instance of it (note the collocation *advehere, adferre, adportare*) and in the inscription which has *adprobo* we find also *adcensus*, though *accensus* is found in the *Acta Arvalium* and elsewhere. Suggestive of such a possibility is the statement of

Statius (*ad Aen.* I. 616) that *applicat* was the earlier spelling as against the *adplicat* of his own time. Moreover in the case of some words even the MS. spelling varies. So Plautus A. has *appono* five times to one of *adpono* and *appuli*, and the Terence A. varies in these words. But in Liv. *Putean.* we find (uniformly, I think) *adpono* and *adpuli*. Note also the Pompeian *apponitur* (*C.I.L.* iv. 1896). Finally, if one adopts *adporto* etc., one cannot consistently stop there. The compounds of *ad-c* and *ad-t* must be considered individually. I suspect for example that the evidence for *adresco* is as strong as for *adporto*. A more thorough examination of all the material bearing on the combinations *ad-c*, *ad-t* and *ad-p* might bring some new light and enable us to accept without reservation the unassimilated spelling for some words. But at present the matter is not sufficiently evident.

ad-sp-, ad-sc-, ad-st-, ad-gn-. There is little to add to what is already known. The assimilated spelling is clearly better for *aspicio, aspergo*, the unassimilated for *adstruo, adstringo, adstipulo*, while usage varies between *ascendo* and *adscendo*, *ascribo* and *adscribo*, *ascisco* and *adscisco*, *asto* and *adsto*, *agnatus* and *adgnatus*, *agnosco* and *adgnosco*. In the *Acta Arvalium* we find *ascendo* and *asto*, but oftener *adscendo* and *adsto*. Both *asto* and *adsto* may be cited from other inscriptions. In general the inscriptional material is too meagre to permit a definite conclusion as to the relation of the two spellings, but one may venture the opinion that *ascendo* etc. represent the older and phonetic spelling, *adscendo* etc. being due to recomposition.

CARL DARLING BUCK.

The University of Chicago.

JURENKA'S *BACCHYLIDES*.

Die neugefundenen Lieder des Bakchylides.
Text, Uebersetzung und Commentar von
HUGO JURENKA. Wien. Alfred Hölder.
1898. Pp. xx., 162. Marks 7.

THIS book represents the fruits of rather more than six months' work on Bacchylides from the appearance of the Editio Princeps. Embodying as it does a larger mass of illustration than was provided by Mr. Kenyon, and professing to attend to metrical questions more fully than had hitherto been

done, Prof. Jurenka's book merits our consideration. To quote his own words: 'my edition, although my chief energies were devoted to criticism of the text, is not a critical one in a narrow sense' (p. xvi. of Introduction). Thus an accurate representation of the Papyrus, the statement of its errors and variants need not be looked for; but in the most important cases the reading of the Papyrus is stated with precision. Mr. Kenyon's work will thus have to be referred to in general; further study how-

ever has revealed sometimes traces in the MS. which were not visible even to his practised eye, and here Jurenka marks an advance. The literature of the subject (to May, 1898), pre-eminently, we notice, the *Classical Review*, he has used with praiseworthy diligence. Prof. Jurenka embarks on his task with a touch of the *furor biographicus* which leads him into extravagance when speaking of Bacchylides' importance. He holds that the poet is (Preface, p. xii.) 'ein meister in der Behandlung der Sprache,' and supports this by an illustration: 'wie neckisch ist im sechsten Liede das Wortspiel Λάχων Λάχε, wie prächtig der Ausdruck στεφάνοις εθείρας νεανίαι βρονήτες, wie malerisch ἀμπελοτρόφον Κέον, wie innig die Ansprache 'Αριστομένειον ὦ ποδάνεμον τέκος! Und all dieser Reiz auf engstem Raume!' One might suppose hastily that the last sentence was 'writ sarcastic,' for not one of the four 'beauties' here so fulsomely praised (certainly in the case of the first and third) is beyond the reach of the veriest Dichterling. The sobriety of Prof. Inama's judgment (as quoted on p. viii.) is in marked contrast with this: while the citation also with apparent approval of Desrousseaux (Preface, p. ix. note 25) in a contrary sense seems to show that Jurenka's admiration 'outstripped the pauser' consistency.

Before leaving the Preface attention must be drawn to a peculiar slip on the part of the editor. In discussing the respective claims of Bacchylides and Pindar to be the more creative (schöpferisch) he makes this statement: 'Uebrigens, Schule hat auch Bakchylides gemacht: Apoll. de synt. (fr. 52, Bgk.⁴) καὶ ὡς ἔχει τὸ "ἀρίσταρχος Ζεὺς" παρὰ τοῖς περὶ Βακχυλίδην'. Now we should be glad of further evidence of our poet's influence than the transmittence of one epithet and that a poor one to others less fortunate in their powers of invention even than he: but Prof. Jurenka must be bold indeed if he has any confidence here that οἱ περὶ Βακχυλίδην means anything more than 'Bacchylides' himself, as usual in grammarians' Greek. The 'school' of Bacchylides then may be considered for the present as visionary as that of Homer.

In textual matters Prof. Jurenka is least good when most independent. One example must suffice: vv. 11-14, as he prints them of poem I. (I omit brackets):—

πολυκυδὲς κεν βαθν- δέειλον ἦδη μὲν γένος
ἐπλετο, καρτερόχειρ 'Αργεῖος ἀγῶνα λέοντος
θυμολοοῖο ποτ' εἰγ' ἀρχεῖος οὐ μῶλοι μάχας.

Here one does not know which to admire most: the construction κεν—ἐπλετο when to all appearance there is no place for an Irrealis, the position of μὲν, and of εἰγε, and again of οὐ after ἀρχεῖος (with which it is to be coupled), or finally the excellent chiasmus of ἀγῶνα with μῶλοι, μάχας with ἀρχεῖος (to say nothing of θυμολοοῖο, and that from an editor who at ii. 3 assails a conjecture of Housman's with 'Kakophonisch'). I do not repent of my own reconstruction (*C.R.* vol. ii. p. 450) and observe that my ἐλαφρὸς v. 14 (Kenyon ἐλαφροῖς) is adopted tacitly by Jurenka usually most scrupulous in his acknowledgments. The editor's suggestion of ἐκ χθὲς (for the ἦδη of his text) in v. 11 will commend itself to no one. At ix. 8 (Kenyon, ix. 13) for the corrupt ἀσαγεύοντα he proposes (with an 'etwa') ἀσακτον γ' εἶντα. With what sense? I find in L. and S. sub. voc. only 'not trodden down: Xen. *Oec.* 19, 11.' We are entitled to ask in such a case for the meaning proposed to be expressly stated. In the allied department of the supplying the lost parts of lines I observe no special felicity in the editor's suggestions, e.g. <ἐντέροις> 'τὼ φέρουσα παῖδα at xix. 28 (Kenyon, xix. 39).

The translation into German (with lines of unequal length) I am not competent to appraise: but it seems to represent but inadequately the simplicity of the original. In the metres a certain amount of help is given: our editor is (p. xviii.) 'in der Musik theoretisch und praktisch geschult.'

There are a few mechanical mistakes: p. 17, critical note on v. 29 for 13, 75 read 13, 76; at v. 90 (Kenyon, v. 188) omit the comma after φθόνον; at vii. 8 we have πρεβύτατον for πρεσβ.; p. 54, critical note on v. 6 read 'not the defensive <weapons>'; xvii. 55 for πορυφέαν, read πορφυρέαν.

J. A. NAIRN.