

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](#)



**Seyffert's Dictionary of Classical Antiquities A
*Dictionary of Classical Antiquities, Mythology, Religion,
Literature and Art*, from the German of Dr Oscar
Seyffert, revised and edited, with additions, by H.
Nettleship and J. E. Sandys, with more than 450
Illustrations. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1891.
21s.**

A. S. Wilkins

The Classical Review / Volume 5 / Issue 08 / October 1891, pp 384 - 385

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00179430, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00179430

How to cite this article:

A. S. Wilkins (1891). The Classical Review, 5, pp 384-385 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00179430

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

P. xxxiii.—*Puplicus* is right, not a mistake for *publicus*.

P. xxxv.—*Accussat* and *recussavere* may well represent a good tradition: *obessus*, again, is not wrong for *obesus*; see 'Contributions' etc. p. 538. The instances of *s* omitted after *x* (*exertus* etc.) should not be registered as mistakes.

P. xxxvii.—*Vatillum* is now acknowledged to be the correct form, not *batillum*.

I append a few instances of confusion of letters which seem to have escaped Mr. Hessels, and a few additional instances of the confusions which he has recorded: P. xxii. *a* for *is*, C 104 *calla* for *callis*. *Ibid.* As an instance of *a* inserted, add C 13 *carauma* = γάρμα. *a* for *er*, F 24 *faria eloquia* for *fariet eloquier*. *Ibid.* *b* for *ci*, A 68 *abdus ab hacrore* (= *acidus*). *b* for *g*, I 303 *iubit* for *iugit*. P. xxiii. *c* for *o* (or *od* ?), C 71 *caeporicon* (= *odoeporicon*) *iterarium*. For *di*, C. 447 *clanculum mare* for *diluculum mane*. P. xxvi. *en* for *m*, E 198 *enicha adultera* for *moecha*. P. xxviii. *g* for *o*, A 345 *Aeglea patria ventorum* (= *Aeolia*). P. xxix. *ia* for *η*, A 724 *archia initium* (=

ἀρχή). P. xxx. *iu* for *ni*, A 464 *alterius agunt* (= *alternis*). For *y*, C 209 *candius* (= *sandyx*) *vestis regia*. P. xxxi. *l* for *d*, B 145 *Bosborius lux lucis* (*Phosphorus, dux*). *Ibid.* *l* for *s*, A 943 *avvultis regalibus*, for *augustis*. *Ibid.* To the instances of *m* inserted add *artemta* (A 752) for *artempta* = *artepta*. P. xxxii. *ni* for *m*, P. 105 *palniatus* for *palmatius*. P. xxxv. *s* for *e*, A 922 *austis opotatis* (= *avetis optatis*). *si* for *z*, G 70 *gesiae* for *gazae*: *si* for *c*, I 239 *insilitus* for *inclitus*. P. xxxvi. *t* for *s*, C 50 *castum* (= *cassum*) *vacuum*. P. xxxvii. *ti* for *u*, A 334 *aerectatio* (= *aere cavo*) *tuba*: B 159 *botitium* = *votitium*. *t* for *g*, A 697 *apototyos* for *apologias*. P. xxxviii. *u* for *ci*, F 122 *fenicum cocumum* (for *coccinum*).

The puzzling gloss A 907, *aulaeis superbis, pulchris amoenibus*, should probably be written (not *p. amoenis*) but *pulchris velaminibus*: see *glossae Vergilianae* in Goetz's fourth volume. p. 431 24. The gloss having been written *pulchris vel aminibus, vel* was taken for the conjunction and dropped: *aminibus* was then changed into *amoenibus*.

H. NETTLESHIP.

SEYFFERT'S DICTIONARY OF CLASSICAL ANTIQUITIES.

A Dictionary of Classical Antiquities, Mythology, Religion, Literature and Art, from the German of DR. OSCAR SEYFFERT, revised and edited, with additions, by H. NETTLESHIP and J. E. SANDYS, with more than 450 Illustrations. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1891. 21s.

It is hardly necessary to add anything to the chorus of general approval with which this English edition of Dr. Seyffert's *Lexikon der klassischen Alterthumskunde* has been widely received. The daily and weekly journals, which undertake to answer for the needs of the 'general reader,' have with great unanimity pronounced this just what was wanted for his requirements. It remains only to look at it from the point of view of the student, and to consider if there are any cases in which it gives him inadequate or untrustworthy guidance. The English publishers have certainly been fortunate in the editors whose aid they have secured. If there are any two scholars whose names are guarantees for careful and minute accuracy of work, they are the Professor of Latin at Oxford and the Public Orator of Cambridge. It cannot be questioned that they have added

materially to the value of the original. Professor Nettleship's notes on Latin literature, and the important articles by Dr. Sandys on Painting, Engraving, and Vases are alone enough to give an independent value to this edition. But the question can hardly fail to arise whether the original plan was that best fitted for a volume of the size and cost of the present one. There is a demand for an authoritative work of reference, in which questions may be treated with some fulness, and which may serve as a guide to the original authorities and to the best modern treatises. There is also a demand for a cheap abridgement, which may be put into the hands of every fifth or sixth form schoolboy, and in which he may find information enough for his immediate needs. But it is hard to see what class of students is served by a guinea volume, in which most of the articles are of necessity somewhat slight, and where there is not a reference to an ancient or modern authority, except such as have been, only too sparingly, though much more fully in the latter half of the book, introduced by the editors. It seems probable that the utility of the book will rather lie in the service which it may

do to those who are not professed students, but who may be attracted by the numerous and excellent illustrations, and may be glad to have on their shelves a book of reference which they can trust so far as it goes. Indeed the extreme care taken to mark quantities throughout, and to give the Latin form of every Greek word seems to indicate that this is the class especially kept in view.

An instance of a thoroughly unsatisfactory result due to the 'popular' character of the articles is furnished by the treatment of *Caprotina*. 'After their defeat by the Greeks, the Romans were conquered and put to flight by a sudden attack of their neighbours, and the enemies demanded the surrender of all the girls and married women. Thereupon at the suggestion of a girl called Tutilla (or Philötis), the female slaves disguised as Roman ladies went into the enemy's camp, contrived to make the enemy drunk, and then, climbing into a wild fig-tree, gave the signal for the Romans to attack by holding up a torch.' 'Greeks' is here only a curious slip for 'Gauls': but if the story was worth telling at all, it was surely worth while saying who the enemies were, that Varro (vi. 18) tacitly discards the story, that Plutarch (*Rom. c.* 29) represents the Latins as asking for marriage alliances with virgins and widows (the latter being omitted: *Camill.* 33), and that the absurd *matres familias* comes only from Macrobi. i. 11, 37. Cp. Niebuhr *Hist.* ii. 573. It is needless to say that no authority represents all the slaves as climbing the fig-tree.

Prof. Nettleship might have had the courage to draw his editorial pen through *or Quintus* added to *Gaius* as the praenomen of Catullus. By the way there is a queer statement in the article on names:—'Some [praenomina] were employed only by certain gentes, even by certain families, as for instance *Appius* exclusively by the *Claudii* and *Tiberius* by the line of the *Nerōnes* who belonged to this race; while others were actually prohibited in certain families e.g. *Marcus* in that of the *Manlii*.' *Tiberius Sempronius* is a tolerably familiar combina-

tion; and even when the reader has corrected *Manlii* to *Manli* he will be puzzled to read about *Marcus Manlius* until he gets information from some other quarter as to the date of the prohibition. The irregularity in the use of cognomina surely began before 70 A.D. What of Paullus Fabius Maximus, or Drusus Claudius Nero? It seems more than doubtful whether *andabatae* fought on horseback (cp. Friedländer ii.⁶ 535). Under the head of *Athenaeus* we find the very doubtful statement that he lived at Alexandria from 170-230 A.D. These dates cannot be fixed with any certainty. It might have been noted too that *Larensius* is only the Greek form of *Laurentius*, a much more probable Roman name. There is no article *concilium*, but under the head of *comitia* we read that out of the *concilia plebis* grew the *comitia tributa*, a very misleading and inadequate statement of the case. Mommsen's views as to the *comitia curiata* are entirely ignored.

It is perhaps in the mythological articles that we most feel the lack of references. An attempt is made to narrate the story in the most compressed form, which does not always tend to clearness: but too often it is pieced together out of different authorities without any notice being taken of their discrepancies: cp. e.g. the narrative of the relations of Atreus and Thyestes, or the story of Catreus.

It is not quite clear what the editors mean by saying that they follow Marquardt in reckoning 1000 sesterces as equivalent to £10. He gives the value of 1000 sesterces at 175 marks, i.e. not far from £8 10s.: their estimate has further the disadvantage of making too marked a difference between the drachma, which they take at 8d., and the *denarius*, which they thus bring out at 9¾d. At the same time on p. 148 b the value of the *denarius* is given at about 7½d. This will surely be very confusing to students.

The printing is remarkably correct: *Sûrdis*, and *Bibliotheca* are the only errors that I have noticed: 'the *contiones*' on p. 162 b is perhaps a misprint for 'four.'

A. S. WILKINS.

Decii Juvenalis Saturae erklärt, von ANDREAS WEIDNER. Zweite und umgearbeitete Auflage. Leipzig. 1889.

HERR WEIDNER's second edition has in the main the same excellences and defects as the first, but as the former have certainly been considerably increased,

and the latter sensibly diminished, we may welcome the new edition as a distinct gain. The introduction, now consisting of xxxii. pages, has been to a great extent rewritten, and is divided into two parts: (1) dealing with Juvenal's life and authorship; (2) containing some information with regard to the sources of the text. The first part is to some extent