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](#)

Martial III 93 18–22

A. E. Housman

The Classical Review / Volume 22 / Issue 02 / March 1908, pp 46 - 47

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00000949, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00000949

How to cite this article:

A. E. Housman (1908). Martial III 93 18–22. The Classical Review, 22, pp 46–47 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00000949

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

to begin with, followed very near on one that was trying to take it close at the finish, unless the pursuing car completed its proper curve, —one whose arc lay more or less at right angles to the axis of the course—passing *in front* of the leading car. (This passing in front gave it no advantage, because it was not yet in the straight, while the other car was.) If, from the moment of beginning the turn, it went off at an obtuse angle to the axis of the course, a collision was inevitable. When the turn was being taken in this manner by the two cars respectively, it was also clear that if the pursuing car were not close enough up to the other to be able to pass in front of it, and yet attempted to do so, there would be no less danger of a collision. No doubt in the ancient races much depended on the skill with which the turn was taken, and I should imagine that this attempt to pass when it was impossible, rather than draw in and let the leading car go by, was a fruitful source of accidents.

Applying all this to the passage before us, I suppose that the Barkaia car was leading, and took the turn wide to begin with (this might compel a cautious pursuer to hold back a little, supposing he were not close enough up to pass in the manner described above), and that the Ainian's team, just after they had begun the turn, bolted straight ahead and dashed into it as it came round.

'But then the Ainian's hard-mouthed horses bolt, and at the turn, as they are finishing the sixth and beginning the seventh round, dash headlong into the Barkaia car.' ἐξ ὑποστροφῆς I take to mean 'immediately after turning,' i.e. after *beginning* the turn, a moment which we should perhaps best indicate by 'at the turn,' as I have rendered the words above. The phrase could hardly mean merely 'swerving' (Jebb), since ὑποστρέφω means 'to turn round.'

This account of the matter accords with the scholiast's note, ἐξ ὑπαντήσεως ἐκείνων ὑποστρεφόντων, 'they met them as they were turning back.' He is brief for the same reason that the poet is brief: the thing seemed to him too simple to need further explanation. It may be added that, though we may reasonably doubt the existence of the *spina* in the 5th century B.C., it is highly improbable that the scholiast imagined a δίαυλος without one. Of course ὄχοι may include the horses, though it cannot mean the horses only, and the Ainian team may have run into both the Barkaia team and car, and probably did, and it may have been at an angle more or less acute, so that some of the horses' faces met; but Sophokles does not say this, he says no more than that they dashed into the whole Barkaia 'turn-out.'

M. A. BAYFIELD.

MARTIAL III 93 18-22.

audes ducentas nupturire post mortes
uirumque demens cineribus tuis quaeris.
prurire quid si satiae uelit saxum? 20
quis coniugem te, quis uocabit uxorem,
Philomelus auiam quam uocauerat nuper?

IN the *Journal of Philology*, vol. xxx p. 235, I corrected as above the punctuation of this passage (formerly printed 'quaeris | prurire. quid') and explained its gist, but said that I could not remove the corruption in verse 20.

The chief lections of the MSS are *satiae*, *sactie*, *satirae* and *satiare*, the two last of

which look like divergent miswritings of *satriae*. Palaeographically nothing could better explain these variants than to suppose that the archetype had

prurire quid si Sattiae uelit saxum?

This name, though known to us from several inscriptions, as *C.I.L.* ix 1088 'Sattiae Siluinae,' 1887 'Sattiae Siluae,' 1955 'Sattiae Ianuariae,' was so far from common that it would easily undergo the simple corruptions *satiae* and *sactie* on the one hand, and be altered on the other to the much more familiar name of *Satria*.

Now compare Sen. ep. 77 20 'uita . . . etiam Nestoris et Sattiae brevis est, quae inscribi monumento suo iussit annis se nonaginta nouem uixisse.' The MSS of Plin. n. h. vii 158 give another form, 'ex feminis Liuia Rutili nonaginta septem annos excessit, *sattilia* Claudio principe ex nobili domo nonaginta nouem,' whence the editors write *Statilia*; but Martial's MSS tend to confirm the witness of Seneca's.

Sattiae saxum I understand to be the 'monumentum' itself on which the vain-glorious old woman had inscribed the number of her years; though as a periphrasis for *Sattia sepulta* the phrase would be no bolder than Stat. silu. iii 3 58 'nec erubuit famulantis *fistula Phoebi*' for *Phoebus fistula canens*.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

EARLY USES OF BRONZE AND IRON.

THE Homeric poems frequently describe iron as the metal for tools and implements, while bronze, save in two cases and in one disputed line (*Odyssey*, xvi. 294, xix. 13), is the metal for weapons. Helbig has expressed his disbelief in the opinion that this distribution of the metals represents a real stage in the employment of iron; nor is the Homeric account corroborated so far, to my knowledge, by Greek graves of the early iron age, the age of the 'overlap.'

But we have evidence which I have not seen adduced for the actual existence elsewhere of a stage of culture in which tools are of iron, while weapons continue to be of bronze. In his valuable reports on the excavation of Gezer, in Palestine, Mr. Stewart Macallister says: 'A general principle has been noticed which probably will be found to be universal in Palestine; that from the commencement of the Iron age the dominant metal is used for agricultural instruments, whilst bronze is retained for weapons and for personal adornments. Thus we find sickles and hoes of iron; arrowheads,

knives, daggers' (and, as is later stated, spearheads), 'brooches, pins, and needles are of bronze' (*Palestine Exploration Fund*, p. 190, 1903).

These facts are in exact accordance with Homeric descriptions. The Palestinian facts do not wholly harmonise with Mr. Myres's theory that 'Egypt and the Mediterranean, with the "open-hearth" process, were restricted to a small output of iron, and used it as a rarity until the North, with its "blast-furnace" principle, produced iron in copious amount and of a quality more suitable for cutting-weapons' (*Man*, October, 1907, p. 157).

Iron cannot have been 'a rarity' in Palestine, when sickles and hoes, no less than finger rings, were made of that metal, while weapons, which need a good edge, continued to be made of bronze. The Homeric descriptions certainly tally with the evolution of iron as found at Gezer, and perhaps this can hardly have occurred by accidental coincidence.

ANDREW LANG.

ETYMOLOGY OF *FOLIUM*.

For this word Walde, *Lat. Etym. Wörterb.*, reports a number of suggested etymologies. The most popular connection appears to be with φύλλον, the *v* of which would be presumably explained like the *v* in γῶπις, σκύλλω, Mansion, *Les Gutturales Grecques*, p. 52. Brugmann would apparently connect also with *phalam*, *phalyam*, though the

representation of idg. *ph* by lat. *f* seems to be uncertain. A more plausible connection for *folium* is, I think, O.I. *duille* <**dholio*-, cf. Zeuss, *Gramm. Kelt*². p. 15. The word could then be connected with *θάλος*, *θάλλω*, etc. and A.S. *dile*, E. *dill* <**dhelio*-.

J. FRASER.

Glen-Uryhart, N.B.