

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](#)



The Scansion of Bacchylides XVII

C. A. M. Fennell

The Classical Review / Volume 13 / Issue 03 / April 1899, pp 182 - 183
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00042839, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00042839

How to cite this article:

C. A. M. Fennell (1899). The Classical Review, 13, pp 182-183 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00042839

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

in a work of this size; but room might have been found for such information in the six-and-a-half pages devoted to this subject.

The discussion of Ptolemy's geographical treatise is lacking in one respect, that it does not consider the value of the work for 'descriptive and political' geography.¹ Is its value equal for all countries and provinces alike? Did Ptolemy probably use different authorities of different dates (as Pliny did, p. 264), and make serious errors in trying to combine their accounts? Its value is in reality very different for different parts, and the second question should apparently be answered in the affirmative. After all, this side of Ptolemy's work is the

most important for the student of ancient life. We await with great expectation the publication of Ptolemy's Maps, recently discovered by Prof. Jelić. If the report communicated to the *Classical Review* for February be correct, the discovery may necessitate some alteration of current views about Eratosthenes and Ptolemy.

These criticisms are made in the hope that they may be considered in view of a second edition, not from any wish to detract from the general merits of the volume, which (as we have already said) is both very useful and very readable, and well worth perusal by any one who wishes to gain a connected view of the progress of geographical knowledge in ancient times.

J. G. C. ANDERSON.

¹ The account of the coast of Britain is examined, but there the majority of the localities mentioned are merely the mouths or estuaries of rivers (p. 348).

THE SCANSION OF BACCHYLIDES XVII.

STROPHE.

PAEONIC.

- I. (1) ∪ : ∪ ∪ ∪ | _ _ _ | _ ∪ _ ||
 (2) _ ∪ ∪ ∪ | _ ∪ _ | _ ∪ _ | _ _ ∪ | _ _ _ ||
 (3) _ ∪ _ | _ ∪ ∪ ∪ | _ ^ ||
 (4) _ _ | ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ | _ ∪ ∪ ∪ | _ ∪ _ | _ ∪ ∪ > ||
 II. (5) ∪ : _ ∪ _ | ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ | ∪ ∪ _ > |
 (6) > ∪ : _ ∪ _ | _ ∪ ∪ ∪ | _ ∪ _ | _ ∪ _ ||
 (7) _ ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ | _ _ | _ ∪ ∪ ∪ | _ ∪ _ > ||
 (8) ∪ : _ ∪ _ | _ _ _ ||
 (9) ∪ : _ _ _ | _ _ _ ||
 (10) ∪ : _ ∪ ∪ ∪ | _ ∪ _ ||
 (11) > ∪ : _ ∪ _ | _ _ _ ||
 (12) _ ∪ ∪ ∪ | _ ∪ _ | _ ∪ _ ∪ | _ ∪ _ ||
 (13) > ∪ : _ ∪ _ | _ ∪ _ | _ ∪ _ | _ ∪ ∪ ∪ | _ ∪ _ > ||
 (14) > ∪ : _ ∪ ∪ _ | _ ∪ | _ ∪ | _ ^ ||
 (15) > ∪ : _ ∪ _ | ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ | _ ∪ _ | _ ∪ _ ||
 ∪ : ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ |
 (16) _ ∪ _ | ∪ ∪ ∪ ∪ | _ _ _ | _ ^ ||

Period I. 3.5.3.5 = 16. Palinodic.

Period II. 3.4.5.2.2.2.2.4.5.3.4.4 = 40. Antithetic with epode. Distinguished by anacrusis except vv. 7, 12, 16 which end the three sections of the period.

EPODE.

PAEONI

- I. (1) $\cup : _ \cup \cup \cup | _ \cup _ | _ \cup _ \cup | _ \cup _ ||$
 (2) $_ \cup \cup \cup | _ \cup _ | _ \cup ||$
 (3) $_ \cup \cup | _ \cup _ | _ \cup \cup ||$
 (4) $\cup : _ \cup \cup \cup | _ \cup _ ||$ or $\cup : _ \cup | _ \cup _ \cup _ | _ \wedge$
 (5) $_ \cup _ | _ \cup \cup \cup | _ \cup _ ||$
 (6) $_ \cup \cup \cup | _ \cup _ | _ \cup _ > ||$
 (7) $_ | _ \cup _ | _ \cup _ | _ \cup > "$
 (8) $_ \cup _ | _ \cup _ | _ \wedge |||$
- II. (9) $\cup : _ \cup \cup \cup | _ \cup _ | _ \cup _ | _ \cup ||$
 (10) $_ \cup _ | _ \cup _ | _ \wedge ||$
 (11) $> : _ \cup \cup \cup | _ \cup _ | _ \wedge ||$
 (12) $\cup : _ \cup _ | _ \cup _ | _ \wedge ||$
 (13) $_ \cup _ | _ \cup _ | _ \cup ||$
 (14) $\cup : _ \cup _ | _ \cup _ | _ > ||$
 (15) $_ \cup _ | _ \cup _ | _ \cup \cup | _ \cup ||$
 (16) $\cup : _ \cup _ | _ \cup _ | _ \cup ||$

Period I. 4. 3. 3. 2 (or 3) 3. 3. 4. 3 = 25 (or 26). Inverted with mesode (anacrusis) and epode.

Period II. 4. 3. 3. 3. 3. 3. 4. 3 = 26. Antithetic with mesode and epode, anacrusis to the mesode and epode and the second verse of the pairs of tripodies.

C. A. M. FENNELL.

NOTES.

HYMN TO THE DIOSKUROI, LL. 15, 16.

15 κύματα δ' ἐστώρεσαν λευκῆς ἁλὸς ἐν πελάγεσσι
 ναύταις σήματα καλὰ πόνου σφίσιν· οἱ δὲ ἰδόντες
 γήθησαν παύσαντο δ' ἐκλυροῖο πόνοιο.

L. 16 cannot be satisfactorily explained, as it stands, by any arrangement of punctuation, and recent critics have generally agreed that σφίσιν is corrupt and have sought to replace it by an accusative such as κρίσιν (Baumeister), σχίσιν (Tyrrell)—to which one might add σχάσιν. Such conjectures, including his own σβέσιν, Mr. Allen (*J.H.S.* xviii. 32) designates as 'evidently useless stopgaps;' but, though none of them has palaeographic likelihood, they all proceed on a probable assumption as to the construction. The error is more deeply seated and extends beyond σφίσιν. I propose to read

σήματα καλὰ πόνων ἀπον-σφίσιν.

The recurrence of the four letters ἀπον led to the accidental omission of the three syllables enclosed in brackets; πονο was inevitably corrected to πόνου; and then ναύταις (unnecessary to the sense) was inserted to complete the metre.

J. B. BURY.

* *

VELLE AS AN AUXILIARY.—Karl Sittl, in his *Lokalen Verschiedenheiten der lateinischen Sprache*, p. 128, cites from Corippus' *Johannis* 6. 89 a description of

captive women; 'miserae modo matribus Afris | iam servire nolunt.' The poem was written about 550 A.D. In the pseudo-Cyprianic *Exhortatio de Paenitentia*, p. 12, ed. Wunderer, the lxx. ἀνδριόμαι in Jeremiah ii. 25 is rendered by *confortabor uolo*, apparently a conflation of *confortabor* with *confortari uolo*. This was written about 400 A.D., and probably in Spain. Cyprian *Ep.* 6. 3 (250 A.D.), speaking of the Jewish *Tres Pueri* in the furnace, has 'addiderunt ... se... non in hoc fidere ut liberari in praesentia uellent, sed illam libertatis et securitatis aeternae gloriam cogitarent' (484. 1 Hartel). It is obvious that their trust must have been in a prospect of liberty, not in the wish for it. The use of *uolle* is in this passage a convenient substitute for a peculiarly awkward future passive of ordinary Latin; and it must have been extended, by a process of analogy, to occasions where such a circumlocution was needless, first in the passive, as in the Spanish instance, and then in the active, as in that from Corippus, where *servire uolunt* is simply equivalent to *servient*. There is no reason to regard this use of *uolle* as peculiarly African; the Wallachian is the only Romance language in which it exists. Further enquiry would no doubt discover more examples.¹

E. W. WATSON.

¹ E.g. Juv. x. 282 'uellet descendere' = 'descensus esset.'—Ed. C.R.