

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](#)



Summaries of Periodicals

F. Haverfield

The Classical Review / Volume 2 / Issue 05 / May 1888, pp 157 - 159
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00192637, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00192637

How to cite this article:

F. Haverfield (1888). Summaries of Periodicals. The Classical Review, 2, pp 157-159
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00192637

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

their character, and it is most probable that the later Paphians have very generally cleared out the great early tombs and used them again. One Cypriote inscription of five characters, and two more on the wall of an entrance-passage were found among them. The Cyprus Government has not yet sanctioned excavations at Poli, and indeed the season is too far advanced for any to be undertaken now, and therefore unless an unrifled necropolis is found here—which is not probable—the portable spoil will not be very great this year.

The end of this season will probably see the great temple fairly cleared out, if funds are forthcoming sufficient for the purchase of such other houses in the village as still encumber the site: but it is always possible that new developments may appear on the northern or village side, and that the two months and a half during which we can still work, may be sufficient to complete the undertaking.

D. G. HOGARTH.

KUKLIA, PAPHO, CYPRUS,
March 8, 1888.

ANTIQUITIES AT ANTWERP.—The little Museum of Antiquities fitted up in the Steen or old Castle of Antwerp consists principally of objects belonging to the Middle Ages or to a later period, but contains a few Greek and Roman antiquities, of which a description may be found in the *Catalogue du Musée d'Antiquités* (Anvers, 1885, 3rd ed.), industriously prepared by M. P. Génard. The Museum also possesses a small collection of Egyptian antiquities, of which a separate catalogue, also by M. Génard, has been published (Anvers, 1881). Among these is a marble relief (length 0.51, ht. 0.37) from Alexandria ('Colonne de Pompée'), belonging to the well-known 'banqueting' class, but inadequately described in the catalogue (p. 28, no. 150) as 'Bas-relief représentant une scène de famille.' I give the following description from a note made by me during a recent visit to the Museum:—Beardless male figure, wearing himation over lower limbs, and with head bare, reclining on a couch, facing. In his right hand he holds a cornucopiae, in his left a bowl, resting on a cushion, from which a serpent rising up beside him is feeding. At the end of the couch a youthful female figure, wearing chiton and peplos, is seated, facing. On the left side of the Relief stands a youthful

male attendant, wearing short chiton, and holding in right, simpulum: near his right hand, krater on stand. Before the couch, a table with food. In the upper left-hand corner of the Relief, horse's head, in panel, looking right. The Relief, which is of tolerable workmanship, is uninscribed.

WARWICK WROTH.

The Numismatic Chronicle, third series, vol. vii. (1887), part iii.

Percy Gardner, 'New Greek Coins of Bactria and India.' Rare and interesting specimens lately acquired by the British Museum, the most important of which is a large silver coin (a decadrachm) found at Khullum in Bokhara: *Obverse*, Greek horseman charging with his lance a retreating elephant on the back of which are two warriors resisting the attack. *Reverse*, a king (Alexander the Great?) wearing a cuirass and holding thunderbolt and spear. The writer considers that this coin was struck 'on the occasion of some notable victory won by a Greek king of Bactria [possibly Eucratides or Heliocles] over the invading hordes of Yueh-chi in the second century B.C.'—Percy Gardner, 'The Exchange-value of Cyzicene Staters.' The writer examines Demosthenes, *Phormio*, p. 914; Xenophon, *Anab.* v. 6, 23; vii. 3, 10; cf. *Anab.* i. 3, 21, and i. 5, 6, and gives the results of accurate weighings of several Cyzicene coins. The conclusion arrived at is that the Cyzicene electrum stater was of the same value as the Daric.—Arthur J. Evans, 'On a Coin of a Second Carausius, Caesar in Britain in the Fifth Century.' On a rude bronze Roman coin bearing the inscription 'Domino Carausio Ces.' This coin must have been struck much later than the time of the well-known Carausius (A.D. 287–293) and may have been coined at the beginning of the fifth century by another British ruler named Carausius, hitherto unknown. Reviews: Head's *Historia Numorum*, by Prof. J. H. Middleton.

W. WROTH.

[The above was accidentally omitted in the March number.]

Annuaire de la Société française de Numismatique, 1888, Jan.—Feb.

A. Oreschnikow, 'The Chronology of the coins of Asander.' The dates proposed are: Asander, Archon of Bosphorus in B.C. 44; King in B.C. 41; Death of Asander, B.C. 16—15.

W. W.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

Athenaeum: 31 March, 1888; Review of Godet's 'Corinthians' (transl.), and of Bishop Ellicott's; Mr. Walker in a note maintains the connexion of *haurpt* and *caput* for 'Indo-Germanic *ā* and probably *ǝ* before *p*, *b* and *f* are represented by Germanic *au* in open syllables.—7 April; Review of Archer Hind's 'Timaeus,' and of Gomme's 'Romano-British Remains.'

Academy: 31 March; Review by T. Hodgkin of Bradley's 'Goths.'—7 April; the correspondence on the *Cod. Amiatinus* is renewed by P. Corssen, and on 14 April by Martin Rule.

American Journal of Philology. No. 32, Dec. 1887.

Robinson Ellis, *Further notes on the poems of the Appendix Vergiliana*: one excellent emendation may be noticed, for 'quae lacerant avidas inimico pectore

mentes' (*Chil.* 60) read 'q. l. a. nimia cuppedine mentes.'—B. Perrin, *The Odyssey under Historical source-criticism*, points out how Kirchhoff's theory has been developed by Wilamowitz-Möllendorf and Seck.—R. C. Seaton, *Symplegades and Planctae*, endeavours to prove that they are distinct in Homer, and were not identified till a comparatively late period.—Karl Brugmann, *Der Ursprung der lateinischen Gerundia und Gerundiva*. *Amandus* is for *ama-tu-us* (as *pando* for *patno*) with a suffix appearing in the related languages, *faci-e-ndus* is modelled on the present participle, *faci-undus* is to *faci-endus* as *euntis* to *iens*.—H. W. Smyth, *On poetical words in Cyprian prose*, quotes Homeric forms and words which occur in Cyprian inscriptions.—W. Everitt proposes to read 'aedonis' for 'idoneus' in Catull. 29, 8.—H. W. Smyth gives an appreciative review of Jebb's Introduction to Homer.

Hermes, vol. xxii. part 4 contains :

1. G. Kaibel, *Sententiarum Liber Quartus*, in which among others the following are the most notable conjectures: (α) Aristoph. *Thesmoph.* 162, *χλιδαῖς θ' ὄσοιπερ ἁρμονίαν ἐχόμεσαν*: (β) he rejects 498 and alters 499 to *ἀλλ' ὡς γυνή, κ.τ.λ.*: (γ) he also rejects 32: (δ) Thuc. viii. 67 for *ἐξεῖναι μὲν Ἀθηναίων ἀνατρέπειν* (or *ἀνειπεῖν*) *γνώμην*, he reads *ἐξεῖναι μὲν* (*Ἀθην.*) *ἀνατὶ εἰπεῖν γνώμην*: (ε) Archestratus apud Athen. (vii. 101 f.) for *ἐρπετόν εἰς ὕδατος στεφάνους*, he suggests *Περσεφόνης ἕδος εὐστεφάνου*.

2. J. Rasson, *Zur Hekabe des Euripides*. He finds evidence of interpolation in the play: (α) 92-97 are inconsistent with 40, 305 and 390, and 262-266 are probably spurious: (β) 119, 120, 135, 267-8, also point to a different version of Achilles' demand for a victim: (γ) 216 and 217 are probably not spoken by the Chorus but by Polyxena: (δ) nor can 141-143 be genuine. To establish this he shows by reference to other plays that the Chorus in the Parados only refers to what has been stated in the prologue, and never introduces any fresh action: (ε) this leads to the further conclusion that 104-143 are all interpolated and also 187-246, and 267-270. Rasson then reconstructs what he believes to have been the course of the play up to the entrance of Odysseus at line 218: (ζ) the Chorus *ἀβρα ποτιὰς ἀβρα κ.τ.λ.* is inconsistent with 98-103, where the Trojan women are already allotted to their masters, and is probably an interpolation, formed on the Chorus in the *Troades* 197-233.

3. M. Rothstein, *In libellum de Sublimitate conjectanea critica* consists partly in defence of the original readings against conjectures of critics: partly in defending certain conjectures of his own.

4. Th. Mommsen, *Die römischen Provinzialmilizen*. An appendix to *Die Conscriptionsordnung* in vol. xix. After mentioning an important inscription lately found at Saintes, probably of the Augustan period, to an *evocato gaesatorum DC Raetorum castello Ircavio*, Mommsen collects the passages relating to those troops which belong neither to the legions nor auxiliaries. Of these the most important are *C.I.L.* x. 6089: Hygin. c. 29: *C.I.L.* iii. 1396: Tac. *Hist.* i. 67: *C.I.L.* v. 536: Tac. *Hist.* ii. 12: *C.I.L.* ix. 3044: Tac. *Hist.* i. 68: *C.I.L.* viii. 2728: *C.I.L.* vii. 1002: Tac. *Hist.* iii. 5: *Ann.* xii. 49: Arrian. c. 7: *C.I.L.* v. 5267: Henz. 6729: *C.I.L.* iii. 803: *C.I.L.* viii. 9045. The provincial militia were clearly a distinct branch of the service, *τὸ συμμαχικόν* (Arrian): *symmacharii* (Hyginus): *auxilia provincialium* (Tacitus): *τὸ στρατιωτικόν τῆς ἐπαρχείας* (Inscrip. at Tomi). It appears (1) that senatorial provinces had no militia: (2) nor the most civilized of the imperial: (3) frontier considerations decide their presence or absence: e.g. Helvetii, Palmyreni: (4) they appear chiefly in procuratorial provinces taken over from client-kings: e.g. Raetia, Noricum, Alpine provinces: (5) and in recently conquered provinces like Britain and Dacia. They were not imperial troops: were paid by the communities themselves, and ranked below not only legionaries and auxiliaries but even *classarii*: they were usually commanded by *praepositi* not of equestrian rank. They were employed locally in their own districts, though after Hadrian sometimes at a distance, and as part of the imperial forces, but while nationality disappeared in the other forces, it still marked these militia-*numeri*. They are not to be confounded (1) with purely municipal troops mentioned in *lex coloniae Genetivae*, (2) with police or *gens d'armes*.

5. R. Schöll, *Polykrite*. A funeral stele was found at Athens in 1870 with a male and female figure

inscribed Lysimachos and Polykrite. These are identified with the grandson and granddaughter of Aristides. Plutarch mentions a decree (*Arist.* 27) granting public assistance to Polykrite in memory of Aristides. This is illustrated from a decree of the Epigoni period in which similar reward was granted to a Timosthenes on account of the merits of his grandfather, and the decree given in full may be taken as an example for all similar cases.

6. E. Maas, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Griech. Prosa*. An attempt to prove (1) that the *περὶ φησῶν* of Hippokrates contains imitations from the *ἐγκόμιον Ἐλένης* of Gorgias: (2) that the *Παλαμήδους ἀπολογία* of Gorgias is authentic: (3) that the two speeches of Gorgias are the earliest specimens of Attic prose: (4) that the discussion on democracy (*Hdt.* iii. 80-82) was taken from the sophistical *τόποι*, and was not the invention of Herodotus: (5) that Isokrates in his third Oration, § 29, draws from the same *τόποι*, adding some points omitted by Herodotus: (6) that these *τόποι* were probably contained in the *καταβάλλοντες λόγοι* of Protagoras.

7. Th. Mommsen, *Zahl- und Bruchzeichen*. Numeral signs, the starting-point of all word-abbreviations in Latin, are generally used in business or official statements and citations from books, and after Actium in the titles of magistrates. The signs for the small unit (-), the large unit (I), five (V), and ten (X) were earlier than the introduction of the Greek alphabet. The signs for 50 (\downarrow ↓. I. L.), 100 (probably Θ), 1000 (⊕), were the Greek aspirates χ, θ, and φ. From these the Romans got D (500), ⊕ (10,000), ⊕ (100,000), &c. The assimilation of numeral signs to the letters I, V, X, L, C, D was later. M, however, was never a sign for 1,000, though sometimes an abbreviation for *mille*. So \bar{X} = 10,000: \bar{V} = 5,000: \bar{X} = 1,000,000: \bar{D} = 500,000 (see *lex Rubria*), but for 100 million and upwards use was still made of ⊕ and its multiples. Some confusion was caused after Augustus by the custom of distinguishing numerals from letters by a horizontal line over them: thus \bar{III} sometimes = 3; sometimes = 3,000. When several signs were placed together, they were added or subtracted, according as the higher or lower number came first; e.g. IIL = 48: CCCX↓ = 340, &c. The original signs for fractions were - (the small unit = $\frac{1}{2}$), S (semis = $\frac{1}{2}$), and Z (semuncia = $\frac{1}{16}$). The use of the precious metals made further subdivision necessary; and the small unit (uncia) was divided into twenty-four parts. Thus Θ (scripulum) = $\frac{1}{24}$ of uncia = $\frac{1}{48}$ of as: ♪ (sicilicus) = $\frac{1}{48}$ of uncia = $\frac{1}{96}$ of as: 2 (sextula) = $\frac{1}{48}$ of uncia = $\frac{1}{96}$ of as: ♪ (dimidia sextula) = $\frac{1}{96}$ of uncia = $\frac{1}{192}$ of as. By combination of these signs uncia could be broken up as far as $\frac{1}{288}$; though ♪, ♪, and ♪ were seldom used, being generally reduced to scruples; the scruple being often used as an exponent with the number prefixed: e.g. PXS—ΣΘV = 11 lbs. 9½ oz. 5 scr. For weights this system was universal; it could also be used for the as, both heavy and reduced, and also for the silver currency, the denarius being the unit. Of this the quinarius is semis, and the sesterce quadrans, while the as would be ♪ i.e. $\frac{1}{4}$ + $\frac{1}{8}$ = $\frac{3}{8}$. On the introduction of the Greek silver coin, the nummus, the decimal division into libellae was introduced with it, and accordingly S = $\frac{1}{10}$ - (libella) = $\frac{1}{10}$: Z (sembella) = $\frac{1}{20}$: T (terruncius) = $\frac{1}{40}$. This decimal system was also applied to the oldest

copper coinage (1) with the sestertius or nummus of $2\frac{1}{2}$ asses as unit—ratio sestertiaria—when the dupondius = $\frac{1}{2}$ = $\underline{\text{S}} \text{ —}$: the as = $\frac{1}{4}$ = — — : the semis = $\frac{1}{2}$ = — — : the quadrans = $\frac{1}{4}$ = — — ; or (2) with the denarius as unit—ratio denariaria—when the quinarius = $\frac{1}{2}$ = $\underline{\text{S}}$: the sestertius = $\frac{1}{4}$ = — S : the as = $\frac{1}{16}$ = — , and the quadrans = $\frac{1}{16}$ = T. The exponent for sesterties was N, or H $\underline{\text{S}}$ N, for denarii ✕. The whole article is most interesting and important.

8. Chr. Hülsen, *Das Pomerium Roms in der Kaiserzeit*. A discussion on the Pomerium as extended by Claudius, Vespasian, and Hadrian, based on an examination of the boundary cippi in *C.I.L.* vi. 1231-33. Two plans are added.

9. B. Kübler, *Zum Julius Valerius de rebus gestis Alexandri*. Kübler has collated the two MSS. Ambrosianus P. sup. 49 and Parisinus 4880, and offers some corrections of the two editions by Mai (1817) and E. Müller in the appendix to Dübner's Arrian (1846). The work is chiefly interesting on account of its peculiar Latinity.

Miscellen: (a) U. Wilcken, *Die Chalkus-siglen in der griechischen Cursive*. Correcting Wessely, who makes χ and $\dot{\chi}$ both stand for 1 chalk., although a Vienna papyrus shows that $\dot{\chi} + \dot{\chi} = 4$ chalk., Wilcken proves that 1 ch. = χ : 2 ch. = $\overset{\beta}{\chi}$ or $\dot{\chi}$ (β being the cursive form of β) : 3 ch. = $\overset{\gamma}{\chi}$: 4 ch. = δ , i.e. half an obol : 5 ch. = $\delta\chi$, &c. (b) G. Knaack, *Zur Phaethonsage*, argues that Lucretius v. 400, 'scilicet ut veteres Graium cecinere poetae,' does not refer to Hesiod and Euripides, but to an unknown Alexandrian poet who seems to have first introduced the idea of a universal $\epsilon\kappa\pi\acute{\iota}\rho\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma$. (c) Bruno Keil, *Der Marcianus 415 des Isokrates* (E). (d) P. Stengel, $\theta\upsilon\sigma\iota\alpha\iota \delta\sigma\pi\omicron\nu\delta\omicron\upsilon$. A schol. to Soph. *Oed. Kol.* 100, speaks of them as $\kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha} \tau\acute{\upsilon}\chi\eta\nu \epsilon\iota\varsigma \epsilon\theta\omicron\varsigma \pi\rho\omicron\epsilon\lambda\theta\omicron\upsilon\sigma\alpha\iota$. Stengel identifies them with purificatory sacrifices, which require blood of victim, and are not ordinary but extraordinary ($\kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha} \tau\acute{\upsilon}\chi\eta\nu$ not $\kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha} \nu\omicron\mu\omicron\nu$). (e) S. Fraenkel, *Mariades—Cyriades* (Momms. *Rom. Gesch.* v. 431, n. 1), two forms of the same name. The Semitic Mâr = lord = $\kappa\acute{\iota}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$. (f) F. Burger, *Stichometrisches zu Demosthenes*. (g) J. S. van Veen, *Gelliana*.

Archiv für Lateinische Lexicographie v. 1. *Kleidung und Wohnung im Sprichwort* (A. OTTO). Continuation of this useful series of papers. As in some previous articles in the series, a few details are open to criticism.

[P. 1. More parallels to Juv. x. 22, are given by Mr. Mayor. P. 2. Cic. *de Orat.* 2.265 *tanquam nudus nucez legeret* is left unexplained. Is it possible that the reference is to some conjurer's tricks? P. 3. Juvenal's *facinus maioris abollae* (iii. 115) is explained as *sceleris potioris* (schol.). But it is probable from the supplementary note in Mr. Mayor's fourth edition that *maior abolla* is the philosopher's great cloak, *duplex pannus* in Hor. *Epist.* i. 17.25. This resembles the older interpretation, also given by the scholia and adopted *Archiv* v. 118, by Wölfflin, *quasi sanctoris philosophi*, except that *maioris* is taken differently. P. 6. *Caligaius* in Juv. iii. 322, does not mean 'schnell,' but 'as a soldier,' i.e. I will serve in your ranks (Mayor on xvi. 24). Turnebus *Advers.*

181, explains *audax miles*. P. 7. The slang *tondere* 'cheat' is not derived, as Dr. Otto strangely imagines, from 'the difficulty of shaving a man well.' The metaphor of our English 'fleece' is obvious enough. P. 12. Plaut. *Miles* 1140 *figam patum in parietem* is no proverb, but a development of *architectus* used just before.]—*Die Partikel ecce* (Albr. Köhler). Almost a lexicographical article, discussing *ecce, eccum* &c., *ecce* with acc. (commonest in early and late Latin), *ecce* with *autem, tibi, quam*, &c. '*Satur*' und die davon abgeleiteten Wörter (A. Funck). An interesting paper. 'The derivation of *satur* is uncertain, the meaning *cibo plenus*; it is common till ecclesiastical Latin, when its odd form makes it vanish. *Saturitas* is the "seltnerer, sinnlicherer Ausdruck für satietas." The common explanation of *lanx satura* is uncertain: *satūra* can only be proved to mean a "reichhaltiges Gemenge mannigfacher Dinge." Of the literary *satūra* Nettleship's theory is probably right.' *Laus alicuius* (Havet) Cic. *Verr.* 5.3, has subjective genitive *laudem populi Rom.* as Quint. xii. 10, 72. *Interemo* und zugehöriges (W. Schmitz) cf. *Archiv* iv. 315. *Litteratura* (E. W.) means (a) $\gamma\rho\alpha\mu\mu\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\eta$ 'instruction in reading and writing' (so Vitruv. 132, 24 R), literary education, &c.; (b) 'literature,' first in Vitruv. 133, 28 R, then in Tertullian and the Fathers = heathen literature as opposed to *scriptura*, the Bible. *Substantiva personalia auf -o-onis* (H. Fisch). A list with comments. 'The words were numerous but vulgar or colloquial and avoided by Cicero, &c. Their sense is usually depreciatory.'

[Two or three notes may be made on this valuable paper. *Babylo* is not for *babylonius* in Ter. *Adelph.* 915, but a bold adaptation of the name of the city. To *bibo* should be added *bibio*, which I have found in the Balliol Glossary, *bibiones sunt qui in vino nascuntur, quos vulgo mustiones appellant*. *Blato* is quoted from Gloss. Steph. p. 31. It occurs in no other glossary that I can find, and is probably an error for *blatero*. *Historie* is not a real word, but invented to explain Isidore's derivation of *histrio*. *Humilio* is perhaps from *homo*, rather than from *humilis*. *Mustio* is a well-attested word: it is given by Isidore and in some glossaries. *Partio* cannot be proved out of *apparitio*. The latter in Cic. *Q. Fr.* ii. 4, is an abstract used as a concrete, and not properly a 'personal substantive in -o.' The names of animals in -o may be increased by *cabo*: see M. Warren's Saint Gall glossary, c. 7, *cabo* : *cavallus* (i. e. *caballus*). Dr. Fisch has overlooked a curious gloss *bulones* : *ipsi sunt cetarii qui diversa genera piscium vendunt* (Bodl. Gl.; Mai. vi. 512, &c.), though the word is perhaps not correctly given.] Lexicographical articles by H. Ploen and E. Wölfflin on forty words, from *abolefacio* to *abrenantio*, with special 'Erläuterungen' to *aborior* and *aboleo*. *Quaranta* (E. W.) and *ambagio* (H. Nettleship). *Abietalis* (E. W.). Occurs Sen. *Aen.* xi. 667. *Vulgärlateinische Substrate* (G. Gröber). Words beginning with Q. R. *Miscellen*: the most noticeable are 'on the domestic cat and meaning of *cattus*' (Sittl.), explanation of *totiens quinquiens*, &c., as 'going 5 &c times' (Stowasser), *animabilis, pulsus* (Hauler), *per omnia* (E. W.). *Litteratur*, Merquet's new lexicon to Cicero is noticed favourably. The 'Sprechsaal' contains 'questions' 201-280, answers returnable by March, 1889. The continuation of the *Archiv* is, therefore, fairly certain.

F. HAVERFIELD.