

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](#)



Corrections

A. E. Housman

The Classical Review / Volume 14 / Issue 08 / November 1900, pp 413 - 413

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00083396, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00083396

How to cite this article:

A. E. Housman (1900). Corrections. The Classical Review, 14, pp 413-413 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00083396

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

compare Juvenal I. 75: *probitas laudatur et alget*.

IV. 132.

A great fish has been presented to Domitian, who summons the imperial council to discuss what shall be done with it.

Montanus ait 'testa alta paretur, quae tenui muro spatiosum colligat orbem.'

The expression *spatiosum orbem* has never to my knowledge been interpreted as refer-

ring to anything but the fish. But the whole opinion of Montanus, contained in the above and three following verses, directly concerns only the making of a dish; and as *orbis* is so commonly used of round surfaces such as shields, mirrors, tables, etc., why is it not better to understand by these words the inside area of the dish, which is thus enclosed by the rim (*tenui muro*)?

HARRY LANGFORD WILSON.

*Johns Hopkins University,
Baltimore, Md., U.S.A.*

CORRECTIONS.

I am sorry to find that on p. 367b I have incidentally misrepresented Mr Heinze as neglecting to say who first invented the explanation of Lucr. iii 420 which he adopts. Mr Heinze, on the contrary, says explicitly 'mit Wakefield.'

This is a good opportunity to retract another slander which I have long had on my conscience. In vol. iv of this Review, p. 107a, I accused Mr Tucker of having invented a fable about Opis and Orion. This was sheer ignorance on my part: the story is duly told by Apollodorus bibl. i 4 5.

And further I will withdraw two conjectures in Ovid's metamorphoses which I published in 1890 in the Transactions of the

Cambridge Philological Society, vol. iii pp. 142 and 145, and which have led others into error. At met. i 632 I adopted Mr Riese's objection to '*amara pascitur herba*' and proposed '*amaro...eruo*' (*erui* is corrupted to *herbe* in med. fac. 55). This is wrong: Ovid is imitating the verse of Caluus quoted by Servius at Verg. buc. vi 47, '*herbis pascereis amaris*.' At met. vi 63 I objected to '*ab imbre...percussis solibus*' on the ground that it ought to be '*a solibus percusso imbre*.' But though Juvenal i 54 has '*mare percussum puero*' Lucan ii 155 sq. can still write '*hic, se praecipiti iaculatus pondere, dura | dissiluit percussus humo*.'

A. E. HOUSMAN.

NOTES.

ARISTOTLE, 'Αθ. Πολ. xiii. 2.—εἴτ' ἔδοξεν αὐτοῖς διὰ τὸ στασιάζειν ἄρχοντας ἐλίσθαι δέκα, πέντε μὲν εἰπατριδῶν, τρεῖς δὲ ἀγροίκων, δύο δὲ δημιουργῶν, καὶ οἱ τοὶ τὸν μετὰ Δαμασίαν ἤρξαν ἐνιαυτῶν.

Professor Bury, in his recent *History of Greece* (p. 188) adduces the Berlin fragment of the 'Αθηναίων Πολιτεία as reading [τέτταρ]ας (the preceding word is lost) in place of πέντε, making the total number of archons for the year following the expulsion of Damasias nine instead of ten. In this he follows the authority of Blass, whose note ('Αθ. Πολ. ed. 3, p. 24) runs: 'δέκα, πέντε] sed τέτταρ]ας (Bl., Landwehr, Diels) ut vid. Berol., quod recte, puto, tuetur E. Meyer.' I had an opportunity recently of examining the Berlin fragment, and am strongly of opinion that its reading is the same as that of the London MS. The letter before μὲν seems to me to be certainly Ε, not C, and the preceding letter may well be T. The rest of the word has wholly disappeared.

If the reading were even doubtful, the *a priori* probability would of course be that it is the same in both MSS.; but personally I feel no doubt that the Berlin fragment has [πέν]τε, and if the London MS. had happened to be the first discovered I do not believe that anyone would have read it differently. The point may appear a small one, but, in view of the use made of it by such historians as Meyer and Bury, it is of some importance.

F. G. KENYON.

* * *

TWO OXFORD MSS. OF DIONYSIUS HALICARNAS-
EUS.—(1) In an article in the *Journal of Philology* (1899), I discussed the composition and authorship of a MS. of Dionysius' treatise *De Compositione Verborum*. I have since received from Prof. R. Förster of Breslau a suggestion which is most attractive; that the writer of the marginal notes was Andreas Dudith. Dr. Förster has compared the writing with